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THE BASIC PROBLEM OF LATIN AMERICA

Mr. McGee. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a very scholarly, enlightening, and forthright article published in the New York Times magazine of December 4, 1969. It was written by our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield), and is entitled "The Basic Problem of Latin America."

In it the distinguished Senator suggests that we must start planning and coordinating our overseas policies in regard to Latin America. He refers to the "beachhead societies" along the coastline, and the wide gap between those beachheads and the poverty-stricken masses in the interior. It is his wise belief—and well should it be observed by Members of the Congress—that our country, along with Latin American countries, should integrate and coordinate their policies, if we are to make our future position in Latin America meaningful and truly helpful.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE BASIC PROBLEM OF LATIN AMERICA

(BY MIKE MANSFIELD)

When the new administration takes office in January it will find the old problems of Latin America still on the doorstep of the White House. It will not be able to step over or around these problems. It is going to have to face them frankly, decide promptly what can be done about them, and begin in earnest to act on them.

As a nation, we have been reawakened to our status in the Western Hemisphere and certain recent actions of Congress reflect this reawakening. We, for example, extended the lending facilities of our Export-Import Bank and joined in the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank. Most recently, Congress proposed a new broad approach to the inter-American problems in authorizing $500 million to begin a new aid program and Under Secretary Dillon followed through at the inter-American Economic Cooperation. Manifestly, there are no signs of U.S. cooperation in dealing with Latin America's economic and social problems.

In short, the legal means for a new approach to Latin America have been accumulated. Their effective use awaits the new administration. If it touches of the Latin American problems, it will have the new administration.

The importance of this kind of leadership in international affairs cannot be overemphasized. Unless it is present, there is grave danger in perceiving Latin America's situation primarily in terms of Castroism and communism. If we do so, we will not fully appreciate the basic problem. It is not only that freedom is in danger there, but it is the nature of an effective engagement of the United States that determines their presence on the stage in Cuba and in the wings elsewhere in Latin America is a more fundamental issue.

In plain terms, the basic problem of Latin America is that the social structures of many nations of the region are seriously out of date and cannot endure in their present form in the second half of the 20th century. They cannot endure for the simple reason that they do not deliver enough education, enough food, shelter and clothing, enough medical care, enough opportunities and conveniences that are taken for granted in this country and everywhere in the Western world and even in Soviet Russia. Most important, they do not provide for a sufficient degree of freedom. Intangible but essential freedom is not a condition of a peak existence of man. It is the key to what is called political stability.

The inability of many Latin American nations to meet the needs of their people arises not so much from underdevelopment as from extremely lopsided development. In Peru, for example, during a plane flight of 2 hours one can travel from the capital of Lima with its wide boulevards, piazzas, skyscrapers, modern conveniences and traffic problems and the quiet, wretchedly poor villages in the Andean highlands to the east, inhabited by illiterate Indians who scratch out a bare existence in the Amazonian jungle stalked by tribespeople who still hunt with poison-tipped darts. Here the social lag is measured in millennia.

In Lima there is a kind of city where the ancients used to live surrounded by a vast urban poor whose culture is remarkable in its persistence. The poor know what decent housing is but they are not educated. In short, they are not capable of bringing about such change.

The economic system is not a social system that is capable of bringing about such change. Responsible Latin-American statesmen know that the long-neglected and/demostrating their countries is to convert the beachhead societies into stable national structures. But this immediate problem of the social lags which exist between the cities and the hinterlands, between the affluent minorities and the poor in the cities themselves. For, because of these lags, the pitch of the dilemma is that not enough is being done to make the abstract promises of prescriptive ideologies tend to wipe the abstractions from freedom.

An adequate solution to the immediate problem of social lag is essential if durable and democratic government is to be made the permanent problem of developing, stable governments in Latin America.

The key to the solution is an indigenous leadership which has the courage to risk shifting substantially the base of political power from the hands of a few to the many. Even if the shift is made, the leadership must still have the wisdom to prepare the land on the long-term power not for a new entrenchment of personal power but for the building of institutions of freedom and progress.

That kind of leadership has not been conspicuous in Latin America until com-
more than one judge.18 Can anyone really doubt how any judges nominated by dicta-
tor, like Cuba, North Korea, China, Vietnam, Nkrumah and Toure and many others, whether Communist or not, will vote on is-
sue and whether their bosses deem vital to their own nations?
The election of judges is by concurrent secret ballot. The minority to which Nehru (and also many western nations) have their way with the admission of Red China to the U.N., is not necessarily the majority in the world. Hence Nehru and others, who believe the U.N. is an instrument of Communist or Communist-dominated nations, will probably try to elect judges who will, like the majority of the Security Council in the past, vote against the admission of Red China to the U.N.

