

See code

VIA: AIR
(SPECIFY AIR OR SEA POUCH)

DISPATCH NO. HGG-A-1076

~~RYBAT/PBSUCCESS/SECRET~~
CLASSIFICATION

MAY 14 1954

TO : Chief, Lincoln DATE _____

FROM : Chief of Station, Guatemala [] Info: Washington

SUBJECT: GENERAL—
SPECIFIC— Transmittal of Embassy Despatch

Attached for Lincoln only is a copy of Despatch No. 901, "Politburo of Guatemalan Communist Party Says U. S. Failed at Caracas, Warns of Continued Interventionist Attempts".

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM
RELEASE AS SANITIZED

2003

[]
Adrian B. Kidwell

Encl; as noted

13 May 1954

Distribution:
2 - Lincoln w/encl
2 - Washington w/o encl
1 - Files w/o encl

15 MAY 1954

~~RYBAT/PBSUCCESS/SECRET~~
CLASSIFICATION

May 3, 1954

MAY 5 1954

**Politburo of Guatemalan Communist Party Says U.S.
Failed at Caracas, Warns of Continued Interventionist Attempts.**

There are enclosed a translation and the Spanish text of a statement on the Caracas Conference adopted by the Political Committee of the Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo (PGT), Guatemala's Communist Party.

This document, which sets the party line towards Guatemala's relations with the United States at the present time, purports to show that the United States has used inter-American organizations for imperialist exploitation of Latin America, that in the present phase of history the Latin American people are rebelling against this exploitation, and that the United States therefore had to resort to blackmail and coercion to have even a watered down "anti-Communist" resolution passed at the Caracas Conference. However, despite this victory of the "anti-imperialist" forces, the Political Committee warns, the imperialists will continue their efforts towards intervention in Guatemala and an organized struggle against such intervention must be maintained.

William L. Krieg
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.

Enclosures:

1. Informal Translation, PGT Statement;
2. Newspaper Clippings thereof.

JCH11:rd

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

Informal Translation, Statement by the Political Commission of the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Labor Party, Tribuna Popular, April 25, 1954:

BALANCE SHEET OF THE CARACAS CONFERENCE

The Tenth Inter-American Conference took place from March 1 to March 27 in the city of Caracas, Venezuela. No other event in international history in recent years has been followed with as much interest by the Guatemalan people as the Caracas Conference. The political Commission of the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Labor Party considers it necessary to make a balance sheet of the Conference.

-0-

Throughout the years, ever since 1890 when the foundation of the inter-American system was laid, beginning with the Pan American Union, and continuing since 1948 under the name of the Organization of American States (OEA), this system has constantly served as an instrument of the expansionist foreign policy of the Government in Washington formulated by the powerful U.S. monopolies. It is not strange that Yankee monopolist investments have increased in Latin America since the creation of the inter-American system, or rather it is not strange that the inter-American system was created and consolidated simultaneously with the increase in Yankee monopoly investments which have resulted in the loss of Latin American national independence. In 22 years, from 1897 to 1919, direct American investments in Latin America amounted to \$1,700,000,000; the rythm of these investments has been greater in recent years; in only seven years, from 1943 to 1950, they grew to \$1,900,000,000, and in only two years, from 1950 to 1952, they increased another thousand million. Mr. Foster Dulles, Secretary of the U.S. Department of State boasted at the Caracas Conference that direct Yankee investments in Latin America amounted to date to \$6,00,000,000 and demanded better terms from our countries for increasing those investments.

Everyone knows what these thousands of millions have signified for Latin America: the backward economy of Latin America is in the strong grip of the Yankee monopolies which obtain millions of dollars in profit from our countries, while the people of Latin America suffer miserable conditions under the heel of bloody despots in the service of foreign capital.

This brutal situation is pointed to by Washington as a "model of international cooperation," as an "example of the solidarity and unanimity" which exist in America, using the well-known phrase, which has no foundation, that "America is the Continent of freedom."

