

This is an interview with Fritz Hollings, South Carolina Senator from Charleston. The interview was conducted by Jack Bass on January 28, 1974. Susan Hathaway transcribed the interview.

JACK BASS: Specifically, how do you analyzed what has happened in South Carolina politics in the last 25 . . . since 1948? The major trends and the major changes.

FRITZ HOLLINGS: The major issue has always been race, and I think if you took a poll right now, I haven't seen one, but if you took one right now I guess that it might be the first time perhaps that didn't signify race as the number one issue. I mean in 1948 it was (inaudible) Truman, but I mean you got right in with Briggs against Elliott, those cases started in '48. Brown against Baskin started at that time . . . then the Briggs - Elliott . . . the voting case, as you remember, to whether or not they were going to vote in the primary. Allen Agree and those folks said that blood was going to flow in the streets, that kind of thing. It was black men being admitted into the white primary. That's it in a capsule, in one word.

J.B.: Let me ask you this question. When you went on your so called poverty tour, what impact did that have on you? Both politically and personally?

F.H.: The impact that it had on me was to open my eyes. I knew that there was something to be learned

but I didn't think that poverty was that extensive. We get callused and hardened to the situation, and you know every town has its town drunk, and there are some poor people and they will be with us when we are dead and gone. But I never realized that say you have 900,000 South Carolinians below the poverty level in this State, or that you have got . . . now I reckon as many as 378,000 deserving and participating in the food stamp program. I just didn't realize with hunger it was that real dier need of food. I never saw persons distended, I never saw it you could see it in the eyes and the blotted bellys and everything else. You can just take story after story in Columbia . . . you don't have to be down in the islands where the auditorium is when you go there and the lady who is about 70 who has got a granddaughter who is denying herself every bit of food and water to try and keep her in good clothing, and the Minister slips her a dollar and for some reason we had gone around to the Lutheran Home where they were feeding and the (inaudible) had caught up and wanted to go back and see that lady . . . we went back and she had already been to the corner, they were just sitting down in the middle of the floor eating bread . . . just plain bread, that's how hungry she was. She took that dollar and there wasn't any question as to what she was going to do with it, she was hungry. I mean just time and again you could see how hunger was really holding us back economically.

J.B.: How did it make you feel at that time . . . first time?

F.H.: Mad, angry, it still makes me mad that we can't get the message across completely. We've made great enroads we have some 378,000, we have got better feeding programs, got better lunch room programs, and what have you, but it still made me mad what I saw up there, and I hadn't seen it as much before and yet it makes me mad still that I can't get that message over, where they think that the hungry are just a bunch of dead beats or something . . . or some moral thing that they would have the initiative and really want to work and have American patriotism and red blood in their veins as a character deficiency then you can see how nobody can have any kind of character at all just sitting there in Chesterfield hauling water five miles one way and five miles the other; nine children in an open cold shack and you can't tell them about work or anything else, they are just listless, they are staring out into space. I mean you have got to see hunger and then you will know how outrageous it is to talk about the work effort to this segment of society.

J.B.: George ^{Essex, of the} ~~Essex, of the~~ Southern Regional Council made a main address before the Southern Historical Association in November and he talked about the progress the south has made economically and so forth, but said it still remains the number one economic problem in the nation. You still have the greater disparity of income, still have a lot of basic problems dealing with economics and problems of poverty that you are familiar with sir,

and he suggested that the solution really isn't going to come from even new south Governors are the only agency that has the resources to find solutions would be the federal government and the initiative must come from Congress. I just wonder if you would respond to that.

F.H.: No. The federal government has the worst of all attitude in relation to let's say welfare reform bill, they think it is a money problem, and that you throw money at it and it's a local problem, you've got to have local participation, you've got to have local administration, there is an educational process. I oppose this money whether George McGovern wants to give them \$600 or whether Richard Nixon wants to give \$1,000 or \$4,000 of a family of four. McGovern was \$2,400. . . I oppose that because it excluded any chance of really education, training, teaching them and everything else. One of the best programs that I know of to tell you what I am talking about is that Clemson through the Agriculture Extension Service started these programs of education, breaking them in, training, showing them what to buy at the grocery store, how to buy it, how to prepare food, and of course like hunger and food needing, it's just part of the wheel of poverty. You've got housing, education, training, job opportunities or what have you. You've got to get decent housing and that is what the Governor is on to now. It's a cumulated thing, but it is not a federal problem that only the federal government is

rich enough to give us the money. that it has got to be locally administered. I would say, for example, that the welfare mess is not so much a southern problem that it is a northern problem. I went up to New York and in Harlem they had a (inaudible) in New York of one billion for one million, it was a billion dollars for a million people on welfare. All you have to do is go up and see how they play the game. And heck, people don't get married they just live together, one gets it for so much for the wife and the children, the other gets it for being sort of disabled, and they are living together having a good time and the Taxi drivers are cussing like hell, cause he is making \$9,000 driving his taxi, but he knows his brother and so called sister-in-law, who are not living together as husband and wife, but are making \$10,000 on welfare because it is just handed out with all these allocations and sums of money, and that is really where the real crying shame is, and the large big cities like New York itself really makes us suffer down in the south when we are talking about the welfare mess and getting them off the rolls. It is just one big scandal in California and New York. It is not a federal program, it has got to be locally administered, that is the only way you would ever solve it. But if you don't get participation and understanding like they are doing in Clemson or like we are doing down there . . . different volunteers and all, then you can go deliver to the hungry

families I am talking about a sum of money and it is gone. It will go to buy this coke machine, it'll go to buy a TV, it'll go and increase rent and all these other things and they will be back where they started a year from now (inaudible) we have put ex-billion into that. Now they want ex-plus, do you see what I am talking about. That's the thing.

J.B.: Are you saying that a direct grant won't work, but are you saying that the other programs have to be initiated locally, or do we need other programs and a different approach . . .

F.H.: You need a program to get people's attention, and cooperation coordination. If you were the President of the United States, number one you have got to make people understand and be aware and appreciate it and you can do that usually on TV and (inaudible). As I went around and made other persons aware and also proud to really be working in this particular field, various rotary clubs picked it up, various other civic clubs picked it up and work groups and you've got generally then just like a pew in a church in lost causes, but you have got everybody. Then once you have got them all aware and seeking it out and working on it, then you can put the money that is needed in these particular programs and know that they would be carried through. They would be coordinated, they don't need a difference in the program, they just need a little bit more education,

training, and administration of it.

