

# Hungary 1956-1959 - correspondence, resolutions, General Assembly and Secur...

*HS L 179:84*



Dag Hammarskjöld's saml.

Hungary - 1958

5 June

U. N. Joint Disciplinary Committee Report  
to the Sec. - Gen. (Annex I - V)  
(Case of Mr. Poul Bang-Jensen)

UNITED NATIONS

JOINT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

*dat 5.06.58*

Case of Mr. Povl Bang-Jensen

Case No. 14

Copy No. 1

I - ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The Joint Disciplinary Committee, composed of Mr. A.D. Meurig Evans (Chairman), Mr. Charles L. Coates (Member appointed by the Secretary-General and Mr. Jean-Pierre Martin (Member elected by the Staff, Group III), considered the case of Mr. Povl Bang-Jensen, Senior Officer in the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, at various meetings held from 20 March to 5 June 1958.

Documentation:

2. The Committee had received the following documentation regarding the case, all of which is available in the files:
  - a) Memorandum dated 19 February 1958 from Mr. John McDiarmid, Acting Director of Personnel, to Mr. Bang-Jensen charging him with grave misconduct and allowing him 14 days for answering the charges before the Joint Disciplinary Committee.
  - b) Final report dated 7 February 1958 of the Committee investigating the case of Mr. Bang-Jensen under the Chairmanship of Mr. Ernest Gross.
  - c) Annexes I to V to the report of the Investigating Committee containing the following:

Annex I Letter of appointment of the Investigating Committee.

Annex II Documents concerning the case which were submitted to the Investigating Committee at the outset

Annex III Interim report of the Investigating Committee (20 December 1957)

Annex IV Report of the Investigating Committee concerning the disposition of certain papers connected with the work of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary, retained by Mr. Bang-Jensen (15 January 1958).

Annex V Memoranda, etc. received by the Investigating Committee during the course of its work.

3. During the course of its examination of the case, the Joint Disciplinary Committee requested on 22 April 1958 and obtained from the Administration on 23 April 1958, the following documents which are also available in the files:

i) Transcript of the interview of the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary with the Investigating Committee on Wednesday 18 December 1957.

ii) Extract from document A/AC.88/CR.10 dated 6 August 1957 and entitled: "Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary - List of Communications received by the Secretariat in relation to the Work of the Committee".

4. A list of the letters and memoranda received or dispatched by the Joint Disciplinary Committee after 19 February 1958 will be found in an Annex to this report. The letters and memoranda listed in this Annex are available in the files.

#### Procedures:

5. In response to paragraph 4 of Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum of 19 February 1958, Mr. Bang-Jensen, on 4 March 1958, addressed a request in writing asking for certain rights to be afforded him in the conduct of his case. Mr. McDiarmid replied in detail to these requests on 7 March 1958, and an additional thirty days from 7 March were allowed to Mr. Bang-Jensen in which to deliver in writing his answers to the charges. Mr. Bang-Jensen on 12 March asked for the right to be represented by independent legal counsel. This request was transmitted to the Committee which considered the request in the presence of Mr. Bang-Jensen and Mr. Simon, and submitted a report to the Secretary-General on 20 March 1958. On 3 April, a further stay of "at least one month" was requested on behalf of Mr. Bang-Jensen by Mr. Simon. An additional 14 days was allowed in view of the departure from New York of Mr. Simon, and Mr. Bang-Jensen was asked to submit his written rebuttal by 21 April 1958. On 9 April 1958, Mr. Bang-Jensen addressed a memorandum to Mr. Cordier requesting copies of 87 documents. On 17 April, he informed the Committee that it was physically impossible to complete his rebuttal in time and that he had appealed to the Joint Appeals Board in regard to a decision concerning his request for documents. The Joint Appeals Board, in a report to the Secretary-General (Case No. 84, dated 29 May 1958), concluded that it was "not competent at this stage to consider the present appeal." It stated that "it is for the Joint Disciplinary Committee to examine procedural questions of which it is actually seized and pertaining to a case before it."

6. The case raises initially a question of the functions and structure of the Committee. This Committee has been set up by the Secretary-General as an advisory element in the administration so that he may have available the best possible recommendation on a case, made by members of the staff of varying seniority on their knowledge not only of the facts reported but also of the general conditions of service in the Secretariat. The Committee is required to act with maximum dispatch and make every effort to send its report to the Secretary-General within two weeks of being convened. The Committee is, therefore, not a body expected to follow a set code of legal procedure and is not to be prevented from examining evidence before it by any procedural obstacle or other prohibition which would be appropriate in an adjudicative body. Its proceedings are, as explained by Mr. McDiarmid in his memorandum of 7 March 1958 to Mr. Bang-Jensen, "internal administrative proceedings, not judicial hearings." The position was made clear also in paragraph 4 of the Committee's memorandum of 20 March 1958 to the Secretary-General.

7. Mr. Bang-Jensen, as the Joint Appeals Board observed, "undoubtedly is entitled to due process." The Committee notes that Mr. Bang-Jensen asserts that "due process" is not being observed because:

- (a) relevant documents have not been made available to him
- (b) necessary time to prepare the case has not been allowed him
- (c) The case is being dealt with by the Committee before the facts are presented in a clear, complete, fair and unprejudiced manner, without suppression of essential documents or testimony.

The Committee has considered this assertion with particular reference to Mr. Bang-Jensen's request for documents dated 9 April 1958, in the light of the interpretation of its functions and structure in paragraph 6, of the guiding principles set out in paragraph 9, and of the two major points made in paragraph 10. The Committee would also emphasize that it has on two occasions invited Mr. Bang-Jensen in explicit terms to appear before it and to justify his requests for documents. The Committee would further observe that it cannot be the function of the Committee to question the judgment of the Special Committee on Hungary on matters entrusted to it by the General Assembly or to re-open the handling by that Committee of the various items of evidence and information laid before it. It would clearly be outside the powers and functions of the Committee to undertake what would be tantamount to a full-scale investigation of the operation of the Special Committee on Hungary. For these reasons, much of the documentation requested by Mr. Bang-Jensen seemed to be wholly irrelevant to the Committee's enquiry, particularly as regards the period after December 4, 1957, and the remainder, where it was not already available on record, appeared to be of such a nature as to be unlikely to be of value in assessing the evidence provided by the documents authenticated by Mr. Bang-Jensen's signature.

