



**The government of the Spanish republic in exile addresses
the following commentary to the governments and the public
opinion of the democratic countries**

<https://hdl.handle.net/1874/35635>



**The Government
of the
Spanish Republic in Exile
Addresses the Following
Commentary to the Governments
and the
Public Opinion
of the
Democratic Countries**

by

Alvaro de Albornoz

1950

Published by the
Spanish Weekly Newspaper
ESPAÑA LIBRE



Alvaro de Albornoz

**The Government of the Spanish Republic
in Exile Addresses the Following
Commentary to the Governments
and the Public Opinion of the
Democratic Countries**

The Government of the Spanish Republic in exile, untouched by the struggles of factions and parties into which humanity is divided, as were the villages in ancient times under their belfries, the unity of old Christian community having been destroyed and all ecumenical sentiment lost, addresses itself to the Governments and to the public opinion of all democratic countries of the world, exposing once more the grave injustice of which the Spanish people continues to be the victim. With the authority that moral right and moral force, purified by misfortune, imparts, the Spanish Republican Government which represents a legality overthrown by a criminal foreign intervention, as well as a people abandoned to the rigours of tyranny by the lack of solidarity of the democracies, this government feels able to judge objectively and impartially the difficult and dangerous situation into which the Spanish problem has been put by the latest evolution of international politics. With this in

view, we submit the following considerations—perhaps more important from the point of view of the chronicle than because of the action in itself—of

Secretary of State Dean Acheson's Letter to Senator Tom Connally

Political feelings seized at once on the aforesaid document, either praising it or discrediting it, according to the tendency of the international forces in disagreement. And frivolity merrily joined the scandal and stridency that are always to be found in a passionate political discussion. Madrid—the official Madrid—was more prudent and cautious in its assertions. The contradictions in the document were obvious at the first glance. The clever pen of the writer did not disguise the reserves, with which he proposed to neutralize the concessions, intended to produce the greatest enthusiasm among the partisans of the Spanish dictatorship. The document is directed both to Republicans and Democrats—though addressed to a Democrat—so as to avoid the disputes that generally hinder negotiations, and to reduce opposition by the Senate to the projects of the Government. This is an attempt to please parliamentary tourists, who show in Washington a Spain seen superficially and the exporters, who keep their wares heaped ready on the

quays of New York. In short, Dean Acheson's letter to Senator Tom Connally seems to be a manoeuvre, a trick of interior politics rather than an act of decisive international importance. In any case, the document of the Secretary of State Dean Acheson justifies the alarm that it has produced and must be considered in its full gravity, because of the risk in as far as it is clear, because of the possibility of misinterpretation in its ambiguity, for the backing it implies, even in its most dubious expressions to the bankrupt Franco Regime, and for the encouragement it can bring to the defenders of Fascism in Europe or America.

Value and Efficiency of the U. N. Decision of 1946

In the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the United Nations on the 1st of December 1946, we find the last of a series of declarations inspired by the Atlantic Charter of August 1941. In this unforgettable—though apparently forgotten—document, published when the soldiers of Hitler trampled all Europe under their boots, the restoration of full sovereignty and free exercise of government to all those who had been deprived of them by force was promised. The declarations of the United Nations of the 1st of January 1942 and the Teheran Conference of December 1943 were followed by the transcendental declaration of Yalta in

1945. In this the three great democratic Powers, Great Britain, United States and Russia, engaged themselves to help the peoples of liberated Europe, and the old satellite States of the Axis, among which without any doubt was Spain, to settle democratically their most urgent political and economic problems, and to restore the sovereign rights and self-government, to the benefit of those peoples who had been so brutally deprived of them by the aggressive powers. The case of Spain was obvious. Her republican institutions, and with them all her liberties, had been destroyed by the arms of Hitler and Mussolini, in the service of the rebels against the legitimate regime of their country, as was solemnly declared later by the United Nations themselves. This inspired the resolution of San Francisco in June 1946, in which it is stated that the Charter of the United Nations is inapplicable to "States whose regimes have been established with the help of the military forces of the countries that fought against the United Nations, as long as these regimes remain in power." Later comes the Potsdam resolution at the end of August of the same year, signed by the United States, Russia and Great Britain, in which these three Governments affirm that "they will not back the admittance to the United Nations of the Franquist Government" "which having been established by the help of the Axis Powers does not possess, owing to its origin, its nature and its close association with the aggressive powers, the necessary qualifications for admittance to