J.B.: We have run into a theory that southern influence in Congress is wanning. That a number of committee chairmanships are down, that those who now chairman are now getting up in years and those who are usually behind them are non-southerners, and the future trend is that this influence will continue to wean. How do you respond to that?

F.H.: That could be the result . . . you've got a two party system in South Carolina. You have never had it before, you had the one party and they were always Democrats and they always get re-elected. Once you've made your primary you never even had to run in the general election. Now, I am not worried about primaries I'm worried about the general election, which is the best example this year. With a viable two party system, it could be caught up in national trends where people are booted out. You don't have the continuity of service that you have had over the years with the Russell's and the Byrnes and the Walter George's and everything else. It is not that the thing is weening, it is responding to a two party system.

J.B.: We talked to Gillis Long today, and he has a theory that based on the 1972 Congressional election that the future Democratic Congressmen to come out of the south will be much more oriented towards National Democratic party. But if you have a number of Republicans elected, who will be much more oriented towards the old

traditional southern democratic conservative.

F.H.: That's theory. That is not necessarily true. Let's look at our local Congressman . . . I don't know about the Congressmen, but let's look at the Senate, let me answer on that basis. The Senators that I know oriented . . . I don't want to say really either party . . . what you are saying, the premacy of your question is Republicans are conservative in that the Democrats as the liberal party, not necessarily. I think as I look at Sam Nunn, ^{Lawton Chiles} ~~(inaudible)~~ ^{See Huddleston,} ~~Giles~~, Bennett Johnson, ~~D. Allister~~, Lloyd Benson, as describing them all as conservative. I don't know what is conservative or liberal, but I do know that I was thinking at one time that we were going to have the real minds and the real electables go into the Republican party as young ones or we are going to hold on to some real good leadership within the Democratic ranch from the Southern States, or are all the Republicans going to be like Howard Baker, and we are going to end up with what is left on the contrary, let's look at what they've got, they've got Scott and Helms and Thurmond, and we've got Nunn and Bennett Johnson and Lawton ^{Chiles} ~~Giles~~ and Benson, ^{te} and I think that is pretty substantial and I think that it is more representative of the South, and I don't want to allude it to a particular party. I can see them getting Republican and Democratic votes as they now do in the states.

J.B.: Would any of the Democratic Senators you mentioned be more representative of the main stream national

democratic party, not necessarily the liberal . . .

F.H.: Well, where is the main stream? It sure isn't George McGovern, and that is what we ended up with. That's why we lost, for example, in North Carolina and other places around, he scared people to death. If you don't make an image of your own in a campaign of your own, you were gone. In America last year, those races, I mean in the year before last in '72, we ran those races. So, the persons we (inaudible) Bob Strauss, who is now Chairman now, yeah, he is more like to us.

Unident: In fact, he was run out by the McGovern crowd in Miami, wasn't he?

F.H.: I picked him up, he was the Treasurer . . . and I picked him up on the campaign committee to co-chair along with Peter McCullough of Xerox our little Senatorial-Congressional campaign committee. Now, Mr. McGovern crowd (?) is not the Chairman but the other crowd (?) is. Now if you want to say Jackson, yes, we'd vote for Jackson. I think that is a very ^{elusive} ~~illusive~~ thing. Every writer from time on in has been writing on various subjects and I can give you the books. A Time magazine reporter will walk up from Atlanta and write about the new south and the Governor from the new south, which is right down town in Atlanta, and everyone of them had been called and everyone of them had been killed off, and I've always tried to avoid that Time magazine reporter, so he wouldn't kill me off with that new south crack. But it took Carl Sanders, every one of these fellows, you can go right on down the line just about, *[beginning]*

with ~~(inaudible)~~ ^{Ellis} Arnold, (inaudible) they have been writing that for about 40 years about the new south. The same with the idea that some how or the other all the egg heads are going to end up in the Democratic party, and all the business conservatives are going to end up in the Republican party, and that ain't so. The chairman of our campaign dinner just walked in here named Herbert Allen, he's a stock broker, a very responsible fellow from New York, Peter McCullough is President of Xerox, we've got substantial conservative business leadership in our party as well, and the party is not just going to go one way.

J.B.: How do you describe the South Carolina Democratic party at this time?

F.H.: I don't know, when I'm on a TV program, I'd say responsible, progressive . . .

J.B.: I mean a coalition of what?

F.H.: It's a coalition like the national party is, various groups. It's got the . . . conservative following as well as liberal followers, it's got black as well as white voters in it. It has got progressives throughout. All you have to do is look at this record. It faces up to the problems and in return how the Republicans have a heck of a time making an ~~in~~road.

J.B.: Do you say then that the way you see it as reflective of the national Democratic party?

F.H.: I'm not going to plead guilty to the national Democratic party being a McGovern party as your question inferes. I don't think that is so. I think we are bringing the national Democratic party down to where

Jack Kennedy had it. But Kennedy was our last winner. He ran on a program of responding to the needs of the people, he ran on a program of strong national defense, and these are the platforms, and he ran on middle America, not extreme . . . the needs of our society, and yes, that's the National Democratic Party that I think is the national party. I think that is why we lost out by going down this primrose path.

J.B.: But in that definition of the National Democratic Party, you would say that South Carolina's Democratic Party today reflects that?

F.H.: Yeah. I think so.

J.B.: What do you think that the Democrats have to do to put the south back in the Presidential elections?

F.H.: What's that?

J.B.: What do you think that the National Democratic Party has to do to win the south back in Presidential elections?