Nevertheless, U.S. domination is not everlasting, and it has been maintained in recent years only by overcoming growing difficulties.

The fight for national liberation by Latin American countries is being strengthened, headed by the Communists and the working class of each country and even, in some cases, taking in sectors of the local bourgeoisie which is also desirous of shaking off the stifling U.S. yoke.

In recent years, the movement for national liberation has taken on particular importance in Guatemala, which, for this reason, has earned the hatred of Yankee imperialists. Everyone knows of the plans and threats used by foreign interventionists in an attempt to overthrow violently the patriotic and progressive regime headed by Colonel Jacobo Arbenz, in place of which they wished to install a government of assassins who dream of bombarding the peaceful citizens of our cities with napalm bombs.

The Caracas Conference was planned, then, at the time when Yankee monopolies dreamed of increasing their direct investments in Latin America, at a time when patriotic opposition in Latin America to the colonial domination of Yankee imperialism was growing, and at a time when Guatemala, like a lightning rod, was attracting to itself a storm of imperialist intervention threats plotted with the tyrannies of Central America and the Caribbean and with the traitors who head the subversive movement in our country, falsely called "anti-Communist."

The democratic forces in Guatemala which have consistently denounced the many plots planned by foreign intervention against our country, also denounced the Caracas Conference well in advance (on November 26, 1953), claiming that it would be used by Washington to wrest a formula from the nations of Latin America which would "legalize" intervention against our country. The formula was to consist of a Conference resolution which would condemn Guatemala as a "threat" to "continental solidarity and security" and would oblige the nations of America to adopt measures against the alleged "threat."

On November 10, 1953 the U.S. Government asked that the Caracas Conference discuss its proposal on "international Communist intervention in the American Republics." The Yankee proposal was nothing more or less than a key to open the door to the intervention resolution mentioned above, and this was soon confirmed by many publications and reports. But it was not long before other publications and reports revealed the difficulties encountered by the Yankee imperialists in attempting to ensure beforehand the support of the Latin American delegations for an anti-Guatemalan resolution. The extensive solidarity with Guatemala's fight, the unanimity of our people's rejection of possible foreign intervention, and the firmness of President Arbenz' Government, made things even more difficult for the U.S. sponsors of local conspirators.

-0-

Even before the Caracas Conference opened it was apparent that the Latin American countries were principally concerned with their economic problems. The yoke of Yankee domination has been tightened to such an extent that even Governments usually very subservient to Washington

were anxious to attend to economic problems. Trembling, stammering, they were forced to present their economic problems in some way, under pressure from their people.

For its part, the U.S. delegation was little inclined to pay attention to such problems and during the debates left no room for doubt as to its real intentions.

The "New York Times" correspondent wrote at the beginning of the Caracas Conference: "To date apparently not one country south of the United States has appeared satisfied with U.S. policy..." It is pertinent to add that now that the Conference is over there are even fewer reasons for satisfaction with that policy.

In order to avoid a discussion of economic problems - so essential to the countries of Latin America - the U.S. delegation, headed by Mr. Foster Dulles, a typical representative of the hated "big stick policy," employed any means to make the seditious "anti-Communist" proposal the principal matter of the Conference, a proposal directed against any country in which difficulties might arise with Yankee monopoly capital, and in particular, at this time, against Guatemala. From the beginning of the Conference, the U.S. delegation demanded that its "anti-Communist" proposal have priority over any other, and made it very clear that Mr. Dulles had come to Caracas for the express purpose of forcing a favorable vote from the majority for that proposal.

But Mr. Dulles was forced to prolong his stay in Caracas more than he had anticipated. The Latin American delegations were not unanimously disposed to be led docilely by the U.S. shepherds. There then began a race of shameful pressure and blackmail. The Latin American delegations were consulted one by one at the American Embassy in Caracas concerning the proposal to be presented by the U.S. delegation, a proposal directed openly against Guatemala. Mr. Dulles received so emphatic a refusal that he was forced to amend his original proposal substantially, convinced that a motion openly directed against Guatemala would not succeed at the Conference.

