

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA STATES  
TENTH INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

CARACAS, VENEZUELA • 1954



Doc. 95 (English)  
SP-23  
5 March 1954  
Original: Spanish

**CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM  
RELEASE AS SANITIZED**

**2003**

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY

GUILLEMO TORIELLO GARRIDO

MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF GUATEMALA

IN THE THIRD PLENARY SESSION

MARCH 5, 1954

DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
PG CHANGE IN CLASS   
 RECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. AUTHORITY TO: TS S S  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: 1989  
AUTH: KR 10-2  
DATE: 31 MAY 1999 REVIEWER: [ ]

Caracas, Venezuela  
1954

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY  
GUILLERMO TORIELLO GARRIDO  
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF GUATEMALA  
IN THE THIRD PLENARY SESSION  
MARCH 5, 1954

Mr. President,

Delegates:

The delegation of Guatemala has come to the Tenth Inter-American Conference with all the faith and the enthusiasm for democratic doctrines that motivated our Revolution of October 20, 1944, wholly in sympathy with the aspirations of the nations of this hemisphere for integrated progress.

The delegation of Guatemala is here, its head high, to express the legitimate aspirations of our people and the Revolutionary Government, solidly united in the desire and the effort to achieve an effective political and economic freedom, through the exercise of democracy, absolute respect for the political and social rights of man, and the development of an economic program in accordance with the present and future needs of the nation.

The peoples of America followed with interest from the very beginning the events that have occurred in Guatemala since the heroic days of June and October 1944. Throughout its history Guatemala has been ravaged by enslaving regimes that had their origin in the colonial period and by brutal tyrannies of both Spanish and native origin, all of them predominately feudal by nature. From the ruins of this tragic past, Guatemala has emerged with the unalterable determination to forge its own destiny without foreign interference, by means of a democratic system of government, in accordance with the vital needs of its people, respecting the rules of international law and motivated by the firm desire to maintain cordial relations with friendly countries and to comply faithfully with its international obligations.

The policy of ransoming the national wealth and resources, neglected for entire decades, is motivated by nothing else than the wretchedness of our own people, resulting from the concentration of land and the backward structure of our economy. On the other hand, this policy conforms to the economic resolutions adopted by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, by the International Labour Organisation, and by the Organization of American States with regard to economic development, agrarian reform, capital investment, social policy, and the exploitation of natural wealth and resources in behalf of the people.

There is nothing novel or alien to the purposes of this organization of American states in the program that is being carried out in behalf of the people of Guatemala. The whole policy of my Government is encompassed within the limits of representative democracy and has three great and fundamental objectives: growth of and absolute respect for democratic liberties; raising of the standard of living of the Guatemalan people through the transformation of a semi-feudal,

semi-colonial economy into a capitalistic economy; and the defense of national sovereignty and independence.

It is for this reason that in Guatemala freedoms of expression of thought, of the press, of association, of labor organization, and of political organization, as well as the freedom to profess any religious creed, are not simply words contained in laws but tangible realities enjoyed to the full by the people. Guatemala is dedicated to the strengthening and the expansion of those freedoms and will not be a party, domestically or internationally, to any compromise that injures the rights of a single one of our compatriots.

Our economic and social policy is based, fundamentally, on the following efforts:

- a. The humanization of labor-management relations in industrial and agricultural enterprises, through the enactment of organic labor laws that, far from provoking violent uprisings of workers made desperate by poverty, institutionalizes these labor-management relations within a system of basic social justice and administrative and judicial decisions in conformity with the law.
- b. The establishment of a social security system that covers only common accidents to workers, labor accidents, and a minimum maternal and child-care program, put into effect gradually and financed through the classic and conservative tripartite contribution from management, workers, and the State.
- c. The organization of a monetary and banking system adequate to meet credit and exchange needs and for the expansion and stability of our economy, in conformity with the most modern concepts of money and central banking originating in international agreements.
- d. The development of a broad domestic market through increases in the purchasing power and the elevation of the standard of living of the people, public investment, and the development of the rural economy, which up to now has been marginal and non-monetary.
- e. The liberation of the national economy through construction of means of communication to the ports and the producing zones; the construction of national docks, the development of an electrification plan adequate for industrial needs and for public consumption; and the subjection of foreign monopolistic enterprises to existing laws -- on equal terms with domestic enterprise.
- f. The industrialization of the country through the organization of appropriate banking institutions and through an economic and legislative policy of industrial development followed by the State for the purpose of increasing the national income and domestic and foreign commerce.
- g. The liberation of the farmers through the abolition of semi-feudal and quasi-slave systems of work.

