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programs under the State plan not affected by such fund.

Local Agency Applications

Section 505. If the Commissioner determines, after due process of law, that the plan as submitted by the State is unacceptable, the Commissioner shall notify the State party that the plan is unacceptable and is not acceptable to the State. This notification shall be in writing and shall include a statement of the reasons for the rejection of the plan. The State may appeal the decision of the Commissioner to the Federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or any other court of competent jurisdiction, within 30 days of receipt of the notification. The court shall have jurisdiction to review the decision of the Commissioner and shall render a decision within 60 days of the receipt of the appeal.

DEFINITIONS

Section 506. For purposes of this title—

1. The term "public school" means a public school that provides elementary and secondary education, as determined under State law, but does not include a school that provides a program of any kind of education.

2. The term "regarded public school" means a public school to which the list of schools, as determined under State law, is applicable, and is not a member of a local educational agency, for which the Commissioner shall make a determination under section 506(b)(1).

3. The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency responsible for the State supervision of public schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

4. The term "local educational agency" means an agency that provides education for the State, or includes any such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

Federal Administration

Section 507. (a) The Commissioner shall collect and disseminate such information as is necessary to the progress of desegregation in the public schools in the several States as may be useful to the State and other public officials, agencies, and organizations in effecting desegregation in such schools.

(b) The Commissioner shall, upon request, provide information and technical assistance to State or local officials, which will develop and implement policies for effecting desegregation in public schools, and, upon request of such officials, shall establish or participate in conferences dealing with the educational aspects of problems arising in connection with efforts to comply with applicable court judgments, agreements, decisions, or decrees.

(c) The Commissioner may delegate to any employee of the Office, any power or duty under this title, except the promulgation of regulations.

(d) No appropriations may be made pursuant to section 502 for any fiscal year ending after December 31, 1960. Prior to the expiration of the December 31, 1961, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall submit to the Congress a full report of the administration of this title, together with his recommendations as to whether it should be extended and as to any modification of its provisions he deems appropriate.

TITLE IV

Civil Rights Commission

Section 601. Section 104(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by adding the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(4) to provide assistance to communities, industries, and educational agencies in the implementation of Constitutional rights in education, housing, employment, transportation, and the administration of public education in a manner consistent with the purposes of this Act."
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Senator George D. Aiken, on a study mission of the countries of Venezuela, Brazil, and Paraguay, was incorporated in the Record at the conclusion of the previous incorporations.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, ordered.

(See exhibit 8.)

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, in my message President Eisenhower indicated that he seeks a further authorization for Latin American aid during this Session. Press reports had previously indicated that he might ask $500 million. This decision does not prohibit any alteration in the advanced text of my remarks on Latin America which I made available to the press and the Senate Department last Friday. On the contrary, now that it is clear that a specific authorization is to be sought, I am compelled to introduce a resolution as an alternative to the President’s proposal. Originally, I had intended to consult with administration spokesmen on the text of this resolution prior to doing so. The President’s reference to a specific figure suggests to me the desirability of introducing it at the conclusion of my remarks today. In that fashion, the Senate shall have before it an alternative when it considers this matter.

In relation to the President’s statement that his proposed Latin-American program should “include further assistance for the rehabilitation of devastated Chile,” I want to say I am in wholehearted accord with his request, but I am sure that he did not propose rehabilitation assistance for Chile with the need for an inter-American development program. He can seek the necessary assistance for Chile through an enlargement of his contingency fund under the Mutual Security Act appropriations which will be considered in the Senate shortly—very possibly later this week.

Administration’s new aid program for Latin America

It has been reported in the press that the Administration intends to ask Congress to provide a $600 million in special aid for Latin America. There is no doubt of the need for some new action with respect to that area. Goodwill mission after goodwill mission to Latin America during the past decade has come back talking of little else. Ideas along these lines have been expressed in Congress and by leading statesmen throughout the hemisphere.

The question is not one of need. The question is whether the administration’s program, as reported, meets the need. And further, the question is whether it is appropriate at this moment to bring forth a new plan of aid to Latin America.

If we may judge from the press reports—and more recently the President’s message—Congress is going to be asked to approve some kind of blanket authority for the administration to make available $600 million for Latin America. The reports do not indicate that a new approach to aid is to be anticipated. The reports suggest merely more of the same. And that is which we have been doing all over the world for the past decade under the mutual security program.

Is this the sort of action that is needed? Will it bring about an end to the steady erosion in hemispheric relations? Quite the contrary, Mr. President, I believe. It is a gesture in the old pattern, particularly at this time, may cause further damage to those relations.

Integrated economic action needed

What is needed, what has long been needed in inter-American relations is an integrated effort to develop this hemisphere’s great resources for the benefit of all its peoples. In connection with that we require, first, a reasonable meeting of minds in the Americas as to what needs to be done and how it can be done. Conversely, a specific understanding with the other American nations which will make clear how much is to be spent over how many years, in what very specific, measurable ways.

We need a plan which involves more than U.S. grants. We need a plan which is financed by all the participating nations. It is not a plan in rough proportion to their capabilities and, I add, if some nations cannot contribute cash to the pool, they can certainly contribute skills and commodities, and personnel. We need a plan, most of all, which involves a large measure of initiative on the part of individual governments in mobilizing the enthusiasm, cooperation, and sacrifice of their own people. The approach should include, if we would deal with the need in its full dimensions, not merely financial and technical aid on inter-American commodity and trade problems. In this connection, I should like to suggest that the approach should not omit consideration of the possibilities of a hemispheric common market. As the Senate knows, Central American nations have been moving toward a regional trade group. So, too, have some of the largest of the South American states and Mexico. Before the hemisphere is split further into regions within which cooperation is no longer a consideration which brings all the American nations together for marketing and other economic purposes.

Mr. Church. Mr. President, with the Senator’s yield...

Mr. Mansfield. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. Church. I commend the distinguished Senator from Montana for the scope of the proposal he makes. I wonder if it would be accurate to say that what the Senator is proposing today is an economic plan. As we have herebefore referred to as our good neighbor policy into what might be called a good neighborhood policy for all the Americas, embracing not just to the situation, but extending beyond unilateral extension of aid and assistance of various kinds emanating from Washington, D.C., New York—or the United States—and instead would replace it with an integrated community approach comprising all the Americas on a basis of equality and a balance of mutual participation, sacrifice, and interest.

Mr. Church. I thank the Senator. I am in full accord with the Senator that this program of integration is called for by the present crisis in the Americas. I commend the Senator for making this proposal in so timely a way, on the opening day of this session.

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, I wish to extend my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Idaho for his kind remarks.

I could be misinformed. Mr. President: it may be that this is the kind of program which the administration expects to present to the Congress in the near future. I hope that such is the case. If it is, I am confident that the Senate will be disposed to give it the most careful consideration.

Timing of new aid program

I should like to compare, however, to question the timing of a new aid program, however impressive it may be, is presented for action during the remaining days of the 86th Congress. It is no secret, after all, that we are engaged in a serious and a bitter dispute with Cuba at this time. It is no secret that this dispute is to be aired with the other American Republics in the Organization of the American States, which is to meet within a matter of days in Costa Rica.

I am sure—I am positive—that the administration had no desire to tie together the two matters—that is, a new aid program for Latin America and this dispute. But it amazes me that the administration would permit this coincidence to occur.

