

to the realization that in the event of social change brought about democratically in those countries where there is a democratic way of expression of the people, there may be a situation in which the powers that have been put out of office , or out of power, as you say democratically, may organize and use force and violence to get back their lost positions; and it will be essential for the people in that position, that had democratically made their change to defend themselves and use force and violence as well. I can give a very clear example that was short of actual social complete change, and that was Spain. Spain went over just innocently from monarchy to a republic and a democratic form of government and one could compare Azana to a Liberal in this country and to people such as that and socialists in the United States or any government at all. When the people/in an overwhelming majority ^{voted} in an election campaign, it is very much the same as we have an election campaign in this country. This government went to work and began to introduce social legislation, unemployment insurance, increase wages, better working conditions and things of that kind. A group of generals under Franco, with the connivance of foreign powers, Germany and Italy, as you know, opened up a civil war against this government. Now, what should these people have done? Should they have turned the other cheek or should they have fought for what they had voted democratically? My position is that when the people have had the opportunity to express their views democratically on the form of government or the social system they desire, that that government has a duty to the people to protect its newly won position against anyone that attempts to overthrow it. That is where the difference lies between