*The National Broadcasting Company Presents*

# MEET THE PRESS

*America's Press Conference of the Air*

*Produced by* LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

*Guest:* The Honorable
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

VOLUME 13 SUNDAY, APRIL 20, 1969 NUMBER 16

*Merkle Press Inc.* *Printers and Periodical Publishers*
*Division of Publishers Co. Inc.*
*Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013*

10 cents per copy

*Panel:* ROBERT J. DONOVAN, *Los Angeles Times*
ROBERT SEMPLE, JR., *New York Times*
CARL T. ROWAN, *Chicago Daily News*
DOUGLAS KIKER, *NBC News*

*Moderator:* EDWIN NEWMAN



# MEET THE PRESS

---

**MR. NEWMAN:** Our guest today on MEET THE PRESS is the former Vice President of the United States and the 1968 Democratic presidential candidate, Hubert H. Humphrey.

We will have the first questions from Douglas Kiker of NBC News.

**MR. KIKER: Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Nixon was inaugurated as President three months ago today. You were the Democratic nominee in 1968 and you are the titular head of the Democratic party today. How do you think Mr. Nixon is doing?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** In the field of foreign policy I believe that it has been a sane and sensible and responsible policy, carrying out pretty much the same general lines of policy as the previous administration. We have had a continuing foreign policy for a number of years.

In the domestic area though I am troubled by the evident lack of recognition of the depth and the seriousness of the domestic problems here that face us. I am also concerned about the lack of a searching inquiry into our vast military spending in an effort to see whether or not we might be able to free up some of those resources for our domestic needs, and I believe there has been what you could term a lack of initiative.

**MR. KIKER: Mr. Nixon submitted his domestic program last week. His critics charged that it was vague and nonspecific, and they are beginning to say that perhaps Mr. Nixon has no fresh ideas of his own. Do you agree with that, Mr. Humphrey?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** I like to give the President the benefit of the doubt. I do think that the approach has been cautious and slow, and I am hopeful that the President will come forward with some proposals of his own. Thus far what you have seen are pro-

posals which have trimmed back some of the measures presented by the previous Administration.

I was, for example, very concerned when I noted that the budget cut, I think, balanced out at around four billion dollars, and of that four billion dollars, only one billion dollars was out of Defense, out of an 80 billion dollar defense budget, and three billion dollars out of the domestic budget. I think that is indicative of some of the attitude that you are beginning to sense here in the Administration, and I would hope that the Administration would take another look, because I am sure that there are—well, there are needs that go unmet when you start to cut education by ten percent, when you cut the Model Cities program by ten percent, when you start to close up Job Corps Centers. It seems to me that this is indicative that the seriousness of the domestic crisis has not been fully appreciated by the Administration.

**MR. KIKER: Mr. Humphrey, there are some small smoke signals coming out of Minnesota to the effect that perhaps you aren't through with politics yet, that perhaps you will be a candidate for the Senate in 1970, perhaps against Senator McCarthy. What is your political future? Do you have one?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** I am very happy to tell you that my reception in my home state seems to be kind and friendly and generous. The public opinion polls have been very encouraging to me. I have made no decision, except to try to do a good job as a professor at the University of Minnesota and at Macalester College.

(Announcements)

**MR. DONOVAN: Mr. Humphrey, in view of the fact that you think the Nixon Administration is spending too much money on military matters, do you regret that the Johnson Administration initiated the ABM program?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Let me make my position clear on this. I am not sure whether an administration is spending too much, but I think the time is at hand for us to really make an in-depth inquiry. I have been studying what are the factors that make up the defense budget. I mean how do you decide what ought to be in a defense budget?

The first thing you have to ask yourself, what are your foreign policy commitments?

Secondly, against what contingencies do you plan?

And, thirdly, what forces do you need to meet those contingencies?

Finally, what kind of weapons do you need for those forces?

Those are the four factors which a Defense Department official, or the Pentagon itself, puts together to make up its budget. I think a budget that represents almost ninety percent, or between eighty and ninety percent of the total budget is extremely large. I am hopeful that it can be cut back.



What I think is necessary is for the Administration to make a searching analysis into these criteria to see whether we are over-committed any place, and secondly, and maybe more importantly, for the Congress of the United States not merely to concentrate on the ABM or any other particular weapons system —important as that may be—because that is just talking about one factor, but, to go into the whole structure of the military budget to see if we can't reduce it and, by reducing it, be able to convert those resources to domestic needs.

