

12/27/19

2 copies

①

W.C.P.
(21)

LB 29

SECRETARIAT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE

Documentary Material

Vienna, June 10, 1955

Bewysstuk No.
 Gekry by... *L. Bernstein*
 Deur... *St. P. ...*
 Te... *12th Regent Hotel*
 Datum... *27.9.55*
 Verspreidings No. *21*

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE PEOPLES OF LATIN AMERICA AND THE
 PRESERVATION OF PEACE

*

CONTENTS

| | |
|-----|--|
| I | - Latin America : A. Brief History |
| II | - The Example of Guatemala |
| III | - Collective Treaties and Bilateral Pacts |
| IV | - The Caracas Conference |
| V | - The struggle of the peoples of Latin America in defence of peace and national sovereignty. |

- I -

L A T I N A M E R I C A

A BRIEF HISTORY

There are still many people who ask: 'What is Latin America?' To put it simply it is a group of twenty countries which, starting from the southern border of the United States, include Central America, South America and the West Indies. The total population is 165 million and it has a total area of eight million square miles.

The present day Latin American has the blood of every race in the world in his veins, though in very different proportions. It can be said, in a very general way, that the major part of the population of Mexico, Guatemala, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia is native in origin. In Haiti, Cuba, Panama and Brazil, negroes and mulattoes form a very considerable part of the population. In San Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, St. Domingo, Colombia, Venezuela and Paraguay, Spanish-Indian half-breeds are the largest section of the population while in Costa Rica, Chile, Argentine and Uruguay the white element predominates.

With the exception of Brazil, with its 54 million inhabitants, where the national language is Portuguese, and Haiti, which is French speaking, all the peoples of Latin America speak Spanish. Quechua, the native language, is still spoken by the rural population in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia; some native languages still exist in Mexico and Guatemala; in Paraguay the majority of the population speaks Guarani.

#

The Origins of Latin America

Discovered in 1492 by Christopher Columbus, the continent, with the exception of Brazil, was conquered in half a century by the armies of Spain. The colonial regime which lasted from the middle of the 16th century to the beginning of the 19th, was based on rigid rule from Spain. This was solidly guaranteed by granting privileges to the conquerors, the Catholic church and the colonial officials in the newly discovered territories. During the first two centuries, Spain was only interested in the precious metals to be found in the new colonies. Later she exploited the native products which rapidly became popular in Europe: cocoa, tobacco, potatoes. First to work the mines and later the plantations, the Spaniards introduced negro slave-labour into the colonies. To maintain its economic and political domination, Spain prohibited its colonies from trading with other countries and established a stringent supervision of Creole education.

Formation of the Latin American States

The emancipation of the United States in 1776 and the French Revolution in 1789 had a considerable influence on the formation of the national and political consciousness of the Latin American peoples who had already risen, albeit unsuccessfully against the Spanish yoke in the middle of the 18th century. In 1809 the invasion of Spain by Napoleon's troops stimulated the Creoles into political

activity. This first of all took the form of a movement of solidarity with Ferdinand VII, but soon developed into a war of national independence.

After a struggle of 17 years, most of the former Spanish colonies were able to break away from Spain and form 15 republics whose constitutions were inspired by the French Revolution and the political institutions of the United States. During this period a constitutional Empire was established (1822) in Brazil, with the Portuguese royal family which had been obliged to take refuge in its former colony. Simon Bolivar, who had led to victory the liberation armies of Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia, sought to form an American Federation, but internal factors and the opposition of Great Britain and the United States thwarted the various plans for partial or total federation.

Latin America in the 19th Century

Three main features stand out in this period. In the first place, the continent was continually shaken by civil wars until the end of the century. Secondly, a great wave of European immigrants came in millions to Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, Argentine, Chile and Central America, mainly Spaniards, Italians and Germans, although important colonies of French, British, Russians, Poles, Jews, Syrians, Lebanese and other nationalities established themselves in all the Latin American countries. Finally, European and American capital was invested in the production, transport and distribution of cocoa, quinine, tobacco and coffee; in working the gold, silver and platinum mines; in the construction of railways and roads; and in the urban public services.

In 1823 the United States government adopted the Monroe Doctrine as its official policy towards the rest of the American continent, with the double aim of preventing political interference in America by other powers and of establishing a privileged position for herself.

In 1848 the United States annexed more than half of Mexico by force. In 1903 they engineered the separation of Panama from Colombia and ensured for themselves the control and the profits of the Panama Canal.

Later, historians noted as many as 55 cases of intervention by the American armed forces in the Latin American countries; this was the policy of the 'big stick', so called by the man who was behind the separation of Panama, President Theodore Roosevelt.

Latin America after the First World War

The events leading up to the First World War and the war itself weakened the political and economic position which the European powers had acquired in Latin America during the period of their imperialist expansion. Investments of American capital, which in 1897 barely amounted to \$300 million, reached \$2,600 million by 1919.

Thus when, at the end of the war, the European powers tried to regain the ground lost in Latin America, the United States found it expedient to replace the 'big stick' policy, which was provoking increasingly strong opposition in Latin America, by the 'good neighbour' policy. The latter policy consisted in eschewing direct intervention while continuing economic penetration and political domination of Latin America by more subtle diplomatic and legal means.

