

HOW MR. CHURCHILL CONSIDERS CHILEANS
AND ARGENTINIANS "INTRUDERS" IN
THEIR OWN TERRITORY

LET us see now how the matter stands with the Antarctica southward of the Straits of Magallanes, and which, both geographically and juridically —according to the postulátes of International Law— corresponds to the republics of Chile and Argentine. The former country owns a group of islands latitude West, perfectly well located, as well as Graham Land which at present bears the name of Bernardo O'Higgins, in honour of the great Chilean liberator. What exists there are small whale-fishing stations, naval bases, a military garrison and other dependencies of the Santiago Government.

The Argentine, on her part, has her jurisdiction also clearly defined with regard to other stretches of land and islands, equipped with a meteorological observatory, a radiographic station and the indispensable naval and military bases so as to leave no doubt as to her sovereignty over the part of the antarctic sector which corresponds to her.

On this subject, on Novembrer 10th, 1948, the already

mentioned lawyer and general Fernando Cuen wrote, for "El Universal" of Mexico, sentences such as these:

"Notwithstanding the positive acts of strict dominion which Chile and Argentina exercise over their respective islands in the Antarctic, England claimed for herself in 1908 the Glacial Ocean; at the Imperial Conference of 1926 England, while claiming her sovereignty over those territories, insisted that they be evacuated by Chile and Argentina; and at a later date, with Mr. Churchill as her spokesman, her audacity went so far as to consider Chileans and Argentinians as "intruders" in their own territories. Fortunately —general Cuen goes on to comment— the two South American nations, rightly indignant, retorted calmly and resolutely with a military alliance, thus entrusting the defense of their sovereign rights to the indomitable valour of their sons."

It is maintained by the same author that the most famous statesmen and jurists, amongst them Poirier and Fauchilly, have expounded on several occasions the opinion that "the poles must be considered as the joint dominion of the States surrounding them". And it is pointed out that the Antarctica of the American Hemisphere has been explored, *for purely scientific purposes*, since the beginning of the XVIIIth century by French, English, Russian, German, Swedish, Norwegian and Belgian explorers; and finally in 1928-1929 —apart from another expedition in these last years— by the intrepid American admiral Richard Byrd, "without any of these explorers, *the English excepted*, having attempted to take possession of that region".

The foregoing observations were answered five days later (November 15th, 1948) by the First Secretary of

the British Embassy in Mexico, who also used the columns of "El Universal". And he dealt with the matter as with that of "British Honduras" and the "Falkland Islands", raising his eyes and saying his prayers to the World Court of the Hague, but without even insinuating the formula *ex aequo et bono*. The textual words of this British official on the case of Antarctica were the following:

"With regard to the Argentinian and Chilean claims on *British territories* the Government of London offered, at the beginning of this year, to negotiate an agreement with those of Argentina and Chile, so that these claims be submitted to the Court of the Hague; an offer which, unfortunately, both powers rejected".

It goes without saying that Mr. Malcolm did not explain why Santiago and Buenos Aires do not accept nor cannot accept the English proposition.

DIFFICULTIES AND EXPERIENCES OPPOSED TO INTERNATIONALIZATION

ANOTHER proposal in which it seems that great interest was shown by General George C. Marshall, ex Secretary of State of the U. S. A., has been to internationalize all that zone. But Chile does not want to discuss such lawful rights as those which she has to the South of the Straits of Magallanes, adjudged since 1539 to Pedro Sánchez de la Hoz by Emperor Charles Vth.

Such titles cannot be denied to the Chilean nation, undisputable heir to the colonial territory when she proclaimed her independence on September 18th, 1810; and they cannot be denied in virtue of the principle, so often

enounced, of *utris possidetis juris*. The same point of view is sustained by the Argentine Republic as regards her corresponding part of the Antarctica.

It is interesting to note, in connection with internationalization, what disastrous experiences have resulted from this system of multiple government, due to the fights and ambitions of the great powers which always pursue their own interests. This has been proved in the North of Africa, in the Middle East and during these very days—it is obvious to the whole world—in the tragic pandemonium of Berlin, to quote only a few examples.

* * *

However, even if one might attempt one more experiment of internationalized territory in that distant meridian of America, at the risk of turning it into a field of atomic bombings, it is evident that it is impossible to achieve the adoption of such a solution on account of the attitude, explained above, adopted by Chile and Argentina. We all know that the fatherland of O'Higgins has reinforced its garrisons southward of Magallanes. On the other hand Dr. Juan Atilio Bramuglia, Argentine Minister of Foreign Affairs, declared categorically (November 8th., 1948) that "Argentina can under no circumstances accept the internationalization of the Antarctica".

These words were delivered by the Minister precisely in London during his visit there, and he added the following explanation: "Great Britain wishes to internationalize our Antarctic zone, but Argentine cannot accept this type of solution. My country is of the opinion that the problem should be solved by means of a conference (he refers undoubtedly to that which was approved at

Bogota), wherein the interested nations should participate, adopting their resolutions in accordance with the rights that can be evidenced by each of the participants, based on their historical, geographical and national claims".

In Washington a few weeks earlier (October 28th) the diplomat Enrique V. Corominas, who had been delegate and Extraordinary Ambassador to the afore-mentioned Bogota Assembly, expressed himself similarly. "When the conference of Havana, which was proposed in the capital of Colombia, takes place—stated the Argentine diplomat—, a complete and detailed study will be made of the colonial question, according to the resolution approved by 18 of the 21 American republics".

He added that it will be possible to prove there how the rights of his country are indubitable in the Argentine region of the Antarctica, and why the Republic of the River Plate considers as hers, by right of history and juridical antecedents, "the entire Archipelago of the Malvina Islands, now in the hands of Great Britain".

REPLY OF SPANISH AMERICAN DELEGATES TO BRITISH PROPAGANDA IN BOGOTA

MOREOVER, at the so frequently quoted IXth International American Conference of Bogota, replying with studies well founded on documentary material to the printed propaganda of the British Government on these subjects, the Argentinian Delegation enounced without euphemisms its anti-colonial viewpoint, as did likewise in writing the Delegation of Guatemala, and in brilliant speeches the Foreign Ministers of both nations and the head of the De-

legation of Venezuela. Amongst other things the Argentine booklet, in reply to the abundant literature of His Britannic Majesty's emissaries, stated the following:

"It shows a complete ignorance of American geography, history, continental system and policy to ascribe to oneself the Antarctic territories as one's own soil; or, if one likes, as part of the Malvinas; or, more still, as British possessions".

"There is nothing that can serve as a documentary juridical basis to Great Britain, not even the unilateral Letters Patent, nor the postage stamps, nor the alleged presence of a British magistrate, a fortuitous resident, in the Shetland Islands of the South".

"Argentina has done much more than all this and, moreover, she has contributed the necessary historical-political and technical-geographical evidence to leave the Argentine titles well guarded as against the British lack of documentation".

