

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
1311 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. C.
Capitol 4-3121, Ext. 2424

FOR RELEASE: Saturday
April 4, 1959

NINE-POINT PROGRAM PROPOSED BY SENATOR HUMPHREY
FOR IMPROVING LATIN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

A nine-point program for improving Latin-American relations was outlined by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.), member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, last night in an address before the University of Florida at Gainesville, Florida.

Senator Humphrey warned that inter-American relations "are in a more critical stage today than they have been at any time in the past three decades."

"It took the demonstrations against Vice President Nixon last spring to explode any remaining illusions about the state of our Latin American relations," he declared.

"Our gravest error has been a misreading of the revolution gripping the region. Some people are prone to dismiss Latin American revolts as mere changes in the palace guard, while others see Communist influence in every upheaval. These stereotypes can be our undoing.

"Today, the nations to the south are in the midst of an epic social revolution. We and the Communists have vied with each other in telling people the world over that they no longer have to live out their lives in hopeless misery. The peoples of Latin-America took us at our word.

"Many thousands of Latin Americans have risked exile, imprisonment, torture and death to achieve responsible governments, responsive to the needs of their people. The rash of revolutions that toppled tyrannies in Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, and Cuba attests to their determination to achieve freedom and bread.

"In the midst of that upheaval, which we above all other peoples should be able to understand and to sympathize with, the United States has somehow managed to appear callous and indifferent. While we have eagerly sought Latin-American support to stop the spread of Communist tyranny, we have demonstrated a peculiar nonchalance toward despotisms of the home-grown variety."

Senator Humphrey said that the Latin-American situation "cries out for imaginative, long-range planning, rather than the hurried, patch-up measures after an explosion has occurred."

In outlining a nine-point program for improving United States-Latin American relations, Senator Humphrey said he believed it was "realistic and workable, and in harmony with the best interests of our country and of our 20 sister republics."

"A coordinated program on the order of the Marshall Plan would give the Latin Americans new hope of attaining bread and freedom," he declared. "The possibilities of such an effort should be explored carefully, not primarily as an anti-Communist strategem, but because it is good for Latin America and for the United States. We should not be ashamed of our humanitarian tradition. Nor should we be embarrassed if humanitarian and security objectives sometimes coincide in our national policy."

(Text of the address, with nine-point proposed program of recommendations, attached.)

A NEW ERA FOR LATIN AMERICA

ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY

BY

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (D., MINN.)

University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Friday Night, April 3, 1959

Tonight I might have selected as my topic the Berlin crisis, the troubled Middle East or the vexing problem of attempting to control the nuclear arms race. But I have chosen instead to talk about Latin America and United States policy toward her Latin American neighbors. Since the end of World War II we have been preoccupied with a series of crises on the periphery of the Communist empire -- Greece, Berlin, Korea, Indochina, Suez, Quemoy, Lebanon and again Berlin. In the meantime, the seemingly less precarious situation in Latin America went almost unnoticed.

It took the demonstrations against Vice President Nixon last spring to explode any remaining illusions about the state of our Latin American relations. The plain truth is that today inter-American relations are in a more critical stage than they have been at any time in the past three decades.

At this point, I would like to pause to pay tribute to the University of Florida, one of the few United States universities which has a well-rounded Latin American studies program. Recently, the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress surveyed universities across the country to find out which ones offered Latin American studies. I am told that only eight universities fall into Category I, that is, ones which offer a well-staffed, well-rounded course of study about Latin America. The University of Florida is one of these eight. Florida's awareness of the importance of inter-American understanding also has been reflected in the thoughtful and persistent efforts of Senator Smathers to bring attention to the realities of our foreign policy in Latin America.

We are now on the threshold of the 69th Anniversary of the Organization of American States. It has long been customary at this time of the year to extol pan-American peace, solidarity and cooperation. Such oratory now would be a gratuitous gesture. It is dangerous to perpetuate comfortable fictions about a bond that has been broken. The first prerequisite of a responsible and effective policy toward Latin America is a willingness to face the facts, however unpleasant they may be.

OUR STAKE IN LATIN AMERICA

There is no disagreement on the importance of cordial, cooperative relations with our 20 sister Republics. Everyone agrees that strategically, ICBM's notwithstanding, Latin America remains one of the key foundations of our defense shield. Politically, close and harmonious relations with the Latin American people, who now number over 180 million, add to the free world's strength in the larger issues of the cold war.

Economically, the American republics constitute a vital ingredient in our own well-being. The area is second only to Europe as a purchaser of our exports. Twenty-five percent of all our exports go there. In 1957 this meant the sale of \$560 million worth of automobiles and parts, of \$445 million worth of chemicals, \$135 million of medicines, \$121 million of edible animal products, and so on across the board of U. S. products. Latin American purchases add up to a lot of jobs for a lot of people in the United States. At the same time, imports from south of the Rio Grande consist of many strategic minerals as well as materials essential to our peacetime industries. U. S. private investments in the area now total over \$9 billion, more than in any other region of the world.

Why, then, have relations deteriorated?

