

## 6506 – Foreign Aid

Guest: Senator Strom Thurmond (R-SC)

Morphew: introduction...there's been a lot of discussion in recent weeks on the subject of foreign aid and I know you have made quite a study of this matter...do you have any figures on how much foreign aid the United States has actually given over the years?

Thurmond: Yes. The United States has furnished foreign aid to a hundred and eleven nations and to the extent of between a hundred and four and a hundred and five billion dollars.

Morphew: just since the end of World War II?

Thurmond: That's right.

Morphew: as a critic of the foreign aid program are you implying that all foreign aid is wrong?

Thurmond: No. I think foreign aid right after the war ended to help to rehabilitate countries like Germany and Japan and to help to keep Greece and Turkey free and Chiang Kai Shek to remain free on Formosa, I think that type of foreign aid has been worthwhile. But this thing of just sending foreign aid to all of these countries in the world, trying to win friendship that way, trying to use that as a method of policy, has not proved wise. To my mind, it's very unwise and very foolish to be furnishing aid to so called neutralist nations and communist nations. Why should we wish to build up the economy and make strong those nations that we know are going to be against us when the showdown comes. For instance, we have furnished aid to Poland. We furnished 900 million dollars to Poland. Poland is behind the Iron Curtain. If a showdown comes Poland will be with Russia. She has to be. We have furnished 2.4 billion dollars to Yugoslavia. Tito has said when the showdown comes he will not be on our side. Therefore, we're helping to build up these countries that will be against us when the time comes. Now Tito claims he's an independent communist, but he's a communist and he'll be on the other side against us if we should have a war or emergency. Now, these so-called neutralist nations, we've furnished a lot of aid to them that we can't count on. For instance, Nasser in Egypt is one. Ben Bella in Algeria is another. Sukarno in Indonesia is another. And Cambodia is another. They are so called neutralists. Well, Cambodia has admitted now that she has embraced Red China so we can probably take Cambodia out of the so called neutralist column now, but she's claimed that til recently. Castro claimed he was a neutralist for a long time. In fact, most of these so called neutralist nations are pro-Soviet.

Morphew: the four you just named, not only are they neutralist in the line up between the free world and Iron Curtain countries but they're also dictatorships

Thurmond: Yes, they are. Nasser has one party in Egypt and he doesn't have freedom of speech over there and he's followed a course just like a dictator does. He is a dictator.

Ben Bella's a dictator. Let me read you a few things about this man Ben Bella because in my opinion Algeria is going to be the nation in Africa from which communism is going to be mounted, just like Cuba is going to be the nation in the western hemisphere from which they expect to mount communism here and spread it. Now, this man, Ben Bella, is a very dangerous man. After smashing all political opposition he had himself elected president and then quickly established a one man dictatorial rule. He outlawed all political parties except one, thus paving the way for a monolithic state. He suppressed all freedom of public opinion by confiscating all newspapers and all communications media. He ordered all noncommunist newspapers from France banned while welcoming the communist newspapers and publications, especially those from Red China. He has nationalized practically all business, all industry, and all the farms in Algeria. In so doing, of course, he violated the treaties they had with the French. He has publicly declared that he will convert Algeria into a Castro-type people's republic or democracy rather. He's signed agreements with Red China on cooperation in the field of culture, information, the arts, and sports. He visited Havana. You remember, he came through here in 1962 and went by the White House, was received handsomely with a red carpet, and said he was on his way down to Cuba to see his friend Castro. And he went on down there and saw him. Now, I could tell you many other things but I just wanted to point out that this is not a neutralist country, this is a country that's working hand in hand with the communists. And we have provided a tremendous amount of aid to this country. In two years, from 1962-64, we have provided a hundred and forty-four million dollars to Algeria. Algeria will not be with us, they will be with the other side. How asinine can we get than to be building up the enemy as we are doing now?

Morphew: what suggestions do you have for strengthening our foreign aid program or cutting it down? What would you do with the aid program of Vietnam, a subject that is very much on everyone's mind right now?