"Can Great Britain deny that the Antarctic territories are not natural extensions of the American Continent? Or do the English believe that a simple statement, arbitrary and obstinate, as contained in the document which they have distributed, will be sufficient to modify the geography of the Continent?"

"Just as the Malvina Islands constitute an Argentine territory unjustly occupied by the British, the Antarctica, in the part corresponding to the Argentine sphere, is Argentinian territory. There is only one truth which cannot be distorted by the opinion of the British, unless one wants to provoke difficult and intolerable situations".

"When the British Government announces its intention to take this problem before the International Court of Jus-

tice, this shows an interpretation *sui generis* of the matter by the United Kingdom. A State —any State— can hardly appeal to the competency of a court of justice, if its titles are perfectly legal and are based on historical truth."

"Is it perhaps admissible to discuss or submit to arbitration positive and clean juridical titles of a State? Would Great Britain be willing, for instance, to submit to the arbitration on the World Court the sovereignty which she exercises on the territory of her century-old islands which comprise, in Europe, the British nation? The idea of the British does not lack piquancy and sense of humour!"

BUENOS AIRES WILL NOT RENOUNCE ITS RIGHTS OVER THE ANTARCTICA AND THE MALVINA ISLANDS

"THE Malvina Islands are Argentinian. The Buenos Aires Government reiterates and will continue to reiterate its rights to the said islands, incontrovertible rights which are only lacking our constantly claimed possession, as against the *de facto* occupation by the British."

"As to the Antarctic sector, it belongs to the Argentine Republic and is Argentinian, without the necessity of making a statement of annexation. There only remains to be solved —as we shall do— with understanding and recognition of equal rights, the problem of the Chilean-Argentinian frontier on that region of the American Hemisphere."

"Argentina will never renounce her rights of sovereignty over the Antarctica nor over the Malvina Islands. She knows that they form part of her share and her territorial patrimony. She has shown and proved so on all occasions when this problem has been discussed, both publicly and at international meetings".

"All the inhabitants of the Republic, women and children, workers and college men, as well as the generations of the past and those of the future, know that the Malvina Islands are ours and that Great Britain, without any rights of sovereignty seized them by a misuse of force, and by this same misuse maintains them in her possession."

"We believe in reason. We have faith in the Law, and we think that justice will soon be done. The Western democracies can only fortify themselves on truth and with truth. In this problem, the truth is Argentinian and pertains to the Argentine Republic."

It can be clearly observed that, as in the case of Belice, one has also reached a *blind alley* with regard to the Antarctica and the Malvina Islands. There is no way out of this *blind alley* as long as England opposes the legitimate rights of Chile and Argentina; and as long as she objects that the International Court of Justice study the problem and pass verdict on it in accordance with the formula *ex aequo et bono*, in the dispute with Guatemala, as has been repeatedly proposed.

But as Great Britain does not want to be faced at the Hague with her pirates of the Elizabethan era, nor with their audacious descendants throughout various generations, there will be no other way but to respect the voice of a whole continent, vigorously expressed at the IXth International American Conference of Bogota.

CHAPTER VIII

FROM THE MONROE DOCTRINE
TO THE ANTICOLONIAL
DECLARATION OF
BOGOTA

BRITISH WARSHIPS OFF THE CENTRAL AMERICAN
COASTS OF BELICE

IN the survey of the European colonial system in America, contained in the foregoing chapters allusions have been made, repeatedly, to the IXth. International American Conference of Bogota, as well as to the resolution which was adopted there on the question. It appears necessary, therefore, to give some details about this Conference and the afore-said anticolonial resolution; to be preceded, however, at least by a sketch of the panorama prior to that historical assembly.

Chapter V, in brief outline, presented some aspects of Guatemala's claim to the territory of Belice. And it was explained how that Central American republic, during the second World War, suspended her claims in order to relieve temporarily the London Government, "defender of the democratic principles and signatory of the ineffable Atlantic Charter", of the preoccupation inherent to this conflict.

But it so happened that, the conflagration ended—giving rise to the preparations for a third holocaust—England forgot the noble gesture of the Guatemalans. And thus, the war having ceased with the crushing of the Nazi-Fascist aggressors; the death, for his own good, of the

barbarian Hitler; with Mussolini hanged by his feet from a butcher's hook; the collapse of Japan under atomic bomb blows; the top men of totalitarian vandalism on their way to the gallows in Nuremberg; with the triumph of Democracy, in one word, throughout the world... it was not possible, however, to have the elation shared by allied countries like Guatemala, morally fortified by her already described gesture toward Great Britain.

On the contrary, the Guatemalan people and Government began to feel preoccupied inasmuch as England, in various ways, brought up the convenience of using her "possessions" in the Caribbean—not excluding Belice—as immigration centres.

But the Guatemala of 1945 was not, by a long way, that of 1859, nor that of Estrada Cabrera, nor that of later dictatorships. The revolutionary movement of the 20th of October of 1944 had crystallized in profound materializations, with a new Constitution which stipulates that Belice forms part of the national territory.

Under such conditions and with the historical and juridical antecedents already mentioned previously, Guatemala was bound to make express reservation of her sovereign rights at several international Conferences. She also did so when Norman Smith proposed in the House of Commons (February 19th, 1947) that Great Britain "should transfer to the United States the British colonies and dependencies situated in the Western Hemisphere, in exchange for loans and supplies".

On this matter the last paragraph of Note N° 3624, signed by the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, Licenciado Eugenio Silva Peña (March 8th, 1947) and addressed to

the English Minister Leslie Charles Hughes Hallett, reads textually as follows:

"As Your Excellency will understand, the Government of Guatemala would be unable to form a previous judgement on the course which the motion presented by Mr. Norman Smith might take; but in view of the possibility that the said project might make headway and it being the duty of this Government to fix its attention on any event liable to provoke a resolution damaging the rights defended by the Republic, it considers itself obliged to make a statement to the effect that, if it were attempted to include Belice in a hypothetical resolution of that nature, such a transfer would injure the principles of International Law and the inalienable rights and interests of Guatemala".

* * *

Notes, answers and counter-answers followed on each other's heels in the course of that year, until we come to February of 1948; to the threshold, we might say, of the Bogota Conference, the sessions of which were to start on the following 31st of March. It would seem that the English had a special reason for choosing precisely the weeks prior to that so transcendent assembly, to exhibit their strength with battleships in the Malvinas, the Antarctica and in what they continue calling imperturbably, for their own consolation, "British Honduras".

Chile and Argentina replied, as explained in Chapter VII, with an agreement between Santiago and Buenos Aires for the defense of their sovereign rights. Guatemala, on her side, apart from the declarations of President Juan José Arévalo, a synthesis of which will be given later; an official Note to the Foreign Ministries of America; an urgent

communication to the United Nations and an energetic protest handed to the British Legation, transmitted, on February 27th, 1948, the following cabled message to the Pan American Union, signed by the new Minister of Foreign Affairs, Licenciado Enrique Muñoz Meany:

"I have the honour of presenting to the Pan American Union the formal arraignment which my Government makes of the armed provocation of Great Britain, who has despatched to the Guatemalan territory of Belice the cruisers "Sheffield", "Devonshire" and "Sparrow" under the pretext of "protecting British interests threatened by irresponsible mobs incited by Guatemala".

