

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

4-1-1968

### Congressional Record - National Shoe Fair - New York - S. 3669-73

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record - National Shoe Fair - New York - S. 3669-73" (1968). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 709.  
[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/709](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/709)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D. MONTANA)

at the

NATIONAL SHOE FAIRS OF AMERICA

AMERICANA HOTEL, NEW YORK

Monday, April 1, 1968

8:00 a.m.



THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION NOT TO  
SEEK REELECTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

I shall not seek and will not accept the nomination of my party for another term as your President.

Thus spoke the President of the United States last evening, in a most historic address to the American people and to the world. I have been interested in the reaction to that speech, and am somewhat disturbed at the different interpretations given, especially by those who seem to raise questions, once again, about the credibility of the President, and who put their own interpretation on what he has to say.

I am quite certain that the President was honest, candid, and forthright, and that he meant what he said. I am quite certain that he searched his own soul before he made that historic declaration. I believe every word he said, and I think the Members of the Senate, unanimously, do as well.

There has been some talk by a candidate of the other party which seems to indicate that he considers this "the year of the dropout." I do not like that term, because I think it denigrates the position taken by the President of the United States last night. The President laid before the people once again the fact that he stood by the San Antonio formula, as refined, and I think I can state without fear of opposition that at no time has he dropped his efforts to bring about, if possible, a way to the negotiating table. Something on the order of 30 public attempts have been made, and in excess of 100 unpublicized attempts have been made.

I approve thoroughly the call issued by the President to both the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union that the Geneva Conference be once again brought into existence. I disagree completely and emphatically with the statement in Moscow this morning which calls this speech by the President a "maneuver."

I do not know what those people have to know to be aware of what the truth is when it is uttered. The Russians are very good at talking peace. They are very good at talking about stopping the bombing as a prelude to peace. But when the time comes to put action where their words are, they can always find an excuse.

Who has been holding up the reconvening of the Geneva Conference for 3 years? The Soviet Union.

Who has been preaching peace for the past 3½ years? The Soviet Union.

Who has said that if the bombing is stopped, there is a good possibility that negotiations will get underway? The Soviet Union, from the lips of her leaders.

Who has been blocking the U.N. resolution, passed by this body unanimously, in the Security Council? The Soviet Union.

What do they mean? Do words have no significance for them? Are they the only ones who speak the truth? Are they interested in peace in Southeast Asia and throughout the world, or are they not?

To repeat, I think it is about time that they put their actions where their words are, and I think that time is long overdue.

I am also in full accord with the statement made by the President that he had ordered, as of 9 o'clock last night, a stop to the bombing of North Vietnam except for that area above the DMZ. And even there I am in accord with him, although I would like eventually to see all bombing stopped as far as the north is concerned—negotiations or no negotiations.

And I am in accord with him on that because of the fact that we have men concentrated in Khesanh, Conthien, Camp Carroll, and other areas along the DMZ. Those men are entitled to all the protection, air and otherwise, that they can get, because those men are there, not because they made the policy, but because under the Constitution they are obligated to carry out the policy laid down in Washington.

I pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who I know has been in the forefront in seeking to bring about a consolidation and concentration of the war to South Vietnam and a cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, always with the proviso that as far as American soldiers, Marines, and others along the DMZ are concerned they should be given full aerial protection.

The President also said last night that the increase in U.S. forces will not be the 206,000 which has been mentioned from time to time, but on the order of 13,000, and those only in the form of support troops to take care of the elements of the 82d Airborne Division and the Marines sent from the west coast several weeks ago as a result of the Tet offensive. That is understandable. That very likely is necessary. And even that increment will keep the overall figure under the 525,000 limitation set for mid-1968.

The President also emphasized, this time more strongly than ever—and I approve completely—that the South Vietnamese should become more active in this war and assume more of the primary responsibility, and also that they should start talking with other South Vietnamese. And, to my way of thinking, that means the Vietcong, because I do not care what one says or how one looks at it, this is basically a civil war and most of the opponents of the allied forces in South Vietnam are South Vietnamese. So, we cannot gloss over that fact, because that is just what it is—a fact. And if there is to be a solution of South Vietnam, then I think it is high time that Saigon which, at the present time, is run by two North Vietnamese—President Thieu and Vice President Ky—get together with the NLF, the political arm of the Vietcong, and that the South Vietnamese themselves not only increase their strength from Saigon with which to carry on the fighting, which is their responsibility, as the President indicated, but also seek to achieve a diplomatic settlement among the South Vietnamese themselves.