this organization." And the London Assembly of February 1946 reiterates the San Francisco and Potsdam declarations. So, the resolution of the United Nations of the 12th of December 1946 is not an improvisation or a surprise, owing to momentary circumstances; it is still less the result of a manoeuvre in the interior of an organization which was not yet divided into two blocks, nor was yet the scene of the hard struggle of the cold war. It is logical in its political principles, and necessary because of the moral premises of a whole series of previous declarations and resolutions, which have the value and prestige of acts of the most important Governments and of the highest international Organization. To derogate this resolution or to suppress it, would be to erase from history the war for democracy and liberty of the peoples, and to forget the millions of dead and the horrible cruelties, whose first victims were the Spanish people. And to consider it as a casual mistake continued absentmindedly or carelessly would prove before the world that the highest diplomacy is but a comedy.

Convention in diplomacy, however liberal this diplomacy may be, has an insurmountable limit, and this is the respect to the evidence of facts. And this limit that even the diplomacy of the most powerful State cannot transgress though it desires to do so, is transgressed when it is said that the resolution of the United Nations of December 1946 served only to invigorate the Franquist Regime, and to unite around the Dictator, with the bonds of patriotic love

for Spain, the great majority of the people. If the first were true, all the organs of propaganda of the Spanish Fascist State would ask for the prolongation of the international boycott against Franco. Instead of this they attack violently, in the usual way of Falangist demagoguery, the U. N. resolution, its promoters and the countries represented by them. And as to the second, if it is perfectly possible that a people may be grouped around a dictator when the independence of the country is threatened, or the honour of the country has been gravely insulted, the attacks against tyranny that are produced outside the country comfort the public opinion inside it, and its appreciation is shown within the strict limits allowed by police vigilance. A proof of this is offered by the extraordinary sympathy that Mexico finds in Spain, the Mexico of Cárdenas, Avila Camacho and Alemán. The silhouette of an artist, the beginning of a dance or the prelude of a Mexican song, are enough to produce an outburst of enthusiasm in a cinema or a theatre. This is sheer love and gratitude for the country in which parents, brothers, husbands and sons live free, under the protection of a State that affirms the principles that so many others forget, and practices the democratic solidarity that so many others ignore, refusing to recognise the spurious regime that oppresses and dishonours Spain.

If the resolution of the United Nations of December 1946 was not so efficacious as it should have been, it is not the fault of the

Spanish people, nor can it be attributed to any peculiar psychological quality of the Spaniards; it is the fault, on the contrary, of the International Organization that gave birth to the resolution. The Security Council did not observe the recommendations made by the Assembly, because these recommendations were not limited to the withdrawal of Ambassadors and Plenipotentiary Ministers in Madrid but, besides excluding Franquist Spain from all international organisations established by the United Nations or having connections with them, as well as from conferences and other activities until a new and acceptable Government be created in Spain, the Security Council was in charge of the adoption of the necessary measures to put an end to this situation, if, within a reasonable delay, a Government had not been constituted in Spain to guarantee the basic rights, calling the people to free elections. But the Council remained inactive, though the tyranny continued to manifest itself with more and more energy, as we can see by many statistics and figures. Nor did the Assembly do anything despite some eminent voices that were heard at the tribune. On the contrary, a few small States, some of them territorially small and some small by their moral authority, were permitted to ignore the resolution of December 1946, sending to Franco as a present, the Ambassadors and representatives of their more or less insignificant dictators, since it was impossible to send the representatives of the peoples themselves. And so—while Franco,

the little man born in the laboratory of Hitler and Mussolini, and destroyer of Free Masons, since he cannot destroy Empires, laughs at the giants of Democracy, who desire above all to be pardoned for having vanquished Nazism and Fascism—we come to the advertisement of bargains in Fascism in the liquidation of the most terrible international bankruptcy.