After the Second World War

The second major world conflict helped the United States very considerably in the pursuit of this policy. With the European markets closed, the Latin American countries found themselves obliged to send all their exports to the United States. The latter, as sole market, automatically had complete freedom to fix whatever prices they liked. Moreover, the European countries had to sell their foreign investments, thus leaving the field wide open to American capital throughout this vast and exceptionally productive area. Thus in 1952, investment of American capital in Latin America amounted to \$5,700 million.

Some Characteristics of Latin America's Economy

At the present time, the United States has more capital invested in Latin America than in any other part of the world. These investments are chiefly in banks, oil, precious metals, mines, fruit exporting, frozen meat, transport and electricity and to a lesser degree, although with a growing tendency to take them over, the processing industries which have been built up by Latin American capital with so much patience and difficulty.

From 1945 to 1952 American capital investments in Latin America yielded \$5,829 millions of profit. Generally speaking the profits obtained in this part of the world are twice what can be obtained in the United States itself. In certain cases, profits amount to five times the invested capital.

The same development is to be found in trade. In 1938 Latin America supplied the U.S.A. with 23 per cent of its imports. By 1950 this figure had reached 33 per cent.

It is particularly important to define the precise nature of the trade carried on between the United States and Latin America. The following table gives a complete picture:

| | Raw Materials | Raw foodstuffs | Processed foodstuffs | Semi-manufactured products | Manufactured products |
|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Exports Latin America - U.S.A | 37.6% | 40% | 4.8% | 13.9% | 3.8% |
| Exports U.S.A. - Latin America | 2.1% | 1.4% | 6.1% | 12% | 78.4% |

Clearly, this is the very epitome of the type of trade which takes place between underdeveloped countries and a great expansionist industrial power.

But the economic problems of Latin America become even clearer when it is known that 80 per cent of the exports to the U.S.A., valued at \$5,000 million annually, consist of only seven products: coffee, cocoa, sugar, bananas, oil, copper and tin.

In San Salvador, coffee exports are 96 per cent of its total exports to the U.S.A.; in Colombia, 85 per cent; Brazil and Guatemala, 80 per cent; and Costa Rica, 45 per cent. Venezuela's oil exports are 90 per cent to 95 per cent of its total

exports. In the Chilean budget, the income from copper exports is almost 50 per cent of the total income. In Honduras, banana exports are 65 per cent of total exports, and in Panama 62 per cent. Cuba's sugar exports are 80 per cent of the total and in Bolivia, tin is 70 per cent of the total.

Foreign Control

60 per cent of the Cuban sugar industry is in the hands of the American Sugar Refining Company; the banana production of Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Colombia and Ecuador is wholly controlled by the United Fruit Company, which, according to the New York Times of February 27, 1952 distributed \$66 million in dividends, which means a net profit of over \$100 million, or the equivalent of the national budgets of Costa Rica, Panama and Guatemala combined. The oil of Venezuela, Colombia and Peru is in the hands of the Tropical Oil Company, Socony Vacuum Oil, the Texas Company, Gulf Oil, etc... the Bethlehem Steel Company and the United States Steel Company hold the enormous iron ore deposits recently discovered in Venezuela. The copper of Chile, Mexico, Cuba and Peru is controlled by the Anaconda Copper Company, the Kennecott Copper Co., the Phelps Dodge Corporation and the American Metal Company. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is the sole purchaser of tin for the U.S.A., arbitrarily fixes the price of Bolivian tin. 70 per cent of Brazilian industry is controlled by American capital.

The picture of these commercial relations becomes even darker if one bears in mind the fact that the men who implement the United States' Latin American policy are closely linked with the economic interests we have just described in detail. Thus, for example, Mr. Dean Acheson, President Truman's Secretary of State, was linked with Rockefeller's oil group; Mr. John Foster Dulles, the present Secretary of State, belongs to the leading American legal firm which was employed by Morgan, Rockefeller and Schneider; Mr. Averell Harriman, former Secretary of Commerce, has interests in Anaconda Copper and in Cuban sugar; General George C. Marshall, also former Secretary of State, was also linked with the Morgan and Rockefeller groups and he is a director of Pan American Airways, which has a large number of shares in all the important Latin American airline companies; Mr. James Forrestal, former Defence Secretary, was President of the Dillon and Read Bank which has a great deal of capital in Latin America; Robert Lovett, former Under-Secretary of State is a share-holder in Brown Bros. and Harriman Co., two companies which have capital in Latin America; Spruille Braden, former Under-Secretary of State, and former ambassador to Argentina, Cuba and Colombia, is the principal shareholder of the Braden Copper Co. and has interests in the United Fruit Company; Harold Stassen, Director of the Mutual Security Agency, whose principles and interests inspired collective and bilateral pacts and also the Caracas resolutions, belongs to the Morgan group which has many economic links with Latin America (oil, mines, transport, films); Charles Erwin Wilson, who, thanks to his post at the Ministry of Defence has the opportunity to decide on the arms to be supplied to the Latin American governments, is a former President of General Motors, a subsidiary of the Du Pont group, the big arms manufacturers; Henry Cabot Lodge, United States delegate at U.N.O., has always been the recognised defender of the United Fruit Company in the American Senate.

