

Maureen and Mike

Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

Archives and Special Collections

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: library.archives@umontana.edu

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

This transcript represents the nearly verbatim record of an unrehearsed interview. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

Oral History Number: 036-007

Interviewee: Daniel Kemmis

Interviewer: Claire Rhein

Date of Interview: December 8, 1980

Project: Daniel Kemmis Interviews Oral History Collection

Claire Rhein: Today is December the 8th and the year 1980, and I'm with Dan Kemmis in his office. I suppose the big question is, Dan, what happened between our last conversation in May and November? Let me remind you in May you expected that Judge [Thomas Judge] would have been nominated and reelected, and I think you were willing to put money on the fact that there would be two Democratic sides Montana Legislature. Should I have brought that up? (laughs)

Daniel Kemmis: I'm notoriously bad as a predictor of races and this is...June, in particular, confirmed my conviction that I should stay away from predictions all together. I was very surprised by a great deal that happened in June, and I was surprised by what happened in November. Although by the time November came around, I was not expecting that we would control both houses of the legislature. I was not prepared for the Republican sweep that took place nationwide and took place in Montana also. It took me by surprise. I expected that we may have a good chance of losing the house in Montana. I didn't expect to be in a minority with the Republicans having a 14-vote margin.

CR: June, of course, was the primary and what happened there?

DK: Well the big upset there was Ted Schwinden beating Governor Judge in the primary, and that came as a surprise. I think some people weren't surprised; although, I everyone I knew was surprised by the margin that Schwinden won by. In a way it was encouraging because what it means is people can have something in their minds that the polls can't uncover, and those of us that don't like politics to be entirely a science, I guess proved to have a few surprises there. That was obviously the case. There was something that the people felt that no governor should serve three terms, or that they were upset with the problems in Judge's person problems or what it is I don't know. But there was something there that made a difference.

CR: Do you think it was those personal issues?

DK: Yes, I don't think there were any significant issues in the gubernatorial primary. The only thing that gets close to an issue, is the question of how a particular person is going to administer state government. But in terms of making decisions about issues I don't think there were any issues between Judge and Schwinden.

CR: Well, let's talk about Schwinden for a minute. I suppose maybe on your political campaigns this was either a very dirty campaign or a very remarkable good campaign. What did you think of Schwinden's campaign?

DK: Oh, I think Schwinden ran a safe campaign. It turned out to be a smart campaign. He didn't stick his neck out very much. He emphasized human qualities and administrative ability, and I think he came across as the type of person that Montana people like and trust and that was the right thing to come across as. He didn't have to practice any deception to do that. He just portrayed himself as what he is. Ramirez, I think, ran one of the most ill-advised campaigns I can imagine. I think in this particular year of a Republican sweep, Ramirez should have been able to win the governorship. He is a very able person. He had fairly broad support in his own party and—obviously the party—and broad support amongst the people in Montana that carried the state heavily in favor of Reagan—carried both houses of the legislature and they should have been able to win the governorship as an attractive candidate as Jack Ramirez was, but he just had bad advice. It was his mistake that he followed that advice.

CR: It's rather stunning for him to have lost under the circumstances.

DK: Oh, it is. I think it can be attributed to Burt Williams who managed his campaign and who I think does not understand Montana voters very much.

CR: This has become almost a profession. I would think particularly on that level of a mistake he would have had some professional leadership as well as national. Did he have a national audience?

DK: I don't know. I'm sure they must have been available.

CR: Characterizing Schwinden's campaign as safe and smart and that he comes across as a very trustworthy person, how would you characterize (unintelligible) his leadership?

DK: Well, I don't know. I'm just waiting to find out. I think he'll be a good administrator, and it appears that is where his strength lies. He has always been interested in administration, and I think he will continue to concentrate on that. So I think that state government will be well run.

The big question will be what kind of leadership he will provide on policy issues. That I don't know, but I'm subject to that honeymoon mentality. I'm more than willing to give him a fair amount of time to prove himself and that certainly means throughout the legislative session.

CR: Is this a fair question to ask you about your personal relationships with him or what you'll anticipate they will be as governor? Did you not always have a good relationship with Judge?

