

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM  
RELEASE AS SANITIZED

~~SECRET~~

26 January 1954

2003

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

SUBJECT: Conversation between U.S. Ambassador Hill and SA/DD/P,  
25 January 1954

1. At 4:00 p.m., I met in Room 4109, New State, with the Ambassador to the Central American country, as you requested. Due to a foul-up in the arrangements for the conference by that office, there was a conflict in conferences and our discussion was compressed.

2. I explained to him that I had been asked by DD/P to get him to specify and clarify the points which he had made to the head of the Central American country to which he was accredited, in order that they might be amplified and reiterated by a significant Democrat. It is hoped that this would disabuse the country head of his belief that these points were simply expressions of Republican Party politics which he thought would not be in power for the next election and would not be adopted by the Democrats.

3. The Ambassador's sole point was directed toward the U.S. Government attitude against the expropriation of the properties of the principal company having holdings in the country in question. The Ambassador stated that he thought it should be made clear that it was the belief of both Republicans and Democrats that the United States would not stand for the expropriation of the property and that this point should be made clear at this time.

4. However, the Ambassador stated that this was not the Department's overt official position; that the Department took the position that the matter at this time was simply a controversy between the American company and the foreign government in question; that this country hoped the matter would be amicably settled; and that only in the event the negotiations broke down would U.S. official interests be made manifest.

5. In any event, if a statement by a prominent Democrat is to be made, it might well be couched along the following lines, which represent my expansion of a few points the Ambassador made:

a. The statement should be made upon a suitable occasion and/or with some suitable peg upon which to base a talk, such as reference to the recent American company reply to the proposal of the government in question. The statement should be more subtle than belligerent, on the belief that the head of the government would clearly understand the implications. The Democrat would state, in effect, that both sides of the aisle

~~SECRET~~

JOB NO. \_\_\_\_\_ BOX NO. \_\_\_\_\_ FILE NO. \_\_\_\_\_ DOC NO. 2 NO CHANGE  
IN CLASS/ DECLASS/ CLASS CHG TO IS 9 ORET. JUST. 22  
NEXT REV DATE 89 REV DATE 25772  
NO. PGS 3 CREATION DATE - ORIG COMM/DOL - ORG CLASS S  
REV CLASS C REV COORD. - AUIER HR 703

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

followed with interest the developments in all Central American countries; that in this particular country, the head of the government has made considerable advances and is to be commended for his work in eradicating Communists and Communism. However, it could be pointed out the considerable help that the United States has furnished the country in question, in no small way contributes to its present state of development. Further, it might be stated that we did not take kindly to the speech recently made by the head of the government and reprinted in an American magazine, stating in effect that foreign investments were not welcome; that the days of the American 'give-away' program are over; and that if this attitude towards foreign investments continues, we should re-examine our policy and attitude toward the foreign government; that both Democrats and Republicans believed in respect for contractual rights; that assurances that were given and received in good faith, and acted on, were expected to be honored. In this particular, the Democrat could point out the attitude of Guatemala on the same question and compare it with the attitude of the government in question, and that while the head of the government was to be praised for his work in ousting the Communists, he would do well to see they did not come in through the back door. A statement endorsing some of Assistant Secretary Cabot's recent speeches on American policy in the area would also be appropriate.

6. Beyond this, the Ambassador had no other points to offer and stated that if there were others which he might have forgotten, he would be happy to discuss them with me further.

7. If an approach to a Democrat is appropriate from a policy viewpoint, I feel confident that the Western Hemisphere Division can supply additional facts to put meat upon these bones and marshal further supporting points.

DD/P [ ]<sub>ic</sub>

Distribution:

- Orig - DD/P/Wisner ✓
- 1 - CPP
- 1 - VHD
- 1 - SA/DD/P

SA/DD/P

2 -

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

HILL, Robert Charles  
US Ambassador to Costa Rica

Has been Ambassador to Costa Rica since late November or early December 1953. (It is rumored that Senator Bridges may have had something to do with his appointment.)

About 37 years old, married, one child (born recently in San Jose)

Presently (January 1954) in Department in Washington for consultation.

There was no press release on his appointment as Ambassador and his name is not listed in recent Department publications. (This may have been an oversight on someone's part.)

At one time was Clerk, US Senate Committee on Banking and Currency (80th Congress).

Served as Vice Consul of Foreign Service at Calcutta, India.

At one time was Department representative in China-Burma-India theater.

At time of his appointment as Ambassador to Costa Rica, was Assistant Vice President of the W. R. Grace and Company.

Info from BR/CD, 19 Jan 54