

Cochran

Interview with Thad ~~Cochran~~^N, Washington, D.C., January 30, 1974, conducted by Jack Bass and Walter de Vries, transcribed by Linda Killen.

Walter de Vries:--look back over politics in Mississippi, what are some of the basic changes that you've seen during that period?

Thad ~~Cochran~~^{Cochran}: Well, I suppose there have been two or three ~~what I~~
~~would like~~ are major changes. One of which would have to be the almost disappearance of the race-baiting type campaign as a predominant style of campaigning for politicians or office seekers throughout the state of Mississippi in particular. And I'm sure this has application throughout the South. For years it just seemed. . . or at least during the 1948 to 1968 era, that 20 year period, the predominant issue it seemed in Mississippi and in most every campaign was a racial issue. Or at least the issues that were talked about were somehow related very closely to the question of segregation vs integration. And no one could be elected to political office in Mississippi unless they were right on the race question first. That was sort of the prerequisite for holding office, that someone be an announced segregationist. And one of the things that would beat a candidate very easily would be to accuse him of being an integrationist or to call him a liberal. During that period the word liberal meant integrationist. Now I think the state has grown out of that to a very large extent. So that now its not even necessary to talk about race in a political campaign. I know my campaign--as an illustration--was totally devote of any racial connotations. And almost every candidate in the race had actively sought support in the black communities, actively campaigned in the black communities. To the extent that it would have been a very negative factor for anybody to have tried to use that

as a basis for getting elected. That's a dramatic change, to me. The other is party--

W.D.V.: Excuse me. Those days are gone forever? It won't be possible in the future to push that button *and re-arouse those racial fears?*

Cochran
~~Cochran~~: Well, it may be. I suppose in a situation as we had in the race between Charles Evers and Bill Waller for governor that race was an issue. But unless it's brought out in such a way that you have a candidate who is a black or who is a part of the radical left, then it probably will not be an issue. So I don't think it's dead as an issue or it's gone or it's disappeared. It's still there. But to such a lesser extent that in many races it will not be a factor.

W.D.V.: In other words it's really not an issue any more between two white candidates in a race, but in a situation where you have a black candidate and a white candidate it might be there.

Cochran
~~Cochran~~: That's right. It would be there. The other dramatic change that I think we've seen in Mississippi--and I suppose this has application in other places--is the question of national party identification. That's a dramatic change that's underway now in Mississippi. For years, of course, everyone was called a Democrat. There were just no Republicans to speak of. The Republican party was not a factor in Mississippi politics and no one ever seriously thought that it would be. But now, all of a sudden, the national Democratic party seems to have moved too far to the left for the likes of most Mississippians. The Republican party has courted the South, in Mississippi in particular. Has given them a front rung seat at their conventions. And since the leadership of the state Republican party in our state changed from the old, what was called the black and tan Republicans to the lily white Republicans--which is a bad way to describe the two factions--the Republican party in the state has grown to include a pretty

broad spectrum of the population of the state. It's not just the silk stocking crowd in the big cities, but has attracted a lot of grass roots following. As an example, one small town in my district now--the town of Liberty--has a mayor and all of its aldermen serving as Republicans. The significance in this is that they were all incumbents and last year they ran for re-election--having been elected originally as Democrats--ran for re-election as Republicans and all were elected without opposition. This is an indication of a switch in allegiance, I suppose, and wanting it publicly known that they would like to be thought of as being on the right side of the political spectrum rather than on the left side. And they didn't want anybody to misunderstand where they were ideologically. So this is a dramatic change that's taken place, not only in the fact that we elected two Republican Congressmen in Mississippi in the last year but that there are numerous local office holders throughout the state that now call themselves Republicans and admit that they're Republicans and run for office on the Republican ticket. That's very interesting and dramatic.

W.D.V.: --thought there might be three changes. Is there another basic change?