"This Government maintains an equanimous claim on juridical ground, emphatically refutes the offensive imputation of incitement and protests, with all energy, against the presence of those battleships in national waters. Guatemala expects the solidarity of her sister Republics and requests the Pan American Union to take action".

After a lengthy discussion—lasting almost three weeks—of the foregoing protest, the Directive Council drew up its answer to the Foreign Ministry of Guatemala. Worded in the usual terms for this type of document it points, however, to the path of Bogota. With some delay (March 18th) the acting President, doctor José A. Mora, replied in the following manner:

"I have the honour of communicating to Your Excellency that the Directive Council of the Pan American Union, inspired by the traditional principles of American solidarity, has devoted all its attention to the important message addressed by Your Excellency to the Director General of the Pan American Union, and have reached the

conclusion that, within their present attributions, they cannot take any other action than that of facilitating a meeting for deliberation between the Governments, a step which would prove to be unfeasible in view of the fact that the Conference of Bogota will take place shortly".

"The Directive Council is pleased to note the well-omened declaration made by Your Excellency as regards the expression that your Government serenely maintains its claim on juridical ground, thus showing to be most nobly disposed towards a normal development of the controversy which interests all the American States".

"Expressing very sincere wishes that a solution be attained to the full satisfaction of Law and Justice, the Directive Council is pleased to assure Your Excellency that it will follow with the greatest interest the development of the matter, and repeats its reprobation of the use of any kind of threat or act of force for the solution of international conflicts".

UNIFICATION OF THE LATIN AMERICAN MIND

ENGLAND'S attitude—of the Laborites Bevin and Attlee!—could not have been more inopportune. It served, more than anything else, to draw the Latin American nations together, particularly in the case of Guatemala, since Belice forms part of the body itself of the said Republic and British armed forces were disembarked there.

It lead to the unification—it is worth while to insist on this—of the anticolonial mentality of Latin America, in the same way as, centuries earlier, the creoles and mestizos had unified their forces to repel the corsairs.

And it might even have fortified the Pan American

idea if General George C. Marshall, possibly a good soldier but a man without the desire to understand Monroe, Henry Clay, Lincoln or Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had realized that here was a propitious opportunity to put into practice the thesis of continental American solidarity.

But this was not the case, unfortunately for Pan Americanism, as General Marshall was undoubtedly weighed down by a series of problems in the rest of the world which caused him to neglect the reality of America. And as a result of this neglect, due to their very comprehensible desire of remaining on good terms with England, to their dread of "exotic doctrines" which had nothing to do with the concrete problem of the colonial system nor with Hispanic-America's provocation by the British men-of-war, the United States were made to feel at Bogota, under the great mural painting of Bolivar in the Capitol, that the southern Republics, from Mexico down to Buenos Aires, were no longer the same ones that had bowed down to Coolidge at the ill-fated Conference of Havana in 1928.

And with greater reason, more than any other country: on account of their Monroe Doctrine and their incident with the United Provinces of the River Plate in 1831, which the English profited by falling upon the Malvina Islands; more than any other power, in accordance with the aforesaid Doctrine and the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850, which Washington helped to violate with the Dallas-Clarendon Treaty in 1856, to the detriment of Central America; more than anybody, in one word, the United States had the obligation to correct their own errors or to repair at least in part their complicities, by now giving their support to Guatemala and the Argentine to whose dismemberment

they had contributed, as well as their moral aid to the remaining injured countries of Spanish America.

* * *

This was not done by General Marshall (who has since resigned from his official functions, on January 20th, 1949); he was unable or did not know how to explore the Latin American sentiments: he limited himself to uttering vague formulas which did not solve anything, which could not offend the British, and which would leave the U. S. A. the opportunity to assume the role of London by means of negotiations similar, for instance, to those carried out by Washington with Denmark for the purchase of the latter country's share of the Virgin Islands.

The result of the attitude adopted by the opulent Delegation of the U. S. A., from the very first sessions of the Conference, was to jeopardize Pan Americanism seriously. And it also put to the test the Hispanic-American thesis, as such, which is not nor wishes to be in conflict with foreign powers or group of powers, but which on the other hand, does have the right to take care of its own interests and, decidedly, to play its part in the concert of nations that aspire to be civilized.

In such a "climate", notwithstanding the formidable staff of ambassadors, plenipotentiary ministers, advisers, experts and economists who accompanied General Marshall, we, the Spanish-Americans, firmly stood the "fire test". Eighteen votes gave a categorical *no* to the colonial system, at the plenary session of April 22nd. Nobody dared to defend it. Those who *abstained* from voting were Brazil, Dominican Republic and the U. S. A.

Regarding other projects which had been brought along

by the American delegates—including a loan of five hundred million dollars to the Republics of the South (plenary session of April 8th)—they were so badly received that it may perhaps be preferable to afford them only a brief mention: militarization of the Continent, committing us to a blind war, possibly to defend Democracy again.—Very disputable plans of economic co-operation, on the basis of “guaranties to private North American capital”, which only after many discussions and amendments might be liable to be approved at future Conferences.—An attack, finally, not against the English battleships in the waters off the coasts of our America, but against the communist ghost, which in the end was turned into a resolution against all types of totalitarisms, whether of the extreme left or of the extreme right.

GENESIS AND DEVIATION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

FROM the above it can be deduced that the Monroe Doctrine, not in general terms but in certain cases, as an instrument of unilateral policy, interpreted and applied according to the convenience and the exclusive criterion of Washington, has not served to oppose itself loyally to the colonial system; and not only to the colonial system, but to different forms of extra-continental aggression against Latin America.

This is a fact, borne out by 125 years of experience, comprising well-known invasions of Spanish-American territory by European armies, and inclusively by sailors or “blue jackets” of the new great Anglo-saxon power.

This is indeed a fact, proved by the already described incidents of the Guiana, the Malvina Islands, the Antarctica

and Belice, in violation of the universal principles of International Law. And in opposition, nothing less, to the Monroe Doctrine itself and to the so often quoted Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850!

This is a fact, finally, and above all, when joint interests of the White House and the English Crown have intervened, or those of prominent *colonizers in the modern style of concessions*, domiciled in Wall Street and London.

Thus, in that way, was distorted the genesis of the famous message proclaimed to the world on the 2nd of December of 1823, “by the President of a democracy which at that time did not dispose of men-of-war, nor of veteran soldiers, nor of sufficient forces to face the ultra-conservative, ultra-montane and militarily very powerful European reaction”.

“But the veterans of the South were ready, notwithstanding, to fight to the bitter end. And they were able to reply to the threats of Europe with new battles and decisive victories, until they crowned the liberty of the new world at Ayacucho, one year after President James Monroe had proclaimed his doctrine.