The figures themselves show us that the U.S. uses the countries beyond its southern border as the larder to supply one hundred and sixty million Americans with their breakfast; coffee, cocoa, sugar, bananas, and also as the back yard where they can accumulate a huge stock of strategic raw materials. But to have their breakfast and their raw materials as cheaply as possible, the big concerns which control fruit and minerals have the greatest interest in isolating and defending both the larder and the back yard. Since the big concerns are represented in government circles by their most important people, their interests take precedence over any other consideration.

6

The Organisation of American States

The complexity of the relations between the U.S.A. and the Latin American countries and the increasing extent of the economic interests at stake made necessary, in 1890, the creation of an inter-American body to co-ordinate policy on matters of common interest. This body was the International Union of American Republics which was later replaced by the Pan American Union. In both cases, the headquarters was in Washington and the director was a U.S. citizen. The countries of Latin America were represented by the heads of the diplomatic missions to the American government. In this way the dependence of the organisation on U.S. policy was increased.

o
o o

- II -

THE EXAMPLE OF GUATEMALA

'Guatemala has become a dangerous bridgehead of international Communism in this hemisphere'

Senator Alexander Wiley, Chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Affairs Committee.

Some Statistics on Guatemala

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Area | : 44,000 square miles |
| Population | : 3,000,000 |
| Army | : 6,000 men, no air force, no navy, no armored units, infantry equipped with rifles from World War Two surplus stocks. |
| Industry | : Small textile factories, breweries, cigarettes, shoes. |
| Exports | : Coffee and bananas. |
| Education | : 72% illiteracy |
| Standard of living | : 75.8% of the population go barefoot. |

*

'Public opinion in the United States might force us to take some measures to prevent Guatemala from falling into the lap of international Communism.

'We cannot permit a Soviet Republic to be established between Texas and the Panama Canal.'

John Pourifoy, U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala. (Time, 11.1.1954)

The Former Government

Although the various constitutions of the Independent Republic of Guatemala limited the president's period of office to six years, in fact between 1840 and 1944 there were only seven presidents.

The century long tradition of dictatorial regimes was interrupted in 1944 when the people of Guatemala freely and democratically elected Juan José Arévalo, a university professor, many years resident in Argentina, as their President. During his period of office a Labour Code was worked out, a few modest measures of social security put into force and the trade unions officially recognised. These elementary reforms, which also included an extension of free education, provoked a large number of attempts, all unsuccessful, to overthrow the President. Political parties were set up during those six years; the Revolutionary Action

Party, anti-imperialist and liberal; the National Renaissance Party, nationalist with some resemblance to the Peronist party in the Argentine; the Guatemala Revolutionary Party, left-centre, a right wing bloc of the big land owners and the Guatemala Labour Party.

In conformity with this new political organisation, President Arvalo, at the end of his term of office, handed over his authority to Colonel Jacobo Arbenz, who had obtained 65 per cent of the votes in the presidential elections, which were free, defeating the right and centre parties.

The general elections which followed the presidential elections sent 40 representatives of the three government coalition parties (R.A.P., G.R.P., N.R.P.) to Parliament along with 12 members of the right-wing opposition and four Communists. Following these elections, Colonel Arbenz formed his government with members of the coalition parties exclusively, neither giving nor offering any ministry to the communists who were only a small minority in the Parliament.

*

Guatemala 'has become a dangerous bridgehead of international communism in this hemisphere'
Senator Alexander Wiley, chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, UP, January 14, 1954.

'In the Caribbean area... we face the implacable challenge of Communism... It has established one centre of infection, and there are circumstances which favour its spread elsewhere. From the viewpoint of our national security, there is practically no area which is more vital to us'

John Moore Cabot, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, December 3, 1954.

An Agrarian Reform

Until the last few years, 73 per cent of the cultivable land in Guatemala belonged to 2 per cent of the population in spite of some agrarian reform laws passed in the 19th century but never implemented. Under the regime of successive dictatorships, the rural population lived in conditions which the Encyclopaedia Britannica has no hesitation in describing in these terms:

'The conditions of the Indians on the plantations is often akin to slavery, owing to the system adopted by some planters of making payments in advance; for the Indians soon spend their earnings, and thus contract debts which can only be repaid by long service'.

Before 1944 an agricultural labourer received 10 cents per day. After the 'reforms' his daily earnings could reach 26 cents, a figure still very much below the subsistence level.

Notwithstanding these very difficult conditions of the rural population, there were large tracts of uncultivated land lying in fallow in Guatemala which the big landowners kept as reserves or which belonged to the state.

In June 1952 an Agrarian Reform Law was passed to deal with land in this category. This law was by no means severe, as a few figures will show: it only applied

to uncultivated land on properties of more than 225 acres or more than 675 acres in the case of properties with a minimum of two-thirds under cultivation. The land was, naturally, expropriated only against payment of compensation, the amount being calculated on the basis of the evaluation which the owners themselves had made in compiling their tax returns and payable in Agrarian Bonds redeemable in 25 years.

During the first 16 months of the reform 426 private properties and 110 state properties were divided up to the benefit of 40,000 peasant families.

'The suppression of the beach-head for international communism in Guatemala, even by force, by one or more of the other republics would not be intervention in the internal affairs of Guatemala.'