DK: I didn't have a close relationship with Judge, and I don't and haven't had a close personal relationship with Schwinden. Obviously in this session, the governor and I and the rest of the Democratic leadership will be working closely together, so I'm looking forward to the opportunity to get to know him a lot better than I had in the past. I think that is one of the things about this session that I look forward to more than anything else. As I say, I think he's going to be a pretty good governor, and I think it's going to be interesting to at least be able to—at least on legislative issues—be close to him and I hope to find out what he's thinking and perhaps at least in one or two instances to have some input on his policies.

CR: How is he on the level of the conservative scale as opposed to Judge?

DK: I think in most cases that he's a little more conservative than Judge.

CR: You really made it a great opportunity in your response to that last question for me to get in what Dan Kemmis is and that is Minority Leader of the House by one vote. Hardly a landslide there, Dan, because of...Would you like to talk about that, Dan?

DK: Well, it wasn't a landslide by any means. It was as close as it could be. Obviously if one vote had gone for somebody else, I wouldn't be the minority leader.

CR: And that somebody else was?

DK: "Red" Menahan [William "Red" Menahan] from Anaconda. He was the only one who ran against me. We had 43 votes to divide up, and that was 21 for Red and I had 22 votes. In a way I suppose by being practiced in counting votes within an eyelash may be helpful in the upcoming session since I expect there will be a number of times votes will be sustained by a margin like that or lost by a margin like that. I don't know exactly how to characterize what went on there. Obviously, I'm biased about it, and I would be interested in somebody's independent analyses about it.

CR: We are interested in yours!

DK: All right, I guess the way that I look at it is for a liberal to have been elected minority leader in the session was a longshot at any event, and the fact that I won it by one vote is actually fairly encouraging. I think that the odds that it would go the other way, and the fact of the matter is that liberalism did not do well in November of 1980 anywhere in the United States. It didn't do well in Montana. The Democrats going into a caucus like the caucus in Helena had to be shy about liberalism. It had to be in the back of their minds that liberalism was a dangerous path for the party to take, and anyone who had a choice, who wasn't himself or herself committed to a progressive path was going to have to think twice about supporting someone with a strong liberal background that I have. Because of the danger, the party would be identified as leftward leaning in the time that the country and the state are obviously going in the opposite direction. I think that was truly the crucial consideration. I think there were probably two crucial considerations that weighed against each other in that situation. On the one hand, the factor I just described and on the other hand was, I think, probably the question of ability to provide effective leadership on the floor of the House. I think that was decisive in its own way. That obviously was something I could not talk about during the campaign for minority leadership, but it's something my supporters did talk about and, I think, probably that consideration is what made the difference.

CR: Okay, back up just a minute. Ann Mary Dussault was majority leader. The question obviously is was she not interested in minority leadership?

DK: The answer is that she was not interested or at least chose not to go after it. Ann Mary and I had been in close contact for several months before the election about the various possibilities and various permutations and combinations after the election, and I had let her know that I was going to be interested in leadership whether we would be in the majority or minority. At the same time it was clear that there was a high potential that we both couldn't be elected to leadership, and while we were hoping that we could be in the majority and were aware of the possibility that the Speaker from last session, Harold Gerke from Billings, might not be reelected to the House even if we were in the majority. He had a tough race and knew he may not be returning. If that happened, I let people know early that I would be interested in running for Speaker. It was obvious if I were elected that it would be difficult for Ann Mary to be elected majority leader because there would be a reluctance to give the top two leadership positions to Missoulians. We had resolved that for sure by the time the election. We had just agreed to consult with each other about it, and I had promised if it came down to a situation where only one of us would be elected that I would step aside so that Ann Mary could have whatever she chose.

Now, when we ended up being in the minority, Ann Mary looked it over and she knew that I was very definitely interested in being minority leader so she decided I think that being in a leadership position in this situation was not going to enhance her political career at all. I think it's no secret that she has political aspirations and ambitions—not necessarily well-defined—but she does have ambitions to hold some position outside of the legislature. I think the way that she looks at it is that she has established herself as a leader statewide, and by remaining in a leadership position in the legislature and particularly in a minority position, she would take some chance with undermining the power base that she now has. I'm not in that position, and I don't have one to undermine and can only build my base. I don't take near the risk that she would have taken. So between the two of us it was agreed that it made sense for me to seek the minority leadership and didn't make as much for her.

