

Interview with Dale Enoch, Director of the Arkansas Institute of Politics,  
Conway, Arkansas, June 10, 1974, conducted by Jack Bass and Walter De  
Vries, transcribed by Linda Killen.

Jack Bass: What is the status of the Democratic party in Arkansas?

Enoch: It's dying as fast as the Republican party. The thing is,  
the only time we've ever come anywhere close to having a Democratic  
party in this state was during the late '60s with Rockefeller. Because  
they finally started getting nervous. The old chairman, under Orval  
Faubus, was Leon Callid [?] who was an old attorney in Little Rock,  
wheeler-dealer type guy. You can just look at him and he just kind of  
looked old guard. Chairman for years and years and years. When he  
finally gave it up. . . . They finally started getting concerned in  
the late '60s. And a young attorney in Little Rock, Charlie Matthews,  
was appointed to really try to build a party for the first time. Try to  
make it into something. He stayed in for a couple of years and they  
were making some progress. Then Joe Percell came in in '70. Joe Percell  
had been attorney general for four years. Honest Joe. Who this year ran  
for lieutenant governor and was elected easily. He's the one that Doug  
Smith, of the Arkansas Gazette, in a story on the lieutenant governor's  
race earlier this year said: "Joe Percell's the only man anybody knows  
who people have gone to sleep shaking hands with him." He was honest,  
credible, not overly bright, but just a nice guy. Was chairman for a  
couple of years.

J.B.: Was this state Democratic headquarters?

Enoch: Of sorts.

J.B.: In Little Rock?

Enoch: Yeah. They had a big fight earlier this year over the

executive director of the Democratic party. The guy who finally won was named Craig Campbell who's about 24, 25 years old. It was a heck of a big fight. Craig had the backing of John McClellan and the tacit support of Bumpers. The theory at the time was that Bumpers was trying to win favor with McClellan and therefore didn't oppose Craig Campbell. The opposition to Campbell was based primarily on the fact that he voted for Richard Nixon in 1972. And the opposition, ironically, was led by Sheriff Marlin Hawkins of Conway county who was old guard Democrat and who has suddenly become vocal state wide in the past year, building himself as a reformed old pro. But that is about the only county in the state that one man can deliver however he wants to deliver it. I'm running an item in the newsletter this time. Marlin had a . . . . Give you an idea of Conway county, and its about the only machine county left in this state. Faubus, four years ago, got 76.6% of the votes in the governor's race. This year he got 23. In Conway county this year he got 23%. But Marlin had supported both Faubus and Pryor. This time he opted for Pryor and refused to support Faubus for the first time in his career and just wiped him out in Conway county. But he had an ad in the Pettijean Country Headlight which started at the bottom of that page which is absolutely hilarious because he tells why he's supporting Pryor over Faubus. It was in the form of a letter, an open letter, on his stationery: Sheriff Marlin Hawkins, listing all his deputies and collectors and everything and winding up by saying "Give me a vote of confidence for supporting Pryor." And they did. Wiped Faubus out, and he'd been carrying that county for years by huge margins. But Hawkins led the fight against Craig Campbell. Craig finally won it by about two votes. He took over the job and it was one of these situations where your first job is to, okay, go raise your own salary. You can make as

much money as you can raise, virtually. They don't have any money. They don't have anything.

Walter De Vries: But this is the only county organization?

Enoch: It's the only one really that can still deliver.

W.D.V.: But are there county organizations as such? Democratic organizations?

Enoch: Democratic organizations? Yeah, technically.

J.B.: Paper organizations.

Enoch: Yeah.

W.D.V.: None of them staffed?

Enoch: Oh no. One, in Pulaski county which is Little Rock. They have a. . . . They're probably, may be in better shape than the state office. Howard Beamer is the executive director of the Democratic party in Pulaski county. That's the only other one. The thing is, the Democratic party in this state has no money, has no real organization, has no policy, has nothing. You win the Democratic nomination in this state and all you've got is a label. Nobody turns to the Democratic party for anything. You know, you get a nomination and you go to the Democratic party and ask for mailing list, for list of party workers or anything and about all you'll get is a list of the county committees. Nobody turns to it for anything.

J.B.: Does the state finance the primaries?

Enoch: Party.

J.B.: The party does?

Enoch: The local committees in each county.

J.B.: So the party actually runs the Democratic primary. Through filing fees?

Enoch: Filing fees.

J.B.: How much are the filing fees?

Enoch: God awful.

W.D.V.: Dale did a special piece on that.

Enoch: Yeah, I've got a newsletter on that, which you can get a copy of.

W.D.V.: Does all the money stay at the local level from the fees? None of it [goes] to the state level?

Enoch: The Congressional and state officials pay a state filing fee and that goes to the state committee.

W.D.V.: So they do have some revenue.

Enoch: Yeah, but that's about the sum of it. To give you an idea. The thing is, early this year Craig Campbell won that job. I think it was December, either December or January. And within a month I think their bank account was \$29. And the only way they managed to even stay open, Campbell went back to his home county, Phillips county, and raised \$5,000 or something. So they managed to keep going for a little while. They've just been hand to mouth all along. Until they started getting some filing fees.

J.B.: Do they have party memberships?

Enoch: No.

J.B.: Looking back, Dale, to 1948, what are the major events and, you know, developments, political developments in Arkansas?

Enoch: Of course '48 was when McMath came in. In contrast to the image of Arkansas, which is based almost totally on 1957, Little Rock crisis, Arkansas has probably one of the best records of electing generally moderates over the past 25 years of any state in the South. The Congressional delegation has been generally moderate. Syd McMath came in as a reformer. Was in for two terms; tried to stay in for a third



term because he wanted to run against McClellan. But he came in as a reformer. Really didn't deliver. Was defeated for a third term by Francis Cherry, who was the moderate in the race. Cherry had good intentions--

J.B.: He was a moderate, you say, compared with McMath. How was McMath perceived at that point at the end of his second term?

Enoch: He was a World War II G.I. reformer who was elected prosecuting attorney in Garland county, which is Hot Springs. On a clean up Hot Springs ticket. And has generally been labeled. . . ran as a reformer and generally was considered to be a reformer. Apparently his problem was that he just couldn't deliver that much and he wound up with scandals in the highway administration. But going to. . . . McMath generally was considered moderate. Certainly on the race issue has generally been moderate. Reformer, good government type candidate. Cherry was generally moderate. Orval Faubus was the moderate in the race in 1954 and his image really didn't change until 1957. You'll run into a lot of debates and a lot of disagreement. The accepted wisdom is that 1957 was purely political. He was determined to win a third term and to do whatever was necessary to do it to win it. There is disagreement on that point. Incidentally--

W.D.V.: What is the disagreement?

Enoch: The thing is, Faubus said that he had information that, one, there was going to be major trouble. He bases it on a telephone call that he says he received.

W.D.V.: Never substantiated?

Enoch: It was never substantiated. Of course his argument is that it didn't occur because he took preventive steps. I don't know. You know, how that will ever be resolved I don't know. It's a matter of perception of Orval Faubus. And I say, the accepted wisdom, at least

among liberals, anti-Faubus people, is that it was purely political and nothing else.

J.B.: How about Pierce's version? You know, of Rockefeller going in to see him, trying to talk him out of it, and Faubus saying--

Enoch: I never heard that before I read it in Pierce's book. I presume it's true. I'd never heard Faubus make any mention of it or any reference to it anywhere. I assume he had that from WR. I think we have a copy of a paper in here which is done by a political scientist at the University <sup>at</sup> of Fayetteville on Faubus and that '57 decision. Which I think takes the other point of view. Which might be helpful to you. I'll double check who wrote that. I got a copy of it about a year ago. It's in the back of my mind that the guy who wrote that was a black political scientist at the University. But I'll pull that out. But at any rate, Orval came in as the moderate in that race. Certainly since then, we've had four years of Rockefeller, four years Bumpers and now Pryor, who clearly was a moderate in this race. The Congressional delegation. Of course McClellan has had. . . you know, you know what his image is. But Fulbright, Mills--who has not been a liberal but he has not been a southern conservative in the strict use of that word either. The only one that was really. . . . The most conservative members of the Arkansas Congressional delegation were McClellan and E.C. *Gaithings* who was the Congressman from northeast Arkansas for 30 years before he retired in '68. And he was replaced by Alexander, who is certainly more moderate than ~~Gavicks~~ <sup>*Gaithings*</sup> ~~[?]~~ was. Trimble, over in northwest Arkansas, was more than moderate, actually. Moderate to liberal. ~~O~~ren Harris in south Arkansas was pretty generally moderate. The one change that took place in the Congresssional delegation was when Brooks Hayes got beat following the '57 crisis, by Dale ~~Alen~~ford [Rauford?] who was the right

wing segregationist.

J.B.: Is that perceived here generally as a direct result of Faubus' intervention?

Enoch: Well, Hayes tried to play the peacekeeper role and it was pretty direct because <sup>A1ford</sup>~~Rauford~~ ran as a write in and beat Hayes. Then he got. . . what, <sup>A1ford</sup>~~Rauford~~ ~~Auford?~~ served two terms, I think. '58-62. And in '62 he was redistricted out. Tried to run for governor and finished poorly against Faubus. Personally, I think Orval Faubus is going to come out better in history than a lot of people think he is. Because with the exception of 1957 he generally managed to stay in for 12 years without any major scandals in his administration, with the exception of the standing charge that he was profiteering from the job-- which apparently is quite true.

J.B.: How about the allegation of the effect of his Little Rock stand hurt the state economically and cut down on industrial development? Pierce's book is sort of ambivalent on that point. Have you seen any hard <sup>[data]</sup> on that?

Enoch: I haven't seen any studies. And I'm not. . . I'm not real sure who would be able to. . . .

W.D.V.: Well Pierce suggests that because Winthrop Rockefeller was heading the industrial development commission at that time or following that time, that that took the edge off it.

J.B.: Well, no, that up to that point things were progressing and then, didn't Rockefeller step aside at that point?

W.D.V.: No, no. He didn't step aside until '64.

Enoch: '62 or '63, wasn't it? I think it was after. . . when he decided to run but it was a year or two before he actually. . . . Seems like it was '63, '64.

W.D.V.: Why do you think he'll do so well, historically?

Enoch: Faubus?

W.D.V.: Yeah.

Enoch: Because with the exception of 1957 it generally was a progressive period. The thing is that Faubus did pass fairly significant tax increase programs. It was a building period. An awful lot of emphasis went into buildings, highways, state institutions. But there was a real need for it at that point. Generally, it was a fairly progressive period, with the exception of '57. And the general perception is that the state's image was hurt and industrial development was hurt. I've never seen anything to prove it. But it was generally perceived that that was true. I don't know how you. . . . In terms of looking at the development of the state, I. . . we'd been losing population consistently before '57 and we continued to lose it after '57. That reversed sometime in the '60s. I don't know how you could prove it with that data. But it's generally been perceived that it hurt the state. Within the state, there was a good bit of progress during that period.

W.D.V.: More so than any of the other governors? In that 25 years?

Enoch: Of course we haven't had many governors during that period.

W.D.V.: Yeah, it's hard to compare it because you have one guy for twelve and then most of them average four.