Spruille Braden, former U.S. Ambassador, former Deputy Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Director of the Public Relations Office of the United Fruit Co., Speech at Dartmouth College, Hanover, U.S.A., 12.3.1953.

Guatemala's Influential Guests

The United Fruit Company is one of the most powerful economic organisations in the United States. Its concessions in Central America, in South America and in the West Indies amount to three million acres and it owns over two thousand miles of railways. Its principal activity consists in the production, distribution and sale of bananas, but it also possesses sugar, hemp, cocoa and oil-seed plantations, etc...

The company has its own fleet of a hundred ships to transport these products, as well as 300 transport aircraft. Through its subsidiaries it also owns most of Central America's telephone and telegraph services, a large section of its electricity industry, as it does also in Mexico and Venezuela, and many hotels. It has interests in the textile and food industries. On its plantations, the company shop system perpetuates in a dozen Latin American countries the sales system which the Encyclopaedia Britannica, in the passage already quoted, considers to be a determining factor in modern slavery.

This economic octopus established itself in Guatemala in 1901. In exchange for building about 75 miles of railways, it obtained successive concessions as follows: the monopoly of two important Guatemalan seaports; ownership of 500,000 acres of banana plantations; ownership of the railway and its rolling stock; the right to import goods tax-free; etc... These concessions are valid until the year 2,009 and were all granted by dictatorial governments.

Under the provisions of the Agrarian Reform Law, passed by the Guatemalan government in June 1952, the United Fruit Company was deprived of 400,000 acres of uncultivated land which the company had kept as 'reserves', and received \$1,118,000 in compensation, the figure being the value estimated by the company itself for taxation purposes. The company, however, claimed \$15,854,000 for the first 175,000 acres alone.

'International reaction, while presenting Guatemala as a menace to the continent's solidarity, is preparing sweeping plans for intervention such as that which was recently denounced by the

Guatemalan government. The published documents, which the State Department was quick to describe as Moscow propaganda, are conclusive proof that the conspirators and the foreign monopoly interests who encouraged and financed them sought to prevent armed intervention as a noble enterprise directed against Communism. We would point out the seriousness of these events at this Conference.'

Guillermo Toriello, Guatemalan Foreign Minister, in a speech to the Inter-American Conference at Caracas, March 5, 1954.

Stages of Aggression

As soon as it was decided to expropriate the United Fruit Company's uncultivated lands, a great outcry began in the United States press which launched a violent, unrelenting and systematic campaign on the theme of 'Communist Guatemala'. More grist was added to the mill by statements hostile to Guatemala made in the U.S. Congress by the Senators and Representatives for Massachusetts whose capital, Boston, is the headquarters of the United Fruit Company. We have already mentioned the threats made on March 12, 1953, by Mr. Spruille Braden, United Fruit's Public Relations Director, who gave a clear warning of the aggression which was to take place against Guatemala a year later.

During the ten year period of democratic government in Guatemala under Arevalo and Arbenz there were over thirty attempts at the violent overthrow of the government for which public opinion in Guatemala and throughout Latin America regarded the United Fruit Company as being directly or indirectly responsible. In such a situation the Guatemalan government felt compelled to defend itself and needed arms to do so. The government persistently asked the United States to sell it the arms required to maintain internal order but all such requests were systematically refused. Later a few thousand war surplus rifles were brought from various European sources. Washington then sought to inspect all ships of whatever nationality bound for Guatemala. In different European countries public opinion, the press and the government protested vigorously against this American move. The State Department hastily signed a 'mutual' military aid treaty with Honduras and started to fly weapons into Honduras and Nicaragua. Meanwhile, an army of 'liberation' was set up in Honduras, and on June 16, 1954 it crossed the Guatemalan frontier, while American-manned aircraft bombed Guatemala City.

*

'The United States has tarnished its reputation among its "good neighbours". Under its leadership the Security Council has run away from the issue by refusing on Friday to even hear the Guatemalan complaint.'

Manchester Guardian, June 29, 1954 - Editorial.

At the Security Council

When the aggression occurred, the Guatemalan Government informed the Security Council of the invasion of its territory and asked that the measures provided for such cases in the Charter should be taken. The delegates of Colombia and Brazil then proposed that the matter be referred to the Organisation of American States. It should be noted that the Colombian Ambassador to Washington, who is advisor to

the Colombian delegation at UNO, and Colombia's representative on the Security Council have for a number of years been the official lawyers of the United Fruit Company. The Soviet delegate, Mr. Terpin, stated:

'While the capital of Guatemala is being bombed we are sitting here discussing the question of whether or not the question should be put on the agenda. Procedural subterfuges are being used to avoid placing this matter on the agenda. Is that in harmony with the spirit and aims of the Security Council? Have we ever referred questions dealing with aggression to another organization? According to the United States Senate, the United Nations Charter becomes inoperative when aggression takes place on the American continent. If we accept this thesis, we will be henceforth bound by our decision and the way will be open for any kind of aggression in the Western Hemisphere'.

Mr. Hopponot, the French delegate, made the following proposal:

'The Council, having made a rapid examination of the communication sent by the Guatemalan Government to the President of the Security Council, calls for an immediate end to all actions likely to provoke bloodshed and asks all members of the United Nations Organisation to follow the spirit of the Charter and abstain from helping in such actions.'

