

Mansfield Offers Amendment For a Pullout Within 9 Months

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times

JUN 22 1971

WASHINGTON, June 21—Senator Mike Mansfield, the Majority Leader, unexpectedly introduced today an amendment to the Selective Service bill calling on the President to withdraw all American forces from Indochina within nine months.

The move caused confusion in Administration ranks, which resorted to parliamentary maneuvers to prevent an immediate vote on the troop withdrawal amendment while they regrouped their forces.

Meanwhile, Senator Gordon L. Allott of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, accused The New York Times of having violated the espionage laws and of having jeopardized chances

for an early end to American involvement in the Vietnam war by publishing part of a secret Pentagon study on the origins of the war.

The Pentagon study was becoming increasingly involved in the Senate debate on Vietnam. Critics of the war, such as Senator Mansfield, were citing the disclosures in the study as an additional reason why Congress should assert its voice in bringing the war to an end.

In reaction, Republicans, such as Senator Allott and Senator Robert J. Dole, chairman of the National Committee, were arguing that the study pointed to deception in pre-

Continued on Page 19, Column 1

ALLOTT CHARGES TIMES VIOLATION

Says Publication of Secret Pentagon Study Imperils Early End to War

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8

vious administrations. They also said that publication of parts of the study at this time was irresponsible.

The Mansfield amendment, which calls for withdrawal from Indochina within nine months contingent upon the release of American prisoners of war, was given a good chance of passage by the Senate when it comes to a vote later this week.

First, however, the Senate will vote tomorrow on an amendment sponsored by two Republicans, Marlow W. Cook of Kentucky and Ted Stevens of Alaska, requiring withdrawal within nine months but with the provision that the withdrawal deadline be suspended if North Vietnam did not agree within 60 days of the legislation's enactment to release American prisoners of war. The Cook-Stevens amendment to the Selective Service bill before the Senate is expected to be defeated, although narrowly.

In contrast to the Cook-Stevens amendment, which would cut off funds for deployment of troops in Indochina, the Mansfield amendment would

represent a nonbinding expression of policy. In that respect, the Mansfield amendment may pick up a crucial few votes in a Senate where there is considerable reluctance to use the Congressional power over the pursestrings to force the President to withdraw from Vietnam under a specific timetable.

Even though it does not cut off funds, the Mansfield amendment, as seen by the Majority Leader, would be part of a deliberate strategy by the war critics to impose a withdrawal policy on the President.

The Mansfield amendment, according to this argument, would fill the policy void created by the repeal last year of the 1965 Tonkin Gulf Resolution authorizing the President to take all necessary steps to repel Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

It is contended that if the amendment were adopted and the Selective Service bill then signed into law, President Nixon would have accepted and be bound by a Congressional statement of policy that the United States should withdraw "at the earliest practicable date," subject only to the release of American prisoners of war.

Call for Cease-Fire

Aside from calling upon the President to set a specific date for troop withdrawals, the Mansfield amendment urges the President to negotiate an immediate cease-fire with North Vietnam to be followed by a phased withdrawal of American troops in return for a phased release of American prisoners of war.

The Senate, meanwhile, accepted by a 79-0 vote an amendment to the Selective Service bill by Senator Edward

M. Kennedy of Massachusetts that would impose an absolute limit of 2.4 million men on the size of the armed forces by the end of the next fiscal year. The Senate Armed Services Committee had recommended such a limit in the legislation but had given the President discretionary authority to lift the ceiling.

In arguing against any discretionary authority for the President, Senator Kennedy said the Pentagon study on the Vietnam war showed that "we [in Congress] have been bystanders, permitted only to receive those documents and those reports that would support the foreign policy decisions already concluded by the executive."

Senator Mansfield used much the same argument in offering his amendment now rather than later in the year, as he had originally planned. Without passing judgment on the Administration's legal challenge to publication of the study, Senator Mansfield said the published documents "confirm" that "this nation has been bound to a course in Vietnam and elsewhere by one branch of the Government — the Executive branch — with virtually no participation of the Congress."

