

Behind Latin America's Blind Oligarchies Too Often Stands Our Own

(Continued from Page One)

nesia. As long as it was somebody else's colonialism, we were all against it. But in Cuba when Castro dared touch the properties of United Fruit and Standard Oil, we rang down an iron curtain hard. That's something else we dare not think about.

Fulbright's Bravest "Unthinkable"

The closest Fulbright comes to the really "unthinkable" is his recognition that the character of the Latin American oligarchies makes it unlikely that social reform there can be achieved peacefully. But even he does not venture to say that behind the local oligarchies stand powerful private North American interests strong enough to frustrate even liberal U.S. policies as they did recently when they drove Juan Bosch out of the Dominican Republic, its first elected President in a generation, a man who was both a reformer and a democrat. The sugar and oil companies said he had to go, and he went.

Fulbright wisely asks us to look ahead and decide whether, if peaceful reform fails, and there are revolutions elsewhere in Latin America, we will tolerate or support them if they are not Communist but follow the Mexican or Nasserite pattern. He did not mention our bitter hostility to Mexican agrarian reform, or the Dulles veto on Aswan that nearly drove Nasser into the Soviet camp. Castro, too, tried to follow an independent or Titoist course, but we wouldn't let him. What needs even more to be said at this moment is that our Latin policy is turning in the other direction. With serious trouble ahead in Brazil and Chile, we are dropping hints that we are not as opposed as Kennedy was to military dictatorships. We preach social reform, but in a showdown prefer the bayonet. That way lies temporary relief and ultimate disaster. This, too, needs to be thought about before we find ourselves, rather than Castro, isolated in this hemisphere.

3. *China.* Here Fulbright makes China's abandonment of Formosa the condition of better relations. This is one of the most pernicious "unthinkables" of U.S. policy. When we deal with a subject on which both sides in the China civil

Who's Snowing Whom?

"Gen Khanh is developing a plan for national mobilization of all personnel and resources in South Vietnam. . . . We will provide the necessary financial assistance. . . . About \$50,000,000 will be added to our foreign aid programs as a result."

—Secretary McNamara on NBC-TV "Sunday" Mar. 29.

"Khanh's bold-sounding proposal for a 'national mobilization' . . . so far has produced no results except confusion among government officials and panic among Saigon's non-mobilized youth. . . ."

"The Vietnamese national mobilization plan has been announced in Washington and written about in Saigon," said one source close to the Vietnamese government, "but that's about all that has happened. . . ."

"Washington has jumped the gun on this mobilization idea," one reliable American source said. "Washington is probably seeking American popular support because more money will be poured in here. So much has been written about the Vietnamese not being with the war effort that Washington wanted to show the American people they are."

—New York Herald-Tribune from Saigon same day.

war despite all their other violent differences are agreed, i.e. that Formosa is part of China, we had better reconcile ourselves to this as a fact of life. It is we who someday will have to renounce this distant island on another nation's doorstep.

4. *Vietnam,* where Fulbright was poorest. Here he sees the picture askew, as do McNamara and Rusk. The truth is that we are not defending South Vietnam from an invasion. We are continuing the French effort to impose a military dictatorship and foreign control on a people with an ancient sense of nationhood and a deep longing in modern times for democratic government. China's desire for trade with the West, Ho's desire for trade with the South and the National Liberation Front's program for a democratic neutralized South Vietnam provide the elements for a viable settlement. But in this inflammable area, Morse, Mansfield, Bartlett, Gruening, Church and Ellender have been more ready than Fulbright to think the unthinkable.

You Can Still Get A Copy of I. F. Stone's Book, "The Haunted Fifties," By Using the Blank Below

I. F. Stone's Weekly	5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:	
Name
Street
City	Zone.....State.....
4/6/64	
For this additional \$5.35 please send a copy of I. F. Stone's "The Haunted Fifties."	
(To) Name
Street
City	Zone.....State.....
Shall we send gift announcement? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Newspaper

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.