But the delaying tactics won the day and the legitimate government of Guatemala was overthrown by force without any notice being taken of the Security Council's recommendations and without the Organisation of American States having taken any step whatsoever.

*

'The recent events were our first victory against Communism in the Western Hemisphere.'
Mr. John Pourifoy, U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala, June 1954.

The New Government and World Opinion

In its issue of July 12, 1954, the American review Time did not hesitate to write:

'How much did the U.S. have to do with the turn of events? No matter who furnished the arms to Castillo Armas, it was abundantly clear the U.S. Ambassador John E. Pourifoy masterminded most of the changes once Castillo Armas began his revolt. It was he who helped spot the phoniness of the first palace change, and it was he who saw to it that the new government was solidly anti-Communist.'

First in Salvador and then in Guatemala, under the immediate and constant direction of the U.S. Ambassador, they set about settling the differences which had arisen between the leaders of the aggression and in organising the repression and consolidating the power of Castillo Armas.

Here are some of the reactions which these events aroused among individuals, the press, and world public opinion in general:

- Telegram from 68 Chilean M.P.s to the Presiding Committee of the Caracas Conference in March 1954:

'We draw your attention to the fact that the democratic forces of Chile are solidly united in rejecting any attack on the sovereignty of Guatemala, any attack on the independence of our peoples and any aggression against the freedom of the continent.'

- General Lazaro Cardenas, former President of Mexico:

'...The hostilities which have been unleashed against Guatemala and which have been aggravated during the last few days by the provocation which is being prepared to involve brother countries in an armed struggle, oblige me to assure you once again of my personal friendship and to express my sympathy with the people of Guatemala and their government at this time when their country, whose sovereignty is threatened, is being put to a severe test. It is to be hoped that the intrigues which are being fermented on the pretext of fighting so-called international communism will not succeed in achieving their aim and that the principles of continental solidarity and patriotic loyalty which all the citizens of our America must feel in a situation such as that facing Guatemala today will assert themselves. (May 29, 1954)

- During the Berlin session of the World Council of Peace in May 1954, several speakers pointed out the dangers which already threatened the people of Guatemala. They included representatives of workers' organisations and in particular Mr. Virgilio Guerra, Secretary of the Guatemalan Confederation of Labour, who said:

'From this platform, which is that of the ordinary people of the whole world, and from which we work for the well-being and the happiness of mankind, we denounced the use of force by the North American imperialists against Guatemala.'

- Mr. Lazaro Pena, Vice-President of the World Federation of Trade Unions, said:

'... It is true that under the pretext of anti-Communism, preparations are being made, which we denounce here, to launch an unjust and reactionary war against the people of Guatemala!'

- The very day that the invasion of Guatemala started eminent individuals from all over the world were meeting in Stockholm to examine together measures which could lead to a lessening of international tension. The news of the invasion of Guatemala had a great effect on this gathering which unanimously adopted the following message to the United Nations:

'Those taking part in the Meeting for the Relaxation of International Tension held in Stockholm from June 19-23, 1954, deeply concerned by the invasion of Guatemala and the bombing of its capital, condemn all help given to the aggressor by any power whatever and address an urgent appeal to the Security Council of the United Nations to take all measures for ending hostilities, for the withdrawal of the invading forces and the re-establishment of the former peaceful state of the country.'

'The meeting for the Relaxation of International Tension asks the peoples of all countries to support this request to the Security Council.'

- In Latin America, a powerful movement of solidarity sprang up in all circles. Government figures, legislative bodies, the press, and the organisations of all kinds made protests:

'...Faithful to Pan-Americanism, we had to proclaim the principle of non-intervention in the unhappy conflict which broke out in Central America on June 18, 1954. They tried to make the intervention in Guatemala look like an intervention directed against another intervention. Nothing could be less true.'

Statement by the President of Ecuador

- Various Parliaments, including those of Chile, Uruguay and Argentina, approved protest resolutions against the attack on the sovereignty of Guatemala. Here is the text of the motion adopted by the Uruguayan House of Representatives:

'...The aggression against Guatemala is not only a conspiracy against peace in America, but it also means the repudiation of the people's right to self-determination and to claim economic and political control of its own territory through the exercise of its absolute sovereignty.'

'In consequence, the Uruguayan House of Representatives protests against the attack, expresses its solidarity with its brother country and resolves to send this statement to the Lower House of the Republic of Guatemala and to all the Parliaments of the continent.'

- The Conference of Latin American M.P.s and public figures which was held in Santiago de Chile on July 10-12, 1954, took the decision

'... to invite American M.P.s to take solidarity action so that the people of the continent, who have a common destiny, should unite their efforts to obtain the re-establishment of peace in Guatemala and enable this brother country to gain its economic independence and develop its own social and cultural life, as an affirmation of the principles of respect for the peoples' sovereignty and right to self-determination.'

- The Peace Movements of different countries expressed their active solidarity with the people of Guatemala. Here is an extract from a statement adopted on June 22, 1954 by the National Council of the Mexican Peace Movement:

'...The aggression in Guatemala is a clear warning to the peoples of Latin America and particularly to the Mexican people...Let us defend the Guatemalan people's right to self-determination.'