8. The Committee has, therefore, thought fit, after making all reasonable efforts to obtain further comments and criticisms from Mr. Bang-Jensen on the evidence and the charges brought against him, to consider all the written evidence within reach that it believes relevant to the charges. The Committee, thereafter, proceeded to a recommendation on the basis of the available evidence in the light of its own knowledge and experience of the conditions of service in the United Nations in general and on the United Nations political missions in particular.

9. In considering all the written evidence within reach that it believes relevant to the charges, the Committee has adopted the following two guiding principles:

(i) Only documents believed by the Committee to be relevant to the charges detailed in Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum dated 19 February 1958 to Mr. Bang-Jensen have been considered. Documents not relevant to the charges have been noted but have not been considered.

(ii) No formal "rebuttal" has been presented to the Committee either by Mr. Bang-Jensen himself or by any staff member on his behalf. The Committee has, however, noted the various comments contained in Mr. Bang-Jensen's request dated 9 April 1958 for documents necessary for the preparation of his case before the Committee, particularly in pages 17, 18 and 19. Since there is no formal rebuttal by Mr. Bang-Jensen and since he has been absent from all proceedings of the Committee at which the charges have been considered, special importance has been attached by the Committee to all documents authenticated by the signature of Mr. Bang-Jensen.

10. This method of assembling evidence has a bearing on the following two major points:

(i) As regards the charge numbered (i) (a) (2) in paragraph 17 below and the charge shown under (ii) in paragraph 2 of Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum dated 19 February 1958, the Committee found that no reference to them was contained in any document authenticated by Mr. Bang-Jensen's signature and produced before it. The Committee therefore considered that it would not be proper to proceed to an examination of the evidence relating to these charges in the absence of a clear statement from Mr. Bang-Jensen of his position in the matter. The present report of the Committee, therefore, contains no examination of the evidence in relation to these charges.

(ii) The various comments, suggestions, findings and recommendations contained in the reports of the Investigating Committee established by the Secretary-General on 4 December 1957 under the chairmanship of Mr. Gross have not been regarded as in any way binding on the Committee. Many of the documents produced before the Committee were first produced for the Investigating Committee and bear directly upon the findings of that Committee as contained in its reports to the Secretary-General. The Joint Disciplinary Committee has, however, held itself at liberty to look at each document separately on its own merits and to assess their relevance and validity anew with specific reference to the charges made in Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum dated 19 February 1958.

11. There is one question of considerable gravity to which reference must be made at the outset, so far as the question of the Committee's procedures is concerned.

12. Mr. Bang-Jensen, in his request for documents states that certain documents are "essential as evidence of the irregular and prejudicial handling of the case, and Mr. Gross' malicious villifications of Mr. Bang-Jensen, and repeated insinuations questioning his sanity" (memorandum of 9 April 1958 to Mr. Cordier, page 7.) He later states "Furthermore, the final report also makes a number of prejudicial statements for which there is not the slightest substantiation in the annexes, for instance in paragraph 20 the following completely false assertion, which is leading up to later libelous and defamatory statements in the report, 'On occasion he became physically ill, during interviews'". Mr. Bang-Jensen then states that it is "absolutely indispensable for the proper preparation of Mr. Bang-Jensen's defense that he receives copy of all testimony and other material which is serving as a basis for the vicious vituperative attack of the Gross Committee on Mr. Bang-Jensen's character, integrity, professional competence and sanity of mind". The Committee considered that these statements of Mr. Bang-Jensen, so far as they can be regarded as statements by him intended to give, for the information of the Committee in establishing its procedures, his reply to the question raised in paragraphs 87 and 88 of the report of the Investigating Committee, made it incumbent on the Joint Disciplinary Committee to proceed with the case in a normal manner.

13. Finally, in making its recommendation, the Committee has not taken into account any part of Mr. Bang-Jensen's past record of service as a member of the United Nations Secretariat, believing that such an examination falls outside the terms of reference as set out in Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum of 19 February 1958, and also that such a record has a bearing not on the truth or falsity of the charges, but on the exercise of his discretion by the Secretary-General under the terms of regulation 9.3(a).

## II. EXAMINATION OF CHARGES

14. The general charge brought against Mr. Bang-Jensen in paragraph 2 of Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum of 19 February 1958 is that "... in violation of your obligation as an international civil servant, you have committed grave misconduct...." .

15. This misconduct is particularized under four main heads, the first of which is itself particularized under two sub-heads, each containing numerous items. These particulars will be examined in turn.

### Head (1): sub-head (a)

16. Mr. Bang-Jensen is charged that

"(1) you have repeatedly and persistently made unfounded charges and allegations, orally and in writing, to the Chairman and Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary and to officials of the Secretariat, imputing to members of the Secretariat "sabotage" and "dishonest motives" regarding the work of the Special Committee and tending to injure their reputation for integrity and their professional standing, for example:

(a) -your charges relating to the drafting of the report of the Special Committee which you persisted in making after they had been found groundless by the Chairman and the Rapporteur."

17. This sub-head consists of a series of unnumbered items which, for convenience of reference, are numbered below from (1) to (7):

- (1) ... your charge that "... the Secretary repeatedly has refused to call errors of fact well-known to him to the Rapporteur's attention"
- (2) your charges made to the Rapporteur that the latter had been deliberately misled by the Secretary, and that the Secretary was dishonest
- (3) your charge made to the Secretary that his "instructions to me not to speak to the Rapporteur and the Chairman (about the report), were based on dishonest motives" (Annex II, No. 2C);
- (4) your charge that "... the dozens of serious errors of fact" in the report "have not yet been pointed out to the Rapporteur, except vaguely in a few cases"
- (5) your charge that the "Chairman and the Rapporteur have ... been deceived with regard to the content and accuracy of the Report".

- (6) your charge of "sabotage" by "insertion of erroneous facts in the report" and
- (7) your allegation to the Secretary-General that "... neither Mr. Andersen nor Mr. Shamm has yet been told the true story about the character and extent of the sabotage, which I have brought to your attention, and that they still are deceived in this respect".

18. Items (1), (3), (4), (5) and (6) relate to matters of fact which the Committee found so closely inter-connected that it decided, as the only logical course, to deal with them concurrently. Item (2) was left out of consideration in accordance with paragraph 10(i) above.

