
The 1962-63 Sidney Hillman Lecture

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS
A Firsthand Report
From Latin America

A Lecture by **SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**
At the University of Minnesota

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS
A Firsthand Report
From Latin America

A Lecture by the **HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY**
UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA

Delivered at Northrop Memorial Auditorium, Minneapolis
On Thursday, January 3, 1963

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 100th ANNIVERSARY OF THE
EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

THE SIDNEY HILLMAN LECTURES have brought to this platform such distinguished figures as Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court William O. Douglas, Gunnar Myrdal, Thurgood Marshall, and the late Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose own lives have reflected and strengthened the principles by which Sidney Hillman lived.

SIDNEY HILLMAN, 1887-1946

Founder and first president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (A.F.L.-C.I.O.); a founder of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; a pioneer in the development of labor banking, insurance, cooperative housing, health insurance, and workers' education; a friend and confidante of President Franklin D. Roosevelt; a wartime member of the War Manpower Commission; Associate Director-General, Office of Production Management; Associate Director, War Production Board.

Introduction

**By PRESIDENT O. MEREDITH WILSON,
University of Minnesota**

THIS EVENING WE HONOR THE MEMORY of one of America's great labor leaders: Sidney Hillman, founder of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, one of the founders of the CIO, close friend of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and a distinguished servant of the people. At the same time, we observe the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation.

It was on January 1, 1863, that President Abraham Lincoln expressed the wish and the will of the government, that all citizens of the then not united states should be free, and that all should have the right to the opportunities and the dignities implicit in democracy. One hundred years later, what Lincoln intended has not yet been fully achieved. This does not, however, prevent us from expressing our appreciation for the Proclamation and pledging our continued efforts to an improvement in our common respect for all mankind.

It is appropriate here to refer to one of Abraham Lincoln's more remarkable statements. In doing so I must paraphrase somewhat freely. Speaking at the Baltimore Fair in the period immediately before his inauguration, Lincoln observed that the world was much in need of a definition of freedom; that few people understood its meaning. He went on to explain: the shepherd, seeing a wolf seize the neck of his sheep, jumps to the sheep's defense, driving the wolf away. The sheep bleats thanksgiving because he is liberated, while the wolf cries tyrant, especially since the sheep was a black one. This typical Lincoln parable is an expression of the problems that face a free society as it struggles toward a definition of freedom that respects all mankind.

As we seek to achieve this definition, it is vitally important that we have distinguished servants aware of both the importance of

freedom and the difficulties of achieving it. We must, from time to time, re-express our ideals, and call attention again to the principles for which we stand. Hubert Humphrey is a distinguished alumnus of this institution. He has received the highest awards that we can give to an alumnus. As a senator he has received the most distinguished award a congressman can receive from the American Political Science Association. But for us, he is most important as an active, practicing member of government who is eternally inquisitive; who wants always to know why. In 1958, in Moscow, he confronted Khrushchev with the questions most important at that time. It was he who pressed for a Peace Corps to serve underdeveloped nations of the world; who walked hundreds of miles through the poverty-stricken sections of Latin America, seeking the truth about their needs and about the activities of the Alliance for Progress. We are very fortunate to have with us one who comes so recently from a study of these problems, to tell us what has been achieved and for what we may hope. I take great pleasure in presenting to you Senator Hubert H. Humphrey.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

A Firsthand Report

From Latin America

By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Senator from Minnesota

THERE IS no more fitting forum to discuss the topic that I have selected — “The Unfinished Revolution” — than this university campus which is dedicated to political freedom and to intellectual and academic freedom and inquiry. It is a challenging opportunity to participate in the Sidney Hillman Lecture series. I knew Sidney Hillman, and I knew him well. I knew him as a respected and gifted leader of men, a labor leader, good citizen, and as a dedicated patriot. His life was the fulfillment of the unfinished business of democracy. He sought to give people greater opportunity. He sought the realization of true equality for all people under freedom. I address myself tonight to “The Unfinished Revolution” — the American revolution that spreads throughout the world. I do not speak of the counter-revolution — the revolution of reaction of Communist totalitarianism — but, rather, of our revolution, the democratic revolution that seeks greater freedom and greater opportunity for all mankind. I was forewarned by one of my associates that perhaps the word “revolution” might be out of place in the comfortable surroundings of mid-America, but I truly believe that we of the United States — and particularly we of this generation — ought to sing forth the great melody and the lyrics of the American revolution. Too few people know about it, here or abroad, and it is our responsibility to know it and to speak of it.

A hundred years ago the great President Lincoln unleashed a second great American revolution — a revolution of political and social equality. It was documented in his Emancipation Proclamation — the charter of freedom for a whole people. It was the mighty whip that struck down the inhuman institution of slavery. Yet, though that proclamation was ratified by fire and sword, a century later there are those who still resist it and repudiate even

in our time the true meaning of that great document. The exploitation of man by fellow man, the denial of constitutional rights of American citizens, will not be ended by a public statement — even by one as unequivocal as a Lincoln — nor, again, even by the ordeal of a shattering civil war. Only through several generations of constant, persistent effort and daring leadership have we been able even to approach the promise of the Proclamation. That effort continues to this very hour, and it will continue until the last vestige of discrimination based upon race, creed or color has vanished from the face of America.

There are, in fact, three great revolutions which have dominated our history. The first was a revolution against foreign domination, the Revolution of Independence in 1776. The second, to which I have alluded, was the revolution against the inhumanity of the slavery system in the Civil War, and the third, more contemporary, was the peaceful revolution of the 20th century, the economic and social revolution that we have witnessed under the administrations of men like Theodore Roosevelt and his "Square Deal", Woodrow Wilson and his "New Freedom", and Franklin Roosevelt and his "New Deal". In this revolution, the American people, particularly the workers and the farmers, were successful, through the democratic process, in achieving a government more responsive to their needs and their wants. These revolutions have succeeded in creating a system which has made the most marked advances in man's history toward freedom from the tyranny of autocratic government, from the lash of poverty, from the fear and prejudice of ignorance, and the savagery of the exploitation of man by man. We have, at least in this century, popularized our politics and humanized our economy.

In recent years we have come to understand and to realize that the competition between the totalitarian forces and those of the free world cannot be measured solely in terms of military strength or gross national product. It has also become a conflict of ideology, of philosophy, a combat between two radically different revolutions.

Two years ago the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, in cooperation with many leaders in this hemisphere, charted a vast new program for the extension of this democratic revolution. There emerged, in fact, a new emancipation proclamation calling for the freedom of millions of impoverished, illiterate, and oppressed peoples throughout Latin America.

Let me pause to comment that the phrase "Latin America" is all too often used, and will be used tonight, in a somewhat inappropriate manner. There is no Latin America, as such, except geo-

graphically. There are the republics of what we call Latin America, each different, each with its own culture, its own history, its own ethnic characteristics, and differing economies. Now if the Alliance for Progress is to have any historical significance, it will be not only because it succeeds in breaking with the past, but also because it succeeds in achieving a peaceful revolution — directed, inspired, and supported by those who believe that inequality, poverty, and backwardness can be eliminated, can be overcome by the rational processes of political decision and economic development. It is well to remember that this continuing revolution grows as much out of the leadership of a Simon Bolivar, a Juarez, as out of a Washington or a Jefferson, as much from a San Martin as from a Lincoln.

The Alliance for Progress is a bold challenge to those who cry, with the Communists and other extremists, that mankind cannot be freed from its bonds of ignorance and poverty without the violent and bloody destruction of the existing system and the imposition of a dictatorship. The *Alianza para el Progreso* is a cooperative venture undertaken in the belief that the processes of constitutional democracy can move sufficiently swiftly and decisively to accomplish vital, urgent social and economic changes. I am committed to the proposition, and this nation is committed to the proposition, that change — radical change, revolutionary change — can come through orderly, peaceful processes. The Alliance is more than a proclamation and it is far more than a declaration of intent. It is, and must be, a program of action. Its success requires the allegiance of those who are motivated by democratic ideals; it demands participation by men and women of decision and action — people who can make decisions, people who are committed to action. If it is to succeed, its leaders must feel a sense of urgency. They must be adventurous. They must be daring. They must be willing to risk making mistakes. President Wilson and I were speaking earlier this evening about our observations of the Latin American scene and we agreed that the greatest problem of all in the Latin American area is the delay in action, the failure to act. Action must be the by-word, the watchword. We must not hesitate to act, even when we are not absolutely sure of all the data, because to delay is to invite defeat. The problems the Alliance is designed to overcome will not yield to any ordinary, timid or conventional effort.

We must understand that there would be trouble, violence and disorder in Latin America even if there were no Communists and Castroites. The truth is that Castro's Communism is the effect rather than the cause of the deep discontent that has submerged

vast areas of the hemisphere to the South. As one observer puts it, most Latin Americans are born on dead-end streets and feel that they are doomed to live on them until the day they die. Lives of grinding poverty and voiceless desperation are commonplace. I have seen them. Latin America is dynamite and some of it has already exploded right on our doorstep. Castro and his Communists are exploiting the tensions and the troubles of a corrupt and dying order. The destruction of Castro and his regime in Cuba alone will not cure Latin America's illness for Latin America is very sick. And it has been sick for many, many years — sick because of its own failures, sick in part because of our neglect.

Just a few figures underscore the depth of the problems of Latin America. Just prior to the time of the Alliance for Progress, Latin America could be measured in terms of more than two hundred million people in an area two and a half times as large as the United States of America. This continent had received less than 3% of the total economic aid of the United States from 1945 to 1960. Compare this with Europe, which had received 41% of our aid, to the Far East with 17½%, to the Near East with almost 12%. Two percent of the people in Latin American countries, if you put them in an aggregate, own more than 50% of the total wealth. Two-thirds to three-fourths of the people live in unbelievable, abject poverty. Furthermore, the Latin American population is exploding — it doubled from 1920 to 1956. It is increasing at an overall rate of more than 2½% a year, and in some of the Central American Republics that I recently visited it runs as high as 3½ to 4%. The life span is being extended, but life expectancy throughout South and Central America remains at less than 45 years, while here in the United States it is 70 years.

The problems illustrated by these statistics are not surface problems. They are not peripheral. They are deep and they are enduring. They are caked in the centuries-old hard crust of tradition and privilege. They demand a coordinated attack by the most daring and ingenious men of our time using a commitment of human and material resources far beyond anything that we have contemplated thus far. The commitment of resources, human and material, we have made thus far can only be regarded as a beginning. I fear that unless we do far more we shall lose all that we have achieved up to now.

Such a commitment cannot and should not be undertaken by the United States alone. We all need to be reminded again and again that the Alliance for Progress is an Alliance. It is a partnership.

We are only part of it, and if that Alliance is to succeed, we — and by “we” I mean all of us in this hemisphere — must mobilize and commit the resources of all of the nations of this hemisphere on an heroic scale. And we can well ask our prosperous friends and compatriots of Western Europe to make their contribution, too, because the battle for freedom is fought on a world-wide front.

What Latin America really needs is a Sidney Hillman. It needs a Franklin Roosevelt. It needs and it cries out for whatever you wish to call it — a “Square Deal”, a “New Freedom”, a “New Deal”, or a “New Frontier”.

Now let me report to you on what I saw in the past month. I am pleased to be able to say that the Alliance for Progress, which I observed last year and upon which I commented rather critically, has now started to move. It has begun rather well. It is now more than a document, more than a Presidential pronouncement, more than publicity. It is more than a plan. It is now taking shape in political and economic reform and in projects. It can be seen in new housing. I have seen thousands of new homes for lower middle income people, for the poor, and for the poorest of the poor. Progress can be measured in new schools, in new health facilities, in new textbooks, new roads, new industries. This is progress and there is an Alliance. The Alliance for Progress is no longer just a phrase. It is beginning to live.

But apathy and inertia remain very strong in many parts of Latin America. The very immensity, the overwhelming, the almost staggering scale of the social and economic problems discourages many. The forces of privilege, entrenched oligarchies — and they have these as well as the Communists — fight every forward movement. We have, indeed, come to grips with a monster — almost a prehistoric monster — the corroded and ugly product of the accumulated oppression and evil habits of centuries.

But, my fellow Americans, we have joined the fight. We have joined the battle with this monster, and I return from my second visit to Latin America in the past two years more encouraged and ever more determined. Our recent travels took us into Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, to El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico. I sense a growing recognition this year, among the key leadership with whom I met in Latin America, that the Alliance for Progress is indeed a cooperative operation. There is increasing understanding that local capital, local initiative, local planning, local sacrifice and hard work are required, and that the United States should not be expected — as, indeed, is not its intention — to

dominate the Alliance nor to pay all the bills. I made this crystal-clear to every head of state that I was privileged to meet. I addressed the members of the Congress in Venezuela, the Congress in El Salvador and the Senate in the Republic of Mexico. I sat down by the hour with their leaders, with their planners, with their economists, stressing always that we are a partner, but we have no intention of paying all the bills. We are demanding reform. We insist upon a degree of integrity in administration. We are not going to permit our capital nor our manpower to be frittered away in useless or ill-planned efforts. We are taking an active role in promoting fiscal and political and economic reform. We are offering the best of our technical assistance and we are lending important amounts of capital. When I hear people talk about "give-aways", I say that such talk is a disservice to our country and to those who are recipients of the aid. These are loans. Many times they are what we call long-term, low interest loans, but they are repayable, and our Latin American friends are repaying on previous loans, just as our European friends have done.

A healthy relationship exists as a result of such frank talk. A genuine feeling of partnership is growing between our representatives and the Latin American leadership. I might point out that North Americans, as we are called, are generally respected and liked. We are not, of course, enlisted in a popularity contest. We are a member of the Alliance because we believe that this is essential to our national security and to our allies. But it is a fact that President Kennedy is a very popular man in Latin America. Of course, it is still fashionable for demagogues to profess a distrust and an animosity toward the United States. In my opinion, however, such professions fall into the category of political cliches which have outrun political reality. I found nothing but the warmest and most enthusiastic welcome. In the drawing rooms of presidents and in the thick dust of the slums, the people pressed to tell me how deeply they appreciated the initiative that our country has and the action of President Kennedy. People came up to me almost in an emotional frenzy explaining in their way how grateful they were for the Alliance for Progress. These were often people who could neither read nor write. But they understood. At long last somebody cared. They demonstrated their affection and respect for the tough-minded men and women that we have representing us today in the day-in and day-out contacts in these countries — our ambassadors, the embassy staffs, our aid missions, our Peace Corps; yes, and our business, professional, and labor representatives.