CRISIS POLICY

Part of the responsibility lies in our preoccupation with Europe, the Middle East and Asia. While attention to these vital areas is understandable, the resulting neglect of Latin America cannot be justified. The personal diplomacy of the Administration has also tended in the same direction. With all decision-making power concentrated in Secretary Dulles, the less precarious situation in Latin America got shoved into the background until it too became a crisis. Up until the recent disturbances, I am told, foreign service officers working in Latin America were somehow considered to be occupying second-class positions.

TAKING LATIN AMERICA FOR GRANTED

The Good Neighbor policy itself may be partly to blame for the assumption that nothing much could go wrong within our Hemisphere. Latin American representatives tried to make their grievances heard through proper channels and at stated conferences. Often their warnings and protests were bitter. But the Good Neighbor policy had been so successful in cementing U. S. - Latin American relations that long after its demise an aura of good-will lingered on, hiding the grim realities underneath. The hangover from the Good Neighbor policy seems to have created an impression in the United States that the Latin American republics were solidly with us no matter what we did or did not do.

LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTIONS

The attitude of taking Latin America for granted is only part of the growing estrangement between the United States and Latin America. I think that our gravest error has been a misreading of the revolution gripping the region. Some people are prone to dismiss Latin American revolts as mere changes in the palace guard, while others see Communist influence in every upheaval. These stereotypes can be our undoing.

Today, the nations to the south are in the midst of an epic social revolution. We and the Communists have vied with each other in telling people the world over that they no longer have to live out their lives in hopeless misery. The peoples of Latin America took us at our word!

They want an end to semi-feudal conditions in which 5 percent of the population owns 80-90 percent of the land; in which a handful of nationals and foreigners live in luxury while the majority live in squalor; in which disease strikes down their children and hunger and ignorance perpetuate their slavery; in which the wealthy minority joins with the army to keep things just as they are.

Many thousands of Latin Americans have risked exile, imprisonment, torture and death to achieve responsible governments, responsive to the needs of their people. These courageous people usually come from the classes that produce political leadership--students, union leaders, professional and business men. The rash of revolutions that toppled tyrannies in Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela and Cuba attests to their determination to achieve freedom and bread.

THE LATIN AMERICAN IMAGE OF THE U.S.

In the midst of that upheaval, which we above all other peoples should be able to understand and to sympathize with, the United States has somehow managed to appear callous and indifferent. While we have eagerly sought Latin American support to stop the spread of Communist tyranny, we have demonstrated a peculiar nonchalance toward despotisms of the home-grown variety.

In 1954 Secretary Dulles took time to fly to the Ninth Inter-American Conference in Caracas to press for an inter-American declaration against Communist intervention in the Western Hemisphere. That very same year we bestowed the Legion of Merit on Pérez Jiménez (pronounced Hema-nes) then the hated dictator of Venezuela. The incredible citation reads in part:

. . . to H. E. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, President of the Republic of Venezuela for the exceptional nature of his outstanding accomplishments. His Excellency, as President of the Republic of Venezuela and previously, has demonstrated a spirit of friendship and cooperation with the United States.

The sound economic, financial and foreign investment policies advocated and pursued by his administration have contributed greatly to the economic well-being of his country, and to the rapid development of its tremendous resources. These policies, judiciously combined with a far reaching public works program, have remarkably improved its education, sanitation, transportation, housing, and other important basic facilities.

Shortly after our tribute to Pérez Jiménez, the Archbishop of Caracas dared to denounce the tyrant in a pastoral letter, and thousands of anguished Venezuelans hazarded their lives to get rid of the bloody oppressor upon whom we had lavished praise.

On January 10, 1958 -- just thirteen days before unarmed men, women and children rose heroically against the brutal Venezuelan dictatorship -- the man who had been our Ambassador to Venezuela from 1951 to 1956 wrote from his new post in Turkey to the dictator's savage secret-police chief congratulating him for putting down the first abortive revolt. The letter, on Foreign Service stationery, came to light after the democratic revolution. (See attached memo on this case.)

These incidents are, unfortunately, not isolated. Our Defense Department, in the middle of the Cuban revolt, decorated the officer who had commanded air raids against the Cuban people. We kept up a stream of armaments to Batista long after it had become apparent that he was using them against his own people, contrary to the terms of our defense agreement.

The Communists, of course, are getting a lot of mileage out of such errors. But we must face up to the fact that our own actions, not Communist propaganda, have created throughout Latin America an image of the United States as a nation selfishly engrossed in defending its own freedoms but heedless of the aspirations of others.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IS SERIOUS

United States official attitudes with regard to Latin America's economic problems have deepened the estrangement between us.

Our economic attitudes toward Latin America have created the image of the United States as arrogant, paternal, interested primarily in promoting the interests of U. S. investors, and unconcerned for the well-being of ordinary human beings. It is painful to think that the generous impulse of the United States, which first created the idea of technical assistance in Latin America in 1942, now seems so perverted.

As you know, all the American republics, to a greater or less degree, fall into the category of underdeveloped countries. All are dependent on the export of one, or at best a few, commodities to earn the foreign exchange to buy vital necessities and to finance economic development.

