

This is an interview with Congressman James Broyhill, from Lenoir, North Carolina, conducted on January 30, 1974 in Washington, D.C., by Walter De Vries and Jack Bass.

J.B.: Congressman, how do you analyze the development of the Republican party in North Carolina? What has taken place in the last 25 years?

Broyhill: You want to narrow that question down? I mean, ...

J.B.: What do you attribute the development of the Republican party in North Carolina from being basically an opposition group to, now, a party that controls the governor's office, has one seat in the Senate and a substantial representation in the House delegation?

Broyhill: Oh, I think there's probably several factors. One, of course, is the desire of the state for competition in government. The state was controlled by one party for so long, that then they demand other, new faces. We've seen this happen in all Republican states, too, you know. Like Kansas, some of the New England states, and others. I think the splintering of the Democratic party has helped contribute to this, not only in the state, but also in the national level. Republican effort, though... We have our moments when we're divisive, too. I think it's been more of a cohesive effort for the last few years. And we've got as much of the factionalism as you'll see in the Democratic ranks. And the... I believe that the national Democratic party's going to the left has tended to alienate a lot of people in our state. The... I would say that the factor, though, of, not only on the local level, but also on the state level, of same old faces being in office. The electorate wanting to make a change. This feeling tended to sweep through the Piedmont particularly. Or giving the impetus to... or the base for a statewide effort last year has helped to a great extent to... as well as these other factors.

J.B.: Do you see the Republican party in North Carolina developing into a position similar to that in Tennessee and becoming the predominant party?

Broyhill: I think we have that opportunity. And we have that real possibility of being the major party. We're at that crossroads right now, being able to develop into that. It depends a great deal on the results of those who've been elected to leadership positions. I think that this is always true, particularly when you're a minority party, you have to work a little harder to stay in, to stay in leadership. And it... you have to work, also, to make sure that your differences with those within your own party don't become so bad that it hurts at election time when you're trying to put together the necessary combination of candidates and manpower to get your people elected. We saw this happen in Florida, as you know, where they elected a governor and senator. Looked like the Republican party was going to be the majority party in Florida. And they blew it. So a lot of the... I suppose this means there's a lot of responsibility on the shoulders of our Republican governor to produce. And the other elected officials, of course. The governor's the one that everybody sees. The big name.

W.D.V.: Do you think the                    have been on whites to keep to their political party(?)?

Broyhill: No, I don't think that. As I say, we've always had differences in the Republican party just as the Democrats have. We have been fortunate, been able to pool together at election time.

W.D.V.: Now, you've been a Republican congressman from the South for a good deal longer than most of them. You've seen new members come in this election and the election before. Do you notice any difference between them and the people who've been here a couple of terms, eight to ten years? Are they more conservative, more moderate, liberal?

Broyhill: No, I think it's... we've always had some good members from the

South. In fact, in the House, that's where our big growth has been. In fact, if the rest of the country had either maintained their relative strength of Republican representatives in the House or had gained as much as the South, we'd be in control now. And we have, generally speaking, have held on to the seats that... I can't think of any seats we've lost.

W.D.V.: [Didn't the Re<sup>(?)</sup>publicans lose a seat in Georgia?]

Broyhill: Well, that was right. That's one. The one in Atlanta. That's right. But an increase, and we've held on to them. There've been some retirements and things have... Republicans have been elected in those places. I'm thinking of Charlotte, and the Roanoke area, and the St. Pete area, where Republican members that have been elected back in the fifties have either retired or ran for other office or whatever other reason, but... elected another member.

W.D.V.: Also the growth of \_\_\_\_\_ past election has been interesting. In the past, Republican congressmen have tended to come from either from mountain districts or \_\_\_\_\_ Republican districts or else in the emerging areas like Memphis. ..

Broyhill: Well, I guess that's right. The... You had the Republicans in the Appalachian area like my district and in the                      and so forth, you see. But you had another unusual thing that was happening starting in the fifties was the Republicans being elected from the cities. That is, those cities which were developing up. There was suburban, new people coming in and so forth. Such as Charlotte. Such as Birmingham, and the Atlanta area, and Memphis and Chattanooga, and so forth. So this was quite a development, that this, oddly enough, ... And maybe we weren't doing as well, say, in a rural area like eastern North Carolina or rural Georgia, or South Carolina. But some changes even in that direction. For example, Ed Young was elected in South Carolina from eastern South Carolina. But...

W.D.V.: Is the basic direction of the party in the South conservative?

Broyhill: Oh, yes.

W.D.V.: Is that changed in the last few years with the new faces that are here? Are they any different than...?

Broyhill: I don't think that they're any different. I think that most of your members on the Republican side are more conservative oriented than on the Democratic side.

W.D.V.: Are there many issues on which the Republicans in the Congress disagree?

