

Page Denied

Next 5 Page(s) In Document Denied

ica are rushing into a tremendous social revolution. The revolution of rising expectations is under way—with brighter hopes for an end to the misery, poverty, hunger, and ignorance which degrade human nature and blight the future for more than 180 million men, women, and children south of the border.

These people want an end to semi-feudal conditions with 5 percent of the people owning 90 percent of the land—with a handful of fabulously wealthy families living in luxury while the vast majority live in squalor on the thin edge of starvation. Many thousands of Latin Americans have risked exile, imprisonment, torture, and death to achieve responsible government, responsive to the needs and the hopes of a better life for their people.

In the midst of this social upheaval, the United States too often has appeared callous and indifferent to Latin America. In our eagerness to stop the spread of Communist subversion and tyranny, we have too often in past years appeared unconcerned about such home-grown despotism as the Trujillo regime in the Dominican Republic. Cuba was ripe for revolution when the Castro coup toppled Batista—and now the Communists are twisting the revolution to their own purposes. But all over Latin America the same sources of discontent and revolution threaten to interfere with democratic political, economic, and social development.

After World War II our concern with problems in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia resulted in neglect of our 20 fellow American republics. We gave billions of dollars—generously and wisely—to restore the economy of Western Europe. But the cumulative 14-year total of economic aid to Latin America under mutual security comes to only \$564 million. We told the Latin American nations, desperately seeking aid to modernize their primitive economies, that they should seek private investments and private enterprise to develop their economic potential.

Now we in the United States like our system of free enterprise. It has worked well for us, although not in the pure way that some people like to pretend. But Latin Americans still have bitter memories of "robber baron" exploitation which we long ago refused to permit in the United States. Furthermore, private enterprise usually is reluctant to make the long-term, low-return investments in a foreign country's economic 'infrastructure,' the roads, powerplants, schools, hospitals, and sanitation facilities which are essential for sound economic development. Latin Americans tell us they cannot stop their revolution of rising expectations while waiting for trickle-down prosperity.

After almost 8 years of indifference and inaction on the needs of Latin America, the President recently requested Congress to authorize \$600 million in economic aid for Latin America. For 8 years responsible citizens and Members of Congress have been calling for a genuine, realistic, adequate, long-range program of assistance for economic development in Latin America—but the light seems to dawn in the White House only when Cuba is well down the Communist path.

I believe the President's request shows a basic misunderstanding of the way to approach Latin America's economic development problems. Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, calls it frankly a stopgap measure, designed to bolster our diplomats at the September economic conference in Bogotá, Columbia. The Washington Post called it vague to the point of despair. I voted for this authorization—not because I want to give this administration a blank check for reckless spending, but rather with the thought that the next resident at the White House will know what is needed.

And what is really needed at this stage in Latin America is not money—but planning. The success of the Marshall plan in Europe was due largely to cooperative planning by the nations which were to receive economic aid. We need the same kind of cooperative regional planning for economic development in Latin America. We must encourage the countries of Latin America to cooperate—and we must join them not as the boss, not as "Mr. Moneybags," but as a partner and good neighbor. The mechanism for this kind of cooperative effort exists already in the Organization of American States.

A coordinated program along the lines of the Marshall plan would give Latin Americans new hope of achieving bread and freedom, a better life with new dignity as human beings. We should not be ashamed of humanitarian motivations. We should not be ashamed of our interest in helping downtrodden peoples break out of the vicious circle of hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance. Nor should we be embarrassed when our humanitarian interests coincide with our national interest in strengthening the underdeveloped countries of Latin America to resist the tempting promises of the Communists.

As population expands, as industrial development spreads, as hope and impatience mingle, Latin America will be a cauldron of competing ideologies. We should welcome this development, not fear it. We should prepare for it wisely, not expect blank check gifts or loans to buy friendship.

Last year in Puerto Rico I outlined a 9-point program to improve relations between the United States and Latin America. Here are the points I made:

1. We must step up economic aid to Latin America. These countries must speed their economic development—or misery and discontent will make them Communist camping grounds. We must encourage cooperative, coordinated planning through the Organization of American States.

2. We should speed and strengthen technical assistance in agriculture, health, education, vocational training and public administration. When President Truman first announced this "bold new program" of point 4 aid, he got a tremendously enthusiastic response from our Latin American friends. This program pays big dividends in good will and progress for a relatively small investment of money and manpower.

3. We should support moves to establish regional markets in Latin America, thus broadening markets for new low cost mass production and encouraging healthy diversification in the Latin American economies.

4. We should review our trade and tariff policies to see how they affect Latin America. It is a waste of time to give economic aid and then nullify the good effects by shortsighted trade restrictions. Of course, if American industries are injured, we must help the people and the communities affected. I have sponsored a Trade Adjustment Act for just this purpose.