CR: Would you elaborate on that a little more? Why it's not such a risk for you?

DK: Well, I suppose politicians always look in terms of the political capital that they have, and I at least always think in terms of what capital I have and how can I invest it in order to get a higher return and end up with more in the end than I do now. What you do is always...I think risk is just like capital that's used in the market place, and you take what you got and then you risk it in a particular situation. If you are lucky, you end up with more at the end of it. What Ann Mary has done by coming majority leader last time is to put herself in a position to where she is recognized as a leader statewide. She then has a certain amount of recognition. There a large numbers of people that know who she is and know what her capacities are and so on. The chance of expanding that base by serving one more term as a leader in the House, she is not just aren't going to expand it much.

On the other hand by serving as minority leader, you take some chances that you are going to have to put yourself in positions where part of what you've already developed may be road where some support groups that you already have may have to hold back from their support. That's a chance that you take. If you weight the fact that you are not going to expand your base very much and you may very well destroy it then from Ann Mary's point of view, it is not particularly appealing to be minority leader. From my point of view, I don't have any of that recognition statewide. I haven't developed any of that because I've never been in leadership before and I haven't risked anything before essentially by going into that position. Eventually I will make enemies, but the chances are what I will do to offset that is I'll develop a lot more contacts than I have now and develop a lot more visibility statewide and so on and so on. In my point of view, I don't have as much risk in this situation. I have more to gain than I have to lose.

CR: During the campaign you really weren't very visible in your own district.

DK: No, I wasn't.

CR: What were you doing?

DK: I was working with other Democrats across the state trying to do what little I could to help get them elected, and I was working for the University of Montana across the state helping to develop its political base. It's trying to help the Alumni Association and organize alumni and students and other friends of the university. That is what I concentrated on doing, and quite frankly, I was running for leadership. I was assured of being elected in House District 94, and I didn't take it for granted. I did go door to door through part of the district and put up yard signs, but given the limited amount of time, what made the most sense to me was to concentrate on statewide rather than stay in my own district.

CR: I have to ask one question, and really, you brought it up. You were on the Education Committee and were very effective for the university and (unintelligible) were very effective in the legislature as minority leader, how are you going to be able to help us even more?

DK: I'm not sure the position of minority leader is going to enable me to help the University of Montana any more than I would be able to if I weren't in that position. There may be some spinoff from that, and it may be that when I talk to individual legislators, particularly Democrats, they may be more willing to listen to me because of the position that I hold now, and it's something that shouldn't be overlooked. The same is true for Bill Norman, who is the minority whip in the Senate and also represents the University District. I think that is true in his case too. I don't think that's negligence at all. The fact of the matter is—and I've talked to President Bowers about this and talked to student leaders about it—the fact of the matter is I think it's important for the university to develop some new spokesmen for their pots because I think it would be dangerous for the university to rely on Bill Norman or me to be accepted as the way we were in the past.

The way I look at it is it's in the nature of my job as minority leader to be public enemy number one to the Republican majority in the House. It's not necessarily the way to characterize it, it's just the fact. That is what I've been elected to do. Given that fact that they are the majority, they control what goes on. I think that you have to expect to a certain extent that if I'm up baiting them all the time is part of what I've been elected to do. But they are not going to necessarily look kindly on my own pet projects, and if I am identified as the spokesperson for the university, it might night be the best thing for the university. Before I was elected minority leader, I encouraged the president, the union, the students, and everyone else to begin to

develop some new spokesman, and I think that they are doing that. I think my most effective role will be working with Democrats, and I'll do that but they will need someone else to convince the Republicans, by in large, of the merits that the university has got. The same in the Senate as well.

CR: Sorry my mind just keeps going back to this incredible vision of Dan Kemmis as public enemy number one! (laughs) But it does make it awkward, doesn't it with you and Norman both in the leadership in this particular legislature? I can see this is...it's almost going to be the university is going to have to beat the system. Not just the university here in Missoula but the university looks further or broad.

