Krechmer -

I have your letter of Dec 11 which I read with interest. Of course you know we have no ambassador in Madrid. I am not sure about your statement about telling Game he must go.

Copy Marked from Mr Byrnes to Mr Sandifer - Con

Send with note.
December 11, 1946

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
29 Washington Square West
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

Thank you very much for your letter of December 4. I regret that this has been my first opportunity to answer it in any detail because of preoccupation with many matters, not the least of which has been the Spanish situation.

I am glad that you agree that to call on the Spanish people to hold a free election -- ignoring completely the facts of their virtual imprisonment -- is a "futile gesture." In fact it is an ironical and even brutal gesture.

I am glad to see in today's papers that the American delegation has finally agreed to support the resolution which passed the Political and Security Committee, which calls for withdrawal of Ambassadors from Madrid and keeping the case within the purview of the United Nations. While this does not meet the situation in its entirety, at least it is an advance.

I may tell you that the most distressing aspect of the whole development has been not simply the American resolution, feeble in itself, but the attitude of Senator Connally, which has been most unworthy of that of the spokesman for a great democracy. And it has been distressing too to hear deputies for the American delegation express their approval in subcommittee of the proposals of the Colombian and Cuban delegations for a negotiated settlement with Franco, the Falange and the Spanish Republicans as co-partners. As one of the delegates put it: "Would Norway have agreed to negotiate with Quisling; or France with Petain; or The Netherlands with De Mussert; or Belgium with Degrelle?"

Since the United States delegation has constantly stated in the present deliberations its belief that Franco is the creature of the Axis, it is totally incomprehensible to me why the same procedures which have been applied to other puppet regimes could not be equally applied to Franco. Surely you agree that if all the United Nations jointly would tell Franco that he must go, there would be no question of his disappearance, without implying at any point -- as Senator Connally has -- that to oust him would mean the employment by the United Nations of armed force.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
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I am still afraid that there are those in our State Department who, recognizing that Franco must go, are thinking in terms of replacing him with a regime which differs little in its general purposes from its predecessor. And I am hopeful that you will be on the watchout to prevent such action.

What you say concerning Senator Vandenberg's position is very interesting. I have tried to see him on several occasions, but unfortunately without success. Nor have my letters to Secretary Byrnes been even acknowledged thus far.

With kind regards,

Cordially yours,

Freda Kirchwey
December 24, 1946

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
29 Washington Square West
New York, N. Y.

My dear Mrs. Roosevelt:

I send you enclosed copies of two letters sent today to Secretary of State Byrnes and Trygve Lie, the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Both letters speak for themselves and they are concerned with the possibilities of a negotiated settlement in Franco Spain which would replace Franco by substituting for him a regime which would not be democratic and which would bypass the Republic.

I should be enormously grateful to you if you could make some inquiries about this development.

With all good wishes for the New Year,

Cordially yours,

Freda Kirchwey
December 24, 1946

The Hon. James F. Byrnes  
Secretary of State  
State Department  
Washington, D. C.

My dear Secretary Byrnes:

I send you enclosed a copy of a letter which has just been addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations, in which we discuss the efforts of Great Britain to produce a change in the present Franco government of Spain. The letter to Mr. Lie poses the questions which were equally relevant with respect to the attitude of our own country.

We should be interested in hearing from you whether the United States is engaged in a similar undertaking jointly with the British or independent of them.

Recalling that the representative of the United States, Mr. Haydn Haymer, sitting in the subcommittee of the Political and Security Committee of the General Assembly, indicated that the United States would be glad to have Colombia and Cuba explore the possibilities of a negotiated settlement with France, and Senator Connally's attitude and action on this question during the entire session of the Assembly, it is difficult not to believe that the United States is carrying out such a policy.

We should be glad to hear from you about this.

Sincerely yours,

Freda Kirchway
H. E. Trygve Lie, Secretary General
The United Nations
Lake Success, New York

Mr. dear Secretary Lie:

On December 18, the Associated Press, in a dispatch from London, quoted an authoritative British government source as stating that "members of a British diplomatic mission to Spain had been examining the possibility of whether a coalition government could be established in Spain to replace the Franco regime and to carry on until elections could be held." This was further confirmed in a statement by Morgan Phillips, Secretary of the British Labor Party.

According to this dispatch, moreover, conversations have taken place with groups of Spaniards ranging from the "right wing Centrists to the left wing Centrists."

As you will see from the enclosed article by Alvarez del Vayo, Foreign Minister of the last Republican government elected in Spain, which will appear in the December 28th issue of The Nation, the right wing Centrists are Monarchists and Generals, while left wing Centrists are a handful of deserters from the Republic. The idea behind the British proposal, according to Mr. del Vayo, is to replace Franco "by a military clerical regime leavened by a few nominal Republicans."

On December 19, 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution in which the issue of Spain was placed within the purview of the Security Council. It is notable that at the time the British expressed their opposition to precisely this aspect of the General Assembly's resolution.

In view of that resolution, The Nation Associates wishes to know whether the present action of the British government is with the knowledge and concurrence, official or otherwise, of the Security Council.

As we interpret the present undertaking, it is an attempt by the British government to secure by unilateral action a negotiated settlement with Franco for which the delegations of Colombia and Cuba openly lobbied. In effect it is an attempt to carry out the intent of the Colombian resolution which was overwhelmingly defeated in the subcommittee of the Political and Security Committee.
of the General Assembly, and by the Political and Security Committee itself.

It is, moreover, the most blatant kind of intervention in the internal affairs of Spain, which can have as its purpose only the most ulterior of objectives, particularly in the light of the concerted effort of the British delegation at the United Nations to prevent collective action against Franco on the spurious claim that such collective action represented intervention.

The question raised by this action is one of principle and practical operation. On a matter within the purview of the Security Council is it ethical for a member state to anticipate or contravene collective action by its unilateral action? From the practical standpoint, should the present maneuver succeed, the Security Council may be confronted with a situation where the technical requirements of the resolution of December 12, 1946 have been met, while fundamentally the Spanish people have been betrayed and the legitimate government of the Spanish people, the Republic, bypassed.

The Nation Associates is of the hope that the questions raised will receive your earnest consideration with a view to discussion by the Security Council at this time.

Sincerely yours,

Freda Kirchwey