DIVISION OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Mr. Wright. Mr. Bondal:

Herewith the kind of thing which I have been fearing and which in my opinion may well rise to damn us when the present crisis is over.

Our Embassy in Costa Rica has sent a formal note to the Costa Rican Foreign Office referring to the resolutions of Hamber CPD and transmitting a list of enemy nationals which "has been approved by the Enemy Alien Control Unit of the United States Department of Justice for internment in the United States." In point of fact, I believe I recognize some of the names as those of Costa Rican nationals.

I feel that we should invite SD.'s attention to the dangers of this course and that we should rap the Embassy sharply over the knuckles for such indiscreet act.

RA: JMC: PAL

my return x the sintary has



## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

## **ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS**

November 23, 1943

RA: Mr. Wrig

SD: Mr. Lafoon

Mr. Clattenburg

I have talked to Mr. Cabot coheerning the exact nature of his criticism. Precisely, it is that the note handed to the Foreign Minister smacks of intervention in its phrasing and that, in the circumstances prevailing vis-a-vis Costa Rica, it was probably unwise to employ this formal avenue of approach at all. With that criticism, based as it is on the special facts pertaining to our political relations with that country, I would not presume to disagree; if I were to exercise judgment on this question I would be inclined to criticize the tenor of the note transmitted.

The important thing to me, however, is that Mr. Cabot recognizes that it is desirable for the missions to make use of the CPD recommendations, which were designed to assist them to avoid charges of intervention by placing the program on the basis of hemisphere approval and character, and only questions the method the Embassy employed in this case in referring to them.

Laurence A. Knapp

Attachment: Despatch from Costa Rica, October 29, No. 734

PA/LD:LAK:MCK

THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

November 24, 1943.

I think for the sake of the record I should make my views regarding this matter quite clear:

- (1) I am not opposed to deportations in general; quite the contrary, as the record on Central American deportations would show.
- (2) I think it would be highly desirable if the written record in each deportation case should show that the deporting Government had requested our collaboration.
- (3) I think it is undesirable for the written record to show that the initiative came from us. With regard to this specific case, I am disturbed at the Embassy's action (a) because, as Mr. Wright points out, we are not self-appointed administrators of the CPD recommendations, which, as Mr. Knapp says, were designed to avoid charges of intervention on our part, (b) because it is not for United States officials to determine what individuals have a sufficient Axis taint to necessitate their deportation from the territory of another sovereign state, and (c) because we certainly do not have the right to tell another sovereign government which of its citizens it should deport, or to what country they should be deported.

I fear that in the post-war period, unfriendly leaders in the other republics may use incidents such as this to demonstrate that behind the façade of Good Neighborship the United States was really interfering in the internal affairs of the other republics. I see no reason why we should give them written evidence to bolster such an assertion. If we really must take the initiative and exert pressure in connection with deportations, it should at least be done with great discretion.

If you agree, will you draft an instruction pointing out the undesirability of this note?

RA: JMCabot : PAL