

**Nelson A. Rockefeller's Office of International Affairs and the
Roots of United States Hemispheric Development Policy, 1940-1946**

**Greta Marchesi
Ph.D. Candidate
University of California, Berkely**

© 2010 by Greta Marchesi
gretam@berkely.edu

In the summer of 2009, I visited the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC) as part of pre-dissertation research into U.S.-sponsored World War II-era soil conservation and agricultural development programs in Latin American indigenous communities. My primary objective was to consult the personal papers of Nelson A. Rockefeller (Record Group 4 in the Rockefeller Family Archives) pertaining to his work as President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. My work at the RAC was conducted as a complement to preliminary research at the U.S. National Archives in Record Group 229, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

My objective in examining Nelson Rockefeller's files from his work directing the World War II-era Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA) -- later the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA) -- was to gain a sense of how agency economic policies and programs functioned to realize U.S. foreign policy more broadly in this period. My focus, then, was on internal memorandum, committee reports, and policy analysis dealing particularly with economic policy and development planning. An ancillary benefit to conducting research at the RAC was the outstanding records of Rockefeller Foundation-funded research throughout the twentieth century. Through field reports from scientists and program officers in Latin America, I was able to gain key insights into U.S. development policy and local production practices during the 1940s and early 1950s.

At the advent of the Second World War, the United States found itself in a sensitive position in relation to what the State Department referred to as the "other American nations." First, war-time activities and anti-colonial impulses in Africa and Asia made the raw materials from these areas difficult to obtain. At the same time, global instability based in these same developments undermined the international hegemony of European powers, opening the door for the United States to assert economic and political influence of an unprecedented scale and structure.

By 1940 it was clear that ambitions for both war-time and post-war success rested on securing U.S. access to the territories and raw materials of Latin America. A hand-written memo from the Bureau of the Budget at the Office of the President dated June, 1940 declared that "the economic policy for the hemisphere should rest on two points: 1. Positive contributions to the prosperity of all countries of the hemisphere. 2. Protection and development of sources of raw material needed for the U.S.... Protection and development of sources of raw materials should be undertaken if possible by private interests but if necessary by public." [1] Making explicit reference to effective strategies employed by the Napoleonic, British, and German imperial armies, officials of Franklin D. Roosevelt's executive branch set about to secure their interests through a

comprehensive "war on all fronts," including Army, economics, propaganda, and diplomacy.[2] Created in 1940, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs was charged with orchestrating these efforts in the American hemisphere.

As Franklin Roosevelt's pick to head the newly formed OCIAA, Nelson Rockefeller's most immediate challenge was supplanting embedded Axis economic and political interests in South America. In a 1941 State Department document entitled "Suggestions for Political-Economic Warfare to Prevent Nazification of Latin-America," Victor Petrullo warns: "If any further major German victories [occur], LA frankly admits they expect Nazi-inspired coup d'etats. We must prevent this by pacific means if possible and [the] best way is by attacking political and economic problems. Nazism has offered a 'better' life and also freedom from Yankee domination. Their strength is the fact that no feasible alternative has been offered to the LA people by U.S." Further, Petrullo argues, the lack of such action on the part of countries like the U.S. was rooted in a fear that advocacy of democracy would "lessen [Latin America's] colonial dependency," the very Yankee domination that made the Nazi program so appealing to many Latin American leaders. While many of the Axis connections were maintained through German economic and cultural interests in South America, and particularly in Argentina and Brazil, the Falangists in Spain laid claim to a deeper, historical network of cultural and political connections. In this sense, U.S. efforts to cultivate a Pan-American solidarity in this period can be seen as pitted against the Pan-Hispanism represented by Latin American Falangism.[3]

Further complicating the situation was an affinity among many potential anti-Axis allies in Latin America for Communist or socialist political change.[4] Indeed, the expansion of U.S. resource interests in the Americas was also challenged by such interests. Rockefeller's personal files included a report in *O'Shaunessy's Oil Bulletin* citing a recent decision by the Colombian Supreme Court to "greatly extend the area of Government-reserved oil rights in public lands," reversing a lower court's confirmation of Royal Dutch Shell's title to that area. Returning from an earlier trip through Latin America in the wake of the Mexican Revolution, Nelson Rockefeller himself had warned U.S. corporate investors that corporate interests in Latin America needed to manage its assets with the best interests of the local people in mind or face the possibility that "they will take away our ownership." [5]