The development of our agrarian economy through the redistribution of unproductive latifundia, furthering of land ownership in small holdings, the progressive increase of the sources of capital, and the organization of easy credit available to the farmers benefited by the democratic agrarian reform that has been carried out in the country by legal means since 1952.

Among the measures for the economic liberation of the country should be cited, because of its special importance, the enactment of the Agrarian Reform Law.

The agricultural census of 1950 revealed this frightful truth: in the country small farmers with holdings of less than 3.5 hectares (the majority of them simple tenants) made up 72% of the agricultural producers, although they held a total of only 9% of the total land area. On the other hand, at the other extreme we find that 2% of the farm owners held a total of 78% of the land; and that among them twenty-two owners of latifundia with more than nine thousand hectares each, held 13% of all the land.

This dramatic and unjust situation is being abolished with determination and courage through a system whose worth must be recognized by even the most recalcitrant reactionaries.

By the 20th of February of this year 55,734 farmers had received 247,833 hectares, but the amount of land in process of distribution in accordance with the law up to the present time is more than 915,000 hectares or 25% of the total registered in the 1950 agricultural census cited above. Thus, in only one and a half years of the application of the law, distribution of one fourth of the affected land has been authorized without causing any important economic disturbance. On the contrary, production has improved in some items, and a more proper and equitable distribution of the national income has been achieved, with the result that the standard of living of the people has begun to improve substantially.

This is our program and these are our purposes: we believe in democracy and we are exercising it to the fullest.

It would appear that all of these efforts, carried out with our own resources and with no assistance from without, would merit spiritual encouragement and moral aid... However, such has not been the case! "Never in America has such a small country been subjected to such great pressure."

The people of Guatemala are enormously disturbed to find that a respected people, freed of brutal tyrannies, eager to progress and to put in practice the most noble postulates of democracy; determined to put an end to the abuses of the past, trying to wipe out feudalism and colonial procedures and the iniquitous exploitation of its most humble citizens, finds itself faced with the dismaying reality that those who boast of encouraging other peoples to travel the road to economic and political liberty decide to bring them to a halt, only because the decisions and the efforts of these peoples injure unjust interests and because the highest interest of these peoples is incompatible with the maintenance of privileges granted by tyrants in evil times as a means of achieving impunity

and a guarantee that they not be moved from the throne of their despotism. And these privileges are so important for the satisfaction of intemperate ambitions and the privileged ones are so powerful that, despite the noble postulates of Pan Americanism, they have unleashed against Guatemala the most iniquitous campaign, and have been unashamed to have recourse to the most cowardly weapons to defame, to deceive, to discredit one of the purest movements that this hemisphere has ever witnessed. They have resorted to the enormous machinery of the means of communication -- created to spread the truth to all the ends of the world -- and have prostituted them by making them instruments of lies and of calumny and have pinned to Guatemala's back the epithet of "Communism". It is indeed sad to give such a label to any nationalistic or independence movement, or to any anti-imperialistic or anti-monopolistic action of the countries which have for so long borne the yoke of economic exploitation. The most serious aspect of this is that those who describe democracy thus do it to destroy democracy itself. These same privileged ones have also resorted to the development and support of plots and subversive acts to destroy by force a government that has the real backing of its people and has no need of foreign godparents to maintain itself in power. They have counseled boycott and economic aggression against Guatemala in the press and even from parliamentary tribunes. Still not content, and seeing the failure of all their efforts, now again invoking the sacred word, democracy, and repeating the absurd pretext that Guatemala is a "beachhead of Communism in America", and that the small republic constitutes a threat to the security of an entire continent, they dare to commit the ultimate attempt, now no longer against Guatemala alone, but against the most solid structure of Pan Americanism, in proposing active intervention against the Guatemalan Government.

