

THE
American Forum

OF THE AIR



Vol. IV

SUNDAY, JULY 15, 1951

No. 28

**“Do We Need A Realignment of Our
Political Parties For 1952?”**

SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT

Republican, of South Dakota

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Democrat, of Minnesota

THEODORE GRANIK

Founder and Moderator of the American Forum of the Air

Announcer: Good evening. It's time again to join the American Forum of the Air . . . Each week at this time the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, one of the Nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products, presents the American Forum of the Air . . . Dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues vital to you and your country.

Tonight the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion of the vital topic "Do We Need A Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952?" Here with us this evening to discuss this problem are Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican of South Dakota, who says: "A coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats controls the legislative program in Congress in many instances. By uniting in a new political party, Southern Democrats and Republicans can elect a President of their choosing in 1952."

And Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, who says: "For an election to be meaningful, our political parties must stand for specific issues. Only when each party stands by a clearly defined platform can we be certain of government by the rule of the majority."

And now, here is your moderator, who twenty-three years ago, founded The American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator Granik: Both Republican and Democratic Parties have started to prime their heavy artillery for the election of '52. The target is you and your individual vote. Before every election, efforts are made to strengthen party unity. But Senator Mundt, in a forthcoming Collier's article, advocated formation of a new political party, with Southern Democrats joining Republicans. Now, how would such a proposal affect our national life? Could a new party elect a President and control Congress?

Tonight the American Forum of the Air discusses this unusual political proposal so that you, the voter, may decide.

Now, Senator Mundt, would the new party you suggest mean the end of the Republican Party, as such?

SENATOR MUNDT: Ted, if by the use of the words "as such" you mean the Republican practice of becoming the champion of lost causes in each of the presidential elections, I would say I hope yes.

If you mean, on the other hand, it is going to mean the end of the influence of the Republican Party, I would say quite the contrary would be the result.

What I anticipate is to have the Republican Party combine with like-minded Democrats of the South in positions which for a long time now have been upheld in Congress by a nameless, but working coalition, of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans. It seems to me that the present Republican and Democratic Party alignments have become pretty confusing and comparatively meaningless to the average voter, because actually today the differences within the two parties are in many instances greater than the differences between the two parties.

What I envision is working out some kind of political formula to form an alliance in 1952, so that people in this country who think

alike can vote alike for President regardless of where they live or to which particular party they happen to pay their allegiance.

Moderator Granik: Senator Humphrey, what do you think of that alliance?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Granik, I say Senator Mundt's proposal makes some sense in the nature of proposing that we get the political parties cleaned up or cleared up on the basis of issues. Yes, I am for a realignment of political parties, but I am not for a realignment of the political parties on the basis of a section of the country or a regional basis. I am not, for example, saying, "Let's realign the political parties by having the Republicans and Southern Democrats get together, because there are all kinds of Southern Democrats and there are all kinds of Republicans, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, and very rightfully so.

Differences within the political parties are frequently greater than they are between the parties. I think that is very true, particularly in the Republican Party, and I think it was equally true in many instances in the Democratic Party.

So I would just say this: If the Senator from South Dakota is proposing that he take the Dixiecrats of the South, who were able to carry four states in the last election, and put them in the Republican Party, as a Democrat — as a New Deal Democrat, a Roosevelt Democrat — I would welcome that. I would say more power to you, and the sooner that you can do it, the better.

If he is saying that what we ought to have is a strong two-party system in every state in the union, I would say that is a distinct political contribution and I would say I would support his hand in it. Every state needs a strong two-party system. That means the growth of the Republican Party in areas where the Republican Party is weak, and it means the growth of the Democratic Party where it is very weak.

Moderator Granik: Senator Mundt.