Our business men do a good job in these countries. But sometimes I feel that American business fails to tell its own good story. We are not exploiters. In the main our people are considerate, fair, pay well and establish high standards. I was very proud of the Peace Corps. The men and women of the Peace Corp are not all young, but they are youthful in spirit and conviction. They are doing an amazing job. I wish you could have seen the group of nurses whom we met in Honduras, one of the countries in Central America in the greatest need of help. I met a dear lady who was in her sixties, from the state of Washington, working up in the hills. She was working like a corpsman, running a health institute, a little mountain health center. Such men and women in the Peace Corps, in the AID and diplomatic missions, are doing great things for other people and for our country. We can be mighty proud of these Americans. They are wiping out the stereotype of the Ugly American. They are fine, first class, trained, alert, and hard working. I speak of all of these people, with few exceptions. There are few second-raters. And the Latin Americans understand, by the high calibre of our present representation in their countries, that we do respect them, that we are in earnest, that we do mean business, and that we are serious about this Alliance. A few years ago I could not have made this statement, because it was a regrettable fact that in all too many instances the Foreign Service of the State Department of the United States did not send its top people to Latin American countries. One singular accomplishment of President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk is that top-grade people, with few exceptions, are being selected for these important posts. This word gets around.

I was pleased also to see the calibre of the men who are coming to leadership in the countries that I visited. There is a kind of new spirit, a "New Frontier" spirit, if you will, about many of these new leaders. They are young, most of them. They are educated, they are trained, they are committed, and they are vigorous. I met young men trained at this University in the fields of education, in the fields of agriculture, and health — proud to be graduates of the University of Minnesota. They are in key cabinet positions in government; they are men in their thirties who are prepared to do battle with man's most ancient enemies, disease and poverty. There is no spirit of *mañana* in these governments. These men had some good experiences here in our universities and they have carried those experiences back home. For the most part, they have a respect and an admiration for our political and economic institutions. We need to back such men and we need to encourage them.

Our vital interests not only lie in the simple accomplishment of higher living standards in Latin America. They also lie in the political stability which can be based only on economic and social progress for the masses of the people and in their acceptance of the principle of orderly change in government. We must do more to encourage the growth of non-governmental, democratic institutions — not only through our government, but through the intensified efforts of United States business management, educators, doctors, and other professional groups, our trade unions, or farm cooperatives. Voluntarism, as we know it — the complex of voluntary agencies that we take for granted, the many organizations to which we belong — is not a tradition in the Spanish culture. But it can be a healthy addition to that culture. We can do much more than we are doing to encourage private initiative, private investment. We ought to be proud of our private investment. We ought to be proud of our private investment system, not apologetic about it. I have traveled in many areas of the world, and I have yet to see a system that works better or that provides greater social justice than this pluralistic economy of ours which combines government, private, and cooperative investment and management. We need to encourage respect, not only for human rights, which is primary, but also for property rights. We need to encourage, and we are encouraging, sensible fiscal planning, sound monetary systems, the income tax and property tax reforms that are so vital to any kind of stable and responsible government.

There are many hopeful signs that I can report to you in Latin America. The movement for economic and eventual political integration of Central America is one. It is gathering momentum. Yes, there is a powerful Common Market in Western Europe, but there is a Common Market, also, in Central America. At the Central American Bank headquarters at Tegucigalpa, Honduras, are men like Enrique Delgado, men who have, many of them, been trained and educated here — men who are devoted to the ideal of an economic and political transformation of Central America. There is every reason to believe that the 11,000,000 Central Americans can succeed in interconnecting their highways and their communication systems, their electrical power systems, in sharing their industrial and agricultural planning, in lowering their barriers to trade. Would you believe it that in these little republics, roads will run out from the capital city up to a national boundary and quit? ECLA, the Economic Commission for Latin America, has made a proposal — a modest proposal running into a few million dollars —

to connect the roads among six Central American Republics. I think it will cost ten million dollars, and by that one effort alone, which can be accomplished in one year, you will have created a network of highways that will permit commerce between the nations. Imagine if the roads in Minnesota stopped short of the Iowa border, and the Iowa roads stopped short of the Minnesota border. There are countries in Central America which have not one railroad system, but 36, all separate, all different. Five and six different gauges of railroad track can be found in one little country. No telecommunications connect the capitals when you call from San Salvador to San Jose, which is less than forty-five minutes by plane. You are routed through Miami or New York. There are huge regional hydroelectric power possibilities. One country now may have a shortage of power, and the next may have an excess of power, and there are no interconnections. What a waste! Now the leaders of Central America understand that this is a waste, and they are moving to interconnect roads, railroads, power, telecommunications. All I say to my Government is "Hurry Up!" These people want action. I sometimes have a feeling that while we are aware that they have great needs, in our own comfortable surroundings we cannot really feel that these are urgent.

Fortunately, we in the United States are supporting this Central American initiative for a Central American Common Market. Minnesotans should be proud that Professor Arthur W. Marget of the Department of Economics of this great University was the godfather, the inspiration for the Common Market of Central America. His widow is still in Guatemala City. He died speaking for it, working for it. So I felt a very personal involvement as I met with Pedro Delgado and his staff of the Central American secretariat. Both we and they now have functioning regional institutions, manned by able people, working together effectively, and I trust rapidly, toward what promises to be an impressive achievement in the next several years. Our programs of economic and technical assistance must continue to emphasize economic and political integration in Central America. I intend to make it my business this year to see to it that priority is put upon regional integration and that loans and projects designed for a country without any direct reference to what it will contribute to regional integration will take a lower priority. That message has already been conveyed to the high places of this government.

The Central Americans know that economic integration is their basic hope for a higher standard of living. However, in South

America, as contrasted with Central America, the development of a common market, or what they call a free trade area, and regional planning have faltered badly. The Latin American nations now face not only the united strength of the Soviet bloc, but also that of Western Europe and its African partners. Individually, the countries of Latin America are weak, and they are in no position either to compete or bargain with the stronger, more prosperous Western Europe, United States or Japan. We can perform no greater service for our neighbors in the South than to insist that in their political and economic planning they now place a high priority on economic integration and joint planning. Cooperating together, joining together in some form of common market supported by international trade agreements, Latin America can become an economic power commanding respect in international market places.

Throughout Latin America the economic situation will continue to depend largely upon the price of raw materials. Therefore, commodity agreements, on an international basis, are vital to the welfare and prosperity of these countries. A drop of a few cents a pound in coffee can wipe out in one year the effect of several years of the Alliance for Progress. Raw material prices in recent years have dropped sharply, and these prices are directly reflected in the budget deficits of country after country, in inflation and in lower standards of living. The recent international coffee agreement, signed at the United Nations, was well received in Latin America, and it is recognized that our country, the United States, played an important role in obtaining this agreement. We need to do more of this. We need to fight for these people because they can be victimized in the international market places. We must help our economically weak neighbors to the south to build their economies, not merely by our loans and grants and technical assistance, but also by helping them to receive a fair price for what they produce. Ultimately the success of the Alliance for Progress may well be determined by the price structure of important commodities produced in the Latin American areas. A nation, in the final analysis, must earn its own way by its own effort, its own production, based on fair prices, fair wages.

We are strongly encouraging a cooperative Central American effort in higher education. A strong beginning has been made. There is regional specialization, with universities opened now to students from the entire region for special disciplines. We have encouraged the spectacularly successful effort to put textbooks this year into the hands of every Central American first and second

grader — the first new textbooks in some of these countries in 50 years. This is another beginning. The plans call for low cost, non-propaganda-ridden textbooks, paperbacks, costing around nine, ten or eleven cents apiece for every school child in Central America through the elementary grades. This is an *Alianza* project. We are identified with it. What a blessing! It is useless to build schools if you have no teachers or books. At long last we are beginning to understand that it is the books and the teachers that are even more important than the structures.

As for the university student bodies, just a quick comment. Student bodies in the countries in which I traveled, at least on this trip, appear to be growing somewhat more sophisticated as to Communist Party organization and techniques. Can you imagine students bringing down governments? Well, they do in these countries. They go on strike. They cause a whole university to close. They fire and hire professors at will. Nevertheless, slowly, subtly, but surely, changes are being made. I talked with Dr. Ignacio Chavez, the Rector of the University of Mexico, which is a tremendous institution of approximately fifty-five or fifty-six thousand regular students, another twenty thousand preparatory students — a magnificent campus, superb facilities. Dr. Chavez is one of the leading heart specialists in the world. He knows of our own University and our own great heart hospital and medical school! He has many friends here on this campus. Changes are coming about on that campus. The professional student who never attends a class, but who can always be found in the leading ranks of the student riots and demonstrations, will either go to school and produce and get his grades or get out! What a happy day that will be in Latin America! I shall summarize by saying that there appears to be a slow but steady rollback of Communist influence among the students and faculty members of Latin America.

Now this is not to say that the Communist party is inactive or that it is not working in Latin America. It is, especially through Fidel Castro's Cuba. Venezuela is its principal target in the Caribbean Area. The Communists are working particularly hard in the rural areas throughout all of Latin America, where poverty is the deepest, where illiteracy and ignorance are the most prevalent, and where we have done the least. I cannot understand what is wrong with us. We have not been an industrialized nation so long. Have we forgotten our rural background? Why are we so dedicated to building steel plants and so unwilling to do a job in agriculture where we excel? We have some competition in steel, but we have

none in agriculture any place in the world. Poverty in the rural areas is the hunting ground for Mr. Castro's boys. While Castro himself has lost a great deal of prestige in recent months, the Communists have not relaxed their drive of subversion, propaganda and infiltration. I saw it in Venezuela. I wondered why a man who was with us all the time was carrying a briefcase which he never opened. I found later that he was carrying a submachine gun. Our ambassador is carefully guarded. It is a unique experience to wake up and find gunmen protecting your hotel room. When you ask not to have it done, you are told that it is necessary. Terrorism, my fellow Americans, is the order of the day in parts of Latin America. But the governments of Latin America are much more aware today of the real Communist threat than they were a year or two ago, and more effective steps are being taken by democratically-elected governments to curtail Cuban infiltration. Embassies have been closed to reduce Cuban propaganda and terrorism. It is now well recognized that the threat of Communism is not its economic and social doctrine. The problem is that of combating a well-organized, disciplined, conspiratorial apparatus which does not hesitate at open and wholesale assassination. This requires effective policing, it requires courageous leadership and the loyalty of the security forces. This conspiratorial activity must be met head-on.

But Communism can finally be defeated only by producing obvious, constructive results through democratic processes — results that are so apparent that they need no interpretation and no publicity to be understood. Yes, results like new schools, broader land ownership, clean water, hospitals, roads, factories, and jobs are the building blocks of such an effort. Communism is strong in certain parts of Latin America principally because freedom and all it represents is weak. Communism gains where the economy falters and where leaders fail to lead. Now to be sure, economic progress must be planned across the board. But we must have more than just big plans. We need dramatic demonstrations of what can be accomplished under progressive democracy, particularly where a dictator has been removed and a free democratic government has been established. For example, there is the Dominican Republic with a new president, President-elect Bosch, elected in a free election. Here is the opportunity to demonstrate, within but a few miles of Cuba, what a progressive democracy can mean for the people. We need a showcase of democratic achievement, and then we need to spread the good news actively. We can have people come to see that as well as shout the bad news of Communist

failures in Cuba. In other words, I submit we need to join the fight on every front — political, economic, propaganda, educational. Above all, we need to produce some demonstrations within the environment, the culture of Latin America, that are dramatic and meaningful.

Perhaps such a demonstration can be made in the Dominican Republic. Another can be made in Venezuela. It is quite obvious that the Communists have made Venezuela their next major objective in Latin America and I call upon my government and the American people to meet this Communist offensive head-on and destroy it. The government of President Betancourt in Venezuela is a progressive government. It is open and friendly to the United States, vigorously supporting us in all international councils. It respects private property, private capital and investment. It encourages capital investment. And at the same time it sponsors the broadest social reforms and developments for its people. It has strong trade unions, rural cooperatives — all the things that we know about in this great state of Minnesota. It is a government that is acting boldly after years of corrupt dictatorship, in the fields of housing, health and education, and in rural development. The Communists are determined to destroy this government because they know that if constitutional democracy can succeed in its program of social and economic development, Communism in Latin America will have suffered a disastrous defeat. The stakes are high here. The Communists know it and they are out to win. And they have money and zealous people ready to fight.

They have unwitting, yet equally zealous, partners in the extreme Right Wing — who fight Betancourt as viciously as the Communists. The question is, do we in the United States fully appreciate the significance of this battle? Where are our zealous people? Are we really using our strength and resources to win? Because, mark it down now, this is a battle. A Communist government in Venezuela would control tremendous resources. Venezuela is potentially rich in oil, iron ore, timber, and in agricultural production. It was bled white by corruption and dictatorship in the past, but it has great natural wealth. Venezuela is a land of contrasts, but it is also a land of hope and opportunity for freedom. Venezuela represents a bastion of strength in the Caribbean for the democracies. Cuba is the Communist spearhead. It is the base for political penetration, Communist penetration in this hemisphere, and if Venezuela can be overwhelmed by Communist subversion from Cuba, the Caribbean could become a Communist sea. Every Central

American republic would be endangered. The Alliance for Progress could literally be destroyed. The energies of the people and the resources of the entire area would be dissipated in efforts to meet subversion or attack, dissipated in fear and in political chaos rather than used to build a progressive and equitable society. Fear and uncertainty could paralyze the leadership of all the Caribbean should Venezuela fall to the Communists.

We cannot afford to lose any more battles in Latin America. And we must make it crystal clear that we do not intend to lose, that we are prepared to put huge resources into this struggle. We should make it clear and precise, too, that those who are friendly partners of the United States and fulfill the commitments of the Alliance for Progress, the commitments of *Puerta del Este*, will receive our fullest assistance and support. Our Latin American neighbors must also understand that we are determined, in fact, to help only those nations and peoples who are willing to chart a course of progressive social and economic change. It is one thing to carry on normal diplomatic relations with governments that may not meet the standards of the Alliance for Progress. I can understand the requirements, the needs of our government in that respect. But we have no obligation — indeed we have no right — to use American taxpayers' money to give financial support to governments that refuse to cooperate under the terms of the Alliance.

There is a tendency in government to adjust to any given set of circumstances, and in recent months we have accommodated ourselves, regrettably, to military juntas which violate the standards of the Alliance and suppress democratic institutions. A case in point is Peru. I submit that we weaken the Alliance for Progress when we cooperate with any military junta that has overthrown a constitutional government and has repudiated a free election. I say this as a friend of this Administration. And I say nothing here that I have not said in the highest councils of our own government. The Peruvian junta has yet to fulfill the political and the economic reforms required by the Alliance. The Alliance for Progress will be a mockery to the Peruvian people until political freedom and free elections are restored.