5. Investment in health is the cheapest, most effective way, we can help build for the future in Latin America. Disease is an economic loss as well as a human tragedy. We must give more support to the work of the Pan American Sanitary Organization which carries out activities along the lines of my health for peace proposals.

6. We must step up student and cultural exchange with bold and imaginative programs. Too often we exclude just those young Latin Americans who would benefit the most—the so-called leftists or those who doubt our good intentions.

7. American press, radio, and TV should give broader and better-balanced news coverage to Latin American affairs. These countries have tremendous, complex problems in pulling themselves up by their bootstraps.

They need understanding as well as economic aid and technical assistance.

And we must step up our own information program to Latin America. Red China and the Soviet Union are pouring five times as much radio broadcasting into Latin America—and their transmitters are four times stronger than ours. We are falling behind in the war of words to win the hearts and the minds of the Latin American peoples.

8. We must reappraise our military assistance program in Latin America. We should not promote an arms race among these countries—and we should not give arms to a dictator to intimidate or tyrannize his own people. Castro still reminds the Cubans that the United States supplied arms to Batista.

9. We should press for regional disarmament in Latin America. The Organization of American States already provides fine machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes. I believe Latin America can be an international showcase of disarmament—with clear evidence that transfer of resources from weapons of war to economic development contributes to world peace.

With our food abundance, with our technical know-how, with our rich, productive economy, with our sympathy and understanding, we can help our Latin American friends put an end to the ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance—and we can build an atmosphere in which peace and freedom flourish.

YOUTH PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Youth Corps Panel Asks Rigid Tests." The article was written by Carroll Kilpatrick and appears in the Washington Post of today.

I now read part of the article:

Rigid standards should be established for selecting young men and women for the Peace Corps, which President-elect Kennedy proposed in the campaign, and they should be paid salaries in local currencies at going rates in the countries where they serve, a task force report today said.

Prof. Max F. Millikan, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, delivered the report to Mr. Kennedy in Washington Saturday, and it was released here today.

Mr. President, one point about the article to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate is that in making public the report, there was an indication of some change in earlier thinking in regard to the draft status or selective service status of the young men who may be included in this corps. Some of the original proposals had included a suggestion that these young men be exempt from selective service, but eligible for the Reserve requirements, and, of course, eligible for universal military training and recruitment in case of national emergency or war.

The Millikan report does not suggest exemption from selective service; but, rather, it suggests deferment. I am very much pleased, Mr. President, first of all, that the President-elect, Mr. Kennedy, appointed the task force to study this worthy proposal; and second, that the task force report has been made available.

As the Senate will recall, part of the Mutual Security Act of last year called on the government to make a study of

the possibilities and feasibility of a so-called Youth Peace Corps. That study is supposed to be available not later than March 31 or April 1. I hope the study will be received early enough so it can be carefully studied by the Congress itself.

I mention this point because it is my hope that once the administration has decided upon the policy it wishes to pursue in connection with this matter, at least I shall be given the privilege of being one of the sponsors or at least a cosponsor of this particular measure, because I am strongly in support of it, and back on June 16, 1960, I introduced a bill which provided for a very modest program for the so-called Youth Peace Corps, limited to 500 young Americans who would become the first enrollees in the first year of the Youth Peace Corps, which would be designed to expand our technical assistance program.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the article published on January 9 in the Washington Post and a release I submitted in the Senate, dated June 16, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article and the release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH CORPS PANEL ASKS RIGID TESTS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

NEW YORK, January 8.—Rigid standards should be established for selecting young men and women for the Peace Corps, which President-elect Kennedy proposed in the campaign, and they should be paid salaries in local currencies at going rates in the countries where they serve, a task force report today said. Prof. Max F. Millikan of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology delivered the report to Mr. Kennedy in Washington Saturday and it was released here today.

In making it public, the President-elect had no comment about the recommendation that his proposal for draft exemption for persons serving in the Peace Corps be abandoned.

The lengthy document said extreme care should be exercised in starting the program, that it should be begun on a modest scale and that universities should be responsible in part for carrying it out.

The Millikan report recommended the establishment of an international youth service agency to administer the Peace Corps. The agency should operate mainly through contracts with private nonprofit organizations such as universities, the report said.

The agency itself should not administer programs in the field. "The program should be launched on a limited pilot basis with no more than a few hundred members employed on tasks now known to be clearly vital to the recipient countries," the report said.

"Tough criteria of both academic and personality qualifications should be required by international youth service administration; participants should be required to commit themselves for at least 2 years, and should all have at least a bachelor's degree."

Youth Corps members should work for the country to which they are assigned but be under the general supervision of a senior American official. In no country should more than a limited number of members be assigned, for they should be spread in small numbers in the host country, the report said.

