

)

Interview with Charles Ward, president, Demographics, Inc, June 10, 1974, Conway, Arkansas, conducted by Jack Bass and Walter De Vries, transcribed by Linda Killen.

NOT FOR ATTRIBUTION

Jack Bass: When did you get started in politics?

Ward: I really got started in 1968. I had been active in the gubernatorial campaign in 1966, but 1968 was when I really became actively engaged in politics. And about that same time I started a firm called Demographics. It was not a demographics. . . I just used the computer I had at night to write computer letters. Winthrop Rockefeller, when he was governor and prior to that time, had probably the most sophisticated computerized direct mail operation in the United States. And there was literally no one that you could go to to compete in this state. So I started my business as sort of a Democratic answer, in the state of Arkansas, to Winthrop Rockefeller's business. It has since grown, as Walter knows, to much larger business than just in Arkansas business. But that's really how I got started. I'd been personally interested, but that's how I got started in politics.

J.B.: Are you involved beyond that in politics?

Ward: Well, I'm involved in two different areas of politics. One, I'm personally involved in politics in that I'm the national committeeman from the state of Arkansas and a member of the executive committee of the national committee. And I'm very involved personally in helping candidates and doing what I can to help the Democratic party. I also am a part owner of a company called Demographics which does political

direct mail. Polling. That sort of thing.

J.B.: You do polling as well?

Ward: Yes.

J.B.: And. . . am I correct, you ^{worked} ~~work~~ frequently and closely with ~~Delouise~~ ^{DeLoss} [?] Walker?

Ward: Yes. We worked. . . DeLoss and I started in 1968 together. The very first candidate that I ever worked for in the area of computers. I did it myself at night. Was Bill Alexander. Congressman Alexander. And that's when I first met DeLoss Walker. We subsequently have done work with him in several campaigns. Most obvious is the Bumpers' campaign.

J.B.: Am I correct, you worked in Eastland's campaign?

Ward: I'm sure we did. First of all, I would have to tell you that I spend very little time in Demographics and really, unless it's a major job that requires some. . . they feel they need my advice on, I really have no idea about the day-to-day workings any more of Demographics. And I haven't, for two or three years.

J.B.: So you're saying that in the '68 your work was primarily with the technical aspects of the computer--

Ward: That's right. In '70 I got more involved in it. Because the business was just getting started and we lost a lot of money in it. And I became very involved after losing a considerable amount of money. But now I have four or five professionals that run that business. I'm primarily a school bus manufacturer. I'm president of the largest school bus manufacturing firm in the United States and that is a full time job. So although I'm a stock holder in Demographics I spend no more than 5% of my time in that business. I'm really not that actively involved in, if you want to say, the mechanical aspects of politics or

working as a consultant. I spend much more of my time as national committeeman on the executive committee and the different things I'm involved in in the national committee.

J.B.: How do you assess the structure of the Democratic party in Arkansas?

Ward: Well the Democratic party in Arkansas is very loosely structured party as state parties go across the country. And I think it's true primarily because we have a number of very strong members in our party, such as John McClellan, Fulbright, Bumpers, Mills and others who have always been, in my opinion, very suspicious of too much strength in our state party. And for all their own reasons the state party is never become a very heavily funded organization and has never been really effective as a campaigning vehicle. That's partially true. The other reason, probably because the Republican party never has been a threat to the Democratic party. When Winthrop Rockefeller was here it was more personality party as far as I'm concerned. It's proven to be true. Only when he ran and put his money into it was there ever any Republican party in this state. So I think those are the two reasons we have a very loosely structured party in this state.

J.B.: Do you see that changing, particularly in so far as the Democratic party?

Ward: I do not. I do not see. . . I see no. . . . Are you talking about state wide or nationally?

J.B.: Statewide.

Ward: I see no change in the status of the Democratic party in the state. I think as long as you have these people, these elected officials, it will continue to be a loose organization. And I'm not too sure I oppose that too much. There are many things that are done in states

that have strong parties that I disagree with. Such as in Ohio, where they actually endorse candidates. Colorado. I mean they do it in many different ways in different states. But they endorse candidates in the primary. I think that, in my opinion, weakens the party, ultimately and I think. . . . They just saw that in Ohio recently, when John Glenn won against the endorsed candidate. So I'm not too sure I oppose that and I do not envision any change in our state party.

J.B.: What is going to have to happen for Arkansas and the South--other states in the South--to go Democratic again in a presidential election?

Ward: Well, the most obvious thing, obviously, would be a candidate that was a little bit more appealing to the southern constituency. For a lot of reasons it was obvious that George McGovern was not very appealing. I think there were many false things said about George McGovern. I think he was painted as far more liberal than he really was. And he was. . . so many things, you know. He didn't get very much vote in this state. And in '68 Wallace was a big factor here. Carried the state. And I think that, certainly, if Wallace were a third party candidate it would be harder for us to carry the state for a Democrat and I think Wallace needs to stay in the party for us to carry the state in '76.