F.H.: They've got to be realistic and put up candidates that will articulate the national needs of the country. When you see a fellow coming down to fight who wants to mail everybody a thousand dollars and talking about amnesty and abortion, and bringing Americans home, that goes right against the rank of the average southern voter who is patriotic, who likes the medal of honor winner. Jack Kennedy was speaking of national pride. He was going to get the country moving. And the Republicans were saying that everything was alright at home and in the store, don't worry about

it and everything else like that, but it was patriotism, it was a strong national defense, it was responsible government that was responding to the housing needs and the social needs of the country. If you can get somebody like that who can not just spend us blind and talk in terms of fiscal responsibility which Kennedy was too, you've got a winner, and he's going to have to talk on those lines, he can't be coming out on amnesty, abortion and all of those other peripheral things that are not real issues. That's what makes George Wallace. We make him every time. We give him the issues . . . when you are talking about National Democratic Party, he takes Michigan as well as he takes Alabama while flat on his back, because he is talking sense. Like Adleyⁱ Stevenson said that was his expression in '52, talk sense to the American people. I think in 1976, we've got to talk sense to the American people.

J.B.: In South Carolina the Governor is usually considered to be a weak office in comparison to other states. You have been Governor and now have observed it from a distant² with some perspective. How do you ^{assess} ~~access~~ the role of the Governor in South Carolina?

F.H.: It's the way you do it . . . not what you do, but the way in which you do it. I had the advantage of having a strong office because having been there 10 years, I had leadership in both houses, I knew the fellows intimately, I worked with them. We got one whale of a lot of legislation through and programs going that the . . . would have a hard time now . . . I don't want to be

egotistical in saying improving upon, but everybody has been running on technical training and industrial development. The higher commission of education cleaned up the penitentiary, (inaudible) and all the things that we did. If I had to go just to the authority or answer on a political science exam, South Carolina has probably got one of the weakest Governors, from the standpoint that other Governors can appoint justices, and they have more responsibility with respect to patronage, public service commission, they get into the highway department, go down to Georgia and the Governor getting inaugurated goes and he says this is a real inauguration, you've heard me tell that story. Sent 500 out there in front of the highway department because the Governor's man goes in and gives him (inaudible) and what have you. In that context, South Carolina has always had one of the very weakest, but we have learned very quickly how to work, and if you do, as John West has done, work with the general assembly, I think Mike Mann did the same thing, and I bet we were general assembly products so we knew the strength and respected the legislature, so we could work with them. So, if you are writing a political science paper it is weak, if you are writing a fact for history about South Carolina government in the last ten years it is very strong . . . the Governor's office.

J.B.: Is that then because of the background of people who have occupied it?

F.H.: I think so. You take the previous decade, we didn't get too much did we?

J.B.: We are not going to . . . this book won't be published before 1976.

F.H.: It won't. Come back then, it'll be changed, we'll have to update it. (inaudible) Senator Hollings said the other day and then bam, hell that was back in January of 1974 two years before. It could be changed around. You can write a book quicker than that. Well if you want all of government and everything else, I think the only difference now is that finally we're . . . it was the voting, then it was school, then it was school desegregation and everything else, and it went to all the other efforts of social endeavor. Then it got climaxed the year before last on busing. But busing was part of the Wallace thing and you couldn't get out of either one of them, I remember when Senator Muskee went to Chatanooga he said busing gave mobility. Well, . . . some of these events, you didn't have any Democratic candidate other than George Wallace talking sense about them. People wanted to live in their communities. Freedom of choice was a ^{good} ~~Thurmond~~ Marshall expression, you all have gone to the arguments in 1952 and he said it was the state of those policies, separation by race and Franklin said what happens if you remove . . . and he said if you remove that your honor, he said, you'll have freedom of choice. They can move any niger to attend any school that they want. So when they came back from the freedom of choice, then they came back with this unconstitutional affirmative

malarky like in Mecklenburg County, because I was on that brief with Sam Ervin reeling and dealing them all around there from early morning until late at night, 600,000 of them, buses and everything else of that kind just won't wash, and they didn't. You bus them all around to have a token amount, that's what we said, that the constitution was color blind. They say though that the Constitution requires a certain amount of color in each school. They tried to reverse their own decision, But in any event now they are talking economics, you remember . . . and I am not saying this with pride, I am saying it because I am trying to offset, because I was making separate but equal talks too during the '50's, and my call at that time, I didn't NAACP down trying to find a job and get a piece of bread for a man to eat, to get a roof over his head, and a job for him to work at. They are only interested politically in getting the vote. Now, by God, we have passed that and they are interested in that piece of bread and that roof over their head and that economic opportunity. So the NAACP . . . and Frtiz Hollings are working on the same side of the street for a change, and the average southern leader isn't because he knows that that is fundamental to the success of the state, his administration. If you all know differences, you all would try to allude it nationally, but that is the difference between the

Republican and the Democratic party in the south which makes the Democratic party sustain and succeed, because no Republican standing up talking now is saying we are going to have a meeting today at the country club where the blacks don't even come. We've got our young leaves, young Republican leaves who meet without the black leaders, and they continue with their social thing in trying to identify with some national cuase or movie star like Reagan, and feeling that they are doing something great for their country. The Democrats are sitting down there meeting with the blacks in their town, trying to find out how to get jobs and housing and everything else, that is why we Democrats continue to get elected at the local level, and we continue to have our majority. That is the real key then, alluding itself to a national party . . . the Democrats or the Republicans alluding itself to the local needs and the Democrats have been small enough to sit around a table and start working together.

J.B.: Do you see the Democratic party building on a base of pupulace class of working whites and blacks.

F.H.: Certainly. That is exactly the success of Roosevelt, that will be the success of the next Democratic President, if he gets to be Democratic President.

J.B.: How about in terms of South Carolina politics?

F.H.: In terms of South Carolina politics. That is what Mr. Thurmond ran on in 1948 or '46, what was it.

J.B.: '46.

F.H.: '46, yeah. . . he was as popular as a Democrat (inaudible).

Unident: Do you think the basic (inaudible) 45 years (inaudible) for the two party system in South Carolina?

F.H.: That's right.

Unident: Second the move of race as the dominant issue, they are now more concerned about economic issues?

F.H.: That's right, back . . . to where they were in the 40's .

Unident: Do you see any other major trends that have occurred during that period, like the way you campaign, or the way you communicate with voters? Is there any difference?