Lack of Similarity Between the Case of Russia and that of Franco Spain

The argument that, if diplomatic relations are being maintained with Soviet Russia and the States under her influence, there is no reason why they should not be maintained with Franquist Spain, is a misconception. Not taking into account any comparison between these two Regimes, the Soviet Regime, either laudable or blameworthy, is not the result of foreign intervention, but of a great historical surge of the Russian people, which is a real national fact. Soviet Russia has existed since 1917, and the Italy of Mussolini was one of the first States to recognise her. The European Democracies, even when ruled by conservative statesmen, have made pacts with her, without considering this nation as a foreigner in continental life. But, above all, Soviet Russia was an ally of Great Britain and the United States in the fight against the Axis Powers. To say up to what point the Soviet effort contributed to the common victory is something that is to be judged by the technicians. But the Russian

heroism, of which evidence is attested by millions of dead, belongs to Universal History, in whose chronicles the names of Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin are joined in memorable conferences and meetings.

And the States that are to-day contemptuously named satellites of Russia, and of whose regimes we shall not speak now, were then in the great constellation opposed to the Totalitarian one, and rotated indistinctly around the great stars of the democratic sky. Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia had in London their Governments in exile. And the leaders who, in the invaded countries were fighting for the national independence, were not asked for their political identity; they were, far from that, applauded and exalted as heroes, and no committee had been constituted to investigate on the day of victory the documentation of the liberators.

The Spain of Franco was on the contrary an ally of Hitler and Mussolini. She attained the heights of insolence in her manifestations of solidarity with the aggressive powers. She congratulated victorious Hitler, sending him dispatches in which enthusiasm was adulterated by flattery and servility. She rejoiced at the fall of Paris with ignoble gaiety. She created obstacles and difficulties in Morocco, trying to appropriate Tangiers, and she supplied the German and Italian submarines in the Mediterranean and in the Atlantic. She sent to Russia the Blue Legion to prove her material participation in the war. She submitted the Spanish

people to the most cruel privations to the profit of the totalitarian fighters. And where arms could not reach she used insult and impudence. All the ineptitudes that a miscomprehension of the Anglosaxon character suggested to the minds of the latin countries were compiled in articles and pamphlets. The English Revolution was reviled, emphasizing its hypocritically puritan and tyrannically anticatholic character. The United States were the object of the coarsest insults. The materialistic or inferior sense of their civilisation was studied in the syllabus of secondary school education. Another subject was the financial immorality of that great Republic. Probably the casual tourists from Washington, and the farmers of Florida and Texas, who now feel tendernes before the agony of the dictator are not aware of this. If they had been informed they would not have been deceived by guile.

The United States and the European Democracy

Europe is no longer the material power it was some time ago, but she continues to be the spiritual basis of the contemporary world. Politically, present Europe is the point of confluence of three movements which still exist: British liberalism, French democracy and a new conception of history brought in by the German philosophy. It is a civilisation born from the Renaissance, from the Reform and from the Revolution. Spain and Italy, who had

been dormant for centuries, contribute to the reforming movement of the world, with the deep gestation of the democratic ideals flourishing in the century of Castelar and Mazzini. And it is this civilisation, in whose bosom the political and social doctrines which prevailed in the last century were elaborated, that opposed an insurmountable obstacle to the dark and tumultuous forces that threw themselves, with Hitler and Mussolini, under the arms of Gothic barbarity to the assault of the modern conscience.

The same civilisation against which the weapons of the great dictators blunted themselves, rejects the dwarf who continues, to the scandal of universal opinion, to rule the destinies of Spain. From Churchill to Stalin all the votes of first quality are opposed to the abominable dictatorship which enslaves the Spanish people. All parties are hostile to Franco, not only the communists, but the moderate socialists, the bourgeois republicans, the christian democrats. All the governments, from the monarchies of the North, purified by puritan moral and enlivened by socialist humanism, to the popular democracies of the Centre and the South, consider the Franquist Regime as a monstrous survival. Even the Vatican, sensitive to the opinion prevailing in Italy, tries to drive away the sinister personage that hovers about it, like a spectre. All Europe rejects, as a foreign body, not only foreign to its political, moral, cultural and spiritual life, but belonging to an extinguished geological period, the dan-

gerous fossil that the victorious allies have forgotten beyond the Pyrenees.

