

This is an interview with Fred Sheheen, Former Aide to Governor and Senator Russell. The interview was conducted by Jack Bass in Camdon, South Carolina, on February 26, 1974. The interview was transcribed by Susan Hathaway.

JACK BASS: . . . what is happening in the south, what do you see as the trend?

~~JACK~~ ^{Fred} SHEHEEN: The moderation of the white racist viewpoint over a period of many years. The emergence of the black political power, the concentration of the State on economic growth, and the eager seeking of federal funds which will want some (inaudible) to the states. All of those things are going on in all of the states in the south, and they are in South Carolina. The development of the strong two party system, the emergence of the Republican party as a more strongly conservative party, and the more sympathy with racially backward viewpoints in my opinion. I think all of those things, with some exception, are going on throughout the south and the political structure is developing along those lines. At one time, when I got out of college, I was convinced that the Republican Party was going to be the party of racial moderation in the south, and

progressive attitudes on racial questions. As a matter of fact, in 1958, when I graduated, all the blacks were in the Republican party. It was only after . . . 1960's that the blacks migrated in the south to the Democratic party, and it became the racially moderate and progressive party, and the Republicans became the more conservative and racially retrogressive party. But I think that those kinds of things, which ^{with} ~~are~~ some rare exceptions, are going on all over the south, and I think that the influence of the black voters in the Democratic Party has had a marked . . . as it naturally would . . . has had a marked affect on ~~the captive (?)~~ the Democratic party. The Democratic could have very well, in the south, ended up being the racist party, but the pride and the participation of the black people just prevented it.

J.B.: Why did they dump the Democrats, was that because the national Democratic party?

J.S.: Well, I don't whether it was because of the national Democratic Party, or, I think it was partially because of the national Democratic Party, but i think it was also partly because the Republicans tried to grab that issue and make it the method of becoming the dominant party in the south. It just drove them away. This happened . . . I remember very specifically, I attended the Republican Convention in Rock¹hill in 1960, or late '59 . . . somewhere in there, between '58 and '60, and the blacks were still in the Republican Party and then Kershaw came to my home county, and the blacks

were still in the Republican Party, and this great migration to the Democratic Party, and the polarization of the blacks in the Democratic Party away from the Republican Party occurred shortly thereafter. I think the Kennedy's may have had a lot to do with it, but I think the Republicans fell into the trap and I considered it to be a trap, and I still do of trying to make race an issue, and then they sublimate it in more polite terms, but I don't think there is any question about the fact, particularly in South Carolina during the West campaign that race was the issue.

J.B.: How broad do you think the race issue is very much alive politically . . .

J.S.: I do. It is camouflaged in terms of being against federal aid, in terms of state's rights, in terms of anti-welfare, in terms of capital punishment, it's camouflaged but it's basically a racial proposition in many cases. A racial proposition is at the basis of many of these public stances and while nobody overtly runs around chanting segregation any more, they are getting the message across in a very low key camouflaged fashion. There is no question about the fact that there are political people largely in the Republican Party, who will play on the race issue now to gain public office. Now if the Democrats don't do what I think because they have to rely in this State on the black voters to get elected. I don't think there has been a politician in this state, elected in the Democratic

Party in many years that hasn't been elected with an important segment of his support coming from the black people.

J.B.: At any level?

J.S.: Any level. You might have some isolated incidences, but you take a fellow like Marion Gressette, some of the real . . . now Marion is a gentlemen and he is intelligent, but he certainly never got any black vote, nor cared about any black votes until they all started registering, and then he found himself running in the district or county to where the black people could make the difference, and by golly, he came around pretty quick. So did all the others. They know they have got to have black votes to get elected. Now, black votes can't elect you by themselves, but if there is a split in the white community, which most of the time there is, black votes can make the difference. Even Strom Thurmond found it necessary to make overtures to . . . in order to insure his stability in public office this last time. He can say that he has never been a racist, and he can say he always believes in equal treatment of people, but if you go back and get some of his speeches in the 1950's and lay them down by the statements he is making today, it would be absurdity . . . the comparison would be absurd.