SENATOR MUNDT: I think there is some difference between my definition of a Southern Democrat and that of Senator Humphrey when he speaks of an alignment along geographical lines. I simply use the term Southern Democrat because that is the place in which most of the Democrats who are voting with the Republicans happen to live. We also understand there are some Democrats in the north who think more like Republicans than do some of the Republicans in the north. It is more an issue. I do not know what Senator Humphrey means by a Dixiecrat. I have a different definition of my own of a Dixiecrat. It happens to have a label with two eyes, and I think that a Dixiecrat is a Democrat who has his eyes open, that is all.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would like to give my definition of a Southern Democrat. A Southern Democrat is a conservative Republican with a Southern accent.

Let us just get down to see whether or not this realignment that the Senator from South Dakota suggests would do what he wants it to do. Let us direct it to particular areas of the country. I happen to believe that some of the most positive liberal leadership in the United

States Congress comes from our states in the South. I think that Senator Hill and Senator Sparkman, from Alabama, deep in the South, are giving the type of progressive leadership which is a great tribute to the whole political background and culture of the people of the South. That is the kind of Democrat I want in the Democratic Party. That is the kind of Democrat who builds for his section of the country.

What would this coalition that the Senator from South Dakota mentions now offer to the South? I think we ought to just think about that a little bit, because he is recruiting, you see, from the South.

Moderator Granik: What do you have to say, Senator Mundt, about your recruiting?

SENATOR MUNDT: I will tell you what it would offer in the South. In the first place, the South is in a very unhappy position today since it lost the two-thirds rule in the Democratic National Convention in 1936. The Southern Democrat is no longer at home in his own party convention because he has lost his veto power. So he goes to the convention and has to endorse a platform which he does not approve. He has to support a candidate with whom he is not particularly happy. Consequently, when he leaves the convention he feels he has had very little impact upon the trend of national affairs. Then comes September and October, the months of the Presidential campaign, and neither major party sends a candidate for President into the Deep South.

The Democratic Party says, "We've got him for nothing; why should we work after him?" The Republican Party says, "We can't get him anyhow; why waste our time and talents?" So the people of the South, who are among the best and most patriotic citizens of our country, are practically disfranchised when it comes to an election of the candidate for President. I think the first thing this would give the South is an impact on the selection of a candidate for President and, more and more, the selection of the correct government for emergency and peace, going in the correct direction.

Moderator Granik: Let me quote from an article in the New York Times of June 29, 1951:

"Paul K. Fitzpatrick, Democratic State Chairman, speaking in the presence of William M. Boyle, Jr., National Chairman, and after a recent conference with the President, attacked the Dixiecrat Congressional group as 'infamous reactionaries', partners in an unholy alliance' with the Republicans and foes of the welfare of the people."

Would you care to comment on that, Senator Humphrey, or Senator Mundt?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would make this general comment. It is perfectly true that in this 82nd Congress, a number of really truly conservative Democrats of the South have joined together with a number of the conservative Republicans of the North, and as such they are the majority within the present Congress. I do not think there is any doubt about that. That is why your price control pro-

gram is being scuttled, that is why you are having trouble today with your foreign aid program. That is why we are having trouble with a number of other projects in the Congress, because on the basis of political philosophy, this group that is referred to in the article from which you quote — a group that agrees with the position of the Minority Leader in the Senate, Mr. Wherry — it is a group that agrees with the basic conservative philosophy of the Republican Party.

I say that the Senator from South Dakota is surely performing a service if he says they should go into the Republican Party, because, frankly, the Democratic Party does not need them and the Democratic Party will be able to gain new strength in other parts of the country, standing as a truly progressive and liberal party.

Moderator Granik: Senator Mundt, would you care to comment on this "unholy alliance"?

SENATOR MUNDT: Yes. It looks like an "unholy alliance" which is a constructive alliance and is making some recruits whom we will be willing to accept and welcome into our party, any person Mr. Fitzpatrick is trying to read out of his party. If Mr. Boyle and Mr. Fitzpatrick do not want them in their party, I feel they could form the gist of a mighty strong national administration.

