

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 2

JANUARY 30, 1968, TO FEBRUARY 7, 1968

(PAGES 1343 TO 2602)

article written by Mr. Reston printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FLIES THAT CAPTURED THE
FLYPAPER

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—“Attack and counterattack widened across South Vietnam today,” The Associated Press reported. “Large sections of Saigon and Hué lay in smoldering ruins, and columns of smoke rose as South Vietnamese divebombers, U.S. helicopter gunships, artillery and tanks blasted away at Communist troops in scattered sections.”

This in a teeming city of three million people. “Tens of thousands of terrified civilians streamed from shacks and huts in Saigon with what meager belongings they could carry. Already nearly 200,000 refugees are reported, 58,000 in Saigon and its suburbs, and the total is expected to double or triple when all reports are in...”

THE DILEMMA

Here is the dilemma of our military strategy of victory. How do we win by military force without destroying what we are trying to save? The battle is so fierce and the situation so solemn that the impulse to rally round is very strong, but the mind boggles at the paradox of tearing apart what we have undertaken to defend.

This, of course, has been the moral and strategic problem from the beginning: How to save South Vietnam without wrecking it. The Vietcong have made clear from the start that they would risk anything, destroy anything, and kill anybody, even if they inherited nothing but the wreckage. But what of us?

THE BITTER PROPAGANDA

It is not our country. Somewhere there must be a line beyond which the killing and suffering, not only on our side but on the side of the Vietnamese, overreach any attainable end, but there is still no evidence here that the Johnson Administration sees the futile brutality of these recent days in this light.

In the bitter propaganda of the war, the official line here is that everything happens for the best. The communiqués sound more and more like a TV singing commercial: “We’re winning, we’re winning,” they cry, just like the Sunoco Sunny Dollars jingle.

Death has now become the official measure of our success. General Westmoreland sends a message of congratulations to his troops. They have killed more of the enemy in the last week, he says (21,330), than the United States has lost in the entire war (18,000). He warns of a “second wave” of enemy attacks on the cities, but our victory “may measurably shorten the war.” The White House press secretary balks at drawing the same conclusion on his own. His name is Christian.

It would be reassuring to feel at this solemn moment that all this human carnage is really bringing us to an end worthy of the means employed, or even that we are getting an honest official appraisal of our predicament, but this city is seething with doubt and even the Administration itself is wracked by suppressed dissent.

Is the President worried about how his State of the Union message will be received? His staff obliges by organizing official cheer leaders in the House of Representatives. Is he concerned about the reaction to recent events in Vietnam and Korea? Secretaries Rusk and McNamara go on “Meet the Press” to calm things down, but not before the Administration approves of the questioners.

Is the President apprehensive about the coming battle at Khesanh? Never mind, he has requested and received a written assurance from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the Marines and the Army will

hold. “I don’t want any damned Diablenphus,” he says.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION

War is a corrupting business—always has been—and this one is no exception. But it is important to decontaminate the propaganda. No doubt the allied victories are true. No doubt the enemy casualties are very heavy. No doubt the civilian casualties are alarmingly high, though they are not mentioned. But the destruction goes on. We are the flies that captured the fypaper. We are stuck with our concept of a military victory, and the main question goes unanswered: What is the end that justifies this slaughter? How will we save Vietnam if we destroy it in the battle?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL
RIGHTS

AMENDMENT NO. 524

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, yesterday Senator BROOKE and I offered, with several cosponsors, amendment No. 524, the Fair Housing Act of 1968. That amendment is identical to S. 1358, with one exception. Since there appears to be some possible misunderstanding of the meaning and scope of that one exception, I would like to make clear what is intended and what the language says. I refer to this exception as the so-called Mrs. Murphy provision, section 4(f) of the amendment, and perhaps that designation may be misleading in view of the circumstances surrounding this provision in the House of Representatives in 1966.

Let me say at the outset that amendment No. 524 does not, nor is it intended to exempt from coverage the sale or rental of single-family dwellings. It is intended to and does exempt the rental or leasing of a portion of a single-family dwelling, which means in practical terms the letting of a room or rooms in a person’s home. The amendment cannot be construed to exempt all sales or rentals of single-family homes.

It does two things, and two things only:

First. With respect to single-family dwellings, owner occupied, it exempts the rental or lease of a room or rooms within that dwelling.

Second. With respect to two-, three-, or four-family dwellings, where the owner occupies one of the units or quarters, it exempts the sale, rental, or lease of the other units.

This amendment does not permit realtors, real estate agents, or brokers to discriminate on behalf of owner-occupants falling under this exception.

The sole intent of this section is to exempt those who, by the direct personal nature of their activities, have a close personal relationship with their tenants.

I want it clearly understood as well

that I do not agree with the need for granting this exemption. But many people both in the Congress and outside the Congress, argue very strongly for this sort of exemption. Some argue on the merits and most, I would say, argue on the basis of a belief that it is politically necessary. Where the loss in coverage represents a very small fraction of the total housing supply—now and in the future—then I think we can give one slice of the loaf in order to save the remainder of the loaf.

Once again, section 4(f) of this amendment does not exempt the sale or rental of an entire single-family dwelling, whether by the owner or an agent. It does exempt the rental or lease of a room or rooms within a single-family dwelling.

With reference to the number of houses and dwellings involved and intended to be exempted under the terms of section 4(f) of the pending amendment. It was estimated in 1966 that this language would exclude some 1,520,000 two-family units and 509,000 three- and four-family units, or a total of about 2,029,000 units out of an estimated 60 million total housing supply. That estimate was made in 1966. It has not been updated. However, our best information is that the percentage of total housing falling within this category would remain at the same percentage, or an estimated 3 percent.

Mr. President, I know of no other conceivable construction that could be made of section 4(f) as it appears in the pending amendment.

I have made my statement at this time to clarify any doubt as to the intention of the sponsors.

THE SPRING CAMPAIGN OF MARTIN
LUTHER KING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention to the lead editorial in today’s Washington Post. The editorial is entitled “The Spring Campaign.”

I read certain excerpts therefrom:

The tactics of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King’s spring campaign against the Government are under discussion here this week and the ideas being considered pose many problems—for Dr. King, for his followers, for other Americans who sympathize with his goals, and for the officials who must handle the Government’s response. The basic plan to “escalate nonviolence to the level of civil disobedience” is a dangerous one if for no other reason than that the line between civil disobedience and violent disobedience, while quite precise, is easy to cross over.

* * * * *

The real purpose of the campaign may well be to re-establish Dr. King as the major spokesman for discontented Negroes.

* * * * *

But if that is to come about, the campaign must have a constructive goal in sight. A campaign aimed solely at what even Dr. King’s aides regard as nigh impossible—the passage immediately of some yet unarticulated legislation by Congress—is more likely to conclude with a whimper than with a success.

The tactics being discussed are disruptive and unappealing. The idea of “a thousand persons in need of health and medical care sitting in around Bethesda Naval Hospital so that nobody could get in or out” until the