

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 22

OCTOBER 9, 1969, TO OCTOBER 20, 1969

(PAGES 29313 TO 30642)

ern Australia, is to be expanded to an operational base on the Indian Ocean.

PRaises LINK TO UNITED STATES

Gorton praised the American-Australian alliance, saying "our alliance with the United States under the ANZUS pact is "vital to our defense. It requires that we should be true allies, that we should be prepared to give, as well as expect to receive, assistance.

"Therefore, we shall continue to cooperate with the United States in the construction of bases for our joint defense, bases of value to us both, in Australia."

The prime minister's defense statements contrasted sharply with those of the leader of the opposition Labor party, Gough Whitlam, who went on the election trail with his policy speech a week earlier.

Whitlam said a Labor government would withdraw troops from Vietnam before the end of June 1970.

A recent Gallup Poll showed more than 55 percent of Australians favor immediate withdrawal.

Whitlam said that if he were prime minister, Australia would sign the non-proliferation treaty.

There would be regional arrangements for the standardization of defense equipment, abolition of the draft, reform of conditions for the permanent army and negotiations to replace the F111C aircraft Australia has ordered from America.

MINORITY REASSURED

Gorton's statement will reassure the minority Democratic Labor party, which was alarmed at what was called External Affairs Minister Gordon Freeth's soft line towards Russia in a speech on Aug. 14.

Though lacking in detail, Gorton's speech will certainly satisfy the DLP and prevent their implied earlier threat to take second preference votes away from the Liberals. In this election, those preferences could be crucial in getting John Gorton and his Liberal-Country party coalition back into office.

OPPOSITION TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, on Wednesday, October 15, many persons throughout the Nation will gather to express opposition to our continuing involvement in Vietnam. Not since the civil rights march of 1963 have so many Americans felt the need to express publicly and visibly their views on national policy.

An editorial published in the Minneapolis Tribune of October 12 eloquently expresses the hope that this moratorium on the war in Vietnam will hasten the end of a senseless and tragic war—a war which few Americans understand or support. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Wednesday's Demonstrations on Vietnam," be printed in the RECORD.

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

WEDNESDAY'S DEMONSTRATIONS ON VIETNAM

As Wednesday draws closer, one recalls the Civil Rights March of 1963 and how it touched the consciences and hearts of millions of Americans.

Across this land, on Wednesday, there will take place marches and demonstrations and vigils, this time not for civil rights but for peace.

The 1963 march, despite fears of violence, was peaceful—and successful. Various types of civil-rights and social legislation followed. The nonviolent nature of the protest was one reason for its success.

Despite the expected participation of radicals (such as members of the SDS) on Wednesday, we believe most demonstrations probably will be orderly and peaceful. We hope so, for violence can only detract from the purpose of the marches, that of demonstrating to fellow Americans and to the President the growing desire of many citizens to end the Vietnam War.

The President has said he won't be influenced by the demonstrations . . . but in a democracy can a President not be influenced by a large outpouring of the people?

More and more one hears across the land the voices of opposition to the war, a war from which our leaders now apparently would withdraw if a means could be found for saving face, a war which is hurting Vietnam more than it is helping a war no longer believed vital (if it ever was) to our basic national interests, a war whose casualties are being felt in neighborhood after neighborhood, town after town . . . a war which is causing the nation to postpone or reduce vital programs.

A war which has hindered efforts to close the gap between the races, between the generations and between the rich and poor.

A war which has brought serious inflation.

A war which has made more difficult any efforts to achieve an international easing of tensions.

President Johnson in March 1968 halted the escalation of American involvement in Vietnam. President Nixon has begun the process of disengagement. We support those troop withdrawals he has ordered. We wish they were larger.

Some of Wednesday's marchers will be demanding an immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops. After 15 years of propping up South Vietnam, and even granting all the faults of that country's present leadership and efforts, we do not believe an instant pullout is a reasonable course for our nation. Indeed, such a pullout is not feasible in terms of logistics.