We must ask ourselves, in all honesty, how does this coincidence look to the people of the hemisphere? I am afraid, Mr. President, it looks very bad. It looks like a callous attempt to purchase favor in Latin America at a time when we are engaged in a dispute. If we are honest with ourselves, we will recognize that the announcement coming at this time produces a serious impression. It suggests that dollars are being dangled before Latin America in the same manner that the Russians of late have been waving rubles before Cuba. Is that impression in keeping with the dignity of this Nation?

The need for action on hemispheric development stands on its own. So, too, does the need for a settlement of the dispute with Cuba. We must act on both, but we must act in a fashion which makes it clear that we do not link them—two matters, it is the same with the other American Republics?

The need for action on hemispheric development stands on its own. So, too, does the need for a settlement of the dispute with Cuba. We must act on both, but we must act in a fashion which makes it clear that we do not link them—two matters, it is the same with the other American Republics?

Mr. Church. Mr. President, with the Senator’s yield once more...

Mr. Mansfield. I yield.

Mr. Church. I ask the Senator from Montana if he has seen the response to my proposal from the American Committees, to the effect that the President’s new pro-
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posal is being labeled in some Latin American countries as the Castro plan? Are we the days?"

Mr. CHURCH. There is no deadlock.

Mr. MANFIELD. Yes. I would say that what the Senator from Idaho has said is one of the rumors now going around, a rumor tied especially to the fact that after the Congress passed a law giving the President discretionary authority in the application of the Sugar Act the administration announced a $800 million aid program to Latin America.

I think we ought to emphasize, as I have tried to do in the course of these remarks, that there was absolutely no connection between the action taken by the Congress vis-a-vis the Sugar Act, in giving discretionary authority to the President, and the later aid program which was announced. While the aid program was indecisive as to what it entails, we, know, of course, that long before it came to pass, which administration was considering ways and means by which assistance could be rendered to Latin America, based in large part on recommendations by men as Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother; Secretary Roy R. Robottom, Jr., the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs; Secretary Thomas C. Mann, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; and others. Most important, plans were based on what we called the freezing of the foreign and an impressive plan advanced by President Juscelino Kubitschek, almost 2 years ago, and known since its inception as Operation Pan America.

Unfortunately, what the administration has proposed up to this time does not have the vision contemplated by Operation Pan America. In my opinion, it is only a first step—and a halting one—in the type of effort which must be put into operation in accord with the wishes, the knowledge, the desire of the techniques, and the know-how of all the Latin American nations along with us, so that from this effort can come some sort of coordinated development which, in one way or another, all the nations would make their just and fair contribution.

SUITABLE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

To keep these questions separate and distinct, I would strongly urge the administration not to try to ram through an aid program for Latin America of a specified amount during the remaining days of this Congress. If the administration feels it will be useful, I can see no objection to a resolution which would put this Congress on record—in the manner of the Vandenberg resolution some years ago—as backing fully a common effort with other American states. I have mentioned the hemispheric economic ministers in Bogotá in September equipped with new spokesmen. Let them go prepared to listen with new attention to ideas such as those advanced by President Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil in his proposed Operation Pan America, to the idea of a Peacetime Peace Bond of Peru, and of other distinguished Latin American leaders. Let them hammer out, in concert, over the next few months, a program which will be needed to replace the patterned of more unilateral technical aid as usual, more unilateral loans as usual, more unilateral grants as usual, and let them put together a plan which will lift the sights of all the Americas to a new concept of hemispheric cooperation. Let them look toward new horizons.

If that is done, if American participation is equitable and just and, if it is adequately explained to the people of the United States, I would anticipate that the next Congress will be prepared to cooperate fully with the new administration in its realization.

In the interim more loans from existing sources in the fashion of two credits recently negotiated with Peru can be helpful. In July, $2,150,000 was made available to Peruvians Building & Loan Association for low-cost housing and $54.2 million for land development and farms. These should prove of great value to Peru which under the enlightened leadership of Prime Minister Pedro Betan is acting with great energy on its internal economic development program. This action owes its origin, in great part I believe, to the missions of the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. LYNCH) which visited Latin America and brought back the best report and the most useful observations on the situation there ever to come to my attention.

Let us then, use the possibilities of expanded lending out of existing resources and eschew new aid announcements, which are not new at all, until after the economic meeting in September can point the way to a really significant attack on the hemisphere's economic problems.

In that fashion, too, Mr. President, I believe we can avoid any confusion of the new aid undertaking with the United States-Cuban aid which should be faced on its own merits in the Organization of the American States.

The Cuban Dispute

As for that dispute, there are some matters of which we need to speak frankly and honestly at this time. The dispute cannot be swept away. Its implications will not disappear by beating the drums for a new aid program. On the contrary, unless this dispute is faced up to, it is not happy that we have solved and it may well nullify any effort for the economic advance of the hemisphere.

If we are to deal with this dispute in the only context in which solution now seems possible, that is, in the larger context of inter-Americanism, we will have to recognize that the majority of Latin Americans will invariably include a measure of sympathy for Cuba and its revolution, regardless of sentiments re­specting the form of government, regardless of the facts of the dispute. There are complex historical roots for these attitudes and they will not change over night. All voices will be raised in the Latin American countries, as was the case recently in Mexico, in emotional support of Cuba. But that should be no alarm nor condemnation in Mexico or the United States. One must question the wisdom of administration in calling the Mexican Congress last week to explain a speech of this kind in the Mexican Congress. After all, it is customary for Members of this body to explain their feelings, emotions, and thoughts on Cuba and on other matters in no certain terms. And I am sure we would not look kindly on the summoning of our Ambassadors by other governments to justify remarks whenever they are made. We can hardly censure in others what we extol as a virtue in ourselves.

I am confident that if we exercise restraint with respect to the emotional attitudes which the Cuban dispute has engendered, we can anticipate that the issues of the dispute will be considered by the OAS on their merits. They will be considered with objectivity and with full attention to the larger interests of the hemisphere.

By the same token, I do not believe that the administration in its approach to this dispute has given the loudest and most emotional voices here at home. I do not and cannot believe there is any widespread desire in this country to back the remaining fruits of the good-neighbor policy by a unilateral military intervention in Cuba. This administration is to be complimented for making it clear, as Senator Sterling has in a recent instance, that he had “never talked with the President about military intervention in Cuba,” nor had the Department “made any specific plans or preparations.” What is at stake is larger than Cuba and Castro and any hot feelings in our own midst however noble and righteous they may seem to those who are predisposed. What is at stake is hemispheric solidarity and that measure of peace and reasonable security and the highly fruitful program of commercial and cultural relations which this solidarity has yielded over the years.

If the national attitude of this country could be expressed on Cuba, I daresay that it would be less one of militant hostility than one of indignation that relations have deteriorated to their current unhappy state. Further, there would be indignation at the incomprehensible calamity which has been heaped upon us. Finally, there would be a firmness which I am sure is shared by other American states that the Soviet Union shall not fish in the troubled waters of the Caribbean or meddle in the family affairs of the Americas, or unnerve us by waving its missiles.

U.S. Position in the OAS on Cuban Dispute

It is a little late now to retrace events of the past, but the particular stones on which United States-Cuban relations have stumbled. Mistakes have been made and they have been made on both sides. We have tried on a bilateral basis to set these relations straight and we have not succeeded. The dispute has come before the United Nations and that body has tried to deal with it through an organization of the American States. In short, Mike Mansfield Papers, Series 21, Box 40, Folder 96, Mansfield Library, University of Montana
the U.N. has placed great trust and responsibility on the Americas to meet an American problem. The nations of the hemisphere can perform a great service by isolating the basic issues at stake, and Cuba can fulfill its mission by soberly considering these issues, and by acting to meet them.