~~Cochran~~ Cochran: Well, I suppose the other change is, coupled with race as an issue, the people are now demanding more from their office holders and the politicians than just rhetoric. The people are becoming a little more sophisticated now and they want candidates to discuss some of the real problems that do face the state and try to address themselves to solving these problems. We've been an economically depressed area for an awful long time. The people of Mississippi now have gotten up to a point socially and economically where they are aware of other regions of the country moving ahead quite rapidly economically. This has caused some impatience and some

re-examining of our own way of life down there in an effort to determine whether we're on the right track or not. And it's generally agreed there that we need to get moving. That Mississippi has been just sort of sitting on its haunches talking about issues that really weren't issues, or at least they didn't effect the progress of the state as they should. So now it's time for us to get going and try to solve some of our economic problems. Try to get some better planning done as far as industrial development in the state is concerned. To get involved in the national political scene, which we sort of just watched for--well, since 1948. To make an impact if we can on the direction of national policies. In other words, the state is maturing to the point that we feel like we need to have a part of the action. Politically and economically. And that it's time for our political leaders to begin thinking in this fashion rather than having an isolationist viewpoint. Which really characterized Mississippi and Mississippi politics probably since 1930.

W.D.V.: Do you think this responsiveness, tightening of social consciousness is related to removal of race as one of the issues in the political dialogue of the state?

Cochran
~~Cochran~~: Yes it is. That's right.

Jack Bass: I talked to Clarke Reed recently. We'll see him longer when we get to Mississippi, but I saw him in Atlanta.

Cochran
~~Cochran~~: At the Southern Republican Conference?

J.B.: Right. He has indicated that southern Republicans lean more toward the center from the political right. Would you agree with that?

Cochran
~~Cochran~~: I haven't noticed that change. But then Clarke has been involved in party politics and with the Mississippi Republican party for many years. And I never really have been involved in party politics, at all, until I ran for Congress. So I really don't have a basis for disagreeing or

agreeing with him. You know, some of my best friends were Republicans, but I didn't really consider myself one and I didn't participate in the party politics at all.

J.B.: How did you get active in the Republican party?

^{TC}
~~Garcera~~: Well, I suppose the first involvement that I had was that in 1968, during the presidential campaign of that year, I served as executive director of Mississippi citizens for Nixon-Agnew. This was not a party organization or a party campaign. It's just that Raymond Brown, from down in Pascagoula, Mississippi, who had been active in the Republican party in national circles, asked me to work with him and set up a state-wide citizens organization. So I went with him to Indianapolis to an organizational meeting that year, the summer before the election, and became involved in that fashion. That was my first involvement with any Republican candidate for office. After that time I didn't do anything for the Republican party or for any of its candidates until this vacancy occurred in our Congressional delegation because of the retirement of Charlie Griffin, who was a young fellow, about 45 years old, and just decided he wouldn't run again. I thought very seriously about being a candidate for Congress as a Democrat. I'd thought about running as a Democrat, I'd thought about running as a Republican. Then a few people who were involved in the Republican party talked to me about running as a Republican and I decided that was the thing to do. So I ran, and to everybody's surprise and to mine too I was elected.

W.D.V.: Getting back to Jack's question, if you would look at yourself in comparison to your Republican colleagues in the Congress, do you think they're more conservative than you, are they moving more to the middle, are they staying about the same? Southern Republicans in the Congress.

TC
Gorcoran: Well, the southern Republicans, I think, are more conservative as a group than all of the House Republicans. I would consider myself as being pretty well in the middle of the Republicans in the House. I think there are many who are more conservative than I am. I consider myself a conservative. There are many who are more liberal. I really feel as though I fit in the middle. There is not, really, though, that great a difference in ideology between the southern Republicans and the entire Republican group in the House, in my opinion. Some of the most conservative members of the Republican party in the House are from Michigan and California and Indiana or Illinois. So that there are examples that you can look at from around the country that would indicate that maybe there isn't that much difference between the South as a region, philosophically, and the other part of the country as far as the Republicans are concerned.

W.D.V.: Let's say in the 11 delegations from the South, the Republicans are generally more conservative than the Democrats.

TC
Gorcoran: That's right. As a general statement that has to be true. Than the Democrats? Oh, yes, that's correct.

W.D.V.: Do you think that that's the direction of the Republican party in the South in terms of the Congressional delegations?

TC
Gorcoran: Yes I do. I think that we can look for that to be a continuing fact. That the Republicans will be the more conservative members; that the Democrats will be the more liberal members.

W.D.V.: Do you see kind of a realignment of the two parties?

TC
Gorcoran: I do, I do. The differences between the Republican party members as a whole and the Democrat party members as a whole--not only in the South but particularly from other parts of the country--is very acute. And it's apparent to me, now that I'm up here, that there is a significant difference between the philosophy of the Republican members of the House and

the Democrat members of the House. That the Republicans are more conservative. This, more than anything else, once it becomes apparent to people in the South, is going to re-enforce the growth of the Republican party in the South. Because the southerners are and are going to continue to be more conservative than the other regions of the country.

