#### **Bates College**

### **SCARAB**

**Congressional Records** 

Edmund S. Muskie Papers

9-19-1968

# Press Conference - San Francisco, California - On the 1968 Campaign

Edmund S. Muskie

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

## PRESS CONFERENCE

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE

DEMOCRATIC NOMINEE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENCY

OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1968

San Francisco, California

WARD & PAUL

OFFICIAL REPORTERS 25 K STREET, N. E. Washington, D. C. 20002

(202) 628-4266

2

5

6

8

11

13

15

17

18

20

22

25

#### PRESS CONFERENCE

#### REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE

DEMOCRATIC NOMINEE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mayor's Chambers
City Hall, San Francisco,
California

Thursday, September 19, 1968 10:15 a.m.

Question: Senator Muskie, now that you are here, you know that your campaign is in financial trouble in California And there have been reports that you haven't been greeted by huge crowds as you have traveled about and neither has Vice President Humphrey.

How do you think you are going to turn this around, or are you going to turn it around?

Answer: Oh, I don't know. Governor Agnew visited my state last week and he wasn't overwhelmed by people, and people seemed to think he somehow has gotten the lead in the polls, with his running mate.

I am sure you realize that it takes time for relatively unknown senator from Maine to acquire a national grass-roots constituency. I am patient, whether or not you are, and I am willing to work hard at the task of getting around the country.

And with the help of you gentlemen in press conferences like this, with the help of the television media, it is possible I think, for a man to become nationally known quite quickly.

I recall when Senator McCarthy announced less than a year ago that you people of the press were quite clear that he was barely visible in the polls and unknown nationally, and now he is a national figure and indeed a historic figure.

These things happen, depending upon whether you are able to strike a responsive public chord, whether or not you have something that people want to hear, whether or not you have qualities that people respond to, and it takes a little time to do this.

I am not going to conclude so hastily that because in less than two weeks I haven't suddenly become say, a second Christ, an instantly known figure, that there is no chance of winning in November. We are going to win in November, and we are going to win because we believe that we represent the right positions in the problems that trouble our people.

So far as the Vice President is concerned, I can speak for myself in this connection that he has the qualities of leadership which, I think, as between the two major candidates offers what the American people want.

Question: Senator Muskie, do you think you can become a household word by November 5?

Answer: As I said quite some time ago, I am a house-hold word in my own household. And that is good enough for me.

Mayor Alioto: You may recall, Nixon was a household word in 1962 when he was beat in California by 800 thousand votes.

Question: Would you concede that Nixon is ahead at this time?

Answer: I concede the polls say he is.

Question: What about yourself personally?

Answer: I don't have any polling resources. I rely upon the same thing you gentlemen do. I don't have any special insights or special survey research or polling resources, and really, I don't worry about it as much as you do. I am concerned about winning an election on November 5. I have been behind before and much further behind than even the polls indicate this time.

That is my preoccupation. The election isn't going to be held today or tomorrow, it is going to be held on November 5, and however much you fellows press the question about the polls, it isn't going to be held any earlier than November 5.

With respect to this question of Party finances in California, I am not aware we have any special problems there except the usual ones at the beginning of a campaign, of raising enough money to carry us through.

Question: What about the theory that George Wallace is the Democratic Party's best name in terms of siphoning votes

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16.

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

off from the Republican ticket of Nixon and Agnew?

Answer: That is a theory that Mr. Nixon is trying to sell. I hope he is successful, but that isn't my view of the Wallace impact.

I think the Wallace impact cuts across party lines and I don't know whether the impact is greater on one Party or another, and whether that situation varies from State to State.

I repeat, I appreciate the confidence that you have in asking me questions like this, but I don't have polling resources. I don't have an organization out in the field as Gallup does or as Harris does, polling people. I am only speculating and I don't know what that proves.

I could speculate that I am ahead, but that doesn't prove anything. The important thing is that we are out to run a campaign and win an election. And we are going to do the best we can. And I am encouraged by the fact that we have more and more people who seem to recognize me. There are still those who say, "Well, who is he?" I remember when I was Governor of Maine and had been Governor three years, I was visiting a town, one in which I campaigned a great deal and was having lunch at a restaurant. People heard that I was there and they gathered outside to greet me when I came out, and I did. So they came forward for autographs and to shake hands, and I noticed this little boy was being pushed forward by his mother. And he was quite reluctant to come.

Finally, he said, "All right, Maw, I will go shake his hand, but who is he?" So I don't care how long you are in public life, there are going to be people who say, "Who is he."

Well, it is my job to reduce that number as much as I can with respect to myself and do it by proving to the American people that I offer something that has appeal for them. If I don't, I am not going to be able to prove it. But you can't expect me to do it in 10 days.

