

My presentation takes approximately one hour. It begins with a two-minute introduction and then goes into the following subjects:

1. Two basic policy objectives of the U.S. foreign policy.
2. How we interpret the basic world struggle today.
3. Capitalism and Socialism.
4. Our policy towards Cuba.
5. Our policy towards non-Communist dictatorships.
6. Some of our specific tactics and objectives in Latin America.
7. The role of American companies in Latin America.
8. Our policy towards the Soviet Union.
9. My own personal opinion as to what is good and bad inside the United States.
10. Conclusion.

This is then followed by questions and criticism, usually fairly intensive.

## INTRODUCTION

First of all, let me apologize for not speaking better Spanish. I am a career diplomat and my first assignment was with the American Embassy in Bogota. I lived with a Colombian family, and at that time, of course, my Spanish was not bad. But since then most of my assignments have been in Eastern Europe, in Moscow and Warsaw, and my last foreign assignment was at Rome, where I learned to speak Italian. I have no trouble understanding Spanish, but now when I try to speak Spanish I use many Italian words. So if you do not understand what I am saying today, please raise your hand. There is enough misunderstanding already about American foreign policy, and I do not wish to add to the confusion today. It is not necessary for us to agree with one another here, but I do want to be sure that we at least understand one another.

Now as I have said, most of my experience has been in

Eastern Europe, under Communist dictatorship, and I am not an expert in Latin American affairs. I have been with the Latin American Bureau of the State Department for the past 18 months, as a political adviser. Talking to Latin American groups is not my official assignment; it is not my regular work. The reason I am talking to you today is this. Soon after coming to the Latin American Bureau in the State Department I started attending as many meetings with Latin American groups as I could find time for. I wanted to refresh and expand my information about Latin America, and to hear as many direct personal comments from Latin Americans as possible, rather than spending all of my time with other American bureaucrats and with paper work. Soon after I started attending these meetings I came to the very painful conclusion that the weakest aspect of our performance in Latin America is our failure to explain clearly and adequately our <sup>policies</sup> ~~policy~~, tactics,

and objectives. I have never seen so much confusion and misunderstanding about American policy, and I think much of this confusion is our fault, although I also think some of the fault is yours. At any rate, there is a very great need for a frank and informal dialogue between the United States and Latin America. Therefore, over the past year I have held lengthy meetings <sup>in Washington</sup> with over 70 groups of Latin Americans, from almost every country in Latin America.

Now what I am going to do today is to talk informally for about 40 minutes on the following subjects:

1. The two basic global policy objectives of the United States.
2. How the United States Government understands the basic struggle in the world today.
3. Capitalism and socialism.
4. United States policy towards Cuba.

5. Our policy towards non-Communist dictatorships.
6. Our tactics in Latin America.
7. The role of American companies in Latin America.
8. Our policy towards the Soviet Union.
9. Some personal opinions of my own about what is good and bad in the United States.
10. Some general conclusions.

Not all of these subjects are of great interest in the United States. But I have found them to be the ones which are creating the most misunderstanding in Latin America about the United States. ~~Of course, those~~

Of course, those of you who wish to do so can take notes. Then, after I have finished, I hope we can have a very frank and long, and informal, discussion, and I hope you will be frank with your questions and criticism. You don't have to be worried about offending me. I have heard the United

States criticized by experts. I will try to answer all your questions. And if you want to make a speech, I will listen to it. And on the other hand, if you wish to sit there and say nothing, that is quite all right, too. And of course we are all here voluntarily, and if you are bored you can leave whenever you wish. Politics is the most important thing to me. But I realize it is <sup>un</sup>not interesting to many people. So do not feel compelled to stay if you would rather do something else.

Therefore, here today, at least, we will proceed with complete democracy.

The Basic Policy Objectives of the United States

First of all, I am going to discuss the basic global policy objectives of the United States. We have two basic objectives. The first one is shared by every government in the world, and that is-survival. Now, we are all adults and we all know that this world is stupid and cruel and dangerous, and that survival is not always easy, neither for governments now for individuals. Survival is the primary objective of the United States, and this is what the American people expect from their government.