19. To determine whether the charges and allegations referred to in the items retained were "unfounded" and whether Mr. Bang-Jensen had "persisted" in making them "after they had been found groundless by the Chairman and the Rapporteur," the Committee drew up a chronology of incidents involved as set out below:

31 May 1957

Mr. Bang-Jensen hands to Mr. Jordan an undated and unsigned memorandum of an accusatory character containing the following allegations:

- "Chapter VII, which is the key chapter of the Report, contains, as I have repeatedly told you, more than forty errors of facts, of which some are very serious; some could easily make the Committee look ridiculous. There are also more than twenty omissions of very essential facts and several contradictions in the text."
- "... I do maintain that as Deputy Secretary, it is my duty to point out errors of fact, and it is your duty to find out whether my statements in this respect are correct by checking the record. This you hitherto have not done."
- "... I also again pointed out to you the responsibility you are taking upon yourself: by refusing to point out errors; ... by refusing, as I know was often the case, to inform the Rapporteur about the errors I have pointed out; by preventing me from speaking to the Rapporteur and to the Chairman; ..."
- "... I could only conclude that this request\*, as your instructions to me not to speak to the Rapporteur and the Chairman, was based on dishonest motives."

\*Mr. Jordan had requested Mr. Bang-Jensen not to attend a certain meeting.

17 June 1957

In a memorandum to the Secretary-General, Mr. Bang-Jensen alleges that:

"...most of the serious errors of fact have not been corrected."

"... dozens of serious errors of fact have not yet been pointed out to the Rapporteur, except vaguely in a few cases."

28 August 1957

In a signed reply to a question put to him by Mr. Bunche, Mr. Bang-Jensen affirms:

"The Chairman and the Rapporteur have in fact, as I had thought I clearly pointed out in my memoranda, been deceived with regard to the content and accuracy of the Report."

20 September 1957

Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum to Mr. Bunche contains the following statements:

"... I will furnish you with specific examples of sabotage ..."

"... I have chosen one example from each of three main categories of sabotage ..."

Under the heading "Insertions of erroneous facts into the Report", Mr. Bang-Jensen gives an account of the drafting of Chapter II to "serve as an illustration of one of the ways" in which this was carried out.

20. From the foregoing it was clear that Mr. Bang-Jensen's "charges and allegations" were made "repeatedly and persistently." It had also to be considered whether they were continued "after they had been found groundless by the Chairman and the Rapporteur."

21. From the abundant evidence on the matter which is to be found in the documents at the Committee's disposal, the following chronology may be established:

Early May 1957

The first draft of Chapter VII is completed (Mr. P. S. Messinesi's memorandum of 31 December 1957). It is systematically subjected to successive checks and re-drafts in which the Rapporteur as well as the Secretariat members, including Mr. Bang-Jensen, were concerned. (Mr. K. C. O. Shann's memorandum of 30 May 1957; Mr. W. M. Jordan's Note of 12 December 1957; and Mr. Messinesi's memorandum of 31 December 1957.)

At the fourth draft, Mr. Bang-Jensen begins to manifest the tendencies which subsequently resulted in the charges now under investigation. In his memorandum of 31 December 1957, Mr. Messinesi, the officer primarily concerned with the drafting of this chapter under the Secretary and the Rapporteur, has described how Mr. Bang-Jensen continued to maintain that the text was marred by serious errors and omissions, even after his views had been considered in detail both by Mr. Messinesi and Mr. Jordan, the Secretary of the Special Committee: Mr. Bang-Jensen, he states, declared "that he would have to speak to the Chairman of the Committee and to the Secretary-General as the Report was being destroyed."

Referring to Mr. Bang-Jensen's behaviour at the same period, Mr. Alsing Andersen, the Chairman of the Special Committee, has stated:

"I said to him, 'It is incredible and you can't make me believe that the responsible persons of the Secretariat who are charged with that work of writing the Report on the basis of existing material, that they should do such a thing'. But he came again, I don't remember, two or three times." (Transcript of the interview of the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary with the Investigating Committee on Wednesday, 18 December 1957.)

28 May 1957

The following extract is from a memorandum dated 30 May 1957 by Mr. K.C.O. Shann, the Special Committee's Rapporteur.

"3. On the 28th of May (1957), Mr. Bang-Jensen insisted on seeing me in the Delegates' area of the United Nations. In a state of some excitement he informed me that Chapter VII of the Report, a chapter incidentally over which a lot of work had been done and on which I had been satisfied some weeks previously, was full of what were described as 'grave errors'. He said there were over forty mistakes of fact in the chapter and that its approval in its present form would bring the Committee into ridicule. ...He claimed, incorrectly, that the Secretary of the Committee had refused to show me his suggestions... Mr. Bang-Jensen is apparently unaware of the extent to which I have participated with the Secretary of the Committee in the drafting of this report through successive stages and the extent to which I have satisfied myself both from my own knowledge of testimony and documentation as to the validity of what has been put before the Committee. So far as Mr. Jordan's refusal to show me Mr. Bang-Jensen's comments is concerned, the fact is that he offered to do so and that after some discussion I told him that I was satisfied with Chapter VII and that if he and the other officers responsible were satisfied that Mr. Bang-Jensen's re-drafting was not an improvement on our own draft then I did not wish to see it."

30 May 1957

Mr. Andersen has stated:

"....I had talked a long talk one night with Mr. Bang-Jensen and I said, 'Well, now, tell me now, give me some facts on which you base your accusations'. And he did so. He had a list and I took notes and so on. And the next day we had that meeting I mentioned." (Transcript of the interview of the Chairman of the Special Committee with the Investigating Committee.)

31 May 1957

A meeting is held at the Chairman's request to examine Mr. Bang-Jensen's "accusations". It is attended by Mr. Andersen, Mr. Shann, Mr. Jordan and Mr. Messinesi.

According to Mr. Jordan:

"Certain quotations were lengthened at the Chairman's desire, but it was agreed that there was no reason to proceed with further changes." (Note by Mr. Jordan dated 12 December 1957.)

According to Mr. Messinesi:

"Mr. Jordan asked me to reply to a questionnaire submitted by Mr. Andersen. Within a matter of an hour or so, Mr. Andersen had accepted my explanations and no changes were made to the draft except one which was later eliminated by a vote of the Committee on the ground that evidence was insufficient to support the change." (Memorandum from Mr. Messinesi to Mr. C. Stavropoulos dated 31 December 1957.)

