

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 16

AUGUST 1, 1967, TO AUGUST 9, 1967

(PAGES 20751 TO 22132)

important tasks that he performed on behalf of his country. I can only say, therefore, that he was one of the really fine public servants and that for his services to our country we should all be truly grateful.

His grieving family, his wife and children, can take consolation in the fact that no man served his country in a time of great peril and danger with more strength and dedication than he.

CIVIL DISORDERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the past few weeks the Nation has been shaken by the civil disorder which erupted in some of our major cities and in various smaller cities.

Each of us, I am sure, has many unanswered questions as to the causes of such outbreaks. Have we failed to provide sufficient programs or sufficient funds to alleviate the devastating effects of slum living conditions? Or, have the programs which we created proven beneficial to the slum residents they proposed to help? Where do we go next?

Frankly, these questions remain unanswered. But we do know two things: The answer is not retribution; nor is the answer a "reward for the rioters."

I do not presume to have instant answers nor solutions. However, I believe noteworthy an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of July 31, which warned of the public's antipathy toward "legislators who lead Negroes on with airy promises of instant progress and then come up with hasty, ill-conceived programs that can produce little but increased frustration."

This warning was sounded most recently in Senate hearings by Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, who cautioned us on a hasty adoption of a homeownership plan for the poor. As the Journal editorial noted, Dr. Weaver said:

Pride in home ownership can quickly turn into fresh bitterness and disillusionment.

He continued to say:

We've got to be honest with the people out there.

I would recommend that my colleagues read this excellent editorial and I request permission to insert this editorial from the Wall Street Journal, July 31, at this point in the RECORD.

In addition, Mr. President, there appeared in the Evening Star on the same date an article by Mr. Eliot Janeway, entitled "Vietnam War Gulps Domestic Funds." This article puts in some perspective the relationship between the war in Vietnam and our unsolved urban problems. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Janeway's article also be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 31, 1967]

PLAYING POLITICS WITH RIOTS

Though some people deplore the idea, this summer's riots are a legitimate political issue. If the issue is thoroughly aired, it's even possible that constructive measures will result.

In the political battling up to now, of

course, certain of the contestants have scarcely distinguished themselves. President Johnson scored no points by delaying dispatch of Federal troops to Detroit while he made it clear that the order was inspired by Michigan's Governor Romney, who may oppose him for the Presidency in 1968.

Congressional Republicans, moreover, were at best superficial in their effort to sum up the current situation. While it's hardly unusual for the party out of power to blame almost everything on the existing Administration, vague charges do little to solve the nation's problems.

With enough debate in this area, however, the public's views may become clearer to their elected leaders. At any rate, that should be the result of the workings of politics in a democracy.

First and foremost, it should be evident that the overwhelming majority of the public, white and Negro, wants and expects preservation of law and order. If further evidence of near-unanimity were needed, it was provided by last week's statement from Roy Wilkins and other Negro leaders; they said nothing could justify "the present destruction" and also urged criminal prosecution of those who help incite violence.

Politicians who sound out their constituencies with any care aren't likely to find that the general desire for repression of riots has yet become a push for new repression of Negroes. But they probably will find a growing public antipathy toward legislators who lead Negroes on with airy promises of instant progress and then come up with hasty, ill-conceived programs that can produce little but increased frustration.

Some lawmakers, for instance, seem to think the prime need is a massive new effort to turn all, or nearly all, of the poor into homeowners. Yet Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, quite correctly cautions that some families are simply incapable of carrying the financial burden, even when aided by liberal Federal subsidies. In such cases, he told a Congressional committee recently, pride in home ownership can quickly turn into fresh bitterness and disillusionment.

The Secretary also stressed that even the most gigantic Federal subsidies cannot possibly produce immediate solutions to problems that have been building up for a century and more. "We've got to be honest with the people out there, he warned.

That does not mean that "the people out there should be told that their lot is hopeless. There is room, though, for a little more mention of the indispensability of self-help and a little less effort to tout the Federal Government as a power that either can or should do everything for everybody.

It is in assessing the role of Government, what it is or ought to be, that there is wide room for political debate. If a particular phase of the antipoverty program is floundering badly, and some of them certainly are, criticism plainly can be constructive. Perhaps the program can be made to work better or maybe resources that would otherwise be merely wasted can be diverted into more useful channels.

In the process tempers will be frayed and the politics won't always be high-minded. Thinking and rethinking the problems will consume a lot of time and, now and then, will continue to lead to solutions that actually aren't solutions at all.

The workings of a democracy, after all, are seldom neat and orderly. When they're given a chance, however, they can sometimes produce astonishing results.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 31, 1967]

VIETNAM WAR GULPS DOMESTIC FUNDS

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—Since 1965, the Johnson administration has been bogged down in the

jungle. But it is beginning to look like it is the wrong jungle. The explosions in our cities have caught the federal government over-committed in Vietnam and undermobilized to root out the source of the cancer at home.