F.H.: Well, when you get to the populace issue, it's not the intellectual level has been raised on all issues. We used to run around with a bottle of salt tablets and talk about air conditioning. Now, you know this is the only air conditioned building we've got right here. There is air conditioning in South Carolina and that is what made it. Now the middles have cleaned up. They can't even get the employees in one of those sweat shops anymore, and all of textile industries are modernized and air conditioned and take the dust out, and these other things. And new industries are coming in and are higher paid, and so you are going to get to better opportunities and more education, and that is why technical training is such a tremendous success in South Carolina because everybody is trying to better themselves and

make more money . . . that's one of the things that the people are just doing generally. I think the labor movement could become a movement in the south, it's not one right now.

J.B.: At this point, would you consider endorsement from organized labor to be an asset or liability in state wide races in South Carolina?

F.H.: A liability.

J.B.: In terms of political campaigning, what changes have there been since you first started running and now in approaching voters and getting . . .

F.H.: We make the labor union meetings, we talk to them and we work with them, at least I do.

J. B.: General . . .

F.H.: But any of those others, I don't want to say we are bored since they are liabilities, I don't need it, whatever it is that they endorsed to find business, but the endorsement hadn't really gotten, you know, hasn't gotten organized enough lately to carry that much weight in a state wide race. There are too many now in the Chamber of Commerce wondering who is this guy who is going to serve. They are very jaundice and very suspicious. I wouldn't want anybody from outside coming in and telling people how to vote . . . you know I could get me a band of all kinds of people down there. Your question is what issues do we have?

J.B.: What changes in campaign methods and styles?

What role has television played?

F.H.: With television it just knocked out completely. We had to hit with the worlds best; most historically what you call county campaigning . . . we'd all get out there and we'd be the one party and this would be the campaign and we'd all come and everybody running for either Adjutant General, Lt. Governor, or United States Senator . . . then we talked all day and rotated around, and we'd go from county to county speaking, plus, extra barbecues that they would have at Silver Hill and the Greenville Auditorium was an extra one . . . and what have you. Now, you can't even get persons to attend those meetings. Those days of communication the late 40's, the early 50's, that's when they could come and learn and see the stands taken and the press would follow. I doubt if even the press would come around and follow the candidates and sit there all day waiting for a guy to talk and say the same thing. So with TV you have got to organize better for one thing. You didn't have to have too much of an organization. I think in the two party system we are going to be using the party organization a little more. My own experience is that I've had to get up until now a Hollings organization every time I run. Incidentally, the last time of course with the history of Governor having appointed himself to the United States Senate and me running against him . . . the fellow who did the appointing be on the ticket. I mean they had to control whatever there was of the state party. You well remember in '66, I had to organize my own . . . and the same in '68. This time I hope we can

get some . . . since the Republicans are well organized we can get our own party organized. I think a change will come about when we are eventually running together as a ticket. Whether that will occur this time, I don't know. But I know that when we started out, in addition to the (inaudible) county to county we were almost on an individual basis. I think now in 25 years, we have eliminated that. We have gone to the media, newspaper and TV and what have you, and we are going to be organizing within the party . . . state party more than ever before . . . trying to limit the cost.

J.B.: You look at the political organizations in other states probably more than most people do . . . running the state campaign last year . . . How do you rate South Carolinas Democratic party insofar as organizational strength compared with other Democratic parties in the south?

F.H.: Very poor.

J.B.: Which state do you think has the best?

F.H.: Well, I don't know, but let me say I was really rating it with respect to the ones like Indiana and all up there where they are taking them out and have an organization. I don't know whether the Democratic party is well organized in North Carolina or Georgia, I'd just have to plead ignorance on that. I wouldn't say that South Carolina is better or worse than Georgia or any other southern state. I was just thinking of party organizations in the real old time places, and we

just don't have that kind of organization. The women are the best organization that we've got, because politics is people who are meeting and greeting and seeing and working and seminars . . . and the women in South Carolina have a lot of that. I don't find the party having anything but a convention to go to. We wait wait around and it comes about that in March, we hope somebody will come to the club meetings and county meetings, and everything else . . . we pray for them to come out and participate. We don't have that much organization. We are just not very organized.

J.B.: Do you feel the south . . . and we should elaborate on this . . . is entering into a period of consolidation in terms of social and political and economic change . . . the major changes have come about and the Region is entering into a period of consolidation of those changes?

F.H.: There will be more consolidating Jack, but how far they will go is another question. Individualistic as the average southerner is, the more affluent and educated he becomes. He continues to play, and I regret it, I think it is a bad trend in a wave from a standpoint of a two party system, because then you could get fragmented into a many party system. He likes the man rather than the brain. If we continue on and let everybody have independence around and everything else, then you'll have a hard time getting an organization for your two parties. So I hope they participate in one or the other. But then another evolution comes around as they do win . . . they do get

local office. Like in Columbia now, you just about swept all the Democrats out in an election two or three years ago. Now the Republicans are in trouble in Columbia, because they haven't been given the services and everything else, they've been bickering, and they have had devasiveness as much as any Democrats have had, so I think . . . yes, it'll begin to coagulate a little more, but the liability of the Democratic party has got to be kept up there so we can keep up with money and business interest and everything else to keep us in office, that's what we got to do, otherwise it will just devolve into a black white situation, that's what we want to try to prevent. That is the strength of the Democrats now . . . is in our state the character of the candidates. Most of the candidates that have been put forward by the Republicans have been disadin Democrats who couldn't win anyway. So they got mad and thought they would just take an issue, whether it was busing that day or the national picture and what have you. They all just jumped to Goldwater, who was popular in South Carolina, who proved it by carrying the state overwhelmingly, they were just jumping at that to get in office, but what . . . there wasn't any service or any hard work or any taking a stand on issues and providing the need . . . it was a momentary political thing. So I think that if we in the Democratic party can keep the character (inaudible) of our own crowd in there, then we will continue to succeed.

J.B.: What do you think has been the greatest weakness of the Republican party in South Carolina?

