

Western Hemisphere

What it needs is a discussion of the political and economic problems of Latin America and some recognition that we are apt to have major problems there regardless of . . . This again suffers from the pervasive social welfare approach. The fact is that Latin America can vindicate its independence primarily on us. Mention that it is a problem. Above all we shouldn't give the impression that just economic development will help them because it is just as likely to make it worse. The whole thrust is on generalized trade preferences and general economics. We ought to say here is a major revolution going on. And I think we are going to look fatuous as hell when all we can say is we are not domineering. The Carthaginians were not domineering after the second Punic War. ~~XXXX~~ The Russians are spreading their influence all over the world. It is one thing for a country that has been overweening not to be domineering, but not being domineering is not an end in itself. We have to say what we are for. These are my major points: to make it a little less economic and group it a little more effectively. We can't just dismiss the meeting with Brazil in two lines. We need something more about Mexico. It feels neglected anyway.

Strategic Purpose & Strategic Forces

The General Purpose Forces didn't bother me as much as Strategic Forces. What I need is a theoretical introduction on the nature of security policy. We have had it in previous reports. Again we are slipping very close to total vapidty. The US says we are defensive, our purpose is political, and they

are going as fast as it is possible for them to go. You have to assume that a major government knows what it is doing. In addition it is politically dangerous for the President with his conservative political opponents. Here are the problems. All this breastbeating has to stop. There hasn't been one year in which the Soviets have slowed down their deployment. If the President doesn't say it how can we expect anyone else to say it. This is just a sort of Harvard/MIT vapid account. I think we should say it is true that the use of strategic forces is in many ways hard to conceive. On the other hand we are confronted with the reality of a constant Soviet build-up. We have not, in effect, developed a new missile since. Yes, we have introduced MIRV but they are a compensation . . . What the Soviets ought to get out of this is that we are damn concerned and if there is no agreement out of SALT we will be forced to go into strategic programs of our own. General Purpose Forces should be more theoretical. All of this is simply stating programs. No one understands what these programs mean unless you are trying to explain what we are trying to do. / some discussion on what we are aiming for in Europe and Asia.