J.B.: (inaudible)

J.S.: You can make the same comparison with most of the people who were in public life in the 1950's and who remained in public life today. You could do it. But the difference is the black vote, and that's why I

think that the Voting Rights Act of 1965, even with all of its inequities and I think there were some inequities in it was the most important piece of legislation with respect to establish that the black people in this country has been passed . . . despite all of the evidence. Public accomodations, all the other Civil Rights Acts, everything else, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was the most important piece of legislation because it gave blacks the political power and people respond to political power. I think there were some faults in it. I think there are still some faults in the legislation, but the principle objection was achieved, and that was to put political power in the hands of all the people, not just the white people in the south. I think that was the landmark piece of legislation that was for the welfare of the black people of this country. Certainly in the South, I can't speak for the northern states because participation in voting up there may have been, you know, but in the south, that, in my opinion, was the landmark.

J.B.: Getting back to the Russell administration. What do you think was the major . . .

J.S.: There were two things that I think could be considered important historically. The first one was the tone, the method, and the leadership of handling the first desegregation in of public institutions in the state. I say that because I think that a different Governor, a Wallace or a Ross Barnett, or a person of that type could have caused real problems in South Carolina. He was, he

is a very decent man, humane person, and kind, and he handled it with a great deal of dignity and with no ~~affront~~ ^{affront} to the black people involved, and he made it clear that we were going to follow the course of law and order. I think that was the first . . . I think that was one historic thing that was achieved in his administration. It just happened to come about during his term, but he handled it in a fashion that I considered to be very profitable for the State of South Carolina, and one which I was proud to be associated with. The second thing that he did that I think was of historic importance was to alter the attitude of the State on seeking federal money. I remember very clearly that the first time we sought a sizeable federal grant, when most people were against federal money, was for the Statute of Training for Economic Progress Program. It was MDTA money. We found several . . . five million dollars, I think, that was available to South Carolina, that had not been utilized primarily because the federal requirements were that the program had to be integrated. Now I remind you that this was at a time when the state had no . . . well, Clemson was integrated in 1963, which was the first public institution desegregated in South Carolina, and here we were seeking federal money for massive state wide programs in adult education and vocational education, and training. The program had to be totally desegregated, and he made the decision to go after that federal money,

to sign the compliance form, to form the inter-racial boards to govern the program, and to have the inter-racial participation in the program that was necessary to get the federal money. He did it, and that set the pattern for South Carolina's approach to federal aid, despite all the civil rights requirements that had to be met. I thought that was the second major thing in his administration. It was of historic importance because we could have and were encouraged by some people to turn our backs on that money. It was leadership training money and vocational training money. It had been sitting there . . .

J.B.: Antipathy to federal funds was really because of the requirements affecting civil rights.

J.S.: Part of it. There was a traditional antipathy to federal aid to education, partly because of that but also because of other things too. Just as sort of general states rights attitude and no control from Washington and all that, but in this particular instance, the thing that was holding up all this money was racial.

J.B.: Wasn't race even an underlying factor . . .

J.S.: Yeah, there is no question about that. But here we had to sign compliance forms to get that money. We had to create inter-racial boards and inter-racial student bodies, and inter-racial faculties when there were no public institutions in South Carolina de-segregated. I remember quite well, we announced the program and sat back to wait for the flack to come in, and we got some, but I think that set the pattern to the determination

that we were going to seek funds from the federal government under all the federal programs which . . . regardless of the conditions in order to improve the economic well being, and the educational well being of all the people to the people in the state. I think that was the second historic thing that . . . The thing of lasting importance that occurred during the Russell administration.

J.B.: Did you ever discuss with him or hear his discuss why he decided not to make a race for the Senate in 1954, to write in campaign.

J.S.: I heard . . . yes we discussed it on a couple of occasions, Jack. I remember quite clearly that he told me that he was being very strongly urged to run by Mr. Byrnes, and others; but if I recall our conversations correctly, he had very shortly before then assumed the Presidency of the University of South Carolina, and he did not feel that he could exit the Presidency of the University of South Carolina after having accepting that obligation, on such short notice. You'd have to check the years on this when he assumed the Presidency.