But even with the modifications which were introduced, the Yankee proposal still had a difficult course to follow toward final approval. Faced with pressure from the people and the firm denunciation of the Guatemalan delegation, all the delegations were forced to affirm in one way or another their "faith" in the principle of non-intervention, and several of them presented serious substantive objections to the Yankee proposal, particularly the Mexican, Argentine and Uruguayan delegations.

The Guatemalan delegation, after clearly and incontrovertibly establishing its position - the position which the democratic forces and the Government of our country have maintained toward the Yankee proposal - suggested that, in the first place, a definition be given of what the Conference understood by "international Communism," since, as Foreign Minister Teriello said, "'Communism' has been used to define the abolition of unjust privileges enjoyed by foreign companies; labor and

agrarian legislation favoring rural and city workers; the expropriation of oil lands; the pro-peace campaign; and any campaign for the economic and social improvement of the people: any effort to achieve complete independence; the desire of colonial peoples to win their freedom and independence, etc."

The Guatemalan delegation's question aroused the most insignificant (ruines) delegations to define, each after its own fashion and not one in accord with the other, what they considered the worn out phantom of "international Communism" to be. The lack of agreement among the various delegations is eloquent evidence of the extent to which the dirty banner of "anti-Communism" is merely a smokescreen!

After days of debate the Yankee proposal was approved, with Guatemala voting against it and two important countries of Latin America - Mexico and Argentina - abstaining. Days before, the "New York Times" correspondent, biting his nails because of the concern he felt for the chances of the Yankee proposal, wrote from Caracas that the "salvation" of the proposal would be possible only through "energetic action and the application of economic pressure." The facts show that that extent blackmail and "economic pressure" were used. Bolivia and Chile were offered a "solution" to the serious conditions of their principal products (tin and copper, respectively); other governments were made similar offers and the Ecuadoran Government was informed that they would not be granted the \$12 million credit they were negotiating for in the United States if they voted against the U.S. proposal! (After the Conference, as payment for its shameless subservience to Yankee demands, Ecuador received the credit.)

Expressing the sentiments of not a few of the delegations, the Uruguayan representatives stated, after approving the Yankee proposal: "We have added our vote for this document without optimism, without enthusiasm, without the satisfaction of believing that we were joining in the adoption of a constructive, progressive measure capable of pleasing anyone in America but the Governments." The magazine "Visión", accomodating spokesman for the Yankee Department of State, reported that a delegate to the Caracas Conference had stated that "the United States came out ahead once more. They wanted an anti-Communist declaration and they obtained it as they wanted it. We are tired of serving as the plaything for American international and domestic interests." And the "New York Post" (to cite only one newspaper, said that Dulles had left Caracas "leaving behind him the seeds for an anti-Yankee front... No verbal victory obtained by us (adds the newspaper) can conceal our profound ideological defeat."

What remains of the Conference if we subtract the "anti-Communist" resolution? What attention and what satisfaction was given to the essential economic problems of Latin America? None! The countries of Latin America were cold-bloodedly deceived once again. The U.S. delegation which employed all measures to achieve unanimity in support of its "anti-Communist" resolution, successfully opposed with all its might the solution of economic problems. With the precise language of

businessmen, the U.S. delegation summed up its position in the following terms: "In political questions the fundamental concern is unanimity; but in economic questions it is "democratic" to ...disagree." (5)

The most that the Latin American nations could obtain in connection with their primary concern was a resolution calling for a future meeting of Ministers of Finance or Economy. In the "whereas" clauses of that resolution it is recalled that the Ninth Inter-American Conference (1948) "implementing a decision of the Rio de Janeiro Conference of 1947, called an Economic Conference of the Organization of American States at Buenos Aires," a conference which after six years has still not been held and shows no signs of being held on any specific date.