Further, the *Oil Bulletin* cites an alliance between elements of the Colombian Conservative Party, Nazi sympathizers, and Spanish Falangists to oppose a loan from the U.S. to finance Colombian military armaments.[6] In some instances, such as in the case of the Mexican government, property formerly held by private U.S. interests had reverted to Latin American states as part of national reform programs.[7] It was the State Department's conclusion that, while Communist groups were not desirable, the threat they posed was "by no means as serious as the Nazi [threat] in Latin America." [8] Though the elimination of Axis influence would effectively eliminate any political leverage on the part of the left, Rockefeller's wartime strategy would need to appeal to interests across the political spectrum. Indians, youth, and organized social groups such as physicians, school teachers, tradesmen, and unionists were seen as potentially effective targets for such appeals.[9]

While much of this work was initiated on the cultural front via film, radio, and periodicals such as *En Guardia*, the OIAA Spanish-language magazine distributed across the Americas,[10] these

efforts were conducted in concert with a concurrent program of economic interventions. In addition to the insertion of U.S. capital, personnel, and training capacities, the OIAA and the U.S. government took "negative" measures to eliminate embedded German pharmaceutical, banking, extractive, and other economic interests in the region. An illustrative example is the airline industry, in which the United States -- through the Defense Supply Corporation -- bought out German-owned airlines around the Americas and revoked franchises of such organizations in Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. Further, they initiated and funded an Inter-American Escadrille to encourage domestic flying in the civil sector and provided funds for more than 300 would-be Latin American pilots to train in the United States.[11]

Part of the U.S. strategy to secure regional political cooperation was the "parity treatment principle." Resolved by the Board of Economic Warfare on December 26, 1941, the so-called parity principle made formal a policy of the U.S. government to "aid in maintaining the economic stability of the other American Republics by recognizing and providing for their essential civilian needs on the basis of equal and proportionate consideration with our own." Notably, the parity principle did not guarantee parity among and between citizens, but rather the distribution of essential, high-demand raw materials between national economies. Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles seconded this sentiment at the 1942 Meeting of Foreign Ministers in Rio de Janeiro, declaring that the government of the United States "stands prepared to render financial and technical assistance, where needed, to alleviate injury to the domestic economy of any of the American Republics which results from the control and curbing of economic activities inimical to our common defense...[and to] enter into broad arrangements for the acquisition of supplies of basic and strategic materials, and to cooperate with each of the other American Republics in order to increase rapidly and efficiently their production for emergency needs." [12]

Among the recommendations of State Department experts was a program to raise the standard of living among Latin American peasants to mitigate their interest in large-scale, ideologically motivated social change, including communism and Fascism.[13] The programs the OIAA funded did, indeed, seek to raise the standard of living among this group through professional training, public health and education campaigns. Finally, because much of the Latin American peasantry lived in rural communities, agricultural specialists and materials were dispatched around the Americas with the mission of modernizing farming practices in these communities.[14]

Initially, funding also extended to the Inter-American Indian Institute and the National Indian Institute, the U.S. branch of this organization. As time went on, conflicts between these organizations and officers at the OIAA and a general lack of OIAA commitment to Indian issues resulted in a termination of support for these agencies.[15] In general, the OIAA under Nelson Rockefeller was concerned less with staking a position in the racial politics underlying Latin American economic reform movements than in pursuing a program of social reform based in expanded production.

If OIAA agricultural development programs in this period had the objective of pacifying potentially fractious peasant populations, they were also designed with other U.S. interests in mind. Such programs, along with public health programs, were situated in close proximity to

industrial and extractive programs designed to provide raw materials to U.S. corporate and military interests.[16] While Nelson Rockefeller's OIAA records at the Rockefeller Archive Center are generally concerned more with macro-level organizational planning than with the specific details of any of these particular programs, one agricultural project -- the stimulation of rubber production -- was of sufficient importance and interest to be retained in the Coordinator's personal files. While the case of rubber production was in some ways exceptional, it does offer useful insight into ways that the OIAA set about realizing abstract U.S. goals on the ground in Latin American agricultural communities during the Second World War.