I agree with Senator Humphrey, from Minnesota, in his respect for Senator Hill and Senator Sparkman, of the United States Senate, but I would say that I am equally confident that the leadership of the South, as exemplified by Senator George and Senator Russel of Georgia, and Senator Byrd of Virginia, and a number of others, is the kind of leadership that would appeal to whole multitudes of Americans.

I would like to add to the statement that Senator Humphrey made about what this alliance has done about price control. It is also this alliance that stopped the Brannan Plan, it has stopped the socialization of medicine, it has stopped the public housing from taking over all public housing in all areas; stopped the socialization of industry as proposed by Senator Benton the other day during the Price Control legislation. This alliance has tended to maintain the rights of the people and the rights of the states as against the strong over-powerful central government.

Moderator Granik: Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator Mundt made a brilliant and powerful statement there. Let us take a little more critical examination of what great things could come and will come from this coalition that you are talking about. On the basis of the philosophy that is represented, for example, there would have been no TVA for my dear friends south of the Mason-Dixon Line had this coalition been the fact. Shall we say there would have been a growth of monopolies because some of my friends in the South, who are liberal, like Senator Long, of Louisiana, Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, have led the fight against the basing point bill. I maintain the South has a great deal to gain from the Democratic Party. It gained an agricultural program which the Republican Party never gave it when it was in

control of Congress. The South gained a great deal in housing, and some of the most adamant champions of cooperative housing, low rent housing, came out of the South to clean up their slums and also from the northern cities, to lead their fight for both low rent housing and the minimum wage, to better the lives of the working people of the north and south.

I say that both the South and the North have a great deal to gain from a truly progressive, forward-looking Democratic Party, and I welcome the day (I hope the Senator will be able to convince every American by his article in *Collier's* that those who are of the vintage that believe in monopoly, those who believe in the bill to fix the freight rates, those who have opposed public health facilities, those that have been opposed to the foreign policy of this country, those who have been opposed to minimum wage), let them get into the Republican Party; that is where they belong.

Moderator Granik: Senator Mundt.

SENATOR MUNDT: The first basic concept of political philosophy, which I think would bring the North and South together, is that they concur in the fact that the doctrine of States Rights is a mighty important American concept toward good government. The difficulty with these New Deal, Fair Deal proposals is that they gradually take away from the people increasing amounts of their money and increasing elements of their power and transfer those to the direction of a few politicians here in the capital city of America. It is that which we propose to eliminate, providing in its stead constructive federal government leadership, but having the implementation and the direction and management of these things in the hands of the people and in the hands of the Governors and the Legislatures of their own states.

I would presume that probably this new division of the political concept in America revolves around how large a federal government you want, whether the federal government should be empowered to do such things as public housing or whether it should be done through incentives on the part of the federal government, by local individual initiative, or by the support and cooperation of patriotic groups.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe that the Senator from South Dakota states his point of view with vigor and force, and I am happy he does, because this type of sharp debate on basic political philosophy is exactly what we need in this country. I want to outline again that had the kind of coalition the Senator from South Dakota is talking about been in this country in the past twenty years, the following things would not have happened:

First of all the per capita income of the people in the TVA area would not have doubled; they still would have been down in the depths of economic despair. I also would tell my friends of the Deep South that had this coalition existed, they would not have had the flood control, the public works, the canals, the public power, that has made their country today into a thriving, growing, prospering community. It is public power that has helped the South and the Far West and the Mid-West, and it is this kind of an overall program of welfare

and the assistance of the federal government to the states and to the people that has made it possible for all parts of America to grow and expand.

Moderator Granik: Senator Mundt.