It is not only the outcast of a civilisation, the repugnance of a culture and the hostility of a political and social system. It is also the alarm of great and grave interests that consider themselves engaged. England knows what bitter enmity to the British spirit and what irreducible opposition are to be found in the bosom of the Spanish reaction, of which Franco is the most typical representative. France needs to be sure she will not be stabbed on the back in the Pyrenees as she was in the Alps. Italy does not forget that the shade of Franco is the phantom of Mussolini, in the same way as the restoration of the Bourbons in Spain might signify the restoration of the house of Savoy. Any organisation of Europe is impossible if it adds to the democratic head a quarrelsome fascist tail. Continental unity on the basis of France and Germany requires firmness and security in the counterforts of the Mediterranean as well as in those of Scandinavia. The Latin Federation needs an equilateral triangle, which cannot be constituted by two republican democracies and a fascist dictatorship. Even the pacts in vigour from Benelux to North Atlantic, held together none too securely by the Marshall Plan, would be split by the distrust and suspicious fear that a foreign and troublesome element would inspire. And for the military cooperation, Franco's sword, this traitor to his creators in misfortune and death, would

be Damocle's sword on the heads of the soldiers of liberty.

Poverty can bring Spain momentarily to a subordinate position, unsuited to her genius and prestige. But soaring above the emergency is the undying soul of the people. And it is the soul of Europe that the United States must conquer, though at the same time they patch her crippled economy. The noble and fruitful collaboration does not come to life because of need but because of free design. Its inspiration cannot be necessity but idealism.

The Rendezvous with Destiny

The United States were, at their birth, the hope of the world. The Philadelphia declaration, formulated under religious auspices was like the revealing of a new gospel to all men. The representatives of the young Republic were welcomed to the France of Rousseau and Voltaire as the new prophets of the human kind. The simple words of Franklin were listened to in Paris—the Paris that was approaching the days of the revolution—as sacred answers of the oracle. The courageous and peaceful Washington—the Cincinnatus of the new Continent—acquired in the days of the war the proportions of an homeric hero. Jefferson, the cleverest and most powerful statesman of all the history of the United States, according to Murray Butler, proclaimed his solidarity with the French revolution. When this broke out, democratic societies to defend it were constituted

in all the territory of the United States, and that of Charleston was considered as a branch by the club of the Jacobins. When after the Napoleonic war and the reactionary movement of the Holy Alliance, the revolution sprang up again in Europe, the American republicans stretched out their hands towards those of the old Continent. In 1846, the National Convention of the Democratic Party expressed their sympathies with the new French Republic; and some time later the Secretary of State, Daniel Webster, affirmed in a note addressed to the Austrian Government, the right of the American people to feel the deepest interest in the nations that were fighting for a regime similar to that of the United States. In 1850, President Fillmore, with the authorisation of the Congress, sent to Turkey a man-of-war to carry to the United States the Hungarian patriot Kossuth, exiled from his country. In this democratic and humane tradition is forged the heroic soul of Lincoln, liberator of the slaves and this very tradition is the soil for the roots of the thought, both profoundly American and universal, of Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the allusion to the appointment with destiny of which the latter spoke, when he felt himself called upon to intervene at the head of his people in the most tragic conflict of all history, there is the emotion that one feels on the threshold of mystery, with the premonition of being before something decisive and irreparable.

The United States were above all the great

example of America; the masters, the guides of the Continent. The liberators turned towards Washington looking for the invincible sword, now an immortal trophy, asking for military inspiration. The Constitution of the United States is adopted by all the peoples who achieve their independence. All of them are constituted as federations in order to dispense with the unitarian and centralist spirit of the old metropolis. From the pampas and the jungle the Capitol is looked to as a star that cannot suffer any eclipse. But the march of liberated peoples towards democracy is slow, difficult and painful . . . The colonial yoke still exists in the spirit of the people, even on the wild mountains and in the immense deserts. The old despotism, without the greatness of historical monarchies, springs up again in these tyrants with the spirit of foremen and slave-traders. Interior wars follow one another and the soul of Rosas, Francia and García Moreno, lives in successive reincarnations. All this is the inheritance of a past of rebellion and slavery that arms could not destroy spiritually with the same ease as that with which they destroyed the material links of administration and government.

