L60-140

U.S. FOREIGN POLICIES TODAY

Honorable J. William Fulbright

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by: Colonel P. B. Klein, USAF

Date: 1 April 1960

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1959-1960

U. S. FOREIGN POLICIES TODAY

4 March 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION--Lieutenant General George W. Mundy, USAF, Commandant, ICAF	1
SPEAKER--------Honorable J. William Fulbright, United States Senator from Arkansas	2
GENERAL DISCUSSION	16

NOTICE

This lecture has not been edited by the speaker. It has been reproduced directly from the reporter's notes for the students and faculty for reference and study purposes.

No direct quotations are to be made either in written reports or in oral presentations based on this unedited copy.

Reviewed by Colonel P. B. Klein, USAF, 1 April 1960.

Reporter: Grace R. O'Toole

Property of the Library
INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE
ARMED FORCES

Publication No. L60-140

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington 25, D. C.

U. S. FOREIGN POLICIES TODAY

4 March 1960

GENERAL MUNDY: As the world gets smaller and smaller, countries that a few years ago seemed very remote and relatively unimportant have become for all practical purposes our next-door neighbors. Whether we like it or not, we have to review our domestic programs against the international scene, because our domestic programs have become interrelated with our foreign affairs.

We are fortunate in having as our speaker this morning the Honorable J. William Fulbright, United States Senator from Arkansas and the Chairman of the very powerful Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I understand that the comparable committee in the House is called the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, according to the House Members, they are the only ones young enough to have affairs.

I don't believe that I can add anything by way of introduction to the biography that you have been given. I might point out that we believe in reciprocating. We have Senator Fulbright here today and members of the College are in Little Rock, Arkansas, his home state, putting on a two-week National Security Seminar.

Senator Fulbright, because of the pressure of his schedule at the moment, proposes that he make only a very short introductory opening remark and then he will make himself available to you for your questions.

Gentlemen, Senator Fulbright.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: General Mundy and Gentlemen: I don't suppose I need to tell you why we are preoccupied at the moment. It's in all the papers. My wife asked me this morning why I was making a speech this morning because I am scheduled to speak this evening from 8:00 until 12:00. As you know, under the recently developed procedure of the Senate, we have to stand watch for the succeeding four hours, so I will be on duty from 8:00 until 4:00 tonight.

Well, I wondered when I was invited to come here just what function I might perform. General Munday was kind enough to say "the very powerful Committee on Foreign Relations." I often wonder about that, how powerful we are in our Government, and whether the source of power in our Government is very difficult to pin down. It is one of the great problems of the way our democratic system is developed. There has been the question of power, of power to make decisions, and I think it puzzles me as well. I am not conscious of any great power, certainly any affirmative power. The power that we have is primarily negative power in our legislature. That is the power to refine, I should say, and to reexamine policies which are normally initiated in the executive. I throw that out only because the General mentioned it. I don't wish to try to avoid any responsibility. But I often feel very frustrated about the capacity to initiate and to actually enact legislation.

I thought perhaps, as I suggested, that it would be most useful if I

would say a few things by way of background and then ask you to ask questions. I do that because I am not at all sure that what is of particular interest to me is of particular interest to you. You may feel quite as well informed on some of the matters which I will discuss as I am myself.

I will run over rather briefly some of the background material which I think will put our present situation in perspective. When we look at our own country it has been an amazing success from the point of view of gross national product. It is now estimated that this year we will pass $500 billion, with the per capita income of $2500 per capita, which is about twice as large as the next most prosperous country. We have more radios, televisions, bath tubs, automobiles. All of these things this kind of economy can produce, more than any other country.

The trouble is: Are these things important? Are they really significant, when it comes to the question of national survival? The Russians, in contrast to the things which I have mentioned, have concentrated upon the production of such things as scientists, missiles, submarines, and so on, the hardware, which which you are so familiar. The great question immediately arises as to whether or not we are allocating our resources and our efforts in the correct manner.

I do not think we are. The rate of growth of the Russian system is so very significant. We had a study before the Committee recently. The C.E.I.R. is a very well known organization for industrial research. It estimated that the industrial output of the Russians is increasing at approximately

9 percent a year, as against 4 percent by ourselves. This, of course, is obvious to all of you, when we consider that only 50 years ago there wasn't any Communist country. The Communists didn't control any more than a couple tables in a Zurich restaurant or a cafe, 50 years ago. Today, within the relatively short period of 50 years, they control about 40 percent of the population, about 27 percent of the land area, and some 30 percent of the industrial power. This is a rather tremendous, unprecedented accomplishment.

