

FROM: THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR BOB DOLE  
NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20510  
(202) 225-8946

376

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE - OCTOBER 6, 1971

## SENATE FLOOR STATEMENT

### DOLE DISAGREES WITH METHODS OF MONTOYA AMENDMENT

I rise to state that the Senator from Kansas shares with his colleagues in the Senate a strong desire to have the American military presence in South Vietnam ended in such a way as to leave in South Vietnam a self sufficient and representative government. But the Senator from Kansas disagrees with the methods with which the pending amendment proposes to accomplish these objectives.

#### UNACCEPTABLE ALTERNATIVES

The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico casts the issue of United States withdrawal from South Vietnam in the context of ideological imperialism. It would have United States withdrawal in an orderly manner be held hostage to an election "circus" in South Vietnam, offering, as the alternative, the threat of a precipitous removal of the American presence. The price which this amendment would exact would be nothing less than direct U.S. involvement in Vietnamese domestic politics through support for reluctant opposition candidates. The pending amendment would have the United States back candidates and become involved in South Vietnamese elections at the very time in which our President is carefully diminishing our presence in Vietnam. The Senator from Kansas finds this logic difficult to understand.

#### THE RISKS OF PRECIPITATE WITHDRAWAL

At stake are several principles and issues of considerable importance. First, is the question of the advisability of risking the fragile fabric of national independence in South Vietnam by precipitate withdrawal when careful and definite withdrawal is already under way. Withdrawal, according to the four-month or ten-month mandate of this amendment, would hand the enemies of South Vietnam an operational timetable and destroy any incentives they might have to negotiate, and it would do nothing to aid the release of our prisoners of war.

#### IMPOSITION OF OUTSIDE SYSTEMS

A second question of principle raised in the pending amendment is whether it can be considered proper to hold an ally "hostage" to American concepts of elections and government. The idea of contested elections held regularly between adversary political parties is the imperfect product of 300 years of Anglo Saxon evolution. Even today this system is a frail innovation in much of Western Europe and but a vague ideal in many non-European states. Its origin is to be found in a history of stable and traditional governments characterized by gradual evolution and dependence upon the existence of a loyal opposition. This loyal opposition, in conjunction with a demonstrated willingness of the incumbent party to relinquish power, stands as the key to institutionalized mechanisms for the peaceful political transfer of power.

In this context I believe it should be pointed out that, far from stating a determination to retain power at all costs, President Thieu showed a willingness to resign if he received less than an affirmation of popular support. This point is particularly significant in the light of the performance of the supposed opposition which was singularly unimpressive at best.

The Senator from Kansas would once again bring to the attention of his colleagues the rather remarkable series of six democratic and successful elections which have been held since the election of the Thieu Government in October of 1967. These elections were both local and national and were subject to intense foreign scrutiny as well as Viet Cong harassment. I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of a brief description of South Vietnam's electoral history since 1965 at this point.

The Senator from Kansas believes that this record speaks loudly and clearly against those who characterize the government of South Vietnam as totalitarian. Indeed, it sets an example with few peers in the developing areas of Asia or Africa.

FROM THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR BOB DOLE  
SENATE FLOOR STATEMENT - MONTOYA AMENDMENT  
PAGE 2

### THE RESPONSIBLE COURSE

The situation in South Vietnam which occupies us here today has been recently viewed by the Senator from Kansas, first hand. Although he viewed without relish the prospect of the uncontested election, he also earnestly believes that this body must concentrate its efforts toward support of the careful and flexible withdrawal which is presently being managed by the President of the United States. Any attempt by this body to bind the President to a date certain or a farcical "show election" in South Vietnam will only diminish the prospects for a termination of the conflict and the recovery of our prisoners of war.

It would be a travesty against the intentions of the American people and three Presidential Administrations should this body force the disorderly and disgraceful termination of United States presence in Vietnam. The alternative sought by this amendment would be a "circus election" in which a United States "ringmaster" would elicit a staged performance by a reluctant foreign country.

The pending amendment would constitute a blatant example of moral imperialism. It would make a mockery of America's professed belief in national self determination. Worse yet, it would turn an orderly and definitive withdrawal into an ignominious and disorderly exit from a difficult problem which the President is succeeding in reducing with distinction. Even the WASHINGTON POST, has editorially stated that: "The time is past for the United States to try to arrange the politics of Vietnam for its own convenience."

### NO DATE CERTAIN

The Senator from Kansas would also point out that this amendment, like the many so-called "end the war" amendments before it, deceptively holds out to the American people the promise of a "date certain" for ending the war.

There is no "date certain" in this amendment. First it speaks of February 3, 1972. But then it says "not more than six months after the date of enactment." Who knows when that will be? Today? Tomorrow? Six, eight, ten months from now?

No, Mr. President, this amendment, like so many others before it, is merely an exercise in appealing to the emotions and anxieties of a war-weary American people. It is not an effective, a responsible or a positive approach to achieving the end of American involvement. President Nixon is the one who is pursuing such an effective, responsible and positive course. And, as I said, if the Senate wants to do something to speed the end of this tragic and costly war it can do so by uniting with the President and backing his efforts to end the war and achieve a lasting world peace.