It seems to me that this Nation ought to bring to the impending consideration of the dispute more than mere justifications for its present firm attitude with regard to Cuba. That attitude must not be justified in view of the hostility of the government in Havana. What is needed is a clear position which illuminates what it is, specifically that we deplore and what it is that we seek in our relations with Cuba.

If we are to have that kind of position we must go beyond the empty words. Why this attitude? Because the revolution of the Cuban people was not only unavoidable but to be welcomed, given the oppression to which they had been subjected by the previous regime.

Indeed, at the United Nations, Ambassador Lodge has stated the position of the United States and the only official position on this point. He has said clearly that we do not favor annulling the understanding and sympathy of the United States for the aims of the Cuban revolution.

We must, to examine further, that the purpose of the Cuban revolution was change and that our own citizens and other outsiders with significant interests in Cuba can help bring about that change. Mr. Lodge has set forth the official views of the administration on this point. At the U.N. he quoted the President directly as recognizing the rights of the Cuban Government "to undertake those social, economic, and political reforms which with due regard for their obligations under international law, that change." We must recognize finally that, except as the actions of the Castro government grossly outrage the conscience of the American Republics or place American security, the nature of the changes in Cuba is a matter solely of concern to the Cuban people. That is the crux of national independence which the Cubans hold as dearly as we do.

It seems to me, however, that in respecting Cuba's national rights we also have a right to expect from a people for whom we have had only the friendliest sentiments a willingness to minimize the adverse repercussions of change on our citizens and to provide equitable treatment for them and their interests. We do have a right to object most vehemently to the subjection of the good name of this country to indefensible charges and slurs by the Cuban Government and its spokesmen; charges and slurs which are as unnecessary as they are inaccurate.

Finally, we do have a right — an American nation has a right — to bring to the attention of the OAS, threats to the tranquility and security of this hemisphere and to seek common action to meet these threats.

If these premises, Mr. President, constitute a basis for good neighborly relations, as I believe they do, then it follows that our position in the dispute with Cuba before the OAS should be built around the following points:

First, we should recognize the right of the Cuban people to make such internal changes as are necessary to transform that country only on a just, nondiscriminatory treatment for our nationals and compensation for damage to their legitimate interests on terms which are consistent with Cuba's present economic and financial capacities.

Second, we should recognize Cuba's right, as a sovereign nation, to trade or otherwise deal with any nation in the world, and, equally, our right to do the same, as regards sugar or any other commodity. Indeed, we should make clear that we are prepared at all times to consider changes in our present economic policies, on a mutual basis, which may be of benefit to the Cuban people and to ourselves.

As is now, the OAS could not do more than condemn such a government. It is the kind of condemnation that we wish to have the power to act against such a government.

Third, we should reiterate the doctrine of non-interference in the internal affairs of Cuba or any other American nation, insofar as any unilateral action on our part is concerned and scrupulously adhere to it so that all agencies and private citizens adhere to it. But if the OAS by due process concludes that the actions of any particular government threaten the tranquillity and security of all the Americas, we should follow whatever course of hemispheric action the OAS may prescribe by due process. It is for the administration alone which, alone, is in possession of all the facts and has the constitutional responsibility to decide when, if at all, to ask the OAS to condemn and to act against any government on these counts and to make the case in support of it.

Fourth, if the need arises, we should seek common hemispheric action of whatever kind and degree may be necessary to prevent the establishment of military bases by nations not of this hemisphere in Cuba.

Fifth, we should welcome conciliatory efforts by the President of the Council of the OAS, Ambassador Vicente Sanchez Gaviria, who, incidentally, with his colleague, Ambassador Antonio Carillo Fiores, forms one of the finest diplomatic teams in the capital, in isolating and in finding solutions to the specific difficulties between Cuba and this Nation.

Whatever the outcome of the dispute with Cuba, I think we had better face the fact that there will be no victory for the side that réalized the success. The fact is that the dispute has already caused serious damage to Cuba, to the United States and to the Western Hemisphere. It is to be hoped, therefore, that we will begin to consider the OAS not with a desire to win Pyrrhic debates on TV, but, rather, with a clear determination to seek a solution to the problem and with clear ideas as to what constitutes an acceptable solution to the problem. It is to be hoped further, that Cuba will do the same. And it is to be hoped, finally, that the other American states will exert every effort to bring about a solution that is just and equitable, to the end that this danger to the hemisphere may be removed.

STATE OF INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS AND POLICY

Looking beyond the Cuban dispute, Mr. President, I believe that we will do well to recognize that our inter-American relations are not good and they are not getting any better. Let this observation outrage those whose political antennas in these political times may be especially sensitive, for I hasten to add that it is made without political motive. In retrospect and, in all honesty, it is clear that the solutions in the Americas which have appeared even before this administration took office.

Be that as it may, it does not serve national interests to offer empty assurances now that all is right with the inter-American world or to imply, as this recent announcement of a new aid program suggests, that that is the answer, that that cannot be cured by a fresh injection of aid dollars.

The difficulties go deep. Insofar as they go on our part I believe they stem from a failure to recognize and appreciate the enormous accumulation of forces for change in Latin America since World War II, we must be prepared to reshape our attitudes and our policies accordingly in the past dozen years. It is out of this accumulation that the revolution in Cuba was spawned and it is possible that that is the cause of the isolated phenomenon. The same upheaval may well reappear in reasonable fashion in large segments of the region to which such upheaval has taken in time by the governments directly involved and by the hemisphere as a whole, to deal resolutely with the social and economic conditions which are the breeding grounds.

What are our responsiblities to ourselves and to the hemisphere in the light of these various changes? For anyone who knows the countries to the south and looks to the present and future rather than to the past, I believe it is apparent that a viable change as it is inevitable. I do not think acquiescence in unnecessary misery and vicious repression and exploitation find any echo in the finest traditions of this Nation. A determination, elsewhere, in the Americas to dispense with such acquiescence is to be welcomed by this Nation. It follows that our relations with the other American states must be allied with progressive change rather than against it. Further it follows that the institutions of inter-Americanism must be so expanded and strengthened that the goals of inter-Americanism will be more than mere satisfaction. It must be used to encourage this change by evolutionary means in order to avoid, if possible, the human tragedies which may accompany change by revolution.

I believe our policies in concept accept these premises. In a halting and inadequate fashion we have done so. It is now time to build on these premises. But what is needed, what has been lacking for years has been that dedicated and perceptive initiative in inter-American policy and
relations which would breathe new life into the premises and inject new energy into the institutions of inter-American action. As the most powerful and the oldest free Nation in this hemisphere, it is only right and proper that we, the Americas and ourselves as a part of them, should act as the Latin Americans, with new self-sufficiency and purpose toward one another. We must act with new policies, pursued by a more effective and dynamic administration of our relations. We know of no way to bring about these necessary changes except by an enlightenment of public understanding of the need and by a responsible leadership, which is able and willing to consider and to act on new insights.

NEW INSIGHTS

I should like to set forth, at this time, certain specific thoughts on how the present and future needs of inter-American relations may be met, insofar as they can be met by this Nation. I need hardly remind the Senate that these relations are two-sided and that regardless of what we do, it will not be enough to renounce the Latin American nations carry their share.

On the need for new insights:

First, That the present and the next administration seek the active and intense cooperation of the press, the picture industry, and other communications media in a concerted effort to bring up to date the 19th century comprehension of Latin America widely held in this country and the 19th century comprehension of this country still largely held in Latin America.