According to Mr. Andersen:

"I received satisfactory answers to each point I raised." (Transcript of the interview with the Investigating Committee.)

22. In regard to the text of Chapter VII, therefore, it is clear that, by 31st May 1957 at the very latest, Mr. Bang-Jensen's allegations had been very thoroughly investigated and that both the Chairman and Rapporteur were satisfied they were groundless.

23. Mr. Bang-Jensen's allegations of errors and omissions in the drafting of the Report of the Special Committee have borne principally, though not exclusively, on the text of Chapter VII. He described it, it is important to note, as the "key chapter" and, in consequence, has been at particular pains to draw attention to his views concerning it. His memorandum of 31 May 1957 to Mr. Jordan, for example, was devoted to the matter almost in its entirety. It is reasonable to assume that, if there were any substance in his allegations, he would have been able to demonstrate the fact in this connexion.

24. The Committee took the view that, by his signal failure to meet this test, Mr. Bang-Jensen largely forfeited any claim he might have had to consideration for his other allegations concerning the drafting of the Special Committee's Report. It, nevertheless, decided to examine his charge concerning Chapter II (see Head (i) (a) (6)) because he himself singled it out as one of three "specific examples of sabotage" which he furnished to Dr. Bunche in his memorandum of 20 September 1957, (see last entry in chronology in paragraph 19).

25. The Committee noted, for example, the following introductory passage from the section of Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum to Mr. Bunche of 20 September 1957 headed "2. Insertion of Erroneous Facts into the Report":

"My long memorandum of 31 May to Mr. Jordan, which is in the possession of Mr. Hammarskjold, will give a general idea about the various ways this was carried out. The following, regarding Chapter II, might serve as an illustration of one of the ways:"

In other words, Mr. Bang-Jensen's allegations regarding Chapter II were put forward in illustration of the very allegations which had been rejected by the Chairman and Rapporteur over three months before, as is shown in paragraph 21 above.

26. The allegations concerning Chapter II itself may be summarized as follows: Mr. Jordan, the Secretary of the Special Committee, allowed less time for the drafting of Chapter II than Mr. Bang-Jensen thought proper; he entrusted the work to an officer whom Mr. Bang-Jensen (his subordinate) considered unsuitable for the assignment; he refused to allow that officer to be given a copy of a list of errors dictated by Mr. Bang-Jensen; he declined to make a statement to the Special Committee at Mr. Bang-Jensen's request.

27. All these matters were within Mr. Jordan's personal responsibility as Secretary of the Special Committee and in that capacity he was bound to concentrate his attention on the efficient completion of the work by the required date. The Committee found no evidence that the draft was the subject of complaint in the Special Committee and it is common knowledge that Chapter II was no less favourably received than the remainder of the Special Committee's Report. The allegation of "sabotage" in connexion with its preparation was, in the Committee's view, groundless.

28. Having thus examined items (1), (3), (4), (5) and (6), the Committee decided to consider item (7) under Head (i) sub-head (b) (see paragraph 41 below).

Head (i): sub-head (b):

29. The charge that:

"(i) you have repeatedly and persistently made unfounded charges and allegations, orally and in writing, to the Chairman and Rapporteur of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary and to officials of the Secretariat "sabotage" and "dishonest motives" regarding the work of the Special Committee and tending to injure their reputation for integrity and their professional standing...."

is further exemplified as follows:

"(b) your charge relating to the handling of witnesses and evidence before the Special Committee...."

This sub-head consists of a series of unnumbered items which are numbered below from item (8) to item (11).

(8)... your charge that "... on account of sabotage the identity of the majority of the witnesses in Vienna became known to a large number of the staff of the Committee and several others";

(9) your charge that "Sabotage of the Committee of various kinds has gone on from the very beginning. For instance, a number of efforts were made to prevent the Committee from hearing certain witnesses";

(10) your charges of "suppression of witnesses" and "concealment of material from the officers and members of the Committee"; and

(11) your allegation that you had "received what appears to be conclusive proof of another serious act of sabotage by the Secretariat" concerning a potential witness; ....

30. Item (8) - The charge made by Mr. Bang-Jensen in his memorandum to Mr. Protitch of 24 October 1957 is a repetition of the charge made in a previous memorandum to Mr. Protitch on 11 October 1957, that "on account of sabotage, a large number of the staff and others learned the identity of several of the witnesses."

31. To this charge, Mr. Jordan has replied that:

"Throughout the proceedings, the names of anonymous witnesses were available to myself as Secretary of the Committee on the same footing as to the Chairman and the Rapporteur. They were available to other members of the Committee Secretariat according to the varying exigencies of their work...."

"In Vienna, the names of the witnesses were known in the first instance mainly to myself, to Mr. Schreiber, to Mr. Duckworth-Barker and to Mr. Hamori...." (Answers by Mr. Jordan to questionnaire, 7 January 1958.)

32. It is common ground, therefore, that the officers of the Special Committee, as well as what may be considered a large proportion of its staff, had or could easily obtain particulars of the identity of various witnesses who wished to remain anonymous. The question is whether this is proof of sabotage. In the absence of any evidence that Mr. Bang-Jensen had, as he claims, been given sole authority to deal with these witnesses (see paragraphs 43 to 54 below) the Committee found nothing to suggest that the position described by Mr. Jordan (and amply confirmed in the statements of the officers of the Special Committee as well as of the members of the Secretariat) differed in any significant respect from the practice of other UN committees which, in the past, had handled political witnesses.