Any down-swing in the world price or demand for their few exports plays havoc with their income. This uncertainty makes development planning exceedingly difficult.

With an average annual per capita income of less than \$300, some areas in Latin America are hard pressed to maintain even this low living standard in the face of a rapidly growing population.

Our neighbors have not been sitting on their hands waiting for assistance. Ninety percent of the capital invested in the area is Latin America's own. The reserves accumulated from the sale of raw materials during World War II, made possible a spurt of development in the region. From 1945 to 1953 the average per capita income rose at the rate of 3.3 percent a year, and Mexico, for example, achieved a rate twice as great. After 1952, with reserves depleted and the price and demand for Latin America's principal products on the decline, the accelerated rate of development ground to a halt.

Responsible leaders in Latin America are worried. On the one hand they have populations awakened from centuries of apathy who are demanding a better deal in life. On the other hand, the ubiquitous Communists are there, dangling tempting promises before the eyes of the underprivileged. Democratic leaders in Latin

America know that they must produce some tangible results, that they must provide some hope for a better future, if democratic government is to endure.

THE U. S. RESPONSE HAS BEEN AMBIGUOUS

On the question of Latin America's economic development the United States has presented an ambiguous picture. Latin Americans understood and welcomed Secretary Marshall's stirring declaration at Harvard University 12 years ago: "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." Hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos well described Latin American conditions. And, we encouraged the Latin Americans to look almost exclusively to us for assistance.

We then proceeded to provide billions in aid to Europe and Asia. To Latin American pleas for assistance, we replied with advice that they should look to private investments and private enterprise as the principal channel for their funds. In 1956 Senator Smathers proposed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to provide a special fund for loans for Latin America for health, education and sanitation projects. This proposal met with resistance from the State Department on the grounds that private capital was doing a good enough job. I am happy to say that Congress passed the amendment in spite of State Department resistance.

The frequent reiteration that private capital would meet Latin American requirements insulted and irritated our neighbors. We Americans like our system of free enterprise. It has worked for us, although not in the simon-pure form that some people like to pretend. Latin Americans, on the other hand, have some sour memories of the robber-baron type investments, both domestic and foreign, which we ourselves have long since ceased to tolerate.

In addition to historical differences, the advice ignored the plain fact that private enterprise goes in to make a profit, and will hardly be attracted when the basic sinews of a national economy -- such as roads, power and sanitation facilities -- are lacking.

Moreover, over-dependence in private investment results in a piece-meal approach to economic development, as private funds haphazardly move into a mine here and a factory there. Latin Americans point out that in their urgent circumstances they cannot wait for the trickle-down theory to maybe work.

THE U. S. CHANGE OF HEART

It took the violent outbursts against Vice President Nixon to make us conscious of the gravity of the Latin-American situation. On March 10 last the Department of State announced a change of heart, as follows:

Not only must account be taken of the private capital and technical know-how required to create employment for those who today are under-employed or unemployed but also of the need to create new jobs for an even larger number of workers. In addition to the expansion of industry and agriculture which this implies, very large additional amounts of public funds will be required for facilities which only governments can provide; for example, highways, sanitation facilities, hospitals and schools.

The recognition that Latin American growing pains differ from ours, and our consequent abandonment of inflexible doctrinaire principles, should open the way for better inter-American understanding.

Along the new guidelines, positive steps are in progress. The Administration has finally announced that it will support an Inter-American Development Bank, something the Latin Americans have been urging for years and we have been resisting for years. We have agreed to consult with the Republics before making decisions which could affect their principal exports. We have indicated a willingness to take a fresh look at efforts to deal with instability and fluctuation in the commodity market. We have lent our support to the idea of regional markets within Latin America.

In short, we have recognized the magnitude of Latin America's problem and have agreed to cooperate with our neighbors in finding solutions.

A NINE-POINT PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Latin America, as population zooms, as industrial development spreads, and hope and impatience mingle, is going to be a cauldron of competing political ideologies. We should welcome this development, not fear it.

In no region of the world have we deeper historical traditions to build upon. It was with the Latin American republics that we first developed the idea of regional cooperation. The bold idea of mutual cooperation to attack disease, illiteracy and poverty was born within the inter-American family. These are the people who wept unashamedly when Franklin Delano Roosevelt died.

Today in Latin America there are many leaders who understand and admire our democratic system and want to develop something comparable in their own countries. I know of an American who, while attending the inauguration last month of the democratically-elected President of Venezuela, was asked on three separate occasions by newly elected Venezuelan congressmen how they could get hold of a copy of the Jefferson Manual of Rules for the House of Representatives.

Our traditions of individual freedom and concern for ordinary human beings were once the cornerstone of our successful Latin American policy. Now, to Latin Americans, these much admired beliefs seem to stop at the border. While we caution our neighbors about Communist activities and Communist infiltration, we appear peculiarly cold toward the Latin American yearning to achieve genuine civil liberties.