Another grave accusation that international reactionism has launched against Guatemala is that our republic "menaces continental solidarity".

What is the reason for this campaign of defamation? What is the real and effective reason for describing our Government as communist? From what source comes the accusation that we threaten continental solidarity and security? Why do they wish to intervene in Guatemala?

The answers are simple and evident. The plan of national liberation being carried out with firmness by my Government has necessarily affected the privileges of the foreign enterprises that are impeding the progress and the economic development of the country. The highway to the Atlantic, besides connecting the important productive zones it traverses, is destroying the monopoly of internal transportation to the ports now held by the Ferrocarriles Internacionales de Centro América (an enterprise controlled by the United Fruit Company), in order to increase foreign trade free of grievous and discriminatory charges. With construction of national ports and docks, we are putting an end to the monopoly of the United Fruit Company, and we will thus make it possible for the nation to increase and to diversify its foreign trade through the use of maritime transport other than the White Fleet, also belonging to the United Fruit Company, which now controls this essential instrument of our international commercial relations.

With the realization of the plan of national electrification, we shall put an end to foreign monopoly of electric power, indispensable to our industrial development, which has been delayed by the lack, the scarcity, or the distribution failures of that important means of production.

With our Agrarian Reform, we are abolishing the latifundia, including those of the United Fruit Company itself. Following a dignified policy, we have refused to broaden the concessions of that company. We have insisted that foreign investment be in accordance with our laws, and we have recovered and maintained absolute independence in our foreign policy.

All this is being done in Guatemala, and yet the American nations are not aware of it. The news that reaches them through the news agencies that serve the cause of the monopolies is distorted news, almost always defamatory. All these modest efforts to bring about changes in the interest of progress are called Communism.

These bases and purposes of the Guatemalan revolution cannot be catalogued within a Communist ideology or policy: a political-economic platform like that put forward by the government of Guatemala, which is settling in rural areas thousands of individual landowners, individual farmers, can never be conceived of as a Communist plan. Far from that, we believe that raising the standard of living and the income of rural and urban workers alone stimulates the capitalistic economic development of the country and the sociological bases of a genuinely Guatemalan functional democracy.

The pretext that we are a threat to continental solidarity is repeated daily, and is disseminated as a dogma, which needs no proof, and almost no one has bothered to analyze it. The truth is that, during the last few years, Guatemala can be considered as one of the countries that have contributed the most to continental solidarity, if we take into account the fact that Article 5 (d) of the Charter states that "the solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy".

From the wording of this article it may obviously be inferred that the solidarity of the hemisphere cannot be threatened by a country that has exerted all its efforts toward making representative democracy effective within its borders and enforcing to the utmost the fundamental rights of man as formally asserted universally and regionally, at Paris and at Bogotá, both in 1948, and categorically affirmed in the 1945 Constitution of Guatemala.

In our opinion those who do threaten continental solidarity are those who oppose or hamper the full development of the American peoples, since such development should be based on tangible acts that are translated into the raising of standards of living and of production of peoples within a system of equitable and humane economic intercourse.

International reaction, at the same time it is pointing out Guatemala as a "threat to continental solidarity", is preparing vast interventionist plans,

such as the one recently denounced by the Guatemalan government. The published documents -- which the Department of State at Washington hastened to call Moscow propaganda -- unquestionably show that the foreign conspirators and monopolistic interests that inspired and financed them sought to permit armed intervention against our country, as "a noble undertaking against communism". Let us emphasize before this Conference the gravity of these events. Non-intervention is one of the most priceless triumphs of Pan Americanism and the essential basis of inter-American unity, solidarity, and cooperation. It has been fully supported in various inter-American instruments, and specifically in Article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. The Secretary General of the Organization, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, in his report on the Ninth International Conference of American States, in commenting on this article, states categorically that with it "the doubt that seemed to arise recently, as to whether intervention carried out collectively would be so considered, has thus been dispelled". Subsequent to the Bogotá Conference, it has been alleged that "Communism" is a good pretext to intervene collectively and to defeat the principle of non-intervention, and those interested have not failed to help in this defeat, regarding so-called "communist infiltration" as a "fifth column". The same Secretary General of the Organization of American States, in the report mentioned, refutes this assumption and shows that there is absolutely no basis for it. Let me quote some of the ideas expressed by that authority. Mr. Lleras Camargo says: "Who is the arbiter that can decide when intervention is just and is being conducted upon acceptable moral and juridical principles and when, on the contrary, it is pursuing imperialistic ends? The only judges would necessarily be the interested parties themselves, and every effective act of intervention by a world power would always find means of justification. In that way the most solid foundation of the freedom and independence of weak nations would be consumed in a single burnt offering to transitory circumstances, and the strong and imperialistic countries would have regained, with no effort, the most powerful of those arms of oppression that the progress of international law had wrenched from them.

