



Declarations of the president of the government of the Spanish Republic don Alvaro de Albornoz at the press conference of the 20th. of January 1950, in the Spanish Embassy of México, the day after Mr. Achensohn's declaration was made known

<https://hdl.handle.net/1874/35619>

Declarations of the President of the Government of the Spanish Republic don Alvaro de Albornoz at the press conference of the 20th. of January 1950, in the Spanish Embassy of México, the day after Mr. Achenson's declaration was made known.

The Republican Government in exile had the intention of making a public declaration in view of the Franquist manoeuvre in the United States. Our declaration is motivated more by the words of Mr. Achenson than by the fact that we are having a meeting to-day. But even had these words not been pronounced, I should have felt it necessary to express to-day my opinion, as I am about to have the honour of doing before you.

It is particularly interesting to remember the text of the resolution of the United Nations of the 12th. Of December 1946, which says :

« The peoples of the United Nations, at San Francisco, Potsdam and London, condemned the Franco regime in Spain and decided that as long as that regime remains, Spain may not be admitted to the United Nations.

The General Assembly in its resolution of 9 February 1946, recommended that the Members of the United Nations should act in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the declarations of San Francisco and Potsdam.

The peoples of the United Nations assure the Spanish people of their enduring sympathy and of the cordial welcome awaiting them when circumstances enable to be admitted to the United Nations.

The General Assembly recalls that in May and June 1946, the Security Council conducted an investigation of the possible further action to be taken by the United Nations. The Sub-Committee of the Security Council charged with the investigation found unanimously :

(a) in origin, nature, structure and general conduct, the Franco regime is a fascist regime patterned on, and established largely as a result of aid received from, Hitler's Nazi Germany and Mussolini's Fascist Italy ;

(b) during the long struggle of the United Nations against Hitler and Mussolini, Franco, despite continued Allied protests, gave very substantial aid to the enemy Powers. First, for example, from 1941 to 1945, the Blue Infantry Division, the Spanish Legion of Volunteers and the Salvador Air Squadron fought against Soviet Russia on the eastern front. Second, in the summer of 1940 Spain seized Tangier in breach of international statute, and as a result of Spain maintaining a large army in Spanish Morocco large numbers of Allied troops were immobilized in North Africa.

(c) incontrovertible documentary evidence establishes that Franco was a guilty party, with Hitler and Mussolini, in the conspiracy to wage war against those countries which eventually in the course of the world war became together

as the United Nations. It was part of the conspiracy that Franco's full belligerency should be postponed until a time to be mutually agreed upon.

The General Assembly, convinced that the Franco Fascist Government of Spain which was imposed by force upon the Spanish people with the aid of the Axis Powers and which gave material assistance to the Axis Powers in the war, does not represent the Spanish people, and by its continued control of Spain is making impossible the participation of the Spanish people with the peoples of the United Nations in international affairs :

Recommends that the Franco Government of Spain be debarred from membership in international agencies established by, or brought into relationship with, the United Nations, and from participation in conferences or other activities which may be arranged by the United Nations or by these agencies, until a new and acceptable government is formed in Spain.

The General Assembly further, desiring to secure the participation of all peace-loving peoples, including the people of Spain, in the community of nations.

Recommends that if within a reasonable time there is not established a government which derives its authority from the consent of the governed, committed to respect freedom of speech, religion and assembly, and to the prompt holding of an election in which the Spanish people, free from force and intimidation and regardless of party, may express their will, the Security Council consider the adequate measures to be taken in order to remedy the situation and,

Recommends that all Members of the United Nations immediately recall from Madrid, their ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary, accredited there,

The Assembly further recommends that the State Members of the Organization report to the Secretary-General, and to the next Assembly, what action they have taken in accordance with this recommendation .»

Besides being interesting to put on record the text of this resolution of the Assembly of the United Nations of the 12th. of December 1946, it is also interesting to remember that this declaration of the Assembly contains a preamble, which I have not time to read, which is probably the most energetic criticism which has been made of Franco and his regime. And in fact this preamble was proposed by the delegation of the United States and read before the Assembly by Senator Connally, who is now one of the partisans of this tendency, which attempts to persuade the American policy to give full recognition, both political and diplomatic, to Franco's regime.

THE PRESENT REGIME WAS IMPOSED WITH THE HELP OF HITLER AND MUSSOLINI

There is one unchangeable fact, which is that the Franquist regime, as is stated in the aforesaid declaration, was imposed on Spain by the help of Hitler and Mussolini. It is an unchangeable fact that nobody pretends to deny or to question. But there is another fact, also established in the resolution of the United Nations, that the Franquist regime is a regime of tyranny, which ignores all liberties, violates all the fundamental rights of the human personality, and this fact for me, for all the Spanish Republicans, and for the majority of the democratic countries of the world is equally incontrovertible.