In a lengthy statement delivered before the Senate Defense Investigating Committee by Earl N. Bressman, Director of the OIAA's Agricultural Division (and previously chief scientific advisor to then-Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace), offered a useful and extensive summary of the U.S. rubber production program. This work was part of a larger program that stressed the cultivation of agricultural products in the Americas that would be complementary (rather than competitive) with existing commodity crop production in the United States. This strategy sought to both compensate for the loss of key crops like rubber, quinine, and spice previously grown in European colonies. At the same time, it would protect U.S. farmers from competition and, by turning Latin American cropland over to non-subsistence products, stimulate a market for U.S.-grown food stuffs.

In the case of rubber, diminished access to Asian supplies had serious implications for U.S. industry. At the outset of the Second World War, more than 96% of the world's supply of rubber came from Asia, with the United States as the largest consumer of that supply (purchasing roughly 50% of that crop annually). Encouraging rubber cultivation in the Americas, then would allow what Bressman referred to as "rubber independence" from Asian supplies and the European financial interests that controlled them. While Ford and Goodyear had been working on developing this production in Brazil and Costa Rica and Panama, it was still inadequate to the growing U.S. demand. Further, a lack of labor supply for this industry posed a further problem in the development of the industry.

In 1940, the U.S. Senate appropriated \$500,000 for research and development of this industry in Latin America. In 1941, these programs were transferred (with Bressman) to the OIAA, where they had the "vigorous support of the Coordinator." Sixteen rubber production experts were sent to Latin America under the auspices of this program, which oversaw the start of more than one hundred nurseries and the planting of over 30,000,000 rubber trees. A major development occurred in 1941, when the Haitian-American Development Corporation, under the leadership of President and General Manager Thomas A. Fennell, initiated a new method of tapping mature Castilla rubber trees. With more than 4,000 employees and plans to put more than 50,000 acres of land into rubber production, primarily on small, private plots held by individual Haitian farmers, Fennell's enterprise promised to revolutionize production across the Americas, initiating what Bressman called "American rubber independence." [17] This combination of strategic crop selection, geographically-sensitive scientific and technical research, personnel training, and capital investment characterized much of the OIAA's agricultural development work in this period.

Another important structural aspect to the OIAA's economic and cultural front was the institution of Coordination Committees for each of the Latin American nations. Composed of locally-networked members of U.S. citizens in residence in Latin American nations, Coordination Committees married private interests and citizens with the public mobilization of the OIAA. Beginning in 1941, local OIAA Field Offices were established to service and administer these groups. By 1943, there were chapters in twenty Latin American nations with membership ranging from two in Panama to 168 in Mexico.[18] Members of these groups were most often in residence representing the interests of American capital abroad. The Coordination Committee for Colombia, for example, included executives from the National City Bank of New York, American Coffee Company, the Tropical Oil Company and Richmond Petroleum Company (both subsidiaries of Standard Oil), and Singer Sewing Machine Co. In Peru, representatives of Southern Railways and the Cerro de Pasco Copper Corporation served as the local OIAA civilian contacts. The Mexican Central Committee leadership drew from a long list of successful U.S. corporations, including General Electric, Westinghouse & Co, Coca Cola, RCA Victor, Colgate-Palmolive Peet, General Motors, and Ford Motor Company, with representatives from Huasteca Petroleum Corporation (owned by Los Angeles-based Pan-American Petroleum and Transport), R. G. Dunn & Bradstreet, American Smelting and Mining, and Price and Waterhouse & Co staffing sub-committees on black lists, economic stabilization, communications, and cultural relations, public health and welfare.[19] Thus, U.S. war-time solidarity building was conducted through and in turn stimulated the existing networks of U.S. business interests abroad. Presumably, these networks would be mobilized and drawn upon in new ways within post-war economic development programs.

