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TV News. Senator, you’ve been in Washington since January, 1974. How would you assess your first two and a half years on Capitol Hill? Is it really what you expected it to be?

Biden. I’ve been surprised by two things. First, before I came here, I assumed that the Senate would be more of an influence on what occurs in the nation than it in fact does. And secondly, I came here thinking I would have some influence on the Senate as a whole. I’ve been proven wrong on both counts. The Senate has exercised less of its responsibility on the body politic than I believe it should, although things have gotten somewhat better during the last eight months. And I’ve found that a freshman senator—if he’s done his homework—can have considerably more influence than I thought possible. I’ve been quite lucky in my committee assignments: the Foreign Relations Committee, the Budget Committee, and the Select Committee on Urban Affairs. So, in a jurisdictional sense, I’m dealing with those areas in which I believe I take both some interest in the policy that’s housing on one hand, fiscal and monetary responsibilities on the other, and foreign policy, which I see as my first love. I really thought that for the first term I would be expected to see and not heard, to be limited to get done, but that has not been the case.

TV News. You spoke of foreign policy as your “first love.” Do you feel about President Ford’s actions in that area? It has been said that foreign policy is not his strong suit.

Biden. President Ford has not taken any new initiatives in foreign policy; he’s conducting it in the same way the 50’s and 60’s—a basically a “cold war” philosophy, with a tinge of détente. In his “state of the world” message about seven months ago, he discussed every part of the world and there was no fundamental change of policy in any area. He spoke of all areas as having equal priority. He is still married to the concept that we can police the whole world, that we must stand up and be counted whenever there is any duplicity, in the international sense—is a threat.

There seems to be less emphasis on identifying a first love, and that is basically whatchdog mechanism that has guided foreign policy for so long. John Kennedy, a man I admired and respected, was right for the early 60’s, but his foreign policy would be wrong for 1975. Remove his inaugural address, “the world is not a Hobbesian world, to have a one-man show. Because I don’t believe in the 50’s and 60’s, then we were, we say, “What do people need to do to protect the American boys there?”

Biden. What I’m getting at is that, in this situation, we have very little choices the policy consideration I believe we should go through would be vitiated by the circumstances. When we are talking about commitment of American lives and money, we should be saying, “What is our self-interest here?” Not simply an altruistic reason we are here to “save” democracy, for instance. We should be asking, “How does it affect America and American lives?” There are at least three primary self-interest considerations: (1) self-interest in terms of physical security; (2) economic self-interest; (3) national self-interest. Physical security hasn’t been a big problem for a while, but economic security is an important issue. We are only having our markets cut off, creating an adverse impact on the domestic economy. When we shift to the dollar and the dollar Product, exports of $105 billion, then we are interlocked around the world, like it or not, and a loss of confidence would be the fact that we cannot renge on our commitment to Israel. The repercussions domestically would be tremendous if...
we allowed Israel and two million Jews to be pushed into the sea. The same holds true for western Europe—we have strong cultural, ethnic, and hereditary ties there ... even today, we still live there, to our whole inheritance of a jurisprudential system. We simply can't let it happen.

But the cold hard truth is that, if we leave, Japan would become very dangerous for South Korea. Now of course, So...
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Biden. Sure, I do. I'd like to make room.

Mommen. It has come from the course primarily, from people who were—for the most part—appointed during the 60's, at the height of the civil rights activist movements. And it has been a pattern that's now set. But if you think the people of Delaware are pretty sharp. Look at their voting record; they have given Nixon the majority ever, and at the same time elected Joe Biden. When Re-,
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I hope I'm not the black man, and I hope that’s why the people voted for me. I don’t want to be a national figure; to make me into a national figure—to make me into a political figure—would be a great effort. I’ve never done any work and got involved, but I steer clear of the social circuit. I prefer being home with my kids, that’s what I’m home with my constituents too.

TV News. The Biden “charisma”—It’s becoming weaker, nationally, even nationally. Can you see yourself as a presidential candidate at some point in the future? Is Delaware big enough to produce a national political figure?

Biden. That’s very flattering, though I think a lot of the attention I’ve gotten is simply because I’m so young. I have no desire to run for those offices, but I’d be a damn liar if I said that I wouldn’t be interested in five, ten, or twenty years if the opportunities were offered. I think it is totally unrealistic that it should be offered. If it were, well, anyone who runs for public office has a tendency to affect what happens, and there is no place you can have greater effect than as president. So, you’re being phony if you’re not interested in being president if you really want to change things. But I’m certainly not going to tell you I have the experience or background. I do want to become a national political figure in the sense that I can do things that can affect things in the U.S. Senate. If I return for a second term, I would not want to be “just another senator”—I would want to be a “power” in the U.S. Senate. Otherwise, why be here?

As for your second question, Delaware clearly could produce a presidential candidate. Look at where the candidates have come from recently—South Dakota, Maine, from extremely small populations. Under control by a million people. Because of electronic media, in particular, the place you come from is significant. In the past. And because of changes in party rules, “bosses” and “machines” have much less power than before; they don’t control as much of what happens. The net effect has been to dissipate the impact of major states, in terms of being a swing state. It’s very possible that Delaware could have a presidential candidate if there were a man or woman qualified to run and able to get that man or woman elected.

TRIBUTE TO LESTER JAYSON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Senators may be aware of the retirement this week of a distinguished servant of the public and the legislative branch of the Fed­eral Government. Mr. Jayson has resigned from his position as Director of the Congressional Research Service.

The past decade has been a period of extraordinary challenge for the Congress as it has sought to keep pace with the explosion of scientific and technological change, and with the tremendous growth of governmental responsibilities.

In order to meet such a challenge without the Congress must have the best possible information available—up-to-date and objectively presented. Our information and research needs are unique. They encompass virtually every known branch of human knowledge—our society, our world, our universe. They require that knowledge be sifted, assembled and presented in usable form, so that it can be brought to bear on specific legislative problems at the time that it is needed. They demand a special kind of expertise that is taught at no university—not only expertise in a specialized field of knowledge, but knowledge of the congressional legislative process and the special requirements of that process for information.

The Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress has been and is one of the important congressional groups helping us to meet this challenge. Its Director, S. Jayson has led the Congressional Research Service in doing an outstanding job of service to Congress, especially in the areas of utilizing modern information technology and providing expended assistance to committee staffs.

Lester Jayson’s administrative ability and distinguished leadership guided the development of the CRS into a modern research facility with more than 600 researchers, information specialists and support staff handling more than 200 congressional requests annually. His departure will be a great loss to CRS and to the Congress, which he has served so ably and with great distinction during a period of rapid change and growth.

A native of Long Island, Mr. Jayson graduated with special honors in history and government from Columbia University in the City of New York in 1936. He was awarded his LL.B. by Harvard University Law School in 1939. At Harvard, he was an associate of the Harvard Law Review and was appointed a Member of the Board of Student Advisors.

Upon his admission to the bar in New York State, Mr. Jayson practiced law in New York City, first with the firm of Oceans & Pepper, and then with Marshall, Bratler & Scigelson. In 1942 he was appointed Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, to handle civil trial and appellate cases for the U.S. Department of Justice in the Federal courts in New York City.

He moved to Washington, D.C. in 1959 and continued his service as a trial attorney in the Supreme Court section—later known as the appellate section—of the Department’s Civil Division. During his 18 years with the Department of Justice he briefed and argued cases in the various courts of appeals and in the U.S. Supreme Court. Early in 1967 he was appointed as assistant director of the Research Division in the Civil Division and later that same year he was appointed to Chief. The torts section is responsible for the de-