Enoch: McMath generally didn't deliver. Cherry was only in for two years. He was generally considered to be administratively ineffective. Nice guy with a good heart but somebody who just wasn't very effective. Faubus was an extremely effective administrator. His general perception has been that he is probably one of the smartest politicians

to come through this state in decades. Extremely effective with the legislature. If he really wanted something he was the type guy who would get it through. Knew how to use political power. Was not afraid to use it. And reached a point where the legislature was generally considered to be a rubber stamp legislature.

J.B.: Why did he retire when he did?

Enoch: I don't know. To some extent. . . . Faubus will deny this. I'm sure Faubus will give standard replies. You know, that he'd been in long enough, he was ready for a rest, and that sort of thing. He would have had one heck of a hard time in the race. Rockefeller had been gearing up and got 43% against Faubus the first time, which was only the second lowest percentage Faubus received since he went into office. And ironically, that was 1964, which was his last race. That was the only time during that whole period that he got a smaller percentage in the general election than he did in the Democratic primary. Actually got something like 61% in the Democratic primary and fell to 57% against Rockefeller. Rockefeller learned from his mistakes in '64 and spent the whole two years running and gearing up for a '66 race against Orval Faubus. Then Orval quit. You know, the extent to which he was afraid that he might lose, I don't know.

J.B.: In those days the Democratic organization was really a paper organization. It ran a primary, right?

Enoch: The only thing that they really do, is they provide a label and they run the primary.

J.B.: And that label in Arkansas still is very important, right?

Enoch: Extremely. Extremely important.

J.B.: Was Rockefeller's election a fluke?

Enoch: I personally have strong doubts that he could have won

against most other people except Jim Johnston. Because what put him in were Democrats for Rockefeller. To some. . . I guess to a good extent, the Democrats for Rockefeller were people who were very disenchanted with Orval Faubus. But there also were just an awful lot of Democrats that just simply couldn't take Jim Johnston. Jim Johnston was an arch segregationist who still, even in 1966, refused to shake hands with a black man.

J.B.: So that automatically got Rockefeller the black vote, which he has a positive appeal for anyway.

Enoch: But the thing is, apparently it took more than just that. Because in 1964 one of his biggest disappointments had been the fact that he thought just because he was Rockefeller and because the family had been contributing to Urban League for years and years and years and because of his associations, the black vote would come trotting out to him. But it just didn't happen. Faubus still got a significant black vote in '64.

J.B.: I presume by '66 the black registration had increased substantially.

Enoch: 1964 was when the constitutional amendment was approved in Arkansas setting up a permanent registration system doing away with the poll tax. In the next two years Rockefeller and the Republicans did a massive voter registration job among blacks in Arkansas. I can show you. . . I've got the data on voter registration increase during that period. It was just phenomenal. I doubt that we've ever really seen a sophisticated campaign like Rockefeller ran. Before or since in this state.

J.B.: How was he as governor?

Enoch: I think the Rockefeller administration was good for the

state. Rockefeller himself was so-so. You know, how do you break it down? He deserves credit for bringing some good people into state administration and supporting them. But as an administrator he was a poor administrator. There's just no way around it. He had a very low understanding of politics. The art of compromise was foreign to him. He just couldn't comprehend it. It was undemocratic, anti-American and everything else. If you propose something good then people ought to flock to it just because it's good. That was his whole approach to the legislature. When they didn't work that way, he moved into an attack position and spent the last two years of his time criticizing the legislature. Buying, going on state wide television, paying for the time, to criticize the legislature constantly. In spite of that, the legislature did get. . . more of his program went through than a lot of people realize. He couldn't stand to stay in the office. I actually at one point did a story, following him for a whole week and I think he spent a total of about ten hours in the office the whole week. Supposedly he was constantly working at the farm or elsewhere. Nobody knows for sure what he was doing. He'd have appointments and just not even show up. Rockefeller just simply was not an administrator. But his administration, generally, I think was, you know, extremely healthy. He brought in good people. Securities, insurance commissioner positions and state departments. Supplemented their salary. Backed them up. Because of that there was a lot of progress during that period. Mixed in to which he was responsible for bringing them in he's responsible for the progress that was made. But as far as he personally, you know, I just don't think he was that good an administrator. So, in 1970, when he lost to Bumpers, I think it was really a combination of things. Number one was simply the fact that the Democrats nominated somebody that was acceptable to Democrats. That was probably sufficient in and of itself.

Second was that Rockefeller said he only wanted two terms. Said he would only seek two terms and then step down. So he wound up with a credibility problem of his own. Third was the general perception that he really was not that good an administrator, that he was not that effective in getting things done. And fourth were personal habits which had been rumored for a good while by 1970. Where most people had seen or heard of some incidents which documented for them that yes he does have a drinking problem, it's not just a rumor the Democrats are spreading. Because there were stories all over the state of Arkansas about his drinking problem. Going to make a speech somewhere and having to be helped off the platform. This sort of thing.

J.B.: Had he developed a fairly acute case of alcoholism by that time?

Enoch: Yeah. . . they. . . you know, this. . . his work habits contributed to it. Because the fact that he stayed out of the office so much. . . . It constantly led to speculation and a good bit of the time when he showed up in public he was, had been drinking. Now the thing is. . . . I never accepted the idea that he was. . . . People would watch him in a speech or press conference or any kind of public situation and they'd come out of there just convinced the man was drunk. I don't think that was always true, because it was usually based on two things. One, that he was sweating profusely. I think that was just. . . that was Rockefeller. And the other, that he was nervous as could be. That again was just Rockefeller. You put him in a public speaking or press conference situation and he would sweat profusely and his hands would shake if he'd been on the wagon for a week. He was just an extremely nervous person. Never did adapt to public requirements. Public speaking type situation. Was very nervous. But. . . . I'll tell you



about a personal situation. The man had a fantastic capacity. I went on a trip with him once, out of state. I'd asked. . . because he kept making such a big thing out of the fact that he was. . . his great contribution was his name and his reputation and the doors it had opened. And so he spent a lot of time on the road, supposedly promoting Arkansas and industrial growth and that sort of thing. So because he'd made a big point of it, I asked to go along with him. I went along on a trip to Ohio. Columbus and Cleveland. The man had. . . . We were supposed to leave about 5 o'clock in the afternoon. We finally got away about an hour, an hour and fifteen minutes or so late. There were more problems at the prison that day. He drank all the way to Columbus on the plane. Apparently had been drinking a goodly bit during the day. Totally emasculated a beautiful speech. It was a formal lecture series which had had some rather big names before. I think McGeorge Bundy had been there earlier in the year. Maybe McNamara. I can't remember. But fairly prestigious lecture series that. . . what is it, Ohio U at Columbus? But he had a beautiful speech that had been written by Charlie Albright, one of his speech writers. There was not. . . I was trying to follow him and I don't think there was one complete sentence delivered as written. He'd just kind of follow and then he'd pump in a phrase out of the text and then he'd wander off again and then you'd find him another paragraph further down pulling out another phrase. That was the one where he delivered the famous remark about the freedoms that many of us in this room have lived and died for--which cracked everybody up during the course of it. We left there, flew to. . . . We spent the night there. He got up the next morning, we flew to Cleveland. He had a bloody Mary on the plane. A round of engagements. Tv, radio, spoke to the Rotary Club that day. The Rotary Club. . . . To give you an idea of

Rockefeller. You know, here's the Rotary Club. You're hitting the top. It's generally the upper crust of the business establishment in any community. Big huge room and all the gathering. At one point during that thing he was talking about Arkansas and how proud he was and everything. He always wore these big boots. Pulled his foot up. Stuck it up right next to the speaker's lectern to show them his boots, the fact that he wore them even in Cleveland. Real. . . real. . . style. He was back in the room drinking periodically all during the day. I don't know how much that man put away during the course of that day. He had a reception that night for industrialists. Drinking all during that. Finally, towards the end of that thing. . . everybody had left except one industrialist. I think Rockefeller sat down for the first time to relax. And boy, when he sat down apparently it hit him. But he had gone all the way up through that day without any noticeable effects and the fact that he'd been drinking steadily. I. . . I have no idea how many he put away.

J.B.: What did he drink? Vodka?

Enoch: Mostly.

J.B.: Well what was his effect with the industrialist?

Enoch: That's where it got embarrassing. He sat down next to the industrialist and began. . . . First he was, started patting him on the leg. Then. . . that went on longer than was necessary for him to make his point. Then he began talking about hands and began comparing hands and holding the guy's hand and holding next to him. Comparing sizes. It really got embarrassing after a while. And they started trying to get him out. At that point he was just stoned. He went back upstairs. They mixed him another drink. He promptly dropped it. Went downstairs. He went over to the cabby and put his arm around him and explained to him

he wanted a cab. We got in the car, went out to the airport. His body-guard was in the front seat. I was in the middle of the back seat. Rockefeller on one side and Bill Conley, his press man, on the other. We got out there and all the way out to the airport he kept on wanting to shake hands with me and explained that he was so pleased that I'd come along, that he could see what it was really like, being the governor of Arkansas and all the responsibilities he had. We must have shaken hands ten times between there and the airport. Got out there and drove right out by the plane. The body guard got out. Conley, the press man, got out. Paid the cabby. I was trying to get out, but he kept wanting to shake hands. And finally the cabby turned around and said "Hey, buddy, they're going to go off and leave you." Which is the wrong thing to say, cause Rockefeller looked at him and said "Buddy, I own that goddamn plane." [Laughter.] Finally he quit, he let go and I jumped out. They helped him out. He took aim for the plane and promptly walked into the jet. And they. . . it really got embarrassing. I went on and got on the plane and they finally steered him in and made him another drink. He promptly dropped it in the aisle and zonked out.

J.B.: How about on the other industrialists, during the day, was he  
? Obviously, the last one was disaster, but during the day. . . .

Enoch: Well, fortunately, that guy already had a couple of plants in Arkansas. [Laughter.] I don't know. You know, he was able to get their attention, which is probably 90% of it. If you can get in the door, which Rockefeller certainly could. It was a heck of a good turn out for the reception that night. And he was. . . we were getting publicity the whole time, all day long. He was on a noon tv interview show. Two radio shows.

J.B.: Did you get any perception or feeling about whether or not at the end of the day some of these guys were thinking "Well, I want to put a plant in Arkansas" or "I really don't want to put a plant in Arkansas"? What I'm getting at. . . . You know, the popular story at least is that Winthrop Rockefeller came in, went to these industrialists and sold them on locating plants in Arkansas and it was a great success. Of course elsewhere in the South, you also had the whole South industrializing.

Enoch: I doubt that it worked that way. I think what Rockefeller was able to do was to get their attention, to get in the door, and to establish communication. His AIDC Arkansas Industrial Development Commission people were always along. And it was. . . . They were the ones who were doing the selling as far as any specifics.

J.B.: But in opening the door he was effective?

Enoch: Extremely.

J.B.: And it did have some--

Enoch: I can't imagine many people from Arkansas or most places in the South going up and having a reception for industrialists in Cleveland and drawing 20, 30, 40 people.

W.D.V.: If it had not been for his wealth, he would not have been able to run that '66 campaign the way that thing was run. Right? He would not have been able to attract the kind of attention that you say he got when he left this state. He would not have been able to attract a lot of people here and supplement their salaries in state jobs. So what factor did the wealth alone play in that?

J.B.: And name.