Now in sharp contrast to the developments in Peru and, regrettably, in the Argentine, is the program of our sister republic to the south across the Rio Grande. In Mexico a proud and vigorous leadership has been, for two generations, carrying through its own social and economic revolution of significant proportions. Yet this revolution has been impeded, has been slowed down, by mis-

understandings and suspicion and distrust between our two peoples. It was shocking to discover how little a citizen of the United States really knows about the character and achievements of the modern Mexican people. And it was equally shocking and distressing to learn how little is understood in Mexico, in high and low places, about the growth and the change in American institutions in the 20th century. Sometimes it seems that we in the United States have been living in a kind of dream world, and bad dreams, too, in which the only Mexicans we have known were the ignorant and slovenly villains of the old Hollywood movie. And perhaps in Mexico they have been living with another bad dream in which 19th century United States robber barons flaunt their wealth in the faces of the poor — as they are pictured in one of the colorful, propaganda-saturated Diego Rivera murals in Mexico City. We have not fully understood and appreciated the intelligence and maturity of the present Mexican leadership, and I fear that they in turn have not fully understood the extent to which the 19th century capitalist economy of the United States has evolved into the pluralistic, humanitarian, and progressive society of the 1960s, nor that we have humanized the economy. They do not, I think, fully understand the role which private investment must play in their own continued progress.

While we in the United States may not have realized the grave problems which a relatively limited amount of arable land forces upon the Mexicans, I am constrained to say that I feel the Mexicans have not fully grasped the significance of our highly productive system of privately-owned family farms, backed up by voluntary associations and cooperatives. There is room for a more intensive and broader exchange of ideas among the agriculturalists and the economists of our two countries. And it is so important.

But the Alliance for Progress is being accepted in Mexico as a serious statement of cooperative intention by the United States. In fact, this week the Mexican labor movement will sponsor a three-day conference of more than 2,000 representatives of organized labor in Mexico to discuss, to better understand, and to implement the Alliance for Progress. I went to the people in Mexico — not just to the governments, but to the *campesinos*, the farmers, and to the workers — and asked them to try to understand a little more of what we are attempting to do, to study it, to come to their own conclusions, to join it. Without exception there was a favorable response. As I said to them, if it is not working in your behalf, then make it do so, because it is for you, and the only way you can make

it perform is to understand it and have something to say about it. I understand that after this three-day conference, the free labor movement in Mexico will sponsor an international conference of all of the Latin American countries designed to improve and strengthen the Alliance for Progress.

The Mexicans are accepting this Alliance as a serious effort and they recognize, in the programs we are supporting in their country and the personnel we are sending there to work with them, that we mean business. There is nothing quite so conducive to friendship and understanding, to overcoming inherited prejudices, as the opportunity for two peoples and two nations to work together for their common good. And the Alliance for Progress, fortunately, permits us an even closer interchange of ideas and cooperative effort with this mature and growing democracy on our southern borders.

The Alliance for Progress cannot succeed unless it receives the cooperation of Mexico and Venezuela, in this area called the Caribbean. I know there are times that we are disgruntled with Mexico. Sometimes she does not do everything we want her to do. But this is a proud country, with a pride in its history — a country that still smarts over the Mexican War and other United States affronts of the past. We need to let the Mexicans know that we are not proud of all of our past actions. But, above all, we need to understand that Mexico represents a modern political democracy in this hemisphere, if not always to our fashion and design. Without Mexico's help and cooperation, our efforts can be only partially successful. Finally, in Mexico as in Venezuela and throughout Latin America, the rural areas will be the decisive battlefield of democracy versus totalitarianism. The war will be fought out on the plateaus, in the mountains, in the back country. We have tended to assume it would be fought out in the cities. But the main battlefield is in the rural areas. The announced objective of the International Communist Party apparatus — announced in 1952 and forgotten by practically every American — is to win the struggle in the rural areas and they have been hard at work in these areas. In the capitals of Latin America, excellent work is beginning in housing, in education, in tax, and fiscal reforms. But out in the country the *campesinos* — the peasants, the country people, the farmers — are often being neglected. We must put a higher priority on rural development in the Alliance. We are just now beginning. We have too many people running many of these projects who do not even know what a farm looks like. We have become a sophisticated,

industrialized, urbanized society, and we have a difficult time relating our experience to their current problems. Remember that more than half of the Latin Americans live in the rural areas. Remember that these people can barely scratch out an existence. In the United States of America 9% of the people feed the rest of us — the greatest productivity of agriculture the world has ever known. In Latin America the problem of adequate food is a major day-by-day problem for millions and millions of people. But we are having trouble finding people who know how to teach the *campesinos* the kind of farming that they need. We are too mechanized, too modern. We must find such men and put them to work raising the standard of living of those farm families to increase the available food supply and to help build private democratic institutions which can become the underpinning of a broader, more representative democracy. The *Alianza* must see to it that agricultural credit on reasonable terms is provided instead of the present system of 30% and 40% and 50% interest, which is commonplace, where you have to pay back in three to six months. Our own farmers could not survive under those terms. We have to help — to see that there is good seed, fertilizer, and necessary machinery. We must provide supervised credit, working in cooperation with them, so that the loans are made to encourage profitable farming. I mean that we must encourage the proven institutions of purchasing and marketing farm cooperatives on a scale that we have not yet achieved.

Up until two years ago our government did not have a single person working on farm cooperatives overseas. I dragged this fact out of a witness from the State Department, and I asked why. The answer was quite simple and is a matter of public record. It was then the policy of our government not to encourage the development of farm cooperatives in the United States, and if we encouraged them abroad, the word might get back; therefore, our people had orders not to encourage their development abroad. I strongly believe that there can be no adequate rural development in Latin America without purchasing and marketing cooperatives. Land and capital are simply too fragmented among the *campesinos*. Either collectivism or cooperation will have to be utilized in agriculture. And only within the last 18 months have we launched any effort to stimulate cooperative activity throughout the world. But now we are beginning.

We must also see to it that farm-to-market roads are constructed. We do not always have to build four lane concrete highways. What we need are plain gravel, farm-to-market roads. There are no big cars to drive on them in these rural areas. We need roads for carts

and donkeys, oxen, horses, perhaps trucks. The farmer's produce has to get to market. Our ambassador to Panama, Joseph Farland, for example, understood this clearly. He knew that if you are going to improve the economy, you have to be able to cut back into the forest and get the food out and down where the people can buy it. Today, thanks to his persistence, the little Indian farmer in the mountains of Panama is supplying fruits and vegetables and other products to the Panama Canal Zone. He has a market. They whacked that road out of the woods — a plain old country road, the kind my granddaddy used to work on when he worked out his taxes in South Dakota, with one of those scoops and one horse. At this stage such a road is a great advance for the *campesinos*. It has tripled the income (that one road) of every farm vegetable producer along the road at a cost of only a few thousand dollars.

We need also to launch a massive attack on rural illiteracy in Latin America — not only upon the illiteracy of being unable to read or write, but the illiteracy of being unable to understand the machine. We need to attack rural illiteracy. We do not need to build steel mills all over the world. If the Russians want to build steel mills, let them build steel mills. If the mills work, the local political leaders will claim that they built them. If they do not work, they can blame the Russians. What is more, most of these countries cannot pay for steel mills, and we do not have the money to finance a steel mill for everyone. We do have the capacity to train people to be teachers. Illiteracy is now so deep and pervasive that it is even extraordinarily difficult to spread the technical knowledge that we already have an improved agricultural production.

Until we break the back of this huge problem of rural poverty and backwardness in the Latin American countries, city slums will continue to fill up with the refugees from that poverty. Why did 400,000 people come from the mountains of Peru to Lima, to live in filth? I saw them; I was there. Because it is worse in the mountains. At least they thought if they got within sight of the capital, somebody would have to take care of them. And somebody did, because the Communists were down there to organize them. Why did 350,000 people come out of the mountains in Chile and live in the slums of Santiago? When I was there I was told that it might be dangerous to go there. It was not dangerous; it was a challenge to see these people, to go into their hovels, to extend them the hand of friendship, to let them know that this country of ours cares about them. Until something definitive can be done to alleviate rural poverty, these cities in Latin America will continue to be inundated with

human beings who are sick, illiterate, unhappy and, ultimately, a danger to the political structure. Throughout vast areas this situation exists.

Latin America, despite a score of great cities, remains largely rural. It remains essentially Indian in country after country. Indeed, in huge blocks of rural territory the character of the life is closer to the 17th century than to the 20th. Throughout vast areas there is no credit whatsoever, no roads, no electricity, no machinery, no sanitation, and little or no water. Men working with the ox and a wooden plow can be seen in fields a mere 20 or 30 minutes drive out of the many large and thoroughly modern capitals. Rural poverty is everywhere. Now these are the people whom President Rivera of El Salvador described to me as "the forgotten ones" — families that science and government have passed by, people left in grinding toil, often in hunger, constantly in danger of death from a score of diseases that modern medicine has conquered in the more advanced nations. These are the families who typically lose their children to dysentery, to cholera, to smallpox, and pneumonia. These are the people who can be truly described as enslaved by their poverty. The *Alianza*, as they call it, can be and should be their emancipation proclamation. It should be their charter of hope. These teeming millions of rural people must be brought to understand its full meaning. We shall lose their support if we permit the Alliance to become a device to make the rich richer and let the poor grow poorer or to make the cities become more affluent and the countryside more poverty-stricken. The *Alianza* must be a program in which they, the *campesinos*, recognize that they have a great stake, and can see the hope of their future.

We of the United States can and should bring a message which strikes home to these people, by telling them about our economic and social revolution including our determined attack on racial discrimination. Let me assure you, racial bigotry is intolerable in these areas. The United States of America bears a handicap that is extraordinarily difficult so long as we carry the stain of racial discrimination and prejudice. No matter how much money we lend, no matter how much technical assistance we give, until we can clean up our own house and treat people as equals, regardless of national origin, race, color, or creed — until we can do that, we are dragging a millstone around our necks in our foreign policy. We are making an effort, and we are making progress. We need to tell our Latin American friends about our efforts to improve ourselves — about our continuing attack on racial discrimination, about what we are

doing in public health and housing, about our historic achievement in popular education, in the development of free trade unions, our voluntary associations, our rural cooperatives. What I am really saying is, let us not be afraid to be ourselves. We do not need to boast; we just need to know what we are, and to convey this.

The country people of Latin America do not ask for much. They know that they cannot be catapulted into the atomic age overnight. But they will be ever grateful, and they will have made gigantic progress, if they are able to lift themselves, with our help, from the 17th century to the level on which the United States was in the first part of the 20th century. They are living much as Columbus and the conquistadors found them in vast areas of Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. If we can, in a few years, help these neighbors of ours to reach the general level of health, diet, and education that our midwestern rural families were able to achieve 50, 60 or even 75 years ago, we shall have carried through one of the great historic achievements of all mankind. And we shall have done the maximum possible to ensure the eventual triumph of constitutional government throughout Latin America. Only from the plateau of a basically healthy and progressive economy, complemented by a strong free-trade union movement, can the superstructure of a 20th century democratic state be raised.

The encouraging growth and development of free trade unions in Latin America deserves a comment. Much remains to be done to strengthen these unions, to help them rid their ranks of Communist agents. But important progress is being made. For better than 20 years the Communists had free run of the labor unions, as they had free run of the campuses of the Latin American universities. In all too many instances they have had free run of the pages of the press and the radio airwaves. I have seen newspapers in Latin America — out-and-out Communist newspapers — in which American industry continued to carry ads, financing them in the name of profit, for a long time. Only in the last two or three years have we made any systematic attempt to help the friends of freedom in Latin America fight back. I was in Ecuador a year ago when the free trade unions were fighting for their very lives — when most of the opposition unions were Communist dominated. Do you know that not a single newspaper in Quito, Ecuador — the capitol city — would carry the report of the free trade union conference?

The editors, you see — all of whom were capitalists — were afraid of Communist reprisals. And I saw our ambassador, representing the richest country on the face of the earth, tied up in such bureaucratic red tape, that he could not even offer them the money

to buy an ad to publish the resolutions of their convention of free trade unions in the press so that the people could be told. Our British friends have a little more flexibility. They had the means available for their ambassador. Ours had to get four clearances from Washington before anything could be done.

I am happy to say that things are changing. Hundreds of Latin American workers have been trained in collective bargaining, in parliamentary law, in union organizing activity by American trade unionists. The American people should know that the AFL-CIO and its affiliated unions have contributed manpower, much money, organizers, and technicians in the struggle against Communist infiltration in the trade union movements in Latin America — yes, and elsewhere. The Latin American free trade unions are gaining because of this, but they need more help, and, frankly, they need more friendly attention from all walks of American life. There is a need for greater understanding on the part of government and industry as to the importance of a free labor sector in these developing countries. Of course, free trade unions are more difficult to bargain with than Communists-dominated unions, and, therefore, sometimes free trade unions are not given the help that they ought to have. The Communist-dominated union is a political instrument, sometimes difficult, sometimes cooperative, depending on what the party line is. I would only admonish our American business friends to remember that in the long run you are better off to bargain with a tough free trade union.

May I conclude with this thought. Most of the news in the United States about Latin America is the news of violence, disorder, deficits, assassinations, inflation, and revolution. This is what we print. This is what we read. This is why we are so unbelievably ignorant of what is really going on, and why we know so little of what they are doing. But we need to know the Latin American of today, not the character out of the fiction book of yesterday. We need to understand that there is a growing middle class in these countries. We need to know of its passionate devotion to constitutional government. We need to know that the Indian in the back country is a good farmer if he is given a chance and a good worker in the factories if he is trained. And we need to know that great cities are being erected and tremendous industrial development is under way. Health centers are being built. Whole new universities are coming up. In other words, we need to know some of the good news. Why not occasionally look with pride and respectful attention on the achievements of these sister republics? I had many a man

and woman in Latin American countries say to me, "Senator, all you *Norteamericanos* hear about us is our weaknesses, our trouble. You don't ever hear what we are trying to do." Now maybe it is not true, but this is what they think. I remember my visit in Ecuador right after the little revolution that took place there. The paper in Miami said Arosemena, the new President of Ecuador, had Communist leanings. I read in the press on the East coast only a few days ago about the election in the Dominican Republic: "Leftist Bosch elected." Well, now, let us understand this. If a leader is not a little bit left of center in Latin America, he cannot be elected. And "leftist" to us means one thing, and to Latin Americans something quite different. All too often we brand people before we even know what they are. That is a good way to drive them to the radical left — and the Communists.