J.B.: [Something about Wallace not having to be on the ticket.]

Ward: No, I just say, you know, he has to stay in the party. I particularly think that George Wallace, if he's treated with respect and the respect that he's due, will stay hitched in the party. A lot of people think he's going to go on to go away. And a lot of people think that a third party candidacy by Wallace in '76 might actually aid the Democrats. I have thought about it a lot and I do not see it that way at all. I mean people think, for instance, that he would take

more votes away from Ford than he would away against Kennedy. I just do not agree with that.

J.B.: Do you agree that he took away more from Nixon than he did from Humphrey in '68?

Ward: Well. . . yeah, I think he did in this state. It would have been very hard. . . no one really knows for sure how this state would have gone in '68. And anything you say is conjecture. But it is my conjecture that he took away more from Nixon. It probably would have gone Republican in '68 had it not been for George Wallace.

J.B.: Do you reckon it will be different in '76?

Ward: Yeah, I do.

J.B.: Do you think Kennedy could carry Arkansas if he gets the nomination?

Ward: Well, a lot can happen between now and '76, but. . . I think it would be difficult to carry the state for Sen Kennedy. That's just my feeling in talking with people around the state. It would be difficult to carry. Say a lot would have to do with the running mate he had.

J.B.: I presume that if he had Bumpers as his running mate he'd have--

Ward: He'd have a very good chance. I think he'd carry many other states in the South. I think with Wallace as his running mate you could carry Arkansas and many other states in the South.

J.B.: How about Asquew?

Ward: I really don't think that Asquew is a vote getter. And I don't know what his busing stand, particularly in this state, would not be helpful. That's [said/sad] truly as one of the possibilities. You understand that I take some teasing because of my avocation. But I'm

candidly saying that I just don't think that Asquew has either the proven vote getting ability or the recognition or the name. You know, you have George Wallace, who's a proven. . . . He has a constituency. And you've got Bumpers who not only. . . everyone's excited now about the Fulbright thing, but you've got to remember. You have to go back and analyze his races against Winthrop Rockefeller who'd been elected twice convincingly. And he was just not defeated. We beat him almost as bad. . . well, it was two to one against Rockefeller. And he beat Orval Faubus 56 to 44 and Faubus had all the machinery behind him and most of the money. So Bumpers has a proven record as a vote getter which far exceeds Ruben Asquew's even though I realize that Asquew's from a bigger state. But I would say right now that he'd have more of a chance. But I will freely admit to being biased in that area. I'm a great fan of Bumpers.

Walter De Vries: Where would you place the Arkansas state Democratic party in comparison to the other parties in the southern states--all states in the old confederacy? In terms of organization, funding, candidate recruitment and so on.

Ward: Well, first of all, I would hesitate to set myself up as an authority in that area. There's many states I have no idea about. I know a lot of people, lot of candidates, lot of people involved, but insofar as knowing the basics of how the parties are organized and what they're doing, I would profess ignorance in, you know. . . .

W.D.V.: What's your perception? Some feeling of it.

Ward: . . . in many, many states. Well. . .

W.D.V.: Say as compared to Louisiana and Mississippi, Georgia.

Ward: I think you'd have to analyze. . . . I would just. . . . It's stronger than Mississippi. How's that? [Laughter.]

J.B.: I thought it was an excellent analysis. [Laughter.]

W.D.V.: What I'm trying to get at. . . are you basically satisfied with the way it is or would you want to change it? Would you want to go to party registration? Would you want more staff? Or are you basically satisfied--

Ward: I'm basically satisfied with what we have. I see absolutely no reason to want to change what we have. I would say that based on one thing. I don't think you'll find any state party in the South that has a higher percentage of elected officials. You know, we got I think one man in the state senate or maybe one representative. . . . Or anyway, they've only got one elected office holder in the state house. And they got one Congressman. And that's it. And you know, in this election this fall they'll be lucky to get 20% of the vote. So I don't know what more we could do, except the presidential election. Obviously, I'd like to do much better there. But I don't think if we'd of had the best organization in the world last time that we could have carried this state for George McGovern. If we'd of had, you know, the best people in the country here I just don't think there's anything we can do about that. And I [really/rarely] say. . . there are two or three things. If you got a really strong state organization and. . . . Maybe I'm being too kind. I should say machine, which is what they turn into many times in many cases. It becomes almost impossible for somebody like Dale Bumpers to come from a little town, Charleston, Arkansas, and be governor of the state. And I think that many people. . . . I'm committed to having our processes as free and open as possible and give everybody a chance to run. And I think as soon as you. . . you know, they say you've got to have a strong party because you've got to recruit good candidates, you know. I think that's just another word for machine, as far as I'm

concerned. And in many, many cases, you'll find that that's true if you study the way the party apparatus is set up and you get one strong man in the state and he takes it over and tries to run. . . tries to decide who is going to be the nominee for the Senate, who the candidates are for Congress. And it gets away from simple recruitment of candidates more into someone deciding who is going to be allowed to run. And for that reason. . . . For two reasons. We're doing very well in this state and I like the openness of the way our party's set up. I would favor leaving it just the way it is right now.

