I shall reply to the President's personal attack upon me on nationwide television on Sunday, on both ABC's "Issues and Answers" and on NBC television.

However, I was shocked that President Johnson saw fit to respond to the serious questions which I raised about American policy in Asia with a personal assault upon me. But the President's temper or the fact that I was its target is not the issue.

The issue is larger than either Lyndon Johnson or Richard Nixon. From a personal standpoint, I respect both the office of President and the man who holds it for the immense energies he exerts in fulfilling his responsibilities.

Like every other American I trust that the President's health problems are minor and I regret that he could not exert his energies to the fullest in behalf of his own party in this national campaign.

However, the issue today is the war in Vietnam. It is my belief that the President's policy is not the one best designed to achieve peace without surrender in Asia. That is why I have raised grave questions about this policy, and I will continue to raise these questions.

This issue must be discussed now because the make-up of the 90th Congress will have a critical impact upon our future policy in Asia. I regret that the President has chosen to reduce the debate to personal levels, and I will not travel that road with him.

While the President was abroad, I refused to engage in any criticism which might undermine his position at Manila. On my own trip abroad last August, I consistently defended the American commitment in Vietnam.
However, it is my duty as a spokesman for the Loyal Opposition in a national campaign to raise questions about a policy which I do not believe is the best policy designed to achieve America's goal of peace without appeasement. I repeat, I will continue to raise those questions.

Now that the President's initial reaction is over, I hope he will address himself to the questions that I have raised. Here are three of them:

1. With regard to the intensity of the war, do we simply react to Communist aggression and resign ourselves to a 5-year war which the Administration's current policy will produce -- or should we follow the policy urged by General Eisenhower and increase our military pressure to a level necessary to achieve victory over aggression?

2. Are we going to continue the President's policy of escalating the number of troops to achieve our goals in Vietnam -- or shall we adopt the recommendations of the Republican Coordinating Committee to increase the use of American air and sea power to bring the communists to the conference table?

3. Are we going to pay for the war by raising taxes which is widely reported to be the Administration's plan -- or shall we take the Republican way of cutting non-essential domestic spending?

These are all legitimate questions. I again urge the President to answer them before November 8th.
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