The United States, masters of America, cope with a grave situation. The spectacle of their universal hegemony can but suffer, confronted with the spectacle of the iberoamerican dictatorships, influenced by them economically, but refractory to their political mastery. It is very important to bring democracy to China and

Japan and the Middle East and the negroes of Africa, but it is much more important for it to be established first in South and Central America. It is right that they should be concerned by the progress of totalitarian regimes everywhere, beyond the Atlantic and beyond the Pacific, in the Asiatic Steppes or in the islands of the Pacific Ocean, but it is much more serious in their own continent, almost at the gates of the Capitol, almost within view of the White House. For democracy all dictatorships are equally inadmissible. And from the spiritual point of view, the nearer they are the more dangerous they can be. The dictatorships of America oppose themselves to the moral unity of the hemisphere, and hinder democratic continental solidarity. It is a singular method of bringing about the disappearance of these dictatorships, relics of old Spain, trying to imitate the Franquist Regime, to save Franco from bankruptcy and disaster, and to present him, rehabilitated, to the contemplation of the peoples of America.

There were in fact simple apologues and edifying parables in the speeches of Franklin Roosevelt expressing the profound emotion before the appointment with destiny. And every morning the emotion is renewed before the magnitude of the world events that are developing. The world is going mad, and there are before us only presentiments, prophecies and augurs; we wait on the threshold of mystery with apprehension and anxiety. It would be terrible indeed that the sacred appointment

with destiny should become a sordid and long-drawn-out dialogue with the Spanish dictator, under the sceptical and ironic regard of Chiang Kai-Shek.

The Equivocation of Diplomatic Relations

The problem that the letter of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, puts before the United Nations is not, as has been erroneously stated, whether or not to recognise the Franquist Regime; the United States recognised it already on the 3rd of April 1939, following the deplorable example of England and France, who had done so on the 27th of February; they recognised him without any reserve, without taking into account the dangerous situation which arose, without adopting any preventive measure to guard against the reprisals of the vanquishers, which were, as is well known, extremely cruel. Nor is it a problem concerning the recognition of the governments *de facto*, and that is why it is useless to speak of the *Estrada Doctrine*, which in any case is little understood; nor must we discuss now whether it is right or not to maintain normal diplomatic relations with governments whose ideological significance is condemned, or whose behaviour is contrary to the elementary human rights and merits universal execration. By using these means of circumvallation they try to present this problem under a false light, which makes a cynical and scandalous camouflage possible.

The initiative of recognising Franco in 1939 was taken by the pusillanimous and reactionary Chamberlain, whose policy of opening the umbrella before it rains is so much like that of the ostrich. France was weak enough to back the British attitude—though both recognitions were made on the same day—and the United States followed, after a considerable lapse of time, the two great European democracies. It was the moment of pacification at any cost; fear taking place of reason of State; the confusion of panic; the slippery slope of Munich. But when war broke out, Franco hastened to proclaim his solidarity with the Powers of the Axis; here we find the material and moral weakness of Spain as an ally of Hitler and Mussolini; they exchange congratulations and greetings, since they cannot exchange arms. The Fascist foxes, unable to turn themselves into lions, applaud the German eagles. The panorama has changed. The possible collaborator, who had been masquerading under a hypocritical neutrality, is really an enemy. Then, with intervals that mark the slow steps of victory, come the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of the United Nations, Teheran, Yalta . . . The Spanish Republicans follow, with anxiety from their prisons and internment camps, the march of the soldiers of liberty at the side of whom fight the compatriots who succeeded in escaping from the dungeon or the hangman. And after the victory, without the apprehension of an uncertain struggle, we hear the victorious peal of the bells of San

Francisco, Potsdam . . . After that, London, New York . . .