Our second basic objective is the extension and strengthening of democracy, both inside the United States and abroad, not only in Mississippi and California, but also in the Dominican Republic, the Soviet Union and Cuba. ~~Now~~ There are two reasons why we favor democracy. First, it seems obvious to us that a democratic world is a safer world for us. What I mean is this. We have many irritating arguments and problems

with many democratic governments. But our really dangerous, critical problems come in our relations with the dictatorships. So we want a democratic world because a democratic world is safer for us. The second reason we want a democratic world is because we think a democratic world is not only a safer world, but a better world. And that means that the United States Government has a clear, positive pro-democratic ideology.

At this point I want to emphasize that when I say the word democracy I do not mean only formal, political democracy. I include economic and social democracy as well. The State Department understands very well that occasional political elections may have little real significance if a country is in the tight grasp of an economic oligarchy, and if the great mass of the population is poor, exploited and uneducated. That is not what we mean by democracy.

Now, what we would like is for all countries to have modern democracies, healthy economies, well educated populations, and long and firm democratic traditions. Obviously much of the world, including Latin America, is far from that today. *We are against the status quo.* Therefore, we do not seek to preserve the status quo. <sup>^</sup> And in Latin America, for example, we strongly favor profound economic and social reforms.

The United States Government is both anti-Communist and anti-Fascist, but it is much more than that. It is pro-democratic, and our policy is not one of sterile anti-Communism. ~~Now~~ <sup>Of</sup> course, it is not going to be easy to obtain the kind of world I am talking about. And there are tremendous problems *ahead of us.* and obstacles, <sup>^</sup> This does not mean that we should be discouraged and defeated by these obstacles, but it does mean that we have to work with the world as it is and not with the world we would like to be in. And the world we live in is not a

fairy tale or a Hollywood film.

So, to obtain our objectives, survival and democracy,  
we must combine idealism with realism.

## II

### The Basic World Struggle

Now I am going to pass on to my next subject, which is how the United States Government sees the basic world struggle today.

First of all, I assure you we are not trying to make the world a carbon copy of the United States. We understand very well that other peoples have aspirations which are different from ours, and we realize that they have different traditions and different values and different temperaments. We are not trying to impose our way of life, or our economic or social system, on any other people against their will. This means we are not trying to impose capitalism or socialism on anyone else. We want each nation to have the opportunity to develop its own way of life, and to develop whatever economic and social system its people may choose, within the framework of political democracy. Therefore, we reject, and we reject categorically, the Communist propaganda line that the basic

world struggle is between socialism and capitalism, and between a so-called "socialist camp" and a "capitalist camp".

For example, we have excellent relationships with Israel, a country with an economy which is predominately socialist. We also have excellent relations with other democratic countries which have, or have had, socialist governments, such as Sweden. Therefore, I repeat, we say the basic world struggle is not between capitalism and socialism. And we reject the Communist propaganda which refers to the Communist dictatorships as the "socialist countries". We prefer to call the countries under Communist control what they really are, that is, Communist dictatorships. Israel may have a socialist economy, but it is not a Communist dictatorship.

We maintain that the basic world struggle today is between, on one side, the Communist dictatorships, which are determined

to impose their own blueprint and their own control over the rest of the world, and on the other side, those truly democratic elements, and I emphasize the word truly, which want to see all peoples have the right and the opportunity to freely choose and develop whatever economy<sup>ic</sup> and social system they prefer. So, to put it very briefly, we say the basic world struggle today is not between capitalism and socialism but between Communist dictatorship and democracy, that is, the right to choose freely.

Capitalism vs Socialism

Now I am going to say a few words on the controversial subject of capitalism and socialism.

I remember when I was an official at our Embassy in Bogota, many years ago, I attended a cocktail party given by the Coffee Federation of Colombia. I recall very well that at that party one of the wealthiest coffee growers in Colombia, who was already quite drunk, told me with great friendship that he would never pay his coffee workers more than a peso a day, because if he did they would only waste the money on alcohol. Well, this is one kind of capitalism.

