

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

APRIL 18, 1966

FOR THE PRESS

NO. 88

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK
SECRETARY OF STATE
BEFORE
THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman:

Thank you very much for the opportunity of appearing before you in support of the President's economic and military assistance programs.

The Foreign Assistance Act and the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1966 will provide the basic authority to carry forward a foreign aid program which, in the words of President Johnson, will "help give the people of the less-developed world the food, the health, the skills and education -- and the strength -- to lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom."

The legislative programs being presented this Committee are the result of a searching review conducted last fall at the direction of the President. That review was a response to concerns expressed by the Congress and this Committee and a response to the call for action in the Conference Committee report on last year's authorization bill.

I myself was an active participant in this review, and I am convinced that the proposals now before you are based on our best attempt to draw upon the lessons of the past to contribute to creative thinking about the future.

For FY 1967 the President is requesting new appropriations of \$2,469 million for economic assistance programs and \$917 million for programs of military assistance. These are minimum estimates, based on conservative appraisals of needs for the coming year.

There has been some indication that this Committee will consider reducing the FY 1967 request to compensate in some way for the supplemental appropriation voted last month. We strongly request you not to follow such a course. Because of the tight programming and minimum levels of the FY 1967 request, there is no way in which such cuts can be absorbed without seriously crippling programs in many parts of the world. Any attempt to take from one year to pay for another would be false economy. The money voted in FY 1966 and the funds requested for FY 1967 are both needed for vital programs.

The funds we are requesting are the bare minimum required to serve United States interests, and should they prove insufficient, the President will not hesitate to request additional funds.

I strongly support these proposals and urge the approval of S. 2859 and S. 2861 by this Committee.

I.

Foreign aid is basic to United States security.

Without it, many countries undoubtedly would have been subverted or overrun in the past two decades.

Without

Without it, the frontiers of freedom would have shrunk and Americans would be living in a less stable and a more threatening world.

Too often, I think, we let immediate crises and headlines obscure the very real progress that is being made in many parts of the world. This is often called the "quiet battle," and it is a battle of which all Americans can be proud. As the President said in his Foreign Aid Message, "We will never know how many crises have been averted, how much violence avoided, or how many minds have been won to the cause of freedom in these years."

Change and movement are the dominant factors of our time. The world of tomorrow will be far different for those growing up in Africa, Asia and Latin America, in contrast to the sameness of life a few generations ago.

The direction which this change takes and the forces it unleashes will vitally affect our own safety and well-being. I am convinced that our foreign assistance programs have served us well. In fact, foreign assistance has been our primary means of helping and guiding the economic, social and political evolution of most of the countries of the non-Communist world.

But much remains to be done, and that is why we ask the Congress to provide the authority and funds to mount a renewed attack on the root causes of misery and unrest on which aggression and subversion feed.

The economic assistance program we are proposing is based on two fundamental facts:

-- First, that the basis for successful foreign aid is self-help. No amount of United States assistance can do the job unless the recipient nation itself invests the resources, makes the reforms, and adopts the policies which will lead to lasting progress.

United States aid will not be provided unless nations are willing to do their part in the crucial task of development; it will not be provided where nations engage in wasteful foreign adventures or bitter disputes with their own neighbors.

The President has made this clear in his Messages to the Congress; and he has made this clear to recipient nations in his actions.

-- Second, that the major concern of a successful foreign aid program must be people. Our aid cannot be concerned simply with dollars or plans or facilities.

That is why we are proposing a renewed attack in the fields of education, health and agriculture.

Our own experience in America demonstrates that the vital ingredient of progress is people who are educated and healthy, people who have enough of the right food to eat, people who look to the future with hope.

This is no vision or dream. It is realism rooted in experience.

Mr. Bell has given you some of the details of these new initiatives in health, education and agriculture. But I should like to say that my belief in this approach is based on my own experiences and the contrast between the life of the previous generation and the life of present-day America.

For

For I do not believe that the situation in many parts of the world now is so different from what it was not too many years ago in many parts of our own country.

I believe that the rapid growth of our nation and the transformation of backward areas into active participants in progress is the direct result of better education, improved health and more efficient agriculture.

You can chart the course of our own progress in school attendance statistics, health records, and agricultural productivity figures.

Our foreign aid program is designed to help others follow the same path of progress.

II.

The President's foreign aid proposals have two important features of particular interest to this Committee -- a five-year authorization for the entire aid program and a split between military and economic assistance.