J.B.: It had been two or three years . . .

J.S.: Well, it had been a very short time and I think that he . . . compelling factor was a desire not to enter and leave the University in such a short time after having accepted that responsibility at the University of South Carolina. That it would not have been

appropriate, it would not have been appropriate or it would not have appeared appropriate. He didn't want to do it for that reason, and he felt like he ought to wait until a later date to run for public office. That was the only conversation that I have ever had with him . . .

J.B.: Do you know why he failed to more directly confront that issue of self-appointment after he went to the Senate?

J.S.: Well . . .

J.B.: Publically confront it?

J.S.: Well, I think that he felt like the less that was said about it, the more politically advantageous it would be for him, and really on the issue of self-appointment, the action was taken, the action was obvious, and there was no good explanation for it, other than the one that had been previously given. That was number one, the feeling that a man had had some (inaudible) at a time number one, the feeling that the man . . . a man was (inaudible) needed in Washington who had some experience in Washington; number two, many of the state's political and business leaders urged him to take the appointment, and I know that for a fact; number three, his desire to serve in Washington in the Senate. It is my personal opinion that he was much happier in the Senate than he was in the Governors office, that he was much more suited to the deliberations of the legislative body

and the questions of great moment that are discussed in the United States Senate, that many of the mundane political questions that plague our Governor, and that he preferred that sort of political life of governmental activity than he did in the Governor's office. I think he made a very fine Senator, and I think he was thoroughly qualified to be in the Senate. I think he enjoyed the Senate much more than he did the Governor's office. But there was no good or rational answer to be given on the question of self appointment other than that which had already been given at the time the appointment was made.

J.B.: That was given in a statement rather than in a question answer .

J.S.: That's right.

J.B.: Do you think he made a mistake in appearing to dodge a confrontation?

J.S.: On the self-appointment thing?

J.B.: Yeah.

J.S.: Well he had numerous press conferences after that, where it could have been brought up . . . it was brought up . . . at the time he made the statement, I thought the reasons were spelled out as clearly as they could be. There wasn't a whole lot to add to it. At the time we discussed the appointment, I predicted that it would be very unpopular for a Governor to resign and take a Senate seat, and so advised him, and . . . but he felt like, and we felt like as the weeks and the months moved on, that the problems of self appointment

were evading most of the politically powerful people in the state, the politically influential people in the state were supporting Russell in his bid for election to the Senate when that next general election came around. I guess we were mistaking the sentiment expressed by many politically influential people for a popular Senator, but the issue of self-appointment in my mind was the compelling issue in his defeat, plus lesser issue of his support for the Johnsons and his very active support and his Russell support for the Johnsons in 1964. Johnson, at that time, was very unpopular in the ~~Senate~~ ^{state}.

J.B.: Am I correct that he took . . . did no polling during that campaign?

J.S.: Absolutely.

J.B.: Why?

J.S.: Well he never did believe much on polls. Number one, he did not think much about . . . he didn't have much faith or confidence in polls, and number two he didn't feel like there was a useful benefit that he could derive from the (inaudible) expenditure, simply by finding where he was and where he wasn't. In retrospect, it might have been useful to determine the major issue in the minds of the people, and then approach the issue. At the time he did not feel . . . he was ^[not] a fan of polls.

J.B.: Many people refer to him as being very able as a political office holder, not very able as a politician.

J.S.: I agree with that 100 percent. I suspect that I had as close and friendly of a relationship as any person outside of his family did during those years, and still do have a very close relationship with him, and I admire his intellect tremendously, I still do, I think that he had more personal integrity than any other public office holder I have ever known, in terms of his personal honesty, and his unwillingness to spend the tax payers money on items of frivolous things or on non-essential items. He had and does have a great deal of humility. He had more intelligence than any other public office holder I have ever known in South Carolina.

J.B.: Is he inherently a shy man?