W.D.V.: Wasn't one of the significant impacts of the four Rockefeller years that it did change it around, did move it from a sort of machine of the Faubus days.

Ward: Well, I think there's no doubt that Orval Faubus had a machine in Arkansas and it was the first time such a machine had existed. I mean in my life time. Of course, he's been governor since like 20 years ago and I'm 34 years old so he started when I was 14 years old. But I certainly think that Rockefeller's tenure did a great deal. You know, first time around you had a fellow from Conway named Jim Johnson who ran and then the next time you had the real machine candidate, Marion Crank, who was a former employee of Arkansas and Louisiana Gas. He ran and he got beat. And they tried again with Faubus. But we had our opening at that point and Bumpers got the nomination. And I think there's been a great move afoot to include more people in politics. And I just. . . I hope that we don't go back to machine politics.

J.B.: How did you get involved in the Bumpers campaign in '70?

Ward: He came to see me. I was disillusioned with the candidates that we had and most everybody was lining up, most people I knew were lining up behind Orval Faubus. And I really did not want to see our state

go back to Orval Faubus. I thought it would be, you know. . . . I never really had that many problems with Faubus as an administrator, as a man who did well for the state. I had great problems with him because of the image he portrayed and because anywhere you go in the United States they think Orval Faubus they think Little Rock 1957. You close the school and, you know, we're going to take the state back. So I opposed him in '70 and I really didn't know who I was going to support. And an ABC affiliate ran a. . . gave all the candidates 20 minutes free time the day the filing closed to say why they were running for governor. And I watched them and I saw Bumpers. And my friend Walker had already signed up to handle him. And I'd already told Walker he must be crazy, you know, to handle a guy. . . say, what has Bumpers done? Well, he's never done anything, really. He didn't tell me that he ran for representative and lost. But you know, just. . . he's an attorney and he's. . . you know. But I watched him on television and I decided that he was going to be the best candidate and that he was a man that I could support. And he came to see me, there in my office at Demographics. I was sitting over there and he came in and we talked and I told him I was his supporter and that was how I got started with him.

J.B.: What was it about him that attracted you?

Ward: Well, now, that's the question of the night, I guess, because that's what everybody wants to know. Maybe his attraction to me was a little different. I thought he came across well on television, first of all. I liked him. But I also thought he was electable. And I thought he was someone that possibly could beat Orval Faubus in that race. And I liked his candor and his sincerity and I liked the way he projected on television.

J.B.: You'd never seen him before?

Ward: Never seen him before.

J.B.: Never heard of him before?

Ward: Never heard of him before. Just except when Deloss Walker told me that he was probably going to. . . . And I didn't know Deloss that well at that point. He and I had worked on one campaign together.

J.B.: How about when he came to see you? What sort of an impression did he make? You know, frequently a guy is one thing on television and in person frequently they're something else. Did you find Bumpers to be something else from what he showed on television?

Ward: No, I found him to be. . . . Of course, I had my mind made up fairly well. And it really surprised him. He came. . . I think he just wanted some financial support or something out of me and I really don't think that he ever really thought that I would say, you know, "I'm for you, Dale Bumpers," in this race for governor. And at that point in time his staff consisted of Archie Shaffer and himself. Archie was his driver. That was the team. And then they had about three people in Little Rock and he had no staff or anything. Well, I liked him and I really didn't know that much about him. But I knew a lot about a lot of other people in the race. And I think that at that point that probably helped him in a lot of areas. As it turned out, there was really not anything bad to know about him except he once preached that the Red Sea didn't part. And that was a great issue in that campaign against Faubus when Faubus revealed that once he knew a man who had been in a Sunday school class when Bumpers was teaching and Bumpers taught, in this class that the Red Sea never really parted.

W.D.V.: What did that do?

Ward: Well, it did about the same thing like Fulbright's deal on the duck hunting. It didn't do anything. People are not stupid and

that's something that a lot of politicians have a hard time understanding. And nobody really cared one way or the other if you said the Red Sea didn't part.

J.B.: What was Fulbright and the duck hunting? Just haven't heard that.

Ward: Oh, well. . .

W.D.V.: Is that in Pierce's book?

Ward: No, unless the book was published last week.

W.D.V.: I read it in ^{Lou}~~the~~ Cannon's piece in the Washington Post.