“If the Holy Alliance had put their plans into practice, the aggressors would have had to fight against material forces of Spanish-America which had proved to be invincible, and with only the support without cannons, with the enormous *moral force* of the North American challenge”.

“The deeds, prowesses, the epic battles of the South American liberators, these, indeed, amounted to action; and the words of Monroe, undoubtedly, constituted a strong link of mutual Inter-American understanding which permitted the Western Hemisphere, vigorous and haughty, to rise against the old Europe, with its overbearing pride,

fanatism and imperialism, whose monarchs plotted oppressions and assaults, both in their own countries and in the distant and coveted lands on the other side of the ocean". (Books of the author: "La Doctrina de Monroe frente a los Nazis en América", Nueva York, 1940.—"Guión de Historia Contemporánea", México, D. F., 1942.)

* * *

In the same works the author made a more or less complete study of the spiritual atmosphere prevailing during those years in our American circles. "That of the U. S. A. was the voice of another race, of another young people, which also fought for liberty. It was the voice of the North which mingled with the triumphant chorus of Spanish-America. The voice of Henry Clay who invited the Senate of Washington to recognize the new republics, and that of 150 senators who voted, firmly, in favor of that proposal, thus proclaiming the defense of the Continent on the basis of Inter-American cooperation". (Books quoted above.)

Reference is also made in those texts to the subsequent deviations or erroneous interpretations of the Monroe Doctrine, which led to a protracted spell of mutual fear and distrust among the Spanish-American republics, no longer in connection with Europe but, precisely, in connection with the foreign policy and slavery interests of the U. S. A. It was then when a pronounced movement of Hispanic-Americanism began to take shape which, in substance, was not one of uncompromising hostility but of fear, as mentioned above, of distrust toward the U. S. A. caused by a series of facts such as the following:

Reluctance of Washington to appoint representatives to the Panama Congress, convoked by Bolivar (1826); the war

of the U. S. A. against Mexico in 1846 and 1847; the policy of President Polk, whose plans comprised the acquisition of the Island of Cuba by means of a purchase; the series of protocols on canalization in Central America; the North American influence in the Caribbean after the war of 1898 against Spain; the events of Puerto Rico, Panama, Nicaragua, Haiti, Veracruz, Santo Domingo, up to the presidential terms of Hoover and Coolidge, who did not hesitate to declare that arms and battleships would follow the dollars invested in Latin America.

VIEWPOINT OF PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON

IN the face of such deplorable facts, it was useless for the U. S. A. to promote Pan-American conferences holding forth on the subject of mutual comprehension, and preaching the need of a rapprochement to Spanish-America. All this was useless, because those words did not correspond to the actions of Washington and of Wall Street.

"Such congresses, initiated in 1889 by James G. Blaine, who several times held the post of Secretary of State, gave rise to what we might call official Pan-Americanism. They were considered, however, as mere meetings of Governments, many of them at the service of the great imperialist North American forces, who went on with their old policy of domination and lack of respect for the integrity of the weak countries, fatally placed in their zone of influence".

"But the reaction of the Spanish-American feeling towards the U. S. A. was not —this has already been said— one of uncompromising hostility. What was desired, on the contrary, was a frank co-operation on the basis of mutual

respect and justice, a new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, so as to obtain the agreement of North America to respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the sister nations of this Continent".

It can be deduced from numerous official documents—reproduced by the author in the studies quoted above, but which would make this chapter too long if they were also published here—, that in Spanish-America there was always the idea that, by means of a multilateral understanding, Pan-Americanism could become a livable fact inasmuch as it would constitute a link of union, an intimate and close alliance between all the American peoples, without rejecting the Spanish-American thesis which would thus become grafted on to the continental system.

The decisions adopted at Buenos Aires in 1936, at Lima, Panama, Havana, Rio de Janeiro, Chapultepec and other Inter-American meetings held lately, might be considered as the new desirable "status" for governing the political and economic relations of the Western Hemisphere; such as the Good Neighborhood policy of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in its most ample meaning; and such as the viewpoint of his master and friend President Woodrow Wilson, whose trend of thought might be summed up in a few sentences taken from his famous speech of Mobile (October 27th, 1913), ratified at Indianapolis on January 8th, 1918. But it seems necessary to explain that not having at hand the original English text of said speeches, the author has to use and re-translate the following from the Spanish version:

"...You have heard speak of concessions granted to foreign capitalists in Latin America. You will never hear

speak of concessions to foreign capitalists in the United States... The nations which find themselves obliged to grant those privileges, are exposed to the foreign capitalists becoming preponderant in their domestic policy; a national state of affairs which is always dangerous and which can become intolerable... What those nations are going to see now is their liberation from the tutelage exercised by foreign enterprises of exploitation... In the matter of loans they have had to subject themselves to conditions much more onerous than any other country of the earth".

"...It is very dangerous to determine foreign policy in terms of material interests. This, apart from being unjust towards those with whom we are dealing, is degrading in our own eyes... The supremacy of human rights and of national integrity over material interests is the problem which now we have to deal with; and I want to avail myself of this opportunity to say that the United States will never again attempt to acquire by armed force a single square foot of territory".

"...It is necessary to reconcile the interests of the United States with the sister Republics of Latin America. We ask them for concessions and privileges; we consider our own convenience, without stopping to think whether the governments and South American peoples will secure or not advantages by favoring our enterprises... When our interests and theirs are taken parallelly into consideration and are harmonized; when we work mutually for their good and at the same time for ours, then an era of approachment and sympathy will commence between the United States and her sisters of the South".

Around the same time of his Indianapolis speech, giving

thought to these problems and to the false interpretations of the Monroe Doctrine, President Wilson declared to a group of Mexican journalists who visited him:

"...For this reason I said that we should make an arrangement and that we should have a guaranty of our own, by signing all of us a declaration of political independence and territorial integrity... Let us agree that if one of us—including the United States—should violate the political independence or the territorial integrity of any of the others, all the remaining ones shall prevent it... Peace can only be achieved by confidence. Therefore each one of us, as a patriotic duty towards his country, must sow the seed of faith and confidence, instead of the seed of suspicion". (Vicente Sáenz: "Rompiendo Cadenas", "La Doctrina de Monroe frente a los Nazis en América", "Guión de Historia Contemporánea".)

* * *

"Whether due to the difficulties of the first European war; to having lacked the support of certain extremely powerful groups in his own country; to the insuperable force of the great North American plutocracy; or because of the shameful servility of certain Spanish-American creole groups, President Wilson was unable to turn his words into facts. He maintained the armed intervention in Nicaragua; he intervened in Santo Domingo and in Haiti; he disembarked naval forces at Veracruz; he took active part in the politics of Cuba, imposing Menocal; he committed, in one word, the most serious errors which could not inspire our people with the slightest confidence".