The recent steps taken by the Administration to repair our tottering Latin American policy should be applauded. They are steps in the right direction, but they will not be enough if the escalator of history is going faster in the opposite direction. We must replace our massive indifference to Latin American aspirations with massive cooperation.

The Latin American situation cries out for imaginative, long-range planning, rather than the hurried, patch-up measures after an explosion has occurred.

A coordinated program on the order of the Marshall Plan would give the Latin Americans new hope of attaining bread and freedom. The possibilities of such an effort should be explored carefully, not primarily as an anti-Communist stratagem, but because it is good for Latin America and for the United States. We should not be ashamed of our humanitarian tradition. Nor should we be embarrassed if humanitarian and security objectives sometimes coincide in our national policy.

In conclusion, I should like to propose a nine-point program for improving United States-Latin American relations. I believe this program is realistic and workable and in harmony with the best interests of our country and of our 20 sister republics.

First: The United States should increase the volume of its economic aid in support of Latin American efforts to develop diversified and viable economies so they will not be dependent, as they now are, on a few commodities. Requests for loans from the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank should be dealt with expeditiously and sympathetically. We should cooperate fully with the new Inter-American Development Institution. The proposed corps of technical experts within the Institute could help the smaller, inexperienced countries draw up coordinated development plans.

Second: The United States should accelerate and strengthen its program of technical assistance in agriculture, health, education, vocational training, and public administration. The time has come to recapture the original fervor of President Truman's "bold new program" which was widely hailed in Latin America when it was first announced a decade ago.

Third: The United States should support vigorously the current moves within Latin America to establish regional markets. The elimination of inter-American trade barriers would broaden markets for Latin American products and make low-cost manufacturing feasible, both indispensable prerequisites to diversification and economic growth.

Fourth: The United States should review its trade and tariff policies as they affect imports from Latin America. It is self defeating for us to provide economic assistance with one hand and take it away with the other by shortsighted trade restrictions. If policies designed to strengthen our trade with

Latin America cause hardship to any domestic industry, the Government has a responsibility to aid those so affected. (I recently co-sponsored an amendment in the Senate to the Area Redevelopment Act (S. 722) to make such aid possible, but unfortunately it did not pass the committee stage.)

Fifth: The United States should give wholehearted support to the health programs under the direction of the Pan American Sanitary Organization. Widespread disease which stalks Latin America is a tremendous economic drain as well as a human tragedy. Investment in health is perhaps the cheapest, most effective investment we can make in the future of the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth: The United States should develop a bold and imaginative program of student and cultural exchange.

We need to reexamine our methods of screening Latin American scholarship recipients. Too frequently the test has been the friendliness of the recipient toward the United States. Young Latin Americans of so-called leftist tendencies have been excluded, when they are often the very ones who would benefit most from the program.

Seventh: The United States press, radio and TV, networks should give wider and better balanced news coverage of Latin American affairs. This, of course, is something our government can do little about. But it is essential that the American people have a continuous report and interpretation of Latin American developments if they are to understand the magnitude of the problems in that region and what we are being asked to support. When news of revolutions and executions dominate our newspapers, it is hard for the American taxpayer to form an understanding of the underlying realities in the 20 American republics, and of our interest in them.

Eighth: The United States should thoroughly reappraise its military assistance program in Latin America. What we have given one nation for hemispheric defense has often provoked demands by another for an equal amount of aid. Great care should be taken not to encourage this type of arms race, which Latin American governments can ill-afford. We should give greater attention to the coordination of military policy and strategy in the Hemisphere. This might well result in a decrease in the requirements of national military establishments.

Further, our military assistance to certain dictatorial governments has raised the question of whose freedom those governments are defending. The use by Batista of U.S. supplied armaments against his own people, contrary to stipulations of our defense treaty, has greatly damaged U.S. prestige throughout Latin America. It makes little sense to speak of Hemisphere defense while arming a tyrant who uses weapons to intimidate his own people.

Ninth: The United States should lend its support to the idea of regional arms control. Last year Costa Rica submitted such a plan to the Organization of American States and received nominal support from the U.S. delegation. Our government should now press for the consideration of the Costa Rican plan or some similar project, at the Eleventh Inter-American Conference to be held at Quito next year.

The quality of our over-all policy toward Latin America will be determined not only by what we do, but by how we do it.

Unless we pursue our policies with a genuine interest in the welfare of our fellow human beings, they will do little to heal our wounded inter-American relations. The steps already taken by the Department of State, many of them complete reversals of former policy, will avail us little if they are done reluctantly and only under Latin American pressure.

We must, if we are to recapture the warm bonds of friendship which characterized the best days of the Good Neighbor policy, breathe into inter-American cooperation that intangible spirit which then characterized our relations --- a deep-rooted conviction that the Western Hemisphere can, indeed it must, be a New World where freedom and opportunity flourish.