Ward: Well, the Wallace people got involved in this state politics here. The man who's supposedly their state manager, named Frank Hensley. And he was for Orval Faubus, which I could understand. I could never understand he ^{was for} ~~s being~~ [?] Fulbright. That was a little hard for me to understand. And also he was for a fellow named Doug Burner [?] for lieutenant governor. And it's not a matter of hearsay because he's listed in Fulbright's reporting as having received something like \$1,700 or \$2,700 for postage. And they sent out this eight page newspaper. This newspaper just occurred during the campaign. It's called Arkansas Sportsman and on the front page of it "Bumpers Signs Proclamation Endorsing the Ban of Hunting." And the whole thing. Then it's got an article over in there by this fellow Frank Hensley and it was just. . . . They mailed, I don't know, like how many thousand of them. But they mailed 100,000 I guess.

J.B.: I remember it now.

W.D.V.: Then Bumpers came out and said that his father had taught him to hunt when he was 12 and he had taught his son to hunt when he was 12 and he kept a dog at the mansion, a hunting dog. Right?

Ward: Yeah, and they had a flier they came out with showing Dale

Bumpers holding up four ducks that says "Does this look like a man who wants to ban hunting?" [Laughter.] But anyway, both those issues were the same. They didn't really. . . .

J.B.: What did you do for him in the '70 campaign?

Ward: I worked very hard for him in the 1970 campaign. I actively worked, you know. Put on Bumper stickers, got up yard signs where I could, spent time in the state headquarters, volunteered, help raise money. Did everything I knew to do to help him be governor.

W.D.V.: Let's go back to those two stories because I think they're kind of typical of politics that used to win campaigns in this state. Right?

Ward: That's true.

W.D.V.: When did that really change in Arkansas? Did it change in '66 with Rockefeller's first campaign? Because it occurs to me that that campaign was one of the most sophisticated ever put on anyplace in the country, and it was put on here in the South and in Arkansas, which is supposed to be one of the most backward states. And succeeded. Yet that same kind of campaign in 1970 did not succeed. Neither did the Faubus campaign, which was typical of the old style campaign, did it succeed then or this year.

Ward: Well I think all of the South has matured over that period of time. I think that in 1966, you know, Rockefeller had run before. And he didn't just happen on the scene. He did have the most. . . he had a terrible handicap to overcome being a Republican in the state of Arkansas. Which never had any votes as a Republican. The last time the gubernatorial candidate got 20%. He admitted he wasn't much, but they got 20% of the vote! So. . . the man he ran against was an avowed segregationist that would, you know, make Lester Maddox look like a

liberal. And I just think the people were ready for a change.

W.D.V.: Yeah, but didn't Faubus try to run that same type of campaign in '70 as he did in '74?

Ward: Well. . . yeah, he tried to run a campaign. It was the first time he'd ever been behind in the polls in a long time. He was very uncomfortable in that position and he reacted very poorly. And he started, you know, the thing that has run through. . . the common thread that's run through all three of the campaigns: Faubus, Rockefeller and Fulbright. In that they all three have accused, and gone on and on and on about Bumpers not saying anything and not addressing the issues. And what they all really have said, in effect, is that they all know that Bumpers has a lead and about the only way they're going to beat him is to get him to react to them. And he refused to react to his opponent. He runs a positive kind of campaign. He addresses the issues as he sees them. And he addresses them to the public. He doesn't get in arguments. He moves a lot. He never stays in one place. You know, he's talking about welfare reform this week and when the other guy reacts to that he's talking about inflation next week. You know, he continues to develop the issues as he sees the public reacting to them and he, for the most part, just ignores his opponent. And they really become very paranoid about it. Because no matter. . . you know, I thought they overreacted this time to the hunting thing. You know, I thought it was. . . they really didn't have to put out that flier that says "Does this look like a man who wants to ban hunting?" But it's normal for people at the end of a campaign, even though the polls continue to show that. . . you know, become a little paranoid. Get scared you're going to get hurt by something. I'm sure you've talked to Dale Enoch. Have you talked to him yet?

J.B.: Yeah.

Ward: Very interesting study he's doing now on the Senate race, I guess.

W.D.V.: There are two theories on Faubus, why he did what he did in '57. One is that that was his basic belief. I mean that's what he really believed and feels. The other is that that was a strategic move and that he was afraid he would not get elected as a third term as governor. Then you think about 1974, he ran the same kind of campaign again. Busing, drugs, crime.

J.B.: The first theory, though, wasn't so much that was the way he really felt but that he supposedly had some inside information that there was a real threat and a real danger.

W.D.V.: Yeah, but the point is, once that strategy seemed to work for him, he then used it in successive re-elections.

J.B.: The other theory was that he saw the opportunity to create an issue on which in the future he couldn't be beat. And jumped on it in '57.