W.D.V.: Yeah, wealth and name.

Enoch: If he'd been Winthrop Smith. . . if he'd been just another

name that we can't even remember their first name.

W.D.V.: Wouldn't the same thing be true of the building of the Republican party as well?

Enoch: Well the thing is, the Republican party during the period of Rockefeller was an abomination anyway. There was no future to it. He didn't build a Republican party and couldn't if he'd wanted to.

W.D.V.: Well, then, he put money in it.

Enoch: He put an awful lot of money in it.

J.B.: Did he want to build one?

Enoch: I think he wanted to. In an abstract sort of way. What he did was not really designed to build a long range party. But the biggest problem he had was simply from an ideological point of view. There is no future to a Republican party as the liberal party in a state. They were just totally out of step. The traditional Republicans were going along because it was a chance. But, you know, for that four years Winthrop Rockefeller was the liberal. The Republican party was the liberal party in the state.

J.B.: How about the handful of Republicans in the legislature during his period?

Enoch: It's less than a handful. They managed to get up to four at one point. One in the senate and three in the house and that was the high point.

J.B.: Were they moderate to liberals or were they conservatives, or what?

Enoch: Generally moderate. You can't tell. . . . Well, give you an example. During this term we've had one Republican in the house, one in the senate. Caldwell, state senate, chairman of the party. I made a study last year of legislators' support or opposition to Bumpers'

legislative program. And the Republicans ranks in the top third probably, certainly in the top half, in terms of support of the governor. I went back and checked bills that they had introduced. The only things in the world that they introduced that could be identified as Republican was one of them introduced a resolution memorializing Winthrop Rockefeller and another one introduced a resolution commending Nixon for ending the war. Other than that there was absolutely nothing concerning their record to set them apart as Republicans. There's no Republican program. They don't stand for anything except they're out and they want in. And they stand for a two party system.

J.B.: Did Rockefeller do anything to try and recruit candidates for the legislature, this sort of thing?

Enoch: Yeah.

J.B.: Was he successful?

Enoch: They were running more candidates, particularly during '68, which is probably the. . . . They ran a full slate for all seven state constitutional officers in '68 plus they had a Republican running for the United States Senate who was conservative. Rockefeller didn't get along with him and he accuses Charles Ward of having beaten him. It's Charles Bernard, who ran against Fulbright. I've forgotten now. I think they had 35 or 40 candidates for the legislature in '68.

J.B.: That was their high water mark then, right? And how many did they elect? Not very many, right?

Enoch: I believe it's four.

J.B.: The impression I have is that the Republican party in Arkansas is weaker than in any other Southern state and the prospects of it getting much stronger aren't very good because the state doesn't have that much urban population, doesn't have. . . apparently doesn't

really have that tradition of mountain Republicanism that you find in most of the upper South states.

W.D.V.: Well, that's where they are. The few that they do have are there.

J.B.: But it's weak.

Enoch: Northwest Arkansas. But it's weak.

J.B.: Nothing like east Tennessee or western North Carolina or western Virginia.

Enoch: For example, last fall, or in '72, the thing we did in here in terms of taking all the state wide races even with Nixon just carrying the state, every county, by huge margins. There were only two counties in the state that wound up going Republican in all the state races. And they had a number of candidates. And generally attractive, presentable candidates.

J.B.: Were those small counties or large counties?

Enoch: Both. Their best strength is in the smaller, very rural counties.

J.B.: The traditional mountain Republican counties.

Enoch: [Unclear.]

W.D.V.: How do you explain that? The inability, even after having a Republican governor for two terms, to build strength in the legislature or even in local offices.

Enoch: Rockefeller was building his strength based on moderates. Those people became Democrats for Rockefeller but that's all. And any idea they had that they could ever make Republicans out of those people, it just was unrealistic. All it took was the Democrats coming back and nominating a moderate, like Dale Bumpers in 1970, and the Democrats for Rockefeller organization was just wiped out. Nothing left to it.

J.B.: If Rockefeller had run as a Democrat, say in '66 or '64, would he have beaten Faubus?

Enoch: I don't know. He would have started out with a better chance.

W.D.V.: Are you saying that because the Republican party was seen as the liberal choice between the two parties it didn't have any future at all? That's what killed it off?

Enoch: I think so.

W.D.V.: Had it been a conservative party, like the other Republican parties in the South, it might have had a chance?

Enoch: Well, the thing. . . . Looking at the other side of the state, that I'm most familiar with in terms of the [two parties?]- Tennessee. There has effectively been a party realignment in Tennessee. But there was a number of circumstances. The Democrats played into their hands. The Republicans were running as conservatives. The Democrats were continuing to nominate John J. Hooker and Albert Gore, etc., with a liberal image. And they have just effectively brought about a party realignment in Tennessee. There's no way Rockefeller could have gone to the right of Jim Johnson. But as a moderate Democrat, he may very well have pulled it off there. He may even have done it against Faubus in '64 as a moderate Democrat. But I just don't think there's any future to the Republicans trying to be the liberal party in this state. One of the guys who was in our program this past year, Dan [D-something] wrote a piece for a newspaper, the Arkansas Advocate, pushing this whole point of view, that the Republican party should go back to the party of Rockefeller and become the moderate to liberal party and nominate somebody like Sterling Cockrall [?] and everything. But it's. . . . There's just no future to it. It's out of step. The whole



theory is based on Democrats for Rockefeller and those are people who would never support Richard Nixon or Barry Goldwater or Ronald Reagan or whoever the Republicans are likely to nominate. It's just out of step with the national party. And would never be at home. They would just. . . . They might move to a point of independence, but they'll never become Republicans and that's what the whole theory is based on. Taking the Democrats for Rockefeller organization and making Republicans out of it. It won't work.

J.B.: Is the reason it wouldn't work because the Republican party nationally has moved too far to the right?

Enoch: Yeah, you know, they would just never accept a national Republican image, general positions.

J.B.: But if the Republicans had nominated--  
[End of side of tape.]

Enoch: -- Republicans. It just means identifying with people and points of view that I don't think they'd ever accept.

W.D.V.: Is the party organization, both in terms of local organization in the state and staffing and so on, stronger than it was ten years ago?

Enoch: The Republican?

W.D.V.: Yeah.

Enoch: As strong. Maybe stronger. They're certainly a heck of a lot further along. Ten years ago they were just beginning to move. I guess they really began to gear up heavily after the '64 election. Rockefeller started getting involved--

W.D.V.: When were they at their peak?

Enoch: '68.

W.D.V.: And there's been a slide downhill since then?

Enoch: Because Rockefeller started pulling his money out in '70, long about '72. He was pouring heavy money into the party. They really had a fantastic operation for a little while. They had research people, field people, staff people in all the Congressional districts. And they're pulling back. Even with that they've got a heck of a lot more staff than the Democratic party's got.

W.D.V.: But the result--still got one legislator in both houses.

Enoch: And one Congressman.

W.D.V.: Which is about where you were in '66.

Enoch: Well, '66 Rockefeller. . . he brought in Footsy <sup>Brith</sup> ~~Brith?~~ for lieutenant governor and Hammerschmidt won in '66.

W.D.V.: Okay, '64.

Enoch: '64. Before '66. Nothing.

W.D.V.: So there's been no permanent impact from all that activity, is what my point. Once he pulled all that out it was gone.

J.B.: Where do you see the Republican party going in this state?

Enoch: I don't see anywhere but down for it. I don't see how they can keep raising even the amount of money that they are getting and apparently they're in considerably better financial position than the Democrats. In terms of party.

J.B.: Is Win-Paul Rockefeller a key to what they do? In the sense that he has access to money if he wants to put it in, just like his father.

Enoch: I don't see any other future for [him/it] except to go back and play the role that they have played in the past. And they were doing it even more with Rockefeller and they could continue it. And that. . . . You know, there can be two purposes for political parties. One, of course, is to win. And in terms of that I don't see

any future for them. Unless Rockefeller, Winthrop Paul, wants to do something. And even there it will be a very personal thing. And I'm not sure what his future would be. I think he's. . . . From what I gather. . . and John can fill you in on this more than I. . . John knows more about him. But apparently he's pretty light weight at this point. Of course I gather that his father was pretty light weight at 26 or 27, too.

J.B.: In what sense?

Enoch: Well, he's not the brightest guy going, from what I gather. That's all second hand. But not a natural leader type. Indecisive. Has an awful lot to learn about Arkansas and Arkansas politics. He only came to this state, I guess, three years ago. And for most part, has been on the mountain ever since. This past year, to his credit, he went down to ~~Texas A&M~~ <sup>TCU</sup>. Went back to school. Learn how to manage a farm. Apparently he's committed to staying in the state. But I'm not even real sure Winthrop Paul could pull it off, even with his money. Depending on what the Democrats do. The Democrats, unless they want to play into their hands. . . . If the Democrats reach a point where they become extremely confident. Everything's back to normal. We can do whatever we want. We don't have to worry about the Republicans. Then they might go back to nominating, conceivably, somebody like Jim Johnston or Marion Crank. That could lead to a resurgence of the Republican party. The only think I could have seen coming out of Orval Faubus. . . . If Orval Faubus had gotten the nomination this year, the Republicans would have had new life. That would have. . . .

J.B.: You were saying there were two purposes of a party and one was to win.

Enoch: One is to win and the other is simply to serve as a check.

In the late 1960s we got almost an entire new election code in this state. Election irregularities. . . . It was just common. In Madison county, which is Orval Faubus' home county, has actually cast more than 100% of the possible votes up there. Things that were happening back in the '60s are just phenomenal. Graveyards literally being voted. An awful lot of that's been cleaned up. And it was cleaned up because of the Republican party. Now they can play a role. . . . The Democratic answer to that in this state has always been "Well, we have that because we have the ins and the outs in the Democratic party so in effect we have two parties." But that's fallacious. The outs in the Democratic party are never organized. They never have research capability. They simply can't play the watchdog role and the Republican party can.

J.B.: You see them viable in that role?

Enoch: Yes. And I think they're committed to it. Now the problem is going to be that it's hard to keep money or enthusiasm or participation going when you have no chance of ever winning anything.

J.B.: How about some local elections? Do they win anything?

Enoch: They have a county judge in Washington county, which is Fayetteville, and a few other scattered, I think, . . . but very, very few. Even in the Republican counties they don't win.

J.B.: What's their problem? I mean, is it a function of leadership or is it a function of demographics?

Enoch: I don't know. They have not attracted. . . they just haven't attracted the type of people that have been able to really pull anything off.

W.D.V.: You mean candidates?

Enoch: Yeah. Although they had generally acceptable. . . . Some of the people who ran in '72. . . . If they'd been running on the Democratic

ticket they may have had a viable chance. But nobody. . . you know, a Dale Bumpers has not emerged out of the Republican party. Anywhere.

J.B.: Let's talk about Bumpers a little bit. How do you analyze Bumpers?

Enoch: He's got a fantastic sense of timing. He's better at the media than anybody I've ever seen in the politics I've covered. Let me tell you the story. . . Charles Kelly, who's news director of channel 11 Little Rock tells. He says that at a press conference Bumpers will be sitting there and that they've gone along and they're just kind of all sitting back and relaxing and pursuing something and some question will come up and they'll turn on the tv to get it. And he says he just seems to have a sense. Boy, he knows exactly when that thing comes on. And he'll have been sitting back, relaxing and chatting. But boy, that camera will come up [and he'll] look right into the camera and just. . . sincerity. Give them an answer. Perfect 45 second cut. Says "I've never seen anybody with a sense of timing like that in my life." He says that guy can give you a 45 second answer, just perfect cut.