F.H.: I think it is the weakness of the Republicans as concerns . . or compared to the Democrats over the darned issue. The Republicans have always had that creative custodial care. They try to enunciate free enterprise and do nothing. They go in and they do nothing and stand around all the time. They think in terms of . . . and I don't say this disparagingly . . . the balance of budget, I believe in it, I've got a triple A credit rating from it . . . but they don't look upon government as an opportunity. They think that all of us should make a lot of money and all of these other people, who are bums, you know the ones alluding there, tuning themselves to the Republican Party are still talking in terms of hand outs, in terms of gold bricks, cheaters on the food stamp program and everything else of that kind, and so they just don't want any progress, they don't want any participation by government. We have got a changing time now where we have got big government, big labor and big industry, and everything is big and it would be darn nice to try and treat the oil companies on a little private free enterprise basis, but you see they've got us, we can't get the truth from them. So what we are going to have to do, we are going to have to put a public company, like TVA on a continental shelf out here to drill that oil, so we will know what the cost of oil and gas is. They don't tell you the truth.

I mean you can see what an energy crisis like that just leaving the private free enterprise alone just won't happen in this inter-dependent society that we have. I think Republicans are . . . have a feeling against government, they really don't like it. They like the title, they like the Cadillac, they like the telephone in the car, they like the emollients of sitting on the fifty yard line. They don't really like to get other people involved what makes them click and solve some of these problems. It's a social thing with them, it's not a political thing. That is the weakness of the Republicans over the land. You can see them met the same old story. They used to be Baptist and poor, no car . . . now they have transferred from a Chevrolet up to a Cadillac, and then to a Lincoln and they belong to a country club, and joined the Episcopal Church. . . praying against all you sinners.

J.B.: Do you think that as the South becomes economically more affluent, more urbanized, and more industrialized that it is going to become more Republican?

F.H.: What has been the trend (inaudible) and that has been a horrible thing to face. It is in Virginia and we see it coming right on down with two Senators and a Governor in Tennessee, a Governor and Senator in North Carolina, a Senator in South Carolina, and in Georgia, as you well know, ^{Bo Callaway} (~~inaudible~~) Caraway got the majority of votes, what was it in '62 or '64 . . . I think in '64 ten years ago. So I am very fearful there might be two Senators from South Carolina.

J.B.: This year Senator?

F.H.: Yeah. I have an advantage because of Watergate because people are stopping in their tracks and beginning to think and wonder where we are headed with this thing. It was a marvel scene . . . the Republican movement in the South. By gosh the National Democrats made it so.

J.B.: Do you think that Republicanism in the south has crested?

F.H.: Oh yeah. I think this Watergate thing has made it crest, and I hope we have learned a lesson down in Miami . . . the Democrats did. I hope all of us in public office learned a lesson from Watergate. You see there ought not be any buying. I think the impact on this adhere to this the Democrats holding the line in the south. What do I think? As I said, I wasn't worried so much about the primary because I can hold my own and we will run alright, I think. But in the general election my great fear is that here comes Mr. Big Daddy with all the wealth and everything else like that, and all he has to do with a Republican press and statements made that this fellow Hollings has got Potomac Fever . . . he's gone off and forgotten his people, he wants to run for Vice-President and all that stuff, and we want people now to stand up for South Carolina, and (inaudible) a half of million dollars in running, and they can do it. But all they can . . . put in a guy like Jim Henderson that has never run for public office came within an inch of becoming the State's Lt. Governor and would have been

a good one between you and me. But I mean it just showed what TV and advertising in packaging. Now we can look behind big daddy giving all that money. I am talking specifically about a gentlemen up in Spartanburg financing all these big campaigns and everything else in the Republican Party. Now we can see who all is giving and how much they are putting in, and I think that will help us arrest it. So I think Watergate has helped us to where you can be decent and be a Democrat still. On the other hand we are all going public, we are all going to have to file in addition to all moneys in the note, our income tax returns and financial statements, and I think this will help the Democrats in South Carolina, and in the South.

Unident: The premise of our book is that there is something different about the south when you compare it with the other regions of the country. Can you think of what those differences might be as it applies in the senate and outside the senate. Is there a difference between the southern group of senators and the rest of them?

F.H.: When you go back to their heritage and culture, I don't know. If you go back to the heritage and culture in the south that we have of having to depend on each other, there was Reconstruction and everything else, but there was a silver lining to that black cloud, we learned to like each other and get along. I know I could get along with a black better than Jack Javitz ever thought of. They can't understand them. I went to

the Broadway Central, by the way, and I would have fallen down at 70th and 3rd Avenue, and they had a Representative, I won't have to name him from the New York Legislature "what did you eat for (inaudible)", you know he was talking with Puerto Ricans and blacks saying I can speak tongue. They would understand, they would respond and everything else. I guess it is a heritage of the contribution to the negro to the southern culture to love and understand and what have you, I think that in our back yard having taken care of people, it sounds Uncle Tomish and persons would resent it. You could understand their resentment to not only let them work on the farm, but to take care of them, and when they got sick, you got sick, you paid their doctor bills, and all of those kind of things. That kind of feeling still exists, some of that will diminish and go out. In turn we are not going to be able to be Uncle Toms and take care of them, that is still a hangover of humor and a feel and an understanding in the south where we work together and we are proud of it and in our communities, I just think that where they say there is no patriotism down in the southern part of America, because they just feel that so strongly. There is a probably a religious heritage in the background. The blacks have always relied on their churches. That has been the focal point of their culture and livelihood during the week and everything else. We understand it and appreciate it. I've been in California. I don't

find the people so differently, I just found it too computerized, institutionalized, business wise, and sort of (inaudible) society. It is not the inter-relationship that we have in our communities working together and taking pride in making sure that that plant succeeds. I think that if I bought a little small plant in Pennsylvania or New York or Illinois, I don't know that you would get the community pride to make sure that up in Michigan it works. I think that's why a lot of them come down because they feel that they have that responsibility and that they have got that mutual pride in community feel, and get a handle and be a part. There is that coldness, you can get the best of industry and locate it in Michigan and never really feel like it belongs there. There is a meeting of the elements and the stand-off and they confrontation me and you, how much pain and whatever it is . . . I don't know, there might be a little more itinerate in their work force and everything else. People in the work force in South Carolina are sticking more to their jobs over the years, they stick more to their communities . . .

Unident: Do these characteristics reflect themselves the way the Senators work together?

F.H.: Yeah.

Unident: Southern Senators work differently than say northern or western?