J.S.: He is a very shy person. He is inherently a very shy person. He is a very private person. He does not enjoy, in my opinion, the normal political activities of idle chatter and shooting the breeze and light and easy compliments and comments and he doesn't have lots of patience with petty political details, or with political appointments. That is one great problem that we had. He didn't like to fool around with a lot of minor appointments and get into lots of arguments about it, and he is more of an intellectual figure than a political figure in my opinion. I think he suffered a whole lot from ~~Adley~~ ^{Adley} Stevenson syndrome.

J.B.: How do you define the ^{Adlai}~~Adley~~ Stevenson syndrome?

J.S.: A very intelligent, but unable to relate that intelligence and that competence and that ability in a political way to masses of people. I don't think . . . I'm convinced in my own mind, and I have known a lot of Governors and lots of Senators, I don't think we have ever had a Senator, in my life time, who had the potential for greatness in the United States Senate that Don Russell had. Now I think that the Governorship was a different story. He did not like all of the political activities that would daily, particularly magistrates and appointments, and Sherriff's appointments and the (inaudible) Board and the . . . all that stuff. He didn't like all that stuff. But in the Senate, where he was dealing with great issues all the time, he was superb. I do not believe that we have ever had in my life time a Senator with the potential for the greatness that he had in the Senate, and I think he would have been a very influential Senator. He was rapidly becoming one when he was defeated. He had the friendship and the leadership of Senate, they called him in on many important questions particularly with him just being a freshman senator. I think he was very happy in his judicial . . . I think he was very happy as the President of the University of South Carolina; those

are all non-political type activities.

J.B.: Do you think he is happier in the Appeals Court than he was as a trial judge?

J.S.: Well, I really haven't had . . . I have seen, and had lunch with him, and we discussed it, but I haven't really discussed his judicial responsibilities as much as . . . over extended periods of time. I was with him daily when he was in the Governor's office and the Senate, and I knew his mind very well. In the Senate if you will recall, his wife was not in Washington, she remained in South Carolina, and I was with him in Washington and we had dinner together most every evening, and I knew his mind very well during his years in the Governorship and Senate tenure. I don't maintain that close of contact with his judicial role, I think he is very pleased to be on the Court of Appeals, and I think his . . . that type of activity would probably be better, I think he enjoyed his District judgeship, and I . . . my friends who are attorneys around the state thought he was one of the finest district judges in the state. They all liked him and liked to take a case before him. They said he was very able. I think the Appeals Court would be suited to him. It's a cerebral sort of process, you know, and I think he would have made a great Supreme Court Justice, but by that time he was too old for appointment.

J.B.: Not in view of ^WLouis Powell though . . . not in view of ^{EW}Louis Powell's subsequent appointment.

J.S.: I think in the absence of age in Russell's case, he might have been appointed to the Supreme Court.

J.B.: Did the problems of his relationship with Fritz Hollings, was that basically a situation of getting two strong personalities clashing.

J.S.: The problems with the relationship with Fritz Hollings, in my opinion, had their roots in his defeat by Fritz Hollings in 1958. When two strong people clash in a political contest (inaudible) and I don't think that those wounds have ever healed. There is no question that there was an unfriendly relationship there, and whether it persists to this day or not, I don't know, but I do know that it persisted from the eaves. I feel it had its roots in the defeat of 1958.

J.B.: I'm trying to get some insight into the role of Byrnes as Governor.

J.S.: Role of Byrnes as Governor?

J.B.: Right, based on your insight or anything you may have heard. I don't know if you ever discussed that with Russell.

J.S.: I didn't discuss Byrnes's Governorship with Russell much at all. I knew Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Byrnes was alive when we were in the Governor's office. He did not visit with us, nor have much influ . . . I wouldn't say influence, but he didn't visit with us or have much activity with us while we were in the Governor's office. We parted company, of course, on the basis of . . . the Russell's and the Byrnes parted company on the

basis of the 1964 election of Johnson. It was a pronounced discreet, and I discussed Mr. Byrnes service in the federal government with him many times, but I never did discuss his service in the Governor's office much with Russell. It never did come up much for some reason.