In that respect, I express the hope that the present Saigon government will seek to broaden the areas of its responsibility, and its personnel; and to that extent, I also hope that it would



include a coalition composed of the Cao Dai, the Hoa Hao, the Montagnards, the Buddhists, the Catholics, and all other groups, so that that additional strength and assistance will be added to its government as well.

Mr. President, I thoroughly approve also, in addition to the warning given to South Vietnam—a warning long overdue—to get together with all South Vietnamese, of the statement made by the President of the United States that on the basis of the Geneva Conference, we were prepared to withdraw as the North Vietnamese withdrew. However, may I say also that the President said at Manila that we would withdraw our forces from South Vietnam 6 months after peace was achieved.

We have no desire to hold bases that we built at Danang, Cam Ranh Bay, or elsewhere. South Vietnam, in my opinion, is not vital to the security of the United States. And I would hope and expect, and I know, that the words uttered by the President at Manila after that conference would still hold true and that if peace is achieved, we will do our best to get out of that area lock, stock, and barrel at the earliest opportunity.

I believe the President, in his speech, followed that old precept which he gave to us so often while he was the majority leader of the Senate—the precept from Isaiah in the Bible “Come now and let us reason together.”

Yes, he has reasoned with his advisers, with himself, and he has reasoned with some Members of the Senate, both those who were for his policy in Vietnam and those who were against it. And he has done it on many occasions which were unpublicized. He has paid heed to what some of us had to say, and he has done his best in line with his responsibility to find a way to the negotiating table.

I express the hope that the principle uttered by the President on yesterday would not only be heard by Brezhnev and Kosygin, so that they would lend their efforts and their leadership to bring about a reconvening of the Geneva Conference—because, after all, the U.S.S.R. is one of the two cochairmen—but that Ho Chi Minh will read the speech and take it at face value.

I would hope that all of them and all of us would understand that the President indeed made a great sacrifice on yesterday when he announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

I hope there will be no question raised in this country about the credibility of Lyndon B. Johnson in this or any other respect. Oh, I know of the rumors and speculations that have gone around. But I wonder how many people took the time and the effort to really find out just how vague and misleading this supposed credibility gap was. To the best of my knowledge, the President at no time has ever knowingly misstated the truth to the American people. It is true that he has said something on one day, and perhaps something quite different occurred a week later. But on the basis of the facts which the President had at his disposal at the time he made that statement, or

those statements, he was telling the American people the truth.

So, I hope, Mr. President, that we recognize that not only has the President searched his soul, but that a lot of us have also searched our souls, and so have the American people.

It is my belief that because of what occurred last night, there will be better understanding and greater tolerance on the part of all of us.

I hope the personal attacks, the placards that carry scurrilous sayings, the invidious comparisons, and the lack of dignity would be done away with; and I would hope that, regardless of the feelings of any of us insofar as Vietnam or any other matter is concerned, we would treat the one who happens to occupy the office of the Presidency with the dignity, the courtesy, and the respect which is his due.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a transcript of the President's address on the Vietnam war and his political plans, which appeared in the New York Times of April 1, 1968.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE VIETNAM WAR AND HIS POLITICAL PLANS

Good evening, my fellow Americans. Tonight I want to speak to you of peace in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

No other question so preoccupies our people. No other dream so absorbs the 250 million human beings who live in that part of the world. No other goal motivates American policy in Southeast Asia.

For years, representatives of our Government and others have traveled the world seeking to find a basis for peace talks.

Since last September they have carried the offer that I made public at San Antonio. And that offer was this:

That the United States would stop its bombardment of North Vietnam when that would lead promptly to productive discussions—and that we would assume that North Vietnam would not take military advantage of our restraint.

Hanoi denounced this offer, both privately and publicly. Even while the search for peace was going on, North Vietnam rushed their preparations for a savage assault on the people, the Government and the allies of South Vietnam.

Their attack—during the Tet holidays—failed to achieve its principal objectives.

It did not collapse the elected Government of South Vietnam or shatter its army—as the Communists had hoped. It did not produce a “general uprising” among the peoples of the cities, as they had predicted.

