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TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE JUNIOR STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT THE OCEAN FOREST HOTEL, MYRTLE BEACH, S.C.
May 20, 1956, at 1:00 o'clock, PM

"WHAT PRICE FRIENDS?"

President Risher, Distinguished Guests, Members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Other Friends:

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to this fine group at your annual convention. It is rare that we find a dynamic community program under way which is not being spearheaded by young men like yourselves. Certainly the Jaycees of South Carolina have distinguished themselves as young men who know how to get a job done. The excellent result of these endeavors has been the moulding of South Carolina into a better state in which to live.

Even while my duties for the past two years have kept me in Washington, I have made it a point to spend as much time as possible among the people of our state. I have been constantly impressed with the programs supported by the Jaycees. I have witnessed your safety checks on vehicles. I have followed with great interest your efforts to raise the salaries of the teachers of this state. In addition, your programs on mental health, the "Voice of Democracy", "Our Stake in Better Government", the Teenage Road-E-O, sports, the securing of tourist trade and the encouragement of industry, have certainly brought lasting results to the people of South Carolina.

It has also been my pleasure to have received many communications from some of your project chairmen, club presidents, state officials and other leaders, who sought my assistance in your civic endeavors. I hope that you will continue to call upon me for
whatever service and encouragement I might render.

While some conventions turn out to be gruelling work, I trust that yours here has been a festive one as well as one of accomplishment. I have already been hearing of the shrewd political maneuvering that characterizes your election of state officers, and I feel sure that this is a healthy situation and one from which you all should benefit.

As you know, I am unopposed in the approaching primary election, and the situation reminds me of a story about two colored women. One of these women was telling her friend that her daughter was going to have a baby, and of course her friend was quite thrilled to learn of this news. The proud mother then added, "And she's married too, and that do make it nice." (laughter) Well, I kinda feel like that colored woman -- here I am with no opposition, and "that do make it nice."

In a more serious vein, I am deeply humble that the people of South Carolina have seen fit to allow me to become the United States Senator-nominate for the Democratic Party without opposition. As I have said in the past, I will do all within my power to fulfill this responsibility.

I would like to talk with you for a few minutes today about a matter that may seem distant to our problems here in South Carolina. Yet I think that you will soon realize, as I have, that this problem is indeed very close to home.

The matter of which I speak is that of foreign aid -- and I ask you the question, What Price Friends?

Since the end of World War II, this country has poured out $51.3 billion dollars of the American taxpayers' money in foreign aid to nations in every corner of the world.
While we all can recognize the great good that has come from the Marshall Plan in the precarious years that followed the close of World War II in 1945, I would remind you that this is 1956 -- 11 years later.

But where are we going today? The Congress is now faced with, and being urged by the administration to pass, a $4.9 billion dollar foreign aid bill for this year alone.

I pose the question again -- What Price Friends? Surely, if we did not know in the beginning that we could not buy friends with dollars, we should certainly know by now.

Only last month we all felt the impact of the heavy tax load imposed upon us as we filed our income tax returns. A reduction in foreign aid would enable us to cut taxes, which are now taking a third of our total income. It would enable us to begin paying our national debt, which is larger than the combined debts of all the nations in the world.

However, before we start using this money, let's examine just where this huge program of support for other countries has brought us today, how many friends we have won and what it has done to strengthen our position in the free world.

We may ask ourselves what has been the result of foreign aid in our close ally Britain, the struggling nation of France, the neutral power of India, Tito's Yugoslavia or a small Asian nation like Ceylon.

First, a close look at the situation in Britain will reveal that one of the worst things that happened to that nation was the $4 billion loan made in 1946, which helped put their Socialist government in office, and later aid helped keep them in office.
Most Britons will tell you that they would have gotten rid of their Socialist Government—which brought them to the brink of ruin—much sooner than they finally did without our interference.

The case of France is far more striking. Since the close of World War II this country has given France about $10 billion dollars in economic and military aid. But 26 per cent of the people of France, with an average of $1 billion a year in help from the American taxpayers during the past 10 years, voted in favor of the Communists in recent elections.

You might now justifiably ask the question I have been asking -- What Price Friends? What kind of ally is this to depend upon when a half million American boys are in Europe prepared to give their lives to halt a sweep from the Russians in the East? Truly we can say that France was a better ally before she received a dime in American foreign aid.

Take the situation in India. Since 1950 this country has shelled out $500 million in aid to this important, and newly independent nation. Now how do the Indians feel about the United States?

They favor turning Formosa over to the Communists; they are supporting Red China in her fight to gain admission to the United Nations; they have recently entertained the Russian leaders and placed them on exhibition before the world as lovers of peace and non-violence; they oppose nearly every defense measure employed by this country to keep the Red menace in check.

Recent visitors to India report that there is agitation within that nation for more trade with the Soviets. The press and people ignore American benefactions or take them for granted.
After all our aid to India, after the American taxpayers' have dug deep into their pockets -- our prestige in India has now fallen to a new low.

