

Bates College

SCARAB

Congressional Records

Edmund S. Muskie Papers

4-27-1971

Press Conference - Tallahassee, Florida - Statement on Vietnam and Next Election

Edmund S. Muskie

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scarab.bates.edu/mcr>

Recommended Citation

Muskie, Edmund S., "Press Conference - Tallahassee, Florida - Statement on Vietnam and Next Election" (1971). *Congressional Records*. 73.
<https://scarab.bates.edu/mcr/73>

This Press Conference is brought to you for free and open access by the Edmund S. Muskie Papers at SCARAB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Congressional Records by an authorized administrator of SCARAB. For more information, please contact batesscarab@bates.edu.

SENATOR EDWARD S. MUSKIE

Senator

Edward S. Muskie

news conference

state capitol press room

tallahassee, florida

april 27, 1971

Q. senator, what do you think about admission of red china to the un.
if it's become an issue again because of the ping pong and i notice that
one of your opponents has come out in favor of admitting red china.
Q. a. well, i couldn't possibly have an opponent since i'm not running
for anything yet.

I think we ought to move in the direction of relations with red
china and admission to the united nations. I'm happy to see that the
movement in that direction
movement in this country is gaining momentum in this country. Now that doesn't
mean it's going to be easy to do. The U.N. thing as well as diplomatic recognition
is a two-way proposition and this is of course why Chen En lai's reaction a
couple of weeks ago in connection with the ping pong team is so interesting.
Because apparently there is an interest on that side as well that hasn't been
evident for some time.

Q: Senator Muskie, there is a thought in Florida to have a presidential preferential
primary at the same time as Massachusetts,--New Hampshire, I mean. Should you
become a presidential candidate, how would you feel about running in two states
at the same time?

A: Of course, that problem could arise not only in connection with New Hampshire
and Florida but with other primaries. The primary season begins in March and continues
into June and there are some 23 of them. Through that period those who are candidates
will have to get involved in many primaries that are running at the same time so I
don't think it's a problem in connection with New Hampshire and Florida. We really haven't

really sorted out our plans and it's difficult to do so in connection with Florida until Florida decides.

Q: Would you like to test yourself in both the North and the South at pretty much the same time?

A: Well, I think anyone who runs next year would and should be interested in testing himself wherever and whenever he can. There are obvious limitations: money limitations, conflicts in the time in which primaries are held. They all have to be sorted out. I simply haven't completed that job. The fact that I'm here today gives some indication of my interest.

Q: There has been speculation that if you decide to run, that Senator Chiles is high on your list of running mates. Is that true?

A: Well, I'd be willing to say anything that ~~me~~ would be helpful to Senator Chiles at this point. I think very highly of him. I wouldn't want anything so I think I say to embarrass him. I'll content myself with saying that anyone with his obvious vote-getting power and personal appeal and ability is prime material for this kind of office.

Q: Would you be willing to walk across the state with him?

A: I'd walk with him anywhere he was willing to walk with me.

Q: How do you feel about President Nixon's cutback on the cross Florida barge canal?

A: Well, it's the kind of choice that increasingly we're going to face in all parts of the country. We have similar problems in my own state. There They're hard choices. I know something about the economic benefits of the canal and also the environmental dangers and I think the decision can be justified in terms of those dangers.

Again it's a kind of a tough decision that has to be considered by the people of the state as well as others who are involved.

Q: It's said that you are perhaps the most acceptable of the Democratic candidates --potential Democratic candidates--at this time to the South.

Are you actually attempting to court the new Democratic leadership, so called, in the south?

A: Well, I find it very attractive leadership whether or not I'm a candidate for national office and I constantly get mail and constantly visited by people who from the South and they urge not only me but others from other areas of the country to regard the South as part of the nation. Well, I do and always have and I'm tremendously attracted by this new leadership--Governor Askew, ~~Senator~~ Senator Chiles, Governor Carter, Governor West, Governor Bumpers. I think it's a very healthy and encouraging thing to see this young, vigorous, vital leadership that is oriented to the future rather than to the past emerging here in the South. The South is part of this country and will make great contributions to its future as it has to its past. And to see it oriented to the future in this way is very encouraging to me and to many people in other parts of the country.