33. Items (9) and (10) - The charge made by Mr. Bang-Jensen in his memorandum of 6 June to the Secretary-General quoted in item (9) states in general terms a charge repeated and exemplified in the memorandum of 20 September 1957 to Mr. Bunche quoted under item (10). In that memorandum Mr. Bang-Jensen gives, as he says, one example chosen "from each of three main categories of sabotage." Under the heading "Suppression of Witnesses" he charges Mr. Jordan with having not informed the officers of the Committee that he "had received a letter giving details about a young Hungarian refugee being available as a witness in the United States, who actually had been deported to Soviet Russia but had escaped." Mr. Jordan recognizes the fact but explains:

"At the time, it seemed to me more than doubtful whether it was wise for the Secretariat to commence to give the Chairman or Rapporteur the names of the witnesses who could testify along specific lines. It was doubtful whether it fell within the instructions of the Secretariat regarding the handling of matters relating to witnesses. Moreover, it was quite undesirable for the Secretariat to give the impression of stacking the evidence in any particular direction. It could only provoke suspicion on the part of the Committee." (Answers by Mr. Jordan to questionnaire, 7 January 1958)

34. This matter was clearly within Mr. Jordan's discretion as Secretary of the Special Committee. While able to conceive of such discretion being exercised on somewhat different lines, the Committee found

nothing in Mr. Jordan's behaviour which could reasonably be attributed to the influence of considerations other than those which must always be present in the mind of an international civil servant and was satisfied that he had applied his judgment normally in the discharge of his functions. The Committee rejected as groundless Mr. Bang-Jensen's charge that Mr. Jordan's action in this matter constituted an example of sabotage.

34. A second "example from each of three main categories of sabotage" given by Mr. Bang-Jensen in his memorandum to Mr. Bunche of 20 September quoted in item (10) is entitled "Concealment of Material from the Officers and Members of the (Special) Committee". Here Mr. Bang-Jensen's charge is that a report from the Secretary-General of the Hungarian National Committee in Exile, received by the Secretariat during the second part of June "was not forwarded to the Chairman, nor circulated to the other members". This exemplifies the charge made in a memorandum sent to the Secretary-General on 27 August 1957 after Mr. Bang-Jensen had ceased to be Deputy Secretary of the Special Committee on Hungary; he then stated that "none of the not inconsiderable material which has come into the hands of the Secretariat since the end of May, has been circulated to the Committee".

35. With respect to this charge, Mr. Jordan has made the following statement:

"It is necessary to bear in mind that the Committee has at no time seen all the material supplied to it. This is well understood by the Chairman, the Rapporteur and the Committee. Only to a very small extent has it been possible to reproduce or to translate the voluminous documentation supplied by Governments, witnesses and non-governmental organizations. The exact documentation to be circulated to the Committee has usually been settled by consultation with the Rapporteur. Therefore, far from being the case that the Secretary of the Committee has been under an obligation automatically to circulate all documentation, he has on the contrary had to exercise his discretion to prevent the members of the Committee from being deluged with material. Nevertheless, to ensure that the Committee should take official cognizance even of documentation which had not been distributed to it, there was, annexed to the report - at my suggestion - a very full list of material ...

... The receipt of the reports (of the Hungarian National Committee in Exile) was brought to the attention of the Committee in document A/AC.88/CR 10 of 6 August 1957. No member of the Committee has asked to see them. Nevertheless, the reports were given to the Chairman on his arrival in New York for the Assembly meeting in September." (Answers by Mr. Jordan to questionnaire, 7 January 1958).

36. In the extract from document A/AC.88/CR.10, entitled "List of Communications received by the Secretariat in relation to the work of the Committee", and submitted for distribution to the Members of the Special Committee on 6 August 1957, the Joint Disciplinary Committee found the following item:

"30. Letters dated 17 June and 21 July 1957, respectively, from the representative of the Hungarian Revolutionary National Committee in Exile, Vienna, enclosing reports on the present situation in Hungary covering the period 1 June to 20 July 1957, as well as depositions of three witnesses."

The Committee found, therefore, that, while the texts of the reports of the Hungarian Revolutionary National Committee in Exile were not forwarded to the Chairman nor circulated to the other members, as Mr. Bang-Jensen alleges, the documents were, nevertheless, dealt with in accordance with the Special Committee's procedures and their existence duly notified to the Special Committee's officers and members. The Joint Disciplinary Committee was unable to find anything here that could be regarded as "Concealment of Material from the Officers and the Members of the Committee" and rejected as groundless Mr. Bang-Jensen's charge that the non-communication of the complete texts to the officers and members of the Special Committee was an example of sabotage.

37. Item 11 - The statement made by Mr. Bang-Jensen in his memorandum of 9 September 1957 to the Secretary-General and quoted in item (11) is amplified in the minute, which he signed, of his interview with Mr. Bunche on 10 September 1957. Mr. Bang-Jensen then charged that a cable or letter received in the middle of the summer from the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Imre Nagy Government, informing the Special Committee that the former body-guard of General Maléter, Minister of Defense and Chief of Staff in the Nagy Government, was available to be heard by the Committee, "was not relayed to the Chairman of the (Special) Committee".

38. Mr. Jordan, the Secretary of the Special Committee, has stated that the message in question was received by cable dated 6th of August 1957 and that it was included in the list of documents received communicated to the members of the Special Committee in the extract from document A/AC.88/CR.10, dated 6 August 1957. (Answers by Mr. Jordan to questionnaire, 7 January 1958).

39. In the last mentioned document the Committee noted the entry:

"34. Cable dated 6th of August 1957 from . . . suggesting the hearing of a witness by the (Special) Committee."

and was assured that this entry related to the cable referred to by Mr. Bang-Jensen and that the name omitted from the extract for security reasons had been communicated to members of the Special Committee.

40. Having thus found that receipt of the message in question had been notified to members of the Special Committee in accordance with the accepted procedure, the Committee rejected as groundless Mr. Bang-Jensen's claim that the facts in this matter constituted "conclusive proof of another serious act of sabotage by the Secretariat".

41. Item (7): The allegation which forms the subject of this charge is to be found in a memorandum from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary-General, dated 22 November 1957. It is entitled "List of witnesses of the Special Committee on Hungary" and is concerned almost in its entirety with that subject alone. It is for that reason that the charge is dealt with here instead of under sub-head (a) where it is placed in Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum of 19 February 1958. The allegation is, however, so vague and general that it is not only difficult to classify but to analyze. As the word "sabotage" is not qualified, Mr. Bang-Jensen's charge must be taken to mean that Mr. Andersen and Mr. Shann "still are deceived" as to the extent and character of the sabotage in general. In paragraphs 16 to 40 various instances of sabotage alleged by Mr. Bang-Jensen have been examined and found without substance. The Committee did not think it necessary to inquire whether they had been brought to the knowledge of Mr. Andersen and Mr. Shann or not. The important consideration in its eyes is that the allegations were baseless so that the fact of their non-communication could not constitute deception. The extract from Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum which is quoted in the charge must thus be regarded as a further example of the persistent repetition of unfounded allegations.