J.B.: There are two general interpretations we hear of Byrnes's role as Governor; one, that he ^has helped prepare the state for coming social change because of his support of the sales tax resulted in great expenditures of funds toward upgrading black schools in South Carolina consequently in the long run, very much helped prepare the state; the other view which is a little less prevalent and more critical is that Byrnes was in a unique position in 1954 as Governor of South Carolina, a deep south state, a man that had been on the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as being in Washington in the highest levels of government in both national and international affairs and therefore an individual who certainly should have had a position to have a much broader perspective than any other southern governor. With that background, was cast into a position where he could have exercised the role of leadership after the 19⁵4 school desegregation decision to pave the way for acceptance of a decision that was the law of the land in working out a means of implementation, would have been far more disruptive than what it was. The question in my mind, do you consider that valid and also fair twenty years later?

J.S.: Well, let me say this now, with respect to Jimmy Byrnes's governorship, I was a student in high school when he assumed Governorship, and I didn't . . . of course I graduated from college in 1958, after he had removed himself from the political scene in the state and there was an intervening gubernatorial term in there. So I know Mr. Byrnes by reputation, I knew Mr. Byrnes by reputation, and my knowledge of history in South Carolina, and I knew him personally after I joined the staff for Donald Russell. We went places together from time to time as he accompanied the Governor. I knew of his participation in the Senate . . . the write in Senate contest in 1952 in which Senator Strom Thurmond was elected, and I knew of his political activities in the 1960's on behalf of the Republican Party, and something of his political attitudes because I was in the Governors office and I knew something of his personal relationship with Donald Russell during those years. Based on all of those things, the knowledge of history and of specific events and of the man, and of his activities during my years in political life when he was still active, I was not and am not an admirer of Jimmy Byrnes. I think he had a great federal career, but based on what I know both from history and from conversations, I think he came back to South Carolina an embittered person because of his disappointments in Washington both in the Vice-Presidential selection in the 1940's, and in his . . . in relationship which resulted in his dismissal by Harry Truman as Secretary of State.

I think he came back to South Carolina an imbittered man. I think that he did all of the damage that he possibly could to the Democratic party after he left the Governor's office. I think he fell into the pattern of segregation and the championship of segregation while he was in the Governor's office even though he did put in sales tax to upgrade the schools, and I'll give him credit for that. But that was all (inaudible) if you will recall and justify it as a means of maintaining segregated school and not as a means of upgrading education.

J.B.: I think he said it because he said it was right, and if that is not sufficient cause then we should do it because it is wise.

J.S.: Yes, but he never did . . . he fought the Supreme Court decision in 1954, and I don't consider that he gave a progressive leadership to South Carolina. Now that is based on my reading of history, and not knowledge, and I know during the period that I knew him, or knew of him, and watched his activities when he was in the Governor's office, that he did all the damage that he possibly could to the Democratic Party, and whether that was based on his (inaudible) colleagues of the Democratic Party was champion or not, I don't know, but I took it to be that he was working also ~~xxxxx~~ against the great milestones the Democratic Party was making at that time nationally in the field of civil rights (inaudible) and everything else. So I am not an admirer of Jimmy Byrnes.

J.B.: Getting back to this historical judgmental question, do you think he was politically astute and perceptive enough to realize that once the Supreme Court acted, that that was going to be the law of the land?

J.S.: Well, I don't know. You see I didn't know him well enough to comment on that, but I think that history would tell us that he didn't give us the leadership. I mean a simple reading of history, and the condition that he left the state in legally and otherwise, in 1950's will tell us that we didn't get the leadership.

J.B.: If he had attempted to provide the leadership, that you are speaking of, which is leadership to meet the problem in a positive . . .

J.S.: Right and progressive fashion.

J.B.: Do you think it would have made any difference?

J.S.: Yes.

J.B.: To the entire south?

J.S.: Yes, I do, and I believe greatly that in critical times the position of the leaderships sets the tone, and I substantiate that by the difficulties that Alabama and Mississippi have had in the 1950's and the 1960's in the field of racial segregation and desegregation, and in the relative calm which prevailed in other southern states. I consider that to be the Governor has set the tone, the leadership. I draw a parallel against the tone and leadership set by Kennedy, and the tone and the

leadership set by Nixon in the field of racial matters. I think it does have a great deal to do with influencing public opinion, setting the course of history and influencing your treatments. And I think a very positive liked progressive vigorous attitude in favor of human equality and dignity by Jimmy Byrnes in the 1950's would have had a profound effect on South Carolina and the whole south. It would have made it respectable. That's what we needed.