Money cannot win wars but lack of money can lose them. If money could buy victory, Vietnam would long since have been won. It has set a new record for dollars spent and goals unrealized.

LOCAL MONEY NEEDED

Worse yet, we are far from the end or even the beginning of the end. Expensive though the war has already become, our commitments of money are necessarily escalating along with our commitments of military manpower and equipment. The cost of the war is admittedly running substantially ahead of the budgetary provision for it.

A year ago, when war costs were already running at the rate of \$2 billion a month, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was admitting to only \$1 billion a month. If McNamara's arithmetic proves as wrong this year as it did last, the country will wake up to discover it has a \$4-billion-a-month war on its hands. A realistic estimate of the present drain is \$3 billion a month, or at an annual rate of \$36 billion.

The \$36 billion will not buy a year's peace in our riot-torn cities. But it would begin to put together the makings of a pretty impressive shopping list of everything that's needed—all the way from nursing homes for the old people to nursery schools for the young, with schools, hospitals, and housing.

Of course, the money that's needed to meet the challenge of the second front—in the jungle war in our cities—could not and would not come from the federal government, even if Vietnam were over and done with. This is the kind of money the cities and states are obliged to raise by their own borrowings, backed by their own use of the taxing power. It is the kind of money need that is best identified and met close to home.

The trouble is that the federal government needs to scoop so much money out of the stream to pay for the running cost of the war that it has crowded state and local governments away. Even before the disaster in Detroit forced the country to recognize that it is involved in not one jungle war but two, and while Vietnam was still costing very much less than it is now, states and cities were withdrawing bond issues and making do without new money for old projects.

LITTLE LEFT FOR CITIES

The underfinanced condition of the federal treasury is the main reason why the present inflation is making cash worth more, not less, and why it is going to be worth still more. The banking firm of Salomon Brothers & Hutzler, in its authoritative weekly commentary on money conditions, calculates that the Treasury supplied \$12 billion of lendable cash to the money market during the first half of 1967, but will borrow more than \$16 billion back during the second half—a greater than seasonal shift. The latest Treasury borrowing announcement suggests that this may be a low guesstimate.

This net change in the federal government's money-using operations will preempt \$28 billion of market availability from less powerful borrowers within half a year. This is the scale on which the cities and the states behind them are on notice to find the money to get ahead of their blight and to defuse the time bombs ticking in their ghettos.

Lyndon Johnson is on notice to make room in our congested money market for our war-torn cities and their tax-burdened citizens.

FOUR PROMINENT NEGRO LEADERS SUPPORT PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CALL FOR LAW AND ORDER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on July 26, four of the most distinguished

Negro leaders in the United States issued a joint statement strongly and unequivocally condemning riots and civil disruptions as methods for resolving urgent national problems. Dr. Martin Luther King, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, and A. Philip Randolph added their respected voices to that of the President and many Members of the Congress in urging an immediate return to reason while condemning rioting which, in the words of the statement, is destructive of the Negro community itself.

On July 27 at a Government Research Subcommittee hearing on S. 843, the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act introduced by myself and 10 other Senators, I commended Whitney Young for his role and that of his associates in the development of this constructive and sagacious statement. I asked that the statement be inserted in the hearing record at that time because of its excellence and I will ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today for the same reason.

Mr. President, this statement by four prominent Negro Americans rightfully reminds both the Negro and white communities that just as no injustice justifies violence, no injustice can be forgotten once the violence subsides. The underlying causes for violent civil disorders do not vanish with the coming of dawn as do the snipers and looters. Those deeply rooted, pernicious problems of human injustice, deprivation and despair remain for reasonable men to deal with. Mr. Young made an eloquent plea for the tools needed to combat and eradicate the causes of such disorders at the hearing on S. 843. President Johnson's recent address to the Nation mirrored that plea.

Mr. President, it is imperative in the difficult days ahead that we unite behind the leadership of the President in condemning violent disorders, in determining as best we can their true causes, and in acting with dispatch and determination to eradicate the social illness of which riots are symptomatic. I was delighted with the President's decision to establish a blue-ribbon Commission to determine the true source of riots in our cities. I was particularly pleased with the President's selection of Senator HARRIS as a member of the Commission, for Senator HARRIS and I had previously co-sponsored Senate Joint Resolution 97 which specifically endorsed the urgent need for such an advisory panel.