Senator,

Q: Would you say your trip to Florida is a publicity tour?

A: No.

Q: What would you say it was?

A: Well, I suppose it's a political trip. There's no point in being coy about that. I'm not the coy type. What will come of it will be interesting. What doesn't come of it will be interesting. In any event, I'm looking for new friends.

Q: Would you find a spring primary in Florida more attractive than an early summer or fall primary?

A: Well, I think Florida would be a very interesting primary to enter for a number of reasons and obviously I wouldn't be here if I didn't think so. It's always a problem to be running in more than one primary at the same time, especially with the New Hampshire primary in March, for example, of considerable importance to me and I don't know how to resolve this. You know, it's Florida's decision as to when its primary will be held and I don't want to seem to dictate it.

Q: Would it be more appealing to you in the spring or later in the year?

A: Well, December would be a little late.

I think spring would be a good time.

Q: What do you think presidential preferential primaries actually accomplish other than getting your name before the people?

A: Well, they certainly have the potential for settling your hash. ~~It's not always~~ --Success in the primaries doesn't always lead to the nomination as Senator Kefauver learned, to his sorrow. But I think that next year the primaries may have a greater impact on that decision than for a long, long time. But this whole business of participatory democracy and the desire of the people to get involved in the system more effectively I think will lend an importance to the primaries that will be new. There are more primaries next year. There are more costly primaries. The evidence ~~that's been shown~~ today is that they'll be more strongly contested than in many times in the past. So they could be very significant.

Q: Senator, as a potential candidate, would you like to see a presidential

preferential primary in Florida ~~would be~~ as it is a Southern State?

A: ~~Q:~~ I'd taken it as an inevitable development so I hadn't haven't considered the alternative

Q-- Senator--

A--Wait, I'd promised a question here and I don't want to break promises this early.

Q: Would you ~~prefer~~ ^{favor} a primary where you get delegates on a winner take all basis or where they'd be apportioned among the candidates according to the percentage of the vote?

A: Well, I'd really prefer not to--At a time when Florida is considering the question of when its primary ought to be held and what kind of a primary it ought to be, I don't think it's particularly useful for me as an outsider to suggest a preference. As a matter of fact, any preference I might indicate might be counter productive so I'd rather ~~do~~ not get into the details. I assume I'll have a chance to discuss them frankly with the leaders here but if I ~~do~~, it won't be with a ~~view~~ ^{may be} to trying to shape it to my desires but to express an opinion as I'm asked.

Q: If we are not completely out of Vietnam by the time your campaign is in full gear, how important will you make the war in your primary effort?

A: First of all, let me make clear that I would prefer it if the war is not an issue and I think the only way that that would be true is if the war is over. I'd rather not have the war as an issue in 1972. If it is still under way, I don't think candidates will have any choice but to discuss it in the primaries. It will be foremost, I think, in the concerns of the American people now and it will be until it's over.

Q: If the legislature were to ^{so} elicit your advice on the timing of the Fair Florida primary from the point of view of attracting as many candidates as possible,

when precisely, what point in March or April or any other time would you recommend they hold it?

A: That's just another way of getting me to intervene ~~and~~ at a time when I'd prefer not to. If the political leaders of the legislature are truly interest^{ed} to the extent that they are, I'll be happy to indicate my ideas but again not for the purpose of ~~x~~ trying to impose my convenience or my comfort or my opinions ~~and~~ upon them. It's their decision to be made.

Q: Do you expect you would campaign in both primaries?

A: ~~With 23~~ Well, I hate to seem to be undecided about these things but with 23 primaries it's going to be difficult to get involved in all of them financially and until I know what my financial situation is close to the beginning of the primary period--also the political imperatives--it'll be difficult to make the selection of those that I might enter and I don't want to paint myself into the corner on one or the other until I've had a chance to work out the total picture.