You are familiar with the missile gap. I won't go into it. In fact, it is not quite in my line of duty with regard to my committee membership, but we have been forced, all of us, to listen to these debates and to take note of the fact that many of our most important military leaders are concerned about it. There is a difference of opinion, of course, but I think that the difference that has developed in itself is sufficient to cause us to be concerned about it. I am very concerned about it. I have very definitely the feeling that our country is not allocating its resources in the way designed to preserve its own future, to preserve it in competition with the Russians.

I think this would be true, however, without the Russians. I think that we have permitted ourselves, during the past 50 years, to lose sight of the essentials for the continued growth and strength of our system of society. I think--take education for example--we have allowed the curricula of our schools, particularly high schools and elementary schools, to

deteriorate in quality. You have read many articles about it. One of your highly controversial officers of the Navy has taken this matter as a specialty of his and has written many articles on it, most of which I have read. I think there is a great deal of truth in what he said. There have been many other articles. Mr. Bestor, one of the leading professors in Illinois, has written a book which has similar statistics in it on the deterioration in the quality of our education.

I think this is an extremely significant aspect of this whole matter. I, having been a former professor, when I first came into the Congress, attempted to pass legislation in this field. I co-sponsored and sponsored legislation back in the forties. We passed it in the Senate--very good bills, designed to improve the quality of education in this country. Unfortunately, it didn't pass in the House. I have often thought, and still believe, that, had those bills been passed, particularly the one on which, as it happened, Senator Taft was the primary sponsor, because this one came in the 80th Congress, and it was only because we were able to obtain the support and sponsorship of Senator Taft in that Congress, which was, as you will recall, a Republican-dominated Congress, that we passed it in the Senate by a large majority but it failed in the House, had we actually enacted such legislation, all this controversy that now divides us with regard to education and integration of the schools would probably have been avoided, because, with such legislation, the requirement of equality

in the former principle or law of the land of "separate but equal" which was applied until the 1954 decision would have been achieved. The one legitimate complaint on the part of those who have attacked segregation was that the schools were not equal, and it is true that they were not in many cases.

This particular aspect of our national life, it seems to me, is the source of many of our troubles. I was very interested, and noticed just within the last few days, an article in Business Week, which, as you know, is one of the leading business magazines in this country and is generally considered a very conservative business publication. I was astounded to see this paragraph in that magazine. It is one of the few encouraging things that I have noticed. This magazine has finally taken note of this fundamental problem in our country. It is a very long article describing all aspects of our economy. It concludes with this:

"This brings the study of growth around full-circle to where it began centuries ago. The growth and power of nations depend primarily upon the qualities of their people. That puts the focus of a long-term growth program not just on our tax laws or on our plant and equipment spending but on our schools and colleges and universities and laboratories and all the other seed beds of American talent. The need to attack the problem from that angle has been widely sensed. Business Week has been already dealing with it in special reports on education, brain power, and research."

When I read that just a few days ago, I felt that it was, as I say, almost

the only hopeful thing I have seen. If our business communities, which are so extremely influential in our political life, do conclude that this a matter of great importance, then there is some hope that we may rectify the national policies which have led to the deterioration of our national life.

In contrast to that, though, I must draw your attention to a statement only a few weeks ago by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Mueller. I quote from a statement which he made at that time. He said:

"I do not believe New York business man and their associates elsewhere are going to keep mum this year when any irresponsible politician or any economic illiterate tries to drain from the blood stream of the private economy the savings urgently needed for investment, research, and capital outlays that create more business, more employment, and more economic growth."

This is a statement, of course, with regard to the problem of whether or not the country can afford further outlays for education, particularly for education. As you know, at that time we had under consideration a bill for education in the Senate, and actually we passed it in the Senate, after a very controversial debate on it. It has been widely stated that the President will veto that bill if it comes to him in the form in which it passed the Senate. Whether or not that develops--I hope it will not--the indications are that he will veto it.

To sum up this aspect of my comment, it is that I think we are a very

fat, rich, complacent Nation, without any sense of direction of purpose. We are just drifting along without exerting ourselves, without being requested or required to exert ourselves, in any meaningful way. This can be considered a reflection upon the political leadership. I think all of us, perhaps, in politics bear part of the responsibility. Under our system the Executive has traditionally been considered the leader of the national political scene and, if leadership is not exerted from that source, as I said a moment ago, it is not likely to come from the Congress. The Congress is not so constituted that it can provide much leadership. It is made up of 537 members now, I believe. So that there is a multiplicity of voices. Even if one should say something with wisdom in it, you are not likely to hear of it, because it would not be reported. About all that is reported from the Congress are the eccentricities that occur there or the strange goings-on. Really, people don't expect much in that sense from us. We play different functions.