F.H.: No, I'd have to say that some of these other of the western Senators work closely together. You can look at it and see, it depends on the politics. Teddy

and Ed Brook will probably work more closely together on Massachusetts problems than say Senator Thurmond or myself. I don't know that is from the State that we get along personally, I think that is from the political situation where Thurmond demands that every announcement of every industry, sewer line or whatever it is, I mean the federal grant goes through his office and it is a completely competitive situation, and it is his task to keep from me what is going on or what the administration proposes to do and when they propose to do it, so that he can be the source or origin of any and all that comes from Washington. You don't work together, like Mr. Nixon never worked together. I think that is the great trouble nationally ... it'll be changed by two years, it could be changed this Thursday night. Last year Mr. Nixon said look, I'm too busy, I don't have time for a State of the Union message, turn on the radio . . . (End of side one of tape) . . . we haven't worked closely, it is hard to.

Unident: I recently heard that Governor ~~earr~~ *Carter* said that the Southern Governors in the National Governor's conference tended to work more closely than the others. I wonder if the same thing happened in the Senate?

F.H.: That same thing happened ten years ago when I was a member of the Governor's Conference. He is dead right, we all got together and everything else like that. The Southern Senators, if you are getting to train the train is opposite because we used to have a southern caucus. There was a southern caucus and a southern

manifesto, and a southern meeting. There hadn't been southern caucuses on busing. In fact different ones drifted from it.

Unident: Why is that? Is it because you have some Republican Senators, or because . . .

F.H.: Because the southern caucus took on the issue of racism. It was given the Thurmond fillabuster . . .

Unident: That was the only thing that held it together - race?

F.H.: That was the one thing, yeah, and they just don't want to be identified as a southern group just meeting on that basis, that's right. And they don't want to be identified as racist. I think that is a significant change, and now that you have brought it out in your question, when I first came up here, you had us all meeting around Dick Russell. Later on we met for a while around Al ^{Ellender}~~Ellen~~ and decided what we were going to do about this busing amendment. I don't know now that you could get a southern caucus on any particular question, we've got legal services there . . . Helms would like to get a fillabuster going and he'd like to have a southern meeting, but he is not going to get one. Might have a Republican meeting on it . . .

Unident: Those days are gone?

F.H.: Those days are gone. We don't see our interests as being any different from any other interest in the country now.

J.B.: Is that basically a reflection of the fact blacks are now voting in large numbers?

F.H.: Oh yes, it is common sense. I mean they are right there, they are voting in large numbers, they are participating. Of course, when they run they solicit their vote, they don't fool with it otherwise, but they get pretty warm and friendly when election time comes around, they are running around announcing arm and arm with victorial delete. Come up here to Washington . . . talking about announcing things, my colleague says, by cracky (inaudible) in South Carolina because I voted for one of those votes, for example, was for vocational rehabilitation, the other one was voter registration . . . all of them were good solid South Carolina votes, but the point is he says that I am too liberal, but it is liberal on the programs that he ran on. He says that I can't run, that I might be getting too liberal for my constituency, but I watched his overwhelming victory in 1972 and it was on vocational rehabilitation, it was on Head Start that he votes against, it was on Social Security that he has been against a long long time, it was on the matter of water and sewer grants the HEW grants that he votes against, and then goes down and announces first (inaudible) has his arm around the mayor and he has got a radio announcer and everything else. You can see that our politics are sound while not worried that the demise of the Republican Party is going down

because Senator Thurmond, the best of the best politician, and he is an excellent politician. He saw how to run down there. He didn't come up and say no he didn't want the black vote like some of them has said in the gubernatorial race and stuff like that. He didn't say we were against all these programs, socialistic . . . blue print for socialism, he just forgot about the blue print for socialism, and he just went right on straight down on the socialistic programs and said whoppee here I am, send me back to Washington because I can bring home the bacon.

J.B.: Do you think that Helms, Scott and Thurmond are going to be the ~~wave~~^{wave} of the future for the Republican Party . . . is that where the party is going in the South?

F.H.: I know it is not the wave of the future of the Democratic party. There is a definite difference there, and it could well end up, yes, it could well end up that way, it just depends on who the national candidate is. I think by the time your book comes out in '76 if you have a Reagan candidacy, that's where they are all going; if on the other hand, you've got Percy or Rockefeller, it could be different, but I don't know. I don't know what the future is going to be with them.

J.B.: Senator, that day down in Beaufort County when you first met Tom Barnwell, had you ever been directly confronted in that manner by a black before?

F.H.: Oh yeah. Well yeah, like I said that is the sort of heritage, see them, work with them, . . .

J.B.: I mean he was right angry that first time . . .

F.H.: Yeah. I had seen, of course, in Charleston right down in Little Mexico when I went down there with Sister Hafling (?), James Clyburn ~~(?)~~ was as angry as Tom Barnwell, he was there, that's where I first met him . . . met Clyburn. It was around the first time that I had ever gotten down there that they were pretty angry and what you are saying is that the first time I have ever met a militant, I wouldn't characterize Tom as a black militant, that's the first time I had gotten the real flavor of black militancy, let me put it that way.

J.B.: What was your first reaction to that?

F.H.: Well when you see it, you can see how they can get angry and outraged, they have been knocking on the door a long time, nobody paying any attention to them. You can remember Beaufort as a good story because when we got there they weren't talking to the mayor or something, the Mayor wasn't talking to the County Council, the lawyers had forbad a conjunctive project that would have searched (inaudible) for farmers homes, and declared the titles back to a certain point so they could get it. They wanted and OEO project to come in and let all the lawyers just come in and claim all the titles. There was no will (?), you couldn't get them together to bring in a water line. There was . . . they had run poor what's his name out, he was having personal difficulties but ^{driving} (inaudible) Gatch (~~inaudible~~) draught

and everything else around there. It was just complete polarization around that place and nobody was talking to anybody. Now they have the (inaudible) Senator and everybody else comes out to that comprehensive health center, and the Republicans go out there too, and try to act like they are responsible for it, which is the amusing thing. We have all learned . . . Mayor, Senator, and all . . . Gatch was allowed back in and working with some of the Doctors. He's not there now, he's got a personal problem, but the Doctors are beginning to talk, the lawyers have searched the titles for the farmers homes, they have gotten together a little commission now with the Senator, and the water line has been brought down, and you have at Warsaw ^{Island} ~~the~~ fresh water for a change so they can wash, and the worms and all you've got. You've got the University of South Carolina in, getting rid of the ^{Ascaris} ~~(inaudible)~~ worm, you've got Clemson making a little movie, training the people, sending ladies . . . giving them degrees in nutrition, thirty-three graduate, they get a nutrition degree and now go back. That's a complete change, and I think without all of that nothing, just pure anger on both sides. One (inaudible) you are too damn lazy to work, and the other you are too dumb to recognize the facts that are facing you.