"But when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt came to power, a new policy of continental solidarity might

indeed have been initiated, notwithstanding the economic imperialism which still weighs on our shoulders and from which we ourselves must seek liberation. It can be asserted that, in his good neighborhood doctrine, President Roosevelt resumed Monroe's correct point of view, the ideas of President Adams, the human sentiment of Henry Clay and the non-fulfilled aspirations of President Wilson".

"He supported, moreover, the thought of Bolivar and of the Spanish-American patriots of various generations. And he ratified in an evident manner his ideas on May 27th, 1941, when the Washington Government decreed the state of emergency in the American Union. At that moment, among other things, President Roosevelt stated: "The United States have the obligation to oppose all their resources, wherever it be necessary, to defend the integrity of the Americas and to fight for them, just as if the security of the North American homes was involved". (Guión de Historia Contemporánea", pages 289 to 292.)

This new spirit of cooperation and solidarity among the American republics, at least as far as the juridical aspect is concerned, was finally able to crystallize in the Act of Chapultepec, article III which reads textually: "Any attempt of a State against the integrity or inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State, in accordance with part III of this Act, shall be considered as an act of aggression against the remaining States signatories of the said Act". (Vicente Sáenz: "Paralelismo de la paz y de la democracia", México, D. F., 1946.)

VICENTE SÁENZ

APPEAL OF GUATEMALA TO THE UNITED STATES

BUT when the moment arrived to put into practice the words of the deceased President Roosevelt and the resolutions of so many Conferences, the Washington Government drew back. It did not pay heed to the clamour of twenty nations, nor to the authorized voice of their most prominent men, nor to the pacts signed during the war.

Neither did it take into account the firm attitude adopted by the American Foreign Ministries against the unexpected British aggression. It did not even trouble to think that, at Bogota, and in face of that danger, the Monroe Doctrine would be applied for the first time to condemn the colonial system, no longer at the will of one great power only, but as an instrument of *multilateral policy* at the service of the ideals of independence, justice and liberty of the Continent.

The U. S. Delegation having proceeded so negatively, the Spanish-American block found itself obliged to wield the afore-mentioned *multilateral policy* of mutual defense and assistance. This as a result of the abstention of Washington, who shrugged their shoulders, notwithstanding the "sanctity of Treaties" and the appeal which the Government of Guatemala had already formulated since the 27th of February. We reproduce below three essential paragraphs of the document in question, transmitted by cable to the U. S. A. and the other American Republics:

"The Government and the people of Guatemala have been and are firm allies of the United States in her international difficulties; for this reason they address themselves especially to that great country, to express that

the small Latin-American Republics confide in that a categorical position will be adopted in favor of this Continent's interests".

"Guatemala is not in a condition to measure her military forces against those of Great Britain, in order to recuperate that part of her soil which the powerful empire retains in its possession since the era of piracy. But if the military forces of Guatemala are not sufficient to oblige England to retire from Guatemalan waters, we continue to be confident that those principles of liberty, justice and dignity for which the American nations are fighting, will prevail over the aggressions of England".

"If the American nations do not solve jointly, energetically and rapidly the problems faced by Chile, Argentina and Guatemala, and which may threaten any other country of America, it would become evident that the Pan-American system is in bankruptcy, and does not serve to defend the highest interests of this Hemisphere".

Two days later, before a demonstration of thousands; and on March 4th over all the broadcasting stations of his country, President Arévalo explained to the people of Guatemala how proofs were being given of "the radical unity of the people and the Government, drawn together by the October Revolution, for the purpose of recovering these moral and material assets whose loss desintegrated the nation; and how the American countries should proclaim that the subsistence of European colonies on the Continent and in the islands of the Caribbean is an affront to the Western Hemisphere". At several meetings and in new declarations the Guatemalan leader and statesman confirmed previous postulates of his (1945), such as the following:

"Now in the twentieth century, our brotherhood is being expressed and exhausted in speeches and banquets. We have lost, for the moment, our most valuable American fundamentals. We have narrowed our political vision. We have chosen to tread separate and sometimes diverging paths. And the twenty Republics are like twenty icebergs, which drift together or separately from each other on the shifting surface of an ocean of coldness, without a submarine connection and without a common horizon".

"The leaders are to blame for this dispersion of the great continental unity. We have not known how to talk to our peoples, nor have we known how to denounce what is petty and what is tortuous. What we need in America is a return to Bolívar. We require men for the summits of the Continent"... "To return to Bolívar does not mean to revert to a warlike conception of life, as when our independence was being fought for. What it means now, one hundred and thirty years later, is to return to continental unity, to the Congress of Panama, to revert to the heroic conception of our lives in order to save our joint home, which is America".

"...One hundred and fifteen years have passed since Bolívar died, and there are still European colonies in America. They are bridgeheads for a possible comeback: a comeback to the empires with their complicities"... "On the sacred soil of America there is no room any longer for European colonies nor for totalitarian doctrines. Let all of us in America close our ranks, shoulder to shoulder, with our thoughts turned towards Bolívar".

TEXT OF THE ANTI-COLONIAL RESOLUTION OF BOGOTÁ

AND thinking of Bolívar, with the three exceptions noted previously, the proposal of Guatemala was finally adopted, re-inforced by some amendments of the Argentine Delegation. This historical resolution reads textually as follows:

THE IX INTER AMERICAN CONFERENCE

W H E R E A S :

The historical process of the emancipation of America will not be completed as long as there subsist on the continent people and regions subjected to the colonial regime or territories occupied by non-American countries;

The ideal which inspired America's crusade of independence will always inspire our peoples and governments, united in the moral obligation to fight by the pacific means at their disposal to banish from the continent all situations of dependency, whether political, economical or juridical;

Ever since their independence the American States have coincided as to this aim which, recently, was precisely defined at the meetings of Foreign Ministers in Panama, Havana and Rio de Janeiro, by means of resolutions which condemn the colonial regime in America and consecrate the right of the peoples of this continent to dispose freely of their own destinies;

The American States have established a zone of security on the continent, to which the extra-continental conflicts

must not be extended by reason of the existence, within the said zone, of territories dependent on or occupied by non-American countries;

The juridical patrimony of the Organization of the American States contains the principle of amicable solution of international controversies, and some American Republics are involved in controversies with European countries as regards titles of sovereignty to certain territories of the continent;

The situation *de facto* or *de jure* of the existing dependent or occupied colonies, possessions and territories on the American continent or in its security zone varies from one to another, within their common condition, which makes it necessary to make studies of each one of them in order to determine solutions that may be adequate in each case;

The spirit of the countries of America is imbued with the desire to preserve and strengthen the close solidarity of all the democratic nations of both hemispheres.

IT MAKES KNOWN

That the Republics of America justly aspire to put an end to the colonial system and to the occupation of American territories by extracontinental countries, and

RESOLVES:

ONE: To create an "American Commission of Dependent Territories", destined to centralize the study of the problem of the existence of dependent and occupied terri-

tries, for the purpose of finding an adequate solution to this question;

TWO: The said Commission shall be formed by a representative of each one of the Members of the Organization of the American States and shall proceed with its constitution as soon as the two-thirds of its members have been appointed; the governments shall proceed with the designation of their representatives prior to the 1st. of September of 1948. The seat of the Commission will be the city of Havana.