The Communists were unable to maintain control of any of the more than 30 cities that they attacked, and they took very heavy casualties.

But they did compel the South Vietnamese and their allies to move certain forces from the countryside into the cities.

They caused widespread disruption and suffering. Their attacks, and the battles that followed, made refugees of half a million human beings.

NEW ASSAULT FORESEEN

The Communists may renew their attack any day. They are, it appears, trying to make 1968 the year of decision in South Vietnam—the year that brings, if not final victory or defeat, at least a turning point in the struggle.

This much is clear: If they do mount an-

other round of heavy attacks, they will not succeed in destroying the fighting power of South Vietnam and its allies.

But tragically, this is also clear: Many men—on both sides of the struggle—will be lost. A nation that has already suffered 20 years of warfare will suffer once again. Armies on both sides will take new casualties. And the war will go on.

There is no need for this to be so. There is no need to delay the talks that could bring an end to this long and this bloody war.

Tonight, I renew the offer I made last August: to stop the bombardment of North Vietnam. We ask that talks begin promptly, that they be serious talks on the substance of peace. We assume that during those talks Hanoi will not take advantage of our restraint.

We are prepared to move immediately toward peace through negotiations. So tonight, in the hope that this action will lead to early talks, I am taking the first step to de-escalate the conflict. We are reducing—substantially reducing—the present level of hostilities, and we are doing so unilaterally and at once.

Tonight I have ordered our aircraft and our naval vessels to make no attacks on North Vietnam except in the area north of the demilitarized zone where the continuing enemy build-up directly threatens allied forward positions and where the movement of their troops and supplies are clearly related to that threat.

The area in which we are stopping our attacks includes almost 90 per cent of North Vietnam's population, and most of its territory. Thus there will be no attacks around the principal populated areas, or in the food-producing areas of North Vietnam.

FULL HALT POSSIBLE LATER

Even this very limited bombing of the North could come to an early end—if our restraint is matched by restraint in Hanoi. But I cannot in good conscience stop all bombing so long as to do so would immediately and directly endanger the lives of our men and our allies. Whether a complete bombing halt becomes possible in the future will be determined by events.

Our purpose in this action is to bring about a reduction in the level of violence that now exists. It is to save the lives of brave men—and to save the lives of innocent women and children. It is to permit the contending forces to move closer to a political settlement.

And tonight I call upon the United Kingdom and I call upon the Soviet Union—as co-chairmen of the Geneva conferences and as permanent members of the United Nations Security Council—to do all they can to move from the unilateral act of de-escalation that I have just announced toward genuine peace in Southeast Asia.

Now, as in the past, the United States is ready to send its representatives to any forum, at any time, to discuss the means of bringing this ugly war to an end.

I am designating one of our most distinguished Americans, Ambassador Averell Harriman, as my personal representative for such talks. In addition, I have asked Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson, who returned from Moscow for consultation, to be available to join Ambassador Harriman at Geneva or any other suitable place—just as soon as Hanoi agrees to a conference.

I call upon President Ho Chi Minh to respond positively, and favorably, to this new step toward peace.

But if peace does not come now through negotiations, it will come when Hanoi understands that our common resolve is unshakable, and our common strength is invincible.

Tonight, we and the other allied nations are contributing 600,000 fighting men to assist 700,000 South Vietnamese troops in defending their little country.



Our presence there has always rested on this basic belief: The main burden of preserving their freedom must be carried out by them—by the South Vietnamese themselves.

We and our allies can only help to provide a shield behind which the people of South Vietnam can survive and can grow and develop. On their efforts—on their determinations and resourcefulness—the outcome will ultimately depend.

That small, beleaguered nation has suffered terrible punishment for more than 20 years. I pay tribute once again tonight to the great courage and the endurance of its people. South Vietnam supports armed forces tonight of almost 700,000 men, and I call your attention to the fact that that is the equivalent of more than 10 million in our own population. Its people maintain their firm determination to be free of domination by the North.

There has been substantial progress, I think, in building a durable government during these last three years. The South Vietnam of 1965 could not have survived the enemy's Tet offensive of 1968. The elected Government of South Vietnam survived that attack—and is rapidly repairing the devastation that it wrought.