While securing war-time resources and alliances was a central aspect of OIAA work in this period, equally important (and perhaps of greatest concern to its Coordinator) were its efforts to lay the foundations for post-war hemispheric relations. As early as 1940, Nelson Rockefeller's edited drafts of agency documents suggest that he was particularly concerned with the long-term balance of power that would result from war-time U.S. foreign policy. Under Rockefeller's administration, the OIAA demonstrated a commitment to the project of Pan-American solidarity negotiated among an assembly of distinct sovereign political interests. In 1943, Rockefeller kept for his personal files a copy of a WNYC radio speech by City College Professor Harry A. Overstreet entitled "International Cultural Relations." In January 1944, Rockefeller sent a copy to Vice President Henry Wallace with a note that read, in part, "This seems to me to be one of the clearest analyses of our foreign relations which I have seen in some time."

Overstreet's speech states that after the war, the United States would be in the relatively distasteful position of having "to impose our will on defeated people." Arguing that, in general, the U.S. should not necessarily remake the world in its own image, Overstreet makes a case that the post-war period represented an exceptional case: "There are two ideas which we have a right [after the war] to insist upon for the rebuilding of the world -- two ideas that are the essence of American democracy. The first of these is the idea of law as embodied in our Bill of Rights." He continues: "The second American idea which we can rightly insist upon is one which is expressed in the words: *e pluribus unum*. Out of many, one. The federal idea - the honor of whose establishment in the world we share with Switzerland - is perhaps the greatest contribution that has been made to political history. It solves the apparently insoluble problem: how to unite into one sovereign power many sovereign powers without infringing upon the

general liberty of any of them. The time has now come when the federal idea must be adopted by the nations of the world. No nation, even the most powerful, can ever go it alone. All the nations together must unite to protect themselves against the possible aggression of any one or group of them. America can rightly insist that the spirit of *e pluribus unum* must now pervade the world.

Overstreet's conclusion is that in order to effectively exercise its power to make such a demand against the world, it must achieve two things. First, it must cease to preach human equality and practice human inequality in the form of both domestic racism and the nationalist chauvinism that has prevented U.S. citizens from educating themselves about the history, geography, and cultures of the world. Second, the United States must "set as its chief goal the highest possible production together with the widest possible distribution under conditions of the maximum freedom for individual initiative and for the common welfare."[20]

Both the cosmopolitanism and the assumption of an exceptional U.S. position in the post-war order were resonant with Rockefeller's objectives as Coordinator of the OIAA. In 1944 and 1945, in subsequent drafts of U.S. economic foreign policy, Rockefeller's marginal notations were almost exclusively concerned with the question of U.S. leadership within the Pan-American alliance of sovereign nations. The recommendation that "The United States Government should provide continued and vigorous leadership in the field of liberal trade policies" was amended to include leadership in *all* economic fields.

Rockefeller was particularly concerned with language suggesting that the United States would deliver technical and administrative assistance for the development of other American national economies only at the request of those countries. Rather, he felt that the U.S. should stimulate development in the Americas according to its own political agenda, and that the growth of national productive capacities would always be in the best interest of local people and economies. The initial draft of the document is marked throughout with notations about the importance of clear U.S. leadership, and in response to a closing statement that "the responsibility and execution of policies and projects related to economic development devolves upon [individual Latin American Republics]. United States cooperation, therefore, should be subject to the fact that the management and administration of such projects are the responsibility and concern of other American Republics," Rockefeller penned in large letters: "In other words, we follow rather than lead!?! We'll never hold the [Americas] together under our leadership on this basis."[21] Subsequent drafts of the document adhere more closely to Rockefeller's view on this point.

