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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 unpuliced 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.

Who has said what they think of the President's words to bring about a consolidation 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 15,000, 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 President Ky—get together with the NLF, the political arm of the Vietcong, and that the South Vietnamese themselves not only increase the pressure on 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 understand 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, and all other groups, so that that additional strength and numbers will be added to its govern-ment as well.

Mr. President, I thoroughly approve also, in addition to the warning given to the Vietminh, the warning long overdue—to get together with all South Vietnamese, from 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 Minneapolis 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 Minneapolis that if that conference would still hold true and the United States withdrew, we will do our best to get out of that area lock, stock, and barrel at the earliest opportu-nity.

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 support to the idea of a bring­ing this ugly war to an end.

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 situation and in 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 read and find out just how vague and misleading this supposed credibility gap was. To the best of my knowledge, the President at no time ever knowingly misstated the truth to the American people. It is true that he has said something on one day, and perhaps some other day, but I do not think a single day has passed where he said something that was not true.

I would hope the President at all times will do his best to avoid the appearance of making public statements which may mislead the public and which may be used for political purposes and which may be used for political purposes.

I would hope that 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."

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 situation and in 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 read and find out just how vague and misleading this supposed credibility gap was. To the best of my knowledge, the President at no time ever knowingly misstated the truth to the American people. It is true that he has said something on one day, and perhaps some other day, but I do not think a single day has passed where he said something that was not true.
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My presence there has always rested on this basic belief: The main burden of preserving peace and freedom is borne by the South Vietnamese themselves. We and our allies can only help to provide them with the means by which South Vietnam can survive and can grow and develop. On their efforts—on their determination to be free of domination of their own population. Its people maintain their identity; to achieve a new unity within their country.
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Political and economic cooperation between nations has proceeded rapidly, so every American can take a great deal of pride in the role that we have played in the search for peace in Southeast Asia. We can rightly judge—as responsible Southeast Asians themselves do—that the result of the two years' efforts would have been far less likely, if not completely impossible, if America's sons and other friends had not bound themselves to endeavor.

At Johns Hopkins University about three years ago, I announced that the United States would be a great work of developing Southeast Asia, including the Mekong valley, for all the people of that region. Our dedication is to the building of 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. Then a vision of the nations of the area could be a foundation stone. Certainly friendship with the nations of such a Southeast Asia remains 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—through free elections, and if we stand by those, who, threatened, have trusted us, and have more than proved that they can withstand the test of war.

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

Nor can it ever 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 nightily 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 emboldened by a single thought: 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 must keep. Resolutions of the Congress testify to the need to resist aggression in the world and in Southeast Asia.

But 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, and with the rest of the world.

And with those nations 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 today than it has ever been, and that what America has done in Vietnam. I believe that the men who endure the dangers of battle there, fighting for their brothers, are helping three and a half years, avoiding perhaps, far greater conflicts, far wider wars, far more destruction, than this one.

On their flowing, their tears, someday will come. Tonight, I have offered the first in what I hope will be a series of messages in this place.

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 them all will be ended. And I ask your help and your support, my fellow citizens, for this effort to reach across the battlefields toward the peace of Vietnam.

Yet, I believe that we must always be mindful of this one thing—whatever the trials and the tests and the strength of our country and our cause will lie, not in powerful weapons or infinite resources, but in the spirit that binds, and 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 any of you was asked. 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 our cause.

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 principles that Senator John Kennedy, in his speech at Johns Hopkins—when he asked me to serve in his Cabinet—has put it ahead of any divisive question of partisanship. And so I would ask all Americans whatever their personal interest or concern or fear 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 move on from our country, from the people, from all of us to the house that is America. 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 can never 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 prospect 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 or fear to guard against divisiveness and all of its ugly consequences.

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 will it take 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 causes that are developing in this political year.

With American sons in the fields far away, With America's 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 engage in an hour or a day, or a week, or a month in partisan causes or to any duties other than the average duties of this office—the Presidency of your country.

Accordingly, I shall not seek, and I will not accept, the nomination of any party for another term as your President. But let men everywhere know, however, that a strong and consistent and vigilantly America stands ready tonight to seek an honorable peace; and stands ready tonight to defend an honorable home, whatever the cost or 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 great concern about the ever-changing situation during this period would be subject to partisan and political question and discard if he were a candidate. By denying himself the nomination, the President has taken the most convincing step possible to prove that he is guided by no motive other than what is best for America and a better world on a scale unprecedented in our history.

President Johnson has acted in the finest spirit of service and devotion to the duties of the President. He has acted as his President, with sincerity and with determination, to achieve world peace, protect the vital interests of the United States, and secure domestic tranquillity. 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 so long, was a wise decision, a realistic decision, and a generous decision, one that was based solely on the best interest of our country and 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 unifying 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 its platform, it should not only stand for 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 end of the war, but instead a period of exclusive military victory or a military solution to the problem.
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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—rather than dwelling on the failures of the past, we all have an opportunity to improve on the situation and to devise constructive solutions to the problems of the late sixties and the early seventies. I submit a suggestion 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 of the part of the Government in certain programs which has undermined the dollar. 

I hope Congress will move forward now with great dispatch to find a way to give us fair housing legislation in the current session, and to give the Senate a 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 Senate yield? 

Mr. BYRD. 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. FERDY. Mr. President, I trust, also, that the majority leader would agree that this certain number of restraint 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 Senator Byrd, and I would hope that those matters could be considered on their own merits.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not base my statement upon the amendments or from any consideration that I had in mind, for I am sure 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 term. 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 is a thing of the past, 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 out of this tragic business, 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 waffing 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 unwaveringly 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 bargaining 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.
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 be-
ginning 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 ap-
proached 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 other, 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.