"Obviously the effort to establish a distinction between collective and unilateral intervention, so as to justify the first and still condemn the second, was a dangerous flaw in the principle of non-intervention. The fact that a majority of nations within a given group combine to intervene in the internal affairs of a State, by no means guarantees the goodness and uprightness of their purposes. No law apart from the individual or collective interest of the States would be applicable in that emergency. Today a group of democratic nations might combine to destroy, in a given country and by means of joint action and intervention, a form of antidemocratic government. But who is to guarantee that the coalition of a group of antidemocratic governments might not proceed in an identical manner against a government ruled by the most righteous laws and the most democratic institutions, if the only thing that makes the act legal is the fact that it is collective, that is, the number of parties that undertake intervention?!

Up to this point, the very clear words of the Secretary General of the Organization, besides containing objective criteria and a cry of alarm against any interventionist maneuver, constitute an authoritative and authentic explanation of the scope of Articles 15, 16, and 19 of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

I should add, with greater emphasis, that the government of Guatemala will never permit its internal politics to become the subject of discussion, much less of decision, in any international body. If by some absurdity, which we are sure will never happen, the governments of the American States, setting aside the principle of non-intervention and acting against their own national interests, go so far as to reach any decision contrary to the principles of the Charter of the Organization, the peoples of the hemisphere would, for a long time to come, be forced to renounce all possibility of economic and social progress.

The government of Guatemala has repeatedly denounced before the United Nations the systematic campaign of defamation that foreign interests, united with native feudalism, have waged against this republic, as well as the whole series of subversive acts designed to destroy the social advances of the Guatemalan Revolution, and the innumerable threats that have culminated in the most recent campaign in behalf of unilateral or collective intervention to destroy the democratic regime of Guatemala.

All the foregoing clearly explains the reasons why Guatemala opposed, in the meetings of the Council of the Organization, the inclusion on the Agenda of this Conference of the topic proposed by the United States on "the intervention of international Communism in the American Republics". We felt at that time, and today feel more strongly than ever, that such a proposal constitutes a maneuver against Guatemala, which has been unjustly and maliciously accused of being Communist, of being a beachhead of Communism, a threat to the Panama Canal, a bad example to the other peoples of the hemisphere, and of threatening the security and solidarity of the American Republics.

We feel this proposal was merely a pretext for intervening in our internal affairs. By accepting this proposal, Pan Americanism would become an instrument exclusively in the service of monopolistic interests and a weapon of coercion to strangle any attempt at political and economic liberation of the oppressed peoples of Latin America. They wanted to find a ready expedient to maintain the economic dependence of the American Republics and suppress the legitimate desires of their peoples, cataloguing as "Communism" every manifestation of nationalism or economic independence, any desire for social progress, any intellectual curiosity, and any interest in progressive or liberal reforms. What is most serious is that they claim to seek the collective support of America to violate with impunity the principle of non-intervention, but we refuse to believe that they want to return to the old and outmoded practices of the past, when great monopolies had a predominant influence over the politics of certain countries, through fear of the "big stick" and the dismal "dollar diplomacy" and when the landing of United States Marines in Latin American ports was a common occurrence or custom-houses were seized "to guarantee investments" or to punish political acts that did not coincide with those interests.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt put an end to this policy and with him there flourished a new Pan Americanism filled with promise. But it appears that certain United States officials wish to restore the policy that did so much damage to the true progress of Pan Americanism and contributed to such a great degree

in hindering good relations and sincere cooperation between the republics of this hemisphere.