Second, the present and the next administration seek the active and intense cooperation of educational institutions in this country to expand rapidly the studies of Latin America and the language of its Republcs. Conversely, that wise and liberal use be made of the stagnating local currency accumulations abroad in consultation with Latin American banks to finance the expansion of the studies of the United States and the English language in Latin America.

Third, serious efforts be made to act on various proposals previously advanced looking to the establishment of a University of the Americas in Puerto Rico or some other suitable place, perhaps with faculties located in various American nations; and, again, that wise and liberal use be made of accumulating local currencies to this end.

Fourth, That inter-American exchange of problems in all the professions be expanded in numbers and in scope; and again, that wise and liberal use of accumulating local currencies be made to this end.

Fifth, That inter-American tourism be encouraged in every feasible way, particularly through the prompt completion and action on the development of the inter-American highway.

Sixth, That the President-elect no matter whom he may be make a get-acquainted visit to the other Latin American Republics prior to his inauguration in January. Further, assuming that an inter-American plan of development and economic cooperation is pursued, if the President-elect, after his inauguration, invite all the American Presidents to meet in Washington to initial it.

NEW POLICIES

On the need for new policies:

I have already in detail what I believe to be the key changes that are required. I reiterate them now:

First, Full acceptance in our policies of the inevitability and the desirability of change, change in the direction of an end to unnecessary misery and of repression wherever these conditions may exist in the Americas.

Second, The rapid one-sided haphazard aid in the old pattern in favor of a carefully conceived, shared-cost, specific, measurable plan of hemispheric action for development and economic cooperation.

Beyond these key changes, Mr. President, I believe we need a reappraisal of the policies by which this Government has sought to channel our private capital into Latin America. We have got to face the fact that Latin Americans do not necessarily always see the progress of this capital as an increase of mixed blessing, and that such capital is not infrequently one of the primary targets of revolutions in those nations. It seems to me that in the year ahead private capital will perform its greatest service on behalf of its own long-range interests and the total interests of this Nation by integrating its foreign investments and operations as rapidly as possible into the other American nations.

In short, U.S. private capital should nationalize itself. In the sense of serving itself in the life of the Nation where it acts.

If it does so, the constant threat of involuntary nationalization may decline. There are instrumentality developments this end, and some of the most far sighted U.S. companies are already putting them into practice in Latin America. They do so by the bread and local capital, by choosing their own officers and their families— for Latin America on the basis of their suitability to live as well as to work in other nations, by rapid transfer of skills, by promotion, extensive training programs of local inhabitants, and by maximum use of local employees on the basis of equality with its home employees in the management of enterprise. It seems to me that even as this Government seeks, as it now does, by its actions and policies which commit us all, to aid U.S. business in Latin America, it must also act to stimulate the development of progressive practices into U.S. business in Latin America since their absence affects us all.

Mr. President, I have already suggested that the broad and vast interests of this Nation in inter-American relations cannot be served by unilateral military intervention in Latin America or by an American nation. Yet I do not believe that the doctrine of nonintervention, as it now stands, is adequate to the present and the future needs of the Americas. There are acts which can be committed by a government which grossly outrage the conscience of the Americas. There are policies which can be pursued by one government in this hemisphere which gravely jeopardize the security of all the American nations. When these acts occur, when these policies are pursued, the doctrine of nonintervention is not adequate to the need. The American nations have already moved and should continue to move in the direction of inter-American political cooperation. Call it the Doctrine of Hemispheric Concern, if you will. What is implicit in it, however, is the need of the American nations to act in common against any member which grossly outrages the conscience of the hemisphere by its behavior or actions or which clearly endangers the security of the hemisphere by its policies. To take this step, Mr. President, to modify the doctrine of nonintervention is a most serious matter but these are most serious times. I, for one, am persuaded that the nations of this hemisphere are prepared to take it in their common interest and am persuaded that, with the proper safeguards in the OAS system, a Doctrine of Hemispheric Concern can be invoked neither lightly nor inequitably. NEW ADMINISTRATIVE METHODS

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to turn to the needs of administration within in our own Government, in terms of inter-American relations and in terms of the efficacy of our concepts with respect to these relations, regardless of our willingness to revamp our policies, we are not likely to do what needs to be done, given the present administrative structures for the conduct of these relations. Apart from a serious lack of outstanding citizens dedicated and skilled in inter-American affairs, there is a lack of the centralization of the Neady of our concepts with respect to these relations, regardless of our willingness to revamp our policies, we are not likely to do what needs to be done, given the present administrative structures for the conduct of these relations. Apart from a serious lack of outstanding citizens dedicated and skilled in inter-American affairs, there is a lack of the centralization of the Neady of our concepts with respect to these relations, regardless of our willingness to revamp our policies, we are not likely to do what needs to be done, given the present administrative structures for the conduct of these relations.
certain that policies originate and flow from the President through the Secretary of State and that these policies are carried out by all agencies concerned under direct and full official control. To that end, all bilateral aid activities, and all informational and exchange activities with respect to Latin America should be made subject to full and decisive control of the Secretary of State. Furthermore the U.S. representatives on the International Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the various United Nations agencies, and all other agencies with a greater or lesser degree of influence on the course of inter-American relations should be fully responsive to the effective guidance of the Secretary of State.

Second, to reinforce this line of authority, it seems to me most desirable that any new funds appropriated by the Congress for economic and related purposes in Latin America should be appropriated to and through the Department of State.

Third, it should be our policy and part of our essential initiative to make every effort to strengthen the OAS and its sub-committees by stimulating common American action through that organization and by encouraging personal policies which will equip that organization for new and heavier responsibilities.

Mr. President, it is true that any President should have a large measure of discretion in the administrative structure through which he seeks to conduct the foreign relations of the Nation. But Congress, which provides for this establishment and influences the nature of it by legislation, cannot remain indifferent when that structure gets out of hand, when it tends by its very nature to dissipate and waste the resources of the people by duplication, inadequate coordination, and a confusion of responsibility.

It is a truism that men are more important than machinery in effective foreign relations. It may be that the suggestions I have made, which look to the concentration of authority as well as responsibility in inter-American affairs in the Department of State, will not act to increase effectiveness. But if they do not, at least we shall know where to begin to look for the difficulty and where to make the adjustments. As it is now, the administrative structure defies an honest fixing of responsibility, no matter how the Secretary of State may be held responsible, and no matter how often—and often unjustly—he may be berated for the failures.

It is my hope that the next President will act promptly on this problem. I, for one, as chairman of the relevant Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, intend to bring this problem to the attention of the committee; and I would welcome an opportunity to cooperate with the administration on any necessary legislation to deal with it.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

I do not desire to detain the Senate much longer. It is my intention to take up other aspects of the international situation and our policies before the session closes. My purpose in these remarks today is to bring to the fore the question of inter-American relations as it is interwoven with the Cuban dispute and aid programs. These questions cannot be sidetracked by either silence or sloganeering until next January. They will be very much with us in the immediate days ahead. We need to face them now. We need to turn the light of discussion on them now, to the end that we may lay the basis for the kind of action which must come with the next administration, the kind of action appropriate to these times, the kind of action which will inspire the American Republics to proceed together to a rededication to the common security and progress of this hemisphere.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution calling for intensification of cooperation in Latin-American relations; and I ask that the resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 352) reaffirming U.S. policy in support of inter-American cooperation for the welfare and progress of the Western Hemisphere, submitted by Mr. Mansfield, was read, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States shares with the other American Republics a common interest in the freedom, tranquility, welfare and progress of the Western Hemisphere, and whereas the safeguarding of this interest requires an increase in inter-American cooperation and more effective use of the instrumentalities of hemispheric solidarity; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate reaffirm the policy of the United States in support of inter-American cooperation for the common benefit of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere and that the President be advised of the sense of the Senate that this Government by its constitutional processes should pursue, particularly, in its relations with the other American Republics:

(1) The development of agreements, setting forth specific plans of action designed to foster economic progress and improvements in the welfare and level of living of all the peoples of the Western Hemisphere on the basis of joint aid, mutual effort, and common sacrifice.