The five-year authorization will extend to the entire program the multi-year principle enacted by the Congress in 1961 and 1962 for development loans and the Alliance for Progress. This principle was carried forward by this Committee in action on last year's legislation. Approval of a five-year authorization would be a commitment by the Congress -- subject, of course, to approval of annual appropriations -- to support of sound and efficient development efforts by less-developed countries. It will make clear to recipient nations and other donors that the United States is prepared to do its part if they do theirs. It will enable us to provide more efficient administration of the funds voted by the Congress, and to enforce self-help requirements more effectively.

The Executive Branch is prepared to make an annual presentation of the program in whatever form you may request. But the long-term authorization will free this Committee from the burden of an annual legislative cycle, and enable you to examine the entire aid program or selected parts of it in whatever depth that you feel is necessary. In this way, your informed judgment can be brought to bear in areas of particular concern; and I can assure you of the desire of the Executive Branch to make such examinations as fruitful and constructive as possible.

The separation of the two parts of the foreign assistance program is designed to clarify the purposes and functions of each and to give the public a greater understanding of what we are doing in our overseas programs. Congressional examination and review of the relations of the two programs and of their effectiveness in carrying out our foreign policy goals is being maintained by reference of the two bills to this Committee and to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In addition

In addition, the President is requesting that the Secretary of State be given continued responsibility to exercise supervision and general direction of the military assistance program, to assure that expenditures and sales are consistent with our foreign policy objectives.

Secretary McNamara will discuss this program with you in detail in the very near future. But I should like to add my strong support for the requests which he will be presenting.

Military assistance helps to strengthen our own security by building the security of others. It helps those nations which are working with us to secure peace by deterring aggression. MAP helps to build the shield behind which economic growth can take place.

But the program does more. It also contributes to the economic progress of the recipients by stressing civic action programs through which local troops build schools and roads and other essential facilities. In addition, we help train foreign military personnel at schools in the United States and abroad, and through these courses, impart a new understanding of the role of the military in a democratic society.

III.

I should like to take a few minutes to discuss four particular aspects of the FY 1967 economic assistance program.

First, we are continuing to focus our aid in those nations and on those programs where self-help and performance are the strongest and where United States security interests are most directly served. As a result, in FY 1967:

- 92% of the total country programs is concentrated in 20 countries
- 84% of Development Loans is for 8 countries
- 93% of Supporting Assistance is for 5 countries, with 72% in Viet-Nam alone.

These are the countries where United States interest is great, where United States aid can effectively serve this interest, and where aid recipients are making the greatest effort to help themselves.

A number of other nations, of course, do receive aid, but only in small amounts. This has led some to question whether we are providing assistance to too many nations, whether we are trying to do too much in too many places. We carefully analyze the programs in each country. The decision about each program is based on a careful evaluation of our interest and the effectiveness of aid. In deciding the number of countries in which we conduct aid programs we do not look to an arbitrary figure for a guide but to the facts in each situation.

The facts

The facts show that we are not trying to do too much. Our program in the countries outside of the major 20 are limited in scope and limited in purpose.

A large number of programs are in the countries of sub-Sahara Africa. Small United States assistance programs to these countries demonstrate our basic interest in their independence and progress and reflect the significance of these countries individually and as a group. Increasingly over the next few years we will design our assistance effort to help build up African regional and sub-regional institutions and to administer more assistance through regional funds and multi-lateral channels. In a number of cases, however, a hard analysis of individual country situations may lead to continuation of United States bilateral aid, at least for some time to come.

We would be glad to discuss such individual situations with you in detail. I believe that a clearer understanding of the number of countries problem will emerge from such a discussion.

Second, we have been continuing our successful efforts to reduce the adverse impact of the aid program on our balance of payments. With relatively small and necessary exceptions, all the funds now being appropriated for the A.I.D. program will be spent in the United States. As you know, A.I.D. is in the business of exporting United States goods and services, not United States dollars.

A.I.D. offshore expenditures declined from nearly \$1 billion in Fiscal Year 1960 to \$515 million in Fiscal Year 1964, and will be further reduced to about \$400 million in FY 1967. Taking into account repayments on past aid of \$186 million, the net impact on the United States balance of payments of A.I.D. offshore expenditures in FY 1967 is estimated to be only \$214 million.