SENATOR MUNDT: It seems to me that what is involved is the fact that neither political party under its present name has an acceptable and understandable political concept. I think we can see in the disagreement between Senator Humphrey and myself tonight that there are two points of view shared by a good many Americans. One feels the central government should be empowered to provide nationalization of power, nationalization of health, nationalization of housing, or education and what not, and my point of view is that it is not the business of the federal government. The federal government is to umpire, to provide the prods and induce the state legislatures and individual businesses and corporations to do those things which are right and proper. I think had we had this kind of realignment charged with the government in the past twenty years, there are some other things we would not have had, either. We would not have a \$260 billion national debt that we now have, and we would not be passing the large tax bill, the largest in the history of America. We would not have government by edict and mandate, but government by legislation, which was the concept conceived by our forefathers in Philadelphia one hundred and fifty years ago.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think we had better look into that. First of all, I do not think that either the Southern Democrats or the Republicans could have stopped the debt. There happened to be a fellow around by the name of Hitler and another by the name of Tojo who had something to do with the war. They had brought on \$250 billion worth of that debt.

SENATOR MUNDT: That is the other side of the ocean. FDR and Harry Truman had something to do with that, too.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I gave him his time, and I will take my time, too.

The Senator makes these broad statements about whether we would not have had this debt. The debt is a war debt and he knows it as well as the Senator from Minnesota.

He says we have the choice of nationalization of health and education and housing. That is not the choice at all. The choice is whether or not the government of the United States, which belongs to all of the people under the terms of the Constitution, is to help other people to lift their housing levels, to lift their educational levels, to lift their health standards. This is not the choice of nationalization or local health authority; it is a choice of whether or not you are going to have good health in this country, or poor health; a choice of whether or not you are going to lift the standards of education, a choice of whether or not you are going to have housing for human beings or no housing.

SENATOR MUNDT: May I put a little better definition on this choice? I do not propose that this realignment of political parties would place the Northern Republicans and Southern Democrats on

platforms favoring disease and bad health at all. I do not think that is the choice in the first instance ? ? ? ? —
It is a question of how to help them. Are we going to help them if a strong government is going by direct contact to interfere with the lives of the individuals on farms or homes, or wherever they find them? Or are we going to help them by expanding opportunities to force them to do the things they would better like to do, by their own power and for themselves?

Take the Missouri Valley, for example, where I live. There we are harnessing the river, providing hydroelectric power, providing soil conservation. But we are doing it by keeping control in the hands of the people in the Valley. As against that in the TVA, the whole business is arranged by directors appointed by the President. The question is: Where does the ultimate authority rest? With the people in the valley, or in the White House?

Moderator Granik: Do you want to answer, Senator Humphrey, before we take questions from the audience?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Senator has heard, I am sure, about the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers the federal agencies that are handling the Pick-Sloan program and the Missouri Valley development, and he knows the states have nothing to say about it one bit. He knows it is a federal program. The difference is whether or not you have a coordinated, integrated program like the TVA, or a hodge-podge like you got out there, which the Hoover Commission said was costing double what it ought to cost because of conflict between the agencies. The Senator knows that.

SENATOR MUNDT: There is one other thing I know. You are talking about construction; I am talking about the administration of the project when it is completed, that I want administered by local direction.

Moderator Granik: Gentlemen, in a moment we will take questions from the audience.

But first, here is an important message.

The Announcer: Before we return you to the American Forum of the Air, brought to you each Sunday by the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, let me ask you this question: What does American freedom mean to you personally? For example, let's consider your job. Here in America, when you like your job you stay on it. If you don't like it, you look for something else. In America you can be a miner, machinist, grocer, baker, doctor, lawyer, or banker. You can be anything your own initiative, training and experience qualifies you to be.

Yes, in America we're free to work at whatever job we choose. Under communism we would be forced to work long hours, at low pay, and shackled to a job we could never leave.

But remember this, freedom to work where we want to work is only one of the many freedoms we will lose if communism wins.

Now the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation returns you to the American Forum of the Air.

Moderator Granik: Now we will have the first question from the

audience; a young lady, a very charming young lady. Go ahead.