Mr. Rents
Mr. Phil Patton

000529

April 3, 1959
Sen Smathers - (Holland)
Bully Mathews (8th DIST)
Doc Collins

A NEW ERA FOR LATIN AMERICA

U. of Florida -
Gainesville

Herlong
Bennett

Tonight I might have selected as my topic the Berlin
crisis, the troubled Middle East or the vexing problem of
attempting to control the nuclear arms race. But I have
chosen instead to talk about Latin America and United States
policy toward her Latin American neighbors. (Since the end
of World War II we have been preoccupied with a series of
crises on the periphery of the Communist empire--Greece,
Berlin, Korea, Indochina, Suez, ^{Hungary} Quemoy, ^{again} Lebanon and Berlin.
In the meantime, the seemingly less precarious situation in
Latin America went almost unnoticed.

Preoccupation
with
Berlin
Korea
Suez
Lebanon

It took the demonstrations against Vice President
Nixon last spring to explode any remaining illusions about
the state of our Latin American relations. The plain truth
is that today inter-American relations are in a more critical
stage than ~~they have been~~ at any time in the past three decades.

Permit me,
~~At this point, I would like to~~ pause to pay tribute to

the University of Florida, one of the few United States
universities which has a well-rounded Latin American studies

program. Recently, the Hispanic Foundation of the Library
of Congress surveyed universities across the country to find

out which ones offered Latin American studies. I am told
that only eight universities fall into Category I, that is,

ones which offer a well-staffed, well-rounded course of study
about Latin America. The University of Florida is one of

the these eight. Florida's awareness of the importance of inter-

American understanding also has been reflected in the

thoughtful and persistent efforts of Senator Smathers to

bring attention to the realities of our foreign policy in

Latin America.

*Time after time he has urged our
Government to pay more attention to
our neighbors to the South.*

We are now on the threshold of the ~~50th~~ ^{69th} Anniversary of

the Organization of American States. It has long been customary

*U of Fla
Latin Amer
Studies*

*Geo.
Smathers*

*U of Fla
Grad!*

69th

000531

at this time of the year to extol pan-American peace,
solidarity and cooperation. Such oratory now would be a
gratuitous gesture. It is dangerous to perpetuate
comfortable fictions about a bond that has been broken.

The first prerequisite of a responsible and effective policy
toward Latin America is a willingness to face the facts,
however unpleasant they may be.

Our Stake in Latin America

There is no disagreement on the importance of cordial,
cooperative relations with our 20 sister Republics. Everyone
agrees, that strategically, ICBM's notwithstanding, Latin
America remains one of the key foundations of our defense
shield. Politically, close and harmonious relations with the
Latin American people, who now number over 180 million, add to
the free world's strength in the larger issues of the cold war.

Economically, the American republics constitute a vital

ingredient in our own well-being. The area is second only
 to Europe as a purchaser of our exports. Twenty-five percent
 of all our exports go there. In 1957 this meant the sale of
 \$560 million ⁱⁿ ~~worth~~ of automobiles and parts, of \$445 million
~~worth~~ ⁱⁿ of chemicals, \$135 million of medicines, \$121 million of
edible animal products, and so on across the board of U. S.
 products. Latin American purchases add up ^{to thousands of} ~~to a lot of~~ jobs for ~~the~~
~~a lot of~~ people ~~of~~ the United States. At the same time, imports
 from south of the Rio Grande consist of many strategic minerals
~~as well as~~ ^{and} materials essential to our peacetime industries.

U. S. private investments in the area now total over \$9 billion,

more than in any other region of the world.

Area for us,

This is an important

Why, then, have relations deteriorated?

Crisis Policy

Part of the responsibility lies in our preoccupation with

Europe, the Middle East ^{Africa} and Asia. While attention to these vital

areas is understandable, the resulting neglect of Latin America cannot be justified. The personal diplomacy of the

Administration has also tended in the same direction. ^{With}

all "decision-making power" concentrated in Secretary ^{the} ~~of State~~ ^{of State}

^{- what appeared to be -} the less precarious situation in Latin America ^{was} ~~got~~ shoved

into the background until it too became a crisis. Up until

the recent disturbances, I am told, foreign service officers

working in Latin America were somehow considered to be

occupying second-class positions.

Taking Latin America for Granted

← The Good Neighbor policy itself may be partly to blame

for the assumption that nothing much could go wrong within

our Hemisphere. Latin American representatives tried to make

their grievances heard through proper channels and at stated

conferences. Often their warnings and protests were bitter.

← But the Good Neighbor policy had been so successful in

We talked of the "Good Neighbor Policy" - but failed to have a policy or act like a good neighbor

000534

cementing U. S. - Latin American relations that long after
its ~~cesses~~ ^{eclipse} "an aura of good-will" lingered on, hiding the grim
realities ~~underneath~~. The hangover from the Good Neighbor
policy seems to have created an impression in the United
States that the Latin American republics were solidly with us
no matter what we did or did not do.

Latin American Revolutions

↳ The attitude of "taking Latin America for granted" is only
part of the growing estrangement between the United States and
Latin America. ~~I think that~~ Our gravest error has been a
misreading of the revolution gripping the region. Some people
are prone to dismiss Latin American revolts as mere changes in
the palace guard, while others see Communist influence in every
upheaval. These stereotypes can be our undoing.