Well, I think, in stating that case as to the direction in which we ought to go, it seems to me it is self-evident. I think a tightening up of our whole system is in order, that we should be required to sacrifice far more, wherever necessary. For example, on the question of whether or not we can afford more money for missiles, as to the technical question of how it should be applied, and so on, I wouldn't presume to say. But there is no question that we can afford it. This idea that the budget must be balanced at the present level is nonsense. In 1954 we passed a bill

reducing our taxes by some 4 or 5 billion dollars a year. Prior to that time we were not going broke. There is no question about our being able to provide much more money for missiles or for education. If we choose to do it, it is purely a matter of choice. It is a matter of whether we wish to do it or whether we wish to continue to build luxury hotels and more and bigger and more extravagant automobiles, and all the other luxuries that we have become accustomed to. It is as simple as that.

You can say, "Well, if it requires more taxes, so be it. We paid at a higher rate before, and we could do it again. No one particularly suffered from it." So that I think that the whole approach of saying, "Here is a budget level now and you've got to make that do," is the wrong approach. I think it should be, "What do we really need to do?" with the best judgment we can get in the field of military as well as civilian activities. If we need more schools--and everybody agrees we do--if we need more qualified teachers--and I know of no one who disputes the fact that we do need them, that we have a deficiency of nearly 100,000 qualified teachers--then I think provision should be made for them. So that the approach to this problem I think is wrong and is exactly in reverse. Instead of making the current level of budget, of the income, the determining factor, you ought to make the demands and requirements first and adjust the income to that level.

That is the main broad criticism that I would offer for this. There are many things of a more detailed nature which I can suggest that we do

in the foreign field. I would like to make more generalization. I think the compartmentalization of foreign and domestic matters is a misleading way to discuss them. I think the way we conduct outselves here at home has become perhaps more important than what we say and do in the foreign field, because the nature of the problem now has changed. The world is looking at these two great countries which are the examples of two different approaches to a society, the way we organize society. It is the way you actually function at home that is perhaps more impressive to them than anything we may say or do in foreign fields. It is the society, its characteristics, its capacity to direct its own efforts in a meaningful way, to discipline itself so that it does what it ought to do that is very impressive to the other countries.

You can put yourself in the position of a foreign country that we will say is a neutral country. It is trying to determine in its own mind whether or not the democratic system which we represent is the better way to organize society or whether the authoritarian system is the better way.

This is a very real problem for Americans. We have become so provincial in many respects that we dare not even discuss the possibility that civilized people might not think our system is the best. We have become very conceited and chauvinistic in this respect. But it is quite possible that many people do question it. Consider that 50 years ago democratic countries had no real rival. No one seriously questioned the validity of the idea of democracy, democratic self-government. And within 50 short years, look

at how the countries that constitute the great Western democratic world have suffered. Look at the decline in their strength, and consider what has happened to all of Western Europe. Outside of this country, the strength of these societies had almost evaporated, until we revived them. Contrast that to the growth of the Communist--which I mentioned--the authoritarian system. Well, to an objective observer, it can well be a question of whether or not we do have the right system. When they observe the weaknesses in the direction of our efforts, our domestic efforts, which I mentioned, there is a very real question, a very real one.

To further illustrate that point, Pakistan, the Sudan, and Thailand all tried to institute a democratic, self-governing system. They all failed to be able to sustain it. They all have--temporarily, we hope but in any case—turned to the military. Maybe that is what we will have to do here before we are through. But in any case those countries have had to do it, and they have what is in effect a military dictatorship in those three countries. They tried to make the democracy work.

Well, can't you imagine that someone reading about what is going on in this country now in the Senate wonders whether or not our system is working? I emphasize these points only to try to impress you with something that I and very few Americans are willing to accept, or even the possibility of it, and that is that many neutral foreign countries in Latin America, Asia, and other places may very well be turning over in their minds whether this system which the Americans represent is the system

they wish to emulate or even to ally themselves with permanently, and whether or not they have confidence in the long-term future of the stability and strength of this country.

That is why what we do here is so important. There are many other things, which I will mention fairly briefly and more directly, in the foreign field which we could do. One, for example, that I tried to do last year, was to abandon the custom of appointing ambassadors purely for political reasons, usually for the reason that they gave a good contribution to the party in power. I tried that and failed to do it. These customs, these old political traditions, are very hard to eradicate from our system. There is no particular feeling of urgency. I mention this only as an example of the difficulty, I think, of effecting a reform which I think is perfectly self-evident and ought to be done. In the old days perhaps it wasn't very important whether our Ambassador to France, to England, to Italy, or to any place else was an intelligent, able person who could interpret the country to which he was assigned and could advise our Government wisely. That may not have been important then. Today it is very important. It seems to me high time that we change this approach and that we should be much more careful in the selection of ambassadors.