J.B.: How do you assess impact on those trips, both on you and on South Carolina and on national programs?

F.H.: Well, I have just given you (telephone rings, break in conversation) . . . commodity feeding that it was phasing out, and we got more in food stamps, we got a continuation, which was about to fall . . . the nutrition committee and the United States Senate, we've got, of course, Senator Olin passed away, but a much more forward thinking Director of Public Welfare, we've got delivery of food stamps and money for it and everything else to administer where you couldn't get a thing before . . . now we have a million six and we still need more . . . don't misunderstand me, that is not enough, because they still don't have enough in Chesterfield County and Marlboro, Bennettesville are still having a time getting their stamps, still having a time . . . just talk to Archie Ellis . . . I continue to work on this as I go around. I was in Clarendon County in the food stamps office in Manning all week long, but they only come two hours in Summerton and if you had to put a bulls eye, you know the area, Summerton would be more centrally located for a majority of the food stamp participants, than it would be for Manning in Clarendon County. So Archie Ellis is going to send them for three days now and I got the mail and the mail will talk, and say here is a room and the room is heated and is clean and everything else, and if they can use it I want them to be able get it. They would never have that in Summerton, South Carolina to bring in some administrators, you know, public welfare and to distribute food stamps in the city hall. I mean he

would never have gotten re-elected. . . now he can't get re-elected without it. He's begging for it, do you see what I mean. That had an impact on me that made me a better person because I just always went like everybody else in those same Republican ranks. I thought by gosh that the world took care of their own. If I brought in enough industry that there would be enough jobs, there would be enough opportunity, we'd all be rich. And that is a fact, we brought in a billion two hundred million in South Carolina last year, we set a national record, but over here you are still at the bottom for per capita income, because there is that fifty percent make less than \$4,000, the people in South Carolina. Over fifty percent of our population make less than \$4,000 or are in families that make under \$4,000. I did not realize that it was that extensive, do you see what I mean? I'm seeing all the cities, and the mayors and the chamber of commerce and the buildings and the contractors, and the development of those people and everything else. Nobody was telling me that it was this extensive. Now I know my state. I know that it has the best economic chamber of commerce program. I've put in a feeding program and a plank and chamber of commerce, you can't get that in yet in a Chamber of Commerce in South Carolina, they don't think that is a responsibility of that. Well it's later, you see, if a stitch in time saves nine, and they don't catch them when they are young and the children have malnutrition,

They get these damaged brains. They wait until they get to be 15 or 16 then they give them this vocational rehabilitation, mental retardation hospitals, hospital rooms and everything else. We are not moving promptly enough. I was arguing with . . . well, just sort of off the record I was arguing with Jim Smith about trying to get him to endorse this housing program . . . here was a State that had a million eighty hundred and seventy million budget, and we couldn't find ten million for housing? When 63% of the housing was sub-standard. Now that is 63% without lights or without running water, or without heat or toilet. So I am talking to my good friend Jim ~~Hatch~~^{Pat} Smith, Jim passed on, but Pat, I was just talking to the other day, because they asked me too. They said you have helped Pat get here, now you talk to him. So I went I knew the Governor was going to deliver it and I knew Pat was opposing it. I was talking to ~~Gray~~^{Grady} Patterson (2) so we are still working on these kind of things to sell them these ideas. I guess it has had a good effect on me, I enjoy working on them because I know that when we get that done, and we really bring them out of their muck and scarce worm, and everything else, then they really can compete. They can get into those public schools and what have you, then the jobs and all are right there. We are going to have the healthiest finest state in all of America, it's bound to be. I think that this is going to occur with the south. I think when you see more what you call enlightened

Governors in Jimmy ^{Carter} ~~Cass~~, and Rubin Askew, who didn't mind going and asking for Corporate Tax and everything else like that to get some programs going down there in his state of Florida. You see it in these other states. You see Mr. Wallace getting real progressive. He's not standing inside of doors saying don't come in. He's knocking on doors saying let me in. Isn't that right?

Unident: . . . Vice-Presidency, (inaudible) about a southerner being Vice-President . . .

F.H.: I resent it . . . second class citizenship.

Unident: I am going down - my second point is now we have heard serious talk over the last year about a Senator being President . . . can you comment on that?

F.H.: Well it was an action at first. I guess Dick Russell could well have been . . . at least Lyndon Johnson and everybody else said so long ago President of the United States, and there were others who came along that could have been, but they were born in Georgia, or they were born below the Mason-Dixon line, and that is the way they have looked upon things. Somehow we were bigoted, we were backward, we were unenlightened and otherwise, and of course in numbers that we didn't have. We had a flop that wouldn't handle economically. I think now that people from the other states realize that, I guess maybe, I don't know when you come up to Watergate and the character it serves, we might have had some demagogues, but we didn't have any . . . I don't want to say thieves, but they were pretty honest politicians . . . pretty hard working

responsive and forward thinking. Now that we have done away with the Demogagery and the Bilboism and you have got some fellows who have come along and they got a good hard common sense for judgement that's needed in government. They would rather have that than a New York Senator who has to go down and respond to the liberal party and get the other votes and everything else and now the Demogagery really ends up in their back yard. I think that . . . I don't know that it is going to come from the south, but I am going to say that it won't be prevented from coming from the south any longer. I think that we can look on our own and get our own and have them listened to, and applauded and received respectfully in California. When I went as Chairman of that committee, I was told that I was the first southerner that had talked there in twenty some years to the California Democratic Party. I've been invited back. I am going out there into the farm section this weekend. (inaudible) but we couldn't do that before.