But, Irrespective of whether Communist or not, will vote on issues and matters which have their way with the admission of Red China to the U.N., is not necessarily the majority in the world. Hence Nehru and others, who believe the U.N. is an instrument of Communist or Communist-dominated nations, will probably try to elect judges who will, like the majority of the Security Council in the past, vote against the admission of Red China to the U.N. The rule heretofore followed is that (a) a vote in a majority of the Security Council is not necessarily a vote in the world; (b) a measure of the world is defined to include all states; and (c) a measure of the world is defined to include all states which have a representative in the U.N., regardless of whether they are members of the U.N.

The Nehru statement was reported in the Baltimore Sun, October 4, 1965; the population figures are reported in various publications—see, for example, U.S. News, October 3, 1966; and the shifting power has been widely commented upon—see, for example, U.S. News, August 22, 1965; New York Times, September 25 and October 2, 1966. The reductio ad absurdum is that 31 of the present member states are as not large as a single average state of the United States, like Maryland county, yet have 31 times the voting of the U.S. Indeed, there are a number of them not as large as the average Maryland county. Moreover, what has happened is that the rush for projected weight of representation, advocated long before the United States' voting strength based on numbers of the general Assembly and the U.N. have been largely agreed upon.

But, irrespective of ultimate or present success in such efforts, nobody can believe that Communist and non-Communist World Powers will block their master's wishes on issues their bosses deem vital.

18 Senate Hearings 45, 51.

19 Changes in the Security Council will inevitably be closely debated. It is widely conceded that the close vote this year indicates Red China will be admitted next year. When the re-
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To bring about such a flow we must first centralize control over the various aid sources within our own Government. Second, we must make the Latin-Americans lead as part of this new direction, and will use the aid in combination with the energies and resources of their national economies, rather than symbols, of modern progress.

Unless we accept for ourselves, and are able through leadership and diplomacy to get recipient countries to accept, the idea of an integrated approach for all future aid activities, development, in the Americas is not likely to be brought about under the aegis of freedom. A new and larger sprinkling of aid in the old random pattern will produce little growth. Better prices and a larger market for coffee, sugar or whatever may act as tranquilizers but they will not cure the ill.

As a nation, we have got to face up to that fact. So, too, must the Latin-Americans. That is the challenge to the new administration. It is a challenge to rid our Latin-American policies of sterile slogans and shibboleths which have heretofore obscured the problems. It is a challenge to supply the national and hemispheric leadership and the administrative followthrough that will use existing resources in a concentrated program to change the people and the states of Latin America into truly national, democratic states.

The success of that effort is essential to Latin America’s future. It is essential to the future of this Nation.

RELEASE OF TWO AMERICAN FLYERS TO RUSSIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last week the Soviet Union made a grandstand play by releasing two American fliers Russia had held illegally since last July, when, in a plain act of piracy on the high seas, the Communists shot down a U.S. RB-47 reconnaissance bomber over international waters.

Certainly we all relish the release of the men and their families who had been so cruelly and unnecessarily separated by the Communist pirates.

At the same time, we should not delude ourselves that the cold war is now thawing. This was no act of humanitariansim on the part of the Communists. It was a transparent move to score a palpable hit with the rest of the world. Undoubtedly, Mr. Khrushchev hopes we will interpret his act as an indication of new sincerity and willingness to make concessions in the interest of relieving tensions between the two great powers.

As the Washington Post and Times Herald pointed out in an excellent editorial last Friday:

It is no more a concession than the agreement of a recalcitrant child, in expectation of reward, to stop throwing stones or breaking up the furniture.

What reward—or ransom—President Kennedy paid to Mr. Khrushchev for the release of our two fliers held hostage by the Russians has not yet been revealed to the American people. I certainly hope our new administration has not begun a policy of appeasement as part of its self-styled “quiet diplomacy.”

For, if the administration paid a big price to obtain the release, Mr. Khrushchev will demand an even bigger price to reveal the fate of other Americans whose unarmed transport was shot down by Soviet fighter planes in September 1960. According to a Soviet magazine recently published, the 11 United States airmen parachuted to safety and were received by the Soviets. The same magazine has just retracted this statement, but doubt persists.