DK: Oh absolutely! Let's be frank about it. The Democrats do not control what happens in the legislature, and it would be foolish for the university or any other group to depend on Democrats to get what they need done. If the university is to be well funded, it will be well funded because of, at least substantially, Republican commitment to doing that. If the Republican commitment is not there, then it won't be well funded. Republicans are in control. They have the responsibility, and that is how everyone has to look at it.

CR: We talked before about the strength of special interest as opposed to party strength and some of the material that I've read on the national level suggests that parties were weakened further in this election. Yet a great deal of your effort is going to be directed pretty much party affairs and use of party politics. What is happening in Montana in this direction?

DK: Well, I think Montana reflects what is happening elsewhere pretty closely, and I think the party structure is gradually being weakened in Montana as it is elsewhere. Although there are counter vailing forces. There both parties show some sides of party revitalization even the Democrats, and as a matter of fact, I think the Democrats this time as a party were better organized and—

CR: Are you talking state?

DK: Yes, more prepared for our campaign than they have been for a long time. The results don't show it, but the results show the nationwide sweep towards the right. I think it would be a mistake to overlook the fact that the Democrats as a party in Montana were fairly well organized this time and that organization is there to be built. I guess the real question is whether party organizations are that important and if a person should put his or her time into developing them. I still believe that they are important. I'm not sure if I'm entirely rational on it. I am a dyed in the wool Democrat, and I've felt Democratic Party loyalty from as early as I can

remember knowing anything about anything. I believe that the Democratic Party serves...I guess I think it serves an essential function in society, and I think it serves an essential function in Montana. It's not easy for me to conceive of Montana moving in the direction of being the kind of society I think it should be without strong leadership from the Democratic Party. I don't mean that the Republicans don't also have an important role to play. It's just I don't see the process working without strongly organized parties, and I don't feel any responsibility for the Republicans to get organized but I do for the Democrats.

CR: Ah yes, but how do the Republicans nominate their people? Come back to the fact on through the party system can you produce an election.

DK: Well, I think that's right. I don't see the process working very well in any other way, and I know there is a lot of talk about scrapping the process all together and doing something else but I don't know what it is. The way that I look at it though is what this election really tells us is that it's time for the Democrats to revitalize itself. I've felt that way for a very long time now, and those of us that have been saying that have a lot more ready audience than we have had in the past. The Democrats have rested on the FDR [Franklin Delano Roosevelt] coalition for so long and on the New Deal policies for so long, and it's worked for so long that there was general unwillingness to explore any new avenues or any new principles for new policies. Now Democrats are ready to do that, and it's time to get to work.

CR: That's interesting. Historically, did Abraham Lincoln carry the Republican Party for probably decades?

DK: Oh sure, all the way into the twentieth century. It's exactly what the Democrats have done with FDR. We've had a few other heroes sprinkled along the way, but the coalition was basically put together by FDR. The majority was put together by FDR, and we've got to get back to what that majority thins. I don't think we are going to get it back in any significant way until we readdress ourselves to the questions of the...

[End of Side A]

[Side B]

CR: We were looking at the Democrats addressing the 21st century rather than the FDR coalition and perhaps getting themselves together with what a different act?

DK: Oh I think so. I don't think that the basic principles of the Democratic Party should change. The basic principle is the one that is reflected in the name, and that is the Democratic faith that the people can rule and should rule. I think that we need to take a new look as to what we mean by that. My way of looking at it is self-consciously partisan and I know there is another way of looking at it.

CR: But we are interested in your way Dan!

DK: My way of looking at the, at what has developed now is the Republican sweep nationwide is basically a reactionary matter that it is in most ways a shying away from the problems that confront us at least from a democratic point of view and by democratic I mean with a small "d." If the Democrats believe that the people can and should rule then what that means to me is that people as human beings can apply themselves to the very, very difficult problems of our time. But the chief of those problems being the human race reaching in many ways to the limits of its natural environment. That it is using up resources, and it is using up space and so on. Those facts present tremendous challenges to the human race, and the question that is presented on an entry level of government is whether the human race is up to meeting those challenges or not. More specifically the question is can the human race maintain those challenges and meet freedom at the same time, or can it only meet those challenges by giving up its freedom by subjected itself to some form of authoritarianism. Now, I don't think there is an easy answer to that. I don't think that a person can say "yes the human race can meet those challenges and its freedom."