More than our money, these peoples in the areas of Latin America want our respect. They want our understanding. They are proud and sensitive people. They are idealistic. Often the intangibles — the non-economic, the friendly smile or the appreciative word — can mean more than a big loan in winning cooperation. Isn't it interesting that neither the American League nor the National League has ever found it within its means to send one single baseball team to Latin America where baseball is king! Isn't it interesting that our own government, up until recent days, never sent a first class athletic team to Latin America? These people want the best. When the Russians send athletes, they send the best. We ought to do the same. And we ought to send our finest students, our best artists, our most competent teachers. Give them the best that we have. The people need to know that we, the people of the United States, care about them and their families, respect them and want to work side by side with them. It is in the people that we have our strength. Governments come and go. Our direct contact with the people through spiritual, cultural, business, labor, agricultural, professional, and *educational* organizations — and I underscore educational — will establish a continuing friendship and communication. The people know that there is no quick, magic answer to their problem. What they need is hope — the assurance that things will be better. There is really nothing that we can do in a year or two that can raise the standard of living in Latin America enough to give them what they really deserve, but we can give them the assurance that the United States, as a good neighbor, is not here just for today or for a year or two, but is with them "for the duration". A year ago I heard some responsible people say that

the only reason we are interested in Latin America is because we are worried about Castro. There was some truth in that. But when Castro is gone, there will still be the problems and the challenges of Latin America before us. We do have, as free men and women, a proper concern for the expansion of the areas of freedom so they may encompass more people. Our other concern is that of national self-interest. It is a fact that if communism should take over vast areas of Latin America, our security would be directly threatened. Our problems would be more difficult. We could not tolerate such a mortal threat to the existence of our nation. We have, therefore, an enlightened self-interest in seeking to establish and maintain a favorable environment in which our ideals of freedom — the common ideals of the peoples of this hemisphere — can grow and flourish. Whatever may have been the cause of our renewed interest in Latin America, that interest must not be permitted to wane. It must be activated, encouraged, and sustained. I cannot believe that America's international efforts can hope to be very successful in Africa and Asia if we fail in the Western Hemisphere.

The American revolution continues here and elsewhere — in South America, in Central America and Mexico, and it is the good news of our time. We have revolted against foreign domination. We have revolted against the exploitation of race by race and man by man. We have revolted against the exploitation of the poor by the wealthy. The goals which we have achieved for ourselves in these revolutions we now seek to help our Latin American friends achieve. In the Alliance for Progress we are exporting our own revolution.

Like all of our successful revolutions, the revolution against the old order in Latin America will take many years of anguish and pain and effort. The American Negro has not been fully emancipated, even in a century. He continues to be the victim of discrimination and prejudice. In a five or a ten year period the old order in Latin America cannot be fully replaced by functioning, liberal, and solvent democracies. But the great initial thrust — the beginning — is being given through the *Alianza*, just as the first momentous breakthrough of Lincoln gave the initial impetus in this great nation to the movement toward true equality of opportunity for all Americans.

The fires have been lighted in Latin America and no one is going to put them out. The *campesinos* and the slum dwellers of Latin America form a force that is moving irresistably toward an overthrow of the institutions which have failed them. There is great power in this movement. Is it not ironical that a government

of the people, by the people, and for the people can fail at times to understand the power of the plain people? We tend to think too much in terms of the power of the atom, the power of our nuclear deterrent. What about the power of our pronouncement of freedom? What about the power of free people working together? We are powerful; the only question is whether the powerful forces of democracy in North and Latin America are moving along the paths of constructive change with sufficient wisdom, intelligence, determination, and rapidity. I am an optimist. I am also, I trust, a careful observer. The Communists are working hard to capture the Latin American revolution, just as they captured the Cuban revolution. But we have roused ourselves. We have seen, in the struggles of the "forgotten ones" of whom President Rivera spoke, a reflection of our own great struggles for freedom. At long last we have remembered our heritage. We have decided that our revolution will remain unfinished just as long as the western hemisphere remains in a real sense half slave and half free. There is no turning back. We are committed. We are in the battle. And we are in to stay.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

No. 22

THE UNFINISHED REVOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last month I was privileged to deliver the annual Sidney Hillman lecture at the University of Minnesota.

My remarks concerned an area of the world which today hangs in the balance between freedom and totalitarianism—Latin America. I discussed some of the problems, opportunities, and challenges of the nations in the central and southern part of this hemisphere.

The University of Minnesota arranged to record my Sidney Hillman lecture of January 3, and sent to me a written transcript. I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNFINISHED REVOLUTION

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

It is a challenging opportunity to participate in the Sidney Hillman lecture series. I knew Sidney Hillman, and I knew him well. I knew him as a respected and gifted leader of men, a labor leader, as a good citizen, as a dedicated patriot. His life was the fulfillment of the unfinished business of democracy. He sought to give people greater opportunity. He sought the realization of true equality for all people under freedom.

I address myself tonight to "The Unfinished Revolution"—the American Revolution that began in the 18th century, that has become contagious, a revolution that spreads throughout the world. I do not speak of the counterrevolution—the revolution of reaction of Communist totalitarianism—but rather of our revolution, the democratic revolution that seeks greater freedom and greater opportunity for all mankind. I was forewarned by one of my associates that possibly the word "revolution" is out of place in the comfortable surroundings of mid-America, but I truly believe that we of the United States—and particularly we of this generation—ought to sing forth the great melody and the lyrics of the American Revolution. Too few people know about it, here or abroad, and it is our responsibility to know it and to speak of it.

America's revolution

A hundred years ago the great President Lincoln unleashed a second great American revolution—a revolution of political and social equality. It was documented in his Emancipation Proclamation—the charter of freedom for a whole people. It was the mighty whip that struck down the inhuman institution of slavery. Yet though that proclamation was ratified by fire and sword, a century later there are those that still resist it, and repudiate even in our times the true meaning of that great document. The exploitation of man by fellow man, the denial of constitutional rights of American citizens, will not be ended by a public statement by one as great as Lincoln's—nor even by the ordeal of a terrible civil war. Only through several generations of constant, persistent effort, and daring leadership have we been able even to approach the promise of the proclamation. That effort continues to this very hour, and it will continue until the last vestige of discrimination based upon race, creed, or color has vanished from the face of America.

There are, in fact, three great revolutions which have dominated our history. The first, a revolution against foreign domination, the Revolution of Independence, 1776. The second, to which I have alluded, was the revolution against the inhumanity of the slavery system in the Civil War, and the third more contemporary, was the peaceful revolution of the 20th century, the economic and social revolution that we have witnessed under the administrations of men like Theodore Roosevelt and his Square Deal, Woodrow Wilson and his New Freedom, and Franklin Roosevelt and his New Deal. In this revolution the American people, particularly the workers and the farmers, were successful through the democratic process in achieving a government more responsive to their needs and their wants. These revolutions have succeeded in creating a system which has made

the greatest advances in man's history toward freedom from the tyranny of autocratic government, from the lash of poverty, from the fear and the prejudice of ignorance, and the savagery of the exploitation of man by man. We have, at least in this century, popularized our politics and humanized our economy.

In recent years we have come to understand and to realize that the competition between the totalitarian forces and those of the free world cannot be measured solely in terms of military strength or gross national product. It is also a conflict of ideology and philosophy, a combat between two radically indifferent revolutions.

Two years ago the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, in cooperation with many leaders in this hemisphere, charted a vast new program for the extension of this democratic revolution. There is, in fact, a new emancipation proclamation calling for the freedom of millions of impoverished, illiterate, and oppressed peoples throughout Latin America.

The Alliance for Progress is a bold challenge to those who cry, with the Communists and other extremists, that mankind cannot be freed from his bonds of ignorance and poverty without the violent and bloody destruction of the existing system and the imposition of a dictatorship.

The Alianza para Progreso is a cooperative venture undertaken in the belief that the processes of constitutional democracy can move sufficiently swiftly and decisively to accomplish vital, urgent, social, and economic changes. I am committed to the proposition, and this Nation is committed to the proposition, that change—radical change, revolutionary change—can come through orderly, peaceful processes.

The Alliance is more than a proclamation, and it is far more than a declaration of intent. It is, and must be, a program of action. Its success requires the allegiance not only of those who are motivated by democratic ideals; it demands men and women of decision—people who can make decisions, people who are committed to action. If it is to succeed its leaders must have a sense of urgency. They must be adventurous. They must be daring. They must be willing to risk, making mistakes. President Wilson and I were visiting earlier this evening about our observations of the Latin American scene, and we agreed that the greatest problem in the Latin American area is the delay in action, the failure to act. Action must be the byword, the watchword. We must not hesitate to act, even when we are not absolutely sure of all the data because to delay is to invite defeat. The problems the Alliance has is designed to overcome will not yield to any ordinary timid or conventional effort.

We must understand that there would be trouble, violence, and disorder in Latin America, even if there were no Communists and Castroites. The truth is that Castro's communism is the effect rather than the cause of the deep discontent that has overwhelmed vast areas of the hemisphere to the south. As one observer puts it, most Latin Americans were born on dead-end streets, and feel that they are doomed to live there until the day they die. Lives of grinding poverty and voiceless desperation are commonplace; I have seen it. Latin America is dynamite, and some of it has already exploded right on our doorstep. Castro and his Communists are exploiting the tensions and the troubles of a corrupt and dying order. The destruction of Castro and his regime in Cuba will not alone cure Latin America's illness, for Latin America is very sick. And it has been sick for many, many years. Sick because of its own failures, sick in part because of our neglect.

Aid to Latin America

Just a few figures underscore the depth of the problems of Latin America. Just prior to the time of the Alliance for Progress, Latin America could be measured in terms of over 200 million people in an area two and a half times as large as the United States of America. This continent had received less than

3 percent of the total economic aid of the United States from 1945 to 1960. Compare this with Europe, which had received 41 percent of our aid, to the Far East with 17½ percent, to the Near East with almost 12 percent. Two percent of the people in Latin American countries, if you put them in an aggregate, own more than 50 percent of the total wealth. Two-thirds to three-fourths of the people live in unbelievable, abject poverty. Furthermore, the Latin American population is exploding—it doubled from 1920 to 1956. It is increasing at an overall rate of more than 2½ percent a year, and in some of the Central American Republics that I recently visited it runs as high as 3½ to 4 percent. The life span is being extended, but life expectancy throughout South and Central America remains less than 45 years, while here in the United States it is 70.

The problems illustrated by these statistics are not surface problems. They are not peripheral. They are deep, and they are enduring. They are caked in the centuries-old hard crust of tradition and privilege. They demand a coordinated attack by the most daring and ingenious men of our times, and with a commitment of human and material resources far beyond anything that we have contemplated thus far. The commitment of resources, human and material, we have made thus far can only be judged as a beginning. I fear that unless we do far more we shall lose all that we have done up to now.

Such a commitment cannot and should not be undertaken by the United States alone. We all need to be reminded again and again that the Alliance for Progress is an Alliance. It is a partnership. We are only a part of it, and if that Alliance is to succeed, we—and by we I mean all of us in this hemisphere must mobilize and commit the resources of all of the nations of this hemisphere on a heroic scale. And we can well ask our prosperous friends and compatriots of Western Europe to make their contribution too, because the battle for freedom is fought on a worldwide front.

Personal report

Now let me report to you on what I saw this past month. I am pleased to be able

to say that the Alliance for Progress, which I observed last year and upon which I commented rather critically, has now started to move. It has begun rather well. It is now more than a document, more than a Presidential pronouncement, more than publicity. It is more than a plan. It is now taking shape in political and economic reform, and in projects. It can be seen in new housing. I have seen thousands of new homes for lower middle income people, for the poor, and for the poorest of the poor. Progress can be measured in new schools, in new health facilities, in new textbooks, new roads, new industries. There is progress, and there is an Alliance. The Alliance for Progress is no longer just a phrase. It is beginning to live.

But apathy and inertia remain very strong in many parts of Latin America. The very immensity, the overwhelming, the almost staggering scale of the social and economic problems discourages many. The forces of privilege, the entrenched oligarchies, and they have them as well as the Communists, fight every forward movement. We have, indeed, come to grips with a monster—almost a prehistoric monster—the corroded and ugly product of the accumulated oppression and evil habits of centuries.

But, my fellow Americans, we have joined the fight. We have joined the battle with this monster, and I return from my second visit to Latin America in the past 2 years more encouraged and ever more determined. Our recent travels took us into Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, to El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico. I sense a growing recognition this year, among the key leadership with whom I met in Latin America, that the Alliance for Progress is indeed a cooperative operation. There is increasing understanding that local capital, local initiative, local planning, local sacrifice, and hard work are required, and that the United States should not be expected to, nor does it have any intention to either dominate the Alliance or to pay all the bills. I made this crystal clear to every head of state that I was privileged to meet. I addressed the Members of the Congress in Venezuela, the Congress in El Salvador and the Senate in the Republic of Mexico.

I sat down by the hours with their leaders, with their planners, with their economists, stressing always that we are a partner, but we have no intention of paying all the bills. We are demanding reform. We insist upon a degree of integrity in administration. We are not going to permit our capital or our manpower to be frittered away in useless or ill-planned efforts. We are taking an active role in promoting fiscal and political and economic reform. We are offering the best of our technical assistance, and we are loaning important amounts of capital. When I hear people talk about "giveaways," I say that this talk is a disservice to our country and to those who are recipients of the aid. These are loans. Many times they are what we call long-term, low-interest loans, but they are repayable, and our Latin American friends are repaying on previous loans, just as our European friends have.

New partnership

There is a healthy relationship as a result of such frank talk. A genuine feeling of partnership is growing between our representatives and the Latin American leadership. I might point out that North Americans, as we are called, are generally respected and liked. We are not, of course, enlisted in a popularity contest. We are a member of the Alliance because we believe that this is essential to our national security and to our allies. But it is a fact that President Kennedy is a very popular man in Latin America. Of course, it is still fashionable for demagogues to profess a distrust and an animosity towards the United States. In

my opinion, however, such professions fall into the category of political clichés which have outrun political reality. I found nothing but the warmest and most enthusiastic welcome. In the drawing rooms of presidents and in the dust of the slums, the people pressed to tell me how deeply they appreciated the initiative that our country has taken, and the action of President Kennedy. People came up to me almost in an emotional frenzy explaining in their way how grateful they were for the Alliance for Progress. These were often people who could neither read nor write, but they understand. At long last somebody cared.

They demonstrated their affection and respect for the tough-minded men and women that we have representing us today in the day-in and day-out contacts in these countries—our ambassadors, the embassy staffs, our aid missions and our Peace Corps; yes, and our business, professional, and labor representatives. Our businessmen do a good job in these countries. Sometimes I feel that American business fails to tell its own good story. We are not exploiters. In the main our people are considerate, fair, pay well, and establish high standards. I was very proud of the Peace Corps. The men and women of the Peace Corps are not all young, but they are youthful in spirit and conviction. They are doing an amazing job.