In what has the Spanish situation been modified? Has the Spanish regime changed? Does the regime which motivated the declaration of the United Nations of December 1946 exist no more? By no means. Not only the situation has not changed, but — Mr. Acheson admits it himself, and he could not do otherwise because the world opinion is being daily informed of the political and juridical life in Spain by illustrious American journalists — in Spain all human rights continue to be ignored. Spain continues to be a police State.

What can be the reasons for changing the declaration of the Assembly of December 1946, in the sense proposed by the Secretary of State. It is said, in the first place, that this declaration served more to invigorate than to destroy the Government of Franco, which is absolutely inexact. — The proof of this is the violent reaction in all the Spanish Phalangist press, each time that the Assembly of the United Nations confirms the resolution of 1946. If this declaration and this attitude of the United Nations serves not to weaken but to strengthen the regime of Franco, the natural thing would be that this declaration should be received with pleasure and applauded by all the propaganda of the Fascist regime in Spain.

THE SPANISH PEOPLE HAS HOPED IN VAIN FOR THE HELP OF DEMOCRACIES IN THEIR LIBERATION

It is said also that this declaration and this attitude of the United Nations has served to provoke a reaction of the Spanish feelings, allowing the dictator the sympathy even of those political elements most opposed to him. This statement is also inexact. On the contrary, the Spanish opinion depends always on the attitude of the United Nations with respect to the Franquist Regime. Even the slightest opposition to this regime is received with pleasure. Only the possibility that the United Nations may fully recognize the Franquist regime is for all democratic and liberal Spaniards a great anxiety. In consequence, this attitude of the United Nations cannot serve to give the Caudillo the backing of the Spanish people. To change this attitude would have the only result of uniting the democratic Spanish elements in desperation, irritation and violence.

Also it is said that at the Assembly of the United Nations, when this question was dealt with in April and May of 1949, the supporters of a modification of the resolution of 1946 were in the majority, which is not exact either. They had not an absolute majority at the assembly, not even the two thirds necessary for a proposal to be approved. On the contrary, the votes against the modification, with the abstention of several countries, and absences, really represent the absolute majority of the votes of the Assembly.

It is said that Franco is not helped, that there is no intention of helping Franco, but, on the contrary, of obtaining the democratisation of the Spanish regime, and that at the same time they are trying to modify the resolution of 1946, the Spanish people are invited to change their regime, to evolve towards a democratic regime. This, gentlemen, is a monstrous contradiction. If Franco is helped, and if he is helped politically, with all the authority and all the prestige of the United States, there is no sense in inviting the

Spaniards; on the other hand, to constitute for themselves a democratic regime, because this help given to Franco makes impossible a pacific and legal means of democratic evolution of the Spanish regime.

That which we can see behind all this is indubitably not help for Franco, nor the intention of helping, but a design for economic penetration into Spain. This is a difficult and delicate subject, I can even say a very grave subject; that is why I reserve it for the written declaration which the Republican Government, of which I have the honour of being the President, will publish.

THE CASE OF SPAIN, SATELLITE OF THE AXIS, CANNOT BE COMPARED TO THAT OF RUSSIA, ALLY OF THE DEMOCRACIES DURING THE WAR

Another argument for modification of the attitude of the United States regarding Franco is that, if normal diplomatic relations are maintained with Russia and with those countries which are called satellites of Russia, which are totalitarian states, why should they not be maintained with Franco, even if this regime is totalitarian? This argument is a fallacy, this argument is a sophism and could make and does make many simple people accept as truth what is in fact only a misrepresentation. Russia can have a regime which is acceptable or is not acceptable; she can be or not be, according to our conception, a totalitarian State, but Russia was an ally and the efficacy and the importance of the contribution of Russia to the war can only be ignored either by injustice or forgetfulness.

In the same case as Russia are other countries, named satellites, which struggled from the first moment against the nazi or fascist invader, who fought for their own liberty, and for the liberty of Europe and therefore for the liberty of the world in the battlefields, and if they have since evolved to a regime different from those which they had at that time, it is done, and whether we like it or not, this is a problem into which we cannot enter here. Their regime changed because they were liberated from the invaders and the oppression of a foreign tyranny, by the army nearest to them, that is to say by the Soviet army.

