

Small files: Guatemala: Small files: Guatemala - 9

HS L 179:180



Dag Hammarskjöld's samml.

Guatemala

23 June - 6 Aug. 54

Lodge, Henry Cabot (Perm. Represent. of
the U.S.A. to the U.N.)

- 3 letters to D.H.
- 5 letters from D.H.
- Statement by H.C. Lodge (U.S.A. Mission - release)



UNITED STATES MISSION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Press Release #1925
June 22, 1954

Statement by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, on Guatemalan Matters.

I note specifically the cable from Mr. Toriello does not ask for another meeting of the Council.

As President of the Security Council I was very glad to respond to his request for an urgent meeting of the Council last Sunday.

The Security Council, after exhaustive discussion, by a vote of 10 to 1, voted last Sunday that the right place to go to get peace in Guatemala is the Organization of American States, where there is both unique knowledge and authority. The one vote against this was that of the Soviet Union.

In the face of this action, therefore, those who continually seek to agitate the Guatemalan question in the Security Council will inevitably be suspected of shadow boxing -- of trying to strike attitudes and issue statements for propaganda purposes.

I can understand that the Soviet Union, which, by its cynical abuse of the veto, has crudely made plain its desire to make as much trouble as possible in the Western Hemisphere, should constantly seek to bring this matter before the Security Council.

But the Government of Guatemala should not lend itself to this very obvious communist plot lest they appear to be a cat's-paw of the Soviet conspiracy to meddle in the Western Hemisphere. In fact, as it is, many persons will wonder whether the whole imbroglio in Guatemala was not cooked up precisely for the purpose of making communist propaganda here in the United Nations. This I am sure Mr. Toriello would not want.

The fact that it has become increasingly plain that the situation in Guatemala is clearly a civil -- and not an international -- war, makes it even more appropriate that the Security Council should not intervene further.

The Security Council showed last Sunday by a vote of 10 to 1 that it emphatically believed that the Organization of American States was the place to try to settle the Guatemalan problem. To fly squarely in the face of this recommendation would raise grave doubts as to the good faith of those who make such requests.

* * * * *

June 23, 1954

Dear Mr. Hammarskjöld:

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 23 June transmitting a letter from the Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations of 22 June requesting an urgent session of the Security Council.

As soon as I have decided, in accordance with Rule 1 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure, on the time for a meeting of the Security Council I shall inform you in order that you may give notice to the Members of the Council.

Sincerely yours,

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

UN-3427/A

His Excellency
Dag Hammarskjöld,
Secretary-General,
United Nations,
New York, New York.



THE REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
TO THE
UNITED NATIONS

June 24, 1954

Dear Mr. Hammarskjold:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of June 24, 1954, forwarding a copy of a cable received by you last night from the Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations, requesting that a message be transmitted to me as President of the Security Council.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. Lodge, Jr.
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

His Excellency

Dag Hammarskjold

Secretary-General of the United Nations

United Nations Headquarters

UN-3427/C

THE UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Two Park Avenue
New York, New York
July 8, 1954


Dear Dag:

This is in response to your letter of July 3rd.

Jerry will have handed you the United States views on this question so that you will know that we consider the memorandum to be extremely one-sided -- not to say unfair -- from the United States viewpoint.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely yours,


Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

His Excellency
Dag Hammarskjold
Secretary General
United Nations, New York

23 June 1954

Dear Mr. Lodge,

..... I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter from Ambassador Arriola, Permanent Representative of Guatemala to the United Nations, of 22 June, which was received by the Secretariat at 12.30 a.m. today.

..... I enclose a translation into English made by the Secretariat. The letter which, as you find, is addressed to me, will in due order be circulated to the Members of the Security Council as a Council document.

The Government of Guatemala requests in the letter that an urgent session of the Security Council be immediately convened in order to consider "a situation defined by Article 35 of the Charter" which, in the view of the Government, has been created as the resolution approved by the Security Council on 20 June 1954 "has not been complied with by other Member States".

Referring to Rules 3 and 25 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure I would like to have your decision as to the notice to be given to the Representatives on the Security Council.

Yours sincerely,

Encl.

Dag Hammarskjöld

H.E. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
United States Mission to the United Nations
2 Park Avenue
New York City, N.Y.

24 June 1954

Dear Mr. Lodge,

.....

I have the honour to transmit herewith copy of a cable received last night with a message addressed to the President of the Security Council. You will note that the message contains a request for a meeting of the Security Council today.

We have also received a communication from the Government of Honduras. As soon as that document is translated, it will be sent to you.

Sincerely yours,

Dag Hammarskjold

Encl.

H.E. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge Jr.
United States Mission to the United Nations
2 Park Avenue
New York City, N.Y.

24 June 1954

Dear Mr. Lodge,

As I gathered from our telephone conversation that you had not received the cable from the Delegation of the Soviet Union concerning a meeting of the Security Council, I have the honour to send to you the enclosed copies of the document he has presented to me.

.....

In his oral comments Mr. Tsarapkin said that when he asked for a meeting "without delay," that should be read as a request for a meeting if possible today -- at all events tomorrow morning.

Yours sincerely,

Dag Hammarskjold,
Secretary-General

His Excellency,
Mr. Nanfy Cabot Lodge, Jr.,
Permanent Representative of the United States of America
to the United Nations,
2 Park Avenue,
New York 16, N.Y.