Q: Some of your detractors have accused you of having once been a hawk on the war. Could you comment?

A: I think that's true of a great majority of the American people. Senator McGovern, for example, voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Everyone who's now considered a potential candidate voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. President Nixon at one point was very much for a military victory in Vietnam. You can go down through the list.

The second point I'd make is that at the time I supported our policy in South Vietnam, I made no commitment that we should stay there forever and the point is that whether or not our initial entry into Indochina was justified, we've now made an investment in that country in lives and treasure

and time and division here at home that in my judgment is all we can afford to invest. So whatever the justification originally, I think now we have one imperative and that is ending the war and disengaging.

Q: In your opinion, is President Nixon moving as rapidly in that direction as you would like?

A: No. I don't. Moreover, what really troubles me about it is that Vietnamization which is almost wholly a military policy does not aim at certain objectives that I think are important: one, a negotiated settlement two, the negotiation of ~~and~~ the return of our prisoners-of-war. ^{historians} The histories of war tell us that prisoners are exchanged when the war is over. ^{If} Vietnamization is policy for continuing the war, it seems to me the prospects for getting our own POW's back are minimal. And then finally there is the question of ^{be} the safe withdrawal of our own troops at some point. That can better be ensured by negotiations with the other side than by Vietnamization. And I think Vietnamization undermines the possibility for a negotiations. I think that ventures into Cambodia and Laos tend to pull the rug out from under the possibilities for negotiations.

Q: I wonder whether you would express an opinion on whether you think that Senator Humphrey will be a candidate and also, a double question, ^{if you feel} ~~whether you~~ think that Governor Wallace's strength is on the wane, if he will be a terribly strong candidate in 1972?

A: On the question of Senator Humphrey, first of all let me make clear that our relations are the relationships of close friends. I'm very fond of Senator Humphrey. Secondly, he's entertained this ambition for a long time. He has not relinquished it. He wouldn't be human if he did. Thirdly, he is actively considering becoming a candidate. I don't think he's made the decision yet

but he's actively pursuing it and sounding out his prospects and that's understandable.

With respect to Governor Wallace, one of the reasons I suppose I'm here is to sound out the strength of the wallace movement at this point and I'll have a better basis for answering it after I've visited here and later this week in Georgia...

Q" How much of a problem does a third party candidate cause?

A: In 1968, it was an important development, I think it took strength away from us, considerable strength away from us--but it also took strength away President Nixon in some areas of the country. Recent polls indicate that Governor Wallace would hurt the Republican party more than it would us. I That's an interesting development. I don't know what the picture would be a year and a half from now. So that Governor Wallace could be and has been an influence in a national campaign.

Whether or not he will be next time depends, I suppose, on how vigorously he pursues it and how people react to him. Now I've gotten the impression from some Southerners that last time they supported Governor Wallace for emotional reasons because of the issues he raised and so on. But that this time they're thinking more in terms of backing a winner. Governor Wallace can't win the Presidency. That's clear. It was clear on the '68 record and I think it must be quite clear now. The questions that face Southerners and others who respond positively to Governor Wallace's message is that he's not going to win and I think it's the disposition of ^{Democrats} ~~Southerners~~ across the country ~~this next time~~ is to win this next election.

Q: Do you think that perhaps the Southerners might want more than ~~just~~ a voice in selecting who is ~~there~~ chosen the President?

A: Well, I'm sure that 's another way of saying the same thing, yes.

Q: What do you have to offer the southax that other potential candidates don't?

A: Well, I haven't gotten to that point since I'm not yet a candidate. I'm not about to discuss the relative merits of others who are not yet candidates except for one. You know, we're going to get involved in that kind of hassle soon enough and I'd rather wait until that time comes.

Q: Can you make any argument for a person who backed Wallace to back your candidacy?

A: It might be difficult.