QUESTION: I am Bernice Teuteberg. I am a placement officer at the National Production Authority. My question is for Senator Mundt. Do you consider the general attitude and policy of the Southern Democrats to be typical of basic Republican policy?

SENATOR MUNDT: By and large, I would say yes. Of course, I agree with Senator Humphrey that you cannot take an area of geography and say that everyone in one area agrees with everybody in that area and disagrees with everybody in some other area. But I would say there is a greater affinity of interest between the Southern Democrats and the Northern Republicans than there is today an affinity of interest between the average Southern Democrat and big city machines and left-wing fringe groups that have come to control the New Deal Party of the North.

Moderator Granik: Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I was just going to pick up that last comment. I am quite interested in that last comment of the Senator, from South Dakota.

Moderator Granik: About the "fringe" comment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The "fringe" comment.

I would just say if the Republican Party is going to accept the political philosophy and policy that has been enunciated by the Dixiecrat element of the Southern Democrats, then the Republican Party tonight on this program is saying there will be no civil rights, because that is why they walked out of the Democratic Party. The Republican Party tonight is simply saying there will be no more of the federal assistance in terms of public health; there will be no more assistance in terms of vocational education; no more assistance in terms of public works programs developing in the South and making it into one of the garden spots of America, as they justly deserve.

I want it quite clear that if the Republican Party wants to embrace that kind of philosophy we will be delighted to join the issue in 1952, because on that issue the Democratic Party will be back in power, with a true majority in Congress and a President in the White House.

Moderator Granik: Do you want to comment on that Senator?

SENATOR MUNDT: Yes, indeed, because Senator Humphrey, while he does not seem to want to join this alliance would like the privilege of helping to write this platform.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I helped on the last one.

SENATOR MUNDT: And some of the Democrats walked out and are trying to get into our party as a consequence this time. But, of course, that is not going to be the program at all. My choice would be the American voter when he has an honest choice between two legitimate positions in government. My position is that the rights of individuals and the rights of states are closely allied, and if you build a great big, strong superstate government in Washington which infringes upon the local autonomies of the states and the local rights of individual citizens, you are marching directly down the trail of national socialism that we want to stop.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think I ought to make a comment on that because my friend from South Dakota gets these words that just dramatize some sort of theory or legend he has of this "monster government," this "great bureaucracy" that he talks about. Let us face up to it. What has the federal government done through its progress of grants-in-aid, which is the state, the New Deal program? What has it done? Lifted up the whole educational structure of every state in this land. What else has it done? Helping soil conservation to replenish the soil of this land; made possible electric power to eighty farms out of every hundred in America, making possible reclamation of the land and irrigation of the land. And I tell you there is no freedom lost in that; only the freedom to starve and freedom to be in misery.

SENATOR MUNDT: I say now that every one of those was supported overwhelmingly by the Republicans in Congress.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course, that is not true.

SENATOR MUNDT: That is correct; those were supported and have been supported time after time. As a matter of fact, I have sat in the House time after time when by unanimous consent, without even a roll call vote, millions of dollars were appropriated for soil conservation and appropriated for REA and things of that kind.

I am talking about the Brannan plan; I am talking about the things which the Senator from Minnesota is ducking in this debate.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Senator from Minnesota is not ducking a thing. The Senator from Minnesota is saying that when REA came up for vote in 1935, seventy-seven percent of the Republicans in Congress voted against it. Now, of course, they are for it? Why not? It works. When the TVA was up in Congress, sixty-six percent of the Republicans voted against it. Now, of course, they have approved it because it works.

The same thing is true of the George-Bardon Act, that has two Southern names on it. When it was up before Congress the Republican Party voted against it. And today they get the same new names against the same old names for the same old programs.

Moderator Granik: We have about thirty seconds for one more question. Can you give it to us quickly?

QUESTION: My name is M. Victor Rosenbloom. My question is for Senator Humphrey. Don't you believe that what we, as a country, need, is not so much a new party realignment against policies, but a strong, courageous conviction for basic party principles in the national interest?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe that is very important because I think, as my friend from South Dakota pointed out very well tonight, that actually a party must stand for something.