A more striking result of the problem surrounding foreign aid was very pointedly made recently when a newspaper of great influence in Ceylon was quoted as saying, "If the United States withdrew its offer of aid, that would be the price Ceylon would cheerfully pay to maintain her independence."

This comment is a typical one, for the people of Ceylon and those of other countries to which we extend this aid, cannot believe that we extend support without harboring motives of gaining control and influence in their governments. This very simple trend of thinking has resulted in suspicion on the part of the people of most all nations we have assisted.

A further look into this basic problem which has manifested itself in Ceylon is revealed even more by another quote from the Ceylon paper which read: "If any country in the world offers Ceylon aid without strings she will gladly and gratefully accept as Nehru's India has done, but she cannot be bought, sold or bartered. After all, we have survived without American aid all these years and our self respect cannot be bought with dollars."

More and more we find that nations are responding to American aid as the Ceylon newspaper does, namely, that when a country accepts foreign aid from the United States, it feels that it is doing this country a favor.

If some of the countries receiving American aid are so blinded with pride that they don't know the difference between Communist oppression and American generosity, then the time has come to stop injuring their pride with gifts of American dollars.
Moving on to our examination of the results of foreign aid in some countries—let us take a look at Yugoslavia.

This nation, once under the influence of Russia, has in the past few years received millions of dollars in aid from America. Even when this aid was given, Tito was operating almost the same kind of Communist state that this country so strongly opposes in the nation of Russia.

Today, after those millions have been turned over to Yugoslavia, we can only hope, at best, that Tito's country would take a neutral stand if the situation came to a showdown.

In fact, we will be fortunate if the same guns, ammunitions and supplies we have furnished a great number of these nations will not be used against us. What assurance have we that this will not be the case?

Surely, after ten years of this sort of thing, we must now admit that our charity has not made us the most popular nation in the world. From practical experience we all realize that in many cases the debtor has no love for the creditor, or vice versa.

While it would be wrong to state that this $50.3 billion in foreign aid has not done this nation some good, it would be equally wrong to assume that the free world expects this country to indefinitely continue this give-away program. Indeed, it now seems that we have very much overdone ourselves.

Still, with our NATO program and other vital programs not yet completed it seems that a certain amount of foreign aid not only should, but must, be continued.

However, we now find ourselves in the undesirable position of increasing this foreign aid rather than drastically reducing it.
Congress is now being asked to approve an increase in foreign aid. The Administration proposes appropriations of $4.9 billion next year compared with $2.7 billion this year. This means that the Administration is committed to continue this foreign aid program at a high level of spending.

We ask again, What Price Friends? It is time we realize we cannot win friends with an aid program that is bringing uncertain returns. More important, it is time that we realize we had best be giving more attention to our economy at home.

Certainly, with a national debt of $230 billion, with appropriations greatly exceeding revenues, with our people paying almost one third of their incomes in taxes, with the need for new roads, new schools, and new hospitals, and with many other economic and social problems facing us, the time has now come for the United States to bring to an end this long over-extended program. No one can argue that the best assurance we have for preservation of freedom in this world is the maintenance of a strong America, and if this strength is to be sustained and maintained, then we must reduce our foreign aid program and attend to some of these demanding problems which face us on the home front.

Furthermore, if given the chance, private investment could replace foreign aid in many nations.

Some feel that the greatest hindrance to foreign investment is fear of confiscation. I do not agree. I think the greatest hindrance is foreign aid. Private capital does not go to a country whose economy is choked with sterile capital that yields no profit.

The largest receiver of federal handouts since World War II has been Western Europe, and it has been the smallest receiver of new investment funds from private sources.
Western Europe received close to 70% of the $51 billion dollar foreign aid program. But the ratio of American private investment there runs only about 14%. 2.4% of the foreign aid program went to Latin America, but it received 35% of United States private investment. Only an invisible amount of aid went to Canada, but 34% of our foreign investment has gone there.

If investment capital is to be stimulated, foreign aid must be cut off. Private investment has been encouraged everywhere through the faith that we may have a lasting peace.

The change-over from the charity dollar to the investment dollar would have a stimulating effect, and inspire the nations we have been trying to help with confidence and new hope.

Aside from this, it would release thousands of foreign aiders and bureaucrats, which, in itself, would be a worthwhile accomplishment.

In summary of my comments on foreign aid, let me say that I favor a reduction in the size of this program now, not tomorrow, next year, or in 1960 -- but now.

America should continue to help faithful and loyal allies in Europe and Asia. Unless it is essential to our national security, however, there is no obligation that requires the American people to be taxed to maintain the peoples of other nations, friendly or not.

As your United States Senator during the last year, I voted for every amendment to reduce our foreign aid program, and after these amendments were defeated on the floor of the Senate, I voted against the entire foreign aid bill.

When I return to Washington, it shall be my purpose to continue to fight to curb our foreign aid program and work toward drastically reducing these appropriations.
In closing, let me once again say that I appreciate the opportunity to speak before this outstanding group of young men and women. The future of our state, to a great extent, depends upon your leadership and the exemplification by you of the high ideals for which your organization stands.