**MR. DONOVAN: Do you think there is any practical possibility that the Democratic leadership in Congress, as currently constituted, with Senator Russell and others, would take the lead on scaling-down the military budget?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** I have some hope of it, and I will tell you why, because there are already efforts under way in certain committees of the Congress, over and beyond Appropriations and Armed Forces and—the Armed Services, to look into the overall budget and particularly the military aspect of it. I want to commend those efforts, but, again, I want to say that this is a responsibility of both the Executive and the Congress. In this instance Congress can perform a great service for this country by examining what are all of our commitments, what contingencies are we planning about or planning against; what are the forces that are needed.

For example, do we really need 15 attack carrier forces, which we have? Those forces cost many millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars per year; do we really need that?

This is about the ABM. Do we really need the ABM? You see, I think it was a bad decision, but I think it is really symbolic more than anything else. It tells us that we are arguing, we are debating over the ABM when, in fact, the debate should cover a much broader spectrum of the whole subject of military spending.

**MR. ROWAN: Mr. Humphrey, as a candidate, President Nixon ridiculed the Johnson-Humphrey Adminstration for letting what he called a "fourth-rate military power seize the U.S.S. Pueblo."**

**Do you approve of Mr. Nixon's actions in the recent shooting-down of one of our planes?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Yes, I approve of the President's actions in reference to the protection of our surveillance craft. I regret that the President, as a candidate, made those statements, but I have been a candidate and I guess I am somewhat forgiving. But when you become President of the United States you face up to the realities, just as President Johnson had to face up to the realities in the Pueblo incident. Now, I think Mr. Nixon sees that the situation is much different than it was out on the campaign stump.

**MR. ROWAN: Do you agree that these surveillance fights are so important that they ought to be continued?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** I have thought a good deal about that, Mr. Rowan. I am not really in possession any longer of the detailed information, the most acute intelligence information and, therefore, I am not sure that I am in a position, in this instance, to really give a qualitative answer, that is, an answer of substance. But I will say this, that if you are going to send men on missions as dangerous as this, they deserve protection. I think that is what both the Pueblo and this aircraft incident have taught us.

My own general view is that a nation with all of our responsibilities must have intelligence information. How we get it is a question for the President and his security advisers.

**MR. SEMPLE: Mr. Humphrey, you have been patient with Mr. Nixon and so has the country as he has tried to find some solution to the war in Vietnam.**

**Two questions: As casualty rates continue to rise, how long will you be patient with him, and how long do you think the country will?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Mr. Semple, I am not trying to be overly kind to the President. I just have great respect for that office, and I watched President Johnson wrestle with this incredibly difficult problem of Vietnam. I am convinced that President Johnson spent every day trying to find peace. I believe this with all my heart, and I believe that President Nixon is trying to do the same thing.

I have heard people lambast the previous administration, and I guess maybe I am going to try to profit by that example and not do the same. I happen to believe that the President is seeking, through every known way, a negotiated political settlement. I hope that he is able to get it, and I am going to try to help him in any way that I can. He knows that the country is restless; he knows that the country feels that this is an unpopular war. I am sure from every point of view, from the point of view of the politics of the war, which is surely negative; from the point of view of the use of the resources of this country—and surely this war drains those resources; from the point of view of needing those resources back here, I can't help but believe President Nixon is going to strive to find an answer. If he can find something, I am going to try and help him.

**MR. SEMPLE: Have you any suggestions that you might like to make to the President on how he can get out of this conflict?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** All of my suggestions are a matter of record. I think they keep the records from previous administrations, and I made some during the campaign. I have been very careful of what I have said of late because I believe that with the recent offensive and the negotiations—that is, the Viet Cong offensive—which, by the way, seems to have tapered off now—and the negotiations going on in Paris, I thought too much talk on my part about withdrawals, and so forth, of forces, might not be helpful.

I want the President to have a free hand in this matter because, Mr. President—if I could talk to you directly—I put my faith in you, that you are going to find an answer to this struggle, and I think that as a Democrat I owe you the courtesy of trying to help, and if I can't help, not trying to make it more difficult.