In the development of our policies with regard to places like Berlin, and with regard to all places for that matter, I think the advice of ambassadors, well qualified ambassadors, on the ground floor in these areas, interpreting the sense of the people of the various countries, would be extremely

important to the final decision makers in the Department of State and in the White House itself. That is merely one example of what I mean. It is a relatively minor point, and yet it is important as a detail of how we could improve our foreign policy.

There are other things, such as the exchange programs which have been started in a small way and are generally considered to be very effective, but which are not expanded. They are still on a very small scale. I think they have had a long enough trial period to prove that they can be extremely useful for our development of much better relations with all parts of the world, even with the Communist countries. I think it is one of the hopeful things. But it is certainly important for the non-Communist countries.

I don't know whether you wish to discuss such policies as disarmament. I thought I would leave that type of question for the question period, if you wish to discuss it. It is a very illusive and difficult subject to make much sense of in a few words.

I would sum up this part of our discussion by merely saying that I think we are in an extremely difficult, serious situation, probably more dangerous and serious than we have ever confronted before, because we are confronted with a very able antagonist. I think, even without that, as I said, many of these things ought to be done. But we could never minimize the importance of the strength of this antagonist. We had the leader here last fall. I had him come to our Committee. Everyone who saw Mr. Khrushchev was

impressed with his originality, his vitality, his both physical strength and vitality, and his intellectual shrewdness and capacity. So that I think we are challenged in a way that we have never been challenged before. Russia is a tremendous country. It is three times as large as ours physically, and it has a substantially larger population. They are concentrating their efforts in a way that we are not. They are allocating what resources they have, and their gross national product is only 40 percent of ours; but they are concentrating it in the areas which are important to national strength--not to consumption of luxury goods or consumers' goods of any kind but to those areas of national strength such as the missile field, the submarine field, and in the scientific field. They are graduating about three times as many engineers as we are. They have concentrated their research in the pure sciences. For some unknown reason--I am not sure it is unknown--I have my own views as to why--they have excelled us in the missile race. I hesitate sometimes to express those views because I cannot prove them. But it is a rather remarkable thing that they have apparently succeeded in outdistancing us in the long-range missile program so relatively quickly.

So that we have this formidable antagonist and we are not taking it seriously. That's why I think it is so dangerous. In this great country with a great potential we could do anything we really wished to do, if we could decide what we want to do, if we could determine our purposes and then apply the energy of our country to the achievement of those purposes.

We are not doing it. I can see very little sign that we are concerned about it.

One aspect illustrates this to me, and I will conclude with this one further observation about our political system. This division of responsibility in your Government is in a sense unprecedented. It is true that in our history we have had short periods in which the Executive is controlled by one party and the Legislature by the other party. This has happened at the end of a relatively long period in which one party has controlled our Government. As the country is about to change over to the opposite party, the last two years of a regime have resulted in anticipation of the next presidential election, and they have elected the opposite party to the Legislature. This happened in the last two years of Wilson and the last two years of Hoover, and there are other cases. But, never before in our history, certainly not since 1848, has this country elected a President of one party and the Legislature of the opposite party in the same time, as we did in 1956.

This to me illustrates a very profound, I think, lack of understanding on the part of the American people of their own political system. It is surprising how many people think that this is rather a good thing. You hear and you read in the paper, "Well, those scoundrels down on the Hill are being checked by the President of the opposite party." Or, if they happen to be Democrats, they will say, "Well, the President is vetoing everything the good, fine Democrats do on the Hill." It's either way you like it.

There were 150 vetoes in the last session of Congress. This illustrates the lack of understanding on the part of the people, the lack of any purpose. They can't make up their minds whether they want the objectives as they are at least pronounced and announced by the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. They take a straddling position--"We'll have a little of both." This is the most disastrous way they could be.

Of course, naturally, I think it would be better to have a Democratic Administration, but I'll go further and say that I think it would be better to have a Republican Administration with the control of both the Executive and the Legislature, better than it is to have this divided Government. This is the worst possible solution that you could reach to these very difficult times. In all frankness, I am very fearful that this problem will not be solved in the next election. If it is not solved and we have four more years of this kind of divided Government, unable to take any clear-cut policies and carry them through, then I think the country is in a very serious time, and indeed the future is extremely dim.

I'll end on that cheerful note. If anyone cares to ask any questions, I'll do my best. I don't guarantee to answer them, but I'll try.

MR. HILL: The Senator is ready for your questions.

QUESTION: Senator, I understand that the Federal Republic of Germany is authorized armed forces only for use in the common defense of Western Europe. It has been reported recently that they have started at least preliminary negotiations with Spain for bases in that country without consulting

NATO. What are your thoughts with regard to this action? Do you find it disturbing?