The Guatemalan delegation presented several constructive proposals to the Economic Commission of the Conference referring to the "Need for guaranteeing stable markets and remunerative prices for raw materials, food products and semi-manufactured items," "Agrarian reform and economic development," "Necessity for prohibiting the economic boycott in inter-American relations," "Diversification of production and industrialization, essential to the progress of American States," "Investments by foreign capital and economic development" and "Monopolies and economic development." The above Guatemalan suggestions followed the general position of President Arbenz' democratic government. Of them all, only the one regarding the Agrarian Reform was approved, while in response to the other proposals the Conference voted a resolution entitled "Investments of private foreign capital and economic development" which contains the monstrous recommendation that our countries adopt the measures long demanded by the U.S. monopolies, measures which go so far as to include the elimination of tax payments which the resolution qualifies as "discriminatory or unduly onerous." This very language has always been used in our country by the United Fruit Company!

Let us proceed to an examination of the "anti-Communist" and "interventionist" resolution adopted by the Caracas Conference under the sonorous title of "Declaration of solidarity for the preservation of the political integrity of American States against intervention by international Communism."

It goes without saying that this statement repeats the oft-repeated anti-Communist lies which appeared in the Bogotá (1948) and Washington (1951) resolutions, and the same hypocritical phrases about the "peace and security of the American States" and "the faith of the American peoples in the effective exercise of representative democracy," etc. What was added to this deceptive smokescreen was the statement that:

"Domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the International Communist movement which might result in the extension to the American continent of an extra-Continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would require the adoption of appropriate measures in accordance with existing treaties."

Which are the treaties referred to by the Declaration? The text does not indicate, but during the debates it was clearly established that the reference was to the Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance Treaty, commonly known as the Rio de Janeiro Pact, signed in September 1947.

This is not the occasion to re-examine that Pact, supposedly of a defensive nature but in reality one of Yankee imperialism's instruments for lashing the countries of Latin America to the cart of their aggressive adventures. The Pact obliges the American States to reject unanimously aggression against any one of them, but its clauses are intentionally and insidiously written with such vagueness and in such general terms that its application under orders from Washington, is extremely dangerous for our countries as proven by the Caracas Conference where the Rio de Janeiro Pact was called upon to trample the sovereignty and independence of any Latin American State which might annoy the governing circles in the U.S.

Article 6 of the Pact states that if "the sovereignty or political independence of any American State is subjected to aggression other than an armed attack, or by a conflict either extra-orintra-continental, or by any other act or situation which might endanger peace in America, the Consultative Body is to meet immediately in order to agree on the measures to be taken in support of the victim, or, in ANY CASE, the appropriate measures to be taken for the common defense and the maintenance of Continental peace and security." (Italics ours, PGT)

The measures which may be taken by the Consultative Body are indicated in Article 8 of the Pact: "Withdrawal of chiefs of mission; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or total interruption of economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraph, telephone, radio telephone or telegraph communications, and the use of armed force."

The aforementioned measures are obligatory for all signatories to the Rio de Janeiro Pact, "with the sole exception that no State is obligated to employ armed force without its own consent." (Article 30) Finally, the sole requirement for the adoption of the above measures is the vote of two-thirds of the signatory States. (Article 17)

As can be seen, the Declaration, proposed by Dulles and approved by the Caracas Conference, the true purpose of which is concealed by the reactionary press, constitutes a monstrous threat against the sovereignty and independence of the Latin American States, since the Government of the United States, dominated by the U.S. monopolies, could, protected by the Declaration adopted at Caracas, call for a meeting of the Consultative Body under the pretext that the Government of Guatemala has fallen under the control or domination of the Communists, and, utilizing at will the votes of some dozen lackey governments in Latin America, have any of the measures included in Article 8 adopted. Needless to say, the ruling circles in the United States have insisted that the Government of Guatemala "is Communist," a lie which at a given moment

can be invoked to set the Rio Pact machinery in motion, with the further support of the Declaration adopted at Caracas.