42. In concluding its examination of the charges preferred against Mr. Bang-Jensen under Head (1) (a) and (b), the Committee noted that there was nothing in the documents regarded as relevant to show that he had repeated to the Chairman and Rapporteur those of his charges and allegations which form the subject of Items (8) - (11). In all other respects the Committee considered the charges preferred against Mr. Bang-Jensen under Head (1) (a) Items (1), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (b) Items (8), (9), (10) and (11) borne out by the evidence at its disposal.

Head (iii)

43. Mr. Bang-Jensen is charged that:

"(iii) in your preliminary interviews with prospective witnesses, you either gave assurances to prospective witnesses which were in excess of your authority, or subsequently you made wrong and unjustified interpretation of the assurances given by you, or both".

44. In a memorandum to Dr. Pretitch, dated 11 October 1957 and entitled "List of Witnesses of Special Committee on Hungary", Mr. Bang-Jensen made the following statements:

"Since, as deputy-secretary, I had been instructed to handle all matters regarding the witnesses, it was of course necessary that their names become known to me, but it was agreed by the Committee that the names of witnesses would only be revealed to the members in individual cases at their request. It was also agreed that, as far as possible, no one else in the Secretariat should know names of the witnesses. This meant, in fact, that I was made an irrevocable trustee, holding the names."

"... since I have had to accept becoming trustee for the names of witnesses and many of them have been promised that nobody in the Secretariat but I would know their names - I am not allowed to hand the list of witnesses over to you, without the consent of the witnesses themselves."

45. In a memorandum to the Secretary-General, dated 22 November 1957 and entitled "List of Witnesses of the Special Committee on Hungary", Mr. Bang-Jensen stated:

"... the fact that many witnesses have been promised that nobody in the Secretariat but I would know their names, that several witnesses made this a condition for testifying, that two of them for very definite reasons which they specified, made it a condition that you in particular would not know their names; there were also other witnesses who gave reasons for their lack of confidence in you and certain other members of the Secretariat."

46. On his own showing, therefore, Mr. Bang-Jensen, in the exercise of his functions as a member of the Secretariat, induced certain persons to furnish him with information by giving them assurances that it would be kept from the knowledge of all other members of the Secretariat, in some cases including expressly the Secretary-General.

47. Staff Regulation 1.2 reads as follows:

"Regulation 1.2: Staff members are subject to the authority of the Secretary-General and to assignment by him to any of the activities or offices of the United Nations. They are responsible to him in the exercise of their functions. The whole time of staff members shall be at the disposal of the Secretary-General" ... "

48. The Committee considered the assurances given by Mr. Bang-Jensen according to paragraphs 44, 45 and 46 above, to have been in such clear contradiction with Staff Regulation 1.2 that, failing proof to the contrary, they were seriously, in the words of the charge, "in excess of" his "authority".

49. In his memorandum to the Secretary General referred to in paragraph 45 above, Mr. Bang-Jensen claimed that special authority had, in fact, been given him:

"As I understand it, you and Dr. Protitch now maintain that you made no arrangements to provide who in the Secretariat should be allowed to know the names of the witnesses and that I was not entitled to promise that nobody in the Secretariat but I would know their names. To this I can first of all say that I was informed at the time that the matter had been thoroughly discussed with and approved by you."

50. The Committee twice invited him (letters of the Secretary of the Committee dated 25 April 1958 and 2 May 1958) to let it know by whom, on what occasion, and in what manner, he was so informed. It has, however, received no reply.

51. The Committee noted the following statement in Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum to Dr. Protitch, already referred to in paragraph 44 above:

"Mr. Cordier, with the Secretary-General's approval, saw to it that an unusual arrangement was made so that I was authorized to pay the witnesses their per diem and travel expenses without receiving any receipt in return..."

52. The Committee found, as indeed it would have expected in the records of a body like the Special Committee, ample proof that these special arrangements were, in fact, made. It found no evidence at all, however, for the interpretation placed on them by Mr. Bang-Jensen, namely, that they were made

"in order to safeguard that nobody but I should know their names."

53. The Committee did not consider this interpretation plausible. Arrangements of the kind described are merely intended to insure that, in approved cases, persons may receive payments out of public funds without there being any risk that their names will be disclosed to unauthorized persons through inclusion in public accounts. The Secretariat of the United Nations has employed this system in connection with certain special missions and no case is known to the Committee in which the disbursing officer regarded himself as given thereby exclusive knowledge of the payees' identity. In the case of Mr. Bang-Jensen, the Committee found no support for such a view in the memorandum from Mr. Cordier to the Controller, dated 8 February 1957, and entitled "Payments to Hungarian refugees who testify at United Nations Headquarters before the Committee on the problems of Hungarian Refugees", whereby the special arrangements mentioned in paragraph 51 were established, and which, indeed, in its last paragraph implies on the contrary that Mr. Bang-Jensen's work would remain subject to the authority of the Head of his Department.

54. Having thus found nothing in the documents to lend colour to Mr. Bang-Jensen's claim that he had been duly authorized to give the assurances detailed in paragraphs 44 and 45 above, the Committee considered that the onus of proof that he had, in fact, been so authorized was on the staff member himself. As he has not availed himself of the opportunities afforded him of supplying it, the Committee - while recognizing the possibility that he might, nevertheless, be able to do so on some other occasion - decided that it had no option but to base its finding on this charge on the assumption that the necessary special authority had never been given him.

55. The Committee considered charge (iii) borne out by the evidence at its disposal.

Head (iv)

56. Mr. Bang-Jensen is charged that:

"(iv) you failed to comply with orders first given orally on 9 October 1957 and later in writing from the Secretary-General to deliver for safe-keeping in the Secretariat papers in your possession relating to witnesses before the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary."

57. In a memorandum, dated 10 October 1957, Mr. Protitch, Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, informed the Secretary-General that Mr. Bang-Jensen had refused to comply with his oral instructions that he should hand over to him the list of witnesses heard by the Special Committee.

