



# US Senate

CIMUN XV

November 29th - December 2nd



# 1. Topic 1 - Military Procurement and Authorizations

## 1.1. Executive Summary

The United States of America is in the midst of some of the most serious geopolitical tensions since the Second World War. With the rising threat of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' nuclear capabilities and the deteriorating situation in Indochina, the quality of the U.S.'s National Security Strategy will determine the success or failure of American security influence abroad. In an effort to maintain its foreign policy of communist containment, the U.S. will also have to articulate a strategic foreign aid policy. The U.S.'s current military and political affairs are multidimensional challenges that require the complete attentiveness of the U.S. government, especially within the Senate Chambers.

## 1.2. Historical Background

The term military procurement refers to “the management of a nation’s investments in technologies, programs, and products support necessary to achieve its National Security Strategy and support its Armed Forces. The goal is to rapidly acquire quality products that fulfill user needs with improvements to mission capability at an equitable price.”<sup>1</sup> With the current tide of global affairs, discussions of military procurements and constituent foreign aid policies have been the center of many Congressional debates for decades. The U.S. government has also been active in developing new military technology since its participation in World War II. Furthermore, the United States has found itself involved in several armed conflicts and diplomatic tensions within the last decade. Such actions have increased the demand for a stronger military and better global influence. The following funds were federally-approved military procurements for the U.S. Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps from Fiscal Year (FY) 1967:

- U.S. Army: \$592,500,000 for aircraft; \$356,500,000 for missiles; \$395,200,000 for tracked combat vehicles; and \$1,518,900,000 for research, development, tests, and evaluation.<sup>2</sup>
- U.S. Air Force: \$3,961,300,000 for aircraft; \$1,189,500,000 for missiles; and \$3,053,800,000 for research, development, tests, and evaluation.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.military1.com/products/military-accessories/article/404325-what-is-military-procurement/>

<sup>2</sup>[https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.\\$b642676;view=1up;seq=6](https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.$b642676;view=1up;seq=6)

<sup>3</sup>ibid

- U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps: \$1,422,200,000 for aircraft; \$385,400,000 for missiles; \$1,751,300,000 for naval vessels (Navy only); \$3,700,000 for tracked combat vehicles (Marine Corps only); \$1,748,600,000 for research, development, tests, and evaluation.<sup>4</sup> Finally, an additional \$459,059,000 has been allocated to various federal defense agencies in FY 1967 to assist with technological developments.<sup>5</sup> Despite this semblance as being too extreme or superfluous, these procurements were deemed essential by the federal government to fund U.S. involvement in several geopolitical events.

### 1.2.1. Arms Race with the Soviet Union (1945 - Present)

On August 29, 1949, the USSR successfully detonated its first atomic bomb, becoming the second country on the planet to harness to nuclear capabilities.<sup>6</sup> This not only ended the U.S.'s global monopoly of atomic weapons, but also instilled fear into millions of Americans of the dangers of nuclear materials in the hands of Communist states. Fueled by President Eisenhower's ideas of mutually assured destruction (MAD) and the development of the first intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) by the Soviets in 1957, a full-scale arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union sparked.<sup>7</sup>

These tensions escalated and reached their apex at the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. Prior to this conflict, the U.S. government made arrangements with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to place 15 nuclear-tipped missiles in Turkey, which shares a border at the Soviet Union.<sup>8</sup> By June 1, 1961, the first shipment of missiles was deployed to Turkey, enraging the Soviet government and motivating a retaliation.<sup>9</sup> In response, the USSR turned to Cuba, a communist state less than 100 miles away from the coast of Florida. The Soviets worked closely with Fidel Castro's regime in opposing U.S. attempts at invasion, trade embargos, and even assassinations. During this time, Soviet President Nikita Khrushchev was able to negotiate placing Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba. On October 15, 1962, teams at the U.S. National Photographic Interpretation Center (NPIC) discovered the arsenal sites for Soviet