Allow me to analyze briefly the United States proposal, so that you may clearly see the danger it contains: First, it speaks of "International Communism" as an interventionist power, but, have we as yet reached an agreement on the meaning of this term? What is International Communism? Is it perhaps a doctrine or a philosophy? Is it an economic theory? Is it perhaps merely a political party, or is it supposed to be an instrument in the hands of the Soviet Union?

Because, Gentlemen, if Communism is a political doctrine, a philosophy, or an economic theory, no one needs to be concerned with the fact that it is international in character, since no doctrine, no philosophy, not even any scientific theory can be limited to a single nationality. All these concepts are obviously universal, as are all ideas; and it is not possible to assert that ideas are interventionist, nor accuse them of intervening in the internal affairs of States.

For if it is affirmed that ideas could be interventionist, it could also be logically asserted that the vehicle of intervention is man's thought, and therefore the basis would be laid for the persecution of ideas and discrimination for political reasons, an extreme condemned by the principles of constitutional and international law.

Now then if what the United States means is that the Soviet Union is intervening in the internal affairs of the American States, it would be desirable for them to say so.

"As for Guatemala", as President Arbenz stated in his message to the Congress of the Republic on the first of this month, "it is obvious even to the most perspicacious that the Soviet Union has not intervened nor is it intervening in the internal affairs of our country, nor does it threaten us with any intervention, contrary to what has happened to us from dominant interests in other countries. Besides, Guatemala is not disposed to permit intervention by any foreign power".

In Resolutions XXXII of Bogotá and VIII of Washington, Communism was condemned, without a previous definition, as "anti-democratic", as "subversive", and as "interventionist"; and at the same time, recommendations were made to strengthen democracy in America.

In the years since the Bogotá Conference, however, democracy has not been strengthened in America. On the contrary, it has suffered serious setbacks in several countries of this hemisphere, and it is particularly worth pointing out that many anti-democratic and unlawful measures have been taken against constitutional liberties, supposedly justified as being in compliance with resolutions taken against Communism.

The situation in Guatemala during these same years has been very different: democracy has become strong in our country, with the peculiarity that in Guate-

mala it is precisely so-called "anti-Communism" that has engaged in anti-democratic and subversive activities and incessantly clamored for foreign intervention on our soil.

And, in speaking here of "anti-Communism", it must be pointed out that under this negative banner have gathered the most heterogeneous elements, with no doctrinary or political connection, and with no other common denominator than their hatred of the social and economic gains of the Guatemalan Revolution. In that group, as opportunists, are fighting the old, ousted politicians, who made up the court and were the support of dictatorships; the enemies of the Labor Code; the feudal landholders and foreign companies, whose unworthy interests were affected by labor legislation and the Agrarian Reform Law. Some individuals, acting in good faith, led astray by the campaign of calumny being waged against Guatemala, have also joined that group.

All this clearly shows that Resolutions XXXII of Bogotá and VIII of Washington have served in practice to injure democracy, and they have been taken as a pretext to infringe upon the sovereignty and independence of countries like Guatemala, which are struggling for their social and economic recovery.

While democracy, as we have already said, has lost ground in the hemisphere, a neo-Fascism has arisen, violent and aggressive. To no avail in fighting it has been the condemnation that appears in those resolutions on "totalitarianism" --another vague word--, which was meant to be interpreted in Bogotá as defining the dictatorial systems of Nazism, Fascism, and Falangism, to eradicate which so much blood was shed in the second world war.

No one should wonder, therefore, that Guatemala now considers the aforesaid resolutions of Bogotá and Washington to be null and void, because experience has shown that they in no wise promote the legitimate interests of the peoples of America, and they do constitute an instrument of coercion. For, according to the interpretation that has been given to them and the broader scope it is desired to give them, any Latin American Government that exerts itself to bring about a truly national program which affects the interests of the powerful foreign companies, in whose hands the wealth and the basic resources in large part repose in Latin America, will be pointed out as Communist; it will be accused of being a threat to continental security and making a breach in continental solidarity, and so will be threatened with foreign intervention.