I wish you could have seen the group of nurses whom we met in Honduras, one of the countries in Central America in the greatest need of help. I met a dear lady who was in her sixties, from the State of Washington, working up in the hills. She was working like a corpsman, running a health institute. A little mountain health center. Such men and women in the Peace Corps, in the AID, and diplomatic missions, are doing great things for other people and our country. We can be mighty proud of these Americans. They are wiping out the stereotype of the ugly American. They are fine, first-class, trained, alert, and hard working. I speak of all of these people, with few exceptions. There are few second-raters. And the Latin Americans understand, by the high caliber of our present representation in their countries, that we do respect them, that we are in earnest, that we do mean business, and that we are serious about this Alliance.

A few years ago I could not have made this statement, because it was a regrettable fact that in all too many instances the Foreign Service of the State Department of the United States did not send its top people to Latin American countries. One singular accomplishment of President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk, is that top-grade people, with few exceptions, are being selected for these important posts. This word gets around.

I was pleased also to see the caliber of the men who are coming to leadership in the countries that I visited. There is a kind of new spirit, a "new frontier" spirit, if you will, about many of these new leaders. They are young, most of them. They are educated, they are trained, they are committed, and they are vigorous. I met young men trained at this university, in the fields of education, in the fields of agriculture, and health—proud to be graduates of the University of Minnesota. They were in key cabinet positions in government, men in their thirties who are prepared to do battle with man's ancient enemies of disease and poverty. There is no spirit of manana in these governments. These men had some good experiences here in our universities and they have carried those experiences back home. For the most part they have come to have a respect and an admiration for our political and economic institutions. We need to back such men, and we need to encourage them.

Progress for people

Our vital interests lie not in the simple accomplishment of higher living standards in Latin America, but in the political stability which can be based only on economic and social progress for the masses of the people, and in their acceptance of the principle of orderly change in government. We must do more to encourage the growth of nongovernmental, democratic institutions—not only through our Government, but through the intensified efforts of U.S. business management, educators, doctors, and other professional groups, our trade unions, our farm cooperatives. Voluntarism, as we know it, the complex of voluntary agencies that we have, the many organizations to which we belong—is not a tradition in the Spanish culture. But it can be a healthy addition to that culture. We can do much more than we are doing to encourage private initiative, private investment. We ought to be proud of our private investment system, not apologize for it.

There are many hopeful signs that I can report to you in Latin America. The movement for economic and eventually political integration of Central America is one. It is gathering momentum. Yes, there is a powerful Common Market in Western Europe, but there is a Common Market also in Central America. At the Central American Bank headquarters at Tegucigalpa, Honduras, are men like Enrique Delgado, men who have, many of them, been trained and educated here—men who are devoted to the ideal of an economic and political transformation of Central America. There is every reason to believe that the 11 million Central Americans can succeed in interconnecting their highways and their communication systems, their electrical power systems, in sharing their industrial and agricultural planning, in lowering their barriers to trade.

Would you believe it that in these little republics roads will run out from the capital city to a national boundary and quit. ECLA, the Economic Commission for Latin America, has made a proposal—a modest proposal running into a few million dollars—to connect the roads among the six Central American Republics. I think it will cost \$10 million, and by that one effort alone, which can be accomplished in 1 year, you will have created a network of highways that will permit commerce between the nations. Imagine a network of highways that will permit commerce between the nations. Imagine if the roads in Minnesota stopped short of the Iowa border, and the Iowa roads stopped short of the Minnesota border.

There are countries in Central America which have not 1 railroad system, but 36, all separate, all different. Five and six different gages of railroad track can be found in one little country. No telecommunications connect the capitals. When you call from San Salvador to San Jose, which is less than 45 minutes by plane, you go through Miami or New York. No decent telephonic communications connect the capitals. There are huge regional hydroelectric power possibilities. One country now may have a shortage of power and the next may have an excess of power, and there are no interconnections. What a waste.

Now the leaders of Central America understand that this is a waste, and they are moving to interconnect roads, railroads, power, telecommunications.

All I say to my Government is "Hurry up!" These people want action. I sometimes have a feeling that while we are aware that they have great needs, in our own comfortable surroundings, we cannot really feel that they are urgent.

Central American Common Market

Fortunately, we in the United States are supporting this Central American initiative for a Central American Common Market. Minnesotans should be proud that Professor Marguet of the department of economics of this great university was the godfather, the inspiration for the Common Market of Central America. His widow is there in Guatemala City. He died speaking for it, working for it. So I felt a very personal involvement as I met with Pedro Delgado and his staff of the Central American Secretariat. Both we and they now have functioning regional institutions, manned by able people, working together effectively, and I trust rapidly, toward what promises to be an impressive achievement in the next several years. Our programs of economic and technical assistance must continue to emphasize economic and political integration in Central America. I intend to make it my business this year to see to it that priority is put upon regional integration, and that loans and projects that are designed for a country without any direct reference to what it will contribute to regional integration will take a lower priority. That message has already been conveyed to the high places of this Government.

The Central Americans know that economic integration is their basic hope for a higher standard of living. However, in South America, as contrasted with Central America, the development of a common market, or what they call a free trade area, and regional planning have faltered badly. The Latin American nations now face not only the united strength of the Soviet bloc, but also of Western Europe and its African partners. Individually, the countries of Latin America are weak, and they are in no posi-

tion to either compete or bargain with the stronger more prosperous, Western Europe, United States, or Japan. We can perform no greater service for our neighbors in the south than to insist that in their political and economic planning they now place a high priority on economic integration and joint planning. Cooperating together, joining together in some form of common market supported by international trade agreements, Latin America can become an economic power that can command respect in international market places.

We are also strongly encouraging a cooperative Central American effort in higher education. A strong beginning has been made. There is regional specialization, with universities opened now to students from the entire region for special disciplines. We have encouraged the spectacularly successful effort to put textbooks this year in the hands of every Central American first and second grader—the first new textbooks in some of these countries in 50 years. This is another beginning. The plan calls for low-cost, nonpropaganda-ridden textbooks, paperbacks, costing around 9, 10, or 11 cents apiece, for every schoolchild in Central America through the elementary grades. This is an *Allianza* project. We are identified with it. What a blessing. It is no use to build schools if you have no teachers or books. At long last we are beginning to understand that it is the books and the teachers that are even more important than the structures.

As for the university student bodies, just a quick comment. Student bodies in the countries in which I traveled, at least on this trip, appear to be growing somewhat more sophisticated as to Communist Party organization and techniques. Can you imagine students bringing down governments? Well, they do in these countries. They go on strike. They cause a whole university to close. They fire and hire professors at will. But slowly, subtly, but surely, changes are being made. I talked with Dr. Ignacio Chavez, the rector of the University of Mexico, which is a tremendous institution, some 55,000 or 56,000 regular students, another 20,000 preparatory students, a magnificent campus, and superb facilities. Dr. Chavez is one of the leading heart specialists of the world. He knows of our own university, and our own great heart hospital and medical school. He had many friends here on this campus. The professional student who never attends a class, but who can always be found in the leading ranks of the student riots and demonstrations, will either go to school and produce and get his grades, or get out. What a happy day that will be in Latin America. I shall summarize by saying that there appears to be a slow but steady rollback of Communist influence among the students and faculty of members of Latin America.

Communist efforts

Now this is not to say that the Communist Party is inactive or that it is not working in Latin America. It is, particularly through Fidel Castro's Cuba. Venezuela is its principal target in the Caribbean area. The Communists are working particularly hard in the rural areas throughout all of Latin America, where poverty is the deepest, where illiteracy and ignorance are the most prevalent, and where we have done the least. I cannot understand what is wrong with us. We have not been an industrialized nation so long; have we forgotten our rural background? Why are we so dedicated to building steel plants, and so unwilling to do a job in agriculture, where we excel? We have some competition in steel, but we have none in agriculture any place in the world. Poverty in the rural areas: this is the hunting ground for Mr. Castro's boys. While Castro himself has lost a great deal of prestige in recent months, the Communists have not relaxed their drive of subversion, propaganda and infiltration. I saw it in Venezuela. I wondered why a man

who was with us all the time was carrying a briefcase which he never opened.

I found later that he was carrying a sub-machinegun. Our Ambassador is carefully guarded. It is a unique experience to wake up and find gunmen protecting your hotel room. When you ask that it not be done, you are told that it is necessary. Terrorism, my fellow Americans, is the order of the day in parts of Latin America. But the governments of Latin America are much more aware today of the real Communist threat than a year or two ago, and more effective steps are being taken by democratically elected governments to curtail Cuban infiltration. Embassies have been closed to reduce Cuban propaganda and terrorism. It is now well recognized that the threat of communism is not its economic and social doctrine. The problem is that of combating a well-organized, disciplined, conspiratorial apparatus which does not hesitate at open and wholesale assassination. This requires effective policing, it requires courageous leadership and the loyalty of the security forces. This conspiratorial activity must be met head on.

But communism can finally be defeated only by producing obvious, constructive results through democratic processes—results that are so obvious that they need no interpretation and no publicity to be understood. Yes, results like new schools, broader land ownership, clean water, hospitals, roads, factories, and jobs. These are the building blocks of such an effort. Communism is strong in certain parts of Latin America principally because freedom and all that it represents is weak. Communism gains where the economy falters, and where leaders fail to lead. Now to be sure, economic progress must be planned across the board. But there must be more than just big plans. We need dramatic demonstrations of what can be accomplished under progressive democracy, and particularly where a dictator has been removed and a free democratic government has been established. For example, there is in the Dominican Republic a new President, President-elect Bosch, elected in a free election. Here is the opportunity to demonstrate, within but a few miles of Cuba, what a progressive democracy can mean for the people. We need a showcase of democratic achievement, and then we need to actively spread the good news. We can have people come and see it, as well as shout the bad news of Communist failures in Cuba. In other words, I submit we need to join the fight on every front—political, economic, propaganda, educational. Above all, we need to produce some demonstrations within the environment and culture of Latin America, that are dramatic and meaningful.

Challenge in Venezuela

Perhaps such a demonstration can be made in the Dominican Republic. Another can be made in Venezuela. It is quite obvious that the Communists have made Venezuela their next major objective in Latin America, and I call upon my Government and the American people to meet this Communist offensive head on and destroy it. The government of President Betancourt in Venezuela is a progressive government. It is open and friendly to the United States, vigorously supports us in all international councils.

It respects private property, private capital and investment. It encourages capital investment. And at the same time it sponsors the broadest social reforms and developments for its people. It has strong trade unions, rural cooperatives—all the things we know about in this great State of Minnesota. It is a government that is acting boldly, after years of corrupt government, in the fields of housing, health and education, and in rural development. The

Communists are determined to destroy this government because they know that if constitutional democracy can succeed in its program of social and economic development, communism in Latin America will have suffered a disastrous defeat. The stakes are high here. The Communists know it, and they are out to win. They have money and zealous people ready to fight. They have unwitting, yet equally zealous, partners in the extreme right wing who fight Betancourt as viciously as the Communists.

The question is, do we in the United States fully appreciate the significance of this battle? Where are our zealous people? Are we really using our strength and resources to win? Because mark it down now, this is a battle. A Communist government in Venezuela would control tremendous resources. Venezuela is potentially rich in oil, iron ore, timber, and in agricultural production. It was bled white by corruption and dictatorship in the past, but there is great natural wealth. Venezuela is a land of contrasts, but it is also a land of hope and opportunity for freedom. Venezuela represents a bastion of strength in the Caribbean for the democracies. Cuba is the Communist spearhead. It is the base for political penetration—Communist penetration in this hemisphere—and if Venezuela can be overwhelmed by Communist subversion from Cuba, the Caribbean could become a Communist sea. Every Central American Republic would be endangered. The Alliance for Progress would be literally destroyed. The energies of the people and the resources of the entire area would be dissipated in efforts to meet subversion or attack in fear and in political chaos, rather than in building a progressive and equitable society. Fear and uncertainty could paralyze leadership of all the Caribbean should Venezuela fall to the Communists. We cannot afford to lose any more battles in Latin America. And we must make it crystal clear that we do not intend to lose, that we are prepared to put all of our resources in this struggle, if need be.

We should make it clear and precise, too, that those who are friendly partners of the United States and fulfill the commitments of the Alliance for Progress, the commitments of Puenta del Esta, will receive our fullest assistance and support. Our Latin

American neighbors must also understand that we are determined, in fact, to help only those nations and peoples who are willing to chart a course of progressive social and economic change. It is one thing to carry on normal diplomatic relations with governments that may not meet the standards of the Alliance for Progress. I can understand the requirements, the needs of our Government in that respect. But we have no obligation—indeed, we have no right—to use American taxpayers' money to support governments financially that refuse to cooperate under the terms of the Alliance.

There is a tendency in government to adjust to any given set of circumstances, and in recent months we have accommodated ourselves, regrettably, to military juntas which violate the standards of the Alliance and suppress democratic institutions. A case in point is Peru. I submit that we weaken the Alliance for Progress when we cooperate with a military junta that has overthrown a constitutional government, and has repudiated a free election. I say this as a friend of this administration. And I say nothing here that I have not said in the highest councils of our own Government. The Peruvian junta has yet to make the political and the economic reforms required by the Alliance. The Alliance for Progress will be a mockery to the Peruvian people until political freedom and free elections are restored.

Progress in Mexico

Now in sharp contrast to the developments in Peru and regrettably in the Argentine, is the program of our sister republic to the south across the Rio Grande. In Mexico a proud and vigorous leadership has been for two generations carrying through its own social and economic revolution, of significant proportions. Yet this revolution has been impeded, has been slowed down by misunderstandings and suspicion and distrust between our two peoples. It was shocking to discover how little a citizen of the United States really knows about the character and achievements of the modern Mexican people. And it was equally shocking and distressing to learn how little is understood in Mexico, in high and low places, about the growth and the change in American institutions in the 20th century. Sometimes it seems that we in the United States have been living in a kind of a dream world, and bad dreams, too, in which the only Mexicans we have known were the ignorant and slovenly villains of the old Hollywood movie. And perhaps in Mexico they have been living with another bad dream in which 19th century U.S. robber barons flaunt their wealth in the faces of the poor—as they are pictured in one of the colorful, propaganda-saturated Diego Rivera murals in Mexico City. We have not fully understood and appreciated the intelligence and maturity of the present Mexican leadership, and I fear that they in turn have not fully understood the extent to which the 19th century capitalist economy of the United States has evolved into the pluralistic, humanitarian and progressive society of the 1960's—that we have humanized the economy. Nor do they fully understand, I think, the role which private investment must play in their own continued progress.

While we in the United States may not have realized the grave problems which a relatively limited amount of arable land forces upon the Mexicans, I am constrained to say that I feel the Mexicans have not fully grasped the significance of our highly productive system of privately owned family farms, backed up by voluntary associations and cooperatives. There is room for some more intensive and broader exchange of ideas among the agriculturalists and the economists of our two countries. And it is so important.