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.preceden.com/timelines/38842-cold-war-arms-race>

<sup>7</sup> Ibid

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/nuclear-weapons/history/cold-war/cuban-missile-crisis/timeline.html>

<sup>9</sup> Ibid

medium-range ballistic missiles (MRBMs) in a U-2 aircraft reconnaissance photograph taken over San Cristobal in Cuba.<sup>10</sup> On the morning of October 16, U.S. President John F. Kennedy was informed that the Soviet Union intended to place nuclear weapons in Cuba, and the Cuban Missile Crisis began.<sup>11</sup>

Fortunately, the crisis did not end in a thermonuclear holocaust. Presidents Kennedy and Khrushchev were able to negotiate via letters and foreign agents to stop the Soviet shipments of nuclear weapons to the island if the U.S. promised not to invade Cuba in the future. Later, in April of 1963, the U.S. also withdrew its nuclear arsenals in Turkey.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, the USSR and United States signed a Limited Test Ban Treaty that prohibited nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. The Treaty entered into force on October 10, 1963, 6 days shy of the one-year anniversary of the start of the crisis.<sup>13</sup>

### 1.2.2. Second Indochina War (1954 - Present)

In the summer of 1954, the Geneva Peace Accords formally ended the First Indochina War and over a century of French colonial rule.<sup>14</sup> However, these negotiations did not establish lasting peace in Indochina. Due to external pressure by communist superpowers, Vietnamese delegates agreed to temporarily divide their country along the 17th parallel.<sup>15</sup> Although there were intentions on holding reunification elections in 1956, this boundary had no regard for historical and cultural borders. Consequently, internal dissidence became an enormous issue both in the north and south, and the reunification election never took place.

Simultaneously, the U.S. government became instrumental in establishing a liberal democracy in South Vietnam after the Geneva Convention. Through military, political, and economic assistance by the United States, the Republic of Vietnam (GVN) was created in 1955.<sup>16</sup> In 1956, an anti-communist politician backed by the U.S. named Ngo Dinh Diem won the GVN's first national election and became the President of South Vietnam.<sup>17</sup> Diem was most known for his

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

<sup>11</sup> Ibid

<sup>12</sup> Ibid

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.state.gov/t/isn/4797.htm>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.pbs.org/battlefieldvietnam/history/>

<sup>15</sup> Ibid

<sup>16</sup> Ibid

<sup>17</sup> Ibid

fear of armed communist aggression by the newly established Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) in the north; therefore, he instigated a widespread “purge” of communism in the south and arrested thousands of communist followers and political oppositions.<sup>18</sup> Such actions had controversial reception in Washington, with some viewing Diem’s abuse of power as oppressive and foul. While the Kennedy administration still provided the GVN with military aid and intelligence, they also recognized the need to limit civil unrest towards Diem’s government in Saigon.

Meanwhile, the Communist Party of Vietnam realized that political attempts to reunify Vietnam remained unsuccessful. In response to Diem’s attacks on communism in the south, southern members convinced the Party that more aggressive uses of violence would be necessary to overthrow Diem’s government and reunite the Vietnamese people. In January 1959, the Party’s leadership approved the use of revolutionary violence and mobilized all its assets towards a united military front against the GVN.<sup>19</sup> This united front became known as the National Liberation Front (NLF) and brought together communists and anti-communists to fight against Diem and work towards peace and unity in Vietnam.<sup>20</sup> Naturally, the U.S. government discredited the NLF as a deceptive communist ploy to take control of all of Indochina. U.S. officials even began to derogatorily call them the “Viet Cong,” which was slang for “Vietnamese Communist.”<sup>21</sup>

In 1961, President Kennedy requested a report on the current situation in South Vietnam to reassess American foreign assistance. After sending a team of analysts to South Vietnam, the consensus was that the U.S. should increase its military and economic presence to help stabilize the GVN.<sup>22</sup> This report became known as the December 1961 White Paper, but Kennedy was very frugal in considering the suggestions this report incorporated. Rather than execute full-scale military presence in Vietnam by putting troops on the ground, the President increased U.S. shipments of machinery and deployed more political and military advisors to Diem’s government.<sup>23</sup> Unfortunately, these actions were not as effective as hoped for, and the