THREE: The attributions of the Commission shall be the following:

- a) To centralize all the information on the above-mentioned problems that be remitted by the interested governments and entities;
- b) To study the situation of the colonies, possessions and occupied American territories, and the problems connected with that situation, whatever their nature, for the purpose of finding peaceful methods for the abolition of the colonial system, as well as of the occupation of American territories by extracontinental countries;
- c) The Commission shall draw up a report on each one of the said territories, to be sent to the Board of the Organization of American States, which shall remit copies of the said reports to the governments of the States members of the Organization, for their in-

V I C E N T E S Á E N Z

formation and study; the said reports shall be examined at the first Meeting of Foreign Ministers that be held after their presentation;

- d) The Commission shall draw up its own by-laws and rulings.

FOUR: The creation of this Commission and the exercise of its functions, does not exclude nor limit the right and actions of the interested States to attempt directly and by pacific means the solution of the problems that affect them.

Bogota, on the 22nd of April of 1948.

CHAPTER IX

DIPLOMATIC INTRIGUES DELAYED THE MEETING OF HAVANA

ENGLISH PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE RESOLUTION
OF BOGOTA

DRAWN up with all the literary defects inherent to phrases and sentences in whose wording, unavoidably, rather too many than too few eyes and hands have intervened; and having introduced, moreover, certain unconsulted changes into the *approved text*, possibly because the honorable members of the Coordination Committee wanted to leave, in suspense or in the air the meeting of Havana with the intention, maybe, to delay it; in spite of, to sum up, these and other details which are very frequent behind the scenes of international assemblies, the American Continent obtained at last a categorical condemnation of the colonial system, with the only three already known exceptions of Santo Domingo, Brazil and the U. S. A.

The document as such, although speaking in certain *whereas* and clauses of "territories occupied by *non-American countries*", points out in others that it is indispensable to "banish from the Continent *all situations of dependency whatever their political, economic or juridical form*". (Italics of the author.)

The declaration, moreover, even when it refers to the "occupation of American territories by *extra-continental*

countries", proclaims a few lines above, with indubitable clearness, leaving no loophole for arbitrary interpretations: "It is the just aspiration of the Republics of America that an end be put to the colonial system". And it was with this aim that the American Commission of Dependent Territories was constituted.

It proved impossible to achieve anything more concrete or more explicit, in view of the attitude and the petty diplomatic intrigues of the Anglo-Saxon block, reinforced by an unceasing and well-directed British propaganda within the seat itself of the Conference.

During the following weeks and months the activities of His Majesty's officials did not diminish but, on the contrary, multiplied. The English propaganda team was headed at long distance —from London—, by Sir Creech Jones himself, Secretary of State for the Colonies of the Empire.

The opposition of England to the anti-colonial resolution of Bogota, the lengthy columns published in various newspapers, and her diplomatic negotiations, became more ample and intensive as the 1st of September, 1948, drew nearer, i. e. the date stipulated in the *original text approved in Colombia* for the meeting at Havana. And when England was able to ascertain, thanks to her powerful influences with her good friends in the two Americas, that by October the necessary number of representatives (at least 14) of the countries members of our hemispheric amphictiony had not yet been appointed, she then intensified her propaganda with a view to having the said meeting indefinitely postponed.

We thus encounter a lengthy communiqué of the afore-

mentioned Sir Arthur Creech Jones, dated October 5th, 1948, addressed to the governors of British Guiana, "British Honduras" (Belice), "Falkland Islands" (the Malvinas), Jamaica and other West Indies under the protection or dominion of His Majesty: Trinidad, Barbados, Barlovento, Sotavento, etc.

TEXT OF ENGLAND'S NOTE TO THE GOVERNORS OF HER COLONIES

THE communiqué of the Colonial Secretary reads as follows: "London, October 5th, 1948.—Mister Governor: As you are aware, the IXth International Conference of the American States was held at Bogota, Colombia, in March and April of this year".

"In the course of the said conference a certain number of delegations, notably those of Guatemala, Argentina, Chile and Venezuela, reiterated the claims of their governments to sovereignty over some of the British territories in the Western Hemisphere. Since during the last months much publicity has been given to those claims; and since the attitude towards the same, on the part of His Majesty's Government, has already been explained on many occasions, I do not propose to refer now to the events in question nor to sum up the arguments employed".

"I believe it necessary to state, however, that His Majesty's Government considers that there exist no legal foundations for any of the claims presented by other countries to the sovereignty over territories of the Crown. In the case of British Honduras, His Majesty's Government accepted, two years ago, the jurisdiction of the International

VICENTE SÁENZ

Court of Justice in order that Guatemala, if she so desires it, might prove there the justice of her claims".

"From the moment that the Government of Guatemala did not want to avail itself of the advantages of this opportunity, although it accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court for all the other matters under discussion, it is to be assumed that the said country does not believe in the possibility that her claim can be supported by legal foundations".

To this respect Mr. Creech Jones knows very well what Guatemala wants to avoid, namely: that the whole controversy be brought up based "on the obsolete text of Article VII of the Treaty of 1859, profiting particularly of the euphemisms of its wording. The points under controversy are others, much more important and elevated".

These figure in all the correspondence sustained on the matter and are clearly stated, among other documents, in the note addressed by the Guatemalan Foreign Office to the British Legation, under N° 1482, on February 3rd, 1940, quoted by Guatemala 8 years afterwards.

"The question today is not to investigate whether there still exists an effective way for Great Britain to fulfil the obligations established by Article VII of the Treaty of 1859. This matter has been exhausted by prolonged discussions between the Foreign Offices of both countries over a protracted period of more than seventy years, without having been able to reach an agreement". (Reply of the Guatemalan Foreign Minister, Licenciado Enrique Muñoz Meany to the Right Honorable Wilfred Hansford Gallienne, Extraordinary Envoy and Plenipotentiary Minister of Great

Britain in Guatemala. It is dated June 22nd, 1948 and refutes each one of the points contained in the new English communication of the preceding 9th of March, regarding plans to transfer to the Guatemalan territory of Belice European refugees and surplus population of the West Indies, as well as regarding the English Government's intentions to include the said Guatemalan territory in a proposed Federation of British Possessions on the Caribbean.)

In order to show the way in which Mr. Creech Jones has been carrying out his false propaganda, we consider it worth while to reproduce two more paragraphs of the Guatemalan Foreign Secretary's note on the matter, reading: "In the opinion of the Government of Guatemala, the Court should be acquainted in detail with all and each of the aspects of the controversy, starting from its most remote origins; so as to enable it, without limitations or hindrances of any kind, to elucidate the titles of the parties and solve the case in good earnest, for the best satisfaction of justice".