Ward: Well, it might. . . I'm at second guessing. I can only conjecture, say, that that's possible. If that's what he wanted to do, it worked. He was governor here for 12 years. And only one other man had ever made it three terms. And no one has ever made it since. I think Bumpers probably could have been re-elected governor with no problem a third term. But Faubus was governor and he had a political base and probably if he would have run again he would have run Rockefeller a hell of a race. He might have gotten beaten. He beat him once. Whether he could have beat him a second time around we'll never know. But if that was his intent, he succeeded in it. It's hard to see. . . you'd have to look at Wallace. Wallace did the same thing, but he's adjusted. He is a politician and he knows that the winds aren't blowing that way now. And you don't see him out beating that drum any

more. He's changed his tactics and his theories altogether.

J.B.: How much, in your opinion, is that change in Wallace a matter of conviction perhaps resulting in part from changes that grew out of his personal tragedy and how much of it is adjusting to the political realities of Alabama and how much of it is adjusting to his perceived political realities of becoming quote respectable in terms of national politics?

Ward: Well, I don't think the change at all is due to his injury. From his stand point. I think if you go back and look, that change had already been made. He'd been off the segregation bandwagon a long time prior to that. But he was still tagged as a segregationist. And I think had the attempted assassination never occurred, he would never have been able to live that down, so to speak. But the sympathy that people felt for him, I think he gained a certain amount of respectability that allowed Charles Evers to say again today--for the 92nd time--that he can support him as the vice presidential nominee. But I don't think that Wallace changed so much because of that. I think people then accepted his change, after the assassination attempt. What were the other parts of your question? Did I answer?

J.B.: Did it grow out of his perception of new realities in Alabama politics or--

Ward: No. I don't think his primary thrust for many years has been Alabama politics. He wants to keep his home base strong. But I think most all the actions he takes are primarily toward national politics. And I think that Wallace is probably one of the most perceptive political men that ever lived in the United States. He can read a crowd better. And he is a man who is very perceptive. He developed most of the issues in '72. George McGovern didn't develop tax reform,

which was one of the big issues. George Wallace developed it. And he developed it because when he gets before a crowd and he says a little something about taxes, tax reform, the crowd roars. The next time around he talks 20 minutes about tax reform. He reads the crowd very well and he's a man that responds to the people. Have you ever seen pictures or anything of a rally? Those people respond and they're very strong. And he reads a crowd very well. I think that's the reason he takes a lot of the stands he does. I think this is why he's developed the posture he's in now. I don't say that he has no inner feelings about this, but I know that he responds very well and I think he develops his issues a lot from it.

J.B.: The Republican party in Arkansas showed a certain amount of weakness in 1972 when with Nixon carrying the state with more than 70% of the vote they still couldn't pick up any seats in the legislature, still held their one Congressional seat. How much has the Watergate damaged them since then? If any.

Ward: Well, their gubernatorial candidate got 20% of the vote. Same man running again would probably get 20% of the vote, I guess. I mean, it's hard for anybody to file. . . . Walker could tell you more about that. If you're unknown and you file, you ought to get 20% of the vote. Just almost by accident. So I don't believe they really have that much to lose. The only thing you'll be able to tell by when this race is over is John Paul Hammerschmidt. Is really. . . I guess you could by the margin of their defeat, but they really don't have anybody to defeat, except Hammerschmidt. So it's hard to say. I can't see that they're really a factor at all in state politics.

W.D.V.: What we kind strange is that here you have a Republican governor for four years, put a ton of money into the party organization,

candidates and all that. Yet they're back where they were or even worse off. They've got one in the senate, one in the house and one Congressman, period.

Ward: That's right.

W.D.V.: So why?

Ward: Well you have to understand that when he ran he took a man like Lynn Davis, who was a very popular man and a very good man, and ran him against our secretary of state, Mr Bryan. And they spent tons of money. And they did the same thing at the treasury and they did the same thing for auditor. They spent tons of money. And the only person he ever elected was Footsy ~~Brad~~^{Brett}, for lieutenant governor. He never could really carry. . . . They picked up a few seats in the house and senate. Not really that many. And it was more people voted for Winthrop Rockefeller and they didn't vote for the Republican party. People would vote for Rockefeller and then that was it. They'd go back over. You're an old, what do you call them, Walter?

W.D.V.: Ticket splitter.

Ward: Ticket splitter. In fact this is not a state of ticket splitters.

W.D.V.: Yeah, but in just about every other southern state you've had some little sustained growth since 1964.

Ward: True.

W.D.V.: But here it just went right back where it was.

Ward: True. But. . . I guess other states have maybe some powerful people. But when you put Mills, McClellan, Fulbright and Bumpers all in here, it's just really hard to go against that.