But the Alliance for Progress is being accepted in Mexico as a serious statement of cooperative intention by the United States. In fact, this week the Mexican labor movement will sponsor a 3-day conference of over 2,000 representatives of organized labor in Mexico to discuss, to better understand, and to implement the Alliance for Progress. I went to the people, not just to the governments, but to the campesinos—the farmers—and to the workers, and asked them to try to understand a little more of what we are attempting to do, to study it, to come to their own conclusions, to join it. Without exception there was a favorable response. As I said to them, if it is not working in your behalf, then make it do so, because it is for you, and the only way you can make it perform is to understand it and have something to say about it. I understand that after this 3-day conference, the free labor movement in Mexico will sponsor an international conference of all of the Latin American countries designed to improve and strengthen the Alliance for Progress.

Finally, in Mexico as in Venezuela, and throughout Latin America, the rural areas will be the decisive battlefield of democracy versus totalitarianism. The war will be fought out on the plateaus, in the mountains, in the back country. We have tended to assume it would be fought out in the cities. But the main battlefield is in the rural areas. The announced objective of the international Communist Party apparatus—announced in 1952 and forgotten by practically every America, is to win the struggle in the rural areas and they've been hard at work in these areas. In the capitals of Latin America, excellent work is commencing in housing, in education, in tax, and fiscal reforms. But out in the country the campesinos—the peasants, the country people, the farmers—are often being neglected. We must put a higher priority on rural development in the Alliance. We are just now beginning. We have too many people that do not even know what a farm looks like running many of these projects. We have become a sophisticated, industrialized, urbanized society, and we have a difficult time relating our experience to their current problems. Remember that over half of the Latin Americans live in the rural areas. Remember that these people can barely scratch out an existence. In the United States of America 9 percent of the people feed the rest of us—the greatest productivity of agriculture the world has ever known. In Latin America the problem of adequate food is a major day-by-day problem for millions and millions of people. But we are having trouble finding people that know how to teach the campesinos the kind of farming that they need. We are too mechanized, too modern. We must find such men and put them to work in raising the standard of living of those farm families, to increase the available food supply, and to help build private democratic institutions, which can become the underpinning of a broader, more representative democracy. The Alliance must see to it that agricultural credit on reasonable terms is provided, instead of the present system of 30, 40, and 50 percent interest, which is commonplace, where you have to pay back in 3 to 6 months. Our own farmers could not survive under those terms. We have to help—to see that there is good seed, fertilizer, and necessary machinery. We must provide supervised credit, working in cooperation with them, so that the loans are made to encourage profitable farming. I mean that we must encourage the proven institutions, of purchasing and marketing farm cooperatives on a scale that we have not yet achieved.

Farm cooperatives

Up until 2 years ago your Government did not have a single person working on farm cooperatives overseas. I dragged this fact out of a witness from the State Department, and I asked, "Why?" The answer was quite simple, and is a matter of public record.

It was then the policy of our Government not to encourage the development of farm cooperatives in the United States, and if we encouraged them abroad the word might get back; therefore, our people had orders not to encourage their development abroad. I strongly believe that there can be no adequate rural development in Latin America without purchasing and production and marketing cooperatives. Land and capital are simply too fragmented among the campesinos. Either collectivism or cooperation will have to be utilized in agriculture. And only within the last 18 months have we launched any effort to stimulate cooperative activity throughout the world. But now we are beginning.

We must also see to it that farm-to-market roads are constructed. We do not always have to build four-lane concrete highways. What we need are plain, gravel, farm-to-market roads. There are no big cars to drive on them in these rural areas. We need roads for carts and donkeys, oxen, horses, and pickup trucks. The farmers' produce has to get to market.

Our Ambassador to Panama, Joseph Farland, for example, understood this clearly. He knew that if you are going to improve the economy, you have to be able to cut back into the forest and get the food out and down where they could buy it. Today, thanks to his persistence, the little Indian farmer in the mountains of Panama is supplying fruits and vegetables and other products to the Panama Canal Zone. He has a market. They whacked the road out of the woods—a plain old country road, the kind my granddaddy used to work on when he worked out his taxes in South Dakota, with one of those scoops and one horse. At this stage such a road is a great advance for the campesinos. It has tripled the income—that one road—of every farm vegetable producer along the road—at a cost of only a few thousand dollars.

Attack on illiteracy

We need also to launch a massive attack on rural illiteracy in Latin America—not only upon the illiteracy of being unable to read or write, but the illiteracy of being unable to understand the machine. We need to attack rural illiteracy. We do not need to build steel mills all over the world. If the Russians want to build steel mills, let them build them. If they work, the local political leaders will claim that they built them. If they do not work, they can blame the Russians. What is more, most of these countries cannot pay for steel mills, and we do not have the money to finance a steel mill for everyone. We do have the capacity to train people to be teachers. Illiteracy is now so deep and pervasive that it is extraordinarily difficult even to spread the technical knowledge that we already have on improved agricultural production.

Until we break the back of this huge problem of rural poverty and backwardness in the Latin American countries, city slums will continue to fill up with the refugees from that poverty. Why did 400,000 people come from the mountains of Peru to Lima, to live in filth? (I saw them; I was there.) Because it is worse in the mountains. At least they thought if they got within sight of the capitol, somebody would have to take care of them. And somebody did, because the Communists were down there to organize them. Why did 350,000 people come out of the mountains in Chile and live in the slums of Santiago? When I was there I was told that it might be dangerous to go there. It was not dangerous; it was a challenge to see these people, to get into their hovels to extend them the hand of friendship, to let them know that this country of ours cares about them. Until you can break the back of rural poverty these cities in Latin America will continue to be inundated with human

beings who are sick, illiterate, unhappy, and ultimately, a danger to the political structure. Throughout vast areas this situation exists.

We of the United States can and should bring a message which strikes home to these people, by telling them about our economic and social revolution, including our determined attack on racial discrimination. Let me assure you, racial bigotry is intolerable in these areas. The United States of America bears a handicap that is extraordinarily difficult, so long as we carry the stain of racial discrimination and prejudice. No matter how much money we loan, no matter how much technical assistance we give, until we can clear up our own house, and treat people as equals regardless of national origin, race, color, or creed—until we can do that we are dragging along a millstone around our necks in our foreign policy. We are making an effort, and we are making progress. We need to tell our Latin American friends about our efforts to improve ourselves—about our continuing attack on racial discrimination, about what we are doing in public health and housing, and about our historic achievement in popular education, in the development of free trade unions, our voluntary associations, our rural cooperatives. What I am really saying is, let's not be afraid to be ourselves. We do not need to boast; we just need to know what we are, and convey it.

The country people of Latin America do not ask for much. They know that they cannot be catapulted into the atomic age overnight. But they will be ever grateful, and they will have made gigantic progress, if they are able to lift themselves with our help, from the 17th century, to the level of the United States in the first part of the 20th century. They are living much as Columbus and the conquistadores found them in vast areas of Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. If we can in a few years help these neighbors of ours to reach the general level of health, diet, and education that our midwestern rural families were able to achieve 50, 60, 75 years ago, we shall have carried through one of the historic achievements of all mankind.

And we shall have done the maximum possible to insure the eventual triumph of constitutional government throughout Latin America. Only from this plateau of a basically healthy and progressive economy, complemented by a strong free-trade union movement, can the superstructure of a 20th century democratic state be raised.

Free trade unions

The encouraging growth and development of free trade unions in Latin America deserves a comment. Much remains to be done to strengthen these unions, to help them rid their ranks of Communist agents. But important progress is being made. For better than 20 years the Communists had free run of the labor unions, as they had free run of

the campuses of the Latin American universities. In all too many instances they have had free run of the pages of the press, and the radio airwaves. I have seen newspapers in Latin America which are out and out Communist newspapers in which American industry continued to carry advertising them in the name of profit—for a long time. Only in the last 2 or 3 years have we made any systematic attempt to help the friends of freedom in Latin America fight back. I was in Ecuador a year ago when the free trade unions were fighting for their very life—when most of the opposition unions were Communist dominated.

I am happy to say that things are changing. Hundreds of Latin American workers have been trained in collective bargaining, in parliamentary law, in union organizing activity by American trade unionists. The American people should know that the AFL-CIO and its affiliated unions have contributed manpower, much money, organizers, and technicians in the struggle against Communist infiltration in the trade union movements in Latin America—yes, and elsewhere. The Latin America free trade unions are gaining because of this, but they need more help, and frankly, they need more friendly attention from all walks of American life. There is a need for a greater understanding on the part of government and industry as to the importance of a free labor sector in these developing countries. Of course, free trade unions are more difficult to bargain with than Communist-dominated unions, and therefore sometimes free trade unions are not given the help that they ought to have. The Communist-dominated union is a political instrument, sometimes difficult, sometimes cooperative, depending on what the party line is. I would only admonish our American business friends to remember that in the long run you are better off to bargain with a tough free trade union.

The real Latin America

May I conclude with this thought. Most of the news in the United States about Latin America is the news of violence, disorder, deficits, assassinations, inflation, and revolution. This is what we print. This is what we read. This is why we are so unbelievably ignorant of what is really going on, and why

we know so little of what they are doing. But we need to know the Latin American of today, not the character out of the fiction book of yesterday. We need to understand that there is a growing middle class in these countries. We need to know of their passionate devotion to constitutional government. We need to know that the Indian in the back country is a good farmer if he is given a chance, and a good worker in the factories if he is trained. And we need to know that great cities are being erected and tremendous industrial development is underway. Health centers are being built. Whole new universities are coming up. In other words, we need to know some of the good news. Why not occasionally look with pride and respectful attention to the achievements of these sister republics? I had many a man and woman in Latin American countries say to me, "Senator, all you Norteamericanos hear about us is our weaknesses, our trouble. You don't ever hear what we are trying to do." Now maybe it is not true, but this is what they think.

More than our money, these peoples in the areas of Latin America, want our respect. They want our understanding. They are proud and sensitive people. They are idealistic. Often the intangibles—the non-economic, the friendly smile, or the appreciative word—can mean more than a big loan in winning cooperation. Isn't it interesting that neither the American League nor the National League has ever found it within its means to send one single baseball team to Latin America, where baseball is king? Isn't it interesting that our own Government, up until recent days, never sent a first-class athletic team to Latin America? These people want the best. When the Russians send them, they send the best. We ought to do the same, and we ought to send our finest students, our best artists, our finest teachers. Give them the best that we have, because we are already 100 years late in the struggle. The people need to know that we, the people of the United States, care about them and their families, respect them and want to work side by side with them. It is in the people that we have our strength.

Governments come and go. Our contact more directly with the people through spiritual, cultural, business, labor, agricultural, professional, and educational organizations—and I underscore educational—will establish a continuing friendship and communication. The people know that there is no quick, magic answer to their problem. What they need is hope—the assurance that things will be better. There is really nothing

that we can do in a year or two that can raise the standard of living in Latin America enough to give them what they really deserve, but we can give them the assurance that the United States, as a good neighbor, is not here just for today, or for a year or two, but is with them "for the duration." A year ago I heard some responsible people say that the only reason we are interested in Latin America is because we are worried about Castro.

Continuing challenge

There is some truth in that. But when Castro is gone there will still be the problems and the challenges of Latin America before us. We do have, as free men and women, a proper concern that the areas of freedom should be expanded to encompass more people. Our other concern is that of natural self-interest. It is a fact that if communism should take over vast areas of Latin America our security would be directly threatened. Our problems would be more difficult. We could not tolerate such a mortal threat to the existence of our Nation. We have therefore an enlightened self-interest in seeking to establish and maintain a favorable environment in which our ideals of freedom—the common ideals of the peoples of this hemisphere—can grow and flourish. Whatever may have been the cause of our renewed interest in Latin America, that interest must not be permitted to wane. It must be activated, encouraged, and sustained. I cannot believe that America's international efforts can hope to be very successful in Africa and Asia if we fail in the Western Hemisphere.

The American revolution continues here and elsewhere—in South America, in Central America and Mexico, and it is the good news of our time. We have revolted against foreign domination. We have revolted against the exploitation of race by race, and man by man. We have revolted against the exploitation of the poor by the wealthy. The goals which we have achieved for ourselves in these revolutions we now seek to help our Latin American friends reach. In the Alliance for Progress we are exporting our own revolution. Like all of our successful revolutions, the revolution against the old order in Latin America will take many years of anguish and pain and effort. The American Negro has not been fully emancipated, even in a century, he continues to be the victim of discrimination and prejudice. In a 5- or a 10-year period the old order in Latin America cannot be fully replaced by functioning, liberal, and solvent democracies. But the great initial thrust—the beginning—is being given through the Alianza, just as the first great breakthrough of Lincoln gave the initial impetus in this great Nation to the movement toward true equality and true equality of opportunity for all Americans.

The fires have been lighted in Latin America, and no one is going to put them out. The campesinos and the slum dwellers of Latin America form a force that is irresistibly moving toward an overthrow of the institutions which have failed them. There is great power in this movement. It is not ironical that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people can fall at times to understand the power of the plain people. We tend to think too much in terms of the power of the atom, the power of our nuclear deterrent. What about the power of our pronouncement of freedom? What about the power of free people working together? We are powerful; the only question is whether the powerful forces of democracy in North and Latin America are sufficiently wise, prudent, intelligent, and determined to lead in the paths of constructive change. I am an optimist. But I am, I trust, a careful observer. The Communists are working hard to capture the Latin American revolution, just as they captured the Cuban revolution. But we have aroused ourselves. We have seen in the struggles of the forgotten ones that President Rivira spoke of a reflection of our own great struggles for freedom, and at long last we have remembered our heritage. We have decided that our revolution will remain unfinished just as long as the Western Hemisphere remains in a real sense half slave and half free. There is no turning back. We are committed in a partnership, in

an alliance. We are in the battle, and we are in to stay. I believe we will win—because I am confident the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

THE UNFINISHED REVOLUTION

Address by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Dr Wilson
Sander Denis

The Sidney Hillman Lecture at the

University of Minnesota

January 3, 1963

I can think of no more fitting forum to discuss my topic, "The Unfinished Revolution," than a university campus dedicated to political and intellectual freedom.

It is a sobering responsibility and a challenging opportunity to participate in the Sidney Hillman Lecture series. I knew Sidney Hillman--as a friend, a respected and gifted labor leader, a good citizen and a patriot. His life was dedicated to the fulfillment of the unfinished business of Democracy--the realization of true equality under freedom.

I shall speak tonight of the unfinished revolution--

our American
~~our~~ revolution--the revolution that has become contagious

and spreads throughout the world. I do not speak of the counter-revolution of Communist totalitarianism, but of the democratic revolution that seeks greater freedom and greater opportunity for all mankind.