Q: I'm not thinking of Mr. Wallace himse,f. I hope you don't imply out of anything I said that I think Governor Wallace would be inclined to suport me or any of the other candidates who are being mentioned. Really what's involved is the question of those people who supported Wallace and their support, the more one analyzes it, was based on reasons that some of which they might identify with other candidates. I think that a great deal of Governor Wallace's support came from people who feel that the system doesn't respond, that the system doesn;t reflect their views or is responsibe to their needs. It was the kind of direct, down-to-earth appeal challenging the establishment that I think got Governor Wallace a great deal of his support. For example, I think it was interesting--the polls indicate this--that a lot of the people who supported Governor Wallace turned to Senator Robert Kennedy at points in the last campaign for the same reason. They felt that Senator Kennedy spoke directly to them and to thir problems and to their views. What his philosophy was is another question. That varied a great deal, Of course, ~~xxxx~~ from that of Governor Wallace. But it was the directness of the approach and the involvement in them that they felt from both men that tended to get them to support both or gleok favorably on both

Q: Are you convinced that Senator Ted Kennedy is out of the running?

A: Oh, I never form such hard and firm conclusions on questions like that. I'm sure that Senator Kennedy is keeping his options open as would any politician. I don't think he's actively seeking the nomination at this point. Whether or not he might change his mind is something that depends upon future developments. So I consider that an open possibility at any time.

Q: Senator, you mentioned this new leadership in the South. Do you think that because of this joining together of the governors in their request for Southern acceptability, I think they've called it, do you think we're going to see more candidates in the South and more of them trying to swing the South.

QA: Oh, I'm sure of that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Humphrey and I would have spent a great deal of time in the South last time but for the fact that we had such a short time between the convention and the election. I campaigned in Florida and also in Arkansas and also in the border states and would have liked to have gone into the south more. But we had to concentrate where we felt the prospects were best and that's what we did. My own preference is to consider this as one country. I think --my view is--that the man who is the Democratic nominee of the Democratic party next time has to have as broad a political base as he can put together, not principally for the purpose of winning the election--although that's part of it--but also so that he can lead the country effectively if he's elected. ^{This} country needs desperately needs healing leadership, unifying leadership--and that means nominating a man who can speak to many different kinds of Americans in all regions of this country. Now that's my objective. If I feel that I can be that kind of a candidate who can reach out to all kinds of Americans, then I will become a candidate because I think the country needs it.

Q: Would you hesitate to campaign against Senator Humphrey if he does decide to become a candidate and you do?

A: If the answer to the question which I have just raised is positive, I would run whoever else might be a candidate.

Q: Would you be favorably inclined to holding a Democratic convention in Chicago again?

A: I'm not going to exclude any city at this point. Questions like this always create the problem of whether you should say yes or no depending on the results you ultimately want. An answer can be counter-productive, so I think for the time being I'd rather take the position that that decision the is a decision of the national committee and if I'm asked, I would try to develop some recommendations but I haven't at the moment.

Q: Would you prefer Miami Beach?

A: Miami Beach, I think, is a very real possibility. There are others of course. Louisville is actively seeking the convention site. I suspect Houston may. The two California cities, Los Angeles and San Francisco. There aren't very many cities that have the hotel facilities and that's the principal problem. Convention halls are available in more than that but the combination of convention halls and hotels is pretty difficult to find and the cities I've named are almost the total the list. Philadelphia, for example, couldn't provide the hotel facilities. New York hasn't been interested in a convention in a long, long time and I don't think is now. So that the list of potential cities is pretty small. Miami, I would say, is a very definite^{ly} possibility.

Q: Senator, ^{could you talk to us a little} ~~would you speak a little bit~~ about your relationship with Speaker Pettigrew? ^{The} ~~His~~ preferential primary bill came up, he announced that you were coming down

here --what is your relationship with the Speaker of the House?

A: We're not part of a conspiracy to settle the primary question.

I met Dick Pettigrew last fall after the November election in Miami at a social affair. I was very much impressed by him, liked him, impressed by his political record--but we've not formed a cabal to settle this question.

