ROBO
FOREIGN AID
January, 1956

Dear:

I appreciate your views on the so-called foreign aid proposals. I can assure you that no member of the House or Senate is more anxious to get out from under this load than I, but I do try to be realistic and see the situation from all sides. Bear with me, therefore, as I set out some observations on this whole problem.

Naturally our foreign policy objective is to preserve peace because it saves lives and money. The armament burden is certainly a constant problem. World War II cost us seven billion dollars per month. Korea cost us eighteen billion dollars. Our national defense outlay in the last five and one-half years was $170,000,000,000. These are firm figures which I have had verified. You can see, therefore, what a burden this is. In fact, national defense and related matters take at least sixty cents out of every tax dollar so that the man who paid five hundred dollars in income taxes for 1955 would see three hundred dollars of the five hundred go for security and the things related to it.

When the cost of young human life is added to it, there is simply no comparison and so peace is an imperative.

Now this thing called foreign aid -- and which should more properly be called mutual security -- is designed to strengthen our own security by bringing to bear the security of other countries that can be helpful and it becomes, therefore, a mutual adventure.

Our assistance has taken several forms. First, there is the so-called economic aid whereby other countries were assisted in developing their resources. In the current year the outlay for this was $162,000,000 and in addition there was created a $100,000,000 development fund to be used at the President's discretion, but mainly in the form of loans to such countries. We have been endeavoring to get out from under this load. Secondly, there is the item of technical cooperation, sometimes referred to as know-how. This covers the cost of technicians, scientists, and some materials which have been provided to teach other countries know-how, particularly in the field of health and agriculture. The outlay during the current year was $153,000,000.
The largest item, however, is military aid. This is broken down into military assistance, which means weapons, direct forces support, which means the things an army normally needs, and defense support, which are those items designed to support the economy of a foreign country so that it can sustain an army that would be useful to us and minimize the need of using American manpower. The outlay for military assistance is just about two billion dollars. This is used, among other things, to pay our share of the cost of the so-called NATO defense line in Europe, the line in Korea, aid in Formosa in maintaining a substantial number of Chinese troops and also in developing an army in South Vietnam.

Frankly, the only way these outlays can ever be justified is as a fortification of our own national security. We can cancel out the whole program but I presume our military leaders who are charged with the defense of this country would then come forward and insist that we provide more American troops and more weapons for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. If that be true -- and I undertook very recently to verify it from official sources -- it would mean that in terms of expenditure we would virtually spend as much more on our own defensive establishment as the whole cost of the military aid program.

This, of course, would run into billions if it had to be done and would mean the induction of greater numbers of young Americans.

Perhaps one other factor ought to be submitted, and that is that a large proportion of the economic aid now rendered is in the form of farm surpluses. This enables us to assist such countries and at the same time get rid of these overhanging surpluses which have so drastically depressed farm prices. In fact, at this very moment there is under consideration proposals for the most expeditious disposal of these farm surpluses, both at home and abroad, and I presume there are a good many who would be glad to give them away if no other consideration could be obtained in return therefor.

I simply point out these things to indicate the many aspects of the problem and I try to give the whole matter realistic consideration. I can assure you that I shall be among the first to relieve our people of this load consonant with what our military leaders insist is a minimum of national defense and national security.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
Dear:

I appreciate your comments on Foreign Aid. They bring to mind that on April 6 we observed the 30th anniversary of the declaration of war which took us into World War I.

In that thirty-nine year period we became involved in three wars which cost more than 600,000 lives, over 1,500,000 wounded, more than 300 million in money, the complete dislocation of our affairs during war time, and a continuing cost of four and one-half million dollars each year in veterans' benefits.

Once more we hear of war scares, war talk and tensions, and the one thought that besets me is what course we shall pursue to avoid war, to keep our defenses strong, and deter other nations from starting a conflict.

I think it is in this light that we must consider a foreign aid program. Along with our army, navy, air force, foreign press, imports, new resources, warning lines, etc., about two-thirds of the whole aid program is devoted to military assistance. If it has no defense value, we should stop it. If it has defense value we should consider its value very carefully.

I refer once more to the census figures that we have about 70 million young men between the ages of 16 and 30 who would be subject to military service if we were again attacked. What would happen if we pursued to provide uniform comfort that their very presence could not be dislocated by war?

These are but some of the factors which beset us this whole question, and I would be willing to believe that a year should be given to avoid our national security and enable the President to conduct our affairs.

Yours...

[Signature]
United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D.C.

, 1956

Dear :

I appreciate your letter on the pending foreign aid proposals. In coming to a conclusion on this problem, I give thought to every opinion and viewpoint, whether it comes in the form of an individual letter, an editorial, an article or from any other source.

Naturally the testimony of those who are charged with responsibility for the security and defense of this country deserves great weight. Within the last few days the Senate Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, has heard testimony from Secretary Dulles, Admiral Radford, Secretary Wilson, General Gruenther, Administrator Hollister, and others, on this subject. It is their function to present the policies which have been very carefully fashioned by the National Security Council, our military leaders and others dealing with security and defense, and their testimony is obviously based on data and information gathered from all areas of the world almost daily.

I am sure that they, as well as all members of Congress and all citizens, are mindful not only of what is required to preserve and make the country secure in the face of the threats and dangers which come from the hostile force in the world under the Red banner, but are also mindful of the tax burden which foreign aid policy imposes on our people. Certainly I am mindful of it and try to keep all of these considerations constantly before me in resolving this problem.

One unfortunate aspect of the matter is that so much highly confidential and off-the-record testimony is presented to the Committee which never becomes available to people generally for security reasons. I am sure that if it could be made available it would have a definite effect upon the general approach to this problem. I assure you I shall certainly resolve it as best I can according to my lights.

With every good wish,

Everett McKinley Dirksen