

~~SECRET~~

JMSWAG/RYPAT #142

VIA Air

DISPATCH NO. []-1900

TO Chief, Western Hemisphere

DATE 8 June 1954

FROM []

SUBJECT General - KUGOWN Operations

Specific - Report on El Primer Congreso Contra la Intervencion Sovietica en America Latina -- Part II

REFERENCE: [] 1869 dated 1 June 1954

1. A week has passed since the subject congress ended its sessions, and the aftermath has been a quiet one in Mexico. Little further publicity has been forthcoming, with the exception of the attached. With the recent wave of arrests in Guatemala, it proved impossible for some of the delegates from Guatemala to return to their homes; their future is still undecided at this writing. Several other delegates found matters to occupy their attention for additional days in Mexico (see Attachment for []), but most returned to their respective countries immediately.

2. It still proves difficult to evaluate the results of the Congress [] As pointed out in reference, Prieto Lauren's determination to expose those whom he considers to be wield- ing Communist influence in the Mexican government brought down upon his head and the Congress' shoulders the ridicule of the majority of the local news- papers. That issue, coupled with a more objective but scarcely-more-favorable criticism that the meetings were tied up in "sterile polemics", tended to de- predate the Congress in the eyes of the Mexican reading public. Other, less- widely-publicized critiques of the Congress were those of:

a) Robert Lubar, local correspondent for "Time" magazine, who stated [] that the delegates "were not specific enough in their declamations -- they talked generally of the threat of Communism but named no names, not even the Soviet Union, in pin-pointing their targets" (this we believe to be an excellent and well-founded criticism of the great majority of the delegates, and points out a weakness in Latin American think- ing which we tried to minimize in naming the Congress and setting the agenda, and which must be considered in the planning of future operations utilizing the Permanent Commission and the country committees.

b) Victor Alba, Spanish Socialist living in Mexico, who was invited to the Congress but did not attend: "the delegates attended the Congress only to 'provechar' the situation for their own (unstated) ends";

~~SECRET~~

10 JUN 1954

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM
RELEASE AS SANITIZED
2003

~~SECRET~~

JMSWAG/RYPAT #142

c) member of the Spanish Communist Party: "the Congress aided the Communists in Mexico since it blasted the local government, thus incurring for the cause of anti-Communism the ridicule of the press and the disgust of the government" (this is an optimistic overstatement but it is certainly based on a certain amount of obvious fact);

d) Jerome K. NASHWINTER, [] who attended the Congress as an observer: "Given the temperament of the Latins, the Congress was a success. There was a great deal of enthusiasm on the part of the delegates, albeit uncontrolled at times, and many of the speeches were excellent -- while most were well received by the assembly" (the Mexican press placed a natural emphasis on those incidents and dissertations of the Congress which pertained to Mexico -- the other speeches were given little play);

e) Jorge Prieto Laurens: "The Congress was a success. All delegates were enthusiastic and cooperative during the Congress and sincerely pledged their support to the future activities of the Permanent Commission" (this, apparently, in spite of momentary lapses of conviction displayed by the Costa Rican, Ecuadorian, and Uruguayan delegations).

The real evaluation of the Congress' success and of the possibilities for effective action under the Permanent Commission must come from the addressees -- as requested by Headquarters, debriefing (where controlled) and interviewing (where controlled) of returning delegates is essential to secure the over-all picture impossible to obtain in Mexico.

3. The outstanding delegates of the Congress, as reported by NASHWINTER and RNSHIELD, were (in no order of excellence): Admiral Penna Botto (for the sincerity and dignity which he lent to the cause, although it was generally agreed that his age militates against his becoming an outstanding anti-Communist leader); RAMOS Viana and PORTO Sobrinho (for their clarity and persuasiveness and for their apparent energy in pushing the anti-Communist effort); Mariano QUIROZ Gonzalez and Fernando VARGAS Fernandez (for their intelligence, lucidity, diplomacy, and seriousness of purpose); Jose BAQUERO de la Calle, (for his intelligence, leadership, seriousness of purpose, and persuasiveness); and Antonio ROBINIGUEZ Garcia (for his superior poise, speaking ability, and delineation of pertinent issues).