In the long run, foreign aid will be a substantial help to our balance of payments. As countries which we now assist grow stronger, they will provide new and growing markets for United States businesses. And an increasing flow of dollars to the United States will result from development loan repayments.

Third, we are increasing our efforts to stimulate the private sector in the developing countries and increase the role of United States private enterprise in our assistance programs.

This is a basic aspect of our aid program. For until the energies of all the citizens of a developing nation are involved in the job of building a better life and until all can share in that life, there is no true progress. Their own and foreign private enterprise can play a vital role in stimulating and releasing these energies. In recent years there has been a growing understanding in the developing nations of this fact. And there has been a corresponding growth in A.I.D. support for efforts to build the private sector. This is being accomplished through modification of policies by developing countries themselves as well as through the creation of institutions under the aid program.

The United States Government itself can only do a small part of the job. It must rely increasingly on our business and labor leaders, our teachers and lawyers, our farmers and bankers, who have great reservoirs of knowledge and experience important to the attack on the problems of the developing nations.

As a part of our renewed efforts we will make greater use of the unique contributions which United States private citizens can make.

We will

We will continue our support for the International Executive Service Corps and are encouraged by the spirit of service which has moved so many qualified business executives to volunteer to participate in its work.

As the President indicated, we expect to carry on a frank and constructive review with recipient countries of obstacles to domestic and foreign private investment. We will continue to support the liberalization of over-controlled economies; to furnish assistance to the formation of cooperatives, and the training of labor and business leaders; and to support institutions offering improved credit facilities and advisory services for small and medium-sized farms and businesses.

We are continuing our policy of encouraging United States private investment in the developing countries, and in support of this, we are requesting that this Committee double the authority of the investment guaranty programs.

Last August the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, composed of distinguished citizens and headed by Mr. Arthur K. Watson, reported its recommendations for strengthening the participation of private enterprise in our foreign aid programs. A number of these recommendations have been adopted; others are being carefully studied and are providing the basis for new initiatives in important parts of the aid program.

Fourth, we are placing increasing efforts on programs to combat subversion and the despair and frustration on which such subversion grows. This is a crucial aspect of our aid, for as we have seen in many parts of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, where insurgents are active, the energies of a people are diverted from the long-range job of peaceful development to the short-run task of survival.

These programs focus in four major areas:

- public safety, which helps to build basic local security;
- civic action, sponsored and supported by both the military assistance program and A.I.D. through which local military units participate in the nation-building projects;
- rural and community development, which helps to build local government units and increase local participation in economic and social improvement projects;
- labor and youth, which are, of course, essential parts of the foundation for a society of progress and freedom.

IV.

I should like to discuss with you some of the areas of particular concern to our own security where the foreign assistance program plays an important role.

A major

A major portion of the funds in the FY 1967 foreign economic aid program-- \$550 million-- is for Viet-Nam.

That struggle is not simply a matter of guns and troops and planes. It also involves hard, basic work being done in the villages to improve agricultural productivity, increase health services and establish educational systems. It is this work which points the way to the kind of life which the people of Viet-Nam can live when the guns are quiet.

The Committee will recall that on January 15 of this year the Government of Viet-Nam announced its proposal to move to a new constitution and to elections. Their original proposal was to convene a representative group during the present year to draft a constitution which would be submitted to the people of South Viet-Nam for approval and on the basis of that constitution elections for a new government would be held next year. These proposals were repeated by the leaders of South Viet-Nam at Honolulu and accepted by us as a constructive step. In the most recent past, various elements in South Viet-Nam have presented their own views about these political developments and there has taken place an active discussion, including opposition from some elements who wish to shorten the time very considerably. The result has been to speed up the timetable by arrangements which call for the election, which we now understand will be in August, of a constitution-making assembly. It has been apparent throughout these recent discussions that there is general agreement among all of the participants that they reject the Viet Cong and the efforts of Hanoi to impose a political solution upon the South by force. It is important, of course, that these political processes proceed on the basis of solidarity on the eventual aims with respect to South Viet-Nam even though, as we ourselves learned, the construction of a basic constitutional arrangement is a complicated and difficult matter.

I think it is important that these political, economic and social works of peace continue even while the military struggle continues. That is why we and the leaders of South Viet-Nam reaffirmed our commitment to improve the life of the Vietnamese people in the Declaration of Honolulu. For we all recognize that, while we could win the victory on the battlefield, we could still lose the more important fight for the future well-being and progress of the people.