J.B.: Is it natural, or acquired?

Enoch: I think it's natural. Deloss Walker can't teach that. Deloss has been a big help to him, apparently, but he just has a feel for that tube that's just unbelievable. And it comes across brilliantly on it. During this campaign. . . . Early in the campaign he started out and they kept pushing, pushing, pushing. Why are you running against Fulbright? What do you have against Fulbright? What do you disagree with him on? And they'd hammer at this all along. And he finally stumbled on and started talking about seniority. Well, it didn't come across very well in print. But about two or three. . . I guess it was

close to a week later, he finally had a press conference and submitted to questions. And they started hammering at this whole thing again. And the cut they had on tv that night. . . I tell you. . . he came out and started talking about seniority system. It didn't come across in print, but man, on tv it just sounded like the worst that you can ever conceive of having been devised. The seniority system. He just. . . . I think that guy could get on and sell a broken down used car that didn't have a motor in it. Just fantastic on the tube. Extremely good credibility. He has taken steps that. . . . Well, one of these stories. . . . After the election, I think it was John Ellrod, who was supposed to have been Fulbright's campaign manager but then he came down in poor health. I think Ellrod was quoted as saying they had spent 2,500 man hours looking for a chink in his armor. And they just couldn't find it. It wasn't there.

J.B.: How do you assess him as governor?

Enoch: I think he's been extremely effective. He had some things going for him when he came in. The Democrats in the legislature had been catching hell from Rockefeller for two years as obstructionists and everything else. So they were extremely ready to cooperate with any Democrat that could get in. The fact that Bumpers was attractive, that he'd come in with an extremely heavy vote only solidified that position. But to give you an example, though. That explains 1971 session. By 1973 all the conventional wisdom was that the honeymoon's over. We're in a second term now and the legislature's not going to be that kind this time. They're really going to get him. The man got everything he wanted through the legislature with the exception of one bill. Which was. . . and even that. . . it was to set up a state commission to start purchasing, acquiring public lands. He got the commission. He asked for \$10

million appropriation. He didn't get that. That's the only thing the man asked for in the '73 session he didn't get.

J.B.: What did he do in those four years in terms of issues and programs?

Enoch: The first thing was government reorganization, which. . . extremely unwieldy. Got that through, cutting it down from 60 to 13 departments. Establishing essentially a cabinet which was all, making everything directly responsible to him. A \$90 million tax program, which was the most massive thing that's ever gone through in this state.

J.B.: And who was paying the taxes? This was making income tax more progressive, in part, right?

Enoch: Yes, mostly.

J.B.: How about property tax?

Enoch: Increased that, too. I can't tell you the details on it. And then community college program, kindergarten program. We'd never had kindergartens in this state. Got the whole program through and began funding for it. More emphasis on voc-tec schools. General increases in programs throughout. The guy who is state insurance commissioner, Art Monroe, is probably. . . . At this point he's doing things that insurance commissioners in no other states are doing. The guy has just cracked down like you've never seen. There's been a good bit of pressure applied. But Art says none of it has ever come through to him. The complaint about Bumpers is. . . . Rockefeller started it back in '70. That he was running on a smile and a shoeshine. That's been a standard line about Bumpers ever since. He's been accused of being wishy-washy, a man who won't take a position, who's totally political and tried to play both sides. I don't think the record bears that out. 1973 session, cities and counties finally got together for probably the

first time in their career--because they never had been able to agree on anything. But the city/<sup>county</sup>forces and municipal county judges association, etc., to push a bill designating 7% of all state revenues, off the top, for turn back to cities and counties. You take on city-county lobby and you've taken on a pretty potent force. That bill sailed through the legislature. Bumpers vetoes it and won. They passed it back through the senate but couldn't override the veto in the house. And In Arkansas all it takes is a simple majority to override a veto. He has appointed generally strong people in state positions and has, as I say, backed them up. Art Monroe being one of the best examples. Art is. . . . For example, earlier this year, just simply ordered all insurance companies doing business in the state of Arkansas to reduce their premiums x percent because of the roll back in the speed limit. They just did their staff work and he said "Accidents are down and you will roll them back." And got away with it. Boy, some insurance people were madder than hell. And Art said he's heard, in a round about way, of some of the pressure that's been applied to Bumpers but Bumpers has never mentioned a bit of it to him.

W.D.V.: You said somebody did \$2,600 of research--

Enoch: Ellrod said they did 2,500 hours of research.

W.D.V.: Of research to what, to find a weakness in Bumpers? And they couldn't find anything? You believe that?

Enoch: Uhhu. Personally I do. You know. . . an example. . . . At one point an insurance man, coincidentally, who is chairman of the Democratic party of Pulaski county, came out with this thing about a month before the election. Said that the governor making \$10,000 was fallacious. That he actually made \$52,000 because he got this mansion account and he got a public relations account and he got a travel account. Well, man,



here's this big thing. You know, we've been feeling sorry for our governor all this time and here he's just given these huge lump sums of money. Man, I tell you, two days later Bumpers, on his own initiative, at the beginning of his term, had it, because he didn't like the arrangement. Had hired an auditor to handle and audit those accounts. And just turned them over and said "You know, if you're interested in them you go look." And the press went and dug in and wrote big long stories about how much they paid for [hams/hands?] and how much they paid for this, that, for repairs, and everything up at the mansion and how much he spent on his trips. And it was all over. When that thing first came out I thought, you know, by god, they've finally come up with something. But it's typical of his whole approach, that he hired an auditor just to be on the safe side. Four days before the election, Friday, before the election on Tuesday, a suit was filed in Sebastian county, Ft Smith, by some guy who said that four years ago Bumpers and Archie Shaffer, his nephew and administrative assistant, and Ben Allen, who's a state senator and close ally of Bumpers, had offered him money or had offered to get a federal warrant against him dropped if he would contribute to Bumpers' campaign in 1970. Bumpers just denied it, said it was absurd. The thing just didn't even. . . with the exception of the fact that the Gazette played the heck out of it, which is one of their lowest journalistic points. . . . But you know, it says something about Bumpers' credibility. The thing just didn't even make a wave. People just kind of look at it and say "It's absurd. Bumpers wouldn't do it." Just got fantastic credibility and personally I think it's deserved. I think the man really. . . . If anything, he maybe gets, becomes a little too messianical occasionally. But I think the man is absolutely clean. I'd be very, very surprised if anything could ever be dug up.

J.B.: Why do you think he ran against Fulbright?

Enoch: It was the only thing open to him. Obviously he's ambitious. He's got every friend he'll ever make in the governor's office. There's just nothing he can do but go down hill from here on. The argument was that he should have waited four years and run for McClellan's seat. But I think there's a serious doubt that he could have even won in four years, even with his credibility. There had been a two term tradition in Arkansas and Orval Faubus did an awful lot of reaffirm that. Now it says something about liberals that they. . . when Orval went out they swore never again. But of course in 1974 they were pleading, run for a third term, Dale. You're our man. But consistency has never been a liberal hallmark. If he'd gone for a third term, opponents, and particularly conservatives, were gearing up to just hammer him over the head for two months on third term and he's trying to become another Orval Faubus. It's just a very high visibility office. You're operating against traditions that have existed. . . .

J.B.: Is he perceived as the best governor Arkansas has ever had?

Enoch: If people could be objective about it I would say yes. Now of course at this point there are 35% very bitter people in this state.

J.B.: Are they bitter enough to vote for a Republican?

Enoch: To some extent.

J.B.: That would be now, but not necessarily in November.

Enoch: You know, this fall, when they get to know John Harris Jones a little better that may become more difficult for them. But to give you an idea of the kind of transition that was occurring. . . . A person who went through our program had supported both Bumpers and Fulbright, was one of those people in that dilemma, who do I support? But for her it was no problem. She said she liked Bumpers but Fulbright was her man.

She was just sorry that one of them had to go because she liked both of them. By the end of the campaign she had talked herself into a total frenzy. She believed. . . she was comparing Bumpers to Hitler. "My god, this man scares me to death. I don't think anything's there." She had just talked herself into a total hatred of the guy. And this was happening throughout. Oh, you ought to read some of the Gazette editorials. Man alive, I'm telling you. We've got them all in there. This was part of Fulbright's problem, too, because they were trying to hurt somebody that the man was just not vulnerable on anything. You know, I think you can criticize and attack in a political campaign if there's some chink you can grab hold of. You're operating on some suspicion that's in the public mind. But it just all came across as so false. In 1970 the Gazette, which had supported Winthrop Rockefeller--in the general election they supported Bumpers over Rockefeller. And they strongly supported him. When the Gazette. . . you know, for the Gazette everything is black and white. There are no greys in politics. Everybody's either pure or evil. They adopted Dale Bumpers and, man, they loved the guy. With the exception of his support of the community college program, which the Gazette opposed, the man could do no wrong. Within the course of a 30 minute announcement Dale Bumpers, March 11th, became the lowest scum of the earth. And all of a sudden they started finding all sorts of things they didn't like about him. You know, it just came across as so false. It would just never sell.

W.D.V.: Did it mean anything?

Enoch: The Gazette?

W.D.V.: Did it hurt Bumpers?

Enoch: My own theory is. . . and, you know, I don't know how you prove it without a poll and I don't have access to them, but I think

there's 30-35% of the people who would have voted for Fulbright against God. And there's probably 30-35% of the people who would have voted for Hitler if that was the only other name on the ballot running against Fulbright. Which would leave 35-40% moveable [?] vote. You know, if that is a correct assumption, Bumpers got every moveable vote in the state. All Fulbright got was just his solid base.

W.D.V.: Didn't the published polls show that? What was going to happen?

Enoch: Well, there was only one published and that. . . . I don't know exactly. . . . It was based on. . . . It was a Newsom poll that was released. . . . Bumpers made his announcement at 9 o'clock and it was on the 6 o'clock news that night based on 167 surveys. You tell me how valid it was. It showed 60-27 Bumpers over Fulbright with 13% undecided. I have no idea if that's the way it stood that day or not. I don't place a great deal of faith in that poll. And that's the only one that was ever published. . . well, Ken Bailey did some up in northwest Arkansas. Walker told me the night of the election that their polls had been consistent, that from the very beginning it was two to one and never waivered although there was a fairly high undecided. Said about a month before the election both of them dropped slightly, but again, that was proportionate. And he said towards the end, when they were trying to pin the undecideds down as to which one they were leaning toward, that that broke down two to one for Bumpers. He said there was never any variance throughout the whole race.

W.D.V.: What that suggests then is that the enormous amount of money Fulbright put in to that campaign did nothing.

J.B.: Where does Pryor fit into the political picture? He's the next governor of Arkansas, presumably.

Enoch: Two things. One, David is important to the state, I think, because of the image he has. He is a moderate. Is perceived as a moderate. And so from the standpoint of the image and the continuity of Rockefeller, Bumpers, I think that's important. Personally, I think David is a weak administrator. I think he's bush league compared to Bumpers. And personally, I think this is the last office David will ever hold, although he clearly is aiming. . . . It just so happens that two terms as Arkansas governor would bring it to 1978 which is when McClellan's seat's up. And I don't think there's much doubt that that's what's in his mind. Personally I don't think he'll have a chance of winning in four years.

