Dollar Diplomacy Of U.S. Is Still Strongly Felt By Latin Americans

By SANDY SHENK

In last week's article we sketched some of the arguments that Henrique Gonzalez Casanova presented (in the Mexico City newspaper Notedades, July 31, 1960), to the effect that the United States has violated in noteworthy instances the principles of the Monroe Doctrine which we unilaterally set up and still refer to.

In the second half of his article he presents some of the various interpretations that our statesmen have given the Doctrine and discusses his own and other Latin Americans' opinion of, and stand on it:

HE QUOTES from Secretary of State Olney, writing in 1895 to his ambassador in England: “The rule in question (the Monroe Doctrine) has only one result and one objective: No European power or combination of powers will be able to deprive, by force, an American state of the right and the means of governing itself and of determining itself its own political destiny.”

However not all of our statements on this subject have been so noble and generous; He says that President Polk's policy included the declaration: “the United States may take possession of an American territory to avoid European colonization or intervention...” And he quotes Olney again: “Today the United States is in fact sovereign of the American continent and its will has the force of law in the matters in which they decide it appropriate to intervene.”

HE CONTINUES: “The policy of Manifest Destiny would develop into that of Teddy Roosevelt—who carried the Big Stick—and would later attack with Dollar Diplomacy... converting the United States into an international police force, protector of the interests of the powerful nations.”

He then says that Latin American lawyers, statesmen, politicians, journalists, and professors have always taken stands against the Monroe Doctrine. “President Carranza... determined the policy which since then (Sept. 1, 1919) Mexico has invariably followed with respect to the matter:

“...The Monroe Doctrine constitutes an arbitrary protectorate imposed on the communities which did not ask for it nor need it... Mexico has not recognized nor recognizes this doctrine, since it establishes, without the will of all of the communities of America a criterion and a situation about which they haven't been consulted, and that for this reason this doctrine attacks the sovereignty and independence of Mexico and constitutes a compulsory guardianship over all the nations of America.”

GONZALEZ CASANOVA again quotes Fabela (discussing Olney): “...the United States dominated economically the major part of the Latin American nations—with some of them in the political category of semi-sovereign states, or to put it another way, satellite countries of the United States. This has been realized not only through efficient application of Dollar Diplomacy and the Big Stick, but also through another shameful means: through the submission of venal dictators of some sister republics who have put their respective countries at the mercy of the septennial power.”

Concerning “the traditional reputation that the so-called Monroe Doctrine has in Latin America,”
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he says, "... the Latin American people are convinced that it has been harmful to their sovereignty; and that if by chance they need some power or the support of some international doctrine, then Latin America needs this defense, not against the European powers, but against the United States, which, betraying the principle of non-intervention which the Monroe Doctrine declared at its birth, has violated fundamental rights of several countries of the continent."

He closes by saying that it is necessary to keep reminding the North American people of their country's relation with Latin America; that the U.S. expansionists and big-business men seem to have the official support of our government and the use of whatever Dollar Diplomacy or Big Stick type policies are at hand; and that thus our democracy seems to be more concerned in Latin America with good business than with equality of rights and duties—"implicitly affirming the principle of natural selection rather than civilized co-existence based on justice between nations as well as between individuals."