Pan-American post-war economic development would hinge on two distinct categories of U.S. exports. The first was dissemination of U.S. industrial expertise in large-scale production. The Committee on Inter-American Economic Development identified what it saw as a concentration of limiting factors to economic development in Latin America. These included the lack of domestic purchasing power to justify rapid, large-scale industrial development, non-competitive regional pricing of raw materials, inadequate electricity and transportation infrastructure, limited pools of skilled workers and managerial competencies, and an underproductive agricultural sector hamstrung by outmoded farming methods.[22] Given the local availability of labor and raw materials, in the view of the committee, the United States government was best positioned to "make a substantial contribution to the economic development of the other American republics

through its accumulated experience in the fields of technology and management." Further, "the utilization of this experience can also promote United States participation in that development," meaning that developing Latin American productive systems under the administration of U.S. experts would mean both a relevant expansion of U.S. knowledge and expertise to include Latin American productive systems as well as a guarantee that those systems could coherently articulate with such systems within the United States.[23]

The second category of critical U.S. intervention lay in the possibility of the export of U.S. capital to the Americas in the form of goods as well as investment. The first recommendation of the Executive Committee on Economic Foreign Policy made the explicit stipulation that "the Latin American Governments should recognize that economic development presupposes just and equitable political and fiscal treatment, including equality of treatment for foreign capital and personnel." [24] The OIAA was particularly interested in the possibility of Latin America as a market for the large volume of equipment and supplies the U.S. military had accrued over the course of the war. A 52-page 1944 report outlined the types and value of potentially available equipment and estimated how much and how quickly each developing American industrial economy could absorb surplus U.S. machinery. Stipulating that equipment be distributed through private U.S. firms, the OIAA Research Division proposed that these materials be used to help develop private U.S. distribution systems around the Americas. In addition, the sale of military surplus to developing Latin American nations would help eliminate the "substantial dollar balances" that accumulated over the course of the war.[25]

By the end of the war, the elimination of the Axis threat had significantly shifted the balance of political power in the Americas. Early strategies to route German, Spanish, and Italian alliances by charting a moderate course between communist and Fascist political interests dissolved as communism and socialism emerged as the symbolic and practical targets of U.S. foreign policy and the United States set upon a program of inter-American development based on a free market, liberal trade policy. For Nelson Rockefeller, such a strategy was much closer to the ideology that would underwrite his own career in elected public office. In the decades that followed, the assertion of an exceptional U.S. power would continue to characterize inter-American political and economic relations.

Editor's Note: This research report is presented here with the author's permission but should not be cited or quoted without the author's consent.

Rockefeller Archive Center Research Reports Online is a periodic publication of the Rockefeller Archive Center. Edited by Ken Rose and Erwin Levold. Research Reports Online is intended to foster the network of scholarship in the history of philanthropy and to highlight the diverse range of materials and subjects covered in the collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center. The reports are drawn from essays submitted by researchers who have visited the Archive Center, many of whom have received grants from the Archive Center to support their research.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and are not intended to represent the Rockefeller Archive Center.

ENDNOTES:

[1]Memo from J.B.B. (unidentified), June 1940. Folder 1, Box 1, Series O, Washington, D.C files, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY.

[2]Memo, July 26, 1940 (n.a.), *ibid.*

[3]Memo from Minter Wood to R.T. Miller, "Historical Origins of *Hispanidad*." November 27, 1941, Folder 2, Box 1, Series O, Washington, D.C. files, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY.

[4]Brief- "Suggestions for Political-Economic Warfare to Prevent Nazification of Latin-America." June 4, 1941, *ibid.*

[5]Greg Grandin. *Empire's Workshop: Latin America, the United States, and the Rise of the New Imperialism*. New York: Owl Books/Henry Holt and Company, 2006, p. 30.

[6]"Colombia." in *O'Shaunessy's Oil Bulletin*. 152 (November 15, 1940), Folder 2, Box 1, Series O, Washington, D.C files, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY.

[7]See "A Planned Society and Government Control," July 19, 1940, *ibid.*, for an example of a document explicitly critical of the New Deal state's own apparent movement toward socialism and failure to defend US private interests abroad. While Nelson Rockefeller made strategic use of US state funds to secure U.S. interests in Latin America. He saw these as emergency wartime measures that would and should pave the way for the operation of private U.S. entities in Latin American production in the future.

[8]"Suggestions for Political-Economic Warfare to Prevent Nazification of Latin-America." pp. 1-3.