And this is the question. This has nothing to do with disquisitions on International Law. The point is to know whether the U.N.O. can nullify all these declarations and all these acts, intoning a shameful *mea culpa*; making a public recantation; dragging themselves to Canosa, like the German Emperor; marching in a procession under the caudine forks, exciting the amazement of the world.

We hope that it will be otherwise. The shade of Chamberlain "the peace-maker" must not win the battle. The honour of the democracies of Europe is engaged, to which are joined the newly constituted democracies in Asia, as well as all the free countries represented at the U. N. There are, above all, the American democracies, which, by their repudiation of the fascism of their mother country, defend their liberty and their soul. Mexico, whose international tradition has the illustrious lineage of Francisco de Vitoria, who inspires the doctrine of Estrada, the great democrat and unforgettable friend of the Spanish Republic. Guatemala, that has dispersed the ashes of the dictatorship. Panama, whose representative at the U.N. offered us an impressive lesson of law. Cuba, in whose fight for liberty competed soldiers and poets. Chile, endowed with so strong and active a political spirit that she is an example in the continent of moderation to the most extreme currents of advance as well as to reaction. The Uruguay of Batlle Ordóñez,

that extraordinary statesman, who turned his country into a model democracy. Some of these democracies can be proud of having the most progressive institutions, and all of them share the ideal, forged by the sword of the Liberator and the muse of Martí; this ideal is also that of the peoples oppressed by a new form of colonial yoke. At the U.N. it is always the voice of an American democracy that defends the noblest cause, or that proposes the most just solution, or that urges concord and fraternity. And when they close the way to Franco, the American democracies continue the secular fight for the spiritual independence of the countries, free from the old domination, whose symbol is the Spanish Dictator.

Economic Assistance to Spain and Subsidy to Franco

Not a Spaniard would be opposed on political grounds, and still less on sectarian grounds, to the collaboration that is required for the economic restoration of the country, destroyed and impoverished by a criminal rebellion that has reduced by more than a million men the working class population, and has thrown into exile the best of the scientific and technical elements of the country. Not one among us follows the catastrophic conception that makes of misery the lever of the historic movements, nor do we mistake the civil virtues for the hate that is generated by a suffering cruelly prolonged. They were sober, hard and persevering

nations—and the great powers of to-day should not forget it—who carried out the most transcendental and glorious undertakings in the last centuries. But the poor nations that have performed and will continue to perform the hardest tasks of history, are not starving and miserable nations.

The average Spaniard is able to distinguish between aid that is offered to his country and aid to a regime that enslaves it. True help to the country must, if its nature is not to be corrupted, take into account the natural conditions of the economic movement, according to the reciprocal needs of the peoples participating. It must begin by showing itself free from any attempt of exploitation, as well as from any spirit of corruption. For a healthy capitalism, Franquist Spain neither is nor can be an "investment field," as is said in financial jargon. The Franquist Regime is like a dry and burning land that would absorb the treasures thrown to it, and give nothing in return. The dictatorship is not only political despotism; it is administrative immorality and economic orgy; a bottomless barrel, as well as the gallows and the prison, is the symbol of this regime. All resources are insufficient for keeping up the display of force that substitutes public opinion, and the corrupted bureaucracy that acts for the Government. An army without soldiers, but with twenty thousand chiefs and officers, is a monstrous parasite, even for the wealthiest country. And, what is not taken by this army of domination, is devoured by the

secondary parasites, underlings no less greedy. This is the misery of Franquist Spain. And it is very important not to mistake the covetousness of the rulers of the country, who need money, for the hunger of the people that they try to exploit.

Any pretended economic help to Spain would only be a subsidy to Franco, the wages of the dictator and the maintenance of his sinister gang. It would be used to reinforce locks and gags, and to repair the prisons that are overflowing with prisoners. It would be the hideous budget of the hangman. Far from favouring the Spanish people, it would rivet their chains. And in the long run it would be bad business too, even without taking into account any moral consideration. Because we cannot believe that any honest government that may replace that of Franco would recognise the national debt created by the usurper of the Spanish sovereignty, in order to maintain his execrable dictatorship.