↳ Today, the nations to the south are in the midst of an
epic social revolution. We and the Communists have vied with

each other in telling people the world over that they no

longer have to live out their lives in hopeless misery. The

peoples of Latin America took us at our word!

They are fed up with misery, poverty, & illiteracy - The people are on the march. They want the blessing of life, liberty, & property.

↳ They want an end to semi-feudal conditions in which

5 percent of the populations owns 80-90 percent of the land;

in which a handful of nationals and foreigners live in luxury

while the majority ^{of the people} live in squalor; in which disease strikes

down their children and hunger and ignorance perpetuate their

slavery; in which the wealthy minority joins with the army to

keep things just as they are.

↳ Many thousands of Latin Americans have risked exile,

imprisonment, torture and death to achieve responsible

governments, responsive to the needs of their people. These

courageous people usually come from the groups that produce

political leadership--students, union leaders, professional

and business men. The rash of revolutions that toppled

dictatorships

tyrannies in Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela and Cuba attests
to their determination to achieve freedom and bread.

The Latin American Image of the U.S.

*Failure to understand
Rural of
Autism!*
{
 In the midst of that upheaval, which we above all other
peoples should be able to understand and to sympathize with,
the United States has somehow managed to appear callous and
indifferent. While we have eagerly sought Latin American
support to stop the spread of Communist tyranny, we have
demonstrated a peculiar nonchalance toward despotisms of the
home-grown variety.

*we ~~are~~
lead
Against
Communism
not for
the people*

{
 In 1954 Secretary Dulles took time to fly to the Ninth
Inter-American Conference in Caracas to press for an inter-
American declaration against Communist intervention in the
Western Hemisphere. That very same year we bestowed the
Legion of Merit on Pérez Jiménez (pronounced Hema-nes) then
the hated dictator of Venezuela. The incredible citation
reads in part:

000537

...to H. E. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, ⁰⁰⁰⁵³⁷ President of the Republic of Venezuela for the exceptional nature of his outstanding accomplishments. His Excellency, as President of the Republic of Venezuela and previously, has demonstrated a spirit of friendship and cooperation with the United States. The sound economic, financial and foreign investment policies advocated and pursued by his administration have contributed greatly to the economic well-being of his country, and to the rapid development of its tremendous resources. These policies, judiciously combined with a far reaching public works program, have remarkably improved its education, sanitation, transportation, housing, and other important basic facilities. >

< Shortly after our tribute to ~~the~~ Pérez Jiménez, the Archbishop of Caracas dared to denounce the tyrant in a pastoral letter, and thousands of anguished Venezuelans hazarded their lives to get rid of the bloody oppressor upon whom we had lavished praise.

000538

On January 10, 1958^{just} ~~---~~thirteen days before unarmed men,

women and children rose heroically against the brutal Venezuelan dictatorship---the man who had been our Ambassador to Venezuela from 1951 to 1956 wrote from his new post in Turkey to the dictator's savage secret-police chief congratulating him for putting down the first abortive revolt. The letter, on Foreign Service stationery, came to light after the democratic revolution.

(See attached memo on this case.)

These incidents are, unfortunately, not isolated. Our Defense Department, in the middle of the Cuban revolt, decorated the officer who had commanded air raids against the Cuban people. We kept up a stream of armaments to Batista long after it had become apparent that he was using them against his own people, contrary to the terms of our defense agreement.

The Communists, of course, are getting a lot of mileage out of such errors. But we must face up the fact that our own actions,

000539

not Communist propaganda, have created throughout Latin America an image of the United States as a nation selfishly engrossed in defending its own freedoms, but heedless of the aspirations of others.

The Economic Situation Is Serious

United States official attitudes with regard to Latin America's economic problems have deepened the estrangement between us.

Our economic attitudes toward Latin America have created the image of the United States as arrogant, paternal, ^{and} ~~selfishly~~ interested primarily in promoting the interests of U. S. investors, and unconcerned for the well-being of ordinary human beings. It is painful to think that the generous impulse of the United States, which first created the idea of technical assistance in Latin America in 1942, now seems so perverted.

As you know, all the American republics, to a greater or less degree, fall into the category of underdeveloped countries.

000540

All are dependent on the export of one, or at best a few,
commodities to earn the foreign exchange to buy vital necessities
and to finance economic development.

Any down-swing in the world price or demand for their few
exports plays havoc with their income. This uncertainty makes
development planning exceedingly difficult.

With an average annual per capita income of less than \$300,
some areas in Latin America are hard pressed to maintain even this
low living standard in the face of a rapidly growing population.

Our neighbors have not been sitting on their hands waiting
for assistance. Ninety percent of the capital invested in the
area is Latin America's own. The reserves accumulated from the
sale of raw materials during World War II, made possible a spurt
of development in the region. From 1945 to 1953 the average per
capita income rose at the rate of 3.3 percent a year, and Mexico,
for example, achieved a rate twice as great. After 1952, with
reserves depleted and the price and demand for Latin America's

principal products on the decline, the accelerated rate of
 development ground to a halt. *But we did tell her nothing!*

Responsible leaders in Latin America are worried. On the
 one hand they have populations awakened from centuries of apathy
 who are demanding a better deal in life. On the other hand, the
ubiquitous Communists are there, dangling tempting promises
 before the eyes of the underprivileged. Democratic leaders in
 Latin America know that they must produce some tangible results,
 that they must provide some hope for a better future, if
democratic government is to endure.