"This is to what Great Britain opposes herself; and in spite of the phraseology of her last notes, her desire is to reduce the judgment to the obsolete text—replete, moreover, with euphemisms and ambiguous terms—of a Treaty imposed upon a weak nation under special circumstances which, inclusively, permitted the English Government to avoid fulfilment of the only clause which afforded some benefit to the weak party; and she endeavours to give the impression that Guatemala refuses to submit to the verdict of the International Court of Justice when, on the contrary, this Republic, from the very beginning of the controversy, proposed that it be solved by arbitration".

AS TO HOW SIR ARTHUR CREECH JONES LAMENTS
THE "ANXIETIES OF UNCERTAINTY"

SIR Arthur Creech Jones having thus been refuted as regards Guatemala, let us revert to the subsequent paragraphs of his October communication to the governors of the Colonies. In connection with the Bogota Conference, they read as follows:

"I should like to draw attention to the main purpose of the Bogota Conference with regard to this matter; that is to say, with regard to the resolution adopted on the question of the European colonies on the American Continent".

"It must be observed that the Commission of Dependent Territories will not include representatives of His Majesty's Government, nor of the governments of the British territories in the Western Hemisphere, and that no suggestion has been made to this respect. Furthermore, it will also be observed that the preface to the resolution condemns, in principle, the "status" which the said colonies, loyal to the British Crown for so long, have enjoyed. The resolution, moreover, envisages certain investigations which may be condemned to a complete failure, since they comprise questions which only concern the internal life of the said territories".

"On the other hand, contrarily to the policy of the British Government, which consists in stimulating all the peoples under her guardianship so that they may progress rapidly towards their complete autonomy, it is the declared intention of the Commission, apparently, not to take into account the will of the interested peoples. This must be deducted from what was resolved as being the "just aspira-

tions of the American representatives", which is equivalent to introducing changes in the "status" of the British colonies in the Western Hemisphere. In this fashion will not only some of those colonies be subjected to the dominion of the countries which have already presented claims of sovereignty over the same, but this will oblige others—likewise without respecting the will of their inhabitants—to break off their connections with the British Commonwealth".

As regards this point one might answer Mr. Creech Jones that, indeed, the resolution of Bogota did not provide for representations of Great Britain nor of the colonial British governments, since the Conference in question was Inter-American wherein the European powers have no interference nor any right to interfere. At the meeting of Havana the different cases will be examined separately and in detail, and pacific means will be sought whereby to eliminate the European colonies from the Western Hemisphere. The British Government must understand that the idea is not to *maintain* but to *abolish* the colonial system, which is synonymous to slavery, and that it will, therefore, be attempted to find the most adequate means to put an end, not to preserve it, in these American lands. But let us now transcribe the last paragraphs of the communiqué we are dealing with:

"I know that, in spite of these intentions, very little attention has been paid so far in the British territories of America and of the West Indies to the resolution of the Bogota Conference; but I do not want to leave their inhabitants with the anxieties of uncertainty. I consider it,

therefore, to be of paramount importance that the people of the said colonies should know of the existence of the American Commission of Dependent Territories, and that they should clearly understand what its aims and planned activities involve. Therefore I shall particularly appreciate it, Mister Governor, if you will do your utmost to give this matter the widest publicity in order that public opinion be duly informed".

(Lacking the original English text of Sir Arthur Creech Jones communiqué, we have used and re-translated to said language the Spanish version of the same, such as it was published in a number of Latin American newspapers. The same observation applies to the following article taken from the "Chicago Daily Tribune" and to some other notes and transcriptions published and translated from Spanish.—Note of the author.)

ENGLAND SENDS ONCE MORE HER WARSHIPS TO BELICE

NOTWITHSTANDING the pressure of some powers and of the English propaganda; and in spite of it not having been possible to complete the Commission of Havana by September 1st, 1948, Guatemala, Argentina and the other Spanish-American republics affected by the colonial system, continued working for the establishment of the said Committee. Towards the middle of October only one Delegation was lacking to have the required minimum of two thirds. At that moment England, as inopportunistly as on the eve of the Bogota Conference, decided to threaten Guatemala once more by despatching two men-of-war, the

LATIN AMERICA AGAINST THE COLONIAL SYSTEM

cruiser "Cirus" and the destroyer "Aisne", which appeared off Belice on the 25th of said month.

Great Britain's attitude, considered as a challenge to the anti-colonial resolution of Bogota, was bound also this time to provoke energetic protests in the official, intellectual and popular circles of the democratic countries of America. It even came to be written that "England could well employ those two men-of-war, their crew of 800 men and their modern war equipment to bombard Russia, for instance, whom Bevin was attacking during those very days —verbally— at the Meeting of the United Nations installed in Paris". Some newspapers recalled, moreover, how the British of Chamberlain, identical to the Labourites, had bowed down in Munich before Hitler and Mussolini while "insulting revolutionary Mexico, which had the firmness to expropriate them".

* * *

But not only writers, statesmen and newspapers of Spanish America condemned this new threat of England to Guatemala and Central America: also liberal dailies and magazines of the United States themselves, with the same energy as displaced by the "New York Times" to disapprove the attitude of Mr. Marshall in Colombia. On November 3rd, among other things, the "Chicago Daily Tribune" wrote:

"Great Britain continues to obstruct with subterfuges the efforts of the small Republic of Guatemala to reach an agreement with regard to the dispute on Belice, a territory of the Crown which cuts off from the sea all the northern part of the Guatemalan nation"... "In this conflict the U. S. A. has adopted a policy of "hands off", maintaining

that the Monroe Doctrine is not applicable, since Great Britain has been claiming that territory (?) before the said Doctrine was enounced in 1823"... "The excuse of the State Department is narrow-minded and legalist, and eludes both the rights of Guatemala, whatever they may be, and the realities of the present situation of the world".

Regarding "international justice" and some other undoubtedly prickly topics, the afore-mentioned daily adds:

"If the United Nations had any of the qualities which their admirers attribute to them Guatemala could, without danger, permit that the dispute be discussed at the International Court of Justice. But that high body comprises 15 members of 15 countries, and the probabilities that their votes be given to the cause of justice are very slim. Many of its members are delegates of nations which have imperialist interests to satisfy".

"Guatemala should continue urging her demand for mediation by the United States until our State Department, to save its face, has to accept its obligations and responsibilities. England cannot honestly accuse us of being unfriendly, in view of the enormous aid we have given her; and Guatemala can be confident that we shall defend the nations of the Western Hemisphere".

"The problem is much more serious than that of whether England or Guatemala should possess some few square miles of tropical jungle. It involves the possibility that, sooner or later Belice, and other European possessions in the Americas, may be turned into bases for military operations against us. The greater part of Europe is socialist at present; some day it may become communist and covet the riches of the new world. Anticipating such a devel-

opment the North, Central and South American countries must adopt measures to end the European domination over every scrap of soil liable to serve as a base for the conquest of these continents".