Having assumed this attitude, the delegation of Guatemala will categorically oppose any resolution or declaration that under the pretext of Communism violates the fundamental principles of democracy, postulates the violation of the rights of man, or attacks the principle of non-intervention, aimed at converting Pan Americanism into an instrument to keep the peoples of Latin America in a semi-colonial status, for the benefit of the powerful interests of foreign monopolies. We are also emphatically opposed to the internationalization of McCarthyism, the burning of books, and the imposition of stereotyped thought.

And we denounce before this Conference and the conscience of America the political aggression and threats of economic aggression and intervention of which the Republic of Guatemala is a victim.

We believe that the Organization of American States, as a regional organization of the United Nations, ought to support, in a spirit of sincere international cooperation, the political and economic independence of all the States, as juridically equal entities and masters of their own fate, as well as to defend the rights of peoples and individuals to live in dignity and to ennobled life, by releasing it from hunger, ignorance, fear, and poverty.

Guatemala will warmly support any proposal to that end.

Anyone who looks at the chapters of the Charter of the Organization of American States will find a splendid code of guarantee of the integrity, sovereignty, and independence of the Member States, as well as a powerful obstacle to any kind of abuses by the powerful nations that have infringed upon those rights.

However, it is deplorable to observe that the peoples of America have shown little enthusiasm for the Organization and have little faith in the efficacy of its work. And the worst of it is that we must confess that such an attitude is reasonable and justifiable.

If we ask ourselves what Pan Americanism has done for the peoples of America, and we want to be sincere in our reply, we shall have to admit that those peoples have often been deceived. Pan Americanism can do nothing for the effective benefit of man in America so long as it does not face the real problems of the hemisphere and the tremendous fact of a majority of nations with an underdeveloped economy, the peoples of which are prisoners of ignorance and poverty, in comparison with other highly industrialized nations, in relation to which they are kept in a semi-colonial dependent situation as suppliers of raw materials and cheap food, and as certain markets for their manufactured goods.

Pan Americanism has not been able to achieve a balance in this situation, and it has not even been able to obtain an adequate correlation between the prices paid for raw materials and foodstuffs, and the price charged for manufactured goods.

On the contrary, some of its actions have served to perpetuate that situation, and many times even agreements reached in good faith have resulted in tying the hands of these countries and favoring the political and economic hegemony of the strongest.

Guatemala is and has always been a peace-loving, hard-working, honest nation that desires, for itself as well as for all sister nations of this hemisphere, that its territorial integrity be sacred and untouchable; that its sovereignty be respected; and that its independence be a reality within the family of American nations, based on mutual respect. Therefore, because Guatemala trusts that the true spirit of Pan Americanism, as it was conceived by Bolívar and dreamed of by so many other illustrious Americans, will be rediscovered, and that it will never

be an instrument of oppression or coercion, and especially, that it will never be used in the service of other interests. Guatemala brings its contribution of collaboration, good faith, and hope, as well as its baggage of troubles, to this solemn assembly.

Here, as in the United Nations, we wish to reiterate that Guatemala, like any one else, is jealous of its independence, its sovereignty, and its dignity, and so it is not, nor can it be, a satellite of the Soviet Union, the United States, nor any other power. My country is allergic to all servitude and repudiates international as well as domestic slavery. The foreign policy of Guatemala, like its domestic policy, is not subject to the policy of any foreign power. Guatemala has demanded to have a voice in its affairs and has succeeded in maintaining, and will always maintain, the most complete independence of judgement in expressing its opinion in international organizations, its only criterion being respect for democratic principles and love of justice.

The Republic of Guatemala is not opposed to the investment of foreign capital in its territory. It only requires of foreign investors loyal compliance with the laws of the country, on an equal basis with the Guatemalans themselves. But it categorically rejects any colonial-type investment, as well as the claim that foreign capital should enjoy privileges that the law does not accord to nationals.

Investment of foreign capital has repeatedly been cited as the panacea for the ills of underdeveloped countries. But little attention has been given to the method of such investment, and frequently it is forgotten that some investment companies are the principal cause of the backward condition of certain countries. Monopolistic investments have strangled, in many cases, the very basic development of some countries.