Q: Are you aware, sir, that no Republicans have been invited to your luncheon today if you seek a broad-base?

A: Well, maybe it was difficult to find any.

Q: Senator Muskie, do you have any political leadership in the state now? Who are your people?

A: Now, we haven't put stripes on anybody at this point. We've been talking with a great many and establishing contact with a great many people and we're looking for advice from a great many people. Some of the names have been mentioned here. I hesitate to bring names in because in some cases there might be objection to my the interpretation of my using the names. But we've gotten advice from a lot of people who are not committed, who're not interested in becoming committed to any candidate at this point. They're interested in being helpful to anybody who's interested in Florida, advising us on the political complexion of this state and on the political leadership of this state.

Q: (Do you have any organizations?)

A: Oh, yes.

A: Can you give us the names?

A: Not yet.

Q: What do these people advise you about the strength you have in Florida as a potential candidate?

A: They're encouraging. I don't have Florida sewed up. I wouldn't presume that and nobody's told me that. But they tell me that I would be acceptable to many, that there's some enthusiasm, a great deal of active interest, and that prospects look reasonably good. That's the understated Maine way of describing the situation.

A: Senator, there are two people in the news that I'd like to hear your (inaudible but asked opinion about J. Edgar Hoover opinion about. One is; do you think Mr. Hoover and Lt. William Calley).

Q A: You've mentioned the names but I'm not sure what your question is.

Q: Do you think, first of all, that J. Edgar Hoover has been unduly maligned byt such people as Hale Boggs--and maybe yourself, I mean, haven't you been ciriticizing him?

Q: Well, let me speak for myself. If you want Congressman Boggs's view, you'll have to ask him. I'm not authorized to speak for him and I don't know really the basis for the statements he's made about Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

With respect to myself, I have never tried to personalize the questions that I've raised about the FBI and the questions about general political surveillance. I think on Mr. Hoove, I think he performed a distinct national service in connection with the FBI when he took over an almost defunct agency in the early twenties and converted it into one of the most respected law enforcement agencies in the world. That was a significant achievement in the national interest. And there's a constant effort to personalize the questions I've raised around Mr. Hoover. Now, I think he

should have retired long ago. In The American political life there's no such thing as an indispensable man and. *Mr. Hoover* ~~is~~ not indispensable. He's been head of the

FBI for 47 years. The FBI now has to operate in a different kind of a world, in different kind of a country and it's role is being challenged. It has to be reshaped and redefined and it ought to be done under new leadership. That's not a personal attack on Mr. Hoover. I disagree with some of the things he's said. I disagree with some of the ways he's approached some of the issues that he confront us now. But I don't relate my recommendation that he retire to that.

Now with respect to the FBI, my questions--and they're still very real--~~much~~ are related to what I believe to be the fact that the FBI now is tending to reach out into the field of general political surveillance. It's difficult of course for anyone on the outside to get all the facts since after all it is a police agency and ^{many} of its files are classified and unavailable to someone like me. But we had enough information to indicate that in the case of the Earth Day rallies, the kind of surveillance that the FBI conducted was more in the nature of general political surveillance than it was surveillance in connection with its principal responsibilities which are the threat of crime, the threat of violence, the threats ^{which} to national security. The one report that I put in the Congressional Record, ~~which~~ was unclassified so I felt I could, was not the kind of a report that one would expect in connection with those responsibilities. It was a description of surveillance that amounted, in my judgment, to general political surveillance. And it wasn't just two or three. My source was in the intelligence community--not the FBI but in the intelligence community and there are many, many more reports covering ^{are} the Earth Day activities which ~~is~~ certainly not subversive activities. These

about
are activities conducted by people concerned by environmental problems
They had every right to participate and get involved without having their
names filed in FBI dossiers which are distributed to intelligence and
police agencies of all sorts with the implications that are drawn from that
fact. And that's the question I raised and I think that unless we are
alert to that sort of development that an honored police agency like the
FBI could become, through overzealousness and lack of alertness on our
part, ~~which is~~ the kind of agency that we associate with different arent
kinds of societies. We don't want it to become that. We want it to remain
what it has been and not to become something different.

