

national order."²⁰ The Soviet Union, Denmark, Lebanon, and New Zealand voted for the U.N. discussion of the case. Nationalist China, Turkey, Brazil, and Colombia voted with the United States against the request, while France and the United Kingdom abstained. The invading forces defeated the Guatemalan Government before the OAS had a chance to take any action. The Guatemalan case is still a source of criticism of U.S. policy in many Latin American countries. Although they sympathize with the anti-Communist stand of the U.S. Government, they fear a serious blow has been dealt to the U.N.'s prestige.

In general, the Latin Americans in the United Nations have followed the same principles which they maintained at San Francisco. They have defended the rights of small countries, favored the principle of universal membership in the Organization, advocated charter revisions to establish juridical equality of all nations, and defended domestic jurisdiction, nonintervention, and compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. In most of these policies they have naturally conflicted with the U.S. point of view.

Concerning economic problems of underdeveloped countries, the main point of contention between Latin America and the United States has been over sources of funds. The Latin Americans (backed by the underdeveloped nations of the Eastern Hemisphere) have always supported large-scale U.N. financial aid to modernize backward economies, while the United States (supported by the industrial powers of Western Europe) has sought to limit the U.N.'s financial programs, such as the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, and to encourage world economic development by private enterprise. Latin America and the United States have also been on opposing sides in U.N. discussions involving international commodity agreements and raw material pricing.

In connection with the struggle for independence of colonial areas, the relations between Latin America and the United States are also in conflict. The United States, because of the ties with colonial powers (Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, etc.), cannot openly support independence without offending its allies. The Latin American republics, on the other hand, have always favored independence and anticolonialism. They have gone on record, in several inter-American meetings, as favoring the abolition of the existing colonies in the Western Hemisphere, while the United States has not supported this policy. The voting record of Latin America in the U.N., in matters of colonialism has, in most cases, supported the Arab-Asian bloc and Soviet Russia. (See below, pt. V.)

Another conflict between Latin America and the United States arises in connection with the utilization of the United Nations. Latin American diplomats often feel that the United States has gone along in world affairs, making its own decisions and formulating its own policies, using the U.N. only as a last remedy when a deadlock is reached. The Latin American countries in general, with the experience of their own international organization and their faith in international law, believe in less unilateral action and more collective action through the U.N.

²⁰ John A. Houston, "Latin America and the United Nations," 1956, p. 110.