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid

<sup>19</sup> Ibid

<sup>20</sup> Ibid

<sup>21</sup> Ibid

<sup>22</sup> Ibid

<sup>23</sup> Ibid

NLF continued to have several strategic successes in the countryside. Even after the U.S. and GVN enforced a bilateral project called the “Strategic Hamlet Program” which migrated villagers to safe zones, the NLF was still able to appeal to many Vietnamese peasants and alienate them from Saigon.<sup>24</sup>

After the South Vietnamese experienced several strategic failures, the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN) began to stage internal coups against Diem’s regime. The coups eventually led to the Diem’s capture and consequential execution on November 1, 1963.<sup>25</sup> Strangely enough, President Kennedy was assassinated three weeks later in Dallas, Texas. After Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in, he pushed for harder policy regarding military involvement in Vietnam.

In August of 1964, the DRV launched a naval attack on the U.S. vessels C. Turner Joy and U.S.S. Maddox in response to GVN espionage on northern Vietnamese coastlines.<sup>26</sup> A second alleged attack on August 4th fueled Johnson to push Congress to approve stronger military presence and retaliation. On August 10, 1964, the U.S. Congress ratified the “Tonkin Resolution,” which granted President Johnson to “take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.”<sup>27</sup> Essentially, this was the U.S.’s formal declaration of war against communist forces in Vietnam, and the armed conflict continues to this day.

### 1.2.3. Foreign Aid Strategies

In addition to global military strategies, the U.S. government has also been very active in providing political and economic foreign assistance. Since 1961, the U.S. government has created multiple foreign aid organizations and programs to put the United States on the front lines of international social and economic crises. Not only have these programs helped alleviate the effects of global issues, but also improved the U.S.’s international reputation. The following are some examples of recent programs and organizations enacted by the federal government:

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid

<sup>25</sup> Ibid

<sup>26</sup> Ibid

<sup>27</sup> [https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc\\_large\\_image.php?flash=false&doc=98](https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc_large_image.php?flash=false&doc=98)

- Public Law (PL) 87-195: Also known as the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, this law called for the establishment of a single government agency to coordinate all of the U.S.'s foreign assistance. This organization became the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and was responsible for the "disbursement of capital and technical assistance to developing countries."<sup>28</sup>
- Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1964: Originally signed by President Eisenhower, this law approved shipments of American surplus commodities to "friendly" states and allowed some stocks to be donated to overseas humanitarian programs. Later, President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10915, which reinvigorated this policy and further coordinated the administration of the program across USAID, the Department of State, and the Department of Agriculture. Additionally, Kennedy's appointed George McGovern to be Director of this program, and McGovern placed a heavy emphasis on combating malnutrition abroad. This program was also nicknamed "Food for Peace."<sup>29</sup>
- Alliance for Progress: This program allocated \$20 billion towards grants and loans to Latin American governments to provide incentives to oppose a growing communist support in that region. This program also provided military assistance to "friendly" states in the region who were struggling to maintain civil order. However, the success of this program is debatable, as some reports suggest that only 2% of the resulting economic growth directly benefited lower class and impoverished classes.<sup>30</sup>

## 1.3. Current Situation

### 1.3.1. Military Procurements of 1968

Due to the escalation of armed events throughout the globe, the U.S.'s military procurements have not slowed or decreased to any extent. In fact, there are calls from a number of parties to increase such expenditures even further in order to bring swifter ends to these crises and foster U.S. superior influence in international affairs. Naturally, this has met its fair share of political opposition with others calling for more arms limitations and encouraging more negotiations. For

---

<sup>28</sup> <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/pl-480>

<sup>29</sup> Ibid

<sup>30</sup> <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/alliance-for-progress>

these reasons, it must be the duty of U.S. legislative bodies like the U.S. Senate to review changes in military procurements thus far in FY 1968 in order properly assess the United States' current defense situation and prepare for the future.