I also remember attending a Congress of the Italian Socialist Party, in Milano, four years ago, where I met one of the leaders of the British Labour Party. He had just returned from his first visit to the United States, and he told me he had been shocked when he had visited a factory

in New York State where he had been shown a program of management-labor relations which was far more progressive than anything the British Labour Party has asked for, thus far. Well, this is another kind of capitalism.

I also remember a trip I made in the Soviet Union, when I was working in our Moscow Embassy. I was on a Soviet train filled with Soviet army officers who were going to the Caucasus Mountains on vacation. The officers were getting drunk on vodka and beer, and were singing and enjoying themselves. The train was going slowly and frequently stopping, as Soviet trains usually do. It was snowing outside. Finally the train stopped completely, and I looked out the window and saw about twenty women, dressed in rags, looking like little animals, holding shovels and axes on their shoulders. They were looking up at the train waiting for it to pass, so that they could go back to work repairing the railway

line. And the officers looking out on this scene saw nothing wrong with it. Well, this is one kind of socialism. And I also remember riding on the best trains I have ever seen, in Sweden, which the Swedish Socialists cite as an example of Swedish socialism.

Now, I think one of the best statements ever made on this subject is a Polish joke, and like most Polish jokes it is both bitter and political. The joke goes like this: "What is the difference between capitalism and socialism? Capitalism is the exploitation of man by man, and socialism is just the reverse!" Unfortunately, there is much truth in this, and the human race is such that it is quite easy for us to exploit one another under both capitalism and socialism. And neither of these words is a guarantee of freedom.

What I am saying is that capitalism in most of the United States is very different from capitalism in much of Latin

America, and what is called socialism in the Soviet Union, China and Cuba is very different from what is called socialism in Israel, Sweden and India.

For over a century millions of people have attached a great ~~deal~~<sup>deal</sup> of emotion to these two words, capitalism and socialism, and I think it is a pity that we do not put them into a laboratory, and study them calmly and objectively.

I also believe that 200 years from now people will look back at the 20th century and find it difficult to understand why we became so excited over these two words, capitalism and socialism, just as we today find it difficult to understand why Protestants and Catholics felt it was necessary to kill each other in the 17th century.

Now, I am sure that if we were to ask every American adult today whether he prefers capitalism or socialism, <sup>OF MY PEOPLE</sup> the overwhelming majority, probably more than 90 percent,

would choose capitalism. And certainly the government which I represent prefers capitalism to socialism. There are some people in the United States who believe America is drifting towards socialism. There are others who think we should go the other way, and even remove the income tax, and return to the days of complete laissez-faire capitalism. I personally believe that neither one of these things will happen and that we will continue modifying our own American capitalist system in such a way as to increase its benefits and to reduce its defects.

But the most important and significant point I want to make here is this. Regardless of what happens in the United States, we are not trying to impose our economic system on anyone else against their will.

Our Policy Towards Cuba

Now for a few words on our Cuban policy. There are two main reasons why we regard Cuba as a major problem for the United States. First of all, the Castro regime has openly aligned itself with the powerful Communist dictatorships. This is not just what I say. Castro himself has said this many times publicly. And I remind you of the crisis which occurred in 1962 when we discovered Soviet missiles in Cuba, and the survival of the United States and the rest of this hemisphere, and the possibility of a Third World War, became urgent problems in the State Department.

The second reason we consider Cuba to be a major problem is that the Castro regime attempts to spread Communist dictatorship throughout Latin America. <sup>Castro</sup> ~~It~~ furnishes large amounts of money, and arms, and other forms of assistance, to totalitarian elements in other Latin American countries. As part of this program, Cuba trains other Latin Americans,

and now Africans, in guerrilla warfare and subversion, and returns them to their native countries to conduct direct and indirect aggression. Once more, this is not just what I say. Che Guevara admitted this openly the last time he was at the UN.