If the Khrushchev truly desires to ease cold war tensions, let him come clean about this incident. If he does not, then we can only assume that he is seeking to use his captives as political pawns in the cold war, just as he has done in the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point three analytical statements on these questions: the Post editorial, an article by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of January 27, and an article by Roscoe Drummond in the Post of January 30.

In the absence of objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1961]

CHEERS FOR WHAT CHEERS FOR WHAT

All Americans will welcome the release of the two surviving RB-47 fliers who have been released from their prison in the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, this move by Mr. Kennedy, as he has wisely ordered not to be resumed. In those overflights the United States was legally the offender. The RB-47 was shot down by Soviet planes over international waters, and the affair was misrepresented by the Soviet Union in an obvious attempt to embarrass the United States at the time.

What then, does the release signify? It merely permits the Soviet Union to purge itself in some degree of an action which was illegal in the first place and which cost the lives of four other Americans. This could have been done at any time during the last 6 months in response to the entreaties of President Eisenhower. The Soviet Government delayed the step in a transparent effort to associate itself with the United Nations and with the American administration with the appearance of a concession.

The release is to be welcomed on its own account, and there will be hopes that it will pave the way for some sort of mutual interest negotiation. But the mere cessation of outrageous behavior makes Mr. Khrushchev no whit less an implacable adversary. It is no more a concession than the agreement of a recalcitrant child, in expectation of reward, to stop throwing stones or breaking up the furniture.

WHAT ABOUT THE OTHERS—FATE OF 11 FLIERS UNEXPLAINED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is every reason to welcome the action of the Soviet Union in releasing the two RB-47 U.S. fliers whose plane, the RB-47, the Russians shot down over the international waters of the Arctic Ocean last July.

But it would be an egregious mistake to construe this gesture as in itself easing any of the significant tensions of the cold war or as offering evidence that the Soviets want to negotiate productively with President Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy is making it clear that he does not intend to be drawn into premature,
unprepared summit talks. To him, this means proof that there is some basis for a meeting of minds.

There are two American flyers who should never have been detained and whose plane should never have been shot down (since it was intruding into Soviet air territory). I understand whatever that Mr. Khrushchev wants to settle anything with Mr. Kennedy except on Soviet relations.

It may be evidence that Mr. Khrushchev wants to build a little good will before approaching the big issues. The United States must have some assurance of the way a settlement will work, or it would be a mistake to make concessions.

What about the 11 Americans who had not been heard from since their unarmed U.S. transport plane, which lost its bearings a few miles over the Soviet-Turkish frontier in September, 1958, was shot down by Soviet fighter planes?

At that time the Soviets turned over the bodies of six dead U.S. airmen and blandly assured us that they had not seen, had no knowledge of, and had done nothing to the other members of the crew.

The news, which has now come out via East Germany and was reprinted perhaps so as to show the Western world that there is no place for Stalinesque propaganda in the world, is that the Soviets captured the 11 flyers after they had parachuted to the ground, still alive, and were paraded before the press. Mr. Khrushchev says he doesn’t believe the Soviet version.

The Americans asked the Soviet authorities: Why should we hide anything? Why are Americans so suspicious about this?

Finally, in a letter with Secretary Dulles he made as though he could stand it no longer and professed to be downright bffed, the official of the United States did not seem to accept his personal and official assurances that the Americans were innocent and that they should be released. He refused to answer the questions the American charges raised.

“This is a fact that I have ordered the release of the RB-47 flyers who should never have been detained and whose plane should never have been shot down (since it was intruding into Soviet air territory). I understand whatever that Mr. Khrushchev wants to settle anything with Mr. Kennedy except on Soviet relations.”

The speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**Speech of the Honorable Wayne Morse, U.S. Senator from Oregon, November 20, 1960, Miami, Fla.**

Ladies and gentlemen, we have gathered together tonight not only to dedicate the new Miami Beach Osteopathic General Hospital to its noble purposes, but also to re dedicate ourselves the moral obligation of promoting man’s humanity to man. The privilege and trust inherent in your invitation to participate with you in this dedication ceremony moves me very deeply.

As the offices of the American Osteopathic Association well know, during my 16 years in the Senate I have always supported and will continue to support equality of consideration for the members of the osteopathic school of medicine in any medical hospital or medical research program in which the Federal Government may play a part.

This proposed hospital in a very real sense will be both a physical monument, and an inspiration in the knowledge that so many men and women both in and out of the osteopathic profession who will make contributions to the research and treatment of disease. As the American Osteopathic Association has stated, “Your osteopathic hospital will represent an advance in the field of medical care which is more than costly equipment and specially