**MR. KIKER: Mr. Humphrey, you just said that the country was restless about Vietnam. If President Nixon doesn't get us out of that war by 1972, in your opinion will he be politically vulnerable?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Yes, sir. I don't think there is any doubt about it. I hope and pray, though, that that won't be the reason for the Democrats defeating Mr. Nixon in 1972. In other words, to put it this way, I hope that long before then this war will be over, and surely that there will be a deceleration of the war and deescalation, and I am confident that this can be achieved. I feel that I ought not to try to cast out rather loosely and freely a lot of little suggestions that might complicate the President's role.

I don't want to overestimate my importance in these matters, but I do represent a spokesman for the opposition, and until the President has demonstrated—which I don't think he will—that he has no answer, I am not going to pick at him. I am going to urge him, though, and encourage him to use every possible initiative that he can think of that will bring about a negotiated political settlement of this struggle.

**MR. KIKER: As long as we are talking about 1972 and presidential politics, it appears that there are two popular candidates already: Senator Muskie and Senator Kennedy. Could that list be expanded? Are you through with presidential politics, Mr. Humphrey?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** I really haven't made up my mind. I am not through with public affairs as such. Whether I am through with elective office, time will tell. I am not trying to be coy. I made up my mind that I am going to be as candid as I can with the American people about issues and about myself. It is a little bit too early. I have a wonderful reception from the American people. I think it is primarily fellowship, frankly, and friendship. I have had every opportunity that a man could have in this country, and I am very grateful for those opportunities.

What the future offers, I don't know, but in the meantime I intend to be working at some matters. Whether they lend themselves to any public office later on, that is yet to be determined. But I will be an active citizen.

**MR. KIKER: The 1968 election left the Democratic Party pretty much in a state of shambles. I think everybody agrees on that——**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Well, I want to take you up on that now.

**MR. KIKER: Well, perhaps you don't agree, but how is the rebuilding going?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Mr. Kiker, there isn't any doubt that when the campaign started in 1968, the party was in a shambles. I have said that. I think there were some factors that in early August, in August and September, that were nothing short of horrendous insofar as their effect on the candidacy, my candidacy and the party. But I really believe that by the time we came to the final week or ten days of the election period we were beginning to pull the pieces back together. There was a feeling of coming together, and it is on that that I have tried to rebuild. It was for that reason that I recommended Senator Fred Harris as Chairman to the Democratic National Committee: young, articulate, in the Senate, up on the issues, a modern man, a border state Senator. I thought he would do well, and he has done well. In the McGovern Commission, we followed the Democratic Convention mandate. There is a commission to look into delegate selection and broadening the base of the party. Congressman O'Hara of Michigan is looking into the rules of the convention for the 1972 convention. We are beginning to rebuild. Our party in Mississippi is an indication of what can happen in the South. We have men like Terry Sanford that are still very active—the former Governor of North Carolina. I think the results in Wisconsin with Mr. Obey, the Congressman there in the Seventh District, a Democrat elected is encouraging. Tom Bradley out in Los Angeles; I think Tom Bradley is going to be elected Mayor of Los Angeles. He is a fine man. Mr. Jones in Tennessee. Al Cervantes, the Mayor of St. Louis.

You know, we are not doing too badly, and we are going to continue to build. My job as I see it is to help heal and to build and encourage people to come in and to help out. I am trying to do that.

**MR. DONOVAN: Mr. Humphrey, many of us who have watched President Nixon in this first three months and who have followed the evolution of the program that you criticized earlier, have come to the conclusion that the President is trying to build a new majority coalition in this country, based on what one expert has called "the unyoung, the unblack and the unpoor."**

**If that is true, does this raise the question of a dangerous polarization in America; in other words, leaving the Democrats the poor, the blacks and the young?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** If I may take your assumptions and speak to them—and I gather that you feel those are just assumptions; we don't know yet whether or not that is a fact—but those assumptions, if they were valid, would pose a very dangerous situation in this country, because the politics for the rest of this century is the politics of opening this society to the people who



have had it closed out—or a society that has closed them out, where the doors have been closed. The politics of the future as I see it is whether or not on the foreign levels, on the foreign policy level, we can stop this arms race spiral and lower the level of danger in this world, reach some semblance of understanding and agreement with the Soviet Union, and also to have the United States of America no longer just to depend upon money and power as a force in this world, but rather upon understanding and policy.