(2) The development of long-range agreements to facilitate the marketing and to insure an equitable price for the principal commodities entering into trade among the nations of the Western Hemisphere and, further, to encourage the gradual emergence of a common market among the American Republics.

(3) The development of uniform standards and practices with respect to the operation, rights, and responsibilities of private capital which flows across national boundaries within the Western Hemisphere.

(4) The consolidation of the public institutions and agencies of inter-American cooperation, as far as feasible, within the structure of the Organization of American States and the strengthening of the personnel, resources, and authority of the Organization in order that it may play a role of increasing importance in all aspects of hemispheric cooperation.

(5) The development of a more accurate and sympathetic understanding among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere through a greater interchange of persons, ideas, techniques, and educational, scientific, and cultural achievements.

(6) The safeguarding of the tranquility of the hemisphere by joint action by due process in the Organization of the American
He has presented to this body the general situation as regards the relationship of the United States and the other countries of the Western Hemisphere. He not only has presented the situation with great clarity, but he has also presented an approach to meeting the problems which we have before us.

I do not say that every detail of the proposal of the Senator from Montana is just what I would agree with, or that this body would agree with, or what the public would agree with; but, he is offering us an excellent approach to the problem which is before us.

I think it should be understood that to carry out the proposals of the Senator from Montana will take some time; but, I believe it is 22 nations, including Canada, working together, cannot overnight agree on common action. We certainly could not get them to agree on a common market without a great deal of debate, consideration, and delay; and the Senator from Montana has recognized this fact in his address by stating that it would take time.

I think we would all agree that we should make a prompt start in this direction if we are eventually to achieve our objectives.

I am very much interested, Mr. President, in comparing the address of the Senator from Montana with the message received from the President of the United States by the Senate today.

The President, it is true, did not go into any specific matters. He simply asked for an authorization of $600 million with which to deal with our Latin American problems. As I understand it, that authorization does not mean he wants the money appropriated right now, but he wants something to manifest the sincerity and the earnestness of the United States Government in approaching this problem.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that of the $600 million authorization which is requested, up to $100 million is desired to meet the emergency conditions which have created in Chile due to the long series of earthquakes with which that unfortunate country has been afflicted during recent weeks and months, and which many of us here on the floor have stated the United States ought to do something about.

I cannot help but think that the request of the President and the speech and recommendations of the Senator from Montana are directed to the same end objectives—raising the living standards of the Western Hemisphere, improving the economic conditions of the people of the Western Hemisphere, and making more secure the Democratic institutions of the Western Hemisphere.

I am delighted we received both the message of the President and the address of the Senator from Montana on the same day.

It seems to me the resolution which has been submitted by the Senator from Montana and the request made by the President for a $600 million for Latin American operations could well complement each other; and that if we grant the authorization, or such part of it as the Congress sees fit to grant, or adopt a resolution which would achieve the purpose of the Senator from Montana—I do not say it would be exactly the same wording—then when the meetings of the Latin American States are held in Bogota and other places during this fall we would be in a position to prove and to show conclusively to the countries of South America, Central America, and North America that we do mean business in this respect.

It is one of the most encouraging moves I have seen for a long time. I refer to the obvious realization—and I am sure our country realizes it, along with the Senator from Montana and the President—that while we may have problems all over the world, no problems are more important for solution than the problems of the Western Hemisphere itself.

So I hope that, after this splendid speech of the Senator, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will, without delay, call hearings on the resolution which has been submitted by the Senator from Montana, so we may get public opinion, the opinion of our officials in the executive branch, and others who desire to appear as witnesses, and get something constructive and get conclusive done before this special session of Congress permanently adjourns—and I hope that will be very soon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am indebted to the Senator from Vermont for his kind remarks and encouraged by what he had to say as being his definition of what the administration's viewpoint very likely will be.

It will be my hope that the administration would give proper and due consideration to the resolution entered today, in accordance with its expressed desire for a $600 million authorization contained in the message to the Congress received today.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont that there is probably more in common and less in divergence between the expressions contained in the speech today and the expression of the administration; and I would hope that out of these proposals and this debate would come a recognition of the need for a new kind of program for all of Latin America, a recognition of the fact that we ought no longer to be the unilateral dispenser, but that there must be an integrated, cooperative effort on the part of all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, to the end that the common welfare of the hemisphere can be furthered.

The purpose, of course, as the Senator from Vermont has expressed it so well, is to try to bring about, at long last, a real recognition of just how important Latin America is to us and, by the same token, how important we are to Latin America. Our destiny is wrapped up together. Our needs, while divergent in some respects, are parallel in others. I would hope, out of the meeting of the foreign ministers in Costa Rica next week, and the meeting of the economic ministers in Bogota in September of this year, that there will come a better feeling, a better spirit; and that there will come to the fore the expressions of men likeжуеленкубитец, of
Brazil, Pedro Beltran, of Peru, and men of the order of Figueres, of Costa Rica, and others up and down the length of this hemisphere, because of the great opportunities, if they will. What we ought to do is not be always up in the forefront, but line up side by side with our Latin American friends, so we can grow to see ways equally in the objectives desired.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator from Montana says is absolutely true. I believe that the situation in the Western Hemisphere is better than it was, for the reason that we now realize we have problems. They have been brought home to us the hard way, perhaps, but we realize now we have problems. I am sure the wheels are already in motion toward creating a better atmosphere and better conditions all the way from Cape Horn to the Arctic Circle and beyond, as far as there is civilization.

I wish to say that I believe that the Senator from Montana has been definitely instrumental in bringing about this movement throughout this country. Many Members of the Congress have come to realize the situation. I think many members of the press have come to realize that the importance of our relationships with other countries of the Western Hemisphere, because these representatives have been covering affairs of Latin America and of South America better in recent months than I have even known them to do before.

I am sure the officers of the executive branch are also cognizant of the situation, and that through cooperation of the executive and legislative branches we can move forward from the present situation.

We have the snowball started. Perhaps I should not refer to snowballs with respect to the tropics, but I have seen a lot of snow not far from the equator, though it was a couple of miles up in the air.

The program is started. Perhaps through the Cuban situation we have been able to realize what a face. Perhaps we did not wish to realize it before, but we realize it now. I look forward to a vast improvement in the economies, in the social levels, and in the political security of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. I wish to give to the Senate from Montana full credit for the part he has played.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Again I thank the Senator. I would state the wish that the administration would take the Senator from Vermont more into its confidences, and that as a result we might have a far better policy toward Latin America in general. Perhaps we shall have it now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has said that what I would call policy order out of what for many months and years has been policy chaos in Latin American-United States relations.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said only a few moments ago that possibly as a result of the difficulties in our relationships with Cuba we have taken a renewed interest in the relationships between the United States and our Latin American neighbors. I believe that the President has required that the Secretary of State make the synthesis of thought and the penetrating analysis of a man such as the Senator from Montana, in the splendid address he has given today, to bring us some perspective and some sense of order to our thinking.

