

Kean University

Kean Digital Learning Commons

Florence Dwyer Report to the People Newsletter 1957 Florence Dwyer Report to the People Newsletter 1957

5-9-1957

Report to the People Vol.1 No. 13

Florence P. Dwyer

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.kean.edu/cp_dwyer_newsletters_1957

In the Battle of the Budget that currently is raging in the halls of Congress, foreign aid appropriations promise to be one of the major targets for long and stormy controversy.

With this battle shaping up, I have been giving considerable study to foreign aid, and discussing various phases of the problem with State Department officials. As a special project, I undertook an analysis several weeks ago to determine the cost of foreign aid, through the years, to the individual taxpayer in Union County. These are my findings:

From 1940 to 1957, Union County's share of the nation's total foreign aid expenditures was \$344,381,407 - or \$864.98 per person in the county.

For the 1956-57 fiscal year alone, Union County's share of total foreign aid expenditures was \$13,831,314 - or \$34.74 per person.

A breakdown of foreign aid costs to various communities in the county shows:

CITIES	POPULATION 1950	AID SHARE 1956	AID SHARE 1940-1957
Union County	398,138	\$13,831,314	\$344,381,407
Elizabeth	112,817	3,919,263	97,584,449
Plainfield	42,366	1,471,795	36,645,743
Union	38,004	1,309,259	33,472,700
Linden	30,644	1,064,573	26,506,447
Rahway	21,290	739,615	18,415,424
Westfield	21,243	737,982	18,374,770
Cranford	18,602	646,233	16,090,358
Summit	17,929	622,853	15,508,226
Roselle	17,681	614,237	15,293,711
Scotch Plains-			
Fanwood	12,297	427,197	10,636,659
Roselle Park	11,537	400,795	9,979,274
Springfield	7,214	250,614	6,239,965
New Providence-			
Berkeley Heights	6,846	237,830	5,921,652

Such statistics, I believe, dramatically show the sizable tax dollar investment each of our County's citizens has in foreign aid. They also are eloquent testimony to the need for making certain our foreign aid dollars are invested wisely and administered properly.

AID WEAKNESSES SPOTLIGHTED

In recent months, more and more letters concerning foreign aid expenditures have been coming across my desk. The writers of these letters, for the most part, express the realization that the United States cannot stand alone in this troubled world; that, in this perilous time of hydrogen bombs and diminishing horizons, no nation can afford to remain a self-sufficient island. But, at the same time, they ask for a sensible, more businesslike approach to the foreign aid problem.

I appreciate the concern of the people over our foreign aid program. Such questioning - not of the purpose of such a program, but of how the money is being spent - certainly has been justified by the findings of various studies of foreign aid during the last few years.

These studies - several authorized by Congress, including a re-examination of aid spending in Iran by the Government Operations Committee, on which I serve; and two comprehensive surveys by the Administration - all have spotlighted certain weaknesses in our foreign aid program.

The findings of these study committees cannot be ignored. In addition to the Government Operations Committee, these studies were made by such outstanding bodies as a special committee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the President's Advisory Committee on the Mutual Security Program headed by Benjamin Fairless, former head of U.S. Steel; and the International Development Advisory Board.

LOAN PROGRAM FAVORED

In general, all of these studies recommended a policy stressing foreign aid loans, rather than outright grants of financial, technical and economic assistance.

In the past, the bulk of foreign aid expenditures have been in the form of so-called handouts, or grants of aid. In Union County, for example, since 1940 only \$45,061,259 of our \$344,381,407 share of foreign aid contributions has been in the form of loans, on which the United States can eventually expect repayment.

The studies also favored wider encouragement of private investment as a means of economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped countries. Under such a program, it is proposed that the government establish guarantees to stimulate and insure private investment in foreign fields.

Beyond the question of implementing such new policies in our foreign aid program, however, there is an unquestioned need for an elimination of waste in the spending of our tax dollars overseas.

The Government Operations Committee study in Iran showed a shocking lack of businesslike practices in the administration of the foreign aid program. Vast sums of money were not accounted for; financial records were incomplete; areas of administrative responsibility were not clearly defined. Similar shortcomings have been noted in the other studies. Certainly, in view of the great investments we are making in foreign aid, it is imperative that more businesslike methods in the handling of these funds be instituted.

ACCURATE APPRAISAL DIFFICULT

I do believe, however, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to sum up in concrete terms just what our foreign aid investments are accomplishing. Many of the results cannot be publicized for security reasons; many are of a long-range nature; and good will and friendship between nations cannot be measured.

I believe, personally, that the best gauge for measuring the results of our foreign aid program is the fact that American men no longer are dying on foreign battlefields; that explosive tensions have been eased without resorting to armed intervention.

But, even with such evident results, our foreign aid program is facing increasing opposition. I believe we must inject into this program new and vigorous policies, and establish adequate safeguards for our tax dollar investments, if we are to restore what appears to be a wavering public confidence. For, unless strong public support is forthcoming, it now appears that our foreign aid program will face drastic cuts in the Battle of the Budget.