#### FURTHER TASKS FOR SAIGON

The South Vietnamese know that further efforts are going to be required to expand their own armed forces; to move back into the countryside as quickly as possible; to increase their taxes; to select the very best men they have for civil and military responsibility; to achieve a new unity within their constitutional government, and to include in the national effort all those groups who wish to preserve South Vietnam's control over its own destiny.

Last week President Thieu ordered the mobilization of 135,000 additional South Vietnamese. He plans to reach as soon as possible a total military strength of more than 800,000 men.

To achieve this, the Government of South Vietnam started the drafting of 19-year-olds on March 1. On May 1, the Government will begin the drafting of 18-year-olds.

Last month, 10,000 men volunteered for military service. That was two and a half times the number of volunteers during the same month last year. Since the middle of January, more than 48,000 South Vietnamese have joined the armed forces, and nearly half of them volunteered to do so.

All men in the South Vietnamese armed forces have had their tours of duty extended for the duration of the war, and reserves are now being called up for immediate active duty.

President Thieu told his people last week, and I quote:

"We must make greater efforts, we must accept more sacrifices, because as I have said many times, this is our country. The existence of our nation is at stake, and this is mainly a Vietnamese responsibility."

He warned his people that a major national effort is required to root out corruption and incompetence at all levels of government.

We applaud this evidence of determination on the part of South Vietnam. Our first priority will be to support their effort.

We shall accelerate the re-equipment of South Vietnam's armed forces in order to meet the enemy's increased firepower. And this will enable them progressively to undertake a large share of combat operations against the Communist invaders.

#### BUILDUP IN U.S. FORCES

On many occasions I have told the American people that we would send to Vietnam those forces that are required to accomplish our mission there. So with that as our guide we have previously authorized a force level of approximately 525,000.

Some weeks ago to help meet the enemy's new offensive we sent to Vietnam about 11,000 additional Marine and airborne troops.

They were deployed by air in 48 hours on an emergency basis. But the artillery and the tank and the aircraft and medical and other units that were needed to work with and support these infantry troops in combat could not then accompany them by air on that short notice.

In order that these forces may reach maximum combat effectiveness, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended to me that we should prepare to send during the next five months the support troops totaling approximately 13,500 men.

A portion of these men will be made available from our active forces. The balance will come from reserve component units, which will be called up for service.

The actions that we have taken since the beginning of the year to re-equip the South Vietnamese forces; to meet our responsibilities in Korea, as well as our responsibilities in Vietnam; to meet price increases and the cost of activating and deploying these reserve forces; to replace helicopters and provide the other military supplies we need, all of these actions are going to require additional expenditures.

The tentative estimate of those additional expenditures is \$2.5-billion in this fiscal year and \$2.6-billion in the next fiscal year.

These projected increases in expenditures for our national security will bring into sharper focus the nation's need for immediate action, action to protect the prosperity of the American people and to protect the strength and the stability of our American dollar.

On many occasions I have pointed out that without a tax bill or decreased expenditures, next year's deficit would again be around \$20-billion. I have emphasized the need to set strict priorities in our spending. I have stressed that failure to act—and to act promptly and decisively—would raise very strong doubts throughout the world about America's willingness to keep its financial house in order.

Yet Congress has not acted. And tonight we face the sharpest financial threat in the postwar era—a threat to the dollar's role as the keystone of international trade and finance in the world.

Last week, at the monetary conference in Stockholm, the major industrial countries decided to take a big step toward creating a new international monetary asset that will strengthen the international monetary system.

And I'm very proud of the very able work done by Secretary Fowler and Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board.

But to make this system work, the United States just must bring its balance of payments to—or very close to—equilibrium. We must have a responsible fiscal policy in this country.

#### TAX BILL IS URGENT

The passage of a tax bill now, together with expenditure control that the Congress may desire and dictate, is absolutely necessary to protect this nation's security and to continue our prosperity, and to meet the needs of our people.

Now, what is at stake is seven years of unparalleled prosperity. In those seven years, the real income of the average American, after taxes, rose by almost 30 per cent—a gain as large as that of the entire preceding 19 years.

So the steps that we must take to convince the world are exactly the steps that we must take to sustain our own economic strength here at home. In the past eight months, prices and interest rates have risen because of our inaction.

We must therefore now do everything we can to move from debate to action, from talking to voting, and there is, I believe—I hope there is—in both Houses of the Congress a growing sense of urgency that this situation just must be acted upon and must be corrected.

