

SEPTEMBER 10, 1965

### NATURE AND PURPOSE OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations reported on the findings and the conclusions he reached from the hearings held by the Committee on the American expedition into the Dominican Republic.

I want to endorse what he said 100 percent, both in its generalities and in its specifics.

But I want to add some observations of my own.

It is obvious from our activities in the Dominican Republic that the American Government does not have a clear idea, an idea appreciated uniformly throughout all its departments, of the nature or purpose of the Alliance for Progress.

Its purpose is to help reform the social, economic, and political systems of all nondemocratic nations of the hemisphere. We think of it as a peaceful, nonviolent revolution, perhaps more in the nature of rapid evolution than true revolution. It is inconsistent with support of economic or military oligarchies or political dictatorships.

We believe that the economic, political, and social institutions which have prevailed in many places in South and Central America for the past 50 years are totally inadequate to the present needs of the people. We saw the rise of Castro as the handwriting on the wall, and we took it as a warning that if affairs continued in the southern half of the hemisphere uninterrupted by any voluntary efforts, the Communist elements which won power in Cuba would be able to lead a Communist revolution in many more neighboring countries.

So the Alliance for Progress was devised not to suppress the demand for change, but to aid it and direct it in certain paths. That is the message the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency have not yet understood. The Alliance for Progress is intended to change the status quo in Latin America. We are pouring a billion dollars a year of private and public money into that endeavor. Yet the Defense Department and the CIA spend millions more trying to offset the Alliance and to forestall its purposes.

Certainly they do so at the behest of many of the people in the countries to the south who are intended to be displaced by the Alliance. The landlords and industrial oligarchs whose economic strangleholds must be broken, will always cry "Communist" when they see a threat to their domination. They do not care much whether the threat is genuinely Communist or comes from democratic reform elements. They stand to lose out either way, and to many of them there is no differ-

As Senator FULBRIGHT has pointed out, Juan Bosch and his party were bringing to their country the kind of revolution envisioned by the Alliance for Progress. But by 1965, the Defense Department, the U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, and many other high officials in the State Department and on the White House staff were frightened by the prospect. They were frightened by the prospect of returning to the practical application of the Alliance.

My own fears for the future of the Alliance, and for the future of Latin America are well known.

I think the demands of the huge population growth there are going to overwhelm the Alliance at its present rate of progress. We must go much further, much faster, if rates of material progress are to be achieved in those countries that will avert a turn to outright communism.

The big bottleneck to progress is not the Treasury of the United States, nor the Congress. It is the factions in the nations of Latin America that cling to the past and to their present power to block reform. So long as these elements are aided and encouraged by the U.S. military aid missions and CIA in thinking they will be sustained and preserved by American military might if they can just demonstrate that a threat of communism exists, they will continue to block essential economic reform.

I would remind the Secretary of Defense that he already has an Army of 125,000 men in South Vietnam, because we backed an oligarch there with 9 years of American financial support, yet he still failed to accomplish anything useful with it. We still have an Army of several thousand in the Dominican Republic, although U.S. aid to the Reid junta had been resumed and was in full supply. Between January 1964 and April 1965, the incredible sum of 61 million American dollars were made available to the Reid government, in a country of about 3½ million population. That means per capita aid of about \$17 for every man, woman, and child in the Dominican Republic, for one of our largest aid programs anywhere in the world.

How many countries can we occupy at one time? That is a question the Defense Department and its counterparts in the State Department had better answer before they commit U.S. backing and intervention to every junta and potential junta in Latin America that comes up to them and whispers: "Communists are about to get us." Granted that we are approaching Halloween, the Defense Department and the State Department should be told that Halloween goblins have no place in United States-Latin American foreign policy.

Many of these Latin American oligarchies and would-be military dictators are using the American military to stay in power. They count on its gullibility, on our overriding obsession with

communism, to hold back the tide that would otherwise sweep them away. That is the surest way I know to hasten the day when the great masses of people in Latin America will have no other path to follow to the promise of economic freedom than the Communist path.

It is a false promise; but we are in danger of making the Alliance a false promise, too. Another intervention on behalf of the likes of Donald Reid and Wessly Wessin, and the people of Latin America will know once and for all that the real Alliance for Progress died with John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

In closing, I want to stress again that the critical problems of economic growth that confront the people of Latin America cannot be solved in economies that continue to be dominated by landed aristocracies. Their control must be broken before economic populism and industrial

democracy can develop, and I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with this topic which appeared in the July issue of the Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Sciences appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which I have the honor to serve, for his speech yesterday which I consider to be an act of far-seeing statesmanship.