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Yes, I do. As you know, that is a very recent development and it is one on which I have not had any briefing or information, other than what has been in the press. It just happened a few days ago. It seems to me a very strange development in that they should have taken such a step without consulting NATO or consulting our Government as a part of NATO. I had assumed and had believed that our relations with Mr. Adenauer in particular had been very friendly and very cooperative. There may be something about it that I am not informed about. With the information that I have, it seems extremely strange and rather disturbing.

It might mean that they are losing confidence in what we plan to do at the Summit Meeting. I hope that is not so. Mr. Adenauer is coming here within a couple of weeks or so, I notice on my schedule. But I can only say that I am not xx informed on that really any better than you are. All meetings of my Committee and of all committees have been suspended. The usual briefings that take place between the Committee and the Departments have been suspended during this present squabble going on on the Hill. This again is a very disastrous situation, I think. I had hearings scheduled nearly every day this week, several of them concerning the studies which we had made last year. I may say for those who are interested that I recommend those studies. A number of them are extremely good, and I regret that we

are not able to proceed on them.

I can't give you much information, except to say that it is very disturbing; but I feel that we should reserve judgment until we know a little more about it. Perhaps our Government knows more about it than what has been published. There may be some aspect of it that we are not aware of.

QUESTION: Senator, you indicated that you thought that one of our big problems was that we were not allocating our resources in the correct direction. Looking at the farm program, it appears that we might be able to extract quite a large sum of money from that program and apply it to this missile gap. If you believe the same thing, how would you go about extracting it from the farm program?

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: To be specific about it, there is a bill which several of us have expressed great interest in. It presently bears the name of Senator Talmadge of Georgia. However, it is very similar to bills that have been introduced in the past. It involves a two-price system which would do away with this whole procedure of accepting agricultural materials and putting them in storage, and paying storage on them and tying up great amounts of cash. During these past years, nearly seven years, the expense of this program has gone up tremendously. We believe--those who agree with me, many of us from the South--that this whole program has been perverted and distorted from its original purpose, and that it has been largely dominated by political considerations. I

certainly would change the existing program. I would change it in the direction of what they call the Talmadge Program. Very briefly, and oversimplifying it, it is that the Government no longer extends loans on commodities, and that the basic amount of materials—cotton or wheat or tobacco, or whatever is involved--in this country is supported at a particular price and that all above that is sold at the world market.

It would eliminate altogether the present procedure of purchasing, through the process of loans, any commodities. You would no longer have a Commodity Credit Corporation. This, I think, is a far better system than we presently have.

I might say in this connection that the Agriculture Program works fairly well. It didn't cost much money. Certain aspects of it, such as the cotton program, made money up until 1952 or 1953. They took in a good deal of cotton in certain years and they sold it at a profit in later years. It operated fairly well as a support program.

The tremendous increase in productivity as a result of scientific discoveries in fertilization and irrigation--the application, I should say, of scientific methods--brought about remarkable increases in productivity. No one, I believe, foresaw that, within the short space of about 20 years, the per-acre production of a commodity like cotton would be doubled. It was.

The original program was based upon acreage control. What happened was that the acreage control became ineffective. It was made ineffective

by the development of these new techniques in the production of these various crops. It was an inherent fault in the original program.

This new proposal is to get away from acreage controls, and the controls would be on the commodity itself; that is, it would be a unit control--so many bales or so many bushels. So that I think it could be cured.

I may say in this connection one other word. I believe that those who are not too familiar with the agriculture picture would question why there should be any interference at all in the field of agriculture by the Government. Well, in a very broad way, I would say for the same reason that you have similar interference--you did have in the construction of railroads, and you do today in the subsidization of the aircraft industry in many different ways and through the tariff program. I mean, throughout our economy you will find many instances in almost all phases of business when at one time or another, or even presently in most of the cases, there is some form of governmental action which is designed to try to bring about more stability within the respective aspects of our economy.

I have often said--I am from an agricultural state, of course, or predominantly so—that, if we had a completely free economy, with no tariffs, no support program for any of the business aspects of our life, then I think the farmer could do all right. Being in a large group of people with no organization themselves, he cannot protect himself in a market

which is controlled for everybody else.

Take big businesses. They do not suffer from the same things that agriculture does, because they are controlled very tightly themselves at the top--in steel, automobiles, and so on. So that, when there is a period of overproduction, they can control their production but they do not lower their prices. This was demonstrated during the last year and the year before. They are able to bring about, in other words, some degree of stability within their particular part of our economy.