58. As is clear from his memorandum to Mr. Protitch of 2 December 1957, entitled "List of Witnesses of Special Committee on Hungary", Mr. Bang-Jensen failed to comply with Mr. Protitch's written instructions of 29 November 1957, conveyed to him "By order of the Secretary-General", to deliver the list of witnesses to him immediately. In explanation of his conduct, Mr. Bang-Jensen referred to his memorandum to the Secretary-General of 22 November 1957.

59. In that memorandum, Mr. Bang-Jensen defended his non-compliance with the instructions given him on the grounds that

"not to do something which one either physically or legally is unable to do, cannot be insubordination"

and that he was "legally and morally" prevented from giving up the names by the assurances he had given to witnesses. The assurances in question were those forming the subject of the charge discussed in paragraphs 44 to 55 above.

60. The Committee saw no reason for following Mr. Bang-Jensen onto such speculative ground. It was clear from the documents that he had received instructions from the Under-Secretary in charge of his Department by express order of the Secretary-General himself, and, as the charge alleged, had not complied with those instructions. His claim that he was precluded from so doing by conflicting instructions issued to him previously could only be entertained were he to supply the proof mentioned in paragraph 54. On this, as on the previous charge, however, the Committee, for the reasons set out in paragraph 54, decided that it had no option but to base its finding on the assumption that the necessary special authority had never been given him.

61. The Committee considered charge (iv) borne out by the evidence at its disposal.

### III - CONCLUSIONS

62. The findings of the Committee, after examining, in accordance with the Procedures outlined in paragraphs 5 to 13, evidence in relation to the charges preferred against Mr. Bang-Jensen, are set out and explained in paragraphs 14 to 61 above.

63. The Committee decided not to examine Head (1) (a) (2) and Head (ii) for the reasons stated in paragraph 10 (i) above. This decision must not, therefore, be taken as reflecting to any extent on the soundness of the charges themselves.

64. Of the charges against Mr. Bang-Jensen examined by the Committee, a number have been established beyond any possibility of doubt by the evidence at the disposal of the Committee. In the case of others its findings are, to some extent, the result of inference. To the first of these categories belong the charges in Head (1) (a) Items (1), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) and, subject to the qualification in paragraph 42, (b) Items (8), (9), (10) and (11). To the second belong those under Head (iii) and Head (iv).

65. These last call for special comment, partly because of the publicity which some months ago surrounded the facts to which they relate, and partly because it has, since the day the charges were preferred, been in Mr. Bang-Jensen's power to dispose of them conclusively by furnishing, as he claimed to be able to do in his memorandum to the Secretary-General of 22 November 1957, evidence that his action had been properly authorized. He has not done so and, for the reasons stated in paragraph 54 above, the Committee has felt obliged to conclude that such evidence does not exist. Mr. Bang-Jensen is, in consequence, seen to have acted, on his sole initiative, in such a way as to preclude his carrying out the fundamental duty laid down in Staff Regulation 1.2 of obedience to the Secretary-General.

66. In the Committee's view, incomprehension of the basic obligations of service in the Secretariat could scarcely be carried further and it is at a loss to understand how an officer of Mr. Bang-Jensen's age and seniority could come to act as he did.

67. In regard to the charges grouped under Head (1) (a) and (b), which relate in the main to the making and reiteration of allegations that the Secretariat's work for the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary was being improperly carried out, the Committee does not suggest that it can never be permissible for a member of the Secretariat to appeal over the heads of his immediate superiors to higher authority, even to that of the Secretary-General. In exceptional circumstances such action could, no doubt, be right. But recourse to it must always be subject to conditions which members of an organized service may be expected to recognize without being told. In the first place, the appeal must be reasonably substantiated and, in the second place, the staff member must accept the findings of the higher authority or leave the service. The Committee considers that the evidence shows Mr. Bang-Jensen to have disregarded both these conditions.

68. While recognizing that the obligations of members of the Secretariat are basically the same, whatever the nature of the duties which may be entrusted to them, the Committee considers it particularly important that the staffs assigned to the secretariats of political bodies, operating either at Headquarters or in the field, should not only sub-ordinate their personal views to the decisions of their responsible supervisors in the Secretariat, but also understand and accept the over-riding authority in all matters of substance of the bodies themselves. In the Committee's view, Mr. Bang-Jensen's conduct shows a total lack of realization of these principles.

69. The grave errors of judgment and serious acts of indiscipline, which the evidence at the Committee's disposal shows Mr. Bang-Jensen to have committed, were accompanied by accusations against individual colleagues or vaguely indicated groups of colleagues of various kinds of deliberate misconduct including acting from "dishonest motives" and "sabotage". Mr. Bang-Jensen has made little attempt to substantiate these accusations and has not, in fact, proved or come anywhere near proving any of them. In spite of that, he has repeated them, sometimes frequently and, in some cases, long after they were authoritatively disproved. Such behaviour, if ever tolerated or condoned in the Secretariat, would rapidly destroy the mutual confidence among colleagues which is the condition of collective effort and, thus, of the effective existence of the service itself.

70. The Committee is of opinion that the general charge against Mr. Bang-Jensen of grave misconduct in violation of the obligations of an international civil servant, could be regarded as amply justified on the sole basis of Head (i) (a) (1), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) and (b) (8), (9), (10) and (11). Taking into account its findings on Heads (iii) and (iv), the Committee considers that the evidence as a whole reveals on the part of Mr. Bang-Jensen a pattern of behaviour incompatible with membership of the Secretariat of the United Nations.

71. Having regard to Staff Regulation 10.1 and to Staff Rules 110.1 and 110.3(a), the Committee, therefore, recommends that Mr. Povl Bang-Jensen be dismissed for misconduct.

\* \* \*

Report adopted unanimously by the Joint Disciplinary Committee:

A. D. Mourig Evans, Chairman

Charles L. Coates, Member

Jean-Pierre Martin, Member

A. Hatami, Secretary

The block contains four handwritten signatures in blue ink, corresponding to the names listed to the left. The signatures are: A. D. Mourig Evans, Charles L. Coates, Jean-Pierre Martin, and A. Hatami. The signature of A. Hatami is underlined.