### SUPPORT FOR THE PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

The Senator from Kansas takes note that the position of the Senator from New Mexico, as expressed in the pending amendment, stands out in contrast to the positions he presented to the public only a brief time ago.

During the previous Administration, the Senator from New Mexico was one of the most forthright and outspoken supporters of United States policy in Southeast Asia.

On June 7, 1965, the Senator took the floor of the Senate to commend the student council of the University of New Mexico for its actions in passing a resolution pledging its "support to the actions being taken by President Johnson in Vietnam".

On August 10, 1967, the Congressional Record contained the text of a speech delivered by the Senator from New Mexico before the annual convention of the disabled American veterans. The Senator's remarks on that occasion were clear, forcefully spoken and unambiguous.

But, loss of American lives in Viet-Nam is not my only concern, nor perhaps even the greatest concern of this day. I have come to accept the fact that our Nation has a self-imposed commitment to protect for others the freedom we so jealously cherish ourselves. And this commitment becomes more acute when aggressors attack a nation incapable of protecting its own freedom because of the overwhelming might and methods of the aggressor.

I believe our men in Viet-Nam are fighting -- and yes, dying -- for the freedom of many peoples; just as surely as Americans fell for liberty and human dignity in the trenches of the Meuse-Argonne or on the Beach at Normandy -- or the frozen hills of Korea.

The Senator went on to say:

I, for one, and I know the membership of the DAV will back this statement all the way -- am ready to make any sacrifice here at home in order that our men will not be deprived of any of their needs in Viet-Nam. I believe we are not safe here at home until Communist aggression is halted -- and it must be halted in Viet-Nam.

FROM THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR BOB DOLE  
SENATE FLOOR STATEMENT - MONTOYA AMENDMENT  
PAGE 3

Because of this conviction -- I pledge full support of our fighting men in Viet-Nam -- for whatever they may need to carry on the war and assure them maximum safety while carrying out their task.

The basis for this unquestioned support for our fighting men in Viet-Nam stems from the fact that I am convinced the threat of Communism is real. It is real in Vietnam -- it is a dark shadow in Thailand and Laos. It stands off our own shores in Castro's Cuba.

I have commented that I am concerned over our internal problems. But this concern is only because of the bigger picture. Communism eagerly awaits our apathy -- our letting barriers down. If we fail in Viet-Nam -- we shall surely have signed over our birthright to Democracy. If those despoilers of patriotism have their way, opposition to the spread of Communism will be obliterated. It will be a welcome sign to war and destruction -- or capitulation of our government to Communist rule.

Yes -- I am concerned that Communists continue to talk out of both sides of their mouth. They speak of peace -- but their reference to peace has a different meaning than what the remainder of the world considers peace. They mean another Munich -- peace through capitulation -- peace by submitting to Communist rule.

And still later, on October 5, 1967, the Senator from New Mexico took the Senate Floor to discuss the topic, "what is our national interest in Vietnam?" In the course of that statement he said:

The problem is not whether one or another country in the area is going to be the base for missiles that might be used against us tomorrow. It is whether the millions of people are going to be able to live in freedom. It is whether their skills and resources and energies are going to be used for cooperation in creating a freer and better world or whether they are going to be harnessed under a system that has as one of its primary goals our destruction -- and the destruction of all we believe in.

Looked at in this light, can there be any doubt of where our national interest lies?"

And in conclusion the Senator stated:

Yes, Mr. President, we do have a vital national interest in Asia. And in fighting in Vietnam we are expressing that interest in a highly effective way.

I predict that if our stand now begins to waver and to weaken, the members of this body, the American people, and the world are going to rue the day. On that day, we can begin to prepare for World War III.

I pray that that day never comes.

#### A CHANGED POSITION

The Senator from Kansas would submit that the adoption of the amendment sponsored by the Senator from New Mexico might well mark such a day as the Senator suggested in his remarks of October, 1967.

In any event, the pending amendment -- standing out as a blueprint, on the one hand, for a precipitate American withdrawal and, on the other hand, for the imposition of a moral imperialism in Vietnam -- bears little resemblance to the views expressed by the Senator from New Mexico during the previous Administration.

The Senator from Kansas would point out that it was the policies of the Administration which raised American troop strength in Vietnam -- bears little resemblance to the views expressed by the Senator from New Mexico during the previous Administration.

The Senator from Kansas would point out that it was the policies of that Administration which raised American troop strength in Vietnam to more than 550,000 with no plan for an end to their presence or an end to their deaths in combat.

It is the present Administration, however, which has reduced American troop strength by more than 300,000 and has reduced combat deaths to nearly 1/10 the rate when it took office.

So, the Senator from Kansas would suggest that our military involvement in Vietnam is being ended and ended in such a way as to avoid the imposition of imperialistic ideals or the accomplishment of the enemy's goal of domination and subjugation of the Vietnamese people.

I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.