Mr. President, I believe we already know in a fragmentary way the roots of rebellion, looting, pillaging, and murder in our great cities. However, the President's Commission will lend authoritativeness to those intuitive beliefs and will point up the imperative need for quick action by the Congress and the public to eliminate the seeds of destruction too long cultivated in our cities. The Commission's work will also demonstrate, I think, the great need which exists for an ongoing systematic appraisal of our progress in providing full social opportunity for all our citizens. The Council of Social Advisers proposed by S. 843 could provide that essential appraisal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement by

Messrs. King, Randolph, Young, and Wilkins be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
July 26, 1967]

A PLEA TO NEGROES

(Text of a statement made by four top Negro leaders today appealing for an end of rioting)

Developments in Newark, Detroit and other strife-torn cities make it crystal clear that the primary victims of the riots are the Negro citizens. That they have grave grievances of long standing cannot be denied or minimized. That the riots have not contributed in any substantial measure to the eradication of these just complaints is by now obvious to all.

We are confident that the overwhelming majority of the Negro community joins us in opposition to violence in the streets. Who is without the necessities of life when the neighborhood stores are destroyed and looted? Whose children are without milk because deliveries cannot be made?

Who loses wages because of a breakdown in transportation or destruction of the place of employment? Who are the dead, the injured and the imprisoned? It is the Negroes who pay and pay and pay, whether or not they are individually involved in the rioting. And for what?

Killing, arson, looting are criminal acts and should be dealt with as such. Equally guilty are those who incite, provoke and call specifically for such action. There is no injustice which justifies the present destruction of the Negro community and its people.

We who have fought so long and so hard to achieve justice for all Americans have consistently opposed violence as a means of redress. Riots have proved ineffective, disruptive and highly damaging to the Negro population, to the civil rights cause, and to the entire nation.

We call upon Negro citizens throughout the nation to forego the temptation to disregard the law. This does not mean that we should submit tamely to joblessness, inadequate housing, poor schooling, insult, humiliation and attack. It does require a redoubling of efforts through legitimate means to end these wrongs and disabilities.

We appeal not only to black Americans, but also to our fellow white citizens who are not blameless. The disabilities imposed upon Negro citizens are a century old. They remain because the white citizenry in general supports these restrictions.

The 90th Congress has exhibited an incredible indifference to hardships of the ghetto dwellers. Only last week the House defeated a rat-control bill which would have enabled the cities to get rid of the rats which infest the slums.

And finally, we support President Johnson's call "upon all our people, black and white alike, in all our cities to join in a determined program to maintain law and order, to condemn and to combat lawlessness in all its forms and firmly to show by word and by deed that riot, looting and public disorder will just not be tolerated."

No one benefits under mob law. Let's end it now!

Signed by: Martin Luther King Jr., A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, and Whitney M. Young Jr.

NEW DEFENSE PERIMETER IN THE PACIFIC OCEAN

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the turmoil and civil war that are currently raging over mainland China have caught

the attention of the world—both Communist and non-Communist. Because of China's size and population, no country or policymaker can afford to ignore the great change that has taken place over the past few years, especially in the field of military technology.

China's rapid progress in developing a nuclear capability will make some of our military bases—in Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines—vulnerable to Chinese blackmail or attack in the near future.

There have been serious discussions among some of our top military and political planners about the possibility of American withdrawal from our forward bases around mainland China to areas that are beyond the range of intermediate range ballistic missiles.

The move, if it is to come, will probably be to the Mariana Islands—included in this chain of islands are Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota—which are some 2,000 miles from China's mainland.

Although the vast South Pacific has been out of the mainstream of world history, it have become an area of great importance to the United States. The security of our country, a Pacific power by virtue of its long Pacific coastline and the presence of Hawaii in the middle of it, is intimately involved in the changes taking place around the vast Pacific basin.

Mr. President, because any new major defense consideration in the Pacific is of the greatest importance and concern to not only the people of my State but to the entire Nation, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a very interesting and enlightening article that deals with the possibility of the United States forming a new defense perimeter in the Pacific.

I ask unanimous consent that "New Defense Line in Pacific: Search on for Bases Closer to Home," that appeared in the August 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW DEFENSE LINE IN PACIFIC: SEARCH ON FOR BASES CLOSER TO HOME

(NOTE.—Time is growing short for a big decision in the Far East—where to build new defenses once U.S. gives up island bases hugging Red China. Military men say the day is near. Pentagon's choice centers on Guam and other Marianas, known to GI's in World War II. State Department has its own ideas for the Marianas. A showdown may be coming.)

A major change in U.S. strategy is now taking shape. It is to mean a withdrawal from bases in the Pacific to a line closer to home than at any time since World War II.

Strategists are looking ahead to the day when vital U.S. installations that have helped contain Communist China for almost two decades are going to have to be given up—in Okinawa, Japan, the Philippines, possibly elsewhere.

The withdrawal is regarded as just a matter of time. Some experts say it will occur in three to five years. Others insist the move will be forced even sooner.

In Japan, emotional and political pressures are building up to get the U.S. out of Okinawa—and out of Japan itself.

That is only one of two reasons why new plans are being made.

The other: The rapid growth of Red China