One hundred years ago President Lincoln ~~proclaimed~~ *unleashed* a second great American revolution--the revolution of political and social equality. It was documented in his Emancipation Proclamation--a charter of freedom for a whole people. It was the mighty whip that struck down the inhuman institution of slavery.

Yet, though the Proclamation was ratified by fire and sword, *a century later* ~~after almost a century~~ there are those who still resist and repudiate the true meaning of the great document. The exploitation of man by man, the denial of constitutional rights of American citizens, were not to be ended by a public statement, nor even by the ordeal of civil war. Only through several generations of

persistent effort and ^{and courageous} daring leadership have

we been able to approach the promise of the Pro-

clamation. That effort continues to this very

hour, and will continue until the last vestige

of discrimination on the grounds of race or

creed or color has vanished in America.

Three great revolutions have dominated our history: the first--against foreign domination--

the revolution of independence; the second was

against the inhumanity of the slavery system--

the Civil War; and the third was the peaceful

revolution of the twentieth century when ^{and Social} ~~The Economic~~ American ^{people}

^{in particular} workers and farmers were successful, through

democratic processes, in achieving a government

responsive to their needs. In these revolutions

we have succeeded in creating a system which has made

the greatest advances in man's history toward freedom

from the tyranny of autocratic government, the lash
of poverty, the fear and prejudice of ignorance,

and the savagery of the exploitation of man by man. *We have popularized our politics, and humanized our economy.*

In recent years we have come to realize that

the competition between the totalitarian forces and
we of the free world cannot be measured solely in terms
of military strength or gross national product. It
is also a contest of ideology--a combat between two
radically different revolutions.

Two years ago the 35th President of the
United States, John F. Kennedy, in cooperation with
many leaders of this hemisphere, charted a vast new
program for the Western Hemisphere in a broad
extension of the democratic revolution. There is
a new Emancipation Proclamation, calling for the freedom
of the millions of impoverished, illiterate, and
oppressed peoples of Latin America. If the Alliance

(*all L.A. Different - This we must understand*)
E

for Progress has any historical significance, it
will be ~~not only~~ ^{not only} because it succeeds in breaking with the
past--but ^{also} succeeds through a peaceful revolution--
directed, inspired, and supported by those who believe
that inequality, poverty, and backwardness can be
eliminated by rational processes of political decision
and economic development.

{ It is well to remember that this continuing
revolution grows as much out of the leadership of a
Simon Bolivar ^{and} ~~as~~ ^{as} of a Washington or a Jefferson,
as much ^{from} ~~as~~ a San Martin as from a Lincoln.

{ The Alliance for Progress has ^{started} ~~been~~ as a bold
challenge to those who cry, with the Communists, that
mankind cannot be freed from his bonds of ignorance,
and poverty without the violent and bloody destruction
of the existing system and the imposition of
a dictatorship.

~~imposition of a dictatorship~~

L The ^{Alliance} Alliance is a cooperative venture undertaken

in the belief that the processes of constitutional

democracy can move swiftly ^{and decisively} ~~enough~~ to accomplish vital ^{and urgent}

social and economic changes.

The Alliance is more than a proclamation, or a
declaration of intent. It is a program of action.

Its success requires ^{the allegiance of} not only those motivated by democratic

ideals, but also it demands men and women of decision

and action. If it is to succeed, its leaders must be

urgent, adventurous and daring. The problems the

Alliance is designed to overcome will not yield to any

timid or conventional effort.

L We must understand that there would be trouble,

violence and disorder in Latin America even if there

were no Communists or Castroites. The truth is that

Castro's Communism is the effect rather than the cause

of the deep discontent that has overwhelmed vast areas of the hemisphere to the South. As one observer put it,

"most Latin Americans are born on dead end streets and feel that they are doomed to live there until the day they die." Lives of grinding poverty and voiceless

desperation are commonplace. Latin America is dynamite, and some of it has already exploded right on our doorstep.

Castro and his Communists are exploiting the tensions and troubles of a ~~rotten~~^{corrupt} and dying order.

The destruction of Castro and his regime in Cuba will not ^{alone} relieve Latin America's illness. For Latin America is very sick, and it has been sick for many years--sick because of its own failures and because of our neglect. A few figures from a review of our foreign aid program from 1945 to 1960 will serve to underscore the depth of the problems in Latin America. Just prior to the Alliance for Progress, Latin America could be measured in terms of over 200,000,000 people in an area

2 1/2 times the size of the United States. This continent had received less than 3 percent of the total economic aid of the United States for the preceding 15 years. Compare this to Europe, which had received 41 percent; to the Far East, with 17 1/2 percent; and the Near East, with almost 12 percent.

Two percent of the people in Latin America own more than fifty percent of its wealth. ~~Eighty percent~~ *2/3 - two thirds*

of the people live in abject poverty. Furthermore, the Latin American population is exploding. It doubled from 1920 to 1956, and it is increasing at an overall rate of more than 2 1/2 percent a year--the highest in the world. In Central America, it runs as high as 3 1/2 to 4 percent. The life span is being extended, but life expectancy throughout the continent of South America and the areas of Central America remains less

than 45 years. In the United States, it is 70.

These problems illustrated by such statistics are deep and enduring. They are caked in the centuries-old hard crust of tradition and privilege. ~~They require~~ *demand* a coordinated attack by the most daring and ingenious men of our time and with a commitment of human and material resources ~~even~~ *far* beyond anything that we have contemplated thus far.

Such a ~~that~~ commitment cannot be undertaken by the United States alone. We all need to be reminded again and again that the Alliance for Progress is an alliance; it is a partnership. If we are to succeed, ~~we must mobilize~~ *all of us in this hemisphere* and commit the resources of all the nations of this hemisphere on an heroic scale. *Yes, and call upon our friends in Europe to help too.*

I am pleased to be able to report that the Alliance for Progress has begun well. It is now more than a document, more than a Presidential pronouncement, and

*Need a F.D.R. - a new Deal
A Sidney Hillman*

Our recent travels took us through Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala and Mexico--supplementing a similar study tour through most of the nations of South America made just a year ago. I sense a growing recognition among the key leadership of the Latin Americans that the Alliance for Progress is, indeed, a cooperative operation. There is increasing understanding that local capital, local initiative and local planning and hard work are required, and that the United States has no intention of either dominating the Alliance or paying all the bills.

This does not mean in any sense that the United States is not an active and vigorous partner in the Alliance programs. We are taking an active role in promoting fiscal and economic reform, we are offering the best of our technical assistance, and we are loaning important

amounts of capital. There is a healthy relationship, a genuine feeling of partnership, between our representatives and the Latin American leadership.

I might comment that North Americans, as we are called, are generally respected and liked. President Kennedy is a popular man in Latin America. *Of course,* It is still fashionable for some political and economic spokesmen in Latin America to profess a distrust of and an animosity toward the United States. *Some think this is good* In my opinion, however, such statements fall into the category of political cliches which have outrun political reality. I found nothing but the warmest and most enthusiastic welcome--in the drawing rooms of Presidents and in the thick dust of urban slums. The people pressed to tell me how deeply they appreciate the initiative President Kennedy has taken. But they also demonstrated their affection and respect for the tough-minded men we have representing us day in and day out in their countries--our Ambassadors and their

Peace Corps

staffs, our AID missions, our Peace Corps, yes and our
business ^{and labor} representatives.

We can be proud of these Americans. They are first-
class. They are trained, alert, and hardworking. There
are few second-raters. And the Latin Americans under-
stand ^{that} the high caliber of our representation in their
capitals that we respect them, that we are in earnest,

that we mean business, and we are serious about the
Alliance. (Previously, our representatives all too
often disappoint.)

and, I was very pleased to see the caliber of the men who
are coming to leadership in these countries. There is
a kind of "New Frontier" spirit and character about many
of these new leaders--they are young and ^{educated, trained} vigorous. There
is no spirit of "mañana" in these governments. Many of
the new leaders are American university-trained, and they
have had good experiences here in the States. They were

Stewart-Lay
Farland
Williams
(El Salvador)
Bell
(Costa Rica)
Tom Mann
Mexico

not only technically well trained, in the United States, but for the most part they absorbed a respect and admiration for our political and economic system. We need to encourage such men.

Our vital interests lie not simply in higher living standards in Latin America, but in the political stability which can only be based on economic and social progress for the masses of people--and in their acceptance of the principle of orderly change of government.

Then, We must do more to encourage the growth of non-governmental democratic institutions--not only through our own government, but through the stepped-up efforts of United States business management, educators, doctors and other professional groups, of our labor unions and farm cooperatives.

Voluntarism is not a tradition in the Spanish culture - yet it is needed if the Alliance is to work
We can do more to encourage private initiative, Respect for Private Property and Civil Rights private investment--along with the income tax and the

~~tax and the~~ property tax reforms that are so vital to any kind of stable government.

There are many hopeful signs in Latin America.

The movement for the economic and eventually the political, integration of Central America is gathering Cent. Amer. Bank Tarzooni Galpa - Enrique Delgado momentum. There is every reason to believe that the eleven million Central Americans can succeed in interconnecting their highways and communications systems, sharing in ^{their Electrical Power systems} their industrial and agricultural planning, lowering their ~~mutual~~ barriers to trade. We in the United States are ~~actively~~ supporting the Central American initiative ~~for a Central American Common Market~~ for a Central American Common Market. Both we and they have functioning regional institutions, manned by able men, working together effectively and rapidly toward what promises to be impressive achievement in the next several years.

Regional
Institutions

L Our programs of economic and technical assistance must continue to emphasize economic and political integration in Central America. It is the only hope of this

area for a higher standard of living. Fortunately, the *Leaders* leaders of these countries ^{*fully*} understand this. ~~fully~~

However, in South America the development of a common market and of regional planning has faltered badly.

L The Latin American nations now face not only the united economic strength of the Soviet bloc, but also of Western Europe, and its African partners. Individually, the countries of Latin America are weak and in no position to either compete or bargain with a more *prosperous* ~~prosperous~~ and a stronger Western Europe, United States, or Japan. We can perform no greater service for our neighbors in South America than to insist that in their political and economic planning they now proceed at a high priority toward closer economic integration.

Cooperating together, joining together, in some form of common market supported by international trade agreements, Latin America can become an economic power that can command respect in the international market.

Throughout Latin America the economic situation largely depends on the price of raw materials. Therefore, commodity agreements on an international basis are vital to the welfare and prosperity of these countries. The drop of a few cents a pound in coffee can destroy or wipe out the full impact of several years' effort of the Alliance for Progress. Raw material prices in recent years have suffered, and these price drops are directly reflected in budget deficits ^{inflation,} and in lowered standards of living.

The recent International Coffee Agreement was well received in Latin America, and it is recognized that the United States played an important role in obtaining

this agreement. We must do more of this. We must help our economically weak neighbors to the south to build their economies, not merely by our loans and our grants and our technical assistance, but more importantly, by helping them to receive a fair price for their products. The ultimate success of the Alliance for Progress may very well be determined by the price structure of the important raw materials and processed products of the Latin American area. A nation and a people must ^{*in the final analysis,*} ~~finally~~, earn their own way by their own production--based on fair prices and fair wages.

Aside from economics, we are strongly encouraging a cooperative Central America effort in higher education--
regional specialization, with universities open to students from the entire region. We have encouraged the spectacularly successful effort to put modern

textbooks, this year in the hands of every Central

America first and second grader. This is a beginning.

The plan calls for low-cost, ^{non-propaganda-ridden} textbooks

for all children through elementary school.

*It is an
Alianza Project.*

The university student bodies in the countries

in which we traveled recently, appear to be growing more sophisticated in the ways of Communist Party organization and techniques. There is a steady rollback of

Communist influence taking place among the students

and faculty members.

*(more needs to be done)
more U.S. students to go there*

That is not to say that the Communist Party is not actively working in Latin America, particularly through Castro's Cuba. Venezuela is their principal target in the Caribbean area, but they are working hard in rural areas throughout all of Latin America--where the poverty is the deepest, and where illiteracy and ignorance are most prevalent. While Castro himself has lost great prestige

during the past year, the Communists have not relaxed their drive of subversion, propaganda, and infiltration.

OAS conferences { Fortunately, the governments of Latin America are much more aware of the threat of Castro's Communism now than a year or two ago. More effective steps are being taken to curtail Cuban infiltration, ~~and~~ propaganda and terrorism. It is now well recognized that the problem of Communism is not merely one of meeting an economic and social doctrine, but also of combatting a well-organized and disciplined conspiratorial apparatus, which does not swerve even from assassination. This requires effective policing. It requires courageous leadership and the loyalty of the security forces.

{ However, the decision over the Communists will ultimately be won, ~~by~~ by proving the hypocrisy of their promises and by producing obvious con-

structive results through democratic government *and* results that can be ~~seen~~ seen without publicity or interpretation.

Yes, schools, land ownership, ^{clear} water, hospitals, roads,
factories and jobs are the building blocks of such
an effort. Communism is strong in certain parts of
Latin America only because freedom and all that it
represents is weak. Communism gains where the economy
falters. *where leadership fails to lead.*

To be sure, Economic progress must be planned across the board,

but there must also be dramatic demonstrations now

of what can be accomplished under progressive democracy.

They call this Impact programs. Well,
The new situation in the Dominican Republic, with a

President elected in a free election, may give us

the opportunity to demonstrate within but a few miles of Cuba what a progressive democracy can mean for the people.

We need a show case of democratic achievement and then we need to actively spread the 'good news' as well as the news of Communist failures in Cuba. In other words, we need to join the fight on all fronts...political, economic and educational.

It is quite obvious that the Communists have decided to make Venezuela their next major objective in Latin America. I urge that we meet this Communist offensive head-on and resolve to defeat it. The government of President Betancourt is a progressive government. It is openly friendly to the United States and vigorously supports ^{us} in all international councils. It respects private property..it encourages Capital investment ...and at the same time sponsors the broadest social development for its people. It is a government that is acting ~~EEEE~~ boldly in housing, health, education and in rural or land reform.

The Communists are determined to destroy this government because if Venezuela can succeed in its program of social and economic

development, Communism in Latin America will have suffered a stinging defeat. The stakes are high...the Communists know it and are doing everything to win. The question is... do we fully appreciate the significance of this battle...and if we do...are we really using our strength and resources to win?

A Communist ~~centralized government in~~ ^{Government in} Venezuela would ~~be~~ ^{control} of tremendous resources. Venezuela is rich in oil, iron ore, timber, and agricultural production. While indeed Venezuela is a land of contrasts, it is also a land of hope and opportunity for freedom. Venezuela represents a bastion ^{of strength} in the Caribbean for the Democracies. Cuba is the Communist spearhead. It is the base for Communist political penetration in this hemisphere.