J.B.: Who will he be running--

Enoch: I'm not real positive David will be able to hold on to the governor's office for four years.

J.B.: Who will be running against him? Alexander?

Enoch: Alexander, Thornton, probably others.

J.B.: Probably Alexander or Thornton? Is that how it's shaping up?

Enoch: Or both.

J.B.: They may both actually go for it?

Enoch: Alexander wants to be a Senator and I understand that's. . . Ray Thornton's definitely aiming at it, too. And I'm sure David will run, provided he's still on the scene. But the thing is. . . . What I was saying earlier, I think it was an extremely soft 51%. There were very few people who were around who were really excited about David. And even people who supported him and worked for him have no confidence whatsoever where David will come down in any real controversy. He. . . he's had some real pressure applied to him. He had. . . . Ironically, at the beginning of this campaign, Faubus started, made a big speech, tv address about the governor makers. A group of businessmen, Arkansas

businessmen who had gotten together and decided that David was the man and then proceeded to dry up the money for everybody else. The thing about it was that it was true. They did get together. <sup>W.H</sup>~~White~~ Stevens held it and meetings did occur. When it first came out David just denied it and said no such thing had happened. A couple or three weeks later John Bennett came out with a story in the Commercial - Appeal saying here's when the meeting happened, here's what time it happened, here's where it happened, here's who was present, here's what happened at the meeting. Following that, David did remember something about the meeting. He recalled that he had gone to such a meeting, but he certainly didn't know anything about drying up money or being picked or anything. Of course, Orval had gone, too. And these were the people who had supported Orval for years and years and years. This time they were going with David. It's big business in this state. David also has the support of big labor. And how he's going to keep both of them happy will be very interesting.

J.B.: What is labor's role in Arkansas politics?

Enoch: I don't know. Money and manpower more than influence. It's not major, but it's. . . . Becker is, I think, pretty well respected all the way around. You'll find him to be very articulate. He's sharp. A good man. Probably, to a good extent, the influence of labor is the result of Becker. He's been very articulate. They've got a very definite bent. Two years ago McClellan started hitting Pryor over the head with his labor money and apparently it certainly had an effect. I don't know any way to isolate out that one factor. But man, they were beating David over the head. Tell you a funny story about that. When Pryor, when McClellan first started hitting. . . . I think he charged that Pryor had gotten something like \$76,000 from labor at that point. And

said, you know, apparently David really got upset, said he wanted to answer that sort of stuff. One of his aides said, you know, "Hold back, David, you know it's really more than that." [Laughter.] Incidentally, be sure and ask Becker, because they have had a poll run on attitudes toward labor in the state of Arkansas and he is not. . . I don't think he's hesitant to discuss it or to give you some of the information out of it. Because he brought it to our session a year ago and talked about it and gave us some of the stuff out of it. So be sure and ask him about it.

W.D.V.: What about the role of newspapers and television stations in politics?

Enoch: Oh, it's a so-so press. The Democrat's been just trying to stay alive. They've just been bought by the Palmer news media. Palmer is a south Arkansas chain that has five newspapers and now has six with the Arkansas Democrat, which apparently will keep them alive. But until Palmer bought them it was a constant speculation as to how long the Democrat would live. The Gazette certainly took it's lumps following '57. They lost revenue, they lost circulation, they lost advertising. They paid for their courage and paid hard. Unfortunately the Gazette has been living off that reputation and glorying in its tribulations for how many years now, 16, 17. They. . . I'm not sure about the real influence of the Gazette. I'm not sure it's as significant as some people may think. Their editorial page is so strident and so predictable and it almost never has any of the insights that you'll get out of a Post editorial or Times editorial or anything of that nature. Just . . . it has no real insights, no new information, new points of view or anything. It's just hit them over the head and move on. I think they do have. . . . You know, if I were running for local office I would do

whatever I could to get the Gazette's editorial endorsement, but I think it's of real dubious value in any major state race. Robert Fisher--you said you've talked to him already--he had a thing. . . his column in the Democrat yesterday was concerned with newspaper endorsements. Most of the newspapers in Arkansas endorsed Fulbright. I thought his whole column was very weak, simply because you can't say "Okay, the newspapers endorsed, here are the election returns, so endorsement did or did not have any effect." You know, it's just a ridiculous position to wind up in and yet that's essentially what he was talking about in his column. I don't know how much influence they. . . . I think it's minimal in any state race.

W.D.V.: How about the reporting of politics or the investigative reporting of state government? Any?

Enoch: Not a great deal. Periodically the Gazette will get out on a crusade but it's very sporadic. Bennett, John Bennett, is probably the toughest investigative reporter in Little Rock. Unfortunately, he's a one man bureau, you know, who's trying to cover everything and do some investigative stuff, too. But Bennett probably comes out with more hard hitting stuff than anybody around there. Even operating against the whole Gazette and Democrat and AP and everybody.

J.B.: Do the wires pick up his stuff?

Enoch: Occasionally. But it's. . . . The Gazette does a poor job of analysis. They'll go through a whole legislative session and they pride themselves on being a newspaper of record and to that extent I think they're strong. Because they do run an awful lot of copy. Man, the amount of stuff they'll run on the legislative session is just. . . . Reams and reams of it. But almost at no point, during that whole session, will they ever stop and say, you know, here's what this big issue that



we've been writing about for six weeks now is all about. Here's where people are lining up and here's what the real gut issue's about and here's why it's hung up and here's where they come out on it. They never do it.

W.D.V.: You mean the interpretive, investigative stuff is done by a guy from an out of state newspaper?

Enoch: AP does a heck of a lot better job than the Gazette. The Gazette just never does that. They don't do it in a political campaign--

W.D.V.: Isn't the Gazette and the Democrat the two state wide papers?

Enoch: And the Democrat will do that more than the Gazette will. The Gazette just doesn't know how to do it.

W.D.V.: What is there beyond that, though? In spite of the commercial appeal of the Democrat and the Gazette?

Enoch: The Pine Bluff Commercial has a guy who works in Little Rock some named George Wills. I don't see the Pine Bluff Commercial that well; I see it very periodically. Apparently Wills [Wells?] does this occasionally. But the thing is that he's kind of part time in Little Rock and he's not even up there all the time. Nobody else really even has anybody down there. Everybody else just feeds off the AP. And the AP could put out anything and the papers of this state [are doing it?]. No telling. I get extremely disillusioned sometimes because I just. . . . Well, you'll see, I get a number of papers from out of the state. . . . If the AP ran a big long story and said two people met each other on the street today, I declare I think a lot of papers around this state would put it on page one. And say Two Men Meet.

J.B.: How much impact did reapportionment have in Arkansas?

Enoch: There was a pretty fair turnover in the legislature. I couldn't say definitely what effect it had on the legislature. The legislature is fairly urban now. Under the old system every county--we have

75 counties in this state. There were 100 legislators. Every county was guaranteed at least one state representative. Then the other 25 were given to larger counties.

J.B.: Are there any real powers in the legislature?

Enoch: The senate, particularly. The single most powerful person in the Arkansas state senate is Max Howell, who is an attorney in Jacksonville, which is just north of Little Rock, still Pulaski county. Now the extent. . . . We had Max up for session this year along with Bill Grantham to talk about the legislature. . . . He was in the legislature for 12 years. He's former chairman of the legislative council. Quite effective. He ran for lieutenant governor and got his ass beat. Doug would be fairly candid and open. Max, I don't think you'd get a great deal out of him.

J.B.: Who has the power in Arkansas?

Enoch: [Unclear--it's going to take a minute?]

J.B.: What groups?

Enoch: Let me think about that one some. The utilities have had and Whit Stevens still has.

J.B.: Many legislators on the utilities' payroll? Has anybody looked into that?

Enoch: At one point they had quite a number of them. Marion Crank, who was the '68 gubernatorial nominee, probably one of the most effective legislators, he'd been in for 18-20 years or something. Extremely effective guy. But he was employed by the Foreman Cement Company, which is a subsidiary of <sup>Arkla</sup>~~Ark~~[something]. Clarence Bell of the state senate was, works directly for Ark[obviously the utility company]. I've forgotten. I think they had seven at one point, directly on the payroll.

J.B.: Not counting retainers.

Enoch: Not counting others. Retainers, political contributions, what have you?

J.B.: How about banks?

Enoch: They've been strong in terms of banking legislation, but I don't think they've really tried to [unclear]

J.B.: Any single industrial group? In this state that's particularly strong? Or dominant. Like textiles would be in the Carolinas. No single dominant corporation like Coca Cola in Georgia. More traditionally

. I sort of had the impression that Arkansas, to some extent, resembled South Carolina and perhaps Georgia in the sense that Democrats are in control and that the Democratic party consists basically of a coalition of blacks, organized labor, courthouse Democrats, and the very top level of the financial and business community.

Enoch: I think where that would break down is I'm not sure the Democratic party is. . . it's not worth anything to have a Democratic party. You haven't got anything if you've got it. The whole thing is still individuals. If you want power and you get control of x number of legislators. But the party, what's that? I don't know if anybody's ever wasted their time trying to get control of the party.

J.B.: Not control of the party but--

Enoch: The blacks, of course, are only now coming back to the Democratic party. That was a transition that generally took about four years. '70-'74. I think it was pretty well complete by then. Give you an interesting--

J.B.: Did Bumpers get much black support his first time around?

Enoch: Not much.

J.B.: What has he done in that area?

Enoch: Not that much overt. They have brought apparently a pretty good percentage of blacks into state jobs. Probably his most overt thing was the big controversy in '72 over the Lee county cooperative.

[Which is Marianna.?] Are you familiar with that?

J.B.: Yeah.

Enoch: Finally came down to hinging on Bumpers taking a position on the thing and he supported the continuation of the cooperative.

J.B.: How about on his staff. Does he have blacks on his staff or in any key positions?

Enoch: He has one now, who was in our program this year. [????Cora McKinley?] She was hired as an education consultant. The question came up in his sessions with us and he continued to say, you know, that he was looking. Just a matter of finding. . . .

J.B.: Does he have any sort of human affairs, human relations commission? No sort of state anti-discrimination law?

Enoch: No.

W.D.V.: No civil rights commission?

[End of side of tape. This interview runs for two tapes.]

[Discussion of some writings, apparently recent--hard to hear who or what.]

Enoch: He came over and interviewed Harry Ashmore and a few other people. And it puts Orval in the same camp exactly, he's just the mirror image of George Wallace in the '50s and early '60s and Herman Talmidge. . . of every just absolute blatant racist that the South's ever produced. And I don't think that's a fair evaluation of him.

J.B.: How does he really differ from Wallace, who started out as a moderate and made race into a viable political issue?

W.D.V.: Faubus started out as a populist.

J.B.: Or Talmidge, who was using, you know, inherited race as a political issue but then moderated. Where does Faubus differ from the others, that's my question? I mean, there's no question that he exploited race politically. To a large extent. Right? I mean there's some question as to detail, but no question about him exploiting race as a political issue.