The Minister of Foreign Relations, Lic. Guillermo Toriello, in the name of the Guatemalan Government, declared at the Caracas Conference that the interpretation which would now be given to the Rio de Janeiro Pact is an "interpretation which attempts to convert the measures established in that Treaty into collective ^{intervention} in the internal affairs of American States." He added: "We make the emphatic statement, and to this highly important matter we call the attention of the American Continent, that we can accept no new interpretation of the provisions of the Rio de Janeiro Treaty which attempts to convert that Treaty into an instrument for intervention in the internal affairs of American States."

Foreign Minister Toriello also said: "Guatemala rejects any type of intervention, individual or collective; intervention committed to injure democracy or intervention carried out under the pretext of defending it. Our position is clear and is not subject to interpretation: the people and the Government of Guatemala are not prepared to allow intervention by any force, any political international organization, any nation within or outside the Continent, and for no pretext... and any such intervention, political or economic, unilateral or collective, will be denounced before the Organization of American States and the Security Council of the United Nations; and it will find Guatemalans defending their native soil inch by inch and prepared for any sacrifice in defense of national dignity."

In the final record of the Conference, the Guatemalan delegation set forth the views it had maintained during the debates. The Mexican delegation also put into the record its views condemning emphatically the Declaration proposed by Dulles and approved in the manner we have discussed. Other delegations included statements revealing their government's lack of inclination, under vigorous popular pressure, to lend themselves willingly to the application of Yankee imperialism's plans against Guatemala and against any other State which may earn the ill will of the monopolies which dominate the Government of the United States.

Moreover, the Conference approved a so-called "Caracas Declaration" the provisions of which are radically opposed and contradictory to those of the anti-Communist resolution. The Governments of Latin America, aware of the sentiment of the peoples of the Continent and their firm opposition to any intervention against any State, and in particular, at the moment, against Guatemala, felt obliged to insist on the non-intervention principle as an axiom in the relations among States. That is why several Latin American delegations, although they were in agreement with the interventionist resolution proposed by Dulles, were in favor of the Conference's approving a Declaration reaffirming the principle of non-intervention and the right of nations to decide freely, without foreign interference, on their internal affairs.

The Caracas Declaration constitutes a denial of the Dulles resolution and it will be the task of the people to see that it prevails in the future.

-o-

An examination of the Conference provides the following conclusions and fixes the position which we suggest the nation assume in defense of democratic freedoms, sovereignty and national independence.

1.-The Caracas Conference was a heavy blow to U.S. policy which continues to consider Latin America as the "back yard" of the United States, an expression used without mincing words by several newspapers like the "New York Times." Never had U.S. policy been the object of so much criticism at an inter-American Conference. From this standpoint and from the standpoint that the Declaration imposed by the North Americans is not all that the Yankee leaders would have liked it to be, since they would have liked to put Guatemala on trial and condemn her as a "threat to Continental solidarity," etc., it can be stated that the Caracas Conference constituted a serious reverse for the leading circles in the United States.

2.-Nevertheless, it would be a dangerous illusion on the part of our people to judge that all threat of foreign intervention against Guatemala has disappeared. The difficulties encountered by Foster Dulles in advancing his proposal did not prevent him from forcing the approval of the majority of the delegations. The Conference did not approve the proposal as originally advanced by the U.S. Government, but it did approve an interventionist declaration under the title of "Declaration of solidarity for the preservation of the political integrity of American States against the intervention of international Communism."