As a part of similar efforts elsewhere in Southeast Asia, we are stepping up our assistance to Thailand and Laos.

There are also encouraging signs of a developing regionalism in Asia. The countries of the area are beginning to look beyond their own borders for ways in which they can cooperate in the common problems of economic development. For some years, the Mekong Coordinating Committee, which includes representatives of Thailand, Laos, Cambodia and South Viet-Nam, has been conducting studies and pre-investment surveys for the long range development of the Mekong Basin. Two smaller projects in Thailand are, in fact, nearly completed, and engineering work for the Nam Ngum Dam in Laos will shortly get underway.

We do not stand alone in our efforts to spur the development of this river basin. Seven other donors --Japan, the Netherlands, Canada, Thailand, Denmark, Australia, and New Zealand-- have matched the United States contribution to the \$23 million Nam Ngum project, which will be administered by the World Bank.

This past

This past year has been one of crisis and turmoil in the Dominican Republic, but since last September there have been signs of progress. The Provisional Government, with the help of the Inter-American Peace Force, has retained control of the divided country. We are working with the peoples of the Dominican Republic to assure the peaceful transition to power of a freely elected democratic government. We are also working with the people and providing economic assistance which will help to direct the energies and the policies of the country toward peaceful reform and a better life.

As you know, we have announced our willingness to negotiate certain economic development loans with India and Pakistan. We are prepared to continue to help if these two countries demonstrate their willingness to take necessary self-help measures in the fields of agriculture and other priority areas and find a way to live at peace with each other.

We are heartened by the progress of reconciliation shown at the United Nations and at Tashkent, and in the announcement of troop pull-backs. We look forward to the day when the full energies of these two great peoples can, with assistance from us and others, be devoted to the task of building for the future. That job, as we all know, will be a staggering one, as the current food shortages in India so starkly remind us. But it must be successful, and we are prepared to do our part.

One of the most encouraging signs of the past year has been the continuing economic progress in Korea. For example, Korean exports in 1965 were 50% larger than in 1964 and five times greater than in 1960. Industrial production rose by 16% last year. Korea's Gross National Product increased by more than 8% in 1963 and again in 1964.

This progress has been a demonstration of what can happen to a country after the smoke of battle has cleared and the energies of the people are turned to the great task of peaceful development. Our A.I.D. program was once largely in the form of grants to support the Korean economy. The grant economic aid program has been declining steadily while our development lending has increased, including loans to private projects, reflecting the ability of the country to make effective use of capital goods. Korea is now providing an excellent example of what can be done when self-help is accompanied by strong United States support.

In Africa there has been some further movement in recent months toward regional cooperation. More and more of Africa's leaders are recognizing that peace and economic growth receive great impetus from a cooperative approach to development. We would welcome additional measures in sub-regional cooperation and institutions, such as a formation of the proposed Economic Community of Eastern Africa. We look forward to cooperating with the new African Development Bank and other regional institutions which can play important roles in drawing together the countries of this great continent. As the means for cooperation develop, the United States intends to make greater use of regional institutions and arrangements as channels for our assistance.

Last

Last November I took part in the Second Special Inter-American Conference at Rio de Janeiro where I had the valuable assistance of Senators Church and Scott. I conveyed to the Conference the intention of the United States to extend its commitment to the great joint effort to promote peaceful change through the Alliance for Progress. In a personal message to the Conference, President Johnson said:

"Recognizing that fulfillment of our goals will require the continuation of the joint effort beyond 1971, I wish to inform the Conference -- and through you, your respective governments -- that the United States will be prepared to extend mutual commitment beyond the time period foreseen in the Charter of Punta del Este. In determining the scope of the United States effort, we will want to examine carefully with you at that time the requirements of the hemisphere, in the light of progress made through self-help measures and the contributions which by then some of your countries will be able to make to one another to further the common effort."

The leaders of the hemisphere demonstrated their commitment to progress by adopting the Economic and Social Act of Rio de Janeiro last November. This Act added an important new element to the Alliance: a commitment by all members of the Alliance to help one another and to provide assistance to achieve economic and social objectives set forth in the Act. Although many members of the Committee may have read it, I would like to submit for the record, Mr. Chairman, the text of that Act.

The Alliance is moving ahead. Brazil, as a result of farseeing and courageous decisions involving difficult measures for stabilization, development and reform, has greatly reduced its inflation rate, restored its credit, encouraged private investment, set its economy moving forward and pressed forward the modernization of its economic institutions. Chile is making important strides, and Colombia is taking the self-help steps which are expected to result in more rapid progress and therefore would justify greater support from the United States.