SENATOR MUNDT: The big difficulty is now, as illustrated in 1948, that less than half the people went to the polls. Why? Because most of them felt there was not any great choice between the two platforms and two candidates. The average American feels he is entitled to a decision when he goes to the polls.

Moderator Granik: It is time for summary. Will you continue with your summary, please, Senator?

SENATOR MUNDT: Yes. In the one minute I have to summarize, let me say I think the South would benefit from this realignment program because it would be given a chance to give its free influence to nomination of candidates for President in the election and in determination of national policy. I think it would be beneficial to the Republican viewpoint because instead of being a sectional party, as we now are, operating in thirty-six states, trying to win a horse race with a three-legged horse, we would operate in every state in the union, the way political parties ought to operate.

Primarily the American citizen would benefit because he would get a clear-cut decision of government, bearing the name of national socialism, regardless of the fancy name you call it. But when you place in the hands of a strong federal government control of the increasing amount of money that you earn and the authority that you have, you move in the direction of socialism. If he favors that, one party would move him in that direction. If he opposes it, the other party would move him away from it. That is an extreme way of stating the basic dividing line which it seems to me would operate under the kind of political alliance I envision for America.

Moderator Granik: Thank you.

Now, Senator Humphrey, your summary.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Rather than get into the realm of theory, as my friend from South Dakota takes us, as he stated in his "extreme" way, let me tell what I think would happen by the facts in the record by this kind of realignment. First of all, it would be wholesome because for the first time the American people would really know the Republican Party stood for the following things:

Opposed to American labor, because the Dixiecrat-Republican combination would stand for that; opposed to the extension of Social Security, because the Republican Congress fought social security, as did the Dixiecrat element of Congress; opposed to soil conservation, because in the Congress of the United States there has been a continuous attack upon that kind of great program; opposed to development of public power, which we had witnessed again just within the last week of Congress, where the Dixiecrat and Republican elements again voted against it.

I say if that is the kind of realignment we are going to have, I welcome it because I would like to have the American people truly know what the political parties stand for.

Moderator Granik: Thank you, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion on "Do We Need a Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952?" Our speakers have been Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican of South Dakota, and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota.

The Announcer: For reprints of this discussion, send ten cents to Ransdell, Incorporated, Printers and Publishers, Washington 18, D. C. That is ten cents to R-A-N-S-D-E-L-L, Incorporated, Washington 18, D. C.

This is the American Forum of the Air. Next week the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, one of the nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products, will again present the American Forum of the Air in a discussion on "AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE DEFENSE OF FREEDOM," based upon an article by Senator Paul H. Douglas, appearing in the August issue of Reader's Digest. Our speakers will be Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat of Illinois, and Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican of Ohio.

Each week at this time the American Forum of the Air, dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, is presented so that you in your home may enjoy the authoritative discussion of the many vital topics of our time.

The American Forum of the Air, founded and moderated by Theodore Granik, has been presented by the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation.

This program has come to you from the NBC Television Studios in Washington, D. C.

This is Ray Michael speaking.

The American Forum of the Air is sponsored each week on N.B.C. Television by the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, one of the nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products.

The Proceedings of

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR

As broadcast simultaneously over the coast to coast radio network and through the television network facilities of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and a limited number are distributed free to further the public interest in impartial radio discussions of questions affecting the public welfare.

by

PRINTERS RANSDALL INC. PUBLISHERS

810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.

WASHINGTON 18, D. C.

(When requesting copies by mail, enclose ten cents to cover mailing)

The proceedings of the American Forum of the Air are held every Sunday afternoon from 1:30 to 2:00 o'clock, Eastern Standard Time, in the Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., before an audience. The public is cordially invited to attend these broadcasts and to submit questions from the floor to the participants. Admission is free and no tickets are required.

17  17

J-10888



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