This is not the case of Spain. The Spanish regime was not allied to North-America nor to France nor to England. Franco's regime was an enemy of the democracies during the war. The Spanish fascist regime joined with Hitler and Mussolini in unforgettable manifestations. Franco and his Foreign Minister Serrano Suñer sent warm congratulations to Hitler on the event of victories of the German army. In Madrid, and this is a disgrace for our civilization, and for our race, was celebrated, with much pomp, the fall of Paris, a fact which was for us a source of great sorrow. In Africa Franco made political manoeuvres, which could be easily converted into military manoeuvres, threatening Tangiers, rendering more difficult and seriously complicating the liberty of movement of the Allies in Morocco, and in the Mediterranean. Fascist Spain furnished the German submarines with gasoline. All this was an undeniable participation in the war, even without mentioning the despatch of the Blue Legion to Russia. So, it cannot be said seriously and conscientiously, with clear and impartial judgment that, because relations are maintained with Russia and with the satellite countries, they must also be fully maintained with Franquist Spain. No; these countries fought for liberty and democracy — as was said by Roosevelt and by Churchill — against the aggressors of the world. Spain, on the other hand, was a fighter against the Allies, unimportant because of the insignificance of her military force, important because of the hatred and venom that the Franquist regime inspired against the Allies. Spain was a fascist-nazi fighter, who did everything in her power against the democracies.

That is not all. Fascist Spain continuously insulted the democratic countries, particularly the United States, Dean Acheson's country. In the classes of Secondary Schools, in the history lessons, Franco said as follows: « The United States represent the materialist sense of the North Ameri-

can civilization, lack of feelings and moral unity ; their unjust aggression of Spain ; there is a moral superiority of South America over North America.

This is franquist Spain, abominable, bitter enemy of all democratic solidarity, enemy of that which we call western civilization and culture ; this is the Spain which now the declaration of the Secretary of State of America comes to help.

TO HELP FRANCO WOULD BE THE GRAVEST ERROR THAT THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES COULD COMMIT

The attitude taken in the declaration of the North-American Secretary of State separates the international policy of the United States from the policy of all democratic Europe. Democratic Europe rejects the franquist regime, as a foreign body in the evolution of our culture, and thus of our policy. Franco's Spain geographically forms part of Europe, but it does not form part of it morally. And the reaction of Europe came soon. We hear from semi-official sources in England that the United States did not consult her regarding Mr. Acheson's declaration, and that Great Britain has no reason to change her policy with respect to Franco. I have the impression, although I have not yet received concrete news, that this is the attitude of official circles in France, this great and friendly country to whom we owe so much.

I said that democratic Europe rejects Franco, and to such an extent that even the conservative parties in Europe are opposed to the Franquist regime. In France not only the communists, the socialists and the catholics, such as Bidault are opposed to Franquism, but also the supporters of General de Gaulle, among whom we have so illustrious defenders, one of whom is the great writer Malraux, and another is our dear personal friend Jacques de Soustelle. And in Italy not only the socialists, from the left group of Nenni to the moderate group of Saragat and our great republican friends are opposed to Franco. The liberals and christian democrats are enemies of the regime of Franco also. Here I see before me a public declaration published in Rome last summer, in favour of the cause of the Spanish republic, and in which, beside the illustrious signatures of socialists and republicans, we find the following signatures : senator Casati, of the Liberal Party ; Count Nicolo Garandino, who has been Ambassador to London, of the Liberal Party ; and Christian Democrats such as Adona Zoli, Senator and Chief of the Parliamentary Group of the Christian Democrat Party, and also Senator Quinto Tossati, who is equally one of the most eminent members of the Christian Democrat Party.

Democratic Europe, I repeat, rejects Franco, and the United States by initiating this policy contrary to all the European democracies, who cannot admit Franco, introduce an element of discord. From this point of view, I cannot exaggerate the gravity of such a declaration.

But there is not only Europe ; there is also America, and for America the signification of Mr. Acheson's declaration is a negation of all the democratic behaviour of the United States, from the great Jefferson to Roosevelt ; it directly contradicts the generous democratic policy with regard to Europe, first followed by Wilson, the forerunner, and afterwards by that great statesman Roosevelt. It not only contradicts the historic tendency of the great North-American democracy ; it also contradicts the democratic opinion of the United States. In the last few weeks I have read articles expressing the opinion that there was no reason for changing the policy of the United States concerning Franco. The articles were published by newspapers such as the « New York Times » « The Herald Tribune » and « The Post ». Thus, these declarations are not only against the democratic traditions of the United States, but also against the present democratic opinions of the United States.

Therefore, I sincerely believe that this mistake is, in the

series of errors committed in international policy by the United States, since the death of Roosevelt, the gravest one of them all, much more serious than that committed with regard to Chang-Kai-Shek and the policy in China. If this declaration really signifies the beginning of a new United States policy, the date of this declaration should be marked with a black stone in the difficult road of the peoples of all continents of the world towards their liberation. If we were sentimentalists, which we are not, we should say that that day was a day of mourning for universal democracy. As we are not sentimentalists, we confine ourselves to saying that it could be a day of mourning for the great North-American democracy.