Unident: Do you think that it is the character of the southern Governor and Senator changing, or is it because you have taken race out of the thing and now you . . .

F.H.: I think both.

Unident: Is it both? I mean different kinds of people.

F.H.: Yeah. I don't think (inaudible) like

George Wallace, I don't want to mislead you because Jack Bass does have the Research Directory. But we could make as good of segragationist speech that George Wallace ever thought of. We have outgrown that thing here, but race is gone, you have got economic issues that are there and the fellows themselves have changed. Isn't that right? (Break in conversation). We made in 1972, I don't know what we did in '73, a hundred million boxed income. . . a hundred million dollars worth of food stamps in South Carolina with four percent sales tax, that is four million bucks. We were only spending about seventy eight hundred thousand administering it. I said heck, you are pocketing three million bucks on this program. I went to Gressette and ~~Rombert~~ ^{Rembert} Dennis and everybody else and said that we might have to put in an amendment that monies received from the program be refunded to the federal treasury if they were going to do something like that. I got a million more right quick from West. He finally recommended it and got them all to go along. So he spent a million seven, but I think we ought to be spending more so as to police it because welfare reform, to go right back to it, where it has succeeded it has been in West Virginia and California where it is locally administered. Welform Reform isn't a national approach like a million in cash . . . like Danny Müllehan, they ought to keep him over there in India . . . he might have gone up in Parliament and everything else, but we never did buy his program on that basis. He sold that thing to Richard Nixon, and it is the wrong sale.

You have got to have that local administration and the performance has got to come at the local level and clean up those roles, and clean up the administration of it, and cut out the cheaters because money is going to everybody and that is what you have got to have public acceptance of it. If we could make a few cases, I just made some Jack . . . I got on Archie Ellis all last fall . . . I said they haven't made a single case in South Carolina in two years administering the program. I mean with income tax cheaters, that by the way happened with the Vice President, he went down to the municipal association at the beginning of his term at Myrtle Beach and he said that there was a fellow not far from the (inaudible) who is beating his breast, and moaning and groaning about the hungry poor. If he had only addressed himself to the real problems, we could make some progress in this country, but there was Agnew refering to me. So, I got him and we talked about it. I wrote a letter . . . I don't know whether it was letters . . . I got sort of made with him, he said if you can't stand the heat of the stove get out of the kitchen . . . I know he said that . . . quoting Truman, . . . you're wearing your feelings on your sleeve and I said no, you don't understand, I said we have got a lot of hungry folk and now there are some cheaters, I said there are some cheaters on the income tax and cheaters on all these other programs, but you don't do away with them. I didn't know that I was speaking from fact . . . or factually as of that

moment, that literally occurred. He was running around Demagoguing America . . . and that is Republicanism. That is what we take up. They would wax heavy and hard about people cheating on that, but they'd be cheating at the same time on, by gosh, their income tax. Now that is just the darndest thing in the world. I mean, at that level of society . . . (break in conversation) . . . You might not like me personally or anything else but the Congress is Democratic and everybody agrees that it is going to stay Democratic, and now why South Carolina needs a junior Republican Senator, isn't Mr. Thurmond doing his job good enough for you and announcing everything, getting all the jobs. I mean what could a junior Republican Senator do or help with that Mr. Thurmond couldn't. On the other hand with the Congress, you ought to let somebody on the policy committee, and on the appropriations committee, and have them work themselves into a position of some seniority continue their efforts toward Congressional things that includes South Carolina influence on whatever is done. It is just smart business for you to have Hollings up there, rather than this junior conservative for Thurmond to tell him what to do.

Unident: I did a little research on it . . .

F.H.: Isn't that right? And wouldn't that be one of my arguments?

Unident: You are right. But the number of states that had a slipped delegation . . . there was one Republican and one Democrat . . . (break in conversation)

. . .

J.B.: This one last question if you have time . . . You came out of World War II, went to Law School, and were in basically the same class, I think, as Bob McNair at least were in school at the same time, and John West and so that is a whole group came out of World War II and provided the political leadership in South Carolina in the last quarter of a century. What effect did the war experience itself have on that. Was that a factor, was there any conscious feeling of coming back and wanting to get South Carolina turned around.

F.H.: Sure. Every one of us. Jimmy Mann was in that group. We had a group of veterans when we started in there on the sales tax program, we changed around, we were 16 years behind North Carolina with a sales tax, and the Educational Finance Commission, that was a bunch that couldn't even get into the Senate because there was all the heads over there and they didn't even want the committee, so we made it a house committee, don't you remember. There were the veterans and all of them over there and Walter Lake and Jimmy Mann and Jim Spruill and Walter Bryan and me, it was these veterans that came back that wanted to get the sales tax passed, get us back in and filling schools and everything else of that kind, and that has continued right on down the line, particularly in this industrial development.

J.B.: Was there a conscious feeling about the

role base was playing in holding the State back at that time?

F.H.: Yeah, but we have got to be honest. It . . . we exceeded to it and played deceptive but equal game ourselves in the '50's. I mean we knew it was holding us back, but we didn't dare see it that they would be having dinner with us and serving on different . . . well we thought they should be serving on boards, I was the first one to recommend in '52, a black on the board education down there in my own home town, and they ran against me on that point. We thought they should serve, but I have to be honest, we didn't really think they would be in the clubs and eating meals and staying in the Hotels and all of those other damn things. We should have, we see it now very clearly.

J.B.: So you see all this basically just a general liberating influence in the South?

F.H.: Yeah.

J.B.: Across the board?

F.H.: I think it is a liberating influence across the board. Then when you bring in . . . you know, the story I have always told about the . . . Camdon and Joe Sinclair when we bring in DuPont instead of having a member of the Ku Klux Klan as a State Senator, we get a Rhodes Scholar like John West, and Joe Sinclair who headed up the hospital. I tried to get him for the state hospital thing. He was so good in Kershaw County Camdon wouldn't let him go, but you get a mental intellectual

transfusion, cultural transfusion and the supervisor of personnel had come in. We have had quite a bit of that . . . they have all come in, they have set higher goals and everything else of that kind, and I think that has been one of the big things.