Now, what we want in Cuba is for the Cuban people themselves to have a chance to decide, in free elections, on the kind of government, and the kind of economic and social system, they wish. And if the Cuban people are wildly enthusiastic for collectivized farming and nationalized industry, that is up to them. And if the Cuban people are wildly enthusiastic for Fidel Castro, and for the system he has imposed on them, why is there any danger for him in allowing free elections?

But the Cuban people have not been allowed to have free elections.

United States Policy Toward Non-Communist Dictatorships

The next subject is our policy toward non-Communist dictatorships. In my discussions with Latin Americans I have found this to be one of the greatest sources of misunderstanding between us.

First of all, I want to emphasize that we do not believe dictatorship is a desirable or satisfactory final or permanent solution for any people or any country, not for Haiti, not <sup>for</sup> ~~be~~ Cuba, and not for the Soviet Union. And as I have said before, nothing would please us more than to have the world filled with solid, prosperous democracies.

But as we look at the <sup>world</sup> ~~map~~ today it seems obvious to us that some dictatorships, the Communist dictatorships, are more dangerous from the viewpoint of American survival and of world democracy <sup>than</sup> ~~are~~ the non-Communist dictatorships.

Now, the fact that we distinguish among dictatorships this

way does not mean that we are hypocritical, or illogical or evil. I remind you that 24 years ago the strongest dictatorship in the world at that time, the dictatorship of Adolf Hitler, attacked the second strongest dictatorship, the dictatorship of Joseph Stalin. The Nazis met the Communists in open combat, and <sup>the</sup> ~~that~~ Nazis were winning. At that time, it seemed obvious to us that the Nazi-Fascist Axis represented the greatest threat to American survival and to world democracy. And, as a result, we gave immense help to one of the most appalling dictatorships in the history of the human race, the dictatorship of Joseph Stalin. I do not know which dictatorship finally succeeded in killing more millions of people, Hitler's or Stalin's, but <sup>God knows</sup> they both killed many millions. And as a direct result of our help, the Stalinist dictatorship survived and continued. As we look back today on that painful decision it seems to us that, considering the

situation in the world at that time, our decision was the right one.

Today it seems just as obvious that the Communist dictatorships are the greatest threat to American survival and to world democracy. So that, for example, while we were glad when the dictatorships of Trujillo and Batista fell, and we certainly do not wish them to be restored, those dictatorships, because they stood alone, did not represent as great a threat to world democracy as does the Castro dictatorship, which is allied with the other Communist dictatorships.

Now as you watch our performance vis-a-vis <sup>governments</sup> ~~the non-~~ <sup>which are neither nor democratic,</sup> Communist ~~dictatorships,~~ and I hope you do watch our performance,

I think there are several things to be remembered. First

of all, it is naive to assume that there is always a democratic

alternative waiting to take power when a <sup>non-democratic government</sup> ~~dictator~~ falls. It

would be nice if that were true, but unfortunately it is not <sup>true</sup>.

*Magloire*                      *Haiti*  
When ~~Syngman Rhee~~ fell in ~~South Korea~~ he was not replaced  
by Jeffersonian democracy. When ~~the Diem family~~ *Machado* fell in  
*Cuba, he was* ~~South Viet Nam, they were~~ not replaced by Swedish democracy.

And when Batista fell in Cuba, he was not replaced by any  
kind of democracy. Unfortunately, a democratic alternative  
is not always available. And when a dictator falls he is  
frequently replaced by another dictator.

Secondly, where the foundations for democracy are very  
weak, or do not exist, it is extremely difficult to build  
them quickly. Moreover, the United States Government is not  
omnipotent. It cannot achieve everything it would like to  
achieve inside the United States, and it is even more  
difficult for our Government to be effective outside the  
United States.

However, there are various important things which can  
be done to help the cause of democracy in countries where it

does not yet exist. For one thing, we can sometimes quietly influence a government to pursue more liberal policies, even to permit elections. Second, we can often provide the kind of economic and technical assistance which *raise the standard of living and* will increase the democratic potential of a country and its people, and thus bring democracy closer. Sometimes we can bring citizens of the country to the United States for useful training, for example, as labor leaders. We can use all of these tactics, and we do use them, to help the growth of democracy. But there is no convenient formula for our tactics. Our tactics must depend on the situation which exists at any given time, and no two situations are ever identical.