On the domestic scene, I see the politics of what we call the poor, the race issue and the cities, and in this, of course, are involved the young and the blacks. Unless we are able in this country to make this system work so that those who are deprived and needy feel that they have a share in the system, we are going to have nothing but trouble. So I would hope that no one would ever contemplate building what you call a majority of the unyoung, the unblack, and—how did you put it, the other one?

**MR. DONOVAN: The unpoor.**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** And the unpoor.

**MR. DONOVAN: But if that was a coalition that elected a President, the President wouldn't lightly put it aside, would he?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** May I say if he doesn't put it aside, he will be put aside, because that kind of politics is sure defeat.

**MR. ROWAN: Mr. Humphrey, Senator Mike Mansfield said the other day that Republican attacks are pushing Senator Edward M. Kennedy into the 1972 Democratic nomination. He said, "They are pushing him so far out in front that if he wants it, it is a a foregone conclusion he will get the nomination."**
**Do you agree with that?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** That is one man's point of view.

**MR. ROWAN: Do you agree with it?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** I think Mr. Mansfield is generally a very judicious man. I believe that we have lived long enough now to know that anybody who predicts 1972 in 1969 is really going way out on a limb, and Mike Mansfield is ordinarily a rather cautious man. There isn't any doubt in my mind that Senator Kennedy is a very popular man, and he is a very fine man, and he is my friend. But Senator Muskie is a very fine man and a very popular man and he is my friend. And I am not dead, and there are a few others around. I think it is really too early, but I will say this: The Republicans are sure helping. They are sure helping, and I want to wish Ted Kennedy the very best. He knows that I feel this way.

**MR. ROWAN: There are some people who feel that violence in Chicago at convention time and animosity toward Mayor Rich-**

**ard Daley really cost you the election. Would you like to see the Daley machine busted up before 1972?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Well, Mr. Rowan, there have been those that have been trying to have me involved in Chicago politics ever since August, 1968. I think Mr. Kiker came a little closer to some of my interests a while ago when he talked about Minnesota politics. I think Chicago politics will take care of itself.

Let me say for Mayor Daley, he hasn't been always very complimentary to me of late, but I happen to have a high regard for the Mayor as a Mayor of a great city. I deeply regret some of the things that have happened in Chicago, but I think we begin to see across the country that this isn't exactly unique to Chicago. There hasn't been too much peace on the college campuses; there has not been too much peace in New York City. Police confrontation with young people is not related particularly to the name "Chicago," so I am not going to fight out the battle of Chicago on politics.

**MR. NEWMAN:** About three minutes left, gentlemen.

**MR. SEMPLE: I'd like to try a general philosophical question on you, Mr. Humphrey. It is addressed also to you as a professor and a political scientist.**

**The Congress, the press and probably even the President, have been having a lot of trouble discovering what is loosely known as the mood of the country.**

**You have been out there speaking a great deal and teaching a great deal. If you had to put your finger on any—one single thing that is bothering everybody—and I mean the blacks, suburbanites, middle-class—what would that single thing be? Or is there such a thing, apart from Vietnam?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** I would say the one pervasive fact is Vietnam. The other—I don't believe you could put your finger on a single thing after that. For the people in the cities it is the problem of poverty, the race problem that seems to confront most every area of our country today. For the blacks, it is their struggle to try to find their place in this society and not only to find it, to have a piece of the action, as they put it.

In other words, how do you get the powerless to share in power? That seems to be the philosophical question today, and we are having to work on that. There is a restlessness in this country over disorder, over crime, over lawlessess, and yet at the same time that restlessness is couched in a desire for reform, for social justice.

For example, like tax reform: I think the American people are very upset with the present tax structure which is filled with inequities, and they are looking forward to the President and the Congress to do something, to bring some sense of equity into the tax structure.



I think the cities, the people in the cities are very upset over the incapacity of local government to meet the social needs of those communities, and they are looking to the federal government to find some way of improving the revenue-sharing program with the local governments.

There are is no one thing, as such, except possibly the feeling that there is too much permissiveness, a little too much—there is far too much disorder and apparently an unwillingness on the part of some people to do much about it.

**MR. NEWMAN:** About one minute left, gentlemen.

**MR. SEMPLE: When I asked the question, I had in mind what I perceive as a growing discontent among all people, all classes, with our role in the world.**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Yes.

**MR. SEMPLE: Do you sense, as you go around the country, this sort of discontent—that we have over-extended ourselves?**

**MR. HUMPHREY:** Yes, I sense it, and I am afraid it can have both a good and bad effect. I believe that the public thinks its military budget is too large, and I think so too.