### 1.3.2. Arms Race with the Soviet Union

If there's one thing the international community has learned from the Cuban Missile Crisis, it is the importance of compromise in diplomatic affairs. If both U.S. and Soviet leaders had not made certain concessions, then the aftermath of the crisis would not have been as peaceful and diplomatic as it was. To many political analysts, the Cuban Missile Crisis was the first step in the right direction to other arms control treaties and agreements between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

According to several correspondences coming from the Soviet Embassy in Washington, there are also shared sentiments in the USSR to begin further arms control to prevent events like the Cuban crisis from ever escalating to that point. Therefore, the U.S. government must seriously evaluate if it is prepared to take a step back and reassess itself for the sake of peace. Legislative bodies must operate not only in a bipartisan fashion for this pursuit, but must also coordinate with other federal government agencies and organizations in brainstorming strategic ways to limit its own nuclear capabilities.

### 1.3.3. Second Indochina War

As the situation in Vietnam becomes more complicated, so too does the question of how much and what kinds of assistance the U.S. should be providing to democratic forces in Indochina. The Tonkin Resolution gave strong implications that the federal government would provide President Johnson with a "blank check" in order to defend American forces in the region. However, the tide of the war has changed several times from four years ago, and the continuity of this bloody war has consequently led to a great deal of civil unrest back home. There have been hundreds of protests outside the White House, massive demonstrations across the nation, and calls to "vote out" politicians who seek to expand U.S. expenditures and troops to suppress the spread of communist values in Vietnam. While the constituents seemed to have spoken, it must be questioned what their Congressmen will do in response?

Furthermore, there are growing concerns from the international community on whether or not U.S. troops properly understand their duties towards their military leadership and towards civilians caught between the gunfire. In fact, a U.S. government report from August of 1967 showed that most American troops in Indochina did not understand their responsibilities in accordance with the Geneva Convention.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, there is growing concern that individual battalions will “misinterpret” orders from their superiors and turn to violence towards Vietnamese citizens. This is a severe flaw in U.S. military structure and must be reviewed. Should the United States strategically use its procurements to properly train its troops before sending them into battle or should it continue to use most of its defense budget on guns, ammunitions, and other war materials? This is a question for the government on Capitol Hill to decide upon.

#### 1.3.4. Foreign Aid Strategies

The various foreign assistance programs and agencies formed under the Kennedy administration have fortunately found relatively good success in providing economic growth and social stability to “friendly” developing countries. USAID has been active in giving economic assistance across the globe and Food for Peace has done tremendous work in alleviating the effects of hunger and malnutrition in impoverished states.

Simultaneously, there are also programs like the Alliance for Progress which desperately need either more funding or better leadership. Especially since this program can provide military assistance to certain Latin American countries, it must be questioned whether funding can be increased through specific military procurements towards foreign assistance? This opens up an entire new dimension to this issue and advocates for more federal procurements to foreign assistance programs and organizations. Whether such advancements become a reality in preparation for U.S. military expenditures in the future is now up to legislative branch in D.C.

### 1.4. Bloc Positions

#### 1.4.1. US Senate

In general, the U.S. Senate appears to be in support of U.S. military action in Vietnam and continuing the war until democracy is secured in the region. However, there have been some very outspoken Senators against continuing the war and withdrawing U.S. assistance before the

---

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/03/30/the-scene-of-the-crime>

situation becomes too bloody and costly. Currently, the Senate majority belongs to the Democratic Party, and most of the political opponents to the expansion of the Vietnam War are Democratic Senators. For example, Democratic Senators Ernest Gruening of Alaska and Wayne Morse of Oregon were the only two Senators to oppose the Tonkin Resolution that put the majority of the war in the hands of the President. Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, the majority leadership for the Democratic Party in the Senate, was also very outspoken against escalating the tensions in Vietnam throughout the course of the war. Even Vice President Hubert Humphrey is starting to see the advantages in drawing back U.S. forces in Vietnam. Therefore, it will be interesting to see how influential these key Senators will be in trying to pull back American military assistance to this specific conflict. It will also be interesting to analyze if such sentiments of diplomatic negotiations will trickle down into drafting arms limitation legislation or bills that will increase funding for foreign assistance.

