

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 3

FEBRUARY 8, 1968, TO FEBRUARY 22, 1968

(PAGES 2603 TO 3952)

once the junta no longer had to deal with the King and the moderate groups who wanted a rapid transition to a constitutional democracy.

A constitution is being prepared, but it is not expected to contain anything that would seriously hamper the exercise of power by the Government. There are signs that the junta is working to mobilize popular support as a first step toward holding elections that it can be certain of winning.

But its decision on elections—whether to hold them in the next year or so, as some officials are hinting, or to defer them for several years, as most observers expect it to do—is expected to be subordinated to the junta's determination to stay in power at all costs.

A second change has been in the junta's relations with the outside world. Although it has not turned neutralist, as some observers believe it will eventually, it has begun to play effectively on Western fears of such a shift.

As the weeks passed after the King's flight, and the Western countries continued to suspend their relations in the hope of getting him back, the junta let it be known that if recognition did not come soon, Premier Papadopoulos would be forced to make a statement reappraising Greece's foreign policy.

#### RELATIONS RESUMED

The rumored direction of this shift was toward France rather than the Soviet Union, but it was enough to convince Washington and London to resume normal relations. Western policy-makers, citing the case of President Nasser, contended that continued pressure on Greece would simply drive her in the wrong direction.

Two events this week demonstrated the new American attitude. Today Premier Papadopoulos, Deputy Premier Stylianos Patakos and Coordination Minister Nicholas Makarezos, along with several other leading members of the junta, spent the day aboard the United States carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt cruising in the Aegean Sea. They were the guests of the United States Ambassador Phillips Talbot, at lunch aboard the ship, and the atmosphere was one of cordiality.

Two days ago Ambassador Talbot gave a less elaborate reception aboard the carrier, which is paying a courtesy visit to Athens. The guests then were several powerful, though less prominent, members of the junta.

A third striking change has been in the public position of Mr. Papadopoulos. Until the King's attempted counter-coup, everyone associated with the junta had insisted that its members were equals.

"Can you separate a drop of water?" Mr. Patakos once demanded of a reporter who asked him if some were more equal than others. It is now apparent that Mr. Papadopoulos is no longer being pictured as first among equals but simply as first.

The change was dramatized at a recent ceremony at the University of Athens. Always before, at public occasions, the triumvirate of officers at the head of the junta had made their entry together.

This time, Mr. Patakos and Mr. Makarezos entered the hall first, without causing too much stir. There was a pause, a rush of photographers, and then, to a rhythmic chant of "Papadopoulos!" the Premier came in.

But even though Mr. Papadopoulos continues to be the strongest figure in Greece and has undoubtedly strengthened his position since December, it is believed that important decisions are still reached only after discussion and agreement among the 30-odd officers of the Revolutionary Council.

The fact that the junta has vacillated in many policy decisions indicates that Mr. Papadopoulos cannot, or will not, impose his views against heavy opposition. Nor is he believed to have the power to purge other

members of the junta who may disagree with him.

For four days in January, for example, a dispute over Mr. Papadopoulos's efforts to get other junta members holding Government posts to resign from the army rocked the council. While tanks maneuvered on the outskirts of Athens and newspapers received contradictory orders two and three times a night to print or not print photographs of Mr. Papadopoulos and his rivals, the argument continued.

It still is not clear whether all the officers have, in fact, complied.

#### A WORDY SPEAKER

In the light of all this, there is some question whether the public build-up of Mr. Papadopoulos represents his climb to supremacy or whether it is a junta decision that a leadership image is necessary if a firm popular following is to develop.

It is not certain that Mr. Papadopoulos, who all but winces when he meets an applauding crowd, will be able to fill the role of popular leader. His speeches are considered wordy, diffuse and full of obscure 19th-century turns of phrase not quite correctly rendered. He notably fails to stir audiences.

"He has always been a schemer and maneuverer," one Western military expert said recently. "In the army he was never really popular. He had a small group of devoted associates, men who now figure in the junta, and with these he was able to manage and trick larger and more important figures, often without their realizing it."

As for the junta's policies, the trend, despite many hesitations, appears to be away from an early emphasis on anti-Communism to a stress on the denunciation of corruption in the Greek ruling classes and upper bourgeoisie.

#### THE DOMINANT TONE

"We are no longer afraid of the Communists," Col. Ioannis Ladas said recently. The de facto head of the Ministry of Public Order and the security police, and one of the most powerful men in the junta, Colonel Ladas was talking to a journalist whom he had just released after having held him for 19 days without charges. It was not the Communists but the "corrupt national ruling classes we are fighting now," he said.