My budget in January, we thought, was a tight one. It fully reflected our evaluation of most of the demanding needs of this nation.

But in these budgetary matters, the President does not decide alone. The Congress has the power, and the duty, to determine appropriations and taxes.

The Congress is now considering our proposals, and they are considering reductions in the budget that we submitted.

As part of a program of fiscal restraint that includes the tax surcharge, I shall approve appropriate reductions in the January budget when and if Congress so decides that that should be done.

One thing is unmistakably clear, however. Our deficit just must be reduced. Failure to act could bring on conditions that would strike hardest at those people that all of us are trying so hard to help.

#### A PLEA TO CONGRESS

So these times call for prudence in this land of plenty. And I believe that we have the character to provide it, and tonight I plead with the Congress and with the people to act promptly to serve the national interest and thereby serve all of our people.

Now let me give you my estimate of the chances for peace—the peace that will one day stop the bloodshed in South Vietnam. That will—all the Vietnamese people will be permitted to rebuild and develop their land. That will permit us to turn more fully to our own tasks here at home.

I cannot promise that the initiative that I have announced tonight will be completely successful in achieving peace any more than the 30 others that we have undertaken and agreed to in recent years.

But it is our fervent hope that North Vietnam, after years of fighting that has left the issue unresolved, will now cease its efforts to achieve a military victory and will join with us in moving toward the peace table.

And there may come a time when South Vietnamese—on both sides—are able to work out a way to settle their own differences by free political choice rather than by war.

As Hanoi considers its course, it should be in no doubt of our intentions. It must not miscalculate the pressures within our democracy in this election year. We have no intention of widening this war. But the United States will never accept a fake solution to this long and arduous struggle and call it peace.

No one can foretell the precise terms of an eventual settlement.

Our objective in South Vietnam has never been the annihilation of the enemy. It has been to bring about a recognition in Hanoi that its objective—taking over the South by force—could not be achieved.

We think that peace can be based on the Geneva accords of 1954, under political conditions that permit the South Vietnamese—all the South Vietnamese—to chart their course free of any outside domination or interferences, from us or from anyone else.

#### MANILA PLEDGE REAFFIRMED

So tonight I reaffirm the pledge that we made at Manila: that we are prepared to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as the other side withdraws its forces to the North, stops the infiltration, and the level of violence thus subsides.

Our goal of peace and self-determination in Vietnam is directly related to the future of all of Southeast Asia, where much has happened to inspire confidence during the past 10 years. And we have done all that we knew how to do to contribute and to help build that confidence.

A number of nations have shown what can be accomplished under conditions of security. Since 1966, Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in all the world, with a population of more than 100 million people, has had a government that's dedicated to peace with its neighbors and improved conditions for its own people.



Political and economic cooperation between nations has grown rapidly.

And I think every American can take a great deal of pride in the role that we have played in bringing this about in Southeast Asia. We can rightly judge—as responsible Southeast Asians themselves do—that the progress of the past three years would have been far less likely, if not completely impossible, if America's sons and others had not made their stand in Vietnam.

At John Hopkins University about three years ago, I announced that the United States would take part in the great work of developing Southeast Asia, including the Mekong valley, for all the people of that region. Our determination to help build a better land—a better land for men on both sides of the present conflict—has not diminished in the least. Indeed, the ravages of war, I think, have made it more urgent than ever.

So I repeat on behalf of the United States again tonight what I said at Johns Hopkins—that North Vietnam could take its place in this common effort just as soon as peace comes.

Over time, a wider framework of peace and security in Southeast Asia may become possible. The new cooperation of the nations of the area could be a foundation stone. Certainly friendship with the nations of such a Southeast Asia is what the United States seeks—and that is all that the United States seeks.

One day, my fellow citizens, there will be peace in Southeast Asia: It will come because the people of Southeast Asia want it—those whose armies are at war tonight; those who, though threatened, have thus far been spared.

Peace will come because Asians were willing to work for it and to sacrifice for it—and to die by the thousands for it.

But let it never be forgotten: peace will come also because America sent her sons to help secure it.

It has not been easy—far from it. During the past four and a half years, it has been my fate and my responsibility to be Commander in Chief. I have lived daily and nightly with the cost of this war. I know the pain that it has inflicted. I know perhaps better than anyone the misgivings it has aroused.