W.D.V.: And [indeed/Dale?] has been one of the most recent people to try that again, in 1970. There are very few candidates in the South, since the 1960s that have tried to exploit race as an issue.

J.B.: Lester Maddox, to a limited extent.

Enoch: Unfortunately, I wasn't in the state during the Democratic primary in '70. In some ways my impression is that he came across more demagogic in this campaign than he did in previous campaigns. Which really surprised me. And incidentally, Bill [Levitt?], who's chairman of my board, was handling Faubus' campaign this year.

J.B.: How does he deal with race this year, because I just really didn't follow that governor's race? What was he saying? What were his code words?

Enoch: Mostly busing. But the issues that he was hammering at this year are all the things that were designed to remind us of the image of Faubus in the '50s and early '60s. Which doesn't make any sense from the standpoint of strategy.

J.B.: He had busing. Was there anything else?

Enoch: He had busing. He had communism. He had drugs. The thing--

J.B.: Crime?

Enoch: The thing is, we've got a communist professor at UofAlr [?]. Arkansas's probably the only state in the country where communism will be an issue in 1974. No, I don't think he was hitting crime that much.

Primarily, his three were busing, communism and drugs. And, you know. . . .

W.D.V.: those are issues that tend to concern issues of the past. So he must have viewed that as THE thing that got him elected. Really.

Enoch: I don't know. That's the thing that doesn't make any sense. As to why they were. . . . Because the thing is, I don't think. . . . We had Faubus for a session last year and I think you'll find him, an interesting session with him. But I don't view Orval Faubus as a man who is just totally ruled by emotion. The man is. . . . Was he emphasizing these issues this year because that was really where he came down philosophically. That these were the most pressing concerns facing the state of Arkansas--

W.D.V.: No, but that's the way he won, before.

Enoch: Then that says that the man who is generally perceived as one of the smartest politicians to hit this state has just totally lost touch with reality. Which way be true.

W.D.V.: But take one of your two alternatives. If he comes down that way or because that's the campaign strategy he won in the past. Either way, what does it say about him?

Enoch: I think the strongest argument is that he's lost touch with reality. Cause the thing is. . . . I think generally in the press, you know, we've felt for years that you just. . . there's no. . . you have to be a moderate to win state office in this state as a newcomer. I don't think a racist, demagogic approach can win state office in this state. Not a major office. Every one we've had run in the past--

W.D.V.: Or to make even the nomination.

Enoch: Well, that's one in the same at this point.

W.D.V.: Yeah, that's right.

Enoch: And we've had some real conservatives try. Just haven't been able to pull it out.

J.B.: Let me ask you, go back to the legislature. Institutionally, has Bumpers. . . . The impression I have is that Bumpers has greatly enhanced the power of the governor's office, to some extent. Through reorganization primarily. Did that result in a weakening of power by whom? By the legislature? Or by these independent boards and commissions?

Enoch: Independent boards and commissions.

J.B.: How much. . . . Who dominates. . . .?

Enoch: The legislature has finally started making some moves to update their structure. This occurred beginning in the session last year and it's in the process of being continued in the interim.

J.B.: The legislature has a great deal of institutional power here, don't they? Or not? I'm just thinking of that majority vote to override a veto. But they don't exercise it. Why not?

Enoch: They haven't been structured to. They don't have--

J.B.: Does seniority prevail in the legislature in both houses?

Enoch: Generally, but seniority I don't think. . . is certainly not as in Congress, for example.

J.B.: How about the speaker? Does the speaker have much power? And who con-- What's the role of the governor in the election of the speaker?

Enoch: None. Really.

J.B.: Okay. Does the speaker appoint committees? Does he name committee chairmen?

Enoch: Yes.

J.B.: Does the speaker usually rotate?

Enoch: Every term.

J.B.: It is. Okay. Is that just by tradition?

Enoch: Yeah. Nobody has just really built up, you know--

J.B.: How about in the senate? Does the lieutenant governor preside?

Enoch: Yes. And the lieutenant governor used to have roughly the same power that the speaker of the house did until Rockefeller won and brought in a Republican lieutenant governor. At which point they stripped the lieutenant governor of any authority to do anything, except preside.

J.B.: Does he vote? On ties?

Enoch: On ties.

J.B.: How are committees appointed in the senate?

Enoch: They probably would have taken that away, too, if it hadn't been in the constitution. Committee on committees.

J.B.: In effect, the Democratic caucus.

Enoch: Yes.

J.B.: The committees. Is it usually the senior member becomes chairman or is it by vote?

Enoch: Senior. So seniority has an effect, but the problem is, it just has not been a strong operation because it's extremely low paid, they've had no interim powers or anything--

J.B.: Annual sessions?

Enoch: No, every two years.

J.B.: It's still every two years.

W.D.V.: Is there a limit on them?

Enoch: Sixty days.

J.B.: So the governor really is in control.

Enoch: Which can be extended and has occurred, but not extended for



very long.

J.B.: How can extend it?

Enoch: The legislature. And the thing is. . . . See, one thing they tried this year, last year was kind of interesting. They finally decided. . . . Once they adjourn sine y die they're dead until the new legislature's elected and comes in in the next two years or until the governor calls them into session. Special sessions in Arkansas, they cannot consider anything except what the governor includes in the call. They have no authority to include any matters of their own.

W.D.V.: Can he call as many of these as he wants to?

Enoch: [Apparently positive.] And the thing is, their pay goes down to nothing when they go into special session. It's just a vast losing proposition. It's losing as it is, but they get--I've forgotten--it's something like \$12 a day per diem for regular session and it goes to something like \$5 a day for special session.

J.B.: What do they get in salary?

Enoch: \$100 a month.

J.B.: The thing was, last year rather than adjourning sine y die they decided they were just going to recess until January of this year. And then. . . if the governor. . . if there were things that had come up that had to be dealt with, then they could just call themselves back into session. Get together in January, look over the situation and decide if they needed to do anything. If they did, they'd come back into session. If not, they'd adjourn sine y die. There would be a couple of advantages to going that route. One would be that if they came back into session they're still in regular session which means they have control over what they can consider. And they'd still get the more pay. They came back in January and just adjourned sine y die.

J.B.: You have an executive budget, I take it. In addition to having an executive budget, has there been any move to increase the governor's salary? Increase legislative salaries?

Enoch: It's on the ballot again this year. The constitutional amendment will be voted on this fall. [Something about salary and commission.]

J.B.: Does that include legislature?

Enoch: Yeah. Everything except. . . . It would include executive, legislative and county officials.

J.B.: You have a commission to set these salaries? How would the commission be selected?

Enoch: I've forgotten. A certain number to be named by the chief justice of the supreme court, a certain number by the governor, a certain number by the legislature.

J.B.: How are judges selected? In Arkansas.

Enoch: Straight ballot.

J.B.: At all levels?

Enoch: Circuit and chancellary judges were all running this year. The supreme court justices have to run staggered terms.

J.B.: How about vacancies? Are they appointed?

Enoch: I can't answer that. Would have to check.

W.D.V.: Does the legislature have any staff at all or any post audit functions?

Enoch: They're finally. . . . This is one of the main things that has come out of this Eagleton study. Which incidentally, you may want to take that along and glance at it. The Eagleton study which they have instituted since the '73 session. Interim committees now, with some staffing for committees. They've streamlined the committees,

establishing ten committees in the house and the senate that are all comparable. The same ten committees in both bodies. In the past all they've had really. . . .

the Arkansas legislative council which had a staff. This is the reason. . . . You know, they were just outgunned. They just simply couldn't compete. Cause they didn't have the staff. They didn't spend the time to really be that knowledgeable. So they just really haven't been that strong.

W.D.V.: Have they been essentially a rubber stamp?

Enoch: Well, they certain became that during Faubus years. During Rockefeller years. . . . Of course you get into that situation then. . . . The Democrats were all saying of course "For years you accused us of being a rubber stamp and now we're trying to show some independence and you criticize." Because at that point they'd started opposing Rockefeller. By 1970 they were tired of being criticized and started cooperating again.

J.B.: Did the conventional wisdom say that Arkansas is likely to return Democratic in national elections soon?

Enoch: Not necessarily.

J.B.: Suppose you end up with Teddy Kennedy against Gerald Ford?

Enoch: I think Ford would carry it. Because the independence is here. People learned to split their tickets and they're willing to do it. It's just that--

J.B.: But you say you've got to be a moderate to progressive to win in a state wide election, but in a national election they'll vote conservative, is that it?

Enoch: Well, the differences between the perception of Pryor or Bumpers who are generally considered to be moderates to Teddy Kennedy who would not be classified by most Arkansas voters as moderate, I don't

think. I'm not sure that a person clearly identified as a liberal would win in Arkansas.

J.B.: Is there anybody in Washington, in the Congressional delegation--

Enoch: Ironically Bumpers is probably considerably more liberal than his image.

J.B.: Is there anybody in the Congressional delegation who sort of plays a heavy hand in state politics? Does McClellan take any role in state politics?

Enoch: Not much.

J.B.: Wilbur Mills?

Enoch: Not to my knowledge. No, for the most part they don't get involved--

J.B.: Did Mills hurt himself in Arkansas in the '72 race for president? We keep reading things that Mills has weakened himself in Congress and it all started with the '72 race.

Enoch: I don't think that hurt him as much as the milk deal's going to hurt him.

J.B.: That was tied in with it, though, wasn't it?

Enoch: But in terms of comparing that, you know, the money problems to just simply an evaluation of his political judgment which suffered some, but not fatally. But the milk thing just comes across as more than just poor judgment. I think that is going to hurt him some, because general perception has been that Wilbur Mills, whatever else may be said, the man is honest. And apparently he was extremely clean until he lost his judgment about the presidential politics. You know, an example is the fact that apparently ever since he's been in Washington he takes the standard deduction on his income tax and doesn't even try

to itemize or claim deductions or anything. Just simply because he was head of that committee in charge of tax legislation. In order to avoid problems. You know, the only explanation I've heard is that he just got carried away in '72 and lost his better judgment process. But he's going to get hit hard this fall. We've got. . . . You can see some of the clippings from Judy Petty that will give you an idea of the sort of tack she's going to be taking this fall. She's already been hitting him. She came out last week calling on Jowersky to start investigating Wilbur Mills, too. I don't know what's going to happen with him. But I just have a feeling that he may not be up there that many more years. Maybe one more term.

J.B.: If he's up there one more term. Fulbright is out. McClellan presumably is on his last term.

Enoch: Presumably.

J.B.: And he's going to have a. . . . He almost lost last time and he's going to be six years older this time.

Enoch: Yes, but he'll have a big thing going for him.

J.B.: The only seniority left--

Enoch: If they ever get campaign. . . if they ever reform quote unquote our campaign laws like they're trying up there I don't think you'll ever beat an incumbent Senator in the state of Arkansas. 119  
and die. The last bill that just passed the Senate will limit total expenditure in an Arkansas primary campaign to \$109,000. Man, you ain't got a chance against an incumbent for \$109,000 unless you're Dale Bumpers with fantastic credibility.

W.D.V.: Even if you financed it with public funds. You had \$109,000 that was publicly financed--

Enoch: The thing is, in a Democratic primary, you know, public

money doesn't make any difference because there's money available. David wasn't hurting for it. He spent a half million, pretty close to it.

J.B.: Where'd his money come from?