#### 1.4.2. White House

The Executive Branch of the federal government continues to be a strong proponent of continuing U.S. military presence in Vietnam and expanding American nuclear arsenals to oppose that of the Soviet Union's. In some ways, President Johnson feels the need to continue these conflicts not only to prevent the spread of communism and maintain his containment foreign policy, but also to avoid international embarrassment. In fact, in a highly sensitive memo from former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the President was told that the most advantageous way to "demonstrate to the VC/DRV that the odds are against their winning" was to increase the manpower in Indochina by hundreds of thousands of troops.<sup>32</sup> Whether or not Johnson has any change in heart has yet to be determined; however, it is fairly safe to assume that the President will continue to follow aggressive policies in terms of the war in Vietnam and the Soviet arms race.

#### 1.4.3. US Department of Defense

Naturally, the Department of Defense is also a strong proponent of stronger U.S. military power throughout the world. It has been instrumental in the expansion of America's nuclear arsenals for decades. Similar to his predecessor, Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford believes in strong U.S. defense systems and its important role in being a global, democratic leader in opposing the

---

<sup>32</sup> <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/vietnam/showdoc.php?docid=141>

spread of communism. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) Earle Wheeler has also been a firm proponent of allocating more procurements to Vietnam. Wheeler has been serving as a strategic advisor to the President for quite some time now, so his word has a significant impact on U.S. military occurrences.

#### 1.4.4. US Department of State

While opinion on American involvement in Indochina is a bit diversified in the State Department, there is a widespread consensus that diplomatic efforts to negotiating arms limitations with the USSR could be beneficial to America's future. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has also been continuing the foreign policy of communist containment like many of his predecessors. Additionally, the State Department has been an extremely strong advocate of increasing U.S. foreign assistance. Undersecretary of State Nicholas de Belleville Katzenbach has been one of the most active politicians in advancing foreign aid, and any future coordination with legislative bodies will most likely go through him.

### 1.5. Discussion Questions

1. With the current development in Indochina, does the United States need to increase, decrease, or maintain its current military procurements, especially in terms of researching and testing new technologies? What will the reaction of American taxpayers be in response to such changes?
2. Should the United States pursue more involvement in global security or foreign assistance? Is a balance between these two sectors possible? If so, what measures need to be taken to ensure the potential continuity?
3. As elected officials of the U.S. Senate, what obligations do you owe to the members of your political party, the citizens of your state, and the greater American public? Will you be able to maintain general transparency, or will most of your political decisions have to be strictly confidential?
4. Should the United States consider convening more negotiations with the Soviet Union to de-escalate the security dilemma of the nuclear arms race?
5. How can the U.S. legislative government collaborate with foreign aid agencies and other international organizations to promote security, economic development, and democratic

values across the globe?

## 1.6. Key Terms

1. Military procurement: the management of a nation's investments in technologies, programs, and products support necessary to achieve its National Security Strategy and support its Armed Forces. The goal is to rapidly acquire quality products that fulfill user needs with improvements to mission capability at an equitable price.<sup>33</sup>
2. Containment Policy: Strategic foreign policy that checked the expansion policy of the Soviet Union. Its main objective is to stop communist regimes from forming all across the globe and to maintain dominance of liberal democratic regimes in the international community.<sup>34</sup>
3. Security Dilemma: A situation in which actions taken by a state to increase its own security cause reactions from other states, which in turn lead to a decrease rather than an increase in the original state's security.<sup>35</sup>
4. Viet Cong: Slang term for the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, which brought together communists and anti-communists to oppose the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem and to a further extent, U.S. "neo-colonialism" in Vietnam.<sup>36</sup>
5. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO): A collective defense treaty among independent member states with a promise for mutual defense in time of external attack. It was originally formed as a united effort between the United States and its western, liberal democratic allies as a political and military opposition to the Soviet Union and other communist satellite states.