J.B.: Would you also agree that he would have been the oneman in the entire south, because of his position of Governor and his prestige of general public life, who could have pulled it off?

J.S.: I think he would have come closer to pulling it off, but I also think that he was one man who had very little to lose. He was in the twilight of his career, and all he had to do was leave a legacy really, and he chose not to leave it.

J.B.: You were saying . . .

J.S.: Byrnes's activities and programs with the effect of the care and treatment of the mentally ill in South Carolina because it is my understanding that he did open up that field in South Carolina for the first time even though it didn't reach full (inaudible) until later on, but that he really went into the wards which were in desperate condition, and started public focus on the plight of the mentally ill in the central hospital. You can check it out but I have heard that, which would be

a noble thing on his part with no, in my opinion, political motivation or involvement, it was simply a humane and noble thing for him to do.

J.B.: How do you assess the role of organized labor in South Carolina as a political force, and where is it heading?

J.S.: Very small, growing, increasingly legitimate and honorable, and sought after increasingly in a public fashion by most politicians because although the number of organized labor in the state is small, in some cases it makes the difference . . . in some districts it makes the difference, in some precincts, in some collection districts, it makes the difference, and number two, unorganized labor often followed the lead of organized labor in their vote . . . that's not always, but they often do, and I think that a few politicians want to risk a negative posture from organized labor. As a matter of fact, most of the political figures that I have any contact with or have any dealings with now, number one, know who the organized labor people are, number two, have made some kind of approach to them, and number three in increasing numbers, it is an open approach to them, and that is the difference from ten years ago.

J.B.: Where do you see the Republican Party ahead.

J.S.: I think the Republican Party of South Carolina will remain a very strong minority party for many years. It will remain a minority party because of the crucial issue it elected to appeal to the

narrow segment of people, that is white conservative, rather than a broader segment of people, and I think they sealed their doom until they change their stamps. In our (inaudible) staff by looking throughout the south, at Republican Governors who have been elected, and almost without exception, they have been moderate or liberal Republicans, and not right wing conservative Republicans. In South Carolina, all we have is right wing conservative Republicans.

J.B.: Wouldn't Mills Godwin be an exception to that at least from the image of the campaign.

J.S.: Now this is Mills Godwin a more (inaudible) he was a Democrat when he ran before. I don't know what happened up there, but I do know that Holshouser in North Carolina, Rockefeller in Arkansas, really most of them that I have known who have made breakthroughs have done it by capturing a portion of the black vote.

J.B.: Linwood Holton.

J.S.: Linwood Holton . . . have done it by capturing the black vote, and in South Carolina, we don't have many Republicans who are willing to go along that line, at least at this stage of the game. Until they have drawn their field on that question, I don't think they are going to be a majority party. I don't think they are going to catch a lot of seats in the legislature, nor the Governor's office, probably the strongest race they would have, and the best advantage that they have had was with a very strong incumbent Congressman in 1970, and they didn't capture the Governor's office then, although they came very close. I think they will

be very strong, very vocal, but a minority party for a long time. Unless they change their attitude on this key question, of human dignity, . . . (break in conversation)

J.B.: What do you think the quality of this legislature has been.

J.S.: Well I think the destruction of . . . and I was for reapportionment, and am for reapportionment and believe in the one man, one vote principal, but I believe that the destruction of the County representation system, is one reason for it . . . that people who had a strong base in a given county . . . the outstanding people who had a strong base in a given county, who could win an election relatively easy, are not willing to run in districts where they are not known in other counties, that would have to do a lot of campaigning, spend a lot of money, you know, and that kind of thing.

J.B.: What do you think is going to be the effect of single member districts if they come?