A Call to Revolutionary Forces Instead of a Peace-Making Gesture

If the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, on making his declarations, had the purpose of contributing to the pacification of Spain, procuring the democratic evolution of the dictatorship, he can consider his attempt as a failure from the very moment of the publication of his letter. It satisfied nobody: the partisans of Franco, because of its reticences and reserves;

the enemies of the dictator, because it excited their anger; this is all that can be expected for the hybrid combinations of all artful and insincere politics.

The present regime of Spain cannot be transformed, nor could Franco himself transform it, even if he desired its transformation. It is not likely that Franco, rather a man of arms than a man of letters, has read Quevedo, but by intuition, he probably knows the philosophy of this maxim of the great writer: "Tyrants are so wicked that to be virtuous is dangerous for them; if they continue on the way of violence, they consolidate their position; if they moderate it, they fall; thus is their nature that obstinacy is better for them, than modification that means their ruin."

The question in Spain is not to camouflage the dictatorship; the problem is to give back to the Spanish people the sovereignty of which they were deprived. And for that purpose, we know only one way; this way is shown in the immortal speech of Roosevelt on "the four freedoms"; this is referred to afterwards in the Atlantic Charter and the declaration of the United Nations, and in the subsequent landmarks of Yalta, San Francisco, Potsdam and New York. Instead of going backwards, we must follow on the same way to the end; if the measures taken up to now against the dictator have not been efficacious, they should be replaced by other more vigorous measures. If the restoration in Spain of the Democratic Regime is sincerely desired, and this makes necessary

the overthrow of Franco, it is an inevitable duty to favour and stimulate with the powerful resources of the great democracies, and without any material intervention, the forces that inside the country and in exile fight for liberation from the dictatorship. But instead of favouring and stimulating these forces, they are weakening and depressing them by acts, such as the letter of Dean Acheson; this exceeds, let us say it with an euphemism, the greatest liberty. To proclaim the necessity of an alternative to the dictatorship and to help this dictatorship, directly or indirectly, is to play a frivolous and dangerous game. The omens of 1950 are too grave to be disdained by the statesmen of the democracies.

The Government of the Spanish Republic in exile, on addressing the international opinion never indulged in stupid vanity, unsuitable to its representation and authority, self-respect and the cause that is being defended, does not permit indulgence in insult or frivolity. When this Government expresses the deep pain that the letter of Dean Acheson to Senator Tom Connally causes to it, it neither wants to make grievances nor provoke them. And we continue to have confidence in the great people of the United States, where we have so many friends, and whose strong democracy has the power of rectifying the mistakes of their rulers. In our irrevocable conviction that this Republic, the last manifestation of the national will, is the only possible solution for the Spanish crisis, we regret bitterly that, instead of offering to

the Spanish people legal solutions, they may be obliged to choose between abject submission or an appeal to violence, to which the arbiters of war and peace are calling.

Alvaro de Albornoz

Government of the Spanish Republic in Exile

Hon. DIEGO MARTINEZ BARRIO
President of the Spanish Republic in Exile

Hon. ALVARO DE ALBORNOZ
President of the Government and Minister
Foreign Affairs. Republican (Democrat).

Hon. FERNANDO VALERA
Vice-Presidente of the Government and Minister
of Finance. Union Republican. Paris.

Hon. FELIX GORDON ORDAX
Vice-President of the Government and Minister
Without Portfolio, Union Republican. Mexico.

Hon. JOSE MALDONADO
Minister of Justice. Republican. (Democrat).

Hon. DR. EUGENIO ARAUZ
Minister Without Portfolio, Secretary
of Government. Federalist. Paris.

Hon. DR. EUGENIO SERRA MORET
Minister Without Portfolio. Socialist.

Hon. JOSE MA. SEMPRUN
Minister Without Portfolio.
Republican Independent (Catholic), Rome

Hon. GEN. JOSE ASENSIO
Minister Without Portfolio
Republican Independent. U.S.A. and U.N.

Hon. VICENTE SOL
Minister Without Portfolio.
Republican (Democrat), Chile.