The farmers are not able to do that because of the nature of the industry. It is spread all over the country and there is no mechanism by which they can protect their industry from the demoralization of competition and the breaking of the prices. We had this for many, many years. The great depressions, going back for 50 or 75 years, were usually contributed to, if not brought about, by the demoralization in the field of agriculture.

So that this was a policy that was intended to benefit the whole economy, not just agriculture. I think some form of regulation, or participation by the Government in the regulation, of agriculture is just as essential as are these other programs of assistance by the Government, and it is a question of reaching a wise one. No one that I know of hardly believes that the present situation in agriculture is satisfactory. It is a question of working it out.

QUESTION: Senator, turning to your comments on the question of the form of governments that some of the new, underdeveloped countries

are taking, and the fact that they have not been able to make our form of democracy work, I wonder, in view of the fact that they don't have an informed electorate or a base that is educated, and don't have the same religious or intellectual or philosophical background among their educated classes that we do, whether or not we should expect that their government should take the form of a Western democracy and whether or not it is really important to the United States that every government does take such a form.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I think that is a very pertinent question, and I think that one of the mistakes we have made in the past is insisting on urging these people to try to imitate our system. I think we should not expect them to. You have already mentioned many of the reasons why we should not expect them to. We should encourage them to develop the system which is best suited to their own capacities, that is, capacities determined by the level of education and the experience. After all, we have been trying to make this operate a long time on our own. We have inherited traditions and political institutions from the British which they had been developing for 500 years before we came along. It is much too much to expect some of these countries to imitate us. This is the most complicated and difficult system, I think, that has ever been devolved. I believe that there are many limitations in applying it to these less experienced countries. Goodness knows, we are having our problems. I mentioned a few of them. We are far from perfecting our system ourselves. So that I think we have made a mistake in trying to insist and in criticising countries which do not have

the same kind of democratic system we have. The more or less authoritarian system is much simpler to arrange. Of course our danger is in keeping them from going all the way into a Communist system. That would defeat our purposes.

Take Pakistan as a good recent example. I believe our policy should be, and as far as I know it is, to encourage Ayuib in his effort to reestablish stability and orderly government in that country, rather than to criticize him. There are some people in this country, and some are my colleagues, who do criticize him and say that this is a terrible thing, that they are not democratic and why should we help them at all, and we should ostracize them, so to speak.

You will remember that there is constantly criticism of Franco Spain. It isn't that we think that system is the best but, on the other hand, he is there and he is serving the purpose of continuing Spain as a stable, free country, and we should help them in any reasonable fashion, and hope that eventually there will be a gradual evolution to a more liberal system.

I agree with you. I think it is a mistake to be too critical of these other countries which are not succeeding. I mentioned those aspects simply to emphasize the fact that this country is not taking as seriously as it should its predicament in this modern world.

QUESTION: Sir, as you know, we have a paper on basic U. S. policy. Do I interpret correctly that your concluding comments regarding a sense of direction are not incorporated in that particular paper and that the nature

of that paper does not give us a sense of direction? If your answer is yes, or even if it is no, what role does your Committee play in developing our basic U. S. policy?

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I would say normally all legislative committees, and particularly in the foreign field, do not initiate policy. The normal role in our system is that the Executive, with their great departments, whether Agriculture, and particularly State Department—I emphasize State Department—and Defense, initiate policies and submit them to the Congress, and their function is to refine, to criticize, and to improve, if they can, upon those policies. That's the nature of the organization. You've got experts who do nothing else in the State Department. That's my field. Let us use that. You've got some fine, well educated, trained men who have spent 20 or 30 years doing nothing but studying our foreign policy, our history, the history of our relations with other countries, and they are experts in the same way that your artillery men, we'll say, or your submarine men are experts.

Now we have Congressmen and Senators. Take myself. I have to be elected by the people of Arkansas. All last fall I, like all my colleagues, spent the whole fall going about informing myself about the conditions in Arkansas and speaking to the people. I did not spend two hours from September until December studying our foreign policy. I was studying something very different. Now, we have a certain competence on all the problems of a domestic nature, through personal experience. Actually,

foreign policy is very much a side line with all Senators. When we get back here we begin to have hearings, and we have these reports which the Committee authorizes and which we have obtained from various reputable institutions in this country, the great universities and others. Then we use what common sense we have to try to apply that knowledge as against the policy which the State Department recommends.

This is the usual function. We hope to improve it and we approve it. That is the function as stated in our Constitution. The initiation of policy, the recognition of foreign countries, is an Executive function. Advice and consent is the phrase that I think sort of describes the function of the Congress and its committees.