W.D.V.: What happens in the future when you take Fulbright out of it; maybe Mills; and certainly at some point McClellans--

Ward: Well, we'll probably get our parties very structured and organized and controlled and the Republicans will take us over on the spot. I don't know, but there are a lot of people. . . . I've been before the institute of politics and discussed. . . and you know, they say "Got to get this party organized." And again, my answer, I said "For what?"

W.D.V.: Organized to do what?

Ward: To do what? We're going to, you know, get rid of the one Republican Congressman we've got and then what are we going to do? It's really. . . .

J.B.: All right, since Faubus has there been any quote political organization in the machine sense in Arkansas? Does Bumpers have a machine?

Ward: Well, he has an organization. How's that sound? Sounds better to me. He has his group of supporters. He has never been a machine man. That's pretty. . . you know, I mean he's never been a man to handle patronage through some one person in a county and you had to go see some person to get a job or an appointment or anything.

J.B.: Didn't the machine, such as it was, support Fulbright?

Ward: To a great extent I believe they did. The courthouses have never supported Bumpers but he's successfully won without them. He's proved that you can win without the courthouses. He did it the first time around. They supported Faubus. They took a walk in the. . . . I mean some of them came across. . . you know, "He's going to be governor." But they'd just about as soon had Rockefeller as governor as. . . you know, then they'd had another shot at Rockefeller in two years. They figure if Bumpers wins he's going to be there four years. I think that was their rational in that. And this time, for the most part. . . there

were a lot of notable exceptions of people that had been in politics a long time that were for Bumpers.

W.D.V.: Were most of the county chairmen and other party officials for, against Bumpers in 1970?

Ward: Yes.

W.D.V.: So he proved that you could win without them.

Ward: And they were against him this time.

W.D.V.: Same thing with the courthouse group.

Ward: That's right, both times.

W.D.V.: But wasn't that one of the established myths of Arkansas politics, that you couldn't win unless you had their support? [Long pause.] Have many Democrats who didn't have the courthouse support won before? State wide. Before Bumpers did it?

Ward: Well. . . Walter I don't know how to answer that because we have two Senators that have been there 30 years. And we got one other Republican governor, one other Democratic governor--that takes us 20 years ago! And I'm just not an authority on history beyond 20 years ago in this state, you know. Maybe I should be. Talk about George W. Dialagee [?] And Joe P. Robinson. But I never really have gone into it that much.

J.B.: Charlie, could Dale Bumpers have been elected governor in Arkansas in 1970 without television?

Ward: I doubt it. I doubt it. He is a very good television candidate. He's great person to person. And that's what he did this time, if you study the reporting records and , you're going to find out he didn't spend very much money, really, at all. He didn't spend that much on tv. Probably had his heaviest spending in radio. Heavy radio. Very little direct mail.

J.B.: How about 1970? How much direct mail?

Ward: Well, you're getting in an area that I really don't talk about, just because I've got a client-professional relationship and I have no great compulsion to go around saying he mailed so many thousand pieces and we sold him like soap, and you know. . . . I'd just really rather not get into that.

J.B.: Well, let me ask you one more question. If you can't answer it, I can understand. Do you consider the direct mail aspect of 1970 as far as his campaign is concerned to have been a significant part of that campaign?

Ward: Yes, I do.

W.D.V.: To basically build his identity?

Ward: [Long pause.] I think it produced votes. I don't know how much it built his identity. Of course he had an identity problem eight weeks before the election. He had less than 1% voter recognition. So he obviously. . . I guess. . . I don't know how you separate the two.

W.D.V.: Is he the first Democratic candidate for governor that was really a ^{media} [mule?] candidate? Now Rockefeller had ^{not} done it. Faubus hadn't done it. Johnson hadn't done it. Who was the guy after Johnson?

Ward: Now you have to. . . . I don't agree with your premise that Rockefeller was a media candidate. He was a media candidate in that he spent money and he bought media by tons and tons and tons. But Bumpers is truly a media candidate in that he personally gets on there and asks you for your vote. And Fulbright had a lot of people saying "Dale's a good guy, but he's no Fulbright." You know. And Rockefeller had a printing press that was going [chugchugchug] for progress and they talk about his progress. Then the press would stop and they'd say do you want progress to stop. They bought a lot of television but he was

not truly a media candidate. I mean, when a man had personal appeal, that's a true media candidate. Not just that you have \$5 million--

W.D.V.: No, I don't mean just buying a lot of time--

Ward: Well Rockefeller was certainly no media candidate.

W.D.V.: I mean the guy who actually used the media himself, by being on the tube.

Ward: Well, okay. Bumpers was, but Rockefeller was not. He very very rarely ever appeared in his television commercials . . . or documentaries. Would be like screens or showing him walking to the capital. Riding a horse. Grey horse.

W.D.V.: A grey horse?

Ward: [Laughter.] [Unclear.]

[End of side of tape.]