In discussing the draft problem, the report recommended draft deferment rather than exemption.

"There is abundant evidence that draft exemption is not required as a bait to induce an adequate number of applications to permit the selection of a first-class group," the report said. Moreover, the numbers to be selected will be small in the early years of the program.

The report warned that unless the whole program were carried out with the greatest care it could be brought into disrepute in the early stage.

"It should be recognized from the beginning that there will inevitably be some failures and some mistakes," it said. "These will not be fatal if they are limited to parts of the program and counterbalanced by some notable successes."

"It is essentially for this reason that we recommend a variety of differing contracts with private organizations each of which will bear principal responsibility for its own program rather than a massive centrally organized Government effort."

HUMPHREY CITES PEACE CORPS AS MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Under legislation introduced Wednesday by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, 500 young Americans would become the first enrollees next year in a Peace Corps designed to greatly expand our technical assistance program overseas.

The Humphrey bill calls for an eventual corps of 10,000 volunteers, enlisted for 3-year terms, to teach basic agricultural and industrial techniques, literacy, vocational education, the English language, and sanitation and health procedures in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. One year of the first enlistment would consist of an intensive language- and area-study program.

Citing the experience of the International Voluntary Service, a private nonprofit organization which has pioneered in the use of young American men in technical assistance programs under contract with the International Cooperation Administration, Senator Humphrey pointed out "these idealistic, talented young men, oriented toward the people-to-people approach, have enjoyed extraordinary success."

The Minnesotan gave as an example of IVS successes the work of a team of eight IVS specialists who set up an experimental station in Laos. The IVS men developed a fiber that would bring in \$1,500 per acre, in a country where per capita annual income is less than \$100 per year. The Laotian Government, Humphrey said, was so impressed that it has requested 11 more teams—1 for each Laotian province.

In Egypt, Senator Humphrey pointed out, one of the first requests made to the U. S. Government by the Egyptians after the Suez crisis had subsided was to send back two IVS men who had been operating a 33-acre experimental farm—"and another 10 just like them."

Humphrey said that the IVS experience demonstrates the "particular value" of utilizing young men without families, able to spend most of their spare time with the local populace and to participate in community cultural affairs.

"They can be real 'grass-roots ambassadors' in the villages and towns," he said, "and can give a tremendous impetus to our people-to-people effort."

"We need many more such young men—far more than any private organization can manage," Senator Humphrey declared. "There is a great body of idealistic and talented young men in this country who are longing to work for their country in constructive ways. The Peace Corps would tap those vital resources."

Senator HUMPHREY pointed out an added dividend in the Peace Corps investment: "the

development of a large pool of experienced men, trained in some of the more remote languages and with detailed knowledge of the emerging areas of the world—a pool from which our Foreign Service, ICA and USIA can profitably draw."

The Minnesotan said that service in the Peace Corps at a modest rate of pay, under his bill would be considered the equivalent of 3 years of active duty with the armed services, although upon discharge from the corps the young men would still be liable under UMT to be called to military service in times of war or national emergency.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most important gatherings of recent years takes place in Washington this week. Twenty-eight hundred delegates, from every State of the Union, as well as the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, will participate in the White House Conference on Aging. Three hundred national voluntary organizations will be represented.

I should like to take this opportunity to welcome all the distinguished persons who are to take part in this significant conference, and to express to them my wishes for a productive and successful meeting. I wish to extend a special welcome to the Minnesota delegation and its Chairman, Dr. Arnold M. Rose.

The White House Conference is a device that has been used successfully in the past to bring into the national spotlight subjects deserving widespread discussion and debate. Unfortunately, the work done at these meetings has not always been followed up, and the usefulness of some of the conferences has therefore been dissipated.

The able Representative from the State of Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY, who introduced in the other body the legislation initiating the Conference, has stressed that:

The Conference was not intended to be a goal in itself, but a "launching platform" for new, strengthened and expanded programs.

The purpose of the White House Conference is to bring together lay individuals interested in the field of aging, as well as professionals and experts, to allow them to meet and talk. The Conference should facilitate an exchange of views and a cross-pollination of ideas. Out of it should come new plans, new goals, and new directions. It should be looked at as only a starting point in building up on every level of government solid programs on aging.

DEMOCRATS TOOK INITIATIVE

Mr. President, the fact that this Conference is taking place in the waning days of the present administration has led some persons to believe that it is a "lame-duck" conference. The idea for this meeting, however, came from Democrats who were concerned that the Eisenhower administration was taking insufficient action in this area. The legislation setting up the Conference was passed by a Democratic Congress. It is unusual, moreover, for Congress to initiate a White House Conference; normally the executive branch takes the lead in proposing such a meeting.