

(83-20)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND (D-SC) FOR HIS WEEKLY RADIO
BROADCAST OF MARCH 7-8, 1959 (RECORDED MARCH 3, 1959)

MY FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS:

The issue of foreign aid will soon be under discussion in the Congress. Hearings have been conducted by a House of Representatives sub-committee, and their findings show that millions of dollars have been spent in an outright wasteful manner/while administering foreign aid in the past.

Other failures in our program to win friends and influence people abroad/are more obvious. The billions of dollars poured down the bottomless pit of foreign assistance/have resulted in few new friendships; in fact, it is questionable ~~today~~ that our friends abroad/are as many/^{today}as they were at the outset of the various aid programs/which started shortly after World War II.

My record has been consistent on foreign aid from the very beginning. This nation cannot afford to give away/billions of dollars carelessly. In fact, we should not be giving money away at all. I have been in favor of limited loans to reliable nations/and military assistance under mutual defense pacts to others, but the bills which always come before the Congress for us to vote on/are much like the one favored by the Eisenhower administration again this year — 3.9 billion dollars for foreign aid, with this aid spelled out in such a way/that no one clearly knows what is going to whom. As a result, I have been unable to support a single foreign aid appropriation bill in four years, despite the passage of foreign aid bills by my colleagues in the Senate and House.

Foreign assistance is generally divided into two categories -- economic and military. I am opposed to any out-and-out give-away program/in principle, but I get particularly disturbed when hearing of inefficient administration of military assistance/to governments which ~~will~~ ^{may} not be on our side in the event of war.

Military assistance should be clearly under the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. Their considerations should be:

1. Is the foreign government reliable?
 2. Is the foreign government a stable one?
 - and, 3. Are the government and people friendly to the United States?
- Unless a foreign nation qualifies ~~after~~ ^{on} all three of these considerations, I see no reason why we should invest heavily in that nation.

Indian Prime Minister Nehru, who is a good one to criticize U. S. foreign aid, since his neutral nation has been on the receiving end/of almost one and a half billion dollars worth of economic assistance, has made the remark that "quality, not quantity" is desired in technicians and advisors from the United States. On this point, I agree with Mr. Nehru. Too many incompetents have been sent to administer foreign aid, and they have frequently not only been careless themselves/but also have discouraged many of the conscientious Americans/who have served in the program.

The United States' position as a world power/has complicated the lives of us all. We cannot shrug off our responsibilities to friendly governments, but neither can we afford to spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

President Eisenhower's latest special group/studying foreign aid/has made some interesting proposals which might be a step in the right direction/if carried out. One proposal would encourage private enterprise to take a greater interest/in the development of foreign countries. I have urged this from the beginning.

Such a program, if carried out properly, could result in:

1. Less demands on the U. S. Treasury,
2. Quicker, more efficient development of foreign nations, and
3. Greater respect between peoples of the United States and foreign governments.

This is Strom Thurmond in Washington.

END