This Declaration is frankly interventionist; it is a threat which hovers over our Nation and over the heads of all governments in Latin America which may decide to undertake an independent policy in harmony with the demands of their people. The Declaration constitutes a brutal violation of the right of self-determination of nations which, in using that right, can give themselves the regime which they have freely chosen, even a Communist regime if they so wish, and no State should have any authority to intervene and molest people from exercising their rights. Under the pretext that "control or domination" of an American Government by the Communists "would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of American States," the Declaration "authorizes" foreign intervention against whichever country the U.S. Government might indicate as being "dominated" by the Communists. A declaration of this type not only violates the right of self-determination; it also violates the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization of American States, and the Human Rights Charter which has been signed in the UN by all American states. Further, the application of the Declaration would violate the Constitution of many nations - if not of all - since there is not a State whose Constitution does not establish the sovereign right of the people to govern themselves and live without being subject to the dictates of a foreign power.

3.-The Declaration imposed by the North Americans at Caracas twists the interpretation of the Rio de Janeiro Pact, placing it at the service of interventionist plans. The Communists and the workers of Guatemala denounced this Pact at the time as an instrument of U.S. policy. Guatemala signed the Pact as a result of a foreign policy contrary to the national interests and impregnated with the false idea that "nothing can be done against the wishes of Washington." At that time no one wished to pay heed to the voice of the Communists and the working class, but now it would be difficult for persons of democratic ideas and patriotic sentiments not to understand clearly that the Rio de Janeiro Pact cannot result in any good for Guatemala and that, on the contrary, it can be utilized by the forces of international reaction to the detriment of the aspirations of our people.

4.-It is essential that one other fact of great importance be pointed out: the vigorous mobilization of peoples against the domination of the foreign monopolies, demanding the reaffirmation of the principle of non-intervention and offering their solidarity with Guatemala was a factor of great weight which could not be ignored at the Caracas Conference. The attitude taken by a goodly sector of the delegations was the result not of the fact that they were animated by democratic convictions, but of the fact that they were forced to consider public opinion in their own nations.

5.-Recent announcements, publications and statements by the government circles in the United States, lead one to believe that the U.S. policy will not in the future become more favorable for Latin America; on the contrary, everything indicates that they will continue to follow a policy of greater extortion of our countries, aggravating our economic problems and the condition of the working masses.

6.-The Guatemalan Labor Party believes that the Guatemalan delegation's conduct at the Caracas Conference was good; it followed fundamentally the line of the democratic forces and the Government of President Arbenz and for this reason the people gave them their firm support.

The conduct of the Guatemalan delegation was in line with the orientation of Guatemala's foreign policy in recent years. At the moment our country's foreign policy is conforming more and more to the internal policy of President Arbenz' Government, that is, it is conforming more and more to a policy in defense of democratic freedom and national independence, a policy which takes into account the national interest and which is, thereby, more anti-imperialist.

7.-The people of Guatemala should be aware of the fact that they cannot relax their vigilance and falter in their patriotic struggle against foreign intervention. U.S. imperialism is not slackening nor will it slacken in its aim to destroy the revolutionary movement in our country. The Government of the United States, a government of the U.S. monopolies, at all times acts and will act with relation to Guatemala and all the nations of Latin America, as imperialism acts and has always acted to stifle the just aspirations for national liberation on the part of oppressed peoples.

This is not to say that foreign intervention and the collapse of our people's revolutionary struggle are inevitable. Imperialism is powerful but not omnipotent. The fight for the national liberation of our people is an irreducible part of the fight for liberation by hundreds of millions of beings firmly resolved to order their destiny with absolute independence. Guatemala is small and weak, but it is not alone, nor is it powerless.

The fight for the unity of all the people in the defense of progress, of democratic freedoms, of national sovereignty and peace, must continue and gain greater and greater force. The political Commission of the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Labor Party once more calls on all patriots to unite; all those who, above their political, religious or other difference, can fight united because there burns in their hearts the flame of liberty and love for the Fatherland.

In this fight the working class has an outstanding role. The working class, which holds in its hands the banner of national independence, of democratic freedoms and of peace, must to an increasing extent become the hard core of the united front of the popular Guatemalan masses. Now that the Caracas Conference is over, the Guatemalan people must give a suitable reply to U.S. imperialism, the only reply in harmony with the interests of the nation: we reject all foreign interference in our internal affairs; we defend and we shall always defend the right of our people to give themselves the political regime they want!