J.B.: Direct mail campaigns. I'm not talking about the Bumpers campaign specifically. I'm talking about campaigns in general and use of direct mail. How is it done from the stand point of different groups and targeting different groups?

Ward: Well, it depends on the candidate. Some cases where they have a good polling organization that can identify his strong areas-- that becomes a very effective way to use direct mail. I think some of the most effective direct mail is done by people that do not necessarily go to the expense to identify their vote or go to specific segments of population. You can find a man who's very attractive to, let's say, women and you can just make a straight shot at women with the right kind of letter. Which is very carefully done. And I think you can attract many votes that way. I think that people sometimes spend too much time trying to identify these groups and trying to write a letter to a left-handed, black preacher. You know, we're going to write them

all this letter rather than--and they spend a lot of money doing that and A lot of people will write the blacks all a letter and say, you know, since I know you're black I understand the problem. And I don't care how good your lists are, you're going to write whites and call them black or vica versa. It makes no difference. And I've often thought there was more of a down side to that sort of thing than the plus you got out of it. I guess every political consultant in the country, number one, has his own idea and mostly they're aimed at their own style of campaigning. Matt ^{Reese}~~Resiss~~ will tell you it's the telephone and targeting and Walter De Vries will tell you that it's really polling and Charles Ward will tell you that it's direct mail. And their various things. That's one of the problems I have with going to seminars. Number one, I don't have the compulsion to tell everything that we do. We do it like here for the Institute of Politics because that's a different kind of thing. But seminars, for the greatest part, are attended more by other consultants than they are sometimes by real prospects. I have no compulsion to go around and tell my secrets. You know, I'll pitch a candidate or something directly but. . . . I don't know if I answered your question or not.

J.B.: To what extent in a campaign is direct mail used in so far as funds' solicitation. Is it used both in fund solicitation as well as voter persuasion efforts--if I may use that term?

Ward: We do quite a bit of fund solicitation and usually, even if we're just doing some direct mail piece, I feel that it's good to ask people for money. I think it's good in any event to ask someone for money. I think, whether they give you money or not, you've involved them in your campaign. And I do think that there's a great myth ongoing in this country right now because of George McGovern's success in raising money through direct mail in 1972. And I think you're going to find--it's

been our experience. . . . It would be very easy to raise money for George McGovern. . . or George Wallace. Because it's easy to define their universe. You know, with George McGovern you go ^{buy} ~~to~~ a liberal magazine list and you mail those and you're doing good. Hubert Humphrey, in 1972, probably could not have covered the cost of the mail, in my opinion, in the time they had to do it, just because they would have had trouble defining. . . . I mean if you're going to try to raise \$10 million, sure, you can go to proven givers and do some good with direct mail. And there's maybe a million name around now that you could go to. I think, though, that obviously you have to know the candidate, what sort of appeal they have. Either have to go to a proven candidate [means giver?] list or determine if they [feel?] liberals, conservatives, what have you and go to them.

W.D.V.: Charles, who are some of the campaign consultants who work almost exclusively in the South that we ought to talk to?

Ward: Well, you definitely should talk to Deloss Walker. Obviously. He's probably one of the most successful in the South. He's got a governor in Texas, one in Mississippi, and one in Arkansas. Senator Eastland. I don't know. He did some work for Bennett Johnston when he ran second. He's now Senator, so he just barely lost that one.

J.B.: Who is Deloss handling in the--

Ward: Tennessee? Butcher. You know, Bumpers has never done anything. Waller ran fourth the first time he ran. He got 60,000 and Briscoe, I think, either ran fourth or fifth first time he ran. So he's got quite a--

W.D.V.: Who else, in terms of consulting and polling and media services?

Ward: Well, I'm just trying to think. There's a group down in

Mississippi. They're in Jackson. I cannot think of their name. But anybody down there could tell you. They've handled. . . .

W.D.V.: Is it an advertising agency?

Ward: Yeah.

W.D.V.: Yeah.

Ward: Yeah, it's an agency. You probably know who I'm talking about. But the two things. . . . I talk like I know what I'm talking about, but I have not been actively, really, in this sort of thing for about two years. At all! So I don't really know that many houses that are operational. I don't know if they are or if they aren't and I never really dealt with it. We usually either work directly with the candidate or we work with the agency involved. Most of our out-of-state work is done strictly on the basis that the agency hires us. We pay the agency commission. We consult with them if they want on the technical aspects of the mail. For the most part we depend on them to do the copy. That sort of thing. I mean because we don't know the appeal of a Congressional candidate running in Tennessee. We just don't know what the issues are in the race. And supposedly the agency or someone should.

W.D.V.: Is the South as a region losing its importance or gaining more importance in the Democratic national committee? Democratic national politics.

Ward: Well, I think it always has been important and I think it is still important. And I think it's proven that you're going to have a hard time electing a Democratic president if you don't carry the South.