- Major trade union organisations throughout the world expressed their support for the people of Guatemala and denounced those responsible for the aggression. The Confederation of Latin American Workers (C.T.A.L.), for example, stated on 19.6.1954:

'...Manoeuvring to create an aggressive bloc directed against Guatemala, although this policy did not have the success which they anticipated at the Tenth Inter-American Conference in Caracas, the North American imperialists have organised a large number of provocations tending to create a suitable atmosphere for armed intervention and the formation of an aggressive bloc. Faced with the chilly reception which this policy met from some Latin American governments, the Yankee imperialists passed to direct action and armed intervention.'

- In Europe, the French C.G.T. and the Italian C.G.I.L. were among the organisations to speak out. The following is an extract of a message sent by the C.G.I.L. on June 22, 1954:

'The Secretariat of the Italian General Confederation of Labour, in the name of its five million members, expresses its complete and unconditional solidarity with the government, the trade union organisations and the people of Guatemala in their struggle against the aggression unleashed by the American imperialist monopolists and a handful of traitors against the democratic and peaceful people of Guatemala.'

- The Inter-American Organisation of the I.C.F.T.U. (Le Monde, July 11-12, 1954):

'Instead of listening to the United Fruit Company, the United States Government ought to accept the advice of the North American trade union movement which knows the needs of the peoples of Latin America. Instead of putting its faith in the anti-communism of dictators, it should realise that the only movements which can save democracy in the world are those which are based on truly democratic ideas.'

- Organisations and groups of intellectuals in a number of countries spoke out. A group of French intellectuals, for example, sent the following message to UNO:

'At a time when it is possible to hope that the war in Asia will soon be at an end, we are agast to learn of the aggression against the Republic of Guatemala.'

Aircraft are once again bombing towns and villages, killing women and children. We, the undersigned French intellectuals, entreat the United Nations Organisation to stop the bloodshed and to forbid, in accordance with article 2 of the Charter, "the use of force against the... political independence of any state".

Pablo Picasso, Paul Rivet, Claude Autant-Lara, René Lalou, Louis Martin-Chauffier, Simone de Beauvoir, Louis Aragon, Fernand Léger, Claude Roy, Gérard Philippe, Joan Wahl, etc...

Le Monde, June 26, 1954

- Brazilian journalists also sent a message to their Guatemalan colleagues:

'Brazilian journalists send this message pledging their deep solidarity with the Guatemalan people in their struggle against the invaders of their land to their Guatemalan colleagues for them to make it known to the noble Guatemalan people. They do this knowing that they are on the side of justice, the right of nations to build their own future, and above all they are convinced that the present attack on the sovereignty of Guatemala is a threat to the sovereignty of the other Latin American peoples.'

Osorio Borbe, Rafael Corroia de Oliveira and 45 other leading Brazilian journalists.

- Throughout the world the aggression against Guatemala was widely commented on in the press:

'It is an attack on the very principles of the freedom and independence of nations as expressed in the United Nations Charter. The sympathy of all who love peace in all countries goes to the people of Guatemala.'

Rude Pravo, June 22, 1954.

'The attack against Guatemala is financed by foreign countries and the arms used in this attack come from foreign countries. It is nothing other than an act of aggression and intervention.'

Suluh Indonesia, June 22, 1954.

'The United States has tarnished its reputation among its "good neighbours". Under its leadership the Security Council has run away from the issue by refusing on Friday even to hear the Guatemalan complaint.'

Manchester Guardian, June 29, 1954 - Editorial.

'The United States have shown the debased nature of their colonial domination in Latin America by overthrowing the democratic government of Guatemala by the most despicable methods.'

People's Daily, Peking, July 2, 1954.

'Such is the basic explanation of the present tragic events. At the appropriate moment the United Fruit Company with the backing of its government in Washington, sent troops, guns and aircraft to the neighbouring states. To strengthen its army, it hired mercenaries at a dollar a day.'

Temoingage Chrétien, July 2, 1954.

(a French Catholic journal)

'On the inter-American level, the civil war which has broken out will have serious consequences. In the Western Hemisphere, the United States will henceforth be the protagonists of the use of force against democracies which do not accede to their demands.'

Le Monde, June 20, 1954.

'The events in Guatemala are a clear proof of the real way in which the United States understands the liberty and independence of small countries and the right of nations to decide their own destiny.'

'Whatever subterfuges American diplomacy and propaganda may resort to, it is impossible to hide the shameful role which has been played by the United States in crushing the bourgeois democratic government of Guatemala - a little country which dared to oppose the domination and blatant pressure of the American monopolies.'

Pravda, July 4, 1954.

'The United Fruit Company is regaining its possessions in Guatemala; Guatemala City, December 29 (A.F.P., U.P.). 'An agreement has just been made between the government of Castillo Armas and the American United Fruit Company according to which the company resumes possession of all the lands which were confiscated by the Agrarian Reform Law passed in June 1952 by the Arbenz government.'

Le Monde, December 30, 1954.

o
o o

COLLECTIVE TREATIES AND BILATERAL PACTS

On March 8, 1945, while the great powers were still united in the struggle against Hitlerism, the Act of Chapultepec was adopted, reaffirming the terms of the principles stated in its day by the League of Nations regarding non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states, the solution of disputes by negotiation, respect for the sovereignty of other countries, etc...