~~2~~

Nevertheless, our basic long-range objectives remain -- survival and democracy.

The Role of American Companies in Latin America

Now I am going to say a few words on the role of American companies in Latin America. I am sure you all know that if an American gets off an American ship at La Guaira, and if he goes into a bar and gets drunk, and if he gets into a fight and accidentally kills a Venezuelan, then he is taken to a Venezuelan jail. Then he has the right to expect that the American Consul will come and make sure he is getting enough to eat, and has a lawyer to defend him. But this does not mean that the American Consul tells the Venezuelan Government that the American was right. And the United States Government does not automatically take the side

*companies in their disputes with Latin American governments.*  
of ~~an~~ American ~~company with the interests of the United States~~  
*Government.*  
*Government.*  
*United States Government.*

Now, I am sure that if all of us <sup>here</sup> were to study in detail the record of every American company in Latin America, we would find that some had contributed significantly to the

the social and economic progress of Latin America--and we would find that others had not contributed. And, incidentally, this is also true of Latin American companies.

We believe that each company should be judged on the basis of its own individual record, just as we, as individuals, want to be judged. We also believe that these disputes between American companies and Latin American governments are not major problems, and that they can be settled intelligently and fairly with full protection of Latin American sovereignty and Latin American interests. And I hope that none of you are so naive as to believe that the United Fruit Company or the Standard Oil Company are running the State Department. They are not running it - they are not trying to do so - and if they did try, they would not succeed.

VIII

Our Policy Towards The Soviet Union

My next subject is our policy toward the Soviet Union.

In accordance with our two basic policy objectives, survival and democracy, we are keeping ourselves strong in order to discourage Communist aggression. At the same time we are trying to use whatever channels are <sup>open</sup> ~~available~~ to us to encourage liberalization inside the Soviet Union. Now, there is nothing wrong with the Russian people. They are good people. They want to live in peace and they do not want to conquer the world. And we are not afraid of the Russian people or of their socialist economy. But we are very worried about their Communist dictatorship, and we are convinced that if that dictatorship is weakened or disappears, the danger of a Third World War will be greatly reduced. That is the main reason we want liberalization <sup>and</sup> ~~democratization~~ <sup>democratization</sup> inside the Soviet Union so much.

Now - there are various ways in which we can encourage

and stimulate that liberalization. For example, every two years we negotiate a cultural exchange agreement with the Soviet Union. In these negotiations we always urge the Soviet delegation to agree to an exchange of professors, so that Soviet professors can teach in American schools and American teachers can teach in Soviet schools. And you can imagine how I would welcome the opportunity to be able to talk to thousands of young Soviet leaders as I am talking to you today. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union has not yet agreed to such an exchange of professors.

However, there have been indications of liberalization inside the Soviet Union since the death of Stalin. For example, when Khrushchev fell from power he was not tried and executed as an imperialist-Trotskyite spy. This is progress. Secondly, the Soviet Union has stopped jamming the Voice of America radio broadcasts we make to the Russian people in

the Russian language. That is certainly progress. And Soviet artists produce abstract art, even though it is against the Party line. Writers, such as Pasternak, <sup>secretly</sup> ~~privately~~ write honest books which they know may never be published.

But we do not consider this to be significant liberalization. What do I mean by "significant" liberalization? Well, that would be, for example, if one Soviet newspaper, on one occasion, made one criticism of one Soviet leader, while he was still in power. And that has not yet happened, after 48 years of Communist dictatorship.