Thurmond: I think we've first got to make a basic decision in Vietnam as to what we're gonna do. Are we going to win the war there or not? I think it's about time this administration is making that decision. We've had a lot of people killed over there. If we are not going to win the war, if we're going to try to neutralize the country, if we're going to get out of there, then why keep having these people killed over there, Americans? Now, I think we ought to win the war. In my opinion, if we lose South Vietnam we're going to lose Burma. We're going to eventually lose India and the rest of Asia. We're going to lose Indonesia and we're going to lose possibly Japan to the communists eventually. There will probably be a tax on the Philippines. We may have the communists coming right up to the beaches of Hawaii and eventually we may have to fight them in the states rather than other there unless we make up our minds that we're going to win this war there and stop the communists. Now, we can stop the communists there if we'll do it, but we haven't decided that yet. And I think it's important that this be decided. And I think that's got to be decided before we determine what is to be provided over there.

Morphew: what would you do about aid to neutralists or communist countries?

Thurmond: I would cut it off completely. I don't think it makes any sense at all to be giving aid to people who are against you, who are avowed communists and others who are working with the communists in every way, shape, and form. Take Nkrumah in Ghana. I was in Ghana a few years ago and at that time President Kennedy had suspended aid for the building of a power dam and an aluminum plant because Ghana had been voting against us in the United Nations to such an extent. Nkrumah had speaking against our country and I was hoping that President Kennedy would not restore it, but he did and continued to furnish aid. Now we know that Nkrumah sends regular delegations to Moscow. We know he's lined up with Moscow. He gets military aid from Moscow. He's buying military equipment from Moscow. He's now had a law passed that makes him president for life and they have only one party, they do not have freedom of speech, and they can place a man in jail for five years for criticizing Nkrumah or Ghana. So how could anyone even run against him if they couldn't criticize? He's a dictator. He's not a neutralist dictator, so to speak, he's lined up with the Soviets. And I think we're foolish to continue furnishing aid to a country like that, and that's what we're doing.

Morphew: is there any assurance that the aid we give is actually helping the people?

Thurmond: Well, we are not so sure it does because the government officials handle this aid, and they are using it in a way to perpetuate them in power. It perpetuates these dictators in power. If time permitted I could go into more details on that, but at any rate, we are not convinced that the people are really getting the aid. If we are going to furnish foreign aid we ought to be sure that people get that aid and not that dictators use it for their own selfish purposes.

Morphew: you think the people should also be aware of where the money is coming from

Thurmond: I certainly do. We sent wheat to Poland, and the Americans sent it over there, they took it out of our bags and put it in their bags. The people of Poland never did know where that wheat came from. They thought their own communist government had furnished it, and that made the communist government look good in their eyes when they did such as that when we, the United States, were furnishing the wheat.

Morphew: there have recently been episodes where Nasser and Sukarno in particular have literally told us where we could go and what we could do with our foreign aid money...would you insist on forcing aid upon these countries from now on?

Thurmond: I certainly wouldn't favor forcing the funds upon those countries. I'd favor cutting the funds off. In fact, this man Nasser, he was against rescuing those white people down there, those hostages, by the Belgian paratroopers and he has done all he could to stir up trouble down in the Congo. We have been trying to protect the central Congolese government and he's working just to the contrary. And he has done many things that indicates clearly that he is not on our side. He's a dictator. He's drunk with power. And we have furnished aid to Poland, as I said a few moments ago, 900 million dollars, and Poland turned around and furnished 13 million of that to Castro. Well, if he's able to give Castro aid, why should we furnish him aid? And we furnished aid to Tito in Yugoslavia,

and he furnished aid to Castro. Poland also furnished aid to North Vietnam. And so what these countries are doing with our money is taking it and furnishing it to other communist countries or so called pro-Soviet neutralist countries. We are making a great mistake, I think, with just cutting our own throats, and at the same time it's bring about an imbalance in payments. We're sending more gold out of the country. We're having trouble on that line now. And it's building up the economies of our enemies.