#### VITAL TO EVERY AMERICAN

And throughout this entire long period I have been sustained by a single principle: that what we are doing now in Vietnam is vital not only to the security of Southeast Asia but it is vital to the security of every American.

Surely, we have treaties which we must respect. Surely, we have commitments that we are going to keep. Resolutions of the Congress testify to the need to resist aggression in the world and in Southeast Asia.

But the heart of our involvement in South Vietnam under three different Presidents, three separate Administrations, has always been America's own security.

And the larger purpose of our involvement has always been to help the nations of Southeast Asia become independent, and stand alone self-sustaining as members of a great world community, at peace with themselves, at peace with all others. And with such a nation our country—and the world—will be far more secure than it is tonight.

I believe that a peaceful Asia is far nearer to reality because of what America has done in Vietnam. I believe that the men who endure the dangers of battle there, fighting there for us tonight, are helping the entire world avoid far greater conflicts, far wider wars, far more destruction, than this one.

The peace that will bring them home someday will come. Tonight, I have offered the first in what I hope will be a series of mutual moves toward peace.

I pray that it will not be rejected by the leaders of North Vietnam. I pray that they

will accept it as a means by which the sacrifices of their own people may be ended. And I ask your help and your support, my fellow citizens, for this effort to reach across the battlefield toward an early peace.

Yet, I believe that we must always be mindful of this one thing—whatever the trials and the tests ahead, the ultimate strength of our country and our cause will lie, not in powerful weapons or infinite resources or boundless wealth, but will lie in the unity of our people.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let me say this:

Of those to whom much is given much is asked. I cannot say—and no man could say—that no more will be asked of us. Yet I believe that now, no less than when the decade began, this generation of Americans is willing to pay the price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival, and the success, of liberty.

Since those words were spoken by John F. Kennedy, the people of America have kept that compact with mankind's noblest cause. And we shall continue to keep it.

#### ORDER OF LOYALTIES LISTED

This I believe very deeply. Throughout my entire public career I have followed the personal philosophy that I am a free man, an American, a public servant and a member of my party—in that order—always and only.

For 37 years in the service of our nation, first as a Congressman, as a Senator and as Vice President, and now as your President, I have put the unity of the people first, I have put it ahead of any divisive partisanship. And in these times, as in times before, it is true that a house divided against itself by the spirit of faction, of party, of region, of religion, of race, is a house that cannot stand.

There is division in the American house now. There is divisiveness among us all tonight. And holding the trust that is mine, as President of all the people, I cannot disregard the peril of the progress of the American people and the hope and the prospect of peace for all peoples, so I would ask all Americans whatever their personal interest or concern to guard against divisiveness and all of its ugly consequences.

Fifty-two months and ten days ago, in a moment of tragedy and trauma, the duties of this office fell upon me.

I asked then for your help, and God's, that we might continue America on its course binding up our wounds, healing our history, moving forward in new unity to clear the American agenda and to keep the American commitment for all of our people.

United we have kept that commitment. And united we have enlarged that commitment. And through all time to come I think America will be a stronger nation, a more just society, a land of greater opportunity and fulfillment because of what we have all done together in these years of unparalleled achievement.

#### LIFE OF FREEDOM

Our reward will come in the life of freedom and peace and hope that our children will enjoy through ages ahead.

What we won when all of our people united just must not now be lost in suspicion and distrust and selfishness and politics among any of our people, and believing this as I do I have concluded that I should not permit the Presidency to become involved in the partisan divisions that are developing in this political year.

With American sons in the fields far away, with America's future under challenge right here at home, with our hopes and the world's hopes for peace in the balance every day, I do not believe that I should devote an hour or a day of my time to any personal partisan causes or to any duties other than the awe-

some duties of this office—the Presidency of your country.

Accordingly, I shall not seek, and I will not accept, the nomination of my party for another term as your President. But let men everywhere know, however, that a strong and a confident and a vigilant America stands ready tonight to seek an honorable peace; and stands ready tonight to defend an honored cause, whatever the price, whatever the burden, whatever the sacrifice that duty may require.

Thank you for listening. Good night and God bless all of you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the Johnson administration our Nation has moved to correct social injustice, resist aggression abroad, and build a better America and a better world on a scale unprecedented in our history.