It is becoming clear that the dominant tone of the junta is not that of a right-wing officers' clique seeking to support the privileged as some thought in its early days. It is that of a deprived lower middle class whose instinctive anti-Communism is accompanied by a far more profound resentment of the rich.

Colonel Ladas's discussions with former political prisoners have not shown the inhibitions that make the junta's public speeches seem wordy and obscure. In a conversation with a jalled political leader, Colonel Ladas, recently gave voice to the radical undercurrent in the junta's thinking.

"Do not be deceived," he told him. "You think Papadopoulos represents the lower classes in the army. Why, he is one of the elite. His father was a schoolteacher, after all. When I was a child I hardly had shoes, and there were times my breath stank with hunger. Do not think we are going to let the rich people keep their yachts."

This kind of sentiment is only part of the key to what may be expected of the junta. It must be contrasted, as must all of its more radical expressions, with the far more cautious character of its actions to date.

#### PROTEST MAY MODIFY REFORM

Of the popular measures it has taken—payment of pensions to farmers, dowries to working girls, limiting of worker discharges—none is particularly extreme. It has passed some harsh regulations about tax collection,

but a wave of protest may well modify them. It has consistently proclaimed its determination to encourage and protect private enterprise, although some of its adherents want to break up the big banking establishments.

Its talk of pruning the bureaucracy is still little more than that, and one official estimated that in some departments as much as 80 per cent of the staff was excess.

It is only the junta's power that is growing steadily. The uses to which it will be put remain obscure, and if there is any principal conclusion among observers, it is that those who hold power are still timid about using it and uncertain what they want to do with it.

"If there is one factor that will bring down this Government," a diplomat observed recently, "it is not foreign hostility or internal opposition. It is its own inability to know its objectives or how much it wants to pay for them."

His point was that the conflict between the radical instincts and conservative ideology of the junta is apt, in time, to lead to disruptive internal conflict.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article points out a striking similarity between former colonel, now mister, Papadopoulos, the Premier of Greece, and Mr. Nasser, the dictator of Egypt. I think the similarity is very strong indeed.

I would like to note that the so-called constitution for Greece drawn by a number of eminent Greek jurists and lawyers has been rejected by the Greek junta which intends to form a constitution of its own, no doubt of a totalitarian nature.

Mr. President, I urge our Government not to give the Greek Government the benefit of our assistance. We have recognized them. Perhaps we had to as a matter of diplomacy, but I urge that the American people stand firm against this totalitarian junta which is destroying democracy in its land of birth.

#### INTERFERENCES WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will vote to sustain the majority leader on his motion to lay on the table the pending amendment on open housing.

I am a little bit impressed this morning with the evangelical spirit that seems to dominate the efforts of those who are trying to push that kind of amendment down the throats of millions of American people who do not want such an amendment.

I heard my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, a few minutes ago ask to have placed in the Record a news article to the effect that the citizens of Flint, Mich., in a referendum held yesterday had approved an open housing provision by a vote of 21,000 and something to a vote of 21,000 and something. I think there was a difference of some 27 votes between the majority, which favored open housing, and the minority, which did not.

There could not be a clearer showing on the floor that there is a great difference of opinion on the subject even in that community. I suspect that there is a great showing that the majority of the non-Negro people do not want open housing in Flint and that the time has come when the non-Negro population of

this Nation cannot be heard and is not entitled to have its strong feelings felt.

I recall that in similar referenda held in Seattle, Tacoma, and in the State of California—now our greatest State in population—the people by sizable majorities went on record as being against open housing.

I remember that only recently in several suburbs of the great city of Chicago it was shown very clearly that the great majority of the white people there do not want open housing.

I recall that in the city of Milwaukee the same situation has been rather clearly shown through the news articles in recent months.

Mr. President, I strongly believe that it is not the proper function of Congress to ram down the throats of the majority of our people in many of our communities legislation in the social field which they do not believe in and do not support.

Mr. President, believing that, I shall, of course, vote for the motion to lay on the table the pending open-housing amendment, and I hope that it will be eliminated from the bill.

