

FOLLOWING the course set last summer, the Ford Foundation made the following grants in April:

\$50,000 to the *Academy of Scientific Research*, for expansion of its services to science professors in provincial universities by seminars and short courses; there is also to be an appraisal of the whole problem—all to be completed in three years.

\$192,000 to support six resident *Harvard University* on-the-job advisors and university teachers for the Planeación in Colombia: this also for a three-year term.

\$96,400 to the *International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center* (CIMMYT), one of the four international agricultural centers jointly sponsored by Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. The purpose here is to enable CIMMYT to work with Argentina's National Institute to find ways and means of increasing corn and wheat production.

\$280,000 to the *National University of Colombia* to develop facilities in economics. It is expected that the University will be a major source of middle-level economists for government and industry.

\$75,000 to Argentina's *Torquato di Tella Institute*. Since forty-five institutions from ten Latin American nations are members, it is expected to stimulate greater progress in problem areas of the social sciences and facilitating introduction of disciplines new to Latin America.

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Editor, *THE AMERICAS*: . . .

Although I call myself a junior member of the historical trade, I consider myself sufficiently "desensitized" to view criticism with some detachment, even to the point of recognizing the difficult position of book reviewers and the real contributions they can make to authors.

Unfortunately, Mr. McCloskey does not give me a full hearing. I recognize the limitations of space provided for the review of my *THE CUBAN POLICY OF THE U. S.* (*THE AMERICAS*, Jan., 1969, pp. 320-321), but the reviewer, who might have re-read my introduction, felt no hesitation in taking up half the review space with a *quotation of a quotation*, which, he states, forms the central theme of the work. Adams' remark was quoted for effect, because he did so much to shape the Cuban policy. But, as subsequent chapters reveal, later Presidents and Secretaries of State, particularly McKinley and Fish, made an equally significant contribution.

Finally, I rely heavily on non-U. S. historians simply because I am a U. S. diplomatist, writing in an area that makes too little use of Spanish-language sources. The López expeditions had deep roots in the 19th century Cuban revolutionary struggle, as Herminio Portell Vilá and Philip Foner amply

demonstrate, and the Black Warrior episode, though it was blown into a war issue by Pierce, nonetheless stemmed from arbitrary Spanish commercial restriction in Havana.

Naturally, I should be more than grateful for any notation of factual errors in order that correction can be made for a future new edition of the work.

Yours sincerely,  
LESTER D. LANGLEY

Central Washington State College  
Reply:

Since I have no desire to make a fool of myself if it can be helped, Dr. Langley's book was carefully studied before writing the review. So I wrote, in full recognition of all points raised in his letter; therefore there appears to be no reason to change any opinions expressed. Perhaps there is an exception to this: from the context of the letter I assume that "diplomatist" here means a diplomatic historian. On a few years experience in teaching that field, I would agree that U. S. diplomatic historians make too little use of Spanish language sources. However, the mere fact that an historian writes in that tongue does not always make him more accurate than those who write from United States sources; nor is every historian of the United States to be followed blindly. In sum, I regret, though, that I can only reaffirm what was published in January.

MICHAEL B. McCLOSKEY, O. F. M.