But, I think to get back to democratic principles that what the Democratic Party must say is "Yes, we can do that." In order to do that, it's clear that the Democrats have to develop some new policies. Our policies in the past, particularly in the economic realm, have been particularly based far too much on the idea that government spending is an important part of the solution to the economic problems, on the idea that economic growth is an unqualified good in the economic sphere. Given that the shape of the world and the fact that we are reaching limits, we have to readdress the problem of growth specifically. That is the one area where New Deal politics simply are not adequate. It's the one area where the Democrats need to come forward with something.

Let me get back to how I look at the Republicans. I think that they face the tremendous stresses of our time with running out of resources and as a result of running out of resources, we then have runaway inflation. We have social changes that are so rapid that people have a great deal of difficulty dealing with them. In that situation, I think it is very natural for the people who want to turn back to what seemed to have been for them much simpler times and more secure times. I think that Ronald Reagan offers them the illusion of being able to turn back to those times. I think that there are two ways that the Republican sweep is anti-democratic in the sense that I am talking about. I think that there are two ways in which it is a turning away from the concept that people can and should address their problems in a creative way. There are two main elements I think to the Republican sweep. One is sort of the religious fundamentalism, and the other is a turn away from government control over anything which means in our society. A matter of turning decisions—major decisions—not over to the people individually but to the giant corporations. Religious fundamentalism to me is a matter of confronting the tremendous problems of our society and saying, “Well, we really can’t deal with those in a creative way so the way we will deal with them is in a rigid morally authoritarian way.” That we see the family dissolving, and rather than deal with that in addressing what it is that’s going on in society, we will try and impose some 19th century concepts on everyone and make everyone live according to those concepts.

Now the motivation I think is correct in that we don’t want to see the family dissolve and see society disintegrate. The solution is unorthodox, I think. The challenge for the Democrats is to come up with a solution that is workable. I think if the Democrats apply themselves to the situation and succeed in coming up with solutions that are workable that they win back the majority eventually because what they will present to the people is being able to move creatively into the future instead of moving in fear of the past. But the real question is whether Democrats have the ingenuity to do that.

CR: The thing that keeps coming to mind in listening to you is Johnson’s [Lyndon B. Johnson] Great Society which of course was the concept of FDR’s common man concept or something like that. Is that possible? It got out of hand and reality of the idea that an economic solution created that may have also been pegged a Republican response. Is something happening here?

DK: Oh yes, I think so. The one thing the Democrats have got to get out of their minds is the idea that big government—that federal government—can solve the problems of the 21st century. I don’t believe it can. I think it is absolutely impossible for it to solve the problems. I think it is one of the problems, and it will not become anything else. The Democrats have to become the party of decentralization of local control, and that of course is my philosophy. That has been a Republican philosophy at least on the surface. But when you look below the surface

what the Republicans all too often are saying is, "Let's get rid of big government in order to have no government." That is saying, "Let's get rid of government control all together." That I don't believe is the solution.

CR: It's the means and not the end that perhaps you are talking about. That's a great national picture, and it clears many things in my mind because you...Now let's look at what happens in Montana when you come immediately back to a specific problem here. That is the state's rights. We have come back to this, and then all Montanans are going over and over this. So can you tie this back to the state's party position?

DK: I think in Montana that the questions presented are in some way the same questions that in some ways are well, they are localized in Montana in particular ways. If one of the main problems nationwide is the fact of our running out of non-renewable resources and if that depletion has cost deflation and so on, the ways that are reflected in Montana are manifold I guess. First of all the inflation hits Montana the same way that it hits everyone else. Basically the short term solution is to the problem hit Montana very differently or it concentrated in Montana very differently than they are elsewhere. Specifically if the focus of the problem is energy, and if the solution of a nationwide problem is energy independence and if a key factor in that is coal development, then obviously Montana becomes impacted in a way that the rest of the country isn't. So that are problem continues to be the problem of coal, and it will continue to be bad at least for the next decade. I think that coal will be the key issue in Montana.