W.D.V.: --most of the members from the South, Republican members, are younger, are freshmen, or haven't been here too long. But they are generally more conservative than the others?

TC
Gorcoran: I don't think that the younger members are necessarily more conservative than the others. Do you mean by others, other Republicans--others outside the South? Other Republicans outside the South?

W.D.V.: Yes, other Republicans. You see there's really not much of a tradition in the South to compare the Republican members.

TC
Gorcoran: I don't know. I don't think, really, that just youth is the factor. It may be that an accurate parallel can be drawn there. I'm not aware of that.

W.D.V.: The reason I asked that is we just finished an interview where it was suggested to us that the younger Democratic members from the South tended to be more socially conscious or more liberal--whatever you want to call it--than the older Democratic members. What I wanted to get at is the reverse true for the Republicans?

TC
Gorcoran: No, I don't think that's true. I think that the younger members generally, whatever the party, are going to be more socially conscious, if you want to use that term, than the older members. I don't know why. Maybe we grew up in a different era. We grew up in a time of turbulent change. We don't have, maybe, some of the old prejudices built in hang-ups that maybe some of the older members have, whether they're Democrat or Republican. We're part, maybe, of what has been called the New

South. The new image. We're part of the South's progress, rather than part of the South's past. We want to be a part of the future and get a piece of the action economically and politically. So we are concerned with different things. We're not preoccupied with maybe some of the older ideological bugaboos that troubled some of the older members.

J.B.: What do you see as the major social problems that need to be resolved in so far as Mississippi is concerned and the South in general? But specific to Mississippi.

^{TC}
~~Coreoran~~: Well, of course, is dealing with social problems our main problem still remains a problem of good, healthy race relations. The other social problems--that may be considered social by some people--are in my opinion economic problems rather than social problems. I don't see government as an entity which has the responsibility really for curing individual social problems. It may very well be that if government would address itself to some of the economic problems that these social problems would tend to cure themselves. Or at least people who were aware of the need to deal on individual basis with social problems would be able to help solve those problems. But government, through its leadership and through the elected representatives, can set a tone and can set a pattern and can, by example, through these elected officials create an environment which would be conducive to good social relationships. This is a major role, in my opinion, for elected leaders to play in improving social conditions generally.

W.D.V.: What do you think the Republican party in Mississippi is going to do in terms of state-wide office? Not presidential voting and not Congressional, but state-wide. Governor on down.

^{TC}
~~Coreoran~~: It's difficult to anticipate what's going to happen. Our next state races occur in 1975. It is probable that there will be candidates for state offices on the Republican ticket. The success that they have

is going to depend, in my opinion, in large measure on the ability of the individual candidate rather than the ability of the party itself. The Republican organization throughout the state is still young and basically untested. The first state-wide Republican primary we've had in Mississippi since Reconstruction was held last year, when Gil Carmichael and James Meredith were the Republican candidates for the Senate. And then we had the race between Gil Carmichael and Jim Eastland in the general election. It was significant that Gil Carmichael received as large a vote as he did, but I'm not sure that the size of that vote can be used to say conclusively that the party has arrived as a state-wide political force. To the extent that it could, for instance, elect a governor in 1975. So much of the success of the party in the state has been related, in my opinion, to the success of individual candidates rather than as a party organization that it's really difficult to say where they are. Or where we are. In the state. After 1975 we'll know an awful lot more about it. But right now there are changes under way and being considered in the state which might impede or might accelerate the force that the Republican party will have in 1975. The state legislature at this time is in session and considering the adoption of an open primary bill, which would abolish party primaries. It's thought by the proponents of the legislation that this will help the established Mississippi Democrat party machinery continue to control the state-wide and state elected offices and that it will prevent the Republican candidates from winning in these races. I don't know what the outcome of it will be. It will just simply mean that every candidate would run in one primary. You could put the party label by your name, but you would run in one primary. It's like, really, abolishing all primaries and just having a general election and having a run-off between the top two to see who wins.

J.B.: In other words, you're really going back to the old Democratic

primary being tantamount to election. . . .

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: That's right. The Attorney General would have to approve that and I understand that--

W.D.V.: Is that constitutional?