But this same 'Act', in its second part, envisaged the conclusion of a treaty to fix the procedure for so-called mutual defence. In reality it opened the way to the establishment of relations based on inequality, between a number of weak countries and a great power which was determined to exercise a dominant role. The international tension which resulted from the rapid development of the world situation considerably accentuated this policy of intervention and domination.

In Latin America, a remarkable series of coups d'état overthrew legitimate governments and generally replaced them by military groups or by anti-democratic and even fascist oligarchies.

This change was immediately reflected in the texts of the collective treaties. In the Final Act of the Ninth Inter-American Conference, the Latin American countries undertook to struggle against certain ideologies and the basis was laid for making the holding of certain views and intentions a crime while a door was opened to foreign interference in the internal affairs of each country.

In 1951 the United States government proposed to certain Latin American countries bilateral agreements of military assistance which would, in practice, mean the incorporation of the signatories into the North Atlantic military bloc and the handing over to the United States of control over those and distribution of the strategic raw materials possessed by the signatories.

But as these pacts did not include all the Latin American States - Mexico had rejected them and in other countries the political conditions were unfavourable - it was considered indispensable to unite them all in a political statement which would permit direct and unrestricted interference by one of the American States in the internal affairs of the others. The Tenth Inter-American Conference was then called in Caracas and the political resolution obtained the support of all the Latin American States except Guatemala, which voted against, Mexico and Argentina, which abstained, and Costa Rica, which had stayed away.

The Act of Chapultepec, while reaffirming the principles of reciprocal assistance and American solidarity, opens the way to the military treaties:

Second Part

Recommendation

'That with the aim of dealing with threats of aggression against any one of the American republics, after the establishment of peace, the governments of the American republics should consider concluding, in accordance with their constitutional laws, a treaty laying down the procedure by which such threats or such acts could be dealt with through all or by some of the signatories of the said treaty using one or more of the following measures: recall of the heads of diplomatic missions, breaking-off diplomatic relations, breaking-off of consular relations, the suspension of postal, telegraph and telephone communications; the breaking-off

of economic, commercial and financial relations; the use of armed force to provoke or repulse aggression.'

Inter-American Conference on War and Peace,
Mexico, February 21, - March 8, 1945, Act of
Chapultepec.

Based on the Act of Chapultepec, the Inter-American Mutual Alliance Treaty of Rio de Janeiro is a regional military agreement automatic in application and independent of Constitutions obliging the American States to act in solidarity in the event of war even outside the continent.

Article 8

'For the purposes of this treaty, the Consultative Body can agree on one or more of the following measures: the withdrawal of the heads of diplomatic missions; the breaking-off of diplomatic relations; the breaking-off of consular relations; the total or partial suspension of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic, or radio-telegraphic communications and the use of armed force.'

(The Consultative Body consists of the Foreign
Ministers Ed.)

Article 9

'In addition to other acts which the Organ of Consultation may characterise as aggression, the following shall be considered as such:

- a) Unprovoked armed attack by a State against the territory, the people, or the land, sea or air forces of another state;
- b) Invasion, by the armed forces of a State, of the territory of an American State, through the trespassing of boundaries demarcated in accordance with a treaty, judicial decision, or arbitral award, or, in the absence of frontiers thus demarcated, invasion affecting a region which is under the effective jurisdiction of another State.

Article 20

'Decisions which require the application of the measures specified in Article 8 shall be binding upon all the Signatory States which have ratified this Treaty, with the sole exception that no State shall be required to use armed force without its consent.'

Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, September 2, 1947.

Final Act of the Ninth Inter-American
Conference-Resolution XXXII

Preservation and defence of American democracy

'Declares:

that by its anti-democratic nature and interventionist tendency, the political action of international communism or any other totalitarianism is incompatible with the American conception of freedom which is based on two incontestable points: the dignity of man as an individual and the sovereignty of the nation as a state.

'Decides:

to condemn the methods of all systems which tend to suppress political and civil rights and freedoms and especially the action of international communism or of any other totalitarianism.'

Bogota, March-May, 1948.

The Charter of the Organisation of American States, of April 30, 1948, in effect enables the sovereignty of the American States to be violated, in invalid-

ting by its Article 19 the principles established by articles 15 and 17:

Article 15

'No State or group of States has the right to intervene directly or indirectly for any reason whatsoever, in the internal or external affairs of another State. This principle excludes the use, not only of armed force, but also of any other form of interference or tendency prejudicial to the character of the State and its political, economic and cultural forms.'

Article 17

'The territory of a state is inviolable; it cannot be the object of military occupation or of other measures of force on the part of another State, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatsoever, even temporarily. Territorial gains and special advantages which are obtained by force or any other method of coercion will not be recognised.'

Article 19

'The measures adopted, in conformity with the treaties in force for the preservation of peace and security, do not constitute a violation of the principles announced in Articles 17 and 15.'

Charter of the Organisation of American States,
Bogota, April 30, 1948.