Some Personal Opinions Regarding the United States and the  
American People

Now - everything I have said up to this point is official American foreign policy. And what I am going to do now is to give you some very personal opinions of my own about what is good and bad about my country and my people. Most of the past 25 years I have lived outside the United States, and I hope that each time I return home I see my country with more mature eyes. If I were going to say what I think are the three best and the three worst things about the United States and the Americans, I would say these:

I believe our worst problem is the problem of racial prejudice. This is a problem in which I have been personally involved for over 20 years. I am a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which I consider to be the best organization in the fight for racial justice. Approximately 20% of its membership is white. I

remember the first time I came to Washington before the war, with some friends of mine from New York City, and I remember how shocked we were to see segregation in the municipal buses of Washington. So that even in the capital of our so-called democracy, whites were seated in front and blackes in the rear. And we - in protest - sat in the rear.

Now, of course, much has been accomplished in the struggle for racial justice since those days, and nobody would now suggest that we return to segregation of the Washington buses. And we have won many great victories, both in the north and in the south. Of course, a great deal still remains to be done, in the north as well as in the south. But America is facing up to this problem, and the United States Government is firmly on the side of racial justice. And we are winning, and we are going to continue to win. And it is precisely because we are solving this problem,

and not ignoring it, that so many ugly incidents, such as the one in Los Angeles, occur.

Now, I want to emphasize that all of this means that we are carrying out, today, in the United States, a profound social revolution, and we are carrying it out successfully, democratically, and with relatively little violence. And I promise you that the negroes in the South are going to vote. And you will see how accurate my statements are when you read in your newspapers that the negroes of the South are voting.

The second defect of the United States I want <sup>to</sup> mention is poverty. Of course, we do not have poverty as it is found in -- let us say -- the Soviet Union, China or the Congo. We have a very high standard of living. But we also have poverty, and it should be criticized *and reduced.*

The third defect of the United States is more difficult

to describe. I would say it is a kind of superficiality and vulgarity in daily life. However, if you share my opinion, I would like you to remember my experience in Italy. When I went to Italy to work in the American Embassy, in Rome, in 1957, I found that many Italian intellectuals were laughing at the United States because millions of Americans were spending so much time watching stupid television programs. And I think they were right for laughing. But in 1958 and 1959 Italy began producing cheap television sets, and millions of Italians then sat down in front of their own TV ~~sets~~ and watched equally stupid programs. So that what I am saying is that much of the superficiality of American life undoubtedly is only the inevitable result of technological progress.

Now, among the favorable aspects of the United States, I would mention these three. First of all, the United States is not only the strongest country in the world, ~~but~~ it is the

most dynamic that I have ever seen. And this dynamism hits me with a tremendous impact every time I return to my country. The U. S. is not only strong -- it is young, healthy, energetic, and has a tremendous capacity for change. Sometimes I even think it changes too quickly.

The second favorable aspect of the United States is opportunity. Now, many foreigners know that there is great economic opportunity in the United States, and that it is easier for poor people in the United States to advance themselves economically than in most other countries. But very few foreigners are aware of the opportunity for social advancement in the United States. What I mean is this. There are many good things about English democracy. But when two Englishmen meet they can usually tell from their respective accents to which social class they belong, and usually they are very conscious of these class differences.

Thank God, in the United States we do not have that terrible stratification of social classes which prevails in so many European and Latin American democracies.

The third thing I would say in favor of the United States is, in my opinion, the most important. The United States is not only the strongest country in the world, but it is also the strongest force for democracy. I remember very well when I was with our Embassy in Moscow. Whenever we made a trip inside the Soviet Union we would carry with us a portable radio. Whenever we stopped at a Soviet town we would plug in the radio in the hotel room, to see if we could hear the Voice of America, which was broadcasting in Russian and which was trying to get through the Soviet jamming in order to inform the Soviet people. Then, when we returned to Moscow, we would send a telegram to Washington saying, for example, on Thursday, in Odessa, your broadcast could

be heard clearly from 9:30 to 11, but in Kiev, on Friday, the jamming was too strong between 7:30 and 9. In this way the Voice of America would know which of its broadcasts were getting through.

I remember very well on one particular occasion I was alone in a little Soviet room, trying to hear the Voice of America. And suddenly it came through very clearly, and instinctively -- without thinking -- I stood up with love for my country, and admiration for my people.