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: Well, I don't know. This is a question that I know will be raised. Charles Evers, who is a factor down there. He's a constituent of mine. He's in my district. Will probably be opposed to that. Even if the legislature passes it I'm sure someone will file suit, contest the constitutionality of it and maybe get it overturned. So, anyway, the reason I mention that is to illustrate the established Mississippi party machinery feels threatened and they are taking some action, whether it's the best action in their behalf I don't know. But they are threatened, or at least they feel so, to the extent that they would abolish the primary system and would establish this open primary. Another example of what they're trying to do is to establish a state-wide preferential primary for selecting delegates to national conventions. And the national committeeman and committee woman. State party chairman. State party finance chairman. And members of the state executive committee. Of each party. Would be elected by popular vote. State-wide election. Now these are two dramatic demonstrations of how they feel threatened.

W.D.V.: If the present system did not change, you would think about the only way a Republican candidate could win would be on the *national ticket?*

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: That's right. I don't think you can. Not in a Congressional race or not in a gubernatorial campaign or campaign for any state-wide office.

W.D.V.: Republican victories are still a function of personality more than party.

^{TK}
~~Corcoran~~: To a large extent that's true, but there are isolated examples that can be shown where that is not true. One little example that comes to mind immediately is an election that was held at the same time my election was held for election commissioners. Which is just about the smallest office there is. We elect by popular vote in each county county election commissioners--people that hold elections. And in my home county, Hines County, which is where Jackson is, the local Republican party had a slate of candidates for election commissioner. All of whom were elected. Now that's the kind of office where the person that goes into the poll to vote does not really know on a personal basis the candidates. There's no money spent on the race to amount to anything. The people who were occupying those offices were fine people as far as I know. It's just that they got beat because they were Democrats. And the Republicans got elected because they were Republicans. I'm not saying they got elected on my coattails. But it was a combination of the presidential election. These were the only things on the ballot. You voted for the president, the Senator, the Congressman and the election commissioners. And those Republican election commissioners won. With the active support of the local Republican party organization. They did a lot of work to elect those election commissioners. And this could happen, I suppose, in some isolated places in the state. But not on a state-wide basis.

J.B.: What was the reaction of Republicans in Mississippi to the president's more or less endorsement of Sen. Eastland in his race?

^{TK}
~~Corcoran~~: The Republicans were upset and disappointed that the president did not endorse Gil Carmichael.

J.B.: Did it set back the development of the party?

^{TK}
~~Corcoran~~: I don't think it had any effect on the development of the party. It may have had a reverse effect and could be argued to have been a

factor in Carmichael receiving as many votes as he did. There was this sympathy and compassion that built up for the man, who was running in a state-wide race against the president pro tem of the Senate, as a Republican, who ought to have been able to count on the national ticket to help him. And they turned against him and for no real reason. No apparent reason. To the people. So there may have been a sympathy backlash in his favor.

J.B.: Did Carmichael get any substantial black vote against Eastland?

^{TC}
~~Coreoran~~: He did in some areas. But Sen. Eastland had a substantial majority of the black vote in the delta areas and in some of the counties in my district. I have some totals there and I thought I'd refresh my memory, but you all have access to all of that. No need to take up this time with that. I doubt if it could be said that Carmichael got a majority of the black vote. I think Eastland probably did.

W.D.V.: As the Republican party grows in Mississippi *will the new*
Republicans be dissident, conservative Democrats? Will that become the basis of attracting people to the Republican party?

^{TC}
~~Coreoran~~: That will account for a lot of the growth. There is, among the younger people in the state, the 25-45 age group, a large number of them who are part of the Republican party growth who never were identified with the Mississippi Democrat establishment or who never felt as though they were a part of the political process in the state. So I suppose from both groups we can point to the basis for the party growth. It's a combination of the two.

J.B.: In your own analysis after your election, what percentage of the ~~white~~ ^{black} vote you got?

