

**Mike Mansfield**

Folder Citation: Collection: Records of the 1976 Campaign Committee to Elect Jimmy Carter;  
Series: Noel Sterrett Subject File; Folder: Mike Mansfield; Container 87

To See Complete Finding Aid:

[http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign\\_1976.pdf](http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign_1976.pdf)

for,

# Mansfield Stalls a Jackson Trade Plan

By JOHN W. FINNEY  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 7 — Shortly after the Senate session began this morning, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, whispered to Senator Howard M. Metzenbaum, Democrat of Ohio, that he had "a little amendment that would just take a few minutes."

Senator Metzenbaum yielded the floor, and Senator Jackson proposed an amendment that would have had the effect of revising the present export-control system and restricting trade with the Soviet Union.

The amendment would have given the Secretary of Defense power to veto any export that might "significantly increase the military capability" of the Soviet Union or other Communist countries.

The Jackson amendment might have been routinely adopted by a voice vote if Senator Mike Mansfield, the majority leader, had not walked on to the Senate floor and discovered what Senator Jackson was proposing. To the annoyance of Senator Jackson, Senator Mansfield succeeded in postponing an immediate vote on the amendment.

### Quiet Day Chosen

Senator Jackson chose to make his move on a day devoted to noncontroversial amendments to a military procurement bill. Many Senators were out of town.

His amendment had not been printed in advance, and most Senators were unaware he would offer it today. Senator Mansfield told a reporter he had not heard of the Jackson amendment until he walked on the Senate floor shortly after noon.

Senator Jackson had informed Senator John C. Stennis, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, about the amendment last night and had arranged for Senator Strom Thurmond, the ranking Republican on the committee, to be a co-sponsor.

With only a handful of the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee on the floor, the Jackson amendment was about to be accepted by Senator Stennis until Senator Mansfield objected that a "most momentous amendment" was being considered in "a haphazard fashion."

### Views of Administration

Senator Mansfield suggested that before acting on such an amendment the Senate should have the views of President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger.

Senator Jackson expressed doubt that such views could be readily obtained. Senator Mansfield shot back that the administration "did it in a hurry" when opposing his troop reduction amendments rejected yesterday by the Senate.

Richard N. Perle, aide to Senator Jackson, told a reporter that one reason the amendment was offered was because "we don't trust Kissinger" on trade relations with the Soviet Union.

When Senator Mansfield objected that too much power would be given to the Secretary of Defense, Senator Jackson modified his amendment so that the President would decide whether goods or technology should be exported to the Soviet Union.

Senator Stennis suggested the Jackson approach should be tried out on "an interim basis" for 18 months.

Not satisfied with such modi-

fications, Senator Mansfield arranged for a vote on the Jackson amendment to be put off until next Tuesday. He made clear that by then he expected Senator Jackson to have obtained the views of President Nixon and Mr. Kissinger on the amendment.

Off the floor, Senators privately complained about the "high-handed way" in which they felt Senator Jackson had attempted to push through his amendment.

Senator George D. Aiken, Republican of Vermont, said that if the Jackson amendment were adopted "we probably couldn't send spades to the Soviet Union because they might have a military value for digging foxholes."

Under present law, the Commerce Department determines whether to grant export licenses for goods or technology intended for the Soviet Union. The Commerce Department normally consults with the Defense and State Departments.

Senator Jackson complained that the Defense Department is now consulted only in a "perfunctory" way.

He said his amendment was "not meant to stop ordinary commercial trade with the Soviet bloc unless that trade can significantly enhance the military capabilities of those countries." But at another point in his speech he observed that "in many cases the tools and techniques needed to manufacture civilian products are virtually identical to those needed in manufacturing the most advanced military devices."