The Washington Conference, March 25-April 7, 1951, established measures for effective military co-operation among the American States, thus making a direct opening for the bilateral pacts:

Resolution III

'Decides:

to recommend the American Republics to direct their military preparations along such lines as will enable them, thanks to their individual efforts and to mutual assistance, within the framework of their possibilities and their constitutional law and in conformity with the Inter-American Mutual Assistance Treaty and without prejudice to their resources and the necessity to strengthen the armed forces which are best suited to individual defence and their internal security:

- a) To increase their resources and strengthen the armed forces which are most suitable to collective defence and to keep these armed forces in a state of immediate preparedness for continental defence;
- b) To co-operate among themselves in military matters in order to develop the collective strength of the Americas necessary to deal with any aggression directed against any one of them.'

A comparative table of the obligations of the United States and Brazil, based on the Bilateral Mutual Assistance Pact which was signed at Rio de Janeiro between these two countries:

Brazil undertakes to:

- supply troops (Art I, X)
- not to use arms without U.S. agreement, even for internal security or to deal with aggression from a neighbouring country (Art. I, §2, point 4)
- allow American officers to control the use of arms (Art. VI, §I)
- supply atomic raw materials (Art. I, §I, VII, point 8a)
- not to have commercial relations with

The United States undertakes to

lend arms on condition that they are used in accordance with American law (Art. I, XII, X)

certain countries as listed in the Battle Act (Art. IX)

adopt coercive measures with regard to firms which indulge in free trade with all countries (Art. IX)

give priority to the transport of strategic materials (Art. VII)

defray the military costs: construction, pay of the American soldiers, etc. (Art. IV)

pay its share of war expenditure (Art. I)

accept the American Mutual Assistance and other laws (Art. I)

grant diplomatic privileges to the American troops stationed on its territory (Art. I)

sign new agreements approving the military plans, without any check by the legislative body (Art. I and IV)

to adhere to the terms of the treaty, while the United States may change it by an Act of Congress (Art. I, § I)

to make no claim if the agreement is revoked by the President of the United States (Art. I, § I)

carry out certain terms of the agreement, even after it has been revoked (Art. XII, § I)

This table is based on a study by the Brazilian M.P., Helio Cabal, which appeared in Folha da Manhã on October 26, 1952.

The bilateral treaties include clauses which allow for secret compromises and unlimited commitments. Here are some extracts from the treaty with Colombia which is in almost every way identical with the others:

Article I

'6 - Each government will take such security measures as have been agreed upon by the two governments with a view to preventing secret military items, services or information furnished by the other government under the terms of the present agreement from being divulged or endangered...'

Article IX

'The Government of the Republic of Colombia, reaffirming its resolve to collaborate in the promotion of international understanding and goodwill and in the maintenance of world peace, to work along the lines which may be mutually agreed upon to eliminate the causes of international tension, and to fulfil the military obligations which it assumed within the framework of bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties to which the United States and Colombia are parties, will furnish, to the extent permitted by the country's economic and political stability, the maximum contribution which its labour, its resources, its installations and its general economic situation permit for the development and maintenance of its defence force and the defence force of the free world, and will take all reasonable measures which may be necessary to develop its defence capacity...'

o o

THE CARACAS CONFERENCE

After the announcement of the Caracas Conference, Mr. John Droier, who represented the United States on the preparatory commission, made the following proposals for the agenda:

- '1) Intervention of international communism in American affairs, including efforts to weaken inter-American solidarity and to contaminate, for its own benefit, authentic political, social and national movements.
- '2) Reaffirmation of the belief of the peoples of the hemisphere in the ideal and in the reality of true democracy as the path leading to the effective social and political progress of the peoples of America.
- '3) Reaffirmation of the vigorous attitude previously adopted by the Organisation of American States against the intervention of international communism in the affairs of the American States.
- '4) Consideration of appropriate recommendations with a view to the adoption of effective complementary measures to combat the intervention of international communism in the American Republics.'

A.F.P. Dispatch printed in Corrêio de Manhã, Rio de Janeiro, October 11, 1953.

- Other official and semi-official statements confirming the interest taken by certain United States circles in obtaining a resolution of a precise political and ideological character which would legalise the violation of the right of the American States to self-determination.

'Upon what could an action against communist intervention in Latin America be based?

Answer: 'The Charter of the Organisation of American States and the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro both contain clauses which could be invoked if necessary.'

Extract from an interview with Mr. Moors Cabot published in the review Visco, Rio de Janeiro, January 8 1954.

'As for the intentions of Mr. Dulles, they were clearly expressed by one of the State Department's spokesmen in these terms: "Our aim at Caracas is to get as strong a resolution as possible to defeat communism in America".'

Los Archivos Internacionales, Doc. II34
Fascicule 336

- A Statement by Mr. John Foster Dulles, November 30, 1954:

'The principal of this Caracas declaration had a special bearing on the situation in Guatemala.'

Speech to the Nation on Television, reported in the New York Herald Tribune, European edition.

Such statements, and the idea that Guatemala was especially threatened, aroused immediate protests by individuals and organisations:

'... For the first time, the serious historical and social problems of Guatemala have been solved. And as a direct result, Guatemala must face foreign intervention in the form of diplomatic pressure by the Government of the United States and of statements by leading politicians of that country. They demand that the

Collection Number: AD1812

RECORDS RELATING TO THE 'TREASON TRIAL' (REGINA vs F. ADAMS AND OTHERS ON CHARGE OF HIGH TREASON, ETC.), 1956 1961

TREASON TRIAL, 1956 1961

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2012

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of the collection records and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.