Q: Attorney General Mitchell said that the people we have most to fear in
this
the country are in the country and not outside. Is the FBI one of those things
we have most to fear now?

A: I wouldn't put it in that form. I prefer to put it in the form I ~~have~~
already have--that perfectly good institutions can become something else
unless we are constantly alert to the directions which they're taking.
And this is a red flag that we ought to watch and be careful about. And
so I've proposed not a continued public criticism but I've proposed the
establishment of a domestic surveillance activities board made up of
representatives of the intelligence agencies, made up of representatives
of the campus communities, of the general public, so that we can identify the
present roles of the FBI and redéfinit so that we don't permit this kind
of danger to emerge.

Q: If you become President, will you ask for Mr. Hoover's resignation?

A: You see, you guys continually try to get me to personalize this thing.
I think Mr. Hoover should have retired. If he has not by the time

I become President if I ~~am~~^{am} I will address myself to that question

It seems to me I've made myself clear without constantly belaboring the point in response to questions.

Q: Would you suggest the retirement of Justice Douglas?

A: This is an interference with the third and coordinate and independent branch of government that I don't think ought to be discussed publicly.

President Roosevelt tried that in the 1930's with unfortunate results ~~o~~^o ~~for himself~~ for himself political and for the court. I don't think that sort of intervention ought to be tried again.

Q: I think you understand that what we know about you is what we read.

in news stories which come out of Washington which Judge Carswell liked to refer to as the Eastern Establishment press. I saw five or six months ago that you were pretty much a hero in the press. Now there seems to be some discontent from the stories I read/ You may not agree with me on this but this is the opinion I have. I wonder if you would comment on this. Is it because perhaps that you are trying to be a candidate for all the nation?

A: I think that what has happened since then is what one would expect to happen and that is that anybody who found himself in my position as the so-called front-runner is going to ~~have~~ be examined closely, criticized fairly or unfairly, taken apart. I mean, this is sort of the hazing that you take, that you get as a freshman in college or elsewhere. Everyone in this position is a human being with weaknesses and with some virtues and the more closely you're examined--and it is a pretty close examination--

I can assure--the more evident your weaknesses become. I expect that.

The question, you know, of whether I have a temper: of course I have a temper.

Anybody who has five kids is bound ~~a~~ to have one. You can't avoid that. I have a temper and that's been built up out of all proportion to the facts.

Q: But I expect it. I take it. I don't react against it.. My whole idea of a free press is that if you let people talk about you long enough and if they will, ~~and~~ eventually the truth will emerge and I hope the truth isn't too unpleasant.

Q: Demonstrations against the war have gone on in Washington and more are planned. ^{making} Do you believe this helps or hinders Congress in the decisions on getting out of Vietnam?

A: I think as long as they are peaceful--and I would always urge that--and non-violent, I think they have an impact. I suspect, for example, that the thousand veterans ~~who~~ against the war who came to Washington last week made a tremendous impact and ~~think~~ I'm sure they must have on the President. How else would one react to these young men and I met with them and talked with them and to them--who fought this war, who lost limbs in this war, who gave their blood, when they react to this war as they do and they did it peacefully and quietly; it's bound to have an impact.

Q: What about the May Day demonstrations which are planned?

A: Well, I think it could be provocative to anticipate unpleasantness. I think our responsibility is to urge peaceful, non-violent activities. If it develops in other directions, ~~that~~ that would be unfortunate. I don't think we ought to stimulate them by anticipating them or predicting them as Attorney General Mitchell did last week.

Q: Would you find it difficult to run in both New Hampshire and Florida ~~in~~ if Florida has a presidential preferential primary?

A: This will be true--as I indicated earlier--right through the primary season : because ~~this~~ this sort of thing is going to happen more than once.

Thank you.