I thank the Senator from Montana. I read his speech, in the prepared text, I heard a part of the speech as the Senator delivered it.

Not only has the speech laid before us a program, but also it has placed before us a philosophy. I believe what is more needed today in our foreign policy than anything else is a change of emphasis, a better philosophical undercurrent—a philosophical base and foundation of cooperation, rather than of dictation or domination.

The Senator from Montana has pointed out the essential truth that we stand side by side with our neighbors in cooperative effort, rather than to project ourselves to the forefront. The Senator has reminded us again of the invaluable contributions, such as the Organization of American States, and of its potentiality for effective action in these very serious situations which now face us not only in Cuba, but also. I regret to say, in many other areas of Latin America.

Mr. President, I wish to express one final thought. I seem to think that one of these many difficulties we shall learn, if we are willing to learn. Mr. Castro has in a sense shocked the American people into a study, into at least a thoughtful consideration of what is going on in the Latin American area. It is not that the Cuban situation is to be interpreted as symbolic of the entire Latin American region, but Mr. Castro is in the minds of the American people. In my visits around this country I have had more questions about our relations with Cuba and more questions about Mr. Castro than about any other single figure on the international scene. The American people are concerned and worried, and justly so.

Secondly, I have the threat of the Soviet Union and of Mr. Khrushchev in particular, with his emotional outburst about missiles and rockets being used in case of any intervention by the United States in Cuba. This, again, has reminded us of the importance of the Monroe Doctrine and what it stands for; but also, more significantly, of the true meaning of the Organization of American States.

Out of all the travail and out of all our pain and suffering has come a new brotherhood, a new appreciation of the importance of cooperation.

I thank the Senator from Montana for his restraint. I hope every American—every one of us—will read what the Senator from Montana has said. The Senator has not placed the blame upon the peoples of Latin America. He has spoken of tolerance, of understanding, of wisdom, and of statesmanship. There has been no demagoguery, no invective, no appeal to irrationality or to emotion. Instead, there has been an appeal for self-examination on our part, an appeal for cooperation between ourselves and our neighbors.

In agreement with the Senator from Montana I believe that the committee on Foreign Relations will act with dispatch upon the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana. I have reason to believe the chairman of the committee, with his training, his experience, and good judgment, will call the committee into session so that we can act. I am hopeful the guidelines laid down in the resolution will be accepted in the spirit in which they are offered: not to chastise, not to place blame, but to criticize, but rather to set patterns of future conduct for this administration and for the succeeding administration.

I salute the Senator from Montana. He is always an inspiration to me.

Today, the Senate, on this first day of the opening of the delayed part of the session, has witnessed statesmanship, leadership, vision, and constructive policymaking. For this we are indebted to the Senator from Montana, who, I am proud to say, is the whip of the Democratic majority. More important than that, the Senator from Montana is one of the outstanding figures of our body and is without a doubt one of the truly wise and great men of the Senate in the field of foreign policy. We are fortunate to have him here. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much, and I assure the Senator I deeply appreciate his kind words.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. As a member of the minority party, I wish to join in supporting the very fine speech the Senator from Montana has made.

We are greatly concerned about the situation in Cuba. But we will be shortsighted if our concern with the problem diverts us from taking constructive steps to strengthen the relations and solidarity of the nations of this hemisphere. I agree with a great deal the Senator has proposed in the resolution. I hope that it will come before the Senate.

In my first part of the resolution the Senator from Montana seemed to express some doubt about the recommendation of the President that $600 million be authorized to further the economic progress in Latin America. It seems to me that the recommendation made by the President, while not detailed, marks the beginning of the program proposed by the Senator. In fact, such a program was announced by the President several weeks ago.

I believe I know the concern of the Senator from Montana. He is worried that the President's recommendation may contemplate a unilateral arrangement. I do not believe the Senator from Montana is standing in any way without knowing any more details about the subject than I have read in the President's message, it seems clear, that his recommendation calls for a program to be initiated by the South American countries. A plan involving all South American countries and our own country is to be developed in which all countries can
take part upon a basis of equality. If the Congress would authorize the sum stated of that sum, it would be an earnest of our intention to join in a multilateral plan, and not a unilateral plan—a multilateral plan which would have great strength and effect. I hope the Senator will consider this point, and I am sure he will not at first impression oppose the proposal of the President.

Our oldest and best friends are the countries of the Western Hemisphere. There is great affection and friendship in the Congress and in the United States for the people of Latin America. We need to strengthen our bonds of friendship, equality and solidarity. The President’s proposal and the Senator from Montana’s resolution are in accord.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am encouraged by what the Senator from Kentucky has said. He put his finger on the fear I had as to the kind of program which might well be developed. However, on the basis of the arguments I am presenting, the administration will give full thought to the Senator’s remarks, and I think very likely will look with more favor on our ideal program which I think would be in the best interests of all of us. I know the Senator from Kentucky agrees with me.

Mr. JAVITs. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITs. I should like to join my colleague from Kentucky. I had in mind much the same point. I think he put point out to my colleague that the Marshall plan started in Europe in very much the same way. Secretary Marshall, under a Democratic President, said that the time had come to aid through self-help and actual cooperation, our European allies, who were heavily damaged by war and threatened by communism. They took up that invitation and the program was, I think, remarkably successful. I should like to join my colleague from Kentucky in expressing his sense of the administration’s proposal that was made this morning that this is what we have in mind with respect to our work with the Organization of American States.

I should like also to congratulate the Senator from Kentucky, with whom I have had a very long standing association in the field of foreign affairs—we both served on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House together—in his perception and understanding that now what we do in the other American Republics must be done together with the other American States as full and equal partners in a joint endeavor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New York, with whom I have served for almost two decades in the Congress of the United States, a man who I think has been a great friend and a great leader, and a keen sense of understanding.

I hope that something will be done along the lines of what the Senator has suggested, most especially that real attention will be given to the plan advanced by President Kubitschek of Brazil almost 2 years ago, the plan known as Operation Pan-America, which would involve all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, which would indicate that other people besides ourselves can come up with good, sound, and worthwhile ideas, and which I think would bring about some shift in the burden of leadership from the northern part of the hemisphere to the southern part. I think such an approach could be made because no country has all the leadership, no country has all the brains, no country has all the know-how.

Under the aegis of such a plan, Operation Pan-America I think we can bring the Americas together and bring about a feeling and an actuality of integration in as many fields as possible. Then I think the future of the Americas will be a happy one indeed, and the recognition which is the due of every country will be assured. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield. The resolution which the Senator is expressing my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Montana for a landmark address. I think that it is one which measures up to the highest standards of statesmanship of the Senate. He has advocated a program of a magnitude and character that is comparable to the combined Marshall plan and Western Europe following the war, and he has introduced a resolution that could open the way for its establishment.

I merely wish to express the hope that his resolution is favorably considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, on which we both serve, and by the Senate; and that it is enacted in such form as to open the way for the initiation of such a program, a good-neighborhood policy for all the Americas. I only add the personal hope that some day we might come to call such a program the Mansfield plan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank my good neighbor, my good friend, and my distinguished colleague from the State of Montana.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It has been a rewarding privilege to listen to the address of the Senator from Montana. I have been intensely interested not only in the content of the speech, but also the text of the resolution presented for the consideration of the Members of this body. The matter should have, of course, the active study of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which I think will appreciate, and I think if there is going to be any plan, the best name would be Operation Pan-America.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It has been a rewarding privilege to listen to the address of the Senator from Montana. I have been intensely interested not only in the content of the speech, but also the text of the resolution presented for the consideration of the Members of this body. The matter should have, of course, the active study of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which I think will appreciate, and I think if there is going to be any plan, the best name would be Operation Pan-America.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe the fourth of this series, as published in the New York Times, is so important that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

As there is no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"From the New York Times, Aug. 4, 1940! Cuba Sharpening U.S. Dispute in Drive for Land in U.S. Assistant(?"