J.S.: I think it's going to produce the blandest legislation we have ever had. I think that it is going to isolate a small number of black legislators with very little influence, I think that it is going to produce a large number of conservative legislators from white districts who are not responsive to the black voters. I think it is going to have a detrimental effect on the quality of legislation in this state. It will elect more blacks, it will elect more Republicans, but it will also elect more conservative white Democrats, who will not

feel a responsibility to be responsive to a black constituency because they are going to have virtually no black constituency.

J.B.: Do you think they will be running as Democrats or Republicans?

J.S.: I don't know. Either way it is not going to be any good as far as I am concerned. I'd rather have the whole shooting match (inaudible) state wide. I think you need a mixed constituency in order to moderate the extreme viewpoints, and I think that if a person is elected from an extremely conservative district, if he is not going to be responsive to that group of people in that district who need government (inaudible) the underprivileged, the people who rely on government for sustenance, and we've got to help them. I am not a fan of single member districts. . . . (break in tape) College, I was very pessimistic about South Carolinas march to enlightenment because we were really in a pretty dark circumstance . . .

J.B.: '58.

J.S.: '58, we had not a single public institution desegregated, we had the Gressette committee standing ^[in] (inaudible) the path of progress in the field of race relations. We had the majority in the legislature with a very local and segregationist view point. The ^[sitings] (inaudible) came to Rock Hill in South Carolina where I was living at the time . . . for the first time in our State . . . came to Rock Hill in 1960 and we had a terrible upheaval up there, that I worked and lived through and reported on

for the Charlotte Observer, and I suffered a great deal of unhappiness in Rock Hill because of my relationship with the black community and my communication with the black community and my reporting on those activities of the black community with respect to sit ins. I remember being just very unhappy and very discouraged about the whole thing, and now as I look back on it, it's amazing to me transformation has occurred in these fourteen years has been so thorough and so complete, and I think it does show the circumstances can change in a very short time because fourteen years is not a long time, and here everywhere I go, blacks are sitting on boards and commissions, and every civic meeting that I go to, we always have blacks represented, and really the last bastion of segregation in the State, in my view, has been in two areas; number one is in the private clubs, and when I was a member of the commission of human affairs, I tried to do what I could to break that down, but in the final analysis if people want to isolate themselves in private clubs, there is not much the government can do about it; and number two in private schools, I think the government has done what it could to break that down by virtue of the IRS ruling, that has been largely ineffective in breaking private schools. So, we are finally going to have to live with those things, but every other facet of life that I am associated with in my daily being in Camden and in South Carolina is integrated. In Camden, we go to you know, integrated parties in private homes.

We go into the bank and have black tellers, and we have the Heart Association, and have black board members. . . not the Heart Association, but the (inaudible) Association, We go to the Red Cross and have black board members, and so really the transformation in the life of South Carolina in race relations in the fourteen years have been very (inaudible), and it shows you how quick things can change on a very very important question because in 1960 when those blacks marched into those lunch counters and sat down and boy the whole town blew up, I would have never dreamed that fourteen years later it would be just as routine as anything in the world.

J.B.: So you think the Voting Rights Act was the key?

J.S.: I think the Voting Rights Act was the key to the events (inaudible) to black people themselves.

J.B.: How important do you think the question of whether or not the Voting Rights Act is extended in 1975?

J.S.: I would like to see it extended, but I would like very much to see it extended on a nation wide basis and not have it applied to given states. I think that is wrong. I thought it was wrong at the time. That did not have any . . . that didn't diminish the positive effects on it in the States that were included and South Carolina was amongst them. So, it did the job, but if it is extended and if it is going to be extended, I think it ought to be extended on a nation wide basis, and all sorts of discrimination every where in voting registration and casting the ballots ought to be eliminated.

J.B.: Including the elimination of literacy as a requirement to vote?

J.S.: No, I don't think we ought to have a blanket elimination of literacies requirement to vote.

J.B.: That is included in the voting rights act, that is why I am asking.

J.S.: They eliminated that . . . suspended the literacy test during that period of time because . . . largely because the amount of administration of the literacy test and the fact that the literacy test was being used to prevent people from registering. I think some kind of standard literacy test or (inaudible) would be proper, but I think the mall administration of it cause the suspension of it.