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REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, (D. MONTANA) AT THE LAST CHANCE PRESS CLUB, PLACER HOTEL, HELENA, MONTANA FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1968 AT 8:00 P. M.

THESE TROUBLED DAYS

I ask you to examine with me, today, the two faces of violence which confront the nation -- the ugly business in Vietnam and the ugly business in the nation's urban centers. These issues are back-to-back on the coin of contemporary crisis. No matter what our personal pursuits or our personal feelings, these issues involve us deeply.

It does not take a crystal ball to see that the outlook in either case is not very reassuring. The trends of the war in Vietnam continue to push us further into the bog of Southeast Asia. By the same token, the fever of social discontent and the terror of random and runaway crime are unabated in many of the nation's cities. As the chill of winter gives way to spring and summer, a recrudescence of the violence which is inherent in this situation is to be expected.

There is the prospect of more mob action and rioting in the pattern of mid-1967. If violence of that kind occurs again, it will be suppressed again. The protection of the right of the citizen
to be secure in his person is the first responsibility of government -- federal, state, or local. Let there be no doubt, therefore, that the use of force will unleash the counterforce of constituted authority.

Let there be no doubt either, however, as to the limitations of force in the kind of situation which plagued many cities of the nation last summer. The right of the citizen to be secure has never been and can never be adequately protected by police power alone. Rather, it is a right which is best protected in and by a community which is right for all its citizens.

The first responsibility of responsible government, therefore, is not the last. While it will be concerned with the immediate protection of people and their property, a responsible government will also be concerned with building the kind of communities in which all people can live in personal decency and harmonious dignity. It will be concerned with the adequacy and equity of the educational opportunities which are available to all young people. It will be concerned with the well-being of the unemployed, the poor, and the helpless. It will be concerned with the protection of the health of
the community. It will be concerned with playgrounds and parks and the wise guidance of young people when guidance is not otherwise available to them.

The responsibility for meeting these and other urgent needs of the cities obviously does not rest with the federal government alone. Every American, every private association of Americans, every state and every municipal government, shares the responsibility. Indeed, I wish that rather than the federal government, individuals, state and local governments, and other institutions of our society would take the great preponderance of the burden. Nevertheless, the interests of the entire nation demand that the responsibility be met somewhere. To the extent that it is not adequately met elsewhere, it is going to be met by the federal government.

The problem which confronts us in the nation's cities is the safety of the streets and it is larger than the safety of the streets. The problem is crime and it is larger than crime. The problem is control of mobs and riots and it is larger than mobs and riots. In the last analysis, the problem is nothing less than the transformation
of those great centers of population which have become places of increasing hostility to decent human habitation if not to human survival itself.

The problem is vast and it is urgent. It involves directly Americans who are gathering in increasing numbers in and around the urban centers of the nation. That is where most Americans are now domiciled. That is where most Americans now make their living. What is already the case today will be even more so tomorrow.

If the urban problem is complex in 1968, think of what it will be like a few years hence. The turn of the century is less than 33 years away and by the year 2000, it is expected that over 150 million persons will have been added to the nation's present population of 200 million. Where else but in and around the cities will this great increase be lodged? What does this imminent growth in numbers mean in terms of urban transportation, water supply, air supply, safe streets, public health, housing, recreation, or whatever?

It is readily apparent what it means. It means that there will be either a dynamic concentration of public leadership and great human and material resources on the difficulties of the urban
areas or there will be national disaster.

We all live in a State with great open spaces and a small population, and, hence, few of the immediate ills which plague the metropolitan centers. Yet, it would be short-sighted in the extreme to assume that any region in this country -- urban, suburban, or rural -- is immune to the catastrophe which threatens in metropolitan areas. We are one nation. We are all in it together. In the end, if the bell tolls, it will not toll for the cities alone, or the suburbs alone, or for New York, Chicago, Detroit, or San Francisco, alone. In the end, it will toll for all of us.

The pressing need is for a well-rounded national program which, when coupled with the initiatives and efforts of the cities and states and private associations, will be adequate to meet the explosive situation in the urban areas. A beginning has been made under the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations. In the last two Congresses a substantial legislative base has been laid. Like all beginnings, it has its flaws, inadequacies and excesses. Nevertheless, the beginning is significant.
Speaking in all frankness for the Senate, I want to say that Republicans as well as Democrats share in this achievement. Under the leadership of Senator Everett Dirksen, Republican Senators along with Democrats, have approached the problem with a minimum of partisanship and a deep sense of national responsibility. Not a few of the measures which have passed owe their enactment to the cooperative votes of Republican Senators.