(B. Tad Scudder)

The Cuban Government, which is trying to spread the influence of its revolution throughout Latin America and to turn the countries against the United States, does not seem interested in reaching an accommodation with Washington.

Despite the frequent protestations of the government of Premier Fidel Castro that it is a victim of U.S. "imperialism" and that it is ready to negotiate on equal footing," most diplomats in Havana believe that Cuba prefers to maintain, and even to sharpen, the present tension.

The violence and the bitterness of the anti-United States campaign carried on by Cuba at home and wherever possible in the rest of Americas do not indicate in which any negotiations could be fruitful.

Months before the United States cut the Cuban sugar quota, thus tested as its principal slogan the cry of "Cuba yes, Yankee no!" This cry echoes throughout Cuba for the return to the regime's top officials, at the anti-United States revolution being held with increasing frequency, in official
newspapers and on radio and television programs. Insults have been heaped on President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and other U.S. officials, and the attacks seem to gain in intensity every day.

In the aftermath of Japan's surrender, the Castro regime has allied itself closely with the Communist bloc, thus bringing Soviet influence to within 50 miles of the United States.

This system of political and economic alliances was highlighted early in July by President Eisenhower's decision to remove from Cuba all of its missiles against the United States should Cuba ever be attacked by the "Yankees." The United States' involvement in the Caribbean, and despite all the hostile acts in the economic and political field, the United States appears powerless for the time being to solve the Castro problem.

PROBLEM TENDED "INSOLVABLE"

A Western European diplomat in Havana commented recently that "this little island has created one of the most insoluble foreign policy problems that the United States has had to face" since World War II.

In the meantime, the possibility that President Castro will be removed from leadership for an indefinite period during his recuperation from the pneumonia attack he suffered last month could deeply affect the entire Cuban picture, domestically and internationally.

Despite the steadily increasing influence of radio and television, Castro's brother Raul Castro and Major Ernesto Guevara, the Premier remains the greatest symbol of the revolution.

Because of their personal allegiance to the Premier, millions of Cubans stand steadfastly for the revolution, even if some of its most recent aspects disturb them.

LOYALTY COULD BE ALTERED

However, if Major Castro, who is Armed Forces Minister, succeeds his brother as Premier even temporarily, as is expected, the whole structure of revolutionary loyalties could be thrown out of balance.

This could be particularly true if the Premier were absent for a long time and if Major Castro and Major Guevara somehow take advantage of their power to implant still deeper their extreme left-wing policies.

Major Guevara, who directs the economy as well as the national bank, is probably work closely with Major Castro if the Premier succeeds.

Notwithstanding great efforts in recent months to build sympathetic images of the two majors, their personal popularity is limited. This may be one reason why the Premier, Castro's closest friends and collaborators, especially since they began moving together, have more and more of the regime's key positions.

OPPOSITION MIGHT GROW

A situation whereby Premier Castro would be forced to stand aside for a prolonged period would undoubtedly be exploited by foes of the Government, who have been working hard to organize an opposition movement. The recrudescence of such opposition activities could bring greater repression by the regime against the domestic tensions.

In the international field, Cuba's position may harden at the conference of American foreign ministers that will deal with the Cuba-United States dispute and with Soviet interference in Latin America, if Major Castro and Major Guevara are in control of the regime.

The key to the whole situation is the length of time that Premier Castro might be away.

It is taken for granted that Premier Castro's brother will succeed him if he must be removed from office; otherwise, it must be some time ago. Major Guevara has not been mentioned in the line of succession, but to-

day his power is so great he cannot be ignored in a reshuffle of the top leadership. An unknown quantity is President Osvaldo Dorticós, whose 14 years in office has been playing an increasingly important role, seemingly favoring radical trends in the regime.

AFFECTS LATIN COUNTRIES

The Cuban situation is intimately tied to the situation in all Latin America. It affects each of these governments as well as the position of the United States in the Western Hemisphere.

In the light of its existence, the Castro regime has worked hard to build up an image of the United States as the enemy of social justice, progress, and Latin America's emancipation from the "imperialist yoke."

Because of the natural sympathies of large segments of Latin American populations are directed toward the concept of the Cuban social revolution and the personality of Premier Castro, this image has found sufficient acceptance to prevent most of the hemisphere's governments from siding openly with the United States in a dispute with Cuba.

Privately, these governments deplore the behavior of the Castro regime and are alarmed by the entry of the Soviet Union into the hemisphere and by the increasing revolutionary communism. Since most of them represent moderate, middle-of-the-road groups, which believe in evolution instead of revolution as a means of solving their countries' problems, they also fear the contagion of the revolutionary ideas emanating from Havana.

LATIN LEADERS CRITICIZED

In its drive for the political leadership of Latin America against the United States, the Castro regime has reportedly classified most of the hemisphere's rulers as its enemies and as the enemies of their people.

President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, President Alberto Lleras Camargo of Colombia, President Jorge Alessandri Rodriguez of Chile, and Premier Pedro G. Betrand of Peru are the favorite targets of the official Cuban propaganda.

Portors in government buildings in Havana describe Cuba as "the Free territory of the Americas," in a clear allusion to the oft-repeated phrase "Cuba and her top aids that the day of Latin America's 'liberation' is approaching.

Last May Castro toured Latin America on an expedition specifically designed to gain support against the United States. Some observers about the United States were so completely removed from reality that the Department of State sent a protest.

On July 26, the anniversary of Dr. Castro's revolutionary movement, an extreme left-wing Congress of Latin American youth opened in Cuba. The Congress' purpose was to discuss plans to oust U.S. influence from Latin America.

On the same day, Dr. Castro urged in a speech that the Andes become "the Sierra Maestra of Latin America," a strike from the Sierra Maestra that the Castro rebels conducted their guerrilla warfare against the regime of Gen. Fulgencio Batista.

Earlier this year, Major Guevara published in his book, "War of Guerrillas," a detailed account of the Commander's escapades that he wrote, could be carried out "in our America."

At present, Cuban leaders are in secret negotiations with a group of leaders of Peronist forces in Argentina—followers of the ousted dictator Juan D. Peron—as a pact of nations. Peru and Argentina, according to reports, Arturo Frondizi of Argentina could become the first target of such operations.

While Cuba's leaders do not intend to go back on his Soviet alliances, his representatives hope to set at rest the concern of Latin American governments on this subject when the hemisphere foreign ministers convene August 16 in San Jose, Costa Rica.

Such is the sensitivity of Latin Americans on the Cuban question that Cuba was not directly mentioned in the ministers' conference. The proposal spoke only of extraordinary activities in the area.

PUERTO RICAN REVOLT PUSHERS

Cuba has been encouraging Puerto Rican nationalists to fight for independence from the United States by any available means. It has even gone to the extreme of dispatching an American radio station south of the United States to incite the Negro populations against the Federal Government.

The pattern of Cuban activities in Latin America has suggested to diplomats that the Castro regime finds It infinitely more attractive to keep up its feud with the United States than to try to settle it.