Secondly, I believe that the public may begin to think that we ought not to have anything to do with many parts of the world, which I think would be most unfortunate. It is a matter of changing our posture in the world, of not trying to police the world, but rather to cooperate with the world, and I think the American people have to be very careful in their disenchantment with war and military expenditures that we don't withdraw from a responsible role of cooperation and engagement and participation in world affairs.

**MR. NEWMAN:** I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up. Thank you, Mr. Humphrey, for being with us today on MEET THE PRESS.

*The Proceedings of*

# MEET THE PRESS

as broadcast nationwide by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and made available to the public to further interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcripts may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope and ten cents for each copy to:

*Merkle Press Inc. Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013*

(*Division Publishers Co., Inc.*)

*MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network. This program originated from NBC in Washington, D.C.*

**Television Broadcast 1:00-1:30 P.M. EST**
**Radio Broadcast 6:05-6:30 P.M. EST**

4/18/69

# The Hot Issues

1. The EC-121 incident

   a. The incident again illustrates that we live in a hard, cruel world, and that wishing for peace will not bring it. North Korea is a lawless, aggressive regime. Our men killed in the spyplane incident are only the most dramatic group of a large number who have been killed in the numerous incidents along the Korean armistice line in the past year.

   b. With no specific U. S. retaliation, the danger now will be that North Korea will be encouraged to try other and more provocative incidents. Protection of our reconnaissance flights will tend to reduce their opportunity, but we must expect other attacks to take place now, on other planes or ships.

   c. I would have hoped the Administration would have gone to the United Nations to demand condemnation of North Korea.

   d. It is interesting to note how very far from the rhetoric of his campaign Mr. Nixon has departed -- we no longer hear any castigation of Mr. Johnson's handling of the Pueblo incident.

2. ABM

   a. This should not be a political issue. It is an issue of the highest national security, upon which informed men can and do differ radically. There are both Democrats and Republicans ranged on both sides of the question.

   b. The objective I seek is greater national security, greater protection for the American people, not less. What the deployment of the ABM at this time does is to provoke a response from the Russians that is quite predictable - an increase in their offensive weapons so as to be able to overwhelm the ABM defenses.

b. (cont'd) Our defense against an attack by nuclear weapons rests entirely on the belief on the part of a would-be aggressor that we could retaliate with unacceptable force. Our whole system of seaborne Polaris and Poseidon missiles is designed to be a retaliatory system that cannot be knocked out in a sudden coordinated attack. And at least some of our Minutemen and some of our airborne alert bombers would be able to be launched before the impact of a sudden nuclear attack -- in sufficient numbers to destroy the aggressor's population and industry.

The fact that the Soviet Union may have as many offensive weapons as we, or even more, does not change the power equation that has existed since the Russians had enough offensive missiles to destroy the bulk of our population.

What is important is that both sides would have enough surviving weapons to destroy the aggressor nation, after having absorbed a first nuclear strike. That is what gives whatever stability there is to the nuclear equation. After a given point, the numbers of offensive missiles on either side really do not make any significant difference.

The danger in all this counterpoise of nuclear weapons is that someone may make a mistake. There could be an accidental exchange of weapons. And the only real safeguard against that dreadful catastrophe is to seek the only real security that we can get -- which is to get a mutual cutback in offensive missiles of the kind which are clearly in the category of "first-strike" missiles. These are the missiles which have to be fueled ahead of time, and are not of any practical utility in serving as a second-strike deterrent. Then we should progressively seek the reduction of all long-range offensive weapons -- protecting the balance as between the two great powers.

So long as both sides possess the power to utterly destroy the life of the other side, we live in an unacceptable state of insecurity. We can hardly get more insecure. We can only get more secure by reducing those weapons below the threshold of mutual destruction.

3. Student disorders

American Civil Liberties Union statement of April 9:

> "We are deeply disturbed about some methods that some student activists have used in the attempt to achieve their ends; methods which violate and subvert the basic principles of freedom of expression and academic freedom. Protest that deprives others of the opportunity to speak or be heard or that requires physical takeover of buildings to disrupt the educational process, or the incarceration of administrators and others are anti-civil-libertarian and incompatible with the nature and high purpose of an educational institution. . .
>
> To abandon the democratic process in the interests of 'good' causes is to risk the destruction of freedom not just for the present but for the future, not just for our social order but for any future social order as well."