If Venezuela can be overwhelmed by Communist subversion, then the Caribbean could well become a Communist Sea. Every Central American Republic would be endangered and threatned. The energies of the people and the resources of the area would be ~~dissipated~~ dissipated through fear of attack and political chaos.

These limited resources ~~and~~ ^{of} material and men are desperately needed in building a progressive and equitable society. The

prospect of such achievement is seriously jeopardized when fear and uncertainty prevail.

We cannot afford to lose anymore battles in Latin America and we must make it clear that we do not intend to. We should make it abundantly clear that those who are friendly partners of the United States and fulfill the requirements of the Alliance For Progress, will receive our fullest assistance and support.

Our Latin American neighbors must understand that we are determined in fact to ^{help} ~~work~~ only with those peoples and nations who are willing to chart a course of social progress. ~~Frankly, we should rebuke~~ those who turn their backs upon the people. It is one thing to carry on normal diplomatic relations ~~with~~ governments that may not meet the standards of the Alliance For Progress. But ~~we~~ we have no obligation to support these governments financially.

There is a tendency in government to adjust to any set of circumstances, and in recent months we accommodated ourselves... regretably...to military juntas that violate the standards of the Alliance and the principles of democratic institutions. A case in point is Peru. We weaken the Alliance For Progress when we

Diplomacy

cooperate with a military junta that had overthrown a friendly government.....a constitutional government and repudiated a free election. The Peruvian junta has yet to make the political and economic reforms required by the Alliance. The Alliance For Progress will be a mockery to the Peruvian people until political freedom is restored.

In sharp contrast to developments in Peru and in the Argentina.....is the program of our sister Republic in Mexico.

In Mexico, a proud and vigorous leadership has been carrying through its own social and economic revolution, of significant proportions. Yet, this revolution has been impeded by misunderstandings, suspicion and distrust between our two peoples. It is a shock to discover how little a citizen of the United States really knows about the character and the achievements of the Mexican people. And it is equally shocking to learn how little is understood in Mexico about the growth and change of American institutions in the twentieth century.

Sometimes it seems that we in the United States have been living in a kind of dream world in which the only Mexicans we have known were the ignorant and slovenly villains of old Hollywood cowboy movies. And perhaps in Mexico they have been living another dream -- in which nineteenth century U.S. robber ~~the fiction story capitalists~~ barons flaunt their wealth in the faces of the poor -- like one of the colorful but propaganda-~~saturated~~ ^{misappreciated} Diego Rivera murals in Mexico City.

We have not fully understood the intelligence and the maturity of the Mexican leadership. And I fear that they have not fully understood the extent to which the nineteenth century capitalist economy of the United States has evolved in to the pluralistic, humanitarian and progressive society of the 1960's -- nor the role which private investment must play in their own continued progress.

While we in the States may not have realized the grave problems which a relatively limited amount of arable land forces upon the Mexicans, I feel that the Mexicans have not fully grasped the significance of our highly-productive system of ~~family-owned~~ privately-owned family farms, backed up by voluntary associations and cooperatives. There is room for some intensive exchange of ideas among the agriculturalists of our two countries.

But, The Alliance for Progress is being accepted in Mexico as a serious statement of cooperative intention by the United States. The Mexicans can recognize in the programs we are supporting and in the personnel we are sending to work with them, our intention to support them in their own programs to raise living standards and to provide greater individual opportunity.

There is nothing quite so conducive to understanding and friendship, and to the overcoming of inherited prejudice as the opportunity for two people or nations to work together for their common good. The Alliance for Progress fortunately permits us an ever closer interchange of ideas and cooperative effort with this mature and growing democracy on our southern border.

L In Mexico, in Venezuela, as in all Latin American countries, the rural areas will be the continuing battlefield of democracy and totalitarianism. That is the announced objective of the international Communist Party apparatus, and it is clearly in evidence throughout Latin America.

L With all the excellent work that has begun in the capitals of Latin America -- in housing, in education, in tax and fiscal reform, in sanitation, in communications -- the issue of Communism or democracy will be decided by the campesinos, the country people -- the farmers.

L We must set a far higher priority on rural development in Latin America -- ^{help in} ~~to~~ raise the standard of living of the farm family, to increase the available food supplies, and to build democratic institutions which can become the underpinning of a broader, more representative democracy. By that, I mean ^{the Alliance must see to it that} ~~we must see that~~ agricultural credit is provided, so that fertilizer, good seed, and the necessary machinery can be bought. I mean that we must provide supervised credit, so that loans are made to encourage profitable farming enterprise. I mean that we must encourage the proven institutions

of purchasing and marketing farm cooperatives on a scale which we have not yet achieved. We must see to it that there are farm-to-market roads, so that the produce of the country can get to market, so that educational and public health services can be more readily provided ^{to the people}

L We must launch a massive attack on rural illiteracy -- now so deep and so pervasive that it is extraordinarily difficult to spread the ~~special~~ ^{technical} knowledge we already have on improved ^{agricultural} ~~farm~~ production.

yes/ Until we break the back of this huge problem of rural poverty in ^{and backward areas} Latin America, the city slums will continue to fill up with refugees from that poverty, and Latin American governments will not be able

to cope with the task of feeding their expanding populations.

The problem is not so much overpopulation as it is underdevelopment of ^{diseases} Latin America -- despite a score of great cities -- remains

essentially rural. It remains essentially Indian. Indeed, in

huge blocks of territory, the character of rural life is ~~close to~~ ^{closer to}

the ^{17th} seventeenth century than to the twentieth. Throughout vast

areas there is no credit whatsoever, few if any roads, no electricity,

no machinery, no sanitation and scarce water. Men working with ox

and wooden plow can be seen in the fields a half-hour drive out of

many large and thoroughly modern capitals. Rural poverty is almost

universal.

These are the people ~~whom~~ whom President Rivera of El Salvador described to me as "the forgotten ones" -- the families that science and government have passed by, the people left in grinding toil, ~~often in famine~~, and constantly in danger of death from a score of the diseases which modern medicine ~~has~~ _____

WIPE OUT IN THE ADVANCED NATIONS. THESE ARE THE FAMILIES WHO TYPICALLY

LOSE THEIR CHILDREN TO DYSENTERY OR SMALL POX OR PNEUMONIA. THESE ARE

THE PEOPLE WHO CAN BE TRULY DESCRIBED AS ENSLAVED BY THEIR POVERTY. THE

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ALIANZA, AS THEY CALL IT...CAN BE A PROCLAMATION

OF EMANCIPATION FOR THEM, A CHARTER OF HOPE....THESE TEEMING MILLIONS OF

RURAL PEOPLE ARE COMING TO UNDERSTAND ITS MEANING. WE SHALL LOSE THEIR

SUPPORT IF WE PERMIT THE ALLIANCE TO BECOME A DEVICE TO MAKE THE RICH

RICHER...AND THE ~~POOR~~ ^{POOR}...POORER. OR TO MAKE THE CITIES MORE AFFLUENT...

AND THE COUNTRYSIDE MOVE POVERTY*STRICKEN. THE ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{ALIANZA} MUST BE A

PROGRAM IN WHICH THEY, THE CAMPEsinOS, RECOGNIZE THEY HAVE THE GREATEST

STAKE. ^{and all their future can} WE OF THE UNITED STATES BRING A MESSAGE ^{can} WHICH STRIKES HOME TO

THESE PEOPLE WHEN WE SPEAK ABOUT OUR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION...

OUR DETERMINED ATTACK ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, OUR SUCCESSES IN AGRICULTURE,

PUBLIC HEALTH AND HOUSING....IN OUR HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT IN POPULAR EDUCATION

AND REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT...AND IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR FREE TRADE

UNIONS...OUR VOLUNATRAY ASSOCIATIONS AND OUR RURAL COOPERATIVES.

THE COUNTRY PEOPLE OF LATIN AMERICA DO NOT ASK FOR MUCH. ~~THEY~~ THEY

KNOW THAT THEY CANNOT BE CATAPULTED INTO THE ELECTRONIC AGE. ~~BUT THEY~~

Let not be afraid to be ourselves.

But they WILL BE VERY GRATEFUL, AND THEY WILL HAVE MADE GIGANTIC PROGRESS

IF...THEY ARE ABLE TO LIFT THEMSELVES WITH OUR HELP...FROM THE ^{17th} SEVENTEENTH

CENTURY TO THE BEGINNING OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY IF WE CAN, IN A FEW YEARS,

HELP THESE NEIGHBORS OF OURS TO REACH THE GENERAL LEVEL OF HEALTH, DIET AND

EDUCATION THAT OUR MIDWESTERN RURAL FAMILIES WERE ABLE TO ACHIEVE FIFTY YEARS

AGO, WE SHALL HAVE CARRIED THROUGH ONE OF THE HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF

MANKIND.

AND WE SHALL HAVE DONE THE MAXIMUM POSSIBLE TO INSURE THE EVENTUAL

TRIUMPH OF CONSTITUTIONAL ^{government} THROUGHOUT LATIN AMERICA. / ^{from} ONLY ~~FROM~~ THIS PLATEAU,

OF A BASICALLY ~~AND~~ HEALTHY AND PROGRESSIVE RURAL ECONOMY...COMPLIMENTED

BY ^a STRONG...FREE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT, ~~and private property~~ CAN THE SUPER STRUCTURE OF

A TWENTIETH CENTURY DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL STATE BE RAISED.

We have reason to be encouraged by the growth and development of the free trade unions in many of the Latin American countries.

But, much more remains to be done to rid the ranks of the organized workers of the Communist agents. For better than 20 years the Communists have had a free run of the labor unions, the campuses of the universities and, in all too many instances, the pages of the press and the air waves of the radio. Only in the last two or three years have we helped the friends of freedom in Latin America fight back. The American people ought to know that the AFL-CIO and its affiliated unions have contributed manpower and money, organizers and technicians in the struggle against Communist infiltration of the trade union movements in Latin America. Hundreds of Latin American workers have been trained in collective bargaining, in parliamentary law, in union organizing activity by American trade unionists. The Communists are in retreat. The free trade unions are gaining but they need more help and, frankly, more friendly

attention from all areas of American life. There is a need for
greater understanding on the part of American government and
business as to the importance of the labor sector in these
developing countries.

May I add just another thought. Most of the news in the
United States about Latin America is the news of violence, disorder,
deficits, inflation, and revolution. There is another and a much
better story to be told. We need to know the Latin American of
today, not the character out of the fiction book of yesterday. We
need to understand that there is a growing middle class. We need
to know of their passionate devotion to constitutional government.

We need to know that the Indian in the back countries is a good
farmer if given a chance, and a good worker in the factories if he
is trained. We need to know that great cities are being ~~constructed~~ ^{erected},

and tremendous industrial development is underway. In other words,
why not occasionally look with pride and respectful attention to the
achievements of these sister republics?

*more than our
money, they need and want our
respect - our friendship - our understanding.
These are proud and sensitive people - they*

are emotional & idealistic. Often the intangibles
the non-economic -- the ~~friendship~~ friendly
people or appreciative world means more than
a big power.

The people of the Latin American republics--each republic a
little different from the other; each with its own problems and
its own heritage--the people need to know that we, the people of
the United States, care about them and their families and their
future. It is in the people that we have our strength and it is

These
need to
know

to the people that we must make our appeal. There may be many
changes in government. ~~New leaders will follow who have~~

~~tried and failed.~~ But our contact with the people through ~~business~~, spiritual, cultural

business, labor, agricultural, and educational, professional organizations, education

(and I underscore education) will establish a continuing friendship

and communication. The people know that there is no quick and magic
answer to their problems. What they need is hope--the assurance that

Hope

things will be better; the assurance that the United States, as a
good neighbor, is here not only for today but for the years to come.

In other words, we have one other ^{important} task in the Alliance for
Progress; proving the genuine sincerity of our concern for the

welfare of the people in Latin America. A year ago I heard responsible

(We need to interpret the Alliance for Progress in
terms of human welfare, not Dollars)

people say that the only reason that we ^{are} ~~were~~ now interested in Latin America, is because we were worried about Castro. There is some truth in this. But, our concern for the years to come must be based on something more than worry over Castro. Our concern should be twofold: a concern about freedom and all that it means, because this is our way of life, our revolution. Our other concern should be one of enlightened self-interest. It is a fact that if Castroism should take over vast areas of Latin America, then our security would be threatened. It is a fact that this would represent the expanding power of the Sino-Soviet bloc which is a mortal threat to the political and economic well-being of our nation. There is nothing wrong with having enlightened self-interest, and seeking to have a favorable environment in which those ideals can grow and flourish. Whatever may be the reason for our renewed interest in Latin America, that interest must not be permitted to wane. It must be activated. It must be encouraged. It must be sustained. The test of the United States foreign policy

may well be determined by what transpires in this hemisphere.

I, for one, cannot believe that America's international efforts can be very successful in Africa and Asia if they fail in the Western Hemisphere.

The American revolution continues here and elsewhere--in South America, in Central America, and in Mexico. It is the good news of our time--and we have made it. *So let's proclaim it.*

We have revolted against foreign domination; we have revolted against the exploitation of race by race; and we have revolted against the exploitation of the poor by the wealthy. These goals, which we have achieved for ourselves, we now seek to help our Latin American friends reach. In the Alliance for Progress we are exporting our own revolutions. *and, as I've said,* Like all of our own successful revolutions, the revolution against the old order in Latin America will take many years of anguish and effort.

The American Negro *has been* ~~was~~ not fully emancipated even in a century. *He continues to be the victim of discrimination.*

And in a five, a ten-year period the old order in Latin America

cannot be fully replaced by functioning, liberal, and solvent
democracies. But the great initial thrust is being given through
the Alianza--just as the first great breakthrough of Lincoln gave
the initial impetus to the movement toward true equality of
opportunity for non-white Americans.

The fires have been lighted in Latin America. No one is going
to put them out. The Campesino and the slum-dweller of Latin
America form a force that is irresistibly moving toward an over-
throw of institutions that have failed them. This is the power of
the people. The only question is whether the forces of democracy
in North and Latin America are ^{sufficiently, wise} intelligent ~~enough~~ and determined
~~enough~~ to guide that irresistible force into constructive change.

I am an optimist, but I am ^{also a} ~~an~~ careful observer. The
Communists are working hard to capture the Latin American revolution
as they captured the Cuban revolution. But we have roused ourselves,
we have seen in the struggles of the "forgotten ones" of Latin
America a reflection of our ^{own} great struggles for freedom. We have
remembered our own heritage.

✓ We have indeed decided that our own revolution will remain
unfinished so long as the Western Hemisphere remains, in a very
real sense "half slave and half free." We are committed. We
are determined. The Alliance for Progress must, and will, succeed.

--Fin--



Minnesota Historical Society

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

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



www.mnhs.org