We believe that it is possible to draw up a timetable for a systematic withdrawal of all combat troops, and we believe such a timetable could encompass a period of 12 to 18 months.

It does not seem to us that a decision for such a timetable will be made by the American military or diplomatic establishments in Vietnam. They appear to be yet thinking in terms of victory—even though the President has said that victory is not our goal anymore. The decision to withdraw rests with the President.

But Mr. Nixon still seems to be listening closely to advisers like Gen. Wheeler, Gen. Westmoreland, Ambassador Bunker and others of the victory school. President Johnson did, too, but persuasive men like Clark Clifford came along to influence a change in presidential policy. We are not sure who will be the Clark Clifford of the Nixon administration. The tone and content of some of Mr. Nixon's statements, so similar to those of Mr. Johnson before he changed course, are greatly disturbing to millions of citizens.

Therein lies the importance of Wednesday's marches, demonstrations and vigils. If conducted peaceably and with dignity, they can help lead other Americans to reconsider the course this country is on in Vietnam. They can help influence national policy.

To march for peace does not detract for one moment from the bravery and sacrifice of those nearly 40,000 Americans who have died in Vietnam. They died, as young Americans have died in generations past and may die in future generations, serving our country.

The question now is whether their sacrifice is served by hurling more young Americans into continuing combat in an Asian land war no longer considered vital to American security.

A majority of Americans, according to a

recent Gallup Poll, believe it was a mistake to send troops to fight in Vietnam. The real question now is how to extricate our men from that mistake.

Present approaches to extrication—Mr. Nixon's three conditions for troop withdrawals—depend on responses from Saigon or Hanoi. We believe the time is here for a policy geared to the needs of our own country. This means an end to American participation in the fighting within a reasonable time.

President Nixon, like many others, has talked of "no more Vietnam." If this concept is good for tomorrow, it is good for today.

On Wednesday, the marchers will be telling the nation: Let's end what has become a wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. Will the nation and our President be listening? We hope so.

THE CHICAGO RIOTS

Mr. PERCY, Mr. President, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations met today to hear testimony from Police Superintendent James B. Conlisk, Jr., of Chicago, regarding the transfer of weapons to the former provost marshal general of the Army. As a member of this subcommittee and as a Senator from Illinois, I wish to comment briefly on a matter that has taken the highest priority in the work of Superintendent Conlisk and his men, constituting the reason why he could not appear before our committee as originally scheduled; namely, the hit-and-run guerrilla forces who have sought to spread havoc in Chicago for the past week.

I wish to commend the Chicago police and the Illinois National Guard for the calm and professional manner in which they responded to repeated provocations from these Maoist "Red Guards." They have skillfully prevented widespread violence and destruction and at all times shown an unwavering devotion to duty.

The outrages that have occurred on the streets of Chicago this past week, and the alert manner in which they have been curbed, presents an essentially different pattern of challenge and response from the well-publicized and well-studied disorders that occurred during the Democratic National Convention of 1968.

The rights of free speech, peaceful protest, and lawful assembly are guaranteed by our Constitution and, as such, are inviolable and sacrosanct. Full freedom to espouse a cause or to denounce injustice is the hallmark of our democracy.

What happened in Chicago, however, is a perversion of these basic rights. Young people who destroy the property, seriously injure, and threaten the lives of innocent citizens, young people who seek to confront authority for the sake of confrontation, may indeed seem mad. But it is clear that their wanton behavior has a clear-cut purpose.

For surely it is the intent of the rioters to destroy, as the main victim of their criminal attack, the free institutions of our democratic society. This radical "Weatherman" element of the SDS is truly Students for the Destruction of Society. It is essential that we repulse this evil challenge to America.

Governor Richard B. Ogilvie and Mayor Richard J. Daley joined together to meet this challenge and have moved