5 June 1958

ANNEX

Correspondence received or dispatched by the Joint Disciplinary Committee  
after 19 February 1958

- a) Copy of a memorandum dated 4 March 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary-General, entitled "(1) Jurisdictional and Due Process Exceptions to Gross Report - (2) Request for the Right to Retain and be represented by Independent Legal Counsel - (3) Request for Right freely to consult Danish Government; and for other equitable relief.
- b) Copy of a memorandum dated 7 March 1958 from Mr. McDiarmid to Mr. Bang-Jensen in reply to Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum of 4 March.
- c) Copy of Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum of 12 March 1958 to the Secretary-General dealing with Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum of 7 March 1958 together with an opinion signed by a Mr. J. Anthony Panuch and dated 11 March 1958.
- d) Copy of a memorandum dated 18 March 1958 from Mr. John McDiarmid to Mr. Bang-Jensen on the subject of his representation before the Joint Disciplinary Committee.
- e) Copy of the Joint Disciplinary Committee's recommendation of 20 March 1958 to the Secretary-General on the question of the representation of Mr. Bang-Jensen before it.
- f) Copy of Mr. McDiarmid's letter of 21 March 1958 to Mr. Bang-Jensen informing him of the decision of the Secretary-General following the recommendation of the Joint Disciplinary Committee.
- g) Memorandum dated 3 April 1958 from Mr. Simon to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee requesting a further stay of at least one month on behalf of Mr. Bang-Jensen.

- h) Copy of a memorandum dated 3 April 1958 from the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee transmitting Mr. Simon's request to Mr. J. McDiarmid.
- i) Mr. McDiarmid's reply to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee dated 8 April, expressing agreement with a further stay of fourteen days.
- j) Copy of letter dated 9 April 1958 from the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee to Mr. Bang-Jensen, in reply to Mr. Simon's memorandum of 3 April 1958.
- k) Copy of Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum of 9 April 1958 to Mr. Cordier, requesting copies of 87 documents.
- l) Mr. Bang-Jensen's letter of 11 April to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee, enclosing copy of a letter dated 11 April 1958 to the Secretary-General on the question of documents.
- m) Mr. Cordier's memorandum of 15 April 1958 addressed to the Chairman of the Joint Disciplinary Committee, enclosing a copy of his reply of the same date to Mr. Bang-Jensen on the question of documents.
- n) Copy of letter dated 15 April 1958 from the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee to Mr. Bang-Jensen, asking him to submit his rebuttal not later than 21 April.
- o) Mr. Bang-Jensen's reply of 17 April 1958 to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee.
- p) Mr. Bang-Jensen's letter of 19 April 1958 to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee together with a copy of his memorandum bearing the same date and entitled "Request for Review of Administrative Decision under Staff Rule III.3 (a) in Appeal to the Joint Appeals Board - Urgent personal Appeal to the Secretary-General for his personal Protection against Violations of Due Process and fundamental Human Rights".
- q) Copy of Mr. McDiarmid's reply of 21 April 1958 to Mr. Bang-Jensen's memoranda of 11 and 19 April 1958 to the Secretary-General.
- r) Copy of the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee's letter to Mr. Bang-Jensen dated 24 April 1958, informing him that the Joint Disciplinary Committee is proceeding with the examination of his case in accordance with the Staff Regulations and Rules.
- s) Copy of letter dated 25 April 1958 from the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee to Mr. Bang-Jensen, informing him of the views of the Joint Disciplinary Committee and requesting specific information.

- t) Copy of memorandum dated 28 April 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary-General, entitled: "Request for the personal attention of the Secretary-General to Mr. Bang-Jensen's memoranda of 11 and 19 April 1958.
- u) Reply dated 30 April 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee's letters of 24 and 25 April 1958.
- v) Copy of memorandum dated 1 May 1958 from Mr. McDiarmid to Mr. Bang-Jensen on certain procedural points raised in Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum of 28 April 1958.
- w) Copy of a letter dated 1 May 1958 from Mr. Green to Mr. Bang-Jensen.
- x) Copy of memorandum dated 1 May 1958 from the Secretary-General to Mr. Bang-Jensen.
- y) Copy of letter dated 2 May 1958 from the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee to Mr. Bang-Jensen in reply to his letter of 30 April 1958, reiterating the request for specific information made in the letter of 25 April 1958.
- z) Letter dated 5 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee together with copy of memorandum dated 5 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to Mr. McDiarmid, entitled: "Reply to Mr. McDiarmid's memorandum of 1 May and notification that Mr. Bang-Jensen, in lack of answer from the Secretary-General within two weeks, as provided for in Rule III.3 (b) is taking the second step in appeal to the Joint Appeals Board", and copy of memorandum dated 5 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary-General in reply to his memorandum of 1 May 1958.
- aa) Copy of a letter dated 5 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to Mr. Green in reply to his letter of 1 May 1958.
- bb) Letter dated 6 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee requesting documents.
- cc) Copy of letter dated 8 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to Mr. Cordier regarding documents.
- dd) Copy of letter dated 10 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary of the Joint Appeals Board regarding his appeal.
- ee) Copy of letter dated 12 May 1958 from the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee to Mr. Bang-Jensen in reply to his letters of 5 and 6 May 1958.
- ff) Memorandum dated 15 May 1958 from Mr. Green to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee reporting a typographical error in the copy communicated to the Committee of Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum of 31 May 1957 to Mr. Jordan.

- gg) Copy of note dated 15 May 1958 from Mr. Cordier to Mr. Bang-Jensen on the question of documents.
- hh) Copy of letter dated 15 May 1958 from Mr. Green to Mr. Bang-Jensen, reporting the typographical error referred to above
- ii) Copy of letter dated 17 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee following his reply of 12 May 1958.
- jj) Copy of letter dated 17 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to Mr. Green on the typographical error.
- kk) Copy of memorandum dated 26 May 1958 from Mr. Cordier to Mr. Bang-Jensen in reply to his memorandum of 17 May 1958.
- ll) Copy of memorandum dated 26 May 1958 from Mr. Bang-Jensen to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee regarding his appeal.
- mm) Copy of Mr. Green's memorandum of 29 May 1958 to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee enclosing copy of the Joint Appeals Board's report.
- nn) Copy of Mr. Bang-Jensen's memorandum of 3 June 1958 to the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee informing him of his decision to appeal to the United Nations Administrative Tribunal.
- oo) Copy of memorandum dated 5 June 1958 from the Secretary of the Joint Disciplinary Committee, to Mr. Bang-Jensen.