Publication of parts of the Vietnam study, he said, "underscores the responsibility of the Senate and the Congress to seek ways and means to go beyond winding down the war." Congress, he said, must now "try to do what we can to speed up the process withdrawal which has dragged on for more than two years with thousands more casualties accumulating during that time."

Contending that the docu-

ments "show with unmistakable clarity that party politics had nothing to do with the descent into the morass of Vietnam," Senator Mansfield termed it "most regrettable" that over the weekend some politicians were "sniffing" at the report "for political profit."

The Majority Leader's comments appeared directed in particular at Senator Dole, who said on Saturday that the Vietnam study clearly showed Democratic policy-makers were guilty of "eight years of deception and escalation."

A few hours after the Mansfield speech on the Senate floor, Senator Allott issued a statement saying The Times's publication of the study was "doubtless the most tragic demonstration of public irresponsibility we have seen in recent years and likely will have very damaging and far-reaching consequences for our country."

Violation by Times Charged

"The New York Times has violated the laws of the country, has breached the trust of our nation's leaders in their dealing with foreign governments and has, by its actions, jeopardized the chances for an early end to America's involvement in the Vietnam war," he said.

Contending that the Constitutional amendment on freedom of the press "has never protected the unauthorized disclosure of classified information relating to the national defense," Senator Allott said, "The Times has neither the right nor the duty to determine which documents should be classified in which way."

"That The Times received and published stolen documents," he

said, "testifies to the political fanaticism which now grips that once great paper. That The Times now tries to justify this action testifies to the arrogance of that paper."

Arguing that the Espionage Law makes illegal the publication of top-secret information, he said "The Times quite simply believes that it has no duty to obey the law" and has "chosen to display contempt for the law."

Senator Allott said that "it is perfectly clear" that the newspaper timed the publication of the study to closely precede Senate votes on various "end-the-war" amendments as "part of a carefully orchestrated campaign to spread distrust, confusion and hysteria." Fortunately, he said, "the congress is calm and orderly while The Times is frantic and duplicitous."

Stratton Criticizes Papers

Representative Samuel S. Stratton, Democrat of upstate New York, described publication of the study by The New York Times and The Washington Post as "un-American in the very literal sense of that word" in that "it can only damage our country—at a time of war—and give massive aid and comfort to the enemy."

"The publication of these documents and the attendant denigration of American leaders both past and present," he said in a statement, "can obviously only complicate and possibly jeopardize" the objectives of withdrawing American forces, securing the release of prisoners of war and bringing the war to a prompt and honorable end.

Among the war critics in Congress, demands mounted for an investigation into the American

involvement in the Vietnam war and for copies of the Pentagon study.

Senator Mansfield plans to meet this week with leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee to discuss an investigation.

In the House, Representative Edward P. Boland, Democrat of Massachusetts, introduced a resolution calling for a joint House-Senate committee to investigate the course of the American involvement.

Representatives Bella S. Abzug, Democrat of Manhattan, and Paul V. McCloskey Jr., Republican of California, introduced "resolutions of inquiry" calling upon the executive branch to produce the Vietnam study and current policy documents on Vietnam and Laos.

Under this parliamentary device, a "resolution of inquiry" must be reported back from committee to the House floor within seven legislative days. If approved, the resolutions would represent formal Congressional demands on the executive branch for the documents.

Mr. McCloskey, a leading Republican critic of President Nixon's Vietnam policies, said the documents make it unmistakably clear that the United States "encouraged and authorized" the overthrow on Nov. 1, 1963, of the South Vietnamese President, Ngo Dinh Diem.

Representatives John E. Moss, Democrat of California, and Ogden R. Reid, Republican of Westchester County, announced that they would file a civil suit under the Freedom of Information Act if the executive branch has not complied by tomorrow afternoon with their request for copies of the Pentagon study.