Now, it is true that when we become very impatient, as I have become and many of us have, with the lack of direction from the State Department or the Executive, we try to furnish that initiative. To give you an illustration, just a year ago now, my Committee undertook a revision of the Foreign Aid Program. We called in experts from all or many of our best institutions, especially M.I.T. They happen to have a couple of men up there who have spent great time and effort on the development of policy in the field of foreign assistance. The Committee brought out a bill in which there were many features different from the Department's recommendations. To be specific, for example, we said that the foreign aid program, the assistance program, should be put on a long-term basis. We believe, and I still believe, that this business of treating it as an annual operation, where

you authorize for only one year and you appropriate for only one year a tremendous program of economic assistance, has within it inherently a serious defect that prevents good administration. In order to carry on this program we must approach it over a long period—five years, for example, and we should make plans for five years.

We brought this bill out. That was one of the principal things. There were other aspects in it. We recommended that in Latin America, for example, the military assistance in Latin American countries be restricted and reduced. That was different from what the Administration recommended. We recommended in connection with this long-term program that, instead of appropriations, which require an annual authorization and appropriation, we give the Executive the borrowing authority, that they be given authority to borrow up to a certain limit of $3 billion over a period of five years of the money for the financing of the development loan fund.

What happened in this case is, the Treasury became concerned about its inability to sell its bonds. It exercises influence with the White House, and it caused the White House to withdraw its support, or in effect to oppose, this bill of the Committee. The State Department in this case was in agreement with the Committee. We had consulted with the State Department, with many individuals—I, particularly, with the Under Secretary. The Secretary was away much of this period, as you recall, in Geneva and other places. The Under Secretary, Mr. Dillon, was very well informed about this and was in agreement. Here is an illustration of what happens

in an administration which is lacking in strong and determined leadership. So, what happened? It was defeated on the floor. Here is an example of the effort, the attempt, by the Legislature to exert leadership, and it failed.

Generally speaking, it will not succeed very well because of the nature of our system. This is only one recent example. Generally speaking, you don't have committees bringing out programs of that kind. As I said a moment ago, I think there is great misunderstanding about the nature of this complicated system of ours.

The Legislature plays a very important part, but it is not the initiating part, expecially in foreign relations. A man who spends his life in an agricultural state, such as I do, I think, can make recommendations about, we'll say, cotton that are probably as good, or better, generally speaking, and knows more about it than Mr. Benson does. He doesn't know anything about cotton. He comes from Utah and spent his life as an apostle of the Mormon Church. That's all very well. He is, I am sure, a fine man. But I don't think he knows anything about cotton.

You can go on down through the various aspects of our economy. I may also go further and say that most people apparently don't understand that the courts under our system are not supposed to legislate. They are supposed to apply the law as passed by the Congress and approved by the President. But our Supreme Court is not conscious of any such limitation. It seems to regard itself as the Legislature, just like the Congress. This

comes from this confusion over what our system is and the basic principles of our system.

QUESTION: Senator, you mentioned that the uncommitted countries of the world tend to watch what we do here, rather than what we say, or words to that effect. As you know, the preponderance of the uncommitted countries of the world are Afro-Asian. Would you comment, please, on what effect our actions might have on them concerning the squabble on the Hill at this time?

SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Well, I don't know whether they understand the squabble or not. I assume they don't. Very few Americans do. I expect they are greatly puzzled by it, although I think in the foreign field what the Executive says and does attracts much more attention. I don't know. It is very disturbing to me. I would think that they will be very puzzled and wonder whether or not these Americans know how to run their Government. I would say that to the extent they do notice it, it would be a very puzzling and disturbing element--disturbing to those who are disposed to be friendly. I am quite sure that the Communists take considerable pleasure in our discomforture. I don't think there is any doubt about that.

I might point out that from my point of view we are not the moving party in this matter. We are strictly fighting a defensive role. We didn't initiate this battle. My own belief is that this recurrent battle becomes very pronounced and becomes very lively only in the presidential election years. Last year there wasn't very much said about these so-called civil

rights. But, just before you get an election coming up, you find the representatives from the States of New York, Illinois, Michigan, and Pennsylvania becoming extremely interested in this type of legislation. Of course my own belief is, the primary motive in this is politics trying to conciliate certain groups of voters in these big metropolitan centers.

When it comes to the assessment of blame, if that is what you wonder, and maybe your question meant why do we, as Southerners, resist this, all I can say is that we believe it is unjustified and it is our duty to resist it. I don't know whether or not you can be persuaded of it. Certainly the Washington Post is not persuaded of it. We feel justified in objecting to this kind of invasion of the traditional rights and privileges of the people that we represent. I think we are justified in it.

I may say I do not think our press gives a fair picture of what is involved. This particular controversy, you would~~nt~~ believe, if you didn't study the debates and the bills themselves, is a controversy over the right to vote. I deny that that is the primary thing at all. In fact I think it is not involved. I think the right to vote on the part of the colored people, insofar as legislation can give it, is already in the law, in the existing legislation. Criminal penalties, as well as civil remedies, are already in the Federal laws as well as in the state laws, and are quite ample to guarantee the right to vote freely.