Enoch: only come up with 48%

J.B.: Oh, you mean in the Senate race.

Enoch: I just don't think you can--

J.B.: Where did his money come from besides organized labor?

Enoch: I don't know

[Interruption in tape. I think they change locations.]

J.B.: You say he had the extreme left and the right.

Enoch: The thing is. . . .

J.B.: how Fulbright did.

Enoch: The leadership of the right. He had some of his celebrated supporters which again really created some problems for him. He was endorsed early in the campaign by ~~J~~<sup>G</sup>erald L. K. Smith. Late in the campaign he had state representative Frank Hensley, who is going to head George Wallace's campaign in Arkansas in '76, working for him and sending out letters for him. Jim Johnson, the former supreme court justice, segregationist, was supporting him. John Norman Warknock, former head of the independent party, AIP in Arkansas, was supporting him. The chairman of the AIP in Arkansas right now endorsed him early in the campaign. You know, it really gave him problems. [Blair?] was quoted in an article I was showing you yesterday, saying that because of that we did look schizophrenic. May be.

W.D.V.: Plus he had Paul Newman and Joanne Woodward. Right?

Enoch: Not down here.

W.D.V.: Yeah, in the paper this morning it said they contributed

\$3- or \$4,000 to his campaign.

J.B.: So the issue with Fulbright is that he was perceived by his opposition as being soft on communism. The issue was really Fulbright and his record. <sup>Unrelated</sup> ~~Unrelated~~ issues. [Z] And the same thing with Faubus.

Enoch: The thing is, with Bumpers, Bumpers never. . . . The same thing would have been true with Faubus. It made no difference whether Bumpers talked about Faubus or not. For that anti-Faubus vote. It was simply there. And those people were voting on the basis of that issue. So, you know, it's really tough to talk about issues. [Unclear.]

J.B.: Was the combination of personality and. . . . Bumpers' personality vs the issue of Faubus or vs the issue of Fulbright or vs the issue of Rockefeller, really.

Enoch: Yeah.

J.B.: Hadn't Rockefeller himself become an issue to the extent that he couldn't work with the legislature. He'd had a problem with alcoholism. The other candidates were the issues, in all three cases.

Enoch: The thing is. . . . Of course Bumpers, this time, could talk in general terms about his record and performance, etc., etc. Which. . . . Most people probably could not name it very far, but the general perception was that he had done a good job, been a credible, effective governor. There are, apparently, some real misconceptions about Bumpers. I think he is. . . I don't know to what extent, but I'm sure he is to the left of his image. His image administer- ing Arkansas is not. He's probably more liberal. . . will probably be one of the more liberal Senators that we'd have with Fulbright. Across the board.

J.B.: It seems then that in Arkansas the issues really revolve

around the candidates. But they are issues. Involved in those personalities. And it's not the fact that Bumpers takes liberal positions that creates an ethos [?] involving him projects his image of integrity and trust. Am I correct? I mean that's much more significant in the voters' mind than what he's done or hasn't done in the legislature.

Enoch: He's able, has been effective. There are very few things--

J.B.: Perceived as being a bad image.

Enoch: Yes, I'd say so.

W.D.V.: Was the 35% of the vote that Faubus got and Fulbright got essentially the same vote? Did they draw from the same groups?

Enoch: No.

W.D.V.: They did not?

Enoch: No.

J.B.: Why was the right wing supporting Fulbright?

Enoch: I'm not sure that those leaders were able to bring that many along when they. . . . Just wound up with a lot of problems

W.D.V.: Are the same ones that voted for Pryor the same ones that voted for Bumpers?

Enoch: No, I don't think it would break down that way in any race. Most of Fulbright's vote would have been liberal. He got some conservative vote. He got some special interest vote. And then this is where it starts getting confused, crossing lines in terms of ideology. Fulbright has been a real friend of special interests. Agriculture, oil, bankers, financial community in general. You know, you're getting into some real conservative folks there. Fulbright's been taking care of the farmers. And they're a farmer and they're conservative. They wind up with some problems, but apparently he did pretty well over in the agricultural areas



of the state. He had the strong support of what oil industry we've got down in south Arkansas. [At least among the leaders.?] So it starts getting across lines.

W.D.V.: Aren't those the same people that support Faubus?

Enoch: No [unclear.] What percent of Fulbright's 35% that would make up I don't know, but not that great. I think most of Fulbright's vote, basically, was the liberal or the left. The moderates apparently swarmed to Bumpers. But the liberals. . . those are the same people. . . . All the people that I know, for example, who are working in Fulbright's campaign here, in Little Rock, etc., all were Faubus haters to the . Basically liberal. Probably all of them voted for Pryor.

J.B.: In state wide races at this point in Arkansas, you were suggesting last night that the Democratic primary has reverted to being paramount to election.

Enoch: Yes. And I don't see anything that can reverse that. Because it's a matter of perception. The thing is that. . . . Do you remember that newsletter we did back in January I think about the general election on the decline?

W.D.V.: I don't think so.

Enoch: The thing is, in the mid '60s, just simply looking at the pattern, the turn out, when Rockefeller started running, '64, '66, the general election started going way up in terms of turn out. The primary, down. Starting in the early '70s, that started reversing. And right now we're back, very clearly, to a situation where the people look to the primary. Which means that those people who in the late '60s nominally considered themselves Republicans <sup>had</sup> reached a point where they passed up the Democratic primary, looked to the general election and the

Republican primary, such as it was, now are coming back to the point which voters in Arkansas had always taken prior to the '60s. If you want to have a voice in government in Arkansas you got to win the Democratic primary. And the turn out just shot up this time. And I think it's going to jump drastically this fall.

JB: If it drops drastically then there is the potential--

[End of side of tape.]

J.B.: How about this one, Dale? Ken Coon is saying that if Win-Paul Rockefeller became active in Republican party affairs, visibly active, it would have a tremendously invigorating effect. His presence meaning money is available again, prestige of the name, the symbolic effect of his being in there would disspell the loser image the party is so badly tagged with and essentially would generate a great deal of enthusiasm in bringing people back in to work and having something to work for and this sort of thing. Is that a pipe dream or is that reality?

Enoch: I think that's a possibility ten years down the road. Just Winthrop Paul's presence can't make the Republicans look like winners when they're still losing. It would be disaster for him to run himself. He's simply not ready and it's going to be several years before he will be ready. For him to try to speed that process up and try to run in the very near future would be disaster for him.

J.B.: I don't think he was talking about him so much as being a candidate as just becoming active in the party.

Enoch: It would be of some value to them, but I don't think of tremendous value. I think that's a pipe dream.

J.B.: But you don't see it as a pipe dream for the long run?

Enoch: No. On the basis of that letter I was showing you yesterday, I think the indications are that Winthrop Paul is going to get active.

Some minimal value to them for a while.

Who's he going to attract? I don't see him building on the Republican base to any great extent. Until we stand out where he stands politically. Nobody knows, and from what I gather Winthrop Paul's not real sure. Based on his father's image, his appeal would be to moderates. But at this point moderates aren't looking for another home. They've got Bumpers. They've got Fryor.

J.B.: In four years they're going to have a couple of challenges to McClellan.

Enoch: The leadership of the Democratic party right now is moderate. They're not looking for anything. Back in the mid '60s, they were. They had a choice between Orval Faubus who was going out and Jim Johnson, who had just been nominated.

J.B.: There's another thing about Arkansas that strikes me as unique. That is the fact that Rockefeller was able to win really overwhelming support from blacks. Left the Democratic party without being quite stigmatized as being a black party. Never had that image. Or could never be tagged that way in Arkansas as could in some of the other southern states. Or attempts were made to do it in some other southern states.

Enoch: I think the answer lies in Arkansas' geographical situation. You know, once again, 1957 notwithstanding. 1957. The general mind, I think, tends to lump Arkansas in with Mississippi, Alabama, etc. But our traditions simply are not that similar. Eighteen percent of the people in Arkansas are black. And about roughly half the counties have some percentage of black population. You know, you've got half the state in Arkansas that is just simply not involved in the race question.

J.B.: [Unclear.] [Race feelings?]

Enoch: No, they really haven't. It's been a pretty moderate area

of the state.

J.B.: Where did Wallace get his support?

Enoch: In the delta, in the south.

J.B.: He didn't run strong at all in the other parts?

Enoch: Oh, he got some. The thing is, of course, Wallace was appealing to more than race at that point. Arkansas is still conservative.

J.B.: But Wallace wasn't running as a conservative on anything but race, was he?

Enoch: I think he was perceived as much more than just a [unclear.] I think he was perceived as stand up, send the message, the whole thing. Which had some real appeal to conservatives outside the race issue. That certainly was the biggest part of it. In Arkansas his areas of biggest support came in the areas of black concentration. looking at Rockefeller, the thing is that in those areas of heavy black vote the Republican party was perceived in those areas, to a great extent, as a black party. The delta area. The thing is, that can happen in Phillips, Mississippi, Crittenden, DeShea, Chico counties without creating a state wide image of a black party. Plus the fact, you know, Winthrop Rockefeller, just the magic of the name. He could avoid a lot of things. And there were a lot of other issues involved in the thing. He was very fortunate in his opposition as his opposition was pure segregationist.

J.B.: Was that [unclear.]

Enoch: No. Crank though was vice president of the Foreman Cement Company, Foreman, Arkansas, which is a little county way down southwest, which is a subsidiary of Arkansas and Louisiana Gas Company, which is headed by Whit Stevens. So Marion just had natural ties to everything that the old guard represented. So he was extremely vulnerable.

Even at that he was probably winning until right at the end of the campaign when they came up with the fact that he had had his family on the legislative payroll for a number of years. The Republicans hit him over the head with that the last two weeks of the campaign. Really hurt him. But his problem was still the of being very closely tied to the old guard, which was everything that Orval Faubus had represented. So Rockefeller. . . . About the next best thing to running against Faubus himself. There were some. . . . George Fisher, cartoonist. And you really ought to look at some of his stuff 'cause he's a fantastic cartoonist. He's done some beautiful stuff. One of the great cartoons of that campaign was Marion Crank standing in cement with his pants legs rolled up to his knees announcing that he was clean and not tied to anybody. Fisher has just been scathing when it comes to Faubus, the old guard, Whit. I think I've got one of his cartoons, or a couple of them, over in the office I'll show you. Beautiful stuff.

J.B.: He with the Cazette?

Enoch: No, he's independent. He has Fisher Art Service and then he does his cartoons and just syndicates them himself. I think about 10, 12, 15 newspapers in the state use him. I accused George earlier this year of paying Orval's filing fee this year, or paying for his campaign. He said "No, I just paid for his filing fee." [Laughter.] But, you know, you go back. . . '64 he ran against Orval but he really wasn't ready. In '66. . . by that point they'd had voter registration going for two years. They literally were in the process, starting in '65 and '66 carrying on into '67 and '68, of almost computerizing the state. I mean they bypassed voter registration, bypassed everything and just got on the phone and literally. . . . I think they had close to half the counties. . . . Everybody on computer. Had them catalogued.

For that '68 campaign. Fantastic operation. In '66 they were fortunate in having Jim Johnson, a racist, and in '68 Marion Grant, who was very closely tied to Whit Stevens. In 1970 they had Dale Bumpers and it was all over. And it was over the minute Bumpers got the nomination. They knew it was over. As this year, those people didn't expect it to be over--

[Interruption in tape]

--were torn.