But it is not only this. The United States do not only go against democratic opinion in Europe, America and their own country. What authority can the United States have with regard to the South-American dictatorships if they continue this policy ? If they back the mother dictatorship, what authority can they have before the dictatorships of South-America ? What is the origin of those little dictators of some unfortunate countries, which we love so much, countries of our language, our culture and our race ? Where do they come from, if not from the very centre of Spanish fascist and reaction ? From where has come Laureano Gomez who muzzles and oppresses the people of Colombia, if not from Madrid, with the most up to date teachings of the Spanish phalangism ? What authority, I repeat, can the United States have with regard to the dictatorships of America if they help the mother dictatorship, that is Spain ?

Fortunately, there are not only dictatorships in America ; there are also democracies. There is the great democracy of Mexico, to whom we are so deeply in debt, and who is chiefly responsible for the creation of the Republican institutions in exile. There are Guatemala, Panama, Cuba, Chile and Uruguay. And even in the countries where dictators reign, the general opinion is contrary to fascism, and friendly to the Spanish democracy, which is explained by the closeness of their past. In the revolutionary movement of Mexico, the eminent name of Juarez is united to the illustrious name of our General Prim. In Cuba to the names of Marti and de Maceo are joined the illustrious name of Pi y Margall. Consequently the victory of the pro-Franco attitude is not so easy ; on the contrary I believe that if once again the problem of the recognition of Franco is put before the United Nations, the result will be the same as at the Assembly of April and May 1949.

NO HELP WILL SAVE FRANCO, BUT CAN ONLY SOW SEEDS OF COMMUNISM IN SPAIN

Fortunately, and to the honour of good sense, in this declaration of Mr. Acheson the strategic argument is not spoken of. It is just as well, as it would be an argument not only without any foundation, but that could not be taken seriously. To suppose that a country, hostile to its own Government, which in fact abominates it, as is the case in Spain, could be a useful combative element in an European war, between the Occidental and the Oriental blocks, is something which it takes all our self control not to qualify with too harsh words. To affirm that the Spanish army, with more than 20,000 chiefs and officers (for so it is !) but without soldiers, without arms, without barracks, without munitions, without transport, etc., could be a useful element in a war of this class is something which cannot be believed for a moment. Given the case where the Soviet army triumphally arrived at the Pyrenees — this is not to be overlooked — given this case, it would be the sign for an explosion in the Iberic Peninsula, and could be a surprise for the world, which does not appear to take into account certain facts, that Franco, this great knight of Christianity, would probably offer his services to Stalin in the quality of trumpeter.

And when is this aid to Franco to be given ? Precisely not only when the regime is tottering, but also when the

regime, in virtue of a phenomenon which occurs in certain soils, and which Victor Hugo describes so well in one of his books, is sinking. They want to help Franco just when the Dictator does not know which way to turn, when all our reporters were telling us that it would not be a matter of months nor of weeks, but of days, before the Franquist regime collapsed into its own opprobrium, its own misery and its own shame.

On the other hand, useless help because the misery of Spain does not depend on an accidental fact, nor on some tons more or less of wheat ; the misery and the hunger of Spain are the consequences of the immorality, of the dishonesty, of the immense strife, by the absence of all moral principles in the production, distribution and consumption of all wealth. And from this point of view, it is not only impossible to give real and efficacious assistance to the Spanish people, but with certain pretended or apparent help, all that can be done is to prolong the agony and suffering of the Spanish people unnecessarily.

And when it is said that this way they help to pacify Spain, they make another declaration which we cannot believe in any way. This is no way to contribute to the pacification of Spain, but to the contrary. I am sure that in a few hours, in only one day, in a few minutes, Mr. Achenso's

declaration has made more rebels and more revolutionaries in Spain than all the communist propaganda inside and outside the country in these last months. The United States with this mistaken policy — I do not say it myself — it is said by the eminent North-American Writer Walter Lipmann, the United States have sown the seeds of communism in China ; the United States with this policy, which we deplore so much, are sowing the seeds of communism in Spain.

And I arrive, gentlemen, at the last words which I had proposed to say before you this afternoon. In such a situation the Republican Government in exile thinks only of intensifying its struggle against the Franquist regime, and in favour of the advent in Spain of democracy, which cannot have — of this we are absolutely convinced — other expression than that of the Republic. Our firmness will make up for the lack of means, produced by the abandonment of those who have so many reasons for helping us, until the hour of victory. Thus, we continue each day with more optimism than ever ; And in this attitude we shall persist until Democracy and the Republic are established in Spain, the only regime, the only atmosphere in which national coexistence is possible and within it peace, liberty and justice.