It has been the lot of the President to bear the criticism and even the personal abuse that befalls one who must take the responsibility for far-reaching and difficult decisions.

The remaining months of the Johnson administration will span a critical and dangerous period in our history. The President must have had great concern that whatever moves he must make during this period would be subject to partisan and political question and discord if he were a candidate. By denying himself renomination and reelection, the President has taken the most convincing step possible to prove that he is guided by no motive other than what is best for our country.

President Johnson has acted in the finest spirit of service and devotion to the duties of the President. He has acted as a great President, with sincerity and with determination, to achieve world peace, protect the vital interests of the United States, and secure domestic tranquillity. In these efforts he must have the support of all Americans.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like to respond to both our majority leader and the able Senator from Washington, on the other side of the aisle, in indicating that it is my deep and sincere feeling that the President's decision, which we all know was an exceedingly difficult decision for a man who has served his country for so long, was a wise decision, a realistic decision, and a generous decision, one that was based solely on his belief as to what was best for the United States of America.

I also believe that this decision will enable those factions which have been working to divide America to begin now the momentous job of uniting this country once again.

I was gratified by the President's initiative in reducing the bombing, and I hope it will move us toward a negotiated settlement of the war.

I also believe very deeply that the Republican Party, as it deliberates now on the policy it should take toward the war, in its platform—and I hope in the voice of its candidate to be nominated in Miami—will not offer this Nation the fruitless task of trying to find a military solution to what is essentially a political, economic, and social problem in Southeast Asia. I cannot imagine our nominating a candidate who would offer the endless road of trying to find some sort of elusive military victory or military solution to the problem.



I believe that today, with the President's clear-cut decision—which I accept in the seriousness and the earnestness with which he made it last night before the Nation—rather than dwelling on the failures of the past, we all have an opportunity and a responsibility to devise constructive solutions to the problems of the late sixties and the early seventies.

I reiterate a suggestion I made on the floor of the Senate last month, that if in our present crisis Congress is unable to move forward with dispatch, it might serve the national interest if the President would appear before a joint session of Congress to once again, in specific terms, show the willingness of this administration to reduce expenses, the willingness of this administration to recognize that the situation in Europe can be drastically altered by bringing back many of our European forces, and to show that we can reduce our balance-of-payments problem by a sacrifice on the part of the Government in certain programs that it has undertaken.

I hope Congress will move forward now with great dispatch to find a way to give us fair housing legislation in this country. I hope the Senate will move forward with the greatest possible dispatch to reduce expenses and to bring forth the tax increase that we know is necessary to restore fiscal sanity to our fiscal and monetary policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Illinois has raised that question; because, there again, the President laid it on the line last night, and he asked Congress to do something about reducing expenditures, reducing his budget, and granting a 10-percent surcharge tax. It is up to us now, because, as he indicated indirectly, all he can do is propose. It is up to us to dispose. I hope we do it and take heed of his warning.

Mr. PERCY. I trust, also, that the majority leader would agree that this certainly is not the time to start putting extraneous matters on his bill, to start loading it up at the time when we are trying to move ahead with a national policy, to have this bill the instrument for moving the foreign economic policy of this country back 30 years, by seeking to limit the importation of goods and merchandise flowing into this country, which will set us back through retaliation abroad.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree completely with the Senator, and I would hope that those matters could be considered on their own merits.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the action of President Lyndon Johnson in taking himself out of consideration for reelection was an act of selfless devotion to duty. The President has clearly placed his own personal interests in a position of secondary importance to the best interests of his

country. I deeply regret that he will not be a candidate for reelection, but I salute him for his courage and for his patriotism.

Lyndon Johnson in my opinion, could have had the Democratic nomination for a second full term as President, if he had sought it. He has not bowed out for any fear that the prize might not be his. He has removed himself so that he may be free to use every means at his command, with any thought of self-interest put aside, to attain the objectives America has sought in this conflict and to bring an early and honorable peace, if that is possible.

I honor him for the decision he has made, and I hope his fellow Americans will recognize that in his announcement there is the stamp of greatness. It has been clear, from the moment he assumed the burdens of the Presidency in those dark days in November 1963, that Lyndon Johnson is a man in whom love of country is deeply ingrained. In a time when so many others seem to think patriotism passé Lyndon Johnson has never hesitated to articulate his faith in America and his deep devotion to his country and to his country's responsibilities wherever they might lie.

