

had, moreover, furnished considerable assistance to the Allies in the war. The representative of El Salvador cited Carlton Hayes' "War Mission in Spain" in defence of this thesis.

It undoubtedly placed a strain on a number of delegates to listen to this speech. The Chairman of the Committee (Dr Manuilsky, the representative of the Ukraine) contented himself with inquiring whether the ventilation system was not out of order "as the atmosphere had become most oppressive." At a later meeting the representative of Byelo-Russia said that the Chairman should not have allowed Dr Castro's speech to be delivered. In the course of the subsequent debate the representative of El Salvador found himself in the necessity of making a number of speeches in reply to criticisms, and at one time he had to appeal to the Committee to support him in his claim to obtain a hearing. This support was accorded by a handsome majority. This evidence that there is at present an assured, though by no means unchallenged, freedom of speech for the expression of unpopular views in the United Nations is perhaps not the least significant feature of the debate on the Spanish problem.

The following were the main points of view expressed in the Committee :—

Firstly, there was general detestation of the Franco regime and a renewal of the determination that Spain could not be associated with the United Nations while that regime continued to hold power, with a corresponding desire that Spain should be admitted to the United Nations so soon as an acceptable regime was in office.

It was agreed that the United Nations had no right to interfere in the purely internal affairs of any State, but there was strong disagreement as to whether action in respect of the Franco regime constituted such intervention. A number of Latin-American countries—El Salvador, Cuba, Costa Rica, Peru—held that any positive action, such as breaking off diplomatic relations, not to speak of stronger measures, did constitute such intervention, and this, on the whole, was the position of the United States and the United Kingdom.

On the other hand, a number of delegates contended that the Franco regime was itself a product of Axis intervention and that steps taken with a view to enabling the Spanish people to rid themselves of the regime could not be called intervention.

There was, in consequence, a sharp difference of opinion as to the practical steps which were legitimate or, if legitimate, opportune. The United States, supported by the United Kingdom and others, wished to rely on the renewed condemnation of the Franco Government as fascist, the exclusion of the Franco Government not only from the United Nations, but also from specialized agencies connected with the United Nations, and an appeal to the Spanish people to rid themselves of Franco by peaceful means.