"Let England renounce to her pretensions over Belice accepting, in exchange, to be credited with part of the banknotes and wealth which we have made her a present of. And let the American nations solve the differences—if they exist, because they should not exist—between Guatemala and Mexico. No other solution of the controversy is possible".

THE AMERICAN COMMISSION OF DEPENDENT TERRITORIES COULD FINALLY BE CONSTITUTED

MANY other publications of the U. S. A. expressed themselves in a tenor more or less similar to that of the "Chicago Daily Tribune" and the "New York Times", corresponding in this manner to the unified criterion of Spanish America.

An effect contrary to the desired one was, therefore, achieved by Great Britain with her new threat and new provocation to the anti-colonial thesis of Bogota since, a few weeks later, in the middle of November of 1948, the Commission of Dependent Territories was constituted, the date of February 15th, 1949, being fixed for the inauguration of the sessions. Subsequently (January 19th) a new postponement was announced. It was then convoked definitely for the 15th of March... or later!

Before the end of the year, however, Delegates had already been appointed by the following countries: The Argentine Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador,

El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela. As will be noted, the U. S. A. does not figure in the list, thereby keeping the Anglo-Saxon block almost in conflict with the Spanish-American one.

It should be added that, one week prior to the new postponement (January 12th, 1949), according to dispatches of the Associated Press transmitted on that date from Washington, the U. S. A. continued opposing the meeting of Havana. "This attitude—the said publicity agency assures—was made known by means of a communiqué sent by the State Department to all the other governments of the Continent, shortly after 14 republics had appointed their delegations in order to constitute officially the Commission of Dependent Territories, which will endeavour to find pacific means for eliminating the European colonies from the Western Hemisphere". To this the Associated Press adds:

"Several of the governments have replied, but the text of their notes has not been revealed. High officials of the State Department explained that the argument of the U. S. declaration is that it would be necessary to hear the two parties, a thing that the Commission of Havana cannot do, since it is merely an Inter American organism and not a court".

"The U. S. criterion follows undoubtedly the general outlines of one or several declarations made in Bogota by the Secretary of State, Mr. George C. Marshall, when this problem was fully discussed at the IXth Inter American Conference".

It can easily be deduced from the above that the

Government of Washington has not modified its attitude, with regard to the colonial system and its desire to keep on the side of England, supporting its position with the same arguments as the latter.

Possibly the procedure of President Truman will be different when he puts into practice his message to the eighty first Congress of the Union, read in the presence of both Houses on January 5th, 1949, wherein he dedicates various optimistic phrases to the *good neighborhood policy* with the nations of the South!

Perhaps the resignation of General Marshall, which had been announced previously and which became a fact on the 20th of the same month, might be—or not!—a step in this direction.

Note to the second edition: April-May, 1949.—The new North American Secretary of State Mr. Dean Acheson, seriously harming the so preached and looked for solidarity, followed the same path of his antecessor General Marshall, in that which refers to the Colonial System in our Continent. On March 4th he declared officially how his Government would not send delegates to the Meeting of Havana. Reasons or lack of reasons? The following, transmitted textually by the Associated Press:

"Washington, D. C., March 4th, 1949.—... "The Government of the United States has great doubts as to whether the American Commission of Dependent Territories will be able to carry out the works entrusted to said Commission"... "It would endanger the principles that have been accepted by all the American Republics in the Inter American Treaties and in the Chart of the United Nations"... "This Government judges that the problems risen from the status of the territories, may and should be solved by means that do not implicate violation of such principles".

Even the most expert juriconsults could hardly explain satisfactorily, why is the anticolonial thesis contradictory to the Inter American principles and to the Chart of the United Nations. Is there any postulate in those multilateral treaties in favor of the Colonial System? Or against the liberty or dignity of the human being? For the benefit, in short, of the great colonizing powers?

The Secretary of State would not be able to answer affirmatively to those questions. Because the only certain thing is that if General Marshall abstained from voting against the Colonial System at the Bogota Conference, now Mr. Acheson went even further, refusing to respect the practically unanimous resolution of that historical Assembly. And this certainly goes against the Inter American principles ruled since 1889 by majority's decision.

Washington, then, has established a doubtless lamentable precedent in our brandnew Organization of American States, pretending to object to the resolution of the majority with its potential veto, something very similar to the Russian tactics which the Anglo Saxons criticize so emphatically in the United Nations!

In spite of this potential veto of the United States; and of the labourites' threat, in the sense that "the English Government will not recognize in anyway the authority of the Conference"; and notwithstanding the distressing attitude of our old creole "quislings" at the service of both powers; opposing and defeating ultimately all kinds of manoeuvring, the sessions of the Havana Meeting started in Spanish —saving time, without interpreters— on the already set date of March 15th., 1949.

The plenary sessions ended on the 28th., thus the first stage of the resolution taken by the IX Inter American Conference, against the colonial system, having been accomplished. The sub-committees will continue to work studying also the case of Porto Rico, with or without the consent of Mr. Muñoz Marín, Governor of the Island as our friend Sancho was Governor of Barataria.

Ah!, the eternal "quislings" —insuperable word and thus so often repeated!—, amongst them the Porto Rico deputies, who decided to condemn "the intervention of the Spanish American countries in the cordial relations between the United States and Porto Rico"! (Associated Press, April 16th., 1949.)

These and other "little" men of the Latin American submission disconcert and make us think quite a bit! They would go as far as to be the first in approving England's transfer of Belice and other colonial territories to the United States, so that the occidental supercivilization —christian meekness— could have new defensive bases against the communistic barbary of the Russians and the Mongols!

Though they may think themselves beloved by their masters and lords, our obliging Francos or Lavales, offering as much as they can offer, from ports and harbors up to canal routes, in defense of democracy, we hope that at last decency will prevail in our "climate", so being able to feel in our cloudy atmosphere the vibration of the highest intellectual and ethical values of Latin America.

CHAPTER X

SUMMARY OF THE SPANISH AMERICAN TREND OF THOUGHT ON THE COLONIAL SYSTEM

PARAGRAPHS EXTRACTED FROM SOME SPEECHES
AND PUBLICATIONS

SINCE, at the beginning of the new year (1949) a situation similar to that brought up at Bogota seems to subsist; and as it has become indispensable to explain, even if only in a very condensed form, the Spanish-American anti-colonial trend of thought, it will be worth while to reproduce at least something of what was said within and without the afore-mentioned IXth Conference, including some notes of the Colombian press, antenna of what at that time was being written in all the newspapers published in our language, although only a synthesis will be given so as not to lengthen this chapter unduly.

On previous pages we have already transcribed the Argentine Delegation's answer to the British propaganda concerning the Malvina Islands and the case of the Antarctica. Both the Foreign Secretary, Doctor Juan Atilio Bramuglia, and the Ambassador Enrique V. Corominas, gave an adequate reply to the English.

Let us now listen to a simple statement by the then Ecuatorian Foreign Secretary, Doctor Antonio Parra Velasco; to three or four of the Head of the Venezuelan Delegation, ex-President Romulo Betancourt; and to some