---

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.military1.com/products/military-accessories/article/404325-what-is-military-procurement>

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/containment-foreign-policy>

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/security-dilemma>

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.pbs.org/battlefieldvietnam/history/>

## 2. Topic 2 - Addressing Civil Disorder in American Communities

### 2.1. Executive Summary

The stability and wellbeing of the United States lays on the Government's ability to solve everlasting social tensions which in recent years have grown over what was known. Civil disorder in American Communities has reached a boiling point featuring violence and hatred, with a divided society questioning itself and the political system that binds it together; hence turning it into a priority for the US Senate within its historical purview of consolidating a sense of national character and appeasing the passions creating such unrest.<sup>37</sup> For this to happen, the multiple dimensions of the issue and the political polarization within it must be understood.

### 2.2. Historical Background

Our country is not unfamiliar with civil disorder, as it has come in many forms and for many reasons throughout its history. During the first decades after the war of independence, they came in shape of rebellious factions over which the consensus that supports the state as we know it today claimed victory. Despite its stabilisation as a new state in the early 19th century, the foundations of the chosen political organisation were shaken further, provoking the start of the Civil War. The reasons that ignited this conflict prevail, but due to the unlikely scenario of setting back the clock to a system linked with slavery within the federal structure of the government, the issue in a political sphere remains vivid in very important issues which are, however, only relevant to local governments striving to maintain and expand faculties on certain

---

<sup>37</sup> James Madison, "No. 62-63: The Senate," in *The Federalist Papers*, ed. Charles R. Kesler (New York: Signet Classics, 2016).

matters. However, in the social sphere the conflict remains as delicate and widespread as ever. In other words, segregation may not attempt against the constitution anymore, as it did in the 1860s, but it does lay in the centre of civil unrest visible today. Therefore, it is safe to say one ideology has tansited from its factious mission in the state-building, to a contempeted viewpoint in the civil order.

Understanding the origin of civil unrest linked to African-Americans is only one part of the panorama, as further important clarifications have to be made. First, civil unrest has mostly been ethnocentric, but not exclusive to African-Americans. Immigrants from all over, but specially from Ireland and Mexico, as well as indigenous groups, have received violent and unfair treatment, creating a reaction in form of revolts and other forms of civil disorder. Second, social unrest can also originate from causes independent to race, such as socioeconomic and political reasons. Third, civil disorder and criminality have been often confused, as the line between freedom of expression and sociopolitical participation, on one hand, and law and order, on the other, seems to be for some thinner than expected, making it clear that current laws and protocols regarding social protest are not properly defined. Moreover, law and order is understood differently by distinct groups along the political spectre. Fourth, ensuring peace in American communities has historically been delegated to local authorities, thus turning it into a sensitive issue for the Federal government to intervene. As it is evident, the matter on civil disorder and each aspect inherent to it has a historical discussion worth reviewing in larger detail.

### 2.3. Current Situation

During the ongoing decade, the most distinguished civil unrest has surged from the fight of African-Americans against the profound racism which is both deeply rooted in American society and institutionalized on various levels of the political apparatus. This complex movement and its undying will for justice is placed in the core of the civil disorder witnessed by many in the country during recent years. However, other social movements, with a flag of their own, have carried out a fight against the *status quo*. Due to these reasons, the general situation of civil unrest in our country has to attend the emblematic fight against segregation but should also consider the existence of other pressing matters being pushed by alternative subcultures operating under different ethical, political and generational values.