[9]*Ibid.*

[10]See bound volumes of *En Guardia*, Subseries 1 (CIAA), Series 0 (DC), RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY. Other cultural efforts in this period were myriad. In addition to activities undertaken directly by the OIAA (through the Committee for Inter-American Artistic and Intellectual Relations), funds were provided to support and enhance the activities of existing organizations and institutions within and outside of government. Early recipients of these funds included the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Education Association, the Museum of Modern Art, the Inter-American Commission on Women, the College of Fine Arts at the University of Chile, the U.S. Tariff Commission, Institute of Latin American Studies at the University of Texas and the Hispanic American Historical Review, among others. See "Approved Projects under the Cultural Relations Program." November 7, 1940, Folder 35, Box 5, Series 4, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY.

[11]"Memo to the Vice-President from the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs on Economic Defense: The Western Hemisphere." Folder 1, Box 1, Series O, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY.

[12]"Appendix to Preliminary Draft Outlines of United States Position, With Supporting Considerations, on Certain Economic Topics which Latin American Governments Might Wish to Discuss at a Possible Conference of the American Republics." January 5, 1945, Folder 39a, Box 5, Series O, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY. However, the document also states that, "It should be noted that when political factors of major diplomatic importance have been brought to our attention by the Department of State in connection with requests for goods, we have deviated from the straight end-use interpretation of the 'parity principle'." As an Axis ally in 1941, Argentina was not included under this policy.

[13]"Suggestions for Political-Economic Warfare to Prevent Nazification of Latin-America." p. 3.

[14]See NARA, RG 229 OIAA-Records of the Division of Agriculture, as well as the USDA Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations journal, *Agriculture in the Americas*, for records of these programs.

[15]See NARA, Box 410-11 OIAA Central Files 3. Information, Science and Education-Race, RG 229 for documentation of these conflicts, in particular of the ongoing efforts of the Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, for intervening on behalf of these programs with the President and State Department against the wishes of the OIAA.

[16]"Summary of Activities of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, January 11, 1943." Washington, DC: United States Office of Inter-American Affairs, 1943.

[17]"Statement by Dr. Earl N. Bressman, Director, Agricultural Division, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, before the Defense Investigating Committee of the Senate." Folder 78, Box 10, Series O, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY. Bressman noted that Wallace himself believed that the most

promising new rubber was made from petroleum, but that as petroleum was a limited resource, investment in natural sources was the best long term national strategy.

[18]Memorandum from John Akin to Nelson Rockefeller. July 25, 1944. Folder 34, Box 4, Series O, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Harry Overstreet. "International Cultural Relations." (WNYC radio address, from the series "Organizing Peace, n.d.). Folder 35, Box 5, Series O, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY. A professor of psychology and philosophy, Overstreet would go on to co-author *What We Must Know About Communism*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 1958, and the widely-read text defending the national service of

J. Edgar Hoover, *The FBI in Our Open Society*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1969.

[21]"Recommendations." Folder 39, Box 5, Series O, RG 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY, p. 14.

[22]"Recommendations Regarding the Policy of the United States Government with Respect to Economic Development in the Other American Republics and the Action which should be Taken to Implement This Policy."

September 23, 1944, *ibid*, pg. 5.

[23]Ibid, p. 7.

[24]Ibid, p. 4. This Committee's notion of equality was focused on the notion of rights in and through property. A December 30, 1944 draft of U.S. positions cites a decree of the Uruguayan government echoing Resolution XXXVI of the 1944 Conference, allowing trade preference to countries with laws protecting labor against exploitation. The U.S. delegation felt that Uruguay's policy was economically unsound and administratively unfeasible and planned to rebuff efforts to interject this policy into future agreements by clarifying that the prior agreement was clearly limited to the war situation and its aftermath. The original proposition was introduced by Cuba. "Possible Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics."December 30, 1944, *ibid*, pp. 18-19.

[25]Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs-Research Division. "Latin America as a Market for Government Stocks of Machinery and Equipment." October 1944, Washington, DC. Folder 19, Box 3, Series O, Record Group 4, Rockefeller Family Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Pocantico Hills, NY.