^{TC}
~~Coreoran~~: I got, I think, about 25-30% of the black vote in my district. Which was substantially higher than either of the other two Congressional candidates got in their districts. We had a Congressional

race up in the second district between a fellow named Carl Butler, who was running as a Republican, against David Bowen. Bowen got virtually all of the black votes there. And in the southern district Trent Lott, running against Ben Stone. . . Ben Stone got virtually all of the black vote as the Democrat candidate there. But in my district, even with a black running as an independent--who ran a strong race--he received 9% of the total vote, 10%. About 11,000 votes. I received, particularly insome areas, like Hines County and Adams County, where Natchez is, I received a substantial black vote. In some of the counties I didn't get any, it didn't seem. In some of the river counties, Clayborne County and Jefferson County, I got a very poor vote in the black areas. But that relates, I think, to the manner of the individual campaigns. Because in thinking back over it, in Hines County I actively campaigned in every community in the county and with every group. And I did the same in Adams County, actively soliciting the votes of the black community. And had black people actively involved in the campaign. But because of lack of time and lack of political organization, I was unable towage that same type campaign in some of the other counties. So in the counties were I did campaign in the black communities I received large black votes. Maybe not a majority, but a significant number of votes. And where I didn't campaign, I didn't receive any votes. So it may have been due to just lack of activity in those counties. It's going to be difficult though, and it is in my district--and I realize this--for a Republican candidate to receive a majority of the black vote. There's this predisposition on the part of the black voter to vote for the Democrat candidate. So the Republican candidate has to really do something, demonstrate his desire to serve the interests of the black community, show his willingness and interest in communicating with the black community, in order to overcome the prejudice against his candidacy because he's running

as a Republican. Where that's not demonstrated, he's not going to get any votes to amount to anything.

W.D.V.: Why do you think you won? You said you were surprised.

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: Well, I was, in that. . . in looking at it from the point when I announced, which was February 16th in 1972, it was difficult to imagine that I would win. But in looking at the campaign two months before the vote, it was not altogether surprising to me and to a lot of people. But as it turned out, it was a race between a young person who did not have any political history therefore no political enemies, who had been involved in community activities and as an attorney and had been successful in both endeavors, with not much name identification, against one of the representatives of the existing political establishment. And it was at a time when the focus was on national politics and not local politics, which permitted a dialogue about national parties, the difference between them, where the future of Mississippi lay as far as identification with a party or involvement in national party politics. And it was a commodity that was sellable. I could sell myself as someone who could go to Congress and remain there for at least 20 years and establish seniority, which would mean better things for the state, as against someone who was almost 20 years my senior--not quite, really. 15 years my senior. That was a difference. And the other difference was his going to Washington shackled to supporting the national Democrat leadership in the House, which was not interested in serving the interests of the people of Mississippi. I could say. And shackled to support of national party nominees with whom he could not agree on most issues. Or at least if he would, he should say that he would. There was just a lot to talk about that made the people stop and think about the party label and what it really meant for a member of Congress. So that the combination of those things, resulted in my being elected. It was a close

race. I think there were only about 6,000 votes difference out of about 130 some odd case between us.

J.B.: Not long after you got elected I believe you appointed a black aide to your staff who was well known in the community and received a considerable amount of attention at the time. Have you gone back into the black community since that election?

~~Cereoran~~¹: Yes, I have. Not to a large extent. But I do try to remain in contact with people in the black community. Of course the difficulty with getting back with any group once you get up here in the Congress is lack of time. I try to get home once a month. And it is extremely difficult to do as many things as you would like to do when you get back home. You can't possibly stay as close to the people once you're in office as you did during the campaign. And this is a difficulty. It requires an awful lot of effort to keep the faith with the people that you were close to in the campaign once you are away from them and in Washington doing a job that they elected you to do. So I've had difficulty getting back with all the people as much as I would like to. I have advisory committees that I think have been a good help to me. And I've tried to involve representatives of the black community and various economic groups on my county advisory committees. There'll be six or eight people whom I'll ask to serve as members of the advisory committee and I call them from time to time and try to meet with them periodically to discuss local needs and interests and views on national politics and legislation that may be pending in Congress. To try to keep that liaison which is so important for this office. Because this job is really the only--this position is really the only conduit the people back there have to the issues of the day in Washington. And if they don't have a voice through this office they don't have a voice at all. I'm here, really, to represent their views and their needs and I feel as though

personal communication is immensely important.

J.B.: What's your general attitude towards such programs as food stamps, low income housing, medicare, medicaid, head start, OEO? This type of program.