The U. S. Response Has Been Ambiguous

On the question of Latin America's economic development the
 United States has presented an ambiguous picture. Latin Americans
 understood and welcomed Secretary Marshall's stirring declaration
 at Harvard University 12 years ago: "Our policy is directed not
against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty,

000542

desperation, and chaos." Hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos well described Latin American conditions. And, we encouraged the Latin Americans to look almost exclusively to us for assistance.

We then proceeded to provide billions in aid to Europe and Asia. To Latin American ~~pleas~~ ^{requests} for assistance, we replied with advice that they should look to private investments and private enterprise as the principal ^{channel} ~~channel~~ for their funds. In

1956 Senator Smathers proposed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to provide a special fund for loans for Latin America for health, education and sanitation projects. This proposal met with resistance from the State Department on the grounds that private capital was doing a good enough job. I am happy to say that Congress passed the amendment in spite of State Department resistance. *I supported this amendment!*

The frequent reiteration that private capital ^{couldn't} would meet Latin American requirements insulted and irritated our neighbors.

000543

✓ We Americans like our system of free enterprise. It has worked for us, although not in the simon-pure form that some people like to pretend. Latin Americans, on the other hand, have some sour memories of the 'robber-baron type investments', both domestic and foreign, which we ourselves have long since ceased to tolerate.

✓ In addition to historical differences, ^{we} ~~the~~ ~~advice~~ ignored the plain fact that private enterprise goes in to make a profit, and will hardly be attracted when the basic sinews of a national ^{such as roads, ~~electric~~ power and} economy--sanitation facilities ~~and roads~~--are lacking.

Moreover, over-dependence in private investment results in a piece-meal approach to economic development, as private funds haphazardly move into a mine here and a factory there. Latin Americans point out that in their urgent circumstances they cannot wait for the trickle-down theory to maybe work.

The U. S. Change of Heart

✓ It took the violent outbursts against Vice President Nixon to make us conscious of the gravity of the Latin-American situation.

Both Private
Public
Capital
are needed!

✓

1958
On March 10, last the Department of State announced a change of heart, as follows:

Not only must account be taken of the private capital and technical know-how required to create employment ~~_____~~ for those who today are under-employed or unemployed but also of the need to create new jobs for an even larger number of workers. In addition to the expansion of industry and agriculture which this implies, very large additional amounts of public funds will be required for facilities which only governments can provide; for example, highways, sanitation facilities, hospitals and schools.

The recognition that Latin American growing pains differ from ours, and our consequent abandonment of inflexible doctrinaire principles, should open the way for better inter-American understanding.

Along the new guidelines, positive steps are in progress.

The Administration has finally announced that it will support
 an Inter-American Development Bank, something the Latin
 Americans have been urging for years and we have been resisting
 for years. We have agreed to consult with the Republics before
 making decisions which could affect their principal exports.

Weak! } We have indicated a willingness to take a fresh look at efforts
 to deal with instability and fluctuation in the commodity market.

↳ We have lent our support to the idea of regional markets within
 Latin America. Common Market!

↳ In short, we have recognized the magnitude of Latin America's
 problem and have agreed to cooperate with our neighbors in finding
 solutions.

A Nine-Point Program For Improving
Latin American Relations

Latin America, as population zooms, as industrial development
 spreads, and hope and impatience mingle, is going to be a cauldron

of competing political ideologies. We should welcome this development, not fear it.

{ In no region of the world have we deeper historical traditions to build upon. It was with the Latin American republics that we first developed the idea of regional cooperation. The bold idea of ⁴mutual ⁴cooperation to attack disease, illiteracy and poverty was born within the inter-American family. These are the people who wept unashamedly when Franklin Delano Roosevelt died. *They want to be "good neighbors"*

{ Today in Latin America there are many leaders who understand and admire our democratic system and want to develop something comparable in their own countries. I know of an American who, ~~wikxxx~~ while attending the inauguration last month of the democratically-elected President of Venezuela, was asked on three separate occasions by newly elected Venezuelan congressmen how they could get hold of a copy of the Jefferson Manual of Rules for the House of Representatives.

Our traditions of individual freedom and concern for ordinary human beings were once the cornerstone of our successful Latin American policy. Now, to Latin Americans, these much admired beliefs seem to stop at the border. While we caution our neighbors about Communist activities and Communist infiltration, we appear peculiarly cold toward the Latin American yearning to achieve genuine civil liberties.

The recent steps taken ~~by the Administration~~ to repair our tottering Latin American policy should be applauded. They are steps in the right direction, but they will not be enough if the escalator of history is going faster in the opposite direction. We must replace our massive indifference to Latin American aspirations with massive cooperation.