But let's back away a little bit from that, and while addressing that, try to address some more problems in Montana. With the simultaneously with the resurgence of coal in Montana came throughout the decade of the '70s, there arose the movement to defend Montana's environment more thoroughly than we ever had before. That I believe was right for Montana and think that Montana's environment is...Well, we don't have to go into that, but I think it is absolutely precious and at the core of what Montana is. I think that it would be a great irresponsibility on our part to ever turn our backs on it. In a lot of ways it would be absolutely wrong to do that. I take a lot of pride in what Montana did at the beginning of the '70s in terms of protecting its environment and in terms of saying basically to the rest of the country that, "We are going to set the ground rules here, and if there is going to be development for coal, it will be in such a way that we do not sacrifice what we have a responsibility to protect."

CR: I have to interject. Remember the emergency legislative session and the Constitutional Convention reflect a lot of that. The early '70s were very big years for you and me to remind our future in that legislature and of course that was your very first experience.

DK: Right, I came in on the tail end of the really revolutionary period. I think that period began and I suppose you can begin that period in 1971 and it ended in 1975. At 1975 was the first session that I served, but you are right that the new constitution played a very important part there. To me it's a very important that the constitution was developed during that period because then it reflects what Montana was doing at that time, and to me dramatically or at least symbolically, that the fact what we were doing then found reflection in the constitution is helpful because as we begin to move away from that the constitution is saying what we meant at that time. The question is whether how far are we going to move away from that and what it means? It's very clear that we have moved away from what was happening there, and I like to try and analyze what was happening there and see whether it really is necessary. Whether it's right or it is to move away or if it's to move away and how we can prevent it. Again I think what Montanans did then was to make a statement that was true to their identity, but they have since then become very unsure of whether they can maintain that position or not or whether they can afford to maintain that position or not. Whether they can have economic security and still protect the state in a way that they should. That I think presents a real historical challenge, and one that I enjoy being a part of although it may be as frustrating as anything that happens in my life. But it is the challenge to me is to develop a philosophy or a political theory or whatever that would help Montanans to see that they can remain true to what they identify as being so central to their identity, to help them to see that they can do that without sacrificing economic security. That is to me the key challenge to the Democratic Party. If we are going to face the future, the future we are going to face is one where there are going to be tremendous pressures on natural resources and what we are going to have to show—

CR: This is really interesting. Dan, you've been talking to me for almost three years, and this same thought is running through every conversation ...

DK: I guess so. I've got a one-track mind!

CR: I think this is just a major challenge for you.

DK: I think that what is happening now it is coming to be seen as a challenge by more people. But the one thing I am looking forward to in this next session is that the program I've been talking about ever since 1975. Some kind of a program of economic development of created economic development that would work to enhance Montana industry of the kind of industry that is compatible with Montana's lifestyle and Montana's environment. I think that program is going to get a hearing in this next session and a much better hearing than it's ever had before. In fact, I think it is going to be a key issue in the next session.

CR: Well, we have the Lieutenant Governor just returning from a tour of electronic areas of California. San Jose is typically where they are. What do they call that? Is it Silicon?

DK: Silicon Valley.

CR: Yes, Silicon Valley! Okay there is apparently much more thought, this is one idea that this is going to be a part of your leadership.

