

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
TO DFL ENDORSED LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES FROM
THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

REMARKS MADE AT A MEETING WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 1970
AT THE HUMPHREY FOR SENATE HEADQUARTERS CONFERENCE
ROOM, MIDLAND BANK BUILDING.

In attendance also were State Senator Wendell
Anderson, DFL endorsed candidate for Governor
and George Rice, DFL endorsed candidate for
Congress, Third District.

It is my policy, in relationship to the
Nixon Administration, to be constructive. When
I believe the President has done something in the
public interest, I'm going to commend the man.
When I believe there is a failure, I'm going to
speak out. And I believe that is the kind of
integrity in the political process that people
will respect, and I encourage you to do exactly
the same. Everything the opposition does is not
wrong, and we ought not to try to pretend that it
is. But when they are wrong, we ought to speak out
and by so doing, by having this balance, our
criticisms are much more balanced.

The initiative of the President and the
Secretary of State to secure a cease fire in the
Middle East is to be commended. I have supported
this. I think, however, it should be noted that

a great deal of pressure has been brought by our government upon Israel to accept this cease fire, even though the cease fire has within it certain dangers for Israel. For example, the cease fire does not require international supervision. It does not require or does not insist that there be supervision to prevent the infusion of new arms into the Arab states. In other words, the Soviet Union can continue to pour in its arms, its MIGs, its artillery, its surface-to-air missiles -- SAM 2's and 3's which are very sophisticated weapons. There can still be airfields built and fortifications established, which means that Israel is running a good deal of risk that her position may very well be weakened if, during this period of the cease fire, negotiations do not proceed well and succeed. Nevertheless, our government has acted in the interests of peace. Every cease fire contains some risk but war contains much more of a risk.

Now, if our government can effectively pursue a policy to get a cease fire in the Middle East, which it has, then I suggest and I recommend that the President and our government pursue the policy of an

immediate cease fire standstill in Southeast Asia. It is there that American lives are being lost. It is there that we are pouring in our treasure. The only way that negotiations are going to succeed for a political settlement in Southeast Asia is under the terms of a cease fire. My policy has been for a long time, and I recommended it for the last four years and, more specifically, the last two years, that the first effort of our government must be to secure an immediate cease fire. Our military has long looked upon this with a certain degree of distrust. And I know that when I was Vice President that we had people in our government, particularly in the military, who would always say, "Well, this isn't the time - after all, our position isn't strong enough" or "We can better our position - let's wait awhile -- let's have a cease fire that puts us in the best negotiating position." I also know that the government in South Vietnam has long resisted a cease fire because it didn't feel that its political position was strong enough. It felt that the Viet Cong and the NLF occupied too many villages and too much territory and they were worried

that a cease fire, a standstill, would put them in a difficult position in terms of political control for the future.

Now, all of those reasons have been advanced to President Johnson and President Nixon. But if the government of the United States can insist that Israel and the UAR accept a cease fire in the name of peace, then the government of the United States must, by necessity and moral principle, insist upon and pursue the course of an immediate cease fire in Indo-China, and in Vietnam in particular and be willing to take whatever risk is necessary. I mean a cease fire not only to stop the shooting but also there shall be no movement of men or material. This is what we call a "standstill cease fire". We should insist that the North Vietnamese accept this, and we should insist that the Russians, who have worked with us and we with them in the Middle East on a cease fire, do the same thing in Southeast Asia.

Therefore, my policy for Southeast Asia has been and continues to be an immediate cease fire standstill; withdrawal of all American forces as

rapidly as possible; no more draftees to be used for combat purposes in Vietnam; and finally, the broadening of the political base in Vietnam through free elections including all political elements, which is the only way that you can approach a negotiated political settlement. Now there is my policy on Vietnam. I ask you to take this message to your constituents.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org