4. For the information of the addressee stations, the business of the Congress was covered on approximately the following schedule:

First Day: Congress convened. Reading of letters and telegrams of greeting and congratulation. Opening speech by Jorge Prieto Laurens (the speech which attacked Communist influence in the Mexican government);

Second Day: Speeches on Communist theory and on Communist penetration of various Latin American countries (many delegates took part in these discussions, major speeches being given by Penna Botto, Andres de

~~SECRET~~

[] 1900
8 June 1954
Page 2

~~SECRET~~

JMSWAG/RYPAT #142

Cicco, BAQUERO de la Calle, URIBE Misas, and Omar IBARGOYEN;

Third Day: Presentation and discussion of the Soviet domination of Guatemala. Resolutions passed to present the Guatemalan issue to the Organization of American States for action and to form a Permanent Commission of the Congress. Appointments made to the Commission and Rio de Janeiro chosen as the meeting site for the 1955 Congress. Brief interruption of Congress by Peronist-inspired students. Temporary walk-out by Costa Rican and Ecuadorian delegations in protest over Prieto Laurens' repeated blasts against the Mexican government;

Fourth Day: Closing Session. Pledges of adhesion to the Congress and the Permanent Commission by all delegates (walk-outs returned for last day). Ceremonies at Mexican monuments to Independence and Bolivar. Evening banquet.

5. For Headquarters and LINCOLN evaluation, and for the information of the [] it should be stated that RNSHIELD proved to be anything but an ideal agent for this type of operation. On a project such as this, where so much detail is involved and where the smallest details can be all-important, complete control over the agent is a must. Control over RNSHIELD was, and will always be, limited: when instructions coincide with his opinion, his cooperation is excellent (as with the formation of and appointments to the Permanent Commission); when there is a variance between orders and the direction in which his pre-conceived and oftentimes over-enthusiastic notions carry him, the result is difficult to predict. It is for this reason that the Mission has in the past recommended that he be used only for the most specific of operations (one-shot posters, etc.), and it was a lesson well-learned that a Congress is far from being a specific operation -- on the contrary, it is an all-inclusive operation with many facets, all of which must be held under tight control in order to guarantee a completely acceptable end-product.

It is therefore the considered opinion of this Mission (seconded, incidentally, by officers of this Embassy unwitting of KUGOWN interest), that the Commission Permanente del Primer Congreso Contra la Intervencion Sovietica en America Latina will flourish and become effective only when its active direction is undertaken by members of its governing body more responsible than RNSHIELD. This is a decision to be worked out by Headquarters, and one which will require the complete coordination of [] involved. In the meantime, the Permanent Commission, under the direction of its present secretary-general, will undertake to inspire and coordinate the activities of the various members of the Commission and the country committees, and will carry out spot missions at the direction of Headquarters. (The first act of the Permanent Commission, described in the attached article, was not carried out at Headquarters request, nor was it cleared with [] -- it was done entirely on RNSHIELD's initiative).

6. Corrections and additions to the list of delegates as given in reference follow:

~~SECRET~~

[]-1900
8 June 1954
Page 3

~~SECRET~~

JMSWAG/RYPAT #142

- Argentina - also in attendance: Arq. Roberto Saenz, representative of the Profesionistas de Buenos Aires
- Bolivia - correction in spelling: ZUAZO Cuenca
- Brazil - also in attendance as an aide to Admiral Penna Botto: Joaquin Miguel Vieira Ferreira, journalist
- El Salvador - also in attendance: Juan Antonio Altamirano and Rene Moreno of PRUD, Dr. Jose Ortiz Narvaez and Dr. Jose Valmore Castro of the Defensa Social Salvadorena
- Nicaragua - correction in spelling: Francisco Perez Estrada
- Peru - correction in spelling: Carlos A. Bamberan
- Paraguay - also in attendance: Fulgencio Bareiro
- United States - although no U.S. delegations were invited, various members of the American GI Forum of Texas (a group of American veterans of Mexican extraction) attended as observers.

Boyd I. Rolender

BIR/cav
7 June 1954

cc: 3 - Wash.
 2 - Linc.
 1 - Gnat.
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 3 - [] []

1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []

1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []
 1 - [] []

[]-1900
8 June 1954
Page 4

~~SECRET~~