### 2.3.1. Anti War Movement

War in the United States is the flagship for patriotic heroism and honour. Defending one's country is no personal matter, but rather a service from and to the whole nation; a duty that reassures the country's commitment to world peace, freedom and democracy. This vision has had the implicit consensus of society for generations, as if it were a mantra fixed in everyone's mentality. Furthermore, the triumphs against fascism and imperialism in the last century had turned it into an apparent perennial and mainstream mindset. Even so, an unconventional war, that has pulled many more young adults away to fight in the shadows of unknown territories in order to fight communism and the fear granted by the Domino Theory, seems to question this core belief. Since the Vietnam War started, war in general seems to have lost its unconditional approval.

The current administration appears to be unable to find an effective path to victory in south east Asia and, moreover, seems to be even more unable to appease the clashing emotions back at home. Events like the Tet Offensive indeed encourage conservatives to criticize Johnson's approach as weak, however, it has the same catalysing effect on the other side of the spectre, where a diverse group of grassroot movements pressure hard to put an anti-war movement on the agenda. From university students, to the older generations including hippies, lobbyists, academics and political operators have pronounced themselves for this anti-war movement. Now, as the general election approaches, similar feelings are starting to be shared within the political establishment. Eugene McCarthy's strong performance in the New Hampshire primary election for the Democratic Presidential nomination as an anti-war candidate show both the cause is worth challenging the incumbent and the movement's capacity of backing up a serious political campaign. Nevertheless, the political visibility did not come on its own. The activity on the streets has increased dramatically since the war began, giving way to intense protests in college campuses and in front of government buildings. Indeed the youth have the strongest feeling against war, due to the natural fear of the draw, nevertheless, the rejection has extended to other sectors of society who have been anything but timid to show their anti-war sentiments in public.

As war itself intensifies without a clear path to victory, the anti-war movement increases both its demands and its organizational capacity. Moreover, it is safe to say the group has an inflexible

stand on the issue, as they will hardly stop as long as the war continues. Therefore, authorities could be more unprepared than expected to appease civil unrest of an unusual nature given its demographic and ideological characteristics.

### 2.3.2. Other Social Movements

Activity in other spheres of american society has also increased among other minorities. These demographic groups have started mobilizing against unfavourable conditions and have managed to establish horizontal grassroots structures to do so. Among the most distinctive groups are the Chicano Movement and the Red Power Movement, which represent Mexican Americans and Native Americans respectively. Both have been more present in the public sphere, making it more likely for them to follow the same path of the African-American civil rights movement. If this is to occur, it becomes imperative to both understand their demands and to evaluate the measures implemented by law enforcers, for an intensification of their *modus operandi* would make the general situation of civil unrest even more overwhelming.

### 2.3.3. International Panorama

Even though this may be an exclusively internal issue, parallelisms can be drawn around the world in order to understand with a broader perspective the causes, consequences and possible solutions of a phenomenon of this nature.

Rejection to the Vietnam war has been seconded in the globe, adding up to an ever growing public opinion which rejects "outdated, rigid and authoritarian" ways of government.<sup>38</sup> It is evident there are strong social discrepancies in all societies, but this appears to be a generational phenomena without a defined and unique cause. The youth of the world appears to be in a irrevocable state of contradiction toward the current establishment, anticipating an unswift change of ideas and values to follow the upcoming and natural generational transition.

A concrete example took place in January, when protests in a french university were resolved by implementing the riot police This raises questions about how many more protests shall come, whether some around the world will follow and if authorities are ready to deal with these in a

---

<sup>38</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/jan/20/1968theyearofrevolt.features>

non-violent way. This all indicates the United States is not the only one experiencing a similar situation.

## 2.4. Bloc Positions

The scenario crafted right now, both for and by lawmakers regarding civil disorder, can be summarised by two bills that have already been approved by the House of Representatives and now await deliberation from the Senate. Nevertheless, in both cases the will of the members of this house and the legislative path the ought to follow are trapped in a stasis that pulls elected politicians away from committing to criminal justice reform on a broad level.