Broyhill: Not a great deal. I think that whatever disagreements we have are more individual than as a group. We don't have a group caucus, as such, such as they do on the Democratic side, because we ... we've been accepted on the House conference and listened to the leadership level. We have representatives in the leadership. A homogeneous group.

W.D.V.: The influence of the Democratic congressmen and senators seems to be declining in terms of committee chairmanships and seniority and so on. Does that mean that as the number of Republicans increases in the Congress, the Republican position might strengthen in the South? You hear what I'm saying? On one hand, there seems to be a decline in power, because of the number of Democratic senators and congressmen retiring and being defeated. And on the other hand you're electing more and more Republicans.

Broyhill: Right.

W.D.V.: That going to represent a shift of power, in a sense, between one party and the other, in the South?

Broyhill: There's a shift. That's what I was saying a while ago. I think there is a definite shift that you can chart. Back in '52, Charley <sup>Jonas</sup> ~~Jones~~ was elected, for example, in North Carolina. There were... I think, as I recall, there were three elected. My cousin Jim Broyhill, and Dick ~~Potts~~ <sup>Poff</sup>

and Charley Jonas were elected that year from the South. And that was sort of the start of it. This year, there were Republicans in the House and Senate from every state in the South of the old Confederacy. That wasn't true when I came here in '63, eleven years ago. So there has been a shift.

J.B.: Did you more or less grow up as a Republican?

Broyhill: Oh, yes.

J.B.: But only a few of... relatively few of the... all of the Southern congressmen fit that. Am I correct? Would the majority of them now have been people who were originally Democrats?

Broyhill: I don't know. You'll have to go ask them. I don't know what their former politics were. I'm not familiar with it. But I know that there've only been two national committeemen in North Carolina for 45 years. And that's Charley Jonas's father and my father.

W.D.V.: Well, of the ones we've interviewed, most of them were Democrats who were disgruntled and disaffected and moved over to the Republican party.

J.B.: Very few office holders who had the kind of background in the Republican party that you did.

W.D.V.: That's not so true of Tennessee, is it?

Broyhill: I don't know if it would be true in Tennessee. It might be.

I don't know. I don't think... I think Bill Brock has always been a Republican.

I think Mizell

may have been Democratic... North Carolina. Bob Daniels has always been a Republican. I guess [Floyd Spence] was Democratic, state legislator at one time.

J.B.: What do you see is the proper role of the federal government in dealing with problems, particularly in dealing with problems in the South?

Broyhill: Well, I think that anytime that there's a need for federal response is to assure to the maximum extent possible that the private sector, number one, is involved in the solution. Number two, that the

1. The first part of the report is a general introduction to the project.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed description of the methodology used.

3. The third part of the report is a discussion of the results of the study.

4. The fourth part of the report is a conclusion and a list of references.

5. The fifth part of the report is a list of appendices.

6. The sixth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

7. The seventh part of the report is a list of abbreviations.

8. The eighth part of the report is a list of symbols.

9. The ninth part of the report is a list of equations.

10. The tenth part of the report is a list of footnotes.

11. The eleventh part of the report is a list of references.

12. The twelfth part of the report is a list of appendices.

13. The thirteenth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

14. The fourteenth part of the report is a list of abbreviations.

15. The fifteenth part of the report is a list of symbols.

16. The sixteenth part of the report is a list of equations.

17. The seventeenth part of the report is a list of footnotes.

18. The eighteenth part of the report is a list of references.

19. The nineteenth part of the report is a list of appendices.

20. The twentieth part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

21. The twenty-first part of the report is a list of abbreviations.

22. The twenty-second part of the report is a list of symbols.

23. The twenty-third part of the report is a list of equations.

24. The twenty-fourth part of the report is a list of footnotes.

25. The twenty-fifth part of the report is a list of references.

26. The twenty-sixth part of the report is a list of appendices.

27. The twenty-seventh part of the report is a list of figures and tables.

28. The twenty-eighth part of the report is a list of abbreviations.

29. The twenty-ninth part of the report is a list of symbols.

30. The thirtieth part of the report is a list of equations.

You've got to remember that we - those of us who are Republicans, and particularly like Holshouser and myself, [we] - feel that the state has an obligation to meet its responsibilities. And so the fact that he may advocate a more activist role on the state level doesn't mean that he doesn't... he feels that he has abandoned his conservative instincts. And I feel the same way. I don't think there's any inconsistency there at all.

J.B.: You think the state should be more activist, then, in that sense, than the federal government and even that....

Broyhill: That's right.

J.B.: Do you see any other direction the party should go in so far as expanding its base?