It is apparent that, when the United Nations recommended the encouragement of investment of foreign capital for the economic development of underdeveloped countries, it did not have in mind taking as employers investors such as the United Fruit Company, which have aroused a wave of indignation in numerous countries of Latin America, and the wealth of which has been obtained for the sole benefit of the stockholders, leaving to the country concerned no equitable revenue whatsoever. The history of investment in Latin America in bananas, petroleum, copper, tin, and other products that are vital to the economy of some countries resembles very closely the painful and primitive story of colonial exploitation. Companies of this type take everything for themselves: they drain off completely the wealth of the soil; they pay high taxes to the country from which they come; and they accumulate millions for a few stockholders who never know that their fat dividends are the fruit of the sweat and poverty of thousands of workers oppressed by ignorance, disease, and hunger.

We are certain that the interests of such monopolies are alien to the legitimate, true interests of the country from which they come and its government, and it is clear that they merely provide grounds for unnecessary and dangerous friction between friendly states, when they not only have irregular recourse to diplomatic protection but even require officials and official

organizations to involve their government in the defense of their untenable cause.

Guatemala is a sincere friend of the people of the United States of America and, therefore, deplors that the interference and maneuvers of the monopolistic enterprises and of some officials connected therewith are maliciously straining the cordial relations that ought to exist between our governments in the spirit of mutual respect proper between sovereign states.

Guatemala has always been concerned over the serious problem of colonialism in America, as well as the existence of American territories that are illegally occupied by a power from outside the hemisphere. The government and people of Guatemala are fully convinced that the colonial era is a thing of the past, and that the continuation of such systems is an anachronism, contrary to the dignity of America, and incompatible with the principles of liberty and democracy.

Guatemala has always expressed its conviction that colonial systems ought to disappear from the American hemisphere, since all peoples have the right to rule their own destinies, and that will not be possible so long as they are not permitted to attain political independence and their complete sovereignty is not recognized. The fallacy that colonialism is an instrument of protection of defenseless peoples, a civilizing of savage peoples, and a school of self-government, is a myth that has been completely exploded throughout the world, and especially in the American hemisphere, since it can no longer admit conditions of dependency that are incompatible with the degree of maturity of its peoples and the political and juridical progress of the inter-American system.

It is our hope that the action of the free countries of this hemisphere will bring about the definitive liberation of all American peoples still in the humiliating status of colonies, and America will then be, completely, the hemisphere of freedom.

Guatemala is especially interested in seeing an end to the illegal occupation of American territories by powers outside the hemisphere, because the continuation of this situation is an affront to the whole hemisphere and makes light of the rights that American nations have been justifiably demanding. Guatemala has never accepted, nor can it ever accept, the mutilation of its territory in the case of Belize which, for historical, juridical, economic, geographic, and moral reasons is an integral part of its territory, wrongfully occupied by a power outside the hemisphere. Such an occupation by Great Britain has no other basis than that of might makes right.

Guatemala trusts that hemispheric solidarity and the principles that govern American brotherhood will be able to operate efficaciously toward a just, peaceful, and early solution of the problems of colonialism in America, so that situations such as those that prevail in Belize and the Falkland Islands may definitively come to an end.

Mr. President, Delegates:

Guatemala has faith in the future of America, because the great vigor and the conscience of its peoples are affirming their rights and duties with a view to obtaining their economic liberation and guiding their own destinies.

It likewise trusts that Pan Americanism (which, in no wise should scorn the action of the United Nations) will steer toward its true objectives and be converted into an instrument of progress and cooperation, contributing to international peace and security.

We have not come to this Conference to defend principles alien to the principles of the San Francisco Charter and the Charter of the Organization of American States. We defend the sovereign rights of the peoples to govern their own destiny and to practice a democracy within which the most diverse ideas are freely manifested and every freedom is practiced.

The struggle that Guatemala is making for economic recovery and in the defense of its sovereignty is the struggle of millions of Latin Americans who aspire to see the Bolivarian dream fully realized, for which the existence of a world peace based on justice, the true practice of democracy, and a sincere and loyal economic cooperation is essential.

Over the immense lands, seas, and skies of America the breath of the liberators keeps the banners of freedom flying. Here we are, Bolívar, and in coming to this land that had the privilege of giving you birth, we, aware of our destiny, present ourselves before you, without the chains of tyranny that for centuries bound us and that you, Liberator, taught us to break. Guatemala is worthy of you, Captain of the dignity of America.