### 2.4.1. H.R. 2516: The Liberal Pivot

H.R. 2516, placed on the floor for discussion in January of this year, represents a continuation of the civil rights movement. As passed by the HR, this bill is “a minimal civil rights bill essentially focusing on protection of civil rights workers in the South and strengthening the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.”<sup>39</sup> Due to the imminent opposition from conservatives, amendments have been pushed forward by liberal Senators to include more sensitive and important issues for African-American communities. This approach does go along the lines of the recently published Kerner Report which regards white racism, lack of opportunities and social services for blacks and the development of two unequal and separate societies as the catalysers of most of today’s social disorder.<sup>40</sup>

Even though attending the roots of civil unrest within African-Americans is a viable solution, it will not happen without a tough political fight and it ignores, as stated before, that there are other dimensions in the matter. Furthermore, reducing violence should not be the primary goal of a civil rights agenda, as it has a moral and ideological value of its own. Therefore, it is evident liberal senators are choosing to pivot away from concrete measures on civil disorder to focus in a civil right agenda which is imperatively blocked by conservatives.

---

<sup>39</sup> Jonathan Zasloff, “The secret history if the fair housing,” in *Harvard Journal of Legislation* vol. 53 (2016), p. 260, [http://harvardjol.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/HLL112\\_crop.pdf](http://harvardjol.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/HLL112_crop.pdf)

<sup>40</sup> Justin Driver, *The Report on race that shook America*, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/05/the-report-on-race-that-shook-america/556850/>

### 2.4.2. H.R. 5037: The Conservative Pivot

On the other side of the political spectre, conservatives see the solution on social disorder as one of re-establishing law and order by strengthening law enforcement. This attempt should find a viable path within H.R. 5037, which promotes federal funding of local police. Even if having stronger police departments across the country sounds as a logically ethical decision, the concept of law and order for some conservatives, such as Governor Wallace from Alabama, also implies a vision of restoring traditional values, such as segregation. Without reforming criminal law, granting more power to law enforcers will inevitably lead into pursuing a violent suppression of social movements, which should raise questions not only on moral grounds, but also on whether this would be effective for reducing civil disorder. Thus, a natural opposition from liberals is to be expected regarding this approach, destining it to follow a moderate and probably unsuccessful solution.

In both cases, it is clear there is an ideological divide which centres exclusively on the issue of race. Each side, which includes members of both parties, has found and followed with discipline a pivoting strategy to the issue of civil disorder, bringing it back to a perennial discussion on segregation. This stasis blocks any further attempt on resolving this problem from neither a bipartisan effort nor a combined approach to stop the causes and effects of civil disorder.

## 2.5. Discussion Questions

1. Is there a possible middleground to the conflict between conservatives and liberals?
2. What is the most efficient way to approach social protests? Why do they seem to naturally evolve into civil disorder?
3. Are current criminal laws and law enforcers ready to cope with growing civil unrest?
4. What are procedural paths for either side to continue the legislative paralysis? What are those to circumvent it?

## 2.6. Key Terms

Law and order

- Basic definition: A situation in which the laws of a country are being obeyed, especially when the police or army are used to make certain of this.

#### Social movements:

- Networks of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations engaged in political or cultural conflicts, on the basis of shared collective identities (Matrio Diani).
- Collective challenges by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities (Sidney Tarrow).

#### Social protest

- A statement or action expressing disapproval of or objection to something.

## 2.7. References

- [http://depts.washington.edu/civilr/Chicanomovement\\_part1.htm](http://depts.washington.edu/civilr/Chicanomovement_part1.htm)
- <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/jan/20/1968theyearofrevolt.features>
- [http://www.d.umn.edu/~epeters5/MAPL5111/5111%20Articles/Tarrow%20--%20Power%20in%20Movement%20\(optimized\).pdf](http://www.d.umn.edu/~epeters5/MAPL5111/5111%20Articles/Tarrow%20--%20Power%20in%20Movement%20(optimized).pdf)