I regret to say that, while we have made a beginning, the problem of the follow-through has been difficult. No matter how much we have tried to avoid it, the Vietnamese conflict has brought about a diversion of initiative, energy and public attention, not to speak of funds, from the pressing problems of the cities. The President has tried to deal with the conflicting demands on the nation's will and resources by practicing budgetary restraints and economies in spending and by pinpointing those federal programs which will have maximum impact on the urban problem at minimum cost. He has centered attention, for example, on a Model Cities Program which can improve the housing, jobs, education and health care of millions of the poor, at a cost of approximately $100 per person affected.
The President's "Safe Streets and Crime Control" proposal gives emphasis to the needs of local law enforcement and rehabilitation; its enactment will stimulate localities throughout the nation to strengthen and to improve police departments and to modernize their technologies. May I say that, in my judgment, it is high time that this effort is to be made. All too often, the police are inadequately equipped and supported by their communities. All too often, they are made the scapegoats for situations for which they have no responsibility. All too often, the stereotyped cry of "police brutality" goes up as a cloak for irresponsible hostility towards the police or simply because there is no one else handy to blame. All too often, the police must take great personal risks and perform onerous tasks without adequate training and under working conditions and at rates of pay which border on the disgraceful. A change in that state of affairs is an essential part of a change for the better in the environment of the cities and the President's proposal on safe streets and crime control is designed to help bring about the change.

What needs to be done in the nation's cities will not come cheap. The over-all program set forth by the President, and, recently by the Kerner-Lindsay Commission -- appointed by the
President -- is costly. So, too, however, is the cost of inertia, neglect, and indifference. What, for example, is the price of the burned out cities of the summer of 1967? What is the monetary value of the property which was damaged or destroyed? What of the lives, many innocent, which were forfeit? And what of the residue of racial suspicion, hostility, and hate which remains after the nightmares of Newark, Detroit, and a dozen other places?

Compare, too, the two or three billions especially earmarked for the urgent needs of America's cities with the cost of the war in Vietnam which now claims close to $30 billion a year out of the federal budget. That brings me to the other face of violence which confronts the nation -- to Vietnam. I wish that I could tell you that the problem of Vietnam was on the way to solution. The fact is, however, that the trend of the war is still upward, still expansive. It is true that until recently there had been a spate of rumors in recent weeks on the possibility of peace talks. It is to be hoped that they will still lead to some tangible result. I know that the President wishes, as do we all, that they might lead to tangible results. I would be less than frank, however, if I did not say that as yet, there are no clear indications of tangible results.
In the meantime, the conflict continues to edge upward, in the pattern of recent years. What was, less than three years ago, a war among Vietnamese, has grown into what is basically a war between the United States, in concert with allies, against Vietnamese.

As late as May 1965, there were only 45,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam. By the end of 1966, the number had risen to 400,000. It is around 510,000 today, and the total is scheduled to go to 525,000 by mid-1968. It will go beyond that figure. The figures given do not include the U.S. military establishment of many thousands in Thailand. Nor do they include the vast naval and air-support forces for Vietnam which are posted in bases throughout the Pacific, from Honolulu westward.

As the depth of our involvement has grown, so, too, has the extent of our casualties. In mid-1965, the South Vietnamese allies suffered eight combat deaths for every American killed in action. In 1966, the ratio had changed to two South Vietnamese killed in action for each American. Last year, American combat deaths were on a par with our South Vietnamese allies.
Over-all, the figure for U.S. dead now stands as of last week at more than 20,000, and the total of all U.S. casualties, including wounded, is more than 140,000. For all of the Korean War, the comparable figure was 136,893. That figure, moreover, was reached only after the conflict had pitted our forces not only against the North Koreans but also against great numbers of Chinese in Korea. In Vietnam, by contrast, not only have the Chinese not been directly engaged, even the regular North Vietnamese armies under General Giap have not been fully engaged, except for about one-seventh of its strength, against us in South Vietnam.

The cost of the war in dollars has come high. Early in 1966, with 235,000 American troops stationed in Vietnam, the generally estimated annual expenditure for military operation was $13 billion. Toward the end of 1967 with 400,000 American troops present, however, the annual rate of expenditures was calculated at $21 billion. Today, with more than 510,000 American combat personnel engaged, the monthly rate of expenditure could be about $2.5 billion.
The vast spending in Vietnam has raised the budget of the Defense Department to well over $70 billion, a figure which represents more than 60 per cent of all federal expenditures. The spending for the war not only lies at the root of the federal budgetary difficulties, it also has been a major inflationary force in the nation's economy and has had a most adverse effect on the nation's international financial position. The President's requests for curbs on foreign travel and investment, for example, would appear largely attributable to the war in Vietnam.

For the present, nevertheless, there is no alternative to the continuance of vast expenditures for military operations in Vietnam. As long as the policies of this nation require young Americans to risk their lives in that distant land, financial considerations will remain secondary. We can and we will do what must be done to meet the costs of those policies.