~~Corcoran~~^{TC}: Well, basically, I start from the premise that each individual person has the obligation to take care of himself economically. Based on that, then, I feel as though a person's own needs for housing, for making a living, for supporting his family, for paying his doctor bills are his own personal responsibility and not the responsibility, particularly, of the federal government. But at the same time, there are people who, because of physical handicaps and for other reasons, are simply unable to provide for their own needs. In those cases where the person is so handicapped or is so unable to take care of himself, then the government should, in my opinion, provide resources for him, should provide means of a livelihood for that individual. I think that in many cases our federal programs of assistance have involved the expenditure of more money than has been. . . than could be efficiently spent in these areas. At the same time, the responsibility of the government is clear. We do have to have some of these programs. They are needed. And so generally I would support the programs. I do think that there is waste in connection with many of them. There is a great deal of suspicion among the people back in my district and state that some of these programs are giving away too much money to people who don't really need it but are using these programs as a means to avoid having to shoulder their own responsibility for their living. And this is a problem. It's a problem in education. It's a problem in trying to sell the real need for some of the programs. In other words, what I've said would not be popular for me to say back home.

J.B.: Which of these programs have you voted for or against?

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: Well, I really haven't had a real opportunity to vote for creating any of them because all of them are programs that have been created in the past, before I got here. I have had to vote on appropriations of money to them and I don't really recall whether I have voted for or against the appropriations. I have voted for some, I know. And I may have voted against some. I really don't know. When an appropriation bill comes out on a House floor, though, it's very seldom narrowly drawn. The way the appropriations bills are more often presented is in a package, so that at the same time we're voting for money for the food stamp program you are voting for money to pay your own salary. Or some other combination of proposals that prevents your ever having to or prevents your opportunity to take a position for or against one narrow program, like housing, or like food stamps. The food stamp appropriation is in the agriculture bill. And if you vote against the agriculture bill, you'd be voting against all the farm subsidies and benefits. And it's even labels the Consumer Protection Act or something. Agricultural and Consumer Protection Act of 1973. It had a beautiful name to it. It's not the Food Stamp bill. That's an interesting thing I discovered when I got up here.

J.B.: Is there anything we didn't discuss that you want to get into?

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: No. You found out more than I know, from me.

[End of side of tape.]

J.B.: Why do you think there's so much more support for the president in the South than elsewhere?

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: Well, I think there's a historical reason. The only time our country's ever been faced with this impeachment cry and talk was back when Andrew Johnson was impeached. And at that time it was purely a political game being played. Johnson was a friend of the South or was trying to be moderate. He was not acceptable to the northern Republican liberal

establishment. So maybe people grew up down there remembering that and some of the older people may have heard their fathers or grandfathers talk about it. And maybe that has something to do with the view that the impeachment of the president is something engineered by the radical left, which, therefore, is against the best interest of the people of Mississippi. Another, though, and probably more real reason, is that President Nixon received a tremendous vote in Mississippi. 79% of the vote in '72. And the people feel as though their vote should not be cancelled out by the action of the Congress. Particularly when it is their view there that the national press has pushed the issue, maybe created the issue. One other sort of sidelight effect is that the national press is not popular in Mississippi and it hasn't been since the days when the people in Mississippi would be watching the evening news and the only time they would ever hear anything about Mississippi or see any of their friends on tv would be in connection with an expose of the rank injustice and backward views of Mississippi and its people. You watch that and you read the papers and you read what has been said in the New York Times and the Washington Post and the other big papers up east about you, as a Mississippian, and it's always critical. And being there, and knowing the people that you do, and growing up with them and knowing that they're not all bad, but most of them are better than the people that write that stuff. . . . They have a real serious distrust if not dislike for the people that are writing the network copy and that are writing the stories in the big Post and Times. So when the Times and Post and the networks come out with accusations against President Nixon and telling us that he ought to resign and that sort of thing, the people down there might just automatically react with the opposite. . . . There's a suspicion that they may not be telling the whole story or that they are so prejudice against what's right that we should do just the opposite of what

they're suggesting we should do. That may, in fact, be the most significant reason why they are opposed to the impeachment or resignation and why they continue to support him. There are exceptions to it, but generally you're right in that Mississippi and the South, probably, as a region, there's more support for the president than anywhere else in the country.

J.B.: He's viewed as somebody that is friendly to the South and, as a Republican legislator from South Carolina told me at Atlanta, the people who support him in the South view him as being--I think the term he used was being beleaguered by the same people who used to beleaguer us. You would agree with that?

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: That's right. That's an accurate view of it.

J.B.: Is there anything else?

^{TC}
~~Corcoran~~: No.

[End of interview.]