Washington Post, editorial of April 14:

> "Harvard is now involved in a showdown which, for the sake of its future as an institution of learning, it had better win. The Arts and Sciences faculty of Harvard . . . somewhat equivocally deplored both the SDS action and the use of force to overcome it . . . there is a handwringing quality about the faculty reaction that strikes us as ominous. The faculty is going to have to choose sides in this situation."

New York Times, editorial of April 11:

> "There is a tragic relationship between the recent endorsement of 'positive violence' by a group of clergymen protesting welfare cuts and the illusions of righteous coercion on the part of Harvard's Students for a Democratic Society.

3. Student disorders (cont'd)

New York Times, editorial of April 11 (cont'd):

> The time has clearly come to stop pretending that the disruptions are adolescent pranks or justifiable excesses of young idealists. What is at stake now is nothing less than the perpetuation of universities as centers of reasons in a free society. To permit them to be paralyzed or subverted by any lawless, coercive force of whatever political ideology or objective is to give up on the survival of free society itself."

American Council on Education statement of April 17:

> "There has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strains attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communication. Within this cult there is a minute group of destroyers who have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university, and in the processes of orderly discussion and negotiation to secure significant change . . .
>
> If universities will not govern themselves, they will be governed by others . . .
>
> Students and faculty whose consciences demand that they express dissent through law violation must be prepared to accept the due processes and the penalties of the law. They should not be encouraged to expect amnesty from the effects of the law."

Dr. S. I. Hayakawa (quoted by Dave Broder April 18):

> "Pusey was doing the right thing, but he was double-crossed by his faculty . . .
>
> First you have the uproar created by students. Then an element in the faculty has to defend the students. The more they have to show the students are justified, the more they have to find reasons they (the faculty) have got problems and grievances too . . .

Dr. S. I. Hayakawa (quoted by Dave Broder April 18) (cont'd.):

> 'One of the real psychological puzzles of our time' is the tendency of some faculty members to condone violence by students but to condemn it on the part of police . . . There's an unconscious cultural snobbery on the part of the college-educated against those who are not college-educated, a deep-rooted prejudice smong some intellectuals that they are a superior order of being because they are intellectuals. Some of them believe the world has no damn business being run by politicians, generals and businessmen."

Political Questions

1. How is Richard Nixon doing?

   He is just beginning to feel the crunch of events. It is too early to tell how he will handle a major crisis. In Congress he is going very slow indeed -- the latest that any President has ever sent up his program.

   His economic policy seems to be emerging gradually -- traditional economics.

   The cutbacks in education which appear to be coming, the cutbacks in Head Start and Job Corps are predictable, but disturbing.

2. What is happening to the Democratic Party?

   It is still recovering from the trauma caused by racial tension and the split over Vietnam.

   Nevertheless, it appears to have great grassroots vitality typified by the successful elections for Congress in Tennessee and Wisconsin in the past weeks.

3. Do you feel that you are the head of the party, or is it in fact Senator Kennedy who is now the actual head of the party?

   The nominee of the party traditionally serves as the head of the party until the next nominating convention, even though the party does not furnish him with an office or a staff. There are many leaders of our party -- we are fortunate in having many bright, able, attractive and articulate men and women -- including Senator Kennedy and Senator Muskie, for two examples.

4. Do you think that Senator Kennedy has the 1972 nomination wrapped up?

   One of the favorite games of armchair quarterbacks and newsmen is picking the nominee of the two parties years ahead of the event. They are seldom accurate.

4. (cont'd)

For example, scarcely a man in the press gave Mr. Nixon any chance to be nominated in 1968 -- let alone be elected -- as late as early 1968.

Events are determinant in politics to a marked degree -- events over which we can have no control because they are unforseeable. Answer: the 1972 Democratic Convention has not been convened yet -- and no Democrat has the nomination at this time.

5. What are your own plans, politically speaking?

It is too early to make any decisions. I am busy this year in teaching, writing, traveling, in business, and in trying to help my party prepare for 1970.

6. Would you run against Senator McCarthy if he decides to run for re-election?

I have not given that possibility any thought as yet. It's an "iffy" question: we do not know what Senator McCarthy plans to do as yet.

Minnesota
Historical Society