30 June 1954

Dear Cabot,

You certainly know that the procedural and legal issues which have recently arisen, are partly new to this Organization. The line taken by the UN organs on these issues thus will have significance for the future constitutional development of the Organization. In such a situation I consider it an obvious part of the duties of the Secretary-General to try and help the Members to develop the UN activities in a way consonant with the basic principles of the Charter and providing consistency in the practices followed. For that reason I have had the main problems now involved studied by our people on the basis of the relevant legal texts and the full records of the Security Council as well as the San Francisco conference. That has been done without any reference to the case now under consideration, solely in order to provide a basis for a further development, established in the light of decisions in the past. You will find a summary of the results of those studies in the enclosed draft memorandum.

.....

The memorandum is an internal Secretariat document but I would consider it in line with my obligations to put it at the disposal of delegations. Before making it available to a wider group, the paper should, of course, be given as a non-official document to the Security Council Members. And before giving it to the Security Council Members, I would like to let you have a look at it.

You will find that it is a rather dry, factual review without evaluations or conclusions; thus, it is not a policy statement or an "advice" from the Secretary-General, and I have no intention to formalize it as a statement in accordance with Security Council Rule of Procedure 22.

As you know I have to leave on Saturday if I am to attend the ECOSOC, and for that reason I would be grateful if I could have your comments in the course of Friday.

H.E. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
United States Mission to the United Nations
2 Park Avenue
New York City

10 August 1954

Dear Cabot,

Thank you for your letter of July 8th. I take it that the United States views to which you refer are those presented in "Comments on the Secretary-General's Memorandum on the Relationship between the United Nations and Regional Organizations" of July 6th.

I have given those Comments the most careful consideration. A comparison between the line taken in the Comments and in the Memorandum is made difficult by the fact that the Memorandum was not concerned with any specific case or the implementation of general principles in the recent Guatemalan question but with the general principles themselves, while on the other hand the Comments obviously approach the problem from the specific angle of the decisions taken in that case by the Security Council. However, if I try to extract from the Comments the general legal interpretation of the Charter and of the relationship between the United Nations and regional organizations which they represent, I find a very wide area of agreement between them and the Memorandum. Thus, it seems at least exaggerated to say, as it is stated in the Comments, that the analysis made in the Memorandum cannot be accepted as valid. The more far reaching judgment that the Memorandum is one-sided - not to say unfair - from the United States viewpoint is obviously based on a confusion, explained by the failure in the Comments to recognize what was the purpose of the Memorandum, and can, therefore, be left aside.

His Excellency
Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.
Permanent Representative of the
United States to the United Nations
2 Park Avenue
New York 16, New York.

When I had my Memorandum prepared - by the way, I take personal responsibility for the way in which it is framed and for the line taken - it was because I feared that certain statements in the debate of the Guatemalan question might further an interpretation of the Council decisions which, if accepted as creating a precedent, would inaugurate a development, departing from the "delicate balance" established in San Francisco. I felt that a clarification of the general legal principles involved had to be given by the Secretary-General, detached from the question how the decisions should be interpreted and whether, with such an interpretation, they were constitutionally correct. Such a clarification should be given before any resumed discussion of the Guatemalan question in the Security Council as it would be at such a discussion that the analysis might prove useful. When I stopped circulation of the Memorandum in order to get a chance of talking matters over with you in the light of the United States Comments, it was clear that no such Security Council discussion was imminent and that, therefore, the matter presented less urgency than I had feared. I now find that the general interpretation among Delegations is along the lines indicated in the Memorandum: thus, the Memorandum is no longer needed for its original purpose.

Under such circumstances, I shelve the question, and the Memorandum will be left in its file, as it stands.

DRAFT

6 August 1954

Dear Cabot,

Thank you for your letter of July 8th. I take it that the United States views to which you refer are those presented in "Comments on the Secretary-General's Memorandum on the Relationship between the United Nations and Regional Organizations" of July 6th.

I have given those Comments the most careful consideration. A comparison between the line taken in the Comments and in the Memorandum is made difficult by the fact that the Memorandum was not concerned with any specific case or the implementation of general principles in the recent Guatemalan question but with the general principles themselves, while on the other hand the Comments obviously approach the problem from the specific angle of the decisions taken in that case by the Security Council. However, if I try to extract from the Comments the general legal interpretation of the Charter and of the relationship between the United Nations and regional organizations which they represent, I find a very wide area of agreement between them and the Memorandum. Thus, it seems at least exaggerated to say, as it is stated in the Comments, that the analysis made in the Memorandum cannot be accepted as valid. The more far reaching judgment that the Memorandum is one-sided - not to say unfair - from the United States viewpoint is obviously based on a confusion, explained by the failure in the

Comments to recognize what was the purpose of the Memorandum, and can, therefore, be left aside.

When I had my memorandum prepared - by the way, I take personal responsibility for the way in which it is framed and for the line taken - it was because I feared that certain statements in the debate of the Guatemalan question might further an interpretation of the Council decisions which, if accepted as creating a precedent, would inaugurate a development, departing from the "delicate balance" established in San Francisco. I felt that a clarification of the general legal principles involved had to be given by the Secretary-General, detached from the question how the decisions should be interpreted and whether, with such an interpretation, they were constitutionally correct. Such a clarification should be given before any resumed discussion of the Guatemalan question in the Security Council as it would be at such a discussion that the analysis might prove useful. When I stopped circulation of the Memorandum in order to get a chance of talking matters over with you in the light of the United States Comments, it was clear that no such Security Council discussion was imminent and that, therefore, the matter presented less urgency than I had feared. I now find that the general interpretation among Delegations is along the lines indicated in the Memorandum: thus, the Memorandum is no longer needed for its original purpose.

Under such circumstances, I shelve the question, and the Memorandum will be left in its file, as it stands.