

Before the main question of continuing or ending the work of UNRRA had been dealt with, so far as it could be, in a Council resolution, a good deal of attention was given to two relatively subordinate issues: (1) the conditions under which help might be given to displaced persons, particularly those who may be able but are at present unwilling to return to their former countries, and (2) extending aid to ex-enemy territories, notably Italy and Austria. The first of these arose in the application of a resolution (No. 57), carried at the Montreal session in 1941, authorizing the Administration to carry out operations (in enemy or ex-enemy areas) for the care and repatriation or return of displaced persons *in agreement with the Government of the country of which they are nationals*. These last thirteen words appeared to require the agreement of the nationals' home Government as a condition of their being cared for by UNRRA, though it was also argued that this condition should not be interpreted as a qualification of the general mandate to provide relief without discrimination on account of either race, creed, or political belief. The question assumed practical importance on account of the large number of displaced persons who, at least for the time being, and partly because of political uncertainties at home, were unwilling to return to their own countries. To refuse them relief because their national Governments objected would, it was argued, be equivalent to discrimination on account of political belief; while, on the other hand, some national Governments maintained that the provision of relief would encourage such persons in an irrational intransigence, and would in fact be a political act of a kind beyond the competence of UNRRA. The Council finally agreed, on a majority vote, to permit the provision of relief to these people without requiring the formal consent of their Governments, the Administration undertaking to encourage them to return to their homes at the earliest possible moment, and the whole matter to be reconsidered at the end of six months after the termination of the Council session.

UNRRA aid to Italy, to the extent of \$50,000,000, was authorized at the Montreal session, but a much greater measure of assistance was brought to her under military auspices, financed by the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada. These three countries were foremost in pressing the view that substantial aid to Italy should now be allowed as a part of UNRRA'S functions. Similar proposals were also made to permit UNRRA activities in Austria, Korea, and Formosa, and these necessarily brought to the fore the question whether ex-enemies should be helped by UNRRA. Is this organization, in short, one for helping the United Nations exclusively, or is it to be more broadly regarded as an organization of the United Nations to bring relief where relief is most needed, but without applying the test at every point of the applicant country's war record?

At an early stage, before, in fact, UNRRA was formally set up, there was good authority for taking the wider view, for, on 20th August, 1940, the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Churchill, declared:

"We can and we will arrange in advance for the speedy entry of food into any part of the enslaved area, when this part has been wholly cleared of German forces and has genuinely regained its freedom. We shall do our best to encourage the building-up of reserves of food all over the world, so that there will always be held up before the eyes of the peoples of Europe, including I say it deliberately the German and Austrian peoples, the certainty that the shattering of the Nazi power will bring to them all immediate food, freedom, and peace."

In contrast with these magnanimous words, the first UNRRA Council at Atlantic City severely limited, and went far to prevent, possible UNRRA operations in ex-enemy countries. The second Session at Montreal went some distance, notably in the vote for relief in Italy, to allow such operations; and the resolutions of the third, London, session, involved further significant steps in the same direction.

Thus, the principal United States delegate said:

"The question naturally arises, Should a United Nations' organization assume the responsibility for relief in an area which only two years ago was an enemy country? I believe that during these two intervening years Italy has earned the right to be treated as a member of the community of free nations. Italy's partisans played a major part in the liberation of the Po Valley, as Field Marshal Alexander and General Mark Clark have testified. The new Italian Government, which began its life under great handicaps in a tiny section of the country, has been progressively strengthened, is growing in a democratic mould, and is now headed by a Prime Minister who formerly directed the resistance movement in Northern Italy."

And he cited the words from the recent Potsdam Tripartite Conference statement crediting Italy with having freed herself from the Fascist regime and with making progress towards democratic institutions. Likewise, Mr. Clayton favoured treating Austria as a liberated area which in the past seven years had suffered as an enemy-occupied country. Mr. Noel Baker, for the United Kingdom, had no hesitation in supporting these views. He had, in fact, already emphasized his, and his Government's view that the essential purpose of UNRRA is to bring relief where it is most needed, to help reconstruct the shattered economies of countries who cannot do it for themselves, and "whose rehabilitation will help not them only, but the rest of the world." It is a common effort in the common interest of the world at large not to bring charity, not to reward merit, nor to equalize the suffering and the sacrifice between those who took part in the war. Elsewhere Mr. Noel Baker quoted with full approval Mr. Eden's statement in the House of Commons, "It is not generosity, it is in our own interest to ensure that Europe shall not collapse." The representative of China, Dr. Tsiang, said:

"It is our view that the spirit of fraternity among the different nations should be nourished and kept alive . . . I know very well that if (ex-enemies are provided for) the share that will fall to China will be diminished; I know that that would mean hardship among many people in China. But it seems to me that it is wiser to adopt that attitude. Many people in the world to-day are in need. Our resources are not enough to meet all those needs. Then, what shall we do? I feel it is best for us to share what we have, even though that sharing may mean a smaller portion for us . . . One of our colleagues warned us about a day when we may be asked to include even Japan and Germany. To-day I must say that the Chinese people hate the Japanese, but if we should come to the question of extension of relief to Japan, I would say I would vote for it . . . UNRRA was created to take care of the pressing needs of the common people, not to settle accounts of the past, for which purpose the United Nations have set up other instruments."