Broyhill: We have to take... First, to show, I think, all the people that we can... And this is where it shows, I think, that it's the governor's... the, such a key in this effort to show the people that we can be effective in running programs and administering programs and advocating solutions to the problems that the... at the state level. And I think that we have to show that we're appealing to all people, not just whites, but blacks and whites. I think we're dealing with all segments of the society, not just one part of the state or the other. Can't be a... a party just with one vote.

J.B.: It's become almost a truism, if you talk to a number of people, that one major cause of the development of the Republican party in the South has been the disaffection of Democrat's reaction to the national Democrat party. And much of it tied to race.

Broyhill: I think that's only one part of it. I think the Democratic party tried to be more of a populist, if you want to put in on a term,... ideas and the... McGovern and so forth, tended to alienate a lot of people also.

National solution to every problem.

J.B.: Do you think that to develop South-wide the Republican party in the South you need to take a strong position on the general area of human rights?

Broyhill: I think we have to show by actions in administering programs that we're in favor of helping all people, not just one group. I don't think we can take the position to alienate blacks. I think that if we're going to be a viable party, we've got to have a... some black support. A share of that black support at the polls, from the black community. Unfortunately, over the years, we have had too many candidates in some places that get 100% of the vote against them.

J.B.: And what would be the means by which the Republican party would attract blacks into the party itself?

Broyhill: Well, this is what I've already said. I think that it's a matter of how you administer the programs. And I think that the governor has done a good job of showing that he's willing to bring blacks into the high administrative positions in his Administration. Certainly opened the door. And this is... I think it's refreshing.

J.B.: When we interviewed Frank Rouse, he commented on some of that. And he was speaking, in a sense, objectively, as the impact of that. He just felt that that was hurting - I may be misrepresenting, and I don't want to do that - but, in effect, that a lot of eastern North Carolinians who voted Republican last time were reacting in opposition to some of those appointments.

Broyhill: I don't know about that. But you haven't had any opposition to them.

J.B.: But your feeling is that it's more important to...

Broyhill: I think that the governor should be commended for what he's done.

W.D.V.: As you think back over the last ten years, what important changes have occurred in the way you campaign?



Broyhill: I don't know that....

W.D.V.: Issues are about the same?

Broyhill: Oh, I don't know that... Of course, issues change. You know, your opponents attack you that things have changed .

W.D.V.: You know, one of the biggest things we've found is that the whole racial question has been...

Broyhill: I've never had any racial question in my campaign.

W.D.V.: Then your district....

Broyhill: I don't recall any.

W.D.V.: Most of the Southern congressmen and senators feel that the removal of race as an issue is the biggest single political change in the last ten or fifteen years. Since the Voting Rights Act.

Broyhill: I'm sorry, what do you mean by referring to...What do you mean, since the Voting Rights Act?

W.D.V.: That the whole racial issue, as an issue in a campaign between candidates, or in primaries, the same principle, underlying issue in most campaigns. That that has been removed as an issue that candidates now articulate and talk about in the South.

Broyhill: That may be your analysis would be better than mine. I don't think I can recall it ever having been an issue in my campaigns.

J.B.: Why did you happen to run, you know, originally, the first time?

Broyhill: I don't know, just lucky I guess, really. I don't know...

J.B.: I mean why. What motivated you to run for Congress?

Broyhill: Oh, a number of us that were working on the Republican effort, and, of course, my family had been closely connected with the development of the Republican party for many years, you know. I worked in several campaigns. I suppose it was... I was out, actually, in a group trying to find a candidate. And more and more [of the group began] asking me to

run. It sorta fell on my shoulders. (Interruption in tape.) You see, up in the areas in which I have been a candidate, not necessarily the present district, but also the old district, in the late '50's and particularly in the '60's, the Republicans made great gains at the local level. You know, for County Commissioner and for local offices. And I think that this is significant. First, they made gains. I think one of the reasons why they're in, you see a lot of people... you know how the tendency is, the same old crowd stays around the courthouse, and so, well, the people said, "We'd like to have a change." And so the Republicans put up some attractive candidates and maybe came up with two or three local issues and promised to make some changes. And got elected, and did a good job. And in most cases, they did. And I don't recall that in those particular races that... contests... that race was an issue. In fact, I think that in a number of cases... for example, the sheriffs... Republican sheriffs were elected, and they appointed black deputies for the first time in history. So...

J.B.: Is there a different...

Broyhill: But they didn't always get the vote in black areas.

J.B.: Is there a difference...? Looking at the South as a whole, there's a distinctive difference between North Carolina, Virginia and Tennessee, all of which have a tradition of what's commonly referred to as mountain Republicanism. A basic... Republican base which was there on which to build. And the deeper South stayed where the major thrust of the shift to the Republican party came in reaction to the change in the Democratic party nationally. Has that resulted in there being what might be referred to, at least on the racial issue, a more moderate Republican party in Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina - all of which had very successful Republican parties as well?

