

General Assembly must by examination and discussion determine the facts and their significance. Mr Makin brought forward a wealth of detailed evidence showing that freedom of political opinion, of expression, and of the press had been denied with the support of the militia and the People's Courts. These latter bodies did not appear to be independent and impartial tribunals since the "people's Judges" were appointed by, and subject to removal by, the Executive. Irrespective of the facts, the impartiality of the trials was open to serious challenge and it seemed a reasonable assumption that the motive of the trials was not to punish crime but to eliminate religious opposition.

The *United Kingdom* representative (Sir Alexander Cadogan) also deplored the manner in which the trials had been conducted, laying particular stress upon the fact that the cases had been prejudged before the trials took place since, in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty, the Government of Hungary itself published a summary of the so-called evidence for the prosecution and claimed the guilt of the accused. "Thus," said Sir Alexander, "the public and, worse still, the Judge of the Peoples' Court and his party-appointed assessors were warned beforehand of the kind of verdict that was expected."

For the *United States*, Mr Cohen stated that it was inconceivable that civil and religious freedoms could survive in the two countries "if the shabbiest kind of excuse sufficed to liquidate political and religious leaders who refused to accept and support the existing totalitarian regime."

Sir Carl Berendsen (*New Zealand*), referred to the notes which his Government had addressed to the Governments of Hungary and Bulgaria, expressing feelings of grave concern and directing the attention of those Governments to the fact that millions of people all over the world had been dismayed by the actions taken against religious leaders. The New Zealand Government deplored these actions because it considered them to be in violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms the observance of which had been guaranteed in the peace treaties and to which the United Nations had given formal adherence by its recently adopted Declaration of Human Rights.

So far as the question of domestic jurisdiction was concerned the New Zealand representative pointed out the unfortunate lack of clarity of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, but went on to say that while certain questions were undoubtedly the sole concern of sovereign States, others transcended national boundaries and rights. Other parts of the Charter stressed the paramount importance of fundamental human rights, which undoubtedly were a matter of international concern, and all the more so in this case because the relevant articles of the peace treaties guaranteed their observance, and by signing these treaties the two Governments had voluntarily made these fundamental human