This trend has also suggested to a number of American diplomats that the United States should abandon temporarily all the efforts to force a direct solution of the Castro problem and concentrate instead of rezoning its positions in the rest of Latin America.

They say that if the United States can convince Latin America of its desire to help solve that area's social and economic problems, the Castro influence will progressively decrease. By the Cuban problem may eventually find its own solution.

UNITED STATES GRANTED LOAN TO PERU

A step was taken in that direction July 28, when the United States announced the grant to Peru of a $232,000 loan for food and farm equipment.

It was the first time that the United States had agreed to a major aid program with Colombia since the past, U.S. assistance concentrated on industrial and related projects, although there were minor efforts and on straight financial loans to aid sagging economies.

The loan to Peru followed a much smaller one to the same country earmarked for housing. That, too, was a departure from past policies. Much of the credit for achieving a change in the United States thinking on these matters is given to the patient eloquence of Premier Beltran.

The Peruvian projects may represent the beginning of the new assistance program announced by President Eisenhowr July 11, which may call for an initial outlay of $500 million.

Many Latin Americans were pleased with this evidence of U.S. interest in their problems, many of them took some pleasure in knowing that the new approach to hemisphere problems was proposed by Brazil's President, Dr. Juscelino Kubitschek. Seven years ago, during the Cuban crisis, they stressed, the United States to begin taking the Kubitschek suggestions seriously, after labeling them as unfeasible in the immediate future.

NEW PRESIDENT ANNOUNCED

Latin Americans are, however, resigned to the fact that President Kubitschek will have to stay the inauguration of a new administration in the United States.
Many of those who are friendly to the United States believe that the new administration will have perhaps the last chance to repair the deteriorating Latin American relationships and set the stage for a new policy. 

Faithful to their traditional sympathy for Democrats in the United States, most Latin Americans are hoping for the election of Senator John F. Kennedy as President. A question often asked in Havana is: "Do you think that if Kennedy is elected, and the United States will improve if the Democratic wins?" 

Aside from Communist and leftist groups of workers and students vociferously supporting Dr. Castro in Latin America, many Latin Americans refuse to share the United Nations States preoccupation with communism in Cuba. They often agree that this is just another case of Washington's using the specter of communism to protect its economic interests. 

While many Latin Americans recognize that Cuba's rejection of basing and con-fiscating U.S. property without offering reasonable compensation, they also take a critical view of President Eisenhower's drastic cutting of the Cuban sugar quota. There would have been few objections if the Americans simply refused to pay its 3-cent premium above the world price on quota sugar, but the outright cut of the quota by the United States and Latin Americans as a naked attempt to force the overthrow of Premier Castro through economic sanctioning. 

While the Castro regime appears to be carrying out its anti-United States campaign with impunity, its motives also include real fears and grievances and even a historical concept. Premier Castro is convinced that the United States will begin, or assist, an attack on Cuba, as he says was the case in Guatemala. In a speech in France, a man of the extreme left, was in power there in 1954. He has said repeatedly that Washington intends to turn Cuba into "another Guatemala" or into "another Spain." 

While this fear is genuine to a large extent, this "aggression" has also been used to be a first-rate instrument for keeping the revolutionary spirit alive. It is an element of Cuba's foreign policy to drive in every breath the "anti-Castro" campaign, for building up military strength through militias, which have become Cuba's army along with the regular military establishment, and for attracting the sympathies of Latin American Indians and other countries. 

In fact, an "aggression" complex has developed in Cuba, and every act or word in this connection is thought to be critical of the revolutionary regime is immediately presented in the official newspapers as a "new aggression." 

In support of this aggression theory, the Government continually reminds Cubans and foreigners that the top officials of the ousted regime of General Batista, classified in Cuba as "war criminals," are harbored in the United States and are allowed to circulate freely. 

When occasional light planes escaped the vigilance of the U.S. authorities last year and early this year to make forays over Cuba, the regime's propaganda spoke of "daring bombing raids." Although these flights are now being prevented, no credit has been given to the United States. 

One of the principal grievances of the Castro regime is that few words of protest were heard from the United States while the Biscayne Government committed atrocities against the opposition but there was an immediate outcry when more than 500 "war criminals" were executed early last year. Behind the Cuban revolutionary attitude toward the United States is the belief, held firmly by Premier Castro and his companions, that the United States has entered into a period of decadence and the future of the world is about to enter the hands of young revolutionaries everywhere. 

In May, Havana's semi-official newspaper, published a special 40-page supplement dedicated to this theory of America's obvious decline. This propaganda campaign in July dealt with racial problems in the United States. 

And in an interview with a recent television speaker, Dr. Castro addressed himself with cold contempt to the United States. "The whole world is turning against you," he said. 

The attitudes of both sides have set off so much heat and ill will that reconciliation, even if Cuba desired it, seems to be ruled out. 

SISTER NOTES EXCHANGED 

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senators who have spoken in behalf of the quality of the speech and the splendid address which has been made by the Junior Senator from Montana. 

For a long period of time I have followed statements the Senator has made on the floor of the Senate and also articles published in magazines of opinion in the Nation on foreign policy. 

The address represents a great step forward. One point in it leads me to refer to it briefly. In the summary, near the end, the Senator advocated the establishment, perhaps at the University of Puerto Rico, of a center to bring together students from all the nations of North America and South America. 

We must cooperate with our neighbors to the south, economically. We must cooperate with them in meeting our responsibilities in relation to defense. In neither of these fields will we find a solution to the problems before us. It will come only from education and through understanding. That involves not toleration, but real appreciation. In the cultures of these nations there is a base for that understanding and appreciation. 

We have already, in the Senate, during the past year, set an example for that, when we added to the Mutual Security Act provisions for the establishment in the United States of the National Cultural and Scientific Institute, which I believe offers a great potential. I commend the Senator.

MR. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Hawaii. As he was speaking I, too, was thinking of the East-West Institute, which he helped so much to get underway. I believe that the University of the Americas, if it comes into being, should be called the North-South Institute.

MR. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? 

MR. MANSFIELD. I yield.

MR. ENGLE. Mr. President, I desire to compliment my distinguished friend, the great junior Senator from Montana, on an excellent address this afternoon. I was necessarily absent from the floor when he made the address, but I took the time before leaving the floor to read his speech. 

I have always observed that when the Senator from Montana speaks on a subject of foreign policy not only speaks with clarity, but also speaks in a constructive manner. The speech he has made today on Latin America is no exception. It is a speech in which he not only outlines the problems, but also deals specifically with the areas involved. In addition, the speech lays down constructive proposals, with which we can deal in respect to the handling of those problems. 

It is one thing to criticize or to say that what we are doing is not adequate or not right, but it is another thing to come forward with a constructive and substantial program which suggests a solution to the problems that confront us. In closing, I wish to say that the junior Senator from Montana, as I have said earlier, has taken precisely the latter attitude. 

I observe that in this instance he is opposed to a direct loan program. He feels that it goes in old paths and that we ought to seek new methods to solve the very difficult problems that confront us in Cuba and elsewhere with other Latin American countries, where we have, as he has stated in his speech, neglected our efforts over a period of years. 

So again, as I did with reference to his speech on the Far East, I compliment the Senator from Montana on the great speech, a fine and constructive statement, in the field of foreign policy, as he always does. I join again, as I have done in the past, other Senators in complimenting him upon the kind of effort he has made. He is, in character, objective in character, and constructive, and which adds to the solution of the problems America faces today, everywhere throughout the world. 

MR. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.