I have pointed out that the solution of the problem of American cities lies in a deepening public commitment. The solution of the problem of Vietnam may well involve, in my judgment, the avoidance of a deepening of an already great commitment. To end the violence, actual and incipient, in our cities,
we need to mobilize our resolve and our resources -- federal, state, local, and private -- as one nation and one people. By contrast, the first step in ending the violence in Vietnam may well be the exercise of great restraint to keep from getting more deeply involved, not only in Vietnam, but throughout Southeast Asia.

It is for that reason that I have joined Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, in urging that the use of aerial bombardment be pinpointed to the support of our forces in South Vietnam and to the entry points of the infiltration routes which lead from North Vietnam. That is not the kind of aerial and naval bombardment which heretofore has been carried on against North Vietnam. Heretofore the bombing has been extended throughout Vietnam to within five seconds of the Chinese borders and our planes have even been brought down inside Chinese territory. Nevertheless, the massive bombing campaign against North Vietnam has not accomplished either its military objective of stopping the infiltration or its political objectives of bringing North Vietnam to the conference table. It has been morally catastrophic and as it has spread and intensified, it has generated the risk of additional U.S. involvement.
I believe that the interests of the United States require that the war be restrained rather than enlarged. I am frank to say that I do not know how, when, or in what circumstance an honorable solution will be found to the conflict in Vietnam. I am persuaded, however, that it is not going to be found in more aerial bombardment. We have already dropped more than 100 pounds of explosives for every inhabitant of Vietnam, north and south. The total tonnage which has fallen to date on that primitive land is greater than that used by the United States in the European theatre throughout all of World War II and three times that in the entire Pacific theatre.

If an answer to Vietnam is not going to be found in the bombing of the North, I am persuaded, too, that it will not be found by extending the war even further afield, whether into Cambodia, Laos, or North Vietnam, not to speak of China. In short, I do not believe that the restoration of a rational peace in this tragic situation lies along the road of ever-widening war.

After a visit to Vietnam in 1965, with several Senate colleagues, we stated the view that the military problem which
confronted the nation was "not one of applying increased U.S. pressure to a defined military situation, but rather of pressing against a military situation which is, in effect, open ended."

Two years later, that is still the problem. The logical consequence of greater American involvement is still greater American involvement. At some point in this process, if it continues, the escalator may well go out of control. The war could then spread throughout the Asian mainland and push headlong towards a catastrophic world conflict.

Neither our national interests nor the interests of international peace and order are served by permitting ourselves to be drawn by the actions of others ever deeper into Southeast Asia. It ought to be for us -- not for others -- to decide how far we will go and when we will stop going further. In my judgment, if there is a first step out of the dilemma of Vietnam, it is not on the basis of further involvement. We need to limit our participation in this conflict to South Vietnam. We need to restore the emphasis of the struggle to what it was in the first place -- a conflict of Vietnamese with Vietnamese, to be resolved primarily by Vietnamese in accordance with the concepts of the Geneva agreements.
That is why negotiations must be sought by this nation. They must be sought not in deference to those who are hostile to us, but, in all good sense, in our own national interests and in the interests of the Vietnamese people, north and south, who have suffered, along with us, most cruelly. Finally, we owe a continuing effort for peace to the world because a conflict of this kind is not circumscribed and contains the seeds of world conflict.

It was for that reason, may I say, that I introduced a resolution in the Senate some months ago asking that a formal initiative be undertaken by our government in the United Nations Security Council in an effort to bring about negotiations either in that forum or at a Geneva Conference, or in any other appropriate setting. Eighty-two Senators voted for that resolution and none opposed it. I regret that circumstances have apparently not permitted the taking of the initiative which was urged by that resolution. I regret that, for whatever the reasons, many weeks have gone by and the U.N., in the sense of taking formal action under the Charter, continues as it has since the outset, to remain oblivious to the breakdown of peace in Vietnam.
In my judgment, it is long past due for nations to stand up and be counted on the question of peace in Vietnam. I see no reason why a confrontation of the United States, North Vietnam, the Soviet Union, China, and all others directly or indirectly involved in Vietnam, which will make clear to the world who is prepared to negotiate a solution to the Vietnamese problem and who is not, cannot initially occur in the United Nations Security Council. There is precedent for inviting non-members of the U.N. and even non-nations to meet for discussions before that body.

As it is, each day that goes by will see a further strain on the few restraints which remain in this barbarous war. On the basis of past experience, each day that goes by without a cease-fire is likely to see at least a score of Americans killed and over one hundred and twenty-five wounded, plus a like number of South Vietnamese soldiers, not to speak of the enemy casualties and the countless civilians caught in the cross-fires of war.

As at home in the crisis in our cities, we have an obligation to ourselves and to our children to face up to the situation. We have
an obligation to leave no stone unturned, no avenue unexplored,
no effort unmade in seeking a negotiated end to this long night of
violence in which we find ourselves, ten thousand miles from home.