

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

915  
P+P

Agriculture

FROM: PCM

DEC 17 1951

DATE: November 8, 1951

TO:

WW		<i>W</i>
		<i>W</i>

COMMENTS:

*CIB - I think this excellent report by Paul Manglerdahl is a fine background for the recommendations to our Trustees for increasing our interest in agriculture. Warren*

*Copy filed 200  
U.S. - State  
Foreign policy  
Conferences*

SUBJECT: PCM's Notes on National Conference on U.S. Foreign Policy, held under the auspices of the Department of State, Washington, D.C., October 30-31 and November 1, 1951.

PCM attended the program and round table on "Inter-American Affairs" on October 30, and the program and round table on "Point IV" on October 31.

Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, made a splendid off-the-record speech on the subject, "Problems of Inter-American Affairs," which has considerably clarified PCM's thinking on Latin America. The United States is dealing with twenty different countries, some very large, some very small, some whose culture is quite primitive, others with a highly developed culture, some overpopulated, some underpopulated. Three different languages are involved. These countries have two things in common:

1. They all obtained their political independence about the same time as the U.S., but this did not bring with it the same economic consequences as it did in the U.S.
2. The Latin countries have low per capita income. Latin American countries in the aggregate have about the same population as the U.S., but the combined income of all the countries is only about 10% of that of the U.S.

In sovereignty the Latin American countries are theoretically equal to the U.S., but politically and economically they definitely are not. This is the basic problem thrown into sharp focus in recent years. There are now two great powers in the world, the U.S. and Russia. In this hemisphere there is only one great power. The U.S. has had to pick up economic responsibilities formerly borne by four powers - Britain, Italy, Germany, and Japan. Although they were competitors, they also shared economic responsibility. Now that responsibility rests almost entirely on the U.S.

We have had the paradoxical situation of the U.S. position becoming increasingly great while it has increasingly been putting its relations with Latin America on an equal basis of sovereignty, and in so

doing voluntarily giving up many of its prerogatives, including those recognized under the Monroe Doctrine. In return, we have expected the Latin American countries to respond with cooperation; in other words, a kind of courtship of the Latin countries has been going on. How successful has this been? Judged by the standards of the Thirties, our present relations with the Latin countries are very good. In Mexico they are the best in history (a possible factor in RF success in Mexico). We have succeeded in eliminating much suspicion, but cooperation is by no means as complete as we should like. How many troops, for example, have the Latin American countries sent to Korea? Almost none. Yet all twenty countries have supported the U.S. in the moral and legal activities of the United Nations with respect to Korea. This is extremely important, since it is traditionally U.S. policy to establish moral and legal bases for going into war.

What are the causes of some of the Latin American disappointment? After a vigorous courtship, we have now given our first attention to Europe. We have shown lack of understanding of their problems. We have imposed duties on products, such as tuna, which are not very important to us but quite important to several of them.

What do we want to accomplish in Latin America in the future? Essentially to give practical reality to our theoretical equality. To accomplish this we must:

1. Build confidence; educate them in our objectives and aspirations.
2. Assist them in obtaining their own national objectives. These include political stability. Dictatorships are never politically stable. Some of the so-called democracies are not real democracies and are not promising from the standpoint of political stability. In Cuba, for example, there is a complete identity of labor unions and government which is itself a kind of dictatorship.
3. Help them in economic development. This is the principal objective of the Point IV program.

There are distinct limits to what government can do in attaining these important objectives. We must look to private enterprise, both local and introduced. We must educate the people of the countries to the roles of capital and labor. The oil companies in Venezuela may be doing a better job of public relations than the U.S. government agencies are doing in Panama.

During the question period which followed, Mr. Miller answered all questions frankly and, it seemed to PCM, intelligently. Many of the questions were concerned with Argentina. Mr. Miller consistently took the stand that it would be a mistake for us to take Argentina too seriously or to overestimate her role. She is at present in a very unhappy situation which he believes will come to an end in due time. Her prestige among the other Latin countries has suffered. In any case, although she may still be the strongest Latin country, she is still relatively small and unimportant as compared to the U.S.

Round Table on Inter-American Affairs

The panel comprised of Rollin S. Atwood, Acting Director, Office of South American Affairs; Edward G. Cale, Director, Office of Regional American Affairs; and Joseph P. Costanzo, Deputy Public Affairs Adviser, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.