The Political Commission of the Central Committee reaffirms on this occasion what it stated in our Program:

"The Guatemalan Labor Party puts its confidence in the ability of our people to move forward. The future belongs neither to the feudal exploiters nor to the imperialist enslavers. The future belongs to the people who are marching toward their national liberation. The people of Guatemala, in whose hands alone is the achievement of their happiness and welfare, are fully capable of achieving the tasks they have set before them."

"In this beautiful and relentless struggle by the people for their happiness and welfare, for national independence and peace, the Guatemalan Labor Party hopes to occupy the combative post of vanguard."

Guatemala, April 24, 1954

POLITICAL COMMISSION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE GUATEMALAN LABOR PARTY

Translated by: R. Dossick

30 Apr 54

LATIN AMERICANS EXPRESS DISSATISFACTION WITH CARACAS CONFERENCE

During the month since the Tenth Inter-American Conference adjourned, comment in the Latin American press has pointed to widespread dissatisfaction with the results, while official comments have dwelt chiefly on the personal triumphs of the various delegations. The reactions seem based largely on a feeling that Latin American objectives were frustrated at Caracas.

Many Latin American delegations arrived at Caracas convinced that virtual unanimity of the 19 countries could force decisive action by the United States to solve some of their pressing economic problems and hasten the end of colonialism in the hemisphere. They also believed that Washington's anti-Communist resolution could be cleansed of "interventionism" and altered to take note of the economic basis of Communism. Their present dissatisfaction apparently stems mainly from a feeling that none of these aspirations was achieved.

In addition, many Latin Americans now see the fortnight devoted to debating the anti-Communist resolution as an unfortunate monopolizing of time which might have been spent on other pressing matters. The decision to hold a special economic conference at Rio de Janeiro in November also appears in a less favorable light in retrospect.

This general sense of frustration may explain in part the unexpected praise accorded Guatemala since the conference by a group of Brazilian congressmen, and in an oblique fashion, by the president of Ecuador. This praise, as well as that from pro-Guatemalan groups in other countries, was inspired by Guatemala's championship of nonintervention principles and of economic reform.

The bitterest comment thus far, and the only non-Communist attempt to pin blame on the United States directly, has come from the normally pro-American foreign minister of El Salvador, Roberto Canessa, who shortly after the conference adjourned, publicly termed it a complete failure and accused the United States of showing a "lack of inter-American spirit" in abstaining on the anticolonial votes. "Disillusionment" with the outcome of the colonial issue has also been expressed by semiofficial Argentine newspapers, as well as in the press in Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, and elsewhere.

OCI - Current Intelligence weekly

~~SECRET~~

Varying degrees of dissatisfaction have been displayed on the anti-Communist resolution. For example, both Argentina, which abstained, and Uruguay, which voted for the resolution, have indicated uneasiness at the positions they feel they were forced to take. Pride plus pique at the American failure to support the Argentine anticolonial resolution are believed by the American embassy in Buenos Aires to have figured in Argentina's final vote. The Uruguayan delegation, on the other hand, felt obliged to issue an "explanation" of its favorable vote.

Latin American comment on the economic resolutions passed at Caracas has been less specific than that on other major items, possibly because the same topics will come up for discussion again at the impending special economic conference. The press has, however, lamented the "postponement" of economic decisions, one conservative Peruvian paper stating, "Just as the chief result of Berlin was Geneva, so the chief result of Caracas is Rio de Janeiro."

Unequivocal enthusiasm for the Caracas conference has been limited thus far to the Dominican and Nicaraguan press, and to the self-serving statements of some of the delegations. Typical of the "average" reaction is this statement to the press by the chief Ecuadoran delegate: "Our delegation behaved brilliantly.... The conference did not take a forward step, but neither did it slip back. Its resolutions lack decision."

~~SECRET~~