DK: Well, I think that it is there and the thinking is there right now and specifically the question is whether we should be investing some of the coal tax trust fund into economic development into Montana. That's going to get a hearing in the next legislative session. The interesting thing to me about the idea of developing an electronic industry in Montana is first of all I don't think we should concentrate maybe quite as heavily on that as we have but that's all right. We could do that. I think we need to look at a lot of different possibilities of the kind of industry that we bring in. They use that as an example, and I think it's clear from that trip to the Silicon Valley that first of all, Montana has a lot of competition in people who want to bring in that kind of industry. Why, all you have to do is go out and start your car today and realize that we have a lot going against us. The way we can bring in that industry is to...Well, we have to be able to provide transportation and we are up against it in those areas. But we do obviously provide. The only thing we do provide that is going to give us the edge, if we have the edge...The single thing we provide is the fact that it is an absolutely magnificent place to live and all kinds of people would like to live here. If we are going to be serious about developing that kind of industry than we have to recognize that we cannot have it both ways. We cannot have that kind of industry and pollute the hell out of western Montana at the same time. We cannot have that kind of industry and have dirty industry at the same time. You have got to make a choice. If you want to develop an economic base in the future that is capable of attracting that kind of industry than you have to remain absolutely committed to environmental protection. That is an economic factor that in many ways that the long term economic future depends absolutely on maintaining environmental integrity. If we sacrifice that then we do it at our great economic hazard.

CR: And the future. We don't have an awful lot more time so I'd like to get back to more personal questions. I'm always asking you, and I'm always expecting you to look at me well you're going to bark at me!

DK: I trust the confidentiality.

CR: Because we did talk before about what this costs you economically as minority leader of the House. This is a 12-month job. You never really are out of politics. You are still a struggling young lawyer!

DK: Particularly put the quotes around “young!” Well, I have done considerable thinking about the business of trying to choose careers and decide the places I am going to go. I think I talked about that the last time you visited with me. I’ve tried to keep my options open for as long as I could and work with the situation—

CR: That’s just it, Dan. You said you used to keep your options open, but now you’ve made a choice.

DK: Well, I definitely made a choice, and I think sometime last spring it becomes more solidified all the time. It’s a choice that basically still says that I’m going to aim in one particular position, and if that doesn’t work out then I’ll go the other way. What I have done that within four years, I will choose to be either a lawyer or a politician. That I will, that I have to choose at that time. As a matter of fact that is four years longer than I can afford to wait. But basically what I think I said is that I’ll make as strong an effort as I can to get myself in a position where I can be effective as a politician and somehow make a living off of it. That is what I’ll aim at and if I can’t do that in four years than that’s what I’ll do. If I can’t do that in four years, I’ll have to turn away from that and practice of private law. I won’t serve in the legislature more than four more years. Well, 1983 would be the last session. Then at that point either I’ll go to work in government somewhere or I’ll run for an office that’s a full time office or I’ll give it up and practice law.

CR: You’ve raised a question that I was going to ask you about having a full-time office because so many other factors come in a full-time state office or if you admittingly would enter a larger race?

DK: There is very little predicting you can do, and there aren’t very many possibilities as a matter of fact. I think the one that is the most attractive to me is Attorney General.

CR: It’s been known that Attorneys General have gone on to the Governor’s house which will either be the old mansion or (unintelligible)...I think I’m implying an interesting question. Are you prepared to answer that one?

DK: No.

CR: 1983 will be an interesting year for a lot of people. We will see whether we are back to one-term presidents among other things. Your race in the House for minority leadership was a very close one. The defeated candidate is now the minority whip.

DK: Well, I think that was a good outcome because when you have that close of a race and really a real sharp division within the caucus the...it would have been very difficult to have led the caucus if those who supported "Red" Menahan had sort of remained on the outside. If they hadn't gained anything at all it would have been difficult to have won their support. Now that "Red" is in the second chair I think that we will have a pretty unified caucus. I look forward to it, I would much rather have it that way. It would have been nice to have someone that was maybe closer to me philosophically sitting on my right hand, but it wouldn't have been worth the time.

CR: This is the compromise then, and you feel pretty good about it?

DK: Yes. I have no doubt about it because a big part of the challenge I think the way that I look at my own political career. The challenge is to build consensus among people, and if I can't do that with the Democratic Party, then obviously I'm not going to have much success in society generally. So I welcome the challenge, and I think that this is a good way to start.

CR: What have I missed, Dan?

DK: I don't know. There is a lot that we could talk about like what the opportunities will be during this session while you are basking in the sunshine, but we can try predicting some of what is going on and what is going to happen in the session and so on. Then we could look at it when you come back next spring and see how it all turns out.

CR: (Unintelligible) I think we leave this session until I come back. As usual, thank you very much.

[End of Interview]