NYT  
6/7/74

# TROOP CUT ABROAD BARRED IN SENATE; MANSFIELD LOSES

His Call for Large Pullback  
Rejected Amid Indications  
of a Stiffer Attitude

## GAIN BY ADMINISTRATION

Significant Victory Follows  
Hard Lobbying—Prestige  
of Kissinger a Factor

By JOHN W. FINNEY  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 6—The Senate today rejected proposals for reducing the number of American troops overseas, giving the Nixon Administration a major foreign policy victory. By a 54-to-35 vote the Senate defeated a proposal by Senator Mike Mansfield, the majority leader, requiring a 125,000-man reduction over the next 18 months in the force of almost 450,000 stationed abroad. Then, by a margin of 46 to 44, it rejected a compromise offered by Mr. Mansfield calling for a 76,000-man reduction.

For the Senator, who has been seeking for nearly 10 years to reverse what he describes as an outdated postwar policy of substantial troop commitments abroad, it was probably his worst defeat on the issue. For the Administration, which had lobbied intensively against the proposals, it was probably the most significant legislative defense of its overseas commitments.

**Stand Appears Harder**  
Compared with votes in previous years, those today indicated that Senate sentiment was hardening against troop cuts at this time. Last year the Senate, by a 48-to-36 vote, approved a 110,000-man reduction. The provision was dropped later.

Last month, the House of Representatives rejected, by a 240-to-163 vote, a proposal by Representative Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. of Massachusetts, the majority leader, calling for a 100,000-man cut.

Congressional quarters saw several factors contributing to the hardening attitude against withdrawal of troops that the United States began deploying overseas in substantial numbers 25 years ago.

One was the prestige of Secretary of State Kissinger, who had warned in a letter that unilateral reductions would have a destabilizing effect on European allies and undermine the negotiations with the Soviet Union on mutual reductions of force in Central Europe.

### Mideast War an Element

Two other interrelated factors cited were the October Middle East war, which, in the view of legislators, emphasized the importance of an overseas presence, and consequent concern over the Soviet Union's intentions despite the apparent movement toward improved United States-Soviet relations.

At least tangentially, in the opinion of some senators, the Watergate affair influenced the votes. At a time of uncertainty over political power on the domestic front, there reportedly

Continued on Page 3, Column 1

# Senate Rejects Bid for a Big Troop Cut Abroad

Continued From Page 1, Col. 1  
was reluctance to take an action that could be interpreted as weakening the American position abroad.

Still another factor cited was that with the shift to an all-volunteer military force, there was less political pressure "to bring the boys home."

It was apparent from the debate that there was reluctance among a majority to take a symbolic step toward reversing a post-World War II policy that lead to the commitments, particularly to the North Atlantic Treaty organization.

Senator Mansfield made it clear that his underlying purpose was to reverse a policy

that he contended had become "a myth of the past" and made the United States "badly over-extended abroad."

Citing the national debt \$475-billion, he asked in his rising voice: "How long are we going to think we are so strong, so rich, so powerful that we think we can afford to be the world's policeman. We haven't got what it takes in resources and we had better wake up to reality."

The Mansfield proposals, offered as amendments to a military procurement bill before the Senate, did not specify where the troop withdrawals should take place. Throughout the debate the opposition emphasized that reductions could not be carried out without withdrawing

forces from Western Europe, where 290,000 men are stationed.

Picking up Mr. Kissinger's theme, Senator John Stennis, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, insisted that a unilateral reduction would "jerk the rug right out from under" the negotiations with the Soviet Union on troop reductions, which he said were making headway. Recalling the argument of Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger, Senator Stennis maintained that with military commitments stretching from Thailand to Western Europe, American forces had already been reduced to "a very reasonable level."

## **Mansfield Says U.S. Appears in Clear in Chile**

Associated Press

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield said yesterday that a Senate panel thus far has found nothing to indicate U.S. involvement in the overthrow of Chilean President Salvador Allende.

Mansfield told reporters that a Foreign Relations subcommittee headed by Sen. Gale McGee (D-Wyo.) has made preliminary checks into recurring reports that the U.S. government or American-based multinational corporations might have provided assistance to a military group that overthrew Allende.

McGee has held two sessions on the matter already and "indicates no substantiation for these allegations at this point," Mansfield (D-Mont.) said.

for