When the time comes that the elected representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives of the people of this Nation are not willing to use persuasion and the development of common-sense in affairs of this kind or advise them as to what their votes will be, it will be a sorry day in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Throughout the history of this Nation, it has always been one of our cardinal principles that persuasion rather than compulsion is the sound method to follow in legislation of this kind.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be laid on the table, and I do hope that my friends—and I see on his feet my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan—realize that such a vote as the Senator from Minnesota has had placed in the RECORD—supporting, he said, the feeling that there was a great wave of support for the adoption of open housing in this country—is based on a thin, attenuated margin of some 27 votes in a vote of over 42,000, which does not present to us a wise course to adopt and follow in this matter.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think we could argue for some months on the question of where the citizens of this country stand. The vote we have been discussing which occurred yesterday in Flint, Mich., followed several months of bitter and searching debate. The vote represents a decision on a matter involving strong feelings of the citizens in that community. However, the fact is that that is not the only evidence we have.

Nearly 20 States now have adopted strong fair-housing laws. My own State is one. These have been adopted after searching debate. They were adopted by the elected representatives.

Over 80 communities have such ordinances, and more and more communities every day are adopting fair-housing ordinances.

In relation to this issue, perhaps the most significant fact with relation to the support for fair housing is that even with the strongest fair housing proposal that has ever been presented in the U.S. Senate, 55 Senators, representing their States, voted to invoke cloture. There were 18 more Senators who voted aye than no. It was a clear and overwhelming majority. In addition, there were five other Senators who had announced pro fair-housing support who, because of absence or pairs, did not have the opportunity to vote. Thus, we have an expression of overwhelming support across this Nation for the principle of fair housing represented yesterday in the vote on the cloture motion.

If we are going to talk about what people want, as expressed through their elected representatives, in order to determine where people stand on the issue of fair housing, it is very clear that the majority favor fair housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Minnesota, if I correctly quoted the article from which he read. I understood the Senator to say that 21,000-odd people had voted in favor of the proposal and that 21,000-odd people had voted against the proposal and that there was a difference between the majority and minority of less than 100 votes. I think the difference was 27 votes. Am I correct or incorrect?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. As I said, this followed on the heels of months of bitter debate. I think one should be surprised in such a poisoned environment to have such a referendum, filed in the way in which it was.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not think the city of Flint, Mich., is a poisoned environment. I think it consists of a very fine group of citizens, and I think that the quoted figures show very clearly that the great majority of non-Negro population of Flint, Mich., do not favor open housing.

I do not see how we could come to any other conclusion.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think more of the citizens of Flint today than I did yesterday, because they did, in fact, vote by a majority vote, however close, in favor of the fair housing principle.

I merely saw the Associated Press story. I could not tell how many Negroes voted one way or the other or how many white people voted one way or the other.

I do not believe such information is available to any of us. But I presented this as further evidence that there is

growing support in this Nation for the principle of fair housing.

When you have nearly 20 States which, after long debate and discussion, have adopted fair-housing laws, when in each successive legislative session throughout the country more States adopt fair-housing laws—and they have improved upon the laws they did have—and when we saw yesterday a substantial and remarkable improvement in support of fair housing and an overwhelming vote in support of fair housing, I do not know how anyone can argue that the trend is not decidedly in favor of fair housing, and the forces in support of it are growing stronger as the facts are becoming known.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I say that 30 States of the 50 have not voted for open housing. I believe every one of them has had the opportunity to vote to do so in its legislature. My State has had the opportunity to do so, and has declined to do so. Many other States have had the opportunity and have declined to do so.

The fact is that where we have had referendums, the rule has been the other way—people have voted against open housing.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he will not debate the matter further. He feels that any effort that strives to push down people's throats a social measure of this nature, which is opposed by large groups of people and majorities in many States, is wrong and is not in accord with sound American principles.

#### PROPOSED TAX ON TRAVEL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on September 25, 1967, the International Union of Travel Organizations met in Tokyo, Japan. My attention has been called to a most interesting message which was sent to this organization by President Johnson wherein at that time he urged an expansion of world travel in order to promote international good will.

Three months later, on January 1, President Johnson had completely reversed this position and was asking the American people to stop international travel on the basis that it was resulting in a drain on our gold.

I read the President's message of September 25, 1967:

As International Tourist year draws to a close it is fitting that we rededicate ourselves to the important task of promoting international goodwill through travel.

This is no small undertaking. And it is worthy of our highest efforts and the unqualified cooperation of all nations. International travel helps satisfy a basic urge in man to learn more about his neighbor in a world which the jet age is making increasingly smaller.

For the first time in history, millions of people have the opportunity to visit distant lands and examine other societies and cultures. World travel lights the way to world understanding. As we advance toward a new decade in which once-distant travel becomes commonplace, let us always hope that our journeys to faraway lands are journeys to a more peaceful, friendly world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 25, 1967.