Broyhill: I don't know that I'm really qualified to compare the Republican

party in these states. I mean, I'm not that well acquainted with all the other congressmen here... I mean, all the party leaders in Georgia....

W.D.V.: I think by the time you found a developing Republican party in the rural Deep South, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana....

Broyhill: In Alabama's the ones that I worked with the longest, of course.

They are... I mean, quite moderate on many issues. John Buchanan, for example, has now been, for the past year, our congressional representative at the U.N. ... thought that a Republican from the Deep South, well, they wouldn't even let him in up there. He's quite an internationalist.

They got Jack Edwards from Alabama in our leadership. He's one of the members that has taken a strong stand against certain presidential stands from time to time. Quite independent. Plus the fact, I think, the development of the Republican party in the Deep South really came after the racial issue. If you take Mississippi, for example, the two congressional races that for the first time we were successful in. Thad Cochran, I believe, polled thirty per cent of the black vote in Vance County, Jackson Mississippi. And that was really the edge in that campaign. Along with the fact that we've polled recently well in the rural areas. Brad Lockwell, not doing as well, did okay with the black vote down in Pascagoula, Gulfport area. And race just isn't the issue down there anymore. It's more a group of... oh, a combination of people disaffected from the Democratic party. A high group of under-35 year olds, under-40 year olds who moved to the South, or else they moved home towns and broken old family ties with the Democratic party. Have become interested in more progressive variety in the state government. They're looking for a party with a chance they can move up, for example. / I think there's a, really, a better place to look at the new Republican party in the South. And really looking at the racial issue, I really think it's something that disappeared from

us early in the sixties. Or by the mid-sixties. I don't really see it being a predominant influence down there any more.

J.B.: We still go back to it in the Helms race, and the Scott race in Virginia.

Broyhill: One thing I was thinking about in the Helms race, and I didn't mean to mention this until the '68 race, but the '64 race... Now, if the First District in North Carolina was ever to go on racial lines, I think they might have in the '64 presidential election, given away that that election was betrayed both in the South and in the North. The First District - and correct me if I'm wrong - Goldwater ran under 40% in the First District.

J.B.: I think he also made a speech in Raleigh in which he advocated an end to tobacco price supports.

Broyhill: Oh, I didn't realize that. That would make quite a big difference. That's a factor that'll... that'll blow the heck out of any...

J.B.: I think it was the North Carolina equivalent of his speech in Tennessee...

Broyhill: Tennessee...

J.B.: on TVA. A very honest position in both cases, but it partly wasn't calculated to win political support.

Broyhill: My feeling was - I went to high school in Craven County, New Bern - is that the racial issue in eastern North Carolina, eastern South Carolina, is getting a lot more credibility and analysis than it really has in terms of making people vote. Like Jesse Helms ran a racial campaign. In 1972 he would have lost the election. I don't think he would have run as strong in the east as he did. People down there are interested mainly in good solid conservatives, and sometimes this is, I think, very improperly mistaken as being racial. It's not. It refers to an awful lot

issues, economic issues and social issues, far beyond racial concerns. I think you ought to...A farmer down in eastern North Carolina went to a shop owner in Wilmington, North Carolina and asked if he knew where Jesse Helms stood. And the man said that he stood on the right side of God and on the right side of law and order. And that, to me, far transcends the racial interpretation. It may just be a pet peeve of mine, but really it would be substantially difficult to use that as a basis for analysis. Maybe you could have six or eight years ago, but I don't think you can now. (Interruption in tape.)

J.B.: ... and that is, how do you perceive the so-called Southern strategy, and what does it consist of? Critics, of course,...

Broyhill: I don't understand what it is they're referring to, myself. If it means treating all sections of the country alike, then I'm for it. I haven't noticed any favoritism, if you want to put it that way. I've really never been able to define what the Northern group called a Southern strategy, and that's most sincere. I don't know whether they're saying that just because the Southerners have meaning in the South, and can say the same things in the South as he says in the North, is that a Southern strategy? If you'll define it for me, then I'll be glad to comment on it.

J.B.: I've heard it defined, I think, by both its defenders and its critics. And I think the defenders, such as Harry <sup>Dent</sup>~~Denton~~, would define it as no more than treating the South like the rest of the country.

Broyhill: Like I said, then I'm for it.

J.B.: And the critics say that in saying let the South take care of its own conditions that what he's really saying is let the South be controlled by whites, that it's an anti-black position. That's an over-simplification, but I think that's more or less what the critics would contend.

Broyhill: I don't see that.

J.B.: Based on a fall-off of enforcement of civil rights, this sort of thing. A backing off of enforcement of civil rights.

seen  
Broyhill: Well, I never/that in it.