The Latin American situation cries out for imaginative, long-range planning, rather than the hurried, patch-up measures after an explosion has occurred.

A coordinated program on the order of the Marshall Plan
 would give the Latin Americans new hope of attaining bread
and freedom. The possibilities of such an effort should be
 explored carefully, not primarily as an anti-Communist
 stratagem, but because it is good for Latin America and for
the United States. We should not be ashamed of our humanitarian
 tradition. Nor should we be embarrassed if humanitarian and
 security objectives sometimes coincide in our national policy.

desired and encouraged.

In conclusion, I should like to propose ²⁹ ~~an eight-point~~

program for improving United States-Latin American relations.

I believe this program is realistic and workable and in
 harmony with the best interests of our country and of our
 20 sister republics.

First: The United States should increase the volume of
 its economic aid in support of Latin American efforts to
 develop diversified and viable economies so they will not be

dependent, as they now are, on a few commodities. Requests for loans from the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank should be dealt with expeditiously and sympathetically.

We should cooperate fully with the new Inter-American Development Institution. The proposed corps of technical experts within the Institute could help the smaller, inexperienced countries draw up coordinated development plans.

Second: The United States should accelerate and strengthen its program of technical assistance in agriculture, health, education, vocational training, and public administration. The time has come to recapture the original fervor of President Truman's "bold new program" which was widely hailed in Latin America when it was first announced a decade ago.

Third: The United States should ~~vigorously~~ support vigorously the current moves within Latin America to establish regional markets. The elimination of inter-American trade barriers would broaden markets for Latin American products and

make low-cost manufacturing feasible, ^{are} both indispensable prerequisites to diversification and economic growth.

Fourth: The United States should review its trade and tariff policies as they affect imports from Latin America.

Common market

It is self defeating for us to provide economic assistance with one hand and take it away with the other by short-sighted trade restrictions. If policies designed to strengthen our trade with Latin America cause hardship to any domestic industry, the Government has a responsibility to aid those so affected. (I recently co-sponsored an amendment in the Senate to the Area Redevelopment Act (S. 722) to make such aid possible, but unfortunately it did not pass the committee stage.)

Fifth: The United States should give wholehearted support to the health programs under the direction of the Pan American Sanitary Organization. Widespread disease which stalks Latin America is a tremendous economic drain as well as a human tragedy. Investment in health is perhaps the cheapest, most effective

Health
Food

000551

investment we can make in the future of the Western Hemisphere.

Sixth: The United States should develop a bold and imaginative program of student and cultural exchange. *expand!*

We need to reexamine our methods of screening Latin American scholarship recipients. Too frequently the test has been the friendliness of the recipient toward the United States. Young Latin Americans of so-called leftist tendencies have been excluded, when they are often the very ones who would benefit most from the program.

Seventh: The United States press, radio and TV ^{networks} ~~and radio~~ ~~and TV~~ ~~and radio~~ ~~and TV~~ should give wider and better balanced news coverage of Latin American affairs. This, of course, is something our government can do little about. But it is essential that the American people have a continuous report and interpretation of Latin American developments if they are to understand the magnitude of the problems in that region and what we are being asked to support. When news of revolutions and executions

*Attack
relativism!
Educa!*

000552

dominate our newspapers, it is hard for the American taxpayer to form an understanding of the underlying realities in the 20 American republics, and of our interest in them.

Eighth: The United States should thoroughly reappraise its military assistance program in Latin America. What we have given one nation for hemispheric defense has often provoked demands by another for an equal amount of aid. Great care should be taken not to encourage this type of arms race, which Latin American governments can ill-afford. We should give greater attention to the coordination of military policy and strategy in the Hemisphere, This might well result in a decrease in the requirements of national military establishments.

Further, our military assistance to certain dictatorial governments has raised the question of whose freedom those governments are defending. The use by Bastista of U.S. supplied armaments against his own people, contrary to stipulations of our

000553

defense treaty, has greatly damaged U. S. prestige throughout Latin America. It makes little sense to speak of Hemisphere defense while arming a tyrant who uses weapons to intimidate his own people.

Ninth: The United States should lend its support to the idea of regional arms control. Last year Costa Rica submitted such a plan to the Organization of American States and received nominal support from the U. S. delegation. Our government should now press for the consideration of the Costa Rican plan, or some similar project, at the Eleventh Inter-American Conference to be held at Quito next year.

The quality of our over-all policy toward Latin America will be determined not only what we do, but by how we do it.

Unless we pursue our policies with a genuine interest in the welfare of our fellow human beings, they will do little to heal our wounded inter-American relations. The steps already taken by

000554

the Department of State, many of them complete reversals of former policy, will avail us little if they are done reluctantly and only under Latin American pressure.

We must, if we are to recapture the warm bonds of friendship which characterized the best days of the Good Neighbor policy, breathe into inter-American cooperation that intangible spirit which then characterized our relations---a deep-rooted conviction that the Western Hemisphere can, indeed it must, be a New World where freedom and opportunity ~~are honored~~ flourish

* * * * *



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org