Question: In terms of your Republican counterpart, do you think Governor Agnew is going to hurt the Nixon ticket and, if so, how?

Answer: I think that is a problem for them to struggle with, not me.

Question: How much of an impact do you think the

Chicago violence is going to have on the Democratic ticket?

Answer: Again, that is a hard one to answer. I will say this, that in the states in which I had campaigned, public sentiment ranging from what I would describe as substantial to overwhelming, has been on the side of Mayor Daley, which was rather surprising to me in view of the fact that the television coverage emphasized the other side.

Now, this may be, I suppose, due to the same kinds of forces that are responsible for the Wallace phenomenon, and I suspect it is.

It is probably also due to the forces that prompt candidates to talk so much about law and order and to try to blame it upon one Party or another.

So that is part of the public mood, and I think it is accurate to say that this issue, this overall problem, is a number one problem.

Now, just how the public reaction will settle down, when they have heard from all parties, and all candidates, is a little unpredictable at this point.

Question: Senator, you will be seeing Speaker Unruh in a few hours. Do you have any hopes of enlisting him in your California campaign?

Answer: Immediately after my acceptance speech, he came up to the platform and said, "I will do anything I can for you, you just let me know."

Question: What are you going to ask him to do?

Answer: He is a better judge of what he can do than I am.

Question: Senator, you said yesterday the country wants a change. What can the ticket headed by a man who has been around for quite a while do to convince the country of the fact that he represents a change from what we have already?

Answer: You might ask that question of Nixon, too. He was Vice President for eight years in an administration that had three recessions. And, as I recall, his 1960 campaign, he said, "I run four square on the record of eight years of Republican Administrations."

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

No one asked him to what extent he disagreed with his President. Nobody thought it was relevant to ask that question of him. Nobody had asked him in this campaign whether or not he intends to pursue the policies that produced three recessions.

He has said quite clearly that if a man has been part of one Administration, he inevitably will offer exactly the same kind of policies and leadership that was offered by the Administration of which he is a part.

from 1952 to 1960, I think he ought to be challenged on this point.

It is a ridiculous argument to make. No two president are carbon copies of each other. They never have been. Every man is a human being, with his own instincts, his own philosoph his own background his own experience, and he is going to have to apply all of those things to different circumstances than did his predecessor.

I don't care who he is -- whether you have two presidents of the same party following each other, or two presidents of different parties following each other. And to suggest you are going to have a repetition of our national experience in the next four years so that we can run the thing all over again with a different man, and that if you could repeat the national experience you would have two men who are carbon copies of each other, is a ridiculous kind of proposition to advance to an intelligent electorate.

endorsement the other day of your ticket? Do you think this is going to help you or hurt you?

Answer: Well, I would think it would help us with some, and hurt us with others.

Question: Senator, how much on either side?

Answer: The same question -- I have no polling organization, I have no surveying organization, I have no way of identifying the limits of these various groups.

Question: Mr. Nixon said yesterday that he was going to keep on eating California grapes and drinking California grape juice. Is that your feeling, too?

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 K Street, N.E., Warfington, D.C. 20002

Answer: I don't know. I like California grapes. I have eaten them.

Why, did he have some special reason for saying that?

Question: He is not supporting the California boycott
The boycott in the State. Some labor dispute.

Answer: I have no position on it as yet. I haven't had a chance to study this, which has developed as a California issue.

Question: What difference do you think it will make whether your ticket wins or the other ticket wins?

Answer: Well, we are spending a lot of time saying that, we have answered a lot of questions from members of the press, trying to suggest differences.

You want me to make a speech now. The last time I did that in a press conference, I later was told by my press secretary that I ought to have beefer and more precise answers. But I would be glad to make a speech, if you want me to.

Question: A little one, maybe.

Answer: You can't do it in a little speech. I think our thrust toward peace is greater and supported by the record with a greater degree than is that of the Nixon-Agnew ticket.

Now, to document that would require a speech. I think that our thrust toward a growing economy, in the direction of a growing economy, that would make it possible for the individual American to live better and to improve his life, and make it possible for governmental and nongovernmental institutions to do the things we need to do to provide essential government services, is greater than that of the Nixon-Agnew ticket on the record, and I have been trying to document that in the course of this campaign. But to go into the details, and make a speech and with all of these television cameras I would be delighted to make it.

Question: Senator, to pin you down just a little bit on President Johnson's endorsement, is that something you would look forward to? Are you happy with it?

Answer: I need his support. He told me that a wack and a half ago.

Question: His public endorsement.

Answer: He has got as much right to speak as anyone else. I am delighted that he has chosen to speak.