We will continue our strong support for successful regional integration in Central America, and are hopeful that the movement toward greater cooperation of all the economies of Latin America will gain momentum in the years ahead. In addition, we will continue to work with the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) and the Inter-American Development Bank to increase regional cooperation.

V.

Mr. Chairman, before closing I would like to say a little more about some matters of particular concern to this Committee -- the use of multilateral channels of aid, the efforts of other aid donors, and the future requirements for aid.

First, multilateral assistance.

Mr. Bell has already discussed with you at length, on April 6, the strong and continuing efforts of the United States to increase the volume of assistance to the less developed countries through multilateral arrangements and institutions. We are ready to increase the amount of

our

our own contributions to international institutions, as other donor nations demonstrate a willingness to increase theirs. It is, of course, essential that international institutions which provide assistance maintain their non-political and multilateral status. The United States has also worked hard to encourage the momentum of regional multilateral institutions. We have, as you know, lent strong support to the Inter-American Development Bank and its Fund for Special Operations, and for the newly formed African and Asian Development Banks.

The second matter of concern to you is the efforts of other aid donors.

We have met with some success in our efforts to get other donor nations to provide more aid on better terms. Total free world aid commitments are substantially greater today than they were in 1960, and United States bilateral assistance accounts for a smaller proportion of the total.

Total bilateral aid commitments from other DAC donors has grown from \$1.8 billion in 1960 to \$2.5 billion in 1964. Other donors are providing more aid to countries other than their own former colonial possessions. The terms on which aid is provided are steadily, if slowly, improving.

There is a growing awareness among aid-giving and aid-receiving countries of the advantages of cooperation and mutual assistance, and I have indicated the increasing spirit of cooperation among developing countries. Donor nations are also moving toward closer relationships in their aid-giving efforts.

The growing number of arrangements for coordination of aid among donors is particularly encouraging.

We are continuing our efforts to strengthen bilateral coordination. For example, the United States recently agreed to engage in regular consultations at the cabinet level with Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany on the aid program.

Formal coordination arrangements have been established for a number of recipient countries. Aid to India and Pakistan is provided through World Bank consortia which include Western European countries, Japan, Canada and the United States. Aid to Turkey is provided through a consortium of the OECD.

The World Bank also sponsors less formal coordinating mechanisms called consultative groups. There are now World Bank consultative groups for six countries including Colombia, Thailand, Nigeria and Tunisia.

These arrangements -- consortia and consultative groups -- bring together donor countries and international financial institutions. They provide an effective forum for reviewing the requirements of a recipient country, for evaluating self-help performance, and providing aid on a more orderly basis.

Third, future requirements for aid.

As the

As the less developed nations increasingly turn their energies to the serious task of development, we expect that over-all requirements for external capital will rise over the next few years.

In addition, the debt burden which the less developed countries bear is expected to grow and must be taken into account. New aid provided to less developed countries each year must be discounted by the amount of repayments they must make on previous hard term debts and increasing amounts of new capital will be necessary just to maintain a constant net flow of resources.

But we hope and we expect that private investment and funding on commercial terms will meet an increasing proportion of these requirements. And we expect the less developed countries to keep their economic houses in order -- not only by using their own resources wisely but also by efficiently managing their debt obligations.

We will continue to look to the other bilateral donors and to the multilateral institutions to play a larger role, as well.

But the United States, as the wealthiest nation in the world should continue to provide a proportionate share of its resources to these great efforts. We should assist those who are prepared to help themselves. We should be prepared to match the contributions of other developed nations. We should, in short, do what is necessary to build a more secure and prosperous world.

VI.

The foreign aid program which this Committee is now considering is essential to United States security and national interest in both their short and long-range aspects.

For the short-range, the program provides direct support to Vietnam, assists self-defense and internal security efforts in other countries, and helps to build the stability essential to a peaceful future.

For the long-range also, we need our foreign aid program, because as the President said, "we are concerned with the kind of world our children will live in."

For we seek a world of progress and of peace, where each nation lives in independence. This is no longer a dream; it is now a necessity. For in this age of rapid communication, rockets, and nuclear power, what happens half a world away is of vital concern to us and our security.

Only as others grow in freedom, progress and security can we here in the United States be truly free and secure to enjoy the blessings of a better life.

* * *