Now, as we all know, I do not assert that they are perfectly enforced. I do not believe that the Attorney General is using the power that he now

has to enforce the law. This is another reason why I think that it isn't really the welfare of the colored people that is involved. It's their votes they are after. The Attorney General is not bringing suits that he is authorized to bring under existing law. He has brought only two, I think, or four under the 1957 law. Two of them were sustained in the Supreme Court only a few days ago.

So there are ample laws. There are very severe penalties already in the law against anyone who interferes. But it is like saying the laws against murder are not adequate, because you continue to have many murders. Goodness knows, we are having more and more, here in Washington and in New York. That doesn't mean there are not any laws on it. You must recognize there is a limit to what a law can do. It does no good at all, once you have an adequate law on the board, to keep putting on more and more laws. The one we passed in 1957 gives the Attorney General the right to go in and sue in behalf of the people against whom there is alleged discrimination.

Now you say, "Well, what's the matter in certain areas in the South, or otherwise, that they resist these laws?" It may well be that there are people who are misguided and who are too provincial, or whatever way you like to describe it, and resist the law, just as there are many people who don't abide by any other criminal law, who violate the parking statutes, and so on, who murder people, who steal, and who do all these things. You

have some people who do. The remedy is not to pass continually more and more laws. The remedy is to enforce what is on the books now.

Let me give one other illustration. They are now proposing that we have a Federal Registrar system. That is part of this Dirksen proposal. We had after the Civil War in 1872 a Federal Registrar system which was put into effect. It proved to be the source of such corruption of the electorate that it was repealed. It had very much the same effect in the field of elections that the Prohibition Amendment and the Volstead Act had in the field of sobriety and morality. I mean it defeated its own purpose. I don't think any reasonable person now thinks that Prohibition was a success. That doesn't mean we are all for drunkenness and alcoholism. It merely means that that remedy is not relevant to the objective.

All we are asking in the case of registrars is, for goodness' sake, go back and look at the history book. Go back and see what happened when you had Federal registrars. It led to much greater corruption than we have now. It was in effect delegating to the registrars the control of elections. These fellows went around all over the country and bought and sold Congressional seats just like you buy cattle, because they could register anybody they liked and just bring them in a thousand and two thousand at a time and vote them. They had the whole authority. They had no local responsibility.

There is always some restraint. It is more or less according to the community, according to the level of education, and to the social consciousness

of the community, whether or not their Republic representatives do their job properly. There is that local restraint. A man who lives in his own community, makes his living there, and raises his family doesn't often engage in too much skullduggery, because he has to live with it. You bring in a registrar who lives in Alaska or in the State of Washington and send him down to do something in Georgia. He is going to be there only for that election. He can do everything he likes and then go back and leave his crimes in Georgia. That is what happened, as you will find if you bother to read the debates that took place at the time of the repeal of these Federal Registrar Acts. They were part of the reconstruction. You would say those people were misguided.

That is not the solution. Actually, I think the only solution there is to try to reach a better level of tolerance and racial relations is primarily one of education. You can't solve many of these problems by legislation. These people are misguided who think that for every evil that develops in a state all you have to do is pass a law. That's nonsense. For many of the evils that I cited, you can't even begin to pass laws. I mean, people who are vicious in their habits, who lie, cheat, and so on, many of them, there is nothing you can do about them. There is no cure, I suppose, except education.

So that what you have done, all you can do, and all the Legislature can do is to insure the freedom to vote. The truth of it is that in my home state, with which I am familiar, they do. I wrote to the Civil Rights

Commission in January, and I put this letter in the record, asking them to inform me if there had been any complaints from my State on interference of the right to vote, and we had none at all. There have been some from other States but there have been very few, relatively.

It is a question of enforcement, not one of the lack of law. Do you see any of this in the paper? Not at all. Actually, this bill overemphasizes the voting aspect. The real objective of the bill, aside from its political implications, is to force integration in the schools. That is the meat of it. It is disguised primarily in the so-called right-to-vote aspect of it.

This tells my view, and this is a point of view which your press, being as prejudiced as it is, refuses to even present. I mean, they don't say, "This is the position of the Senator from Arkansas," or of anybody else. They ignore what the position is. They suggest, "The ignorant Southerners don't want the poor Negro to vote. That all there is to it." In my view that is not so. It is a distortion of the actual fact.

MR. HILL: Thank you very much, on behalf of the Commandant and the faculty, and especially of the students, for your skill and ease in answering a very wide range of questions.