Question: Senator, Vice President Humphrey has indicated that he could bring American troops out of Vietnam late this year or early next year. How does he propose to do this? How will this be accomplished?

Answer: I discussed this statement that he made, and I think I understand what he said better after talking with him than I did from reading accounts of it.

What he said, as I understand it, Clifford has said and others have said it is our purpose right now to gradually enlarge the military role of the South Vietnamese Army, in the hope that as they take over we can begin to bring our men back.

I don't think the Vice President predicted that this would happen. I think he expressed the hope, which is the hope of this whole thrust. The Republican platform, I think, urges an enlargment of the role of the South Vietnamese Army. For what purposes? Presumably for the purpose of relieving our people.

So what is so strange about suggesting that if that policy works, the policy endorsed by both parties, that we can begin to bring our boys home? I see nothing so strange about that.

Question: This doesn't give very much hope for the Paris Peace Talks, though, does it?

Answer: I don't know that our policy has to be an either/or policy; that either we equip the South Vietnamese Army to do its job better or we go to the Paris Peace Talks. Can't we do both things at once? Are they inconsistent? We have got to press for the Paris Peace Talks. But there is very little indication from the other side in Paris that they are committed to the objective of a negotiated settlement.

This is a strange thing. Nobody raises this question. They have never made a commitment to negotiate a settlement as a way of ending the war. Moreover, as we are pressed to define the role of the NLF in peace talks, they have never yet said as much as we said about the NLF, that they would accept a role for sidelines in peace talks. You are not going to get a negotiated settlement until both sides accept that as a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

legitimate objective in their own national interest. They are not going to go to a negotiated settlement because we want one, unless they think it would serve them as well.

So we need, I think, some indication from them that they are committed to the idea of a negotiated settlement. Until we get to the point of actually discussing in a substantive way, political settlement of the war, at the same time we have to have some concern about our military posture in South Vietnam .

Question: How do you interpret Nixon and Agnew's comments so far on this so-called issue of law and order? Do you see it that they are using it as a codeword?

Answer: Well, I think they are greatly distorting it, I notice in the headlines in today's New York Times, that Governor Agnew accused Democrats of being lax on crime. I think that statement is the height of irresponsibility.

Por example, Maine has the fifth lowest crime rate of all 50 States, with a Democratic governor, and Maryland with a Republican governor has the highest rate in violent crime of any of the states.

Now, what does that prove about Governor Agnew -- and he happens to be, I think, Governor of Maryland. Does that prove that the Governor of Maryland has a greater sense of responsibility about controlling crime than the Governor of Maine?

In the period from 1960 to 1968, when the national crime rate went up 88 percent, there were five states that had Republican Administrations in all of that period. And the crime rate in those states increased 170 percent.

> Question: Do you believe it is a racial codeword?

Answer: Let me finish.

In the same period, there were 18 Democratic states and the crime rate rose in those states by 66 percent.

Yes, they are using it as a codeword, to suggest that Democrats are soft on crime, that perhaps Democrats even invented crime. This is what Agnew and Nixon are trying to prove.

And if you use any statistics at all, you can prove the contrary, but I think it is a ridiculous proposition and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

the kind of thing that they try to do in a lot of issues.

Question: But they are not using it as a codeword in racism?

Answer: That is for them to answer.

Question: When are you going to campaing in the South?

Answer: I have been there already.

Question: How long?

Answer: I am going there again this week.

Question: How long?

Answer: There have been two weeks. I was there last week and this week. I don't think I have discriminated against them.

Question: Mayor Alioto, how do you think this visit of the Vice Presidential Candidate has effected the Democratic campaign in this area?

Answer by Mayor Alioto: I want to say, without embarrassing the distinguished Senator from Maine, that his presence
in San Francisco has greatly aided the campaign for the ticket.
He is a man of unusual talents, unusual experience, unusual
capacity, a man who has a great past in terms of not only his
experience but his reading of the basic problems of our times.
And I would invite, very, very gladly invite, anybody to make
a comparison between vice presidential candidates on the Democratic side and the vice presidential candidate on the Republican side.

I invite that comparison just in terms of the kind of men they are, the kind of experience they have had, the kind of capacity they have. Of that kind of a comparison, we can only come out very, very well. On that basis, I am pleased to say that the distinguished senator from Maine has had a wide exposure to the people of the Bay Area in the terms of the public appearances and he has greatly aided the cause of the Democrats. They are going to close this gap that you are talking about just as surely by October 15 as they did in 1948, as they also did, you recall, in 1960.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen for being here.

25

**经现货工工工工工** 

Senator Muskie: I apologize. I do have a polling resource in San Francisco Bay.