The course he has chosen now in Vietnam—the cessation of bombing in most of the country—should resolve once and for all the question of whether or not there can be genuine hope for any meaningful negotiation with the Communists. The President has offered Hanoi an honorable way to bring an end to the hostilities, while serving notice at the same time through the troop increase that the United States is acting from strength and not from weakness. The President is wavering neither in his search for peace nor in his resolve to honor America's commitments to stop Communist aggression and to help preserve freedom in the world wherever there is a desire for it.

President Johnson has pointed out to our people time and again that the United States is in Vietnam because three Presidents and three administrations have believed that our presence there is fundamental both for the preservation of freedom in Southeast Asia and for the protection of the vital national interests of the United States. While some have denounced this course and his perseverance in it, he has unswervingly held to what he believes to be the right course. By his willingness to step out of the presidency, he has done all that any man could do for a cause that he believes is in the best interests of America.

I hope that other nations will now redouble their efforts to bring peace to the world, and especially do I hope that the message of the President will be instrumental in exerting the Soviet Union to match his dedication to peace and thus hasten the day when Hanoi will move to the negotiating table.

Lyndon Johnson, I believe, will be counted among America's great Presidents. There is no doubt about his achievements on the domestic front. I have not always agreed with all of his proposals, but there can be no question about the forward-looking nature of

many of the programs he has proposed and has seen enacted.

It is my opinion that he may be equally well known in years to come for the far-sightedness and the soundness of his approach to the complex world problems that involve the Nation. To the solution of these problems he has now fully addressed himself in his final months in office.

From the moment I entered the U.S. Senate, Lyndon Johnson has been my friend, a fact in which I take great pride. I am honored to have served with him in its Chamber, and I am proud as I look back now that I supported him for the Presidency before the convention of 1960. When there have been differences between us they have usually been differences over methods and seldom disagreements over objectives or goals.

The unity of the American people now is of the utmost importance in the face of the external threat which Communist aggression poses for the whole free world. A nation divided as America has recently been divided by the more radical and reckless war dissenters cannot hope to prevail in its national purposes. Those who would divide and fragment America for their own ends have shaken our people's belief in our Nation's purposes and their faith in themselves, and they have tarnished the image of the United States. The President himself has been the target of much of this abuse.

Lyndon Johnson, recognizes that America's strength can come only from unity, and that the divisiveness that has been eating away at the national fabric can have only ruinous results. He has put this need for unity above everything else, even his own career. History, I believe, will accord him a high place indeed for his resolute determination to take all personal political considerations out of the conduct of the war and the efforts to bring peace.

I regard Lyndon Johnson as a great American. I hope that his desire for world peace will be realized.



REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D. MONTANA)

at the

NATIONAL SHOE FAIRS OF AMERICA

AMERICANA HOTEL, NEW YORK

Monday, April 1, 1968

8:00 a. m.

TWO FACES OF CRISIS

*file of  
do not remove  
not used*

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, these issues involve us deeply.

It does not take a crystal ball to see that, as we advance into this year, the outlook in either case is not very reassuring. The trends of the war in Vietnam continue to push us further into the morass 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 lawlessness 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.

I happen to come from 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 pinpointing those federal programs which will have maximum impact on the urban problem at minimum cost.

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 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 around \$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 there has been a spate of rumors in recent weeks on the possibility of peace talks. It is to be hoped that they will lead to some tangible result. I know that the President wishes 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. That figure will be exceeded. These figures 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, and this year, to date, ahead of our allies.

Over-all, the figure for U.S. dead now stands at more than 20,000 and the total of all U.S. casualties, including wounded is over 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 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 operations was \$13 billion. Towards the end of 1967 with upwards of 450,000 American troops present, however, the annual rate of expenditures was calculated at \$21 billion. Today, with 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 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 to the 17th parallel and the entry points of the infiltration routes which lead from North Vietnam. That is not the kind of aerial and



and naval bombardment which heretofore has been carried on against North Vietnam. Heretofore the bombing has been extended throughout Vietnam to within five seconds, or less, 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 reducing 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 of North Vietnam. 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 theater throughout all of World War II and three times that in the entire Pacific theater.

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 to forego 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 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, the NLF, 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 discussion 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 over twenty 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.