J.B.: Is there a lot of talk within the committee, when you start talking in political terms and in terms of '76, of need to have a southerner on the ticket?

Ward: Lot of talk among the southerners that we need to have a

southerner on the ticket. I'm not too sure I've ever heard anybody from New York or Iowa talk a lot about it.

J.B.: How do the people from New York or Iowa or Minnesota respond to the idea?

Ward: Well, committee people for the most part don't really talk about things like that. At this point, they're not really discussing. When you talk about that right now, everyone's considering maybe George Wallace and they're all cautious about that. I think you really have to analyze who the nominee is going to be. And you have to analyze each nominee differently. It would be different if Kennedy or Jackson, for instance. . . . If Jackson is the nominee, he doesn't really need anybody from the South. Jackson probably could run very well on his own in the South. And, you know, Jackson would probably help the ticket in the South if he were the vice presidential nominee. Not as much as a Bumpers or a Wallace or an Asquew would. But if Kennedy were the nominee, I think he would need a southerner to help him in the South.

J.B.: As opposed to say a Jackson.

Ward: And a Mondale, he would. . . you know, it would certainly be helpful to him. You know, if a Jackson were the nominee, then it might make sense for them to go to the northeast. You hate to give up that entire section. . . . I don't know if you would necessarily give it up. But, you know, you got a man from the extreme west and from the south. Be a little tough in Massachusetts and New York I would think. [Something about Benson.] Haven't really discussed him. He's a very attractive candidate. Are you fellows really down here for Terry Sanford?

J.B.: [Laughter.] No.

W.D.V.: [Unclear.] Never thought of that, did you, Bass? Because

you're temporarily located at Duke University conceive
now as an agent of Gov Sanford circulating among the 11 southern states.
Push his drive for the presidency/vice presidency/secretary of defense/
[Interruption on tape.]

J.B.: You've been on a DNC, this is what, your second year?

Ward: I was elected in the spring of '72.

J.B.: So you're starting a third year. That's your first experience in a politically active role?

Ward: Yes.

J.B.: As a participant.

Ward: That's right.

J.B.: Have you gotten it in your blood to the extent that you may be a candidate one day?

Ward: No, because I. . . . I really enjoy my activities for the national committee. I think I'm making a contribution. I have worked very hard as a member of the executive committee to try to keep all the segments in the South together. Just as hard as I can. And I think that's what Straus has tried to do on the national level. Keep all the pieces from flying apart. The wheel's a little unbalanced but we've been able to keep it all together. I think we are going to have to keep it all together if we're going to win in '76. I think that's extremely important. You don't let the blacks take a walk, or labor take a walk, or Wallace take a walk, or the liberals or the conservatives or what have you. Now, as it gets closer to election time, I recognize that that's going to be continually harder to do. But all the appointments that have been made to commissions, both by Jean Westwood and by Strause since '72, have been good ones, in my opinion. And we've created no great rifts in the party. And for the most part we've been

working very well. I really enjoy my work in that party.

W.D.V.: How many people are on that executive committee?

Ward: 25

W.D.V.: How many from the South?

Ward: Well, depends on how you want to count. Let me tell you what the executive committee is, then you'll understand it better. There are two elected from each region.

[Interruption on tape.]

--within the national committee. And there's a southern caucus. That's how we're elected, at that southern caucus.

W.D.V.: You mean there are four regional caucuses?

Ward: Four regional cuacuses within the national committee. That's right. There are 13 states in the South.

W.D.V.: Does the South tend to act more as a unit than the other regions?

Ward: Well, we have our divisions in the South just like the other re--I think they all have their divisions. But any differences we have are usually within our caucus. I'm sure, you know, we vote differently. But. . . you know. . . I try to stay away from we and they. It's just hard to say. Right now the chairman is in very good position on the national committee. If he held a vote of confidence he'd get at least 90%. I do a lot of floor work for him. The head counting and that sort of thing when we're in committee. And I would say that he'd get at least 90% of the votes as a confidence factor for the job he's done the last two years. People who were his worst enemies, you know, now come out very strongly for him. It's going to be very interesting to see what happens at the mid-term convention. Obviously everyone's got great anxiety about that convention. Whether

or not the right wing is going to control it or the left wing. And everyone's scared of the potential embarrassment that could come out of that. If the party should take stands on issues. The original reason for the mid-term convention was strictly to draft a new constitution for the party. And we'll have the same sort of arguments in that convention that we talked about here tonight: whether we should have a strong national party. There are people that want you to have to pay dues to join the party and they want you to be a card carrying member of the Democratic party. Other people favor a loose federation of state parties and let the states determine on their own how they're going to run their own state politics. In my opinion, we're going to go on to take up as many as ten planks in a platform or policy. . . . It's yet to be decided--

[End of interview.]