J.B.B. This was in '72.

Enoch: '72.

J.B.: Blacks were just northern Republicans in Arkansas and here's Nixon on the ballot and no attractive state wide candidates.

Enoch: Thing is, there were two groups that wound up in this position. One was blacks, who regardless of age had been brought into the political system by Republicans and by Rockefeller. And the other were an awful lot of young people. Like this man [Bernie?] I was mentioning yesterday whose first activities came in the mid '60s with TARs, teenage Republicans, and they got real involved in the Rockefeller campaign. And all of a sudden Rockefeller's gone and they're sitting there saying "Hum, am I really a Republican?" Both these groups were really having schizophrenia in '72 and '73. By '73 interviews blacks had just

. We interviewed one black who said. . . . He had run for the legislature as a Republican. We said "What did you learn in the campaign?" He said "I learned I'll never run as a Republican again." '72 was just kind of--

J.B.: What's the effect of Nixon's southern strategy so far as Arkansas is concerned?

Enoch: None that would have any permanence. Nixon's got the votes and maybe the next Republican nominee will get it. But there's no rub

off on the local campaigns.

J.B.: Did it kill any chances of any permanent allegiance of blacks? Or was there any possibility of that anyway?

Enoch: I don't think that there really was.

W.D.V.: Is it all gone?

Enoch: No, there's still. . . . There are probably more black Republicans here than in most southern states. My impression is that most of the blacks who still identify as Republicans were the leaders, who are sticking. But they're not really leading anybody any more. Maybe a few isolated exceptions. But there are several. Sam Sparks [?], Annie Zachary over on the delta area. They were in leadership positions, but *[E doubt now]* they're leading anybody. There's just nothing else in the Republican party to attract anybody, to attract blacks. Ken's not going to have the appeal to Republican party support him. John Harris Jones sure as hell won't. Traxle's not going to have any appeal to blacks. And there aren't any Democratic nominees, at least on the major level, that repel blacks. On the ticket this fall for the Democrats, going to be Bumpers, Pryor, Joe Percell, who is generally perceived moderate. Third district, Robert Benton. [Somebody and Alexander who have not repelled blacks.] The conditions just aren't there. They're in a state of flux to some extent. One of the people in the program this year was a black attorney, female attorney from Helen Arkansas. And she and another guy from Little Rock said their real movement now was towards independence. That whole thing that blacks shouldn't be identifying with either party. Let's play it for what we can get. But it's the same situation you've got nationally. They can talk about it all they want, yet when you wind up with the choices it comes back to the Democratic party.

*[Interruption on tape.]*

J.B.: Senate and the house serve. . .

Enoch: Everybody was surprised. They were. . . .

W.D.V.: Have unattractive salaries. Why don't you have the high attrition rate that most legislatures have? Some of the states we've been in have as much as 50%.

J.B.: One, you don't have to work. . . much. You only come up here two months every two years, isn't that right?

Enoch: Everybody was expecting a huge number of candidates this year and it just fizzled. I don't know why. I haven't heard anybody who's come out with anything except theories. Politics in general has a bad name. Money. [Unclear.]

J.B.: Do the house and the senate both serve two year terms?

Enoch: The senate has four year terms, staggered. House, two year terms.

J.B.: And how many members in the senate?

Enoch: 35. 18 I think it was this year [came up for election?]

J.B.: And the house? 100. So that's sort of a lobbyist's dream. Just a 35 member senate.

Enoch: Yeah, even though it's a particularly susceptible senate. Bad body. Incidentally, a convicted felon, who's a state senator, is from Conway. Guy named Jones. He was convicted of income tax evasion. Senate won't kick him out and he won't quit. Judge gave him a three year probation and \$1,000 fine. Something like that.

J.B.: Was he up for re-election this year? Will it hurt him?

Enoch: I don't know. Be a real interesting question to see what the senate will do. Whenever they meet. There are some senators who are going to introduce a resolution to push for his removal. It will be



interesting to see what they do. Guy H. Jones. Better known as 5'2". Extremely flamboyant. Smart. Parliamentarian. Been in the legislature for [20?] years or better.

[interruption on tape.]

Enoch: [The lead in to what he's talking about is unclear.] They couldn't bring it up because they physically didn't have it. And he wouldn't give it back to them. And he just held the thing for several days. Wouldn't give them the key.

J.B.: How much reform is there going on in the legislature?

Enoch: Most of the action's been in the house. The senate just really is a depressing body.

J.B.: Oppressing?

Enoch: Depressing. What hope there is, it's in the house.

J.B.: What, some of the house people moving up into the senate?

Enoch: I don't see any hope for the senate. Again, with all its problems and its lousy image and everything else, there's hardly any opposition to [the seats that] are up this year. I think there are only about four or five contested races out of 18. The two that ran for re-election already won easily.

J.B.: Is there a key man in most counties, politically? Not so much as delivering votes as controlling power.

W.D.V.: Like the sheriff or somebody.

J.B.: Senator. How much home rule--

Enoch: In some counties.

J.B.: Most counties have some sort of governing body with some power?

Enoch: The county judge or the county sheriff generally is going to be the most powerful. But that's in the rural counties. Counties

with any urban vote at all, they're really not a power. For example this county, Faulkner [?], which is, you know, not huge, but you've got 28- 29,000 in Faulkner county. You have about 17,000 in Conway. Neither the county judge nor the county sheriff has any real power. They're not a local political force. You get up to Madison, , Searcy, Carroll, some of these, you know, some of these rural, delta counties, and the county officials have some real power. But it strictly varies from county to county. Crittenden county, which is West Memphis, is one that is still fairly well controlled, and yet the state representative over there was one of two incumbents who got defeated. Surprised me. So apparently even Crittenden is changing. Conway county is the only one that I know of that really just one person can deliver any direction he wants.

You ever heard of Gene Worges? That's where. . . . Conway county, Marlton, the Marlton Democrat [was] Gene Worges' paper. It's a lousy paper. Gene Worges is a lousy journalist. There are two weeklies in there and if you want to get an idea of what's going on you have to read both of them and come out somewhere in between. Because Worges is just on a vendetta. [Something about Hawkins.] Hawkins is close to the Pettijean Country Headlight, which is the other weekly. So everything that's dealt with over there is in terms of pro or anti Marlin Hawkins.

Worges' stories are just hilarious. They're not even news stories. His story will start out talking about the high sheriff of Conway county who is well known for his illegalities. Wild stuff like this. ~~Thix~~ His paper last week with the election returns had a picture, two column picture of Marlin Hawkins with the caption: The Big Loser. [Laughter.]

J.B.: So basically the state has a strong governor, is that right? Is that a fair characterization?

Enoch: Because it has a weak legislature. The thing is, institutionally it is not set up. . . . The constitution really doesn't provide for a strong governor. But it has been true. [Something about a weak legislature.]

J.B.: Is that to some extent the result of rotating leadership?

Enoch: You mean in the legislature?

J.B.: Yeah.

Enoch: Rotating leadership, lack of staff, lack of professionalism, lack of sessions. Boy, you know, when you ram through everything for two years, two years of legislation in 60 days, you can't give too much consideration to it.

J.B.: Do any of the other constitutional officers have any power to speak off? Beyond their obvious jurisdiction.

Enoch: The only other one would be. . . . No, no.

J.B.: None of them have any voice in writing the budget? There is no. . . . The legislature's just very weak, is that right?

Enoch: They have been. Though some of the changes. . . . I think they're going to start gaining some strength. They're not going to be at the mercy of the governor as much in future sessions as they have been. As they start implementing more of these things. . . .

J.B.: I get the impression they really have a very deep mind set in Arkansas. Spending money. Spending money for government in terms of salaries, staff and everything else. Is this something that grew out of Reconstruction?

Enoch: I don't know. But you know, they've been trying repeatedly. . . . The governor gets paid \$10,000 a year; the lieutenant governor makes \$2,500; the other constitutional officers make \$5,000.

J.B.: \$5,000!

Enoch: All county officials are limited to \$5,000 a year.

J.B.: You mean the attorney general, for example, makes \$5,000?

Enoch: Uhuh.

J.B.: What does he live on? I mean, where does his income come from?

Enoch: The secretary of state has his wife on the payroll as a \$18,000 a year administrative assistant, and her job is to greet everybody who walks in the office.

J.B.: He makes 5 and she makes 18? Does the attorney general practice law? He obviously can't live on \$5,000 a year. Who else is elected?

W.D.V.: You mean the governor is the highest paid state wide official at 10?

J.B.: The other five are. . . . The secretary of state's elected. Attorney general.

Enoch: The governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general, secretary of state, state auditor, state treasurer, ~~planning~~<sup>land</sup> commissioner.

J.B.: You mean the state auditor and the state treasurer are making \$5,000. What does the land commissioner do?

Enoch: He keeps up the state land, except he doesn't do a very good job of it.

W.D.V.: He gets 5 as well?

Enoch: Yeah. And he's overpaid. [Laughter.]

J.B.: State treasurer. Does he have regulation over banks and this sort of thing?

Enoch: No. Purely administrative job.

J.B.: How about the auditor?

W.D.V.: Is there any competition for all these jobs?

Enoch: Only in the late '60s when Rockefeller put [it over?] a

full slate.

W.D.V.: in primaries?

Enoch: No.

J.B.: Do any of them have regulatory functions?

Enoch: No. . . really, all it is is administrative.

J.B.: How does the auditor make a living? He got a farm somewhere or something?

Enoch: And the thing is. . . you know, it's appalling--

J.B.: What do judges get paid?

Enoch: Theirs is not in the constitution. So they. . . theirs can be set by the legislature. It's whatever they can get out of the legislature. Generally about \$17- 18,000.

J.B.: Even for say a supreme court judge?

Enoch: No, I think they make around 20.

J.B.: Who's the prosecuting attorney for the state? I mean what's he called?

Enoch: For the state? The thing is, we have prosecuting attorneys in each of the judicial districts.

J.B.: What are they called? Prosecuting attorneys? Are they elected?

Enoch: They're elected.

J.B.: What do they get?

Enoch: It's set by the legislature. I think that's generally \$16- 17- 18,000. But it varies and I can't tell you. . . . I think there are about three different classes, depending on size or something. But they have constantly tried. . . . Every so often they have another constitutional amendment to raise salaries. It never gets passed. John Ward tells the story that we have literally had people. . . .

[unclear]

low quality of

public officials looking at the county level. John tells about the people who have literally run for office in Faulkner county on the platform that they need the job and it pays \$5,000 a year

[Interruption in tape.]

because they've been on--

J.B.: Fee system?

Enoch: Fee system. In most counties they hold dual position of sheriff and collector and they also make some money off their tax collections. It's not reported so nobody knows for sure how much they have made.

J.B.: Is there any campaign reporting law in this state for state wide offices?

Enoch: Have to report expenditures by the candidates.

J.B.: What he spent personally.

Enoch: So, you know, it's virtually worthless. Never enforced. Now this again is an area I think we're going to have legislation introduced next year.

J.B.: How about conflict of interest, ethics legislation?

Enoch: There is state legislation in that area, but I can't tell you the provisions of it.

[End of tape. End of interview.]