Much of the discussion was concerned with questions of raw materials and military outlook, but some time was devoted to agriculture. The statements on this subject were either confined to the broadest generalities or to relatively unimportant specific examples. No attempt was made to give the participants a clear picture of what Point IV is doing in agriculture. It was stated that magnificent progress had been made in Mexico in improving corn, but The Rockefeller Foundation was not mentioned in this connection, and the definite impression was left that Point IV is responsible for the achievements in Mexico. The statements about the far-reaching influence of the Institute at Turrialba were quite unrealistic. Mr. Cale did express concern about getting personnel for an expanded program. He stated that the program would be no better than its personnel and that it is extremely difficult to get competent personnel.

Mr. Bennett's Speech on Point IV

Henry G. Bennett, Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration, stated that Point IV program, which was enunciated in principle in President Truman's inaugural address in 1949, represented a pulling together of many things which had been done for many years by private enterprise, including missionaries, and industry, and by government agencies. Since funds became available in September of 1950, Point IV has signed agreements with 32 nations. It is understood that those nations shall always furnish a fair share of the cost and that the programs entered into shall be only those which the host nation requests. In the majority of the underdeveloped countries of the world, 80% to 90% of the people are engaged in agriculture, and consequently the improvement of agriculture is one of the principal objectives of Point IV. Two other principal objectives are improvement in education and public health. Mr. Bennett spent most of his time in describing the miracles which this country has witnessed in the past hundred years in the development of scientific agriculture, the techniques of mass education, and the control of disease. It is the purpose of Point IV to pass on these miracles to less fortunate parts of the world. How this is to be done and how much success Point IV has had so far are questions to which almost no answers were given. Mr. Bennett obviously has popular appeal; his speech drew greater applause than any presented at the conference. Nevertheless, I heard it said by several people in the audience that we hadn't learned much from it.



#### Round Table on Point IV

PCM attended one of the two Round Tables on Point IV. This one was in the charge of Patrick Condon, and the panel comprised of a Mrs. Simons and Messrs. Vaughan, Hanson, and Williams. The discussion was largely confined to questions 3, 4, 6, and 7 among the prepared questions, and never did really get around to what Point IV is doing and how it is doing it. Some aspects of agriculture were treated. In answer to a question about changing the culture of a country as the result of improving agricultural methods, Vaughan, a specialist in agriculture, replied that Point IV is recommending that there be a sociologist or an anthropologist on each mission, and in any case, all personnel sent on missions are instructed to keep their eyes and ears open and their mouths closed until they have become acquainted with the culture of the country to which they were assigned. The implication was that this might be a matter of weeks. PCM was quite disturbed at Hanson's statement that there is no longer any difficulty about getting personnel for the Point IV program; the machinery has been set up, and there is abundant manpower in the United States in all categories of technical assistants to do the job. When pressed on this point, he admitted that there is a shortage of water geologists, but insisted that well-trained people are available in all other categories and that there is no difficulty whatever in obtaining their services in connection with Point IV. The only limitation that he could see in helping other countries to develop their economic improvement is their ability to absorb what we can give them.

In spite of what seemed to PCM an unrealistic attitude on the part of the people involved in the panel, a number of rather penetrating statements were made. Hanson, for example, expressed the opinion that there is scarcely a country in the world today in which the government in power is not under pressure from its people to improve health, education, and the food supply. Point IV is a calculated risk, and at the moment seems the only actual method of solving the problem. It may or may not succeed. Its philosophy of helping other people to help themselves is sound. Williams, in public health, when asked whether it was more important to improve the food supply first or to control malaria, answered that in his opinion it doesn't make any difference: "Once you start a good program of any description," he said, "others inevitably follow."

#### General Impressions

PCM has the general impression that the strategy of Point IV is excellent, but that its tactical implementation is in many cases appallingly ineffective. The contrast between the speeches of the several Assistant Secretaries - Miller, Hickerson, McGee, and Rusk - and the answers given to questions in the round tables by the men who are responsible for the implementation of Point IV is quite disturbing. If Point IV is at all effective, it will be primarily because of sheer volume in which by chance alone there will be an occasional success, and not because of efficient administration. Some of the reports which have been issued are unrealistic, to say the least, while others come close to verging on dishonesty. PCM is more than ever

convinced of the need for private enterprise in connection with this great problem of bringing food, health, and education to the backward parts of the world. RF programs in agriculture can do two things in helping to set a pattern: they can show how well-trained personnel can do an effective job at relatively small cost (compared with costs of governmental projects), and they can demonstrate the importance of long-range planning and sustained effort.

Attached are a number of documents to accompany the diary notes.

PCM:akm