

~~Gillary~~
Ferrel Gillary

December 11, 1973

F.G.: I can tell you about the election what I know about it but as far as citing trends.

J.B.: We understand that. We are really more saying that this is one of the things which we are seeking but in the last year and one half which has been a very important time and you know what is happening and you've read enough to put it in some perspective

F.G.: Ask me specific questions about what you want so I don't run all over the place.

J.B.: How do you analyze the senate race in 1972? And also what you've heard.

F.G.: My view of it is that it was a special case of "the right person in the right place at the right time". By right I mean the pun in all. I think the politicians around, the ones I've talked to, even the Republicans, consider it a case of their party, Republican Party, putting up a guy who had a particular attraction to a region, the East, that their party had never done well in and that they overcame that simply because ^{Jesse} ~~Jessie~~ Helms first off had built in exposure there and ^{Jesse's} ~~Jessie's~~ people will tell you that they went into rural counties and in a fact exploited his having been on the air, the word of mouth and the way they campaign was to accentuate that this is the guy that you've been seeing on television or that you've been hearing over the ~~XXXX~~ tobacco network, TN or whatever they call it out there. He was just a person and I think he won because he did well in the East and I think it was a case of his ultra-conservatism, his seeming to speak the frustrations of the people out there. It just carried it and I don't think it's any grand strategy about it that you could point to. Particular things like his McGovern Galonfinactus ads where he wrote him as one word and that kind

of stuff helped a little and I suppose the Nixon helped a little.

J.B.: Is McGovern galonfinactus just one word?

How much of his appeal is based on race?

F.G.: It's my view almost all of it, but ~~X~~ that's a biased view there. I think that the racial issue had a lot to do with it.

J.B.: Kind of rock bottom you might say.

F.G.: I think that deep down, if you really get down to it, ^{Jesse}~~Jessie~~ Helms was going to take the cheats off welfare, he's going to get the federal government out of our business, and he's going to stop bussing and he's going to return things to local control and all that kind of stuff and I just think that deep down he was..that's it. He talked about foreign affairs, he talked about his relationship to Nixon, he talked about a lot of that. But I think deep down his race symbolized ~~XX~~ and his winning was a symbol of of the racial issues still having an appeal in the south. I think other races show that other people can overcome that by running a good campaign or by going to certain issues but I think ^{Jesse}~~Jessie~~ Helms, I think the race issue there was a very heavy factor.

W.D.: Then is there a special case? He won on the basis of race or racial causes?

F.G.: I think he's a special case in terms of the way he's a special case in that he won as a Republican. Okay. I think ^{Jesse}~~Jessie~~ Helms could have won in the other party. Okay. I say a special case because he's the first Senator elected in 72 years as a Republican. Okay. And I think that the reason that he won that was that by being ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ a special case as a Republican. You understand what I mean? Okay. But

W.D.: So you think that the racial politics would have been enough in either case, either as the Democrat or as the Republican to have won it?

F.G.: It's my guess, yes. Totally yes.

J.B.: That's assuming one could have gotten a Democratic nominee on that slate. How big of a factor.

F.G.: You know Wallace won a primary. I think he was appealing to the same people. I haven't looked at each precinct he won and Wallace won. I guess I could spend a few days doing that but that would be something for you to look into where his vote was and where Wallace's vote was. He probably could have won ~~XX~~ a Democrat, given his exposure and everything else.

W.D.: So I would suggest to you that the Democratic Party/ⁱⁿ1974 with any kind of candidate is going to want it back. That will not be another special case with a Republican elected as the senator in this state.

F.G.: Yes, but the Republicans keep telling me they can win with somebody like ^{Mizell}~~Mizell~~. I don't think they can. I think the Democrats ~~X~~ run a smart race, they can beat

J.B.: How big a factor was the

F.G.: I haven't seen any of their polls. Okay. But their polls say that Mizell is close enough to Ervin that they can beat. They feel that Mizell can pull the East too, not so much on a racial issue, though I'm sure that would have something to do with it, there too, I'm sure he could make a racial.

W.D.: of ^{Jesse}~~Jessie~~ Helms?

F.G.: Not exactly with ^{Jesse}~~Jessie~~ Helms, but close enough to it. I could see Mizell running a campaign I could work well with ^{Jesse}~~Jessie~~. I can see him going out East and telling his baseball stories and saying I'm one of you.

~~X~~ And I think the undercurrent of race could be there, too. I don't see the Republican Party making a poor man's economic campaign out of these. I just don't see him doing that in my view and people that I talk to don't talk about it in the blantant terms that I'm talking, but I think all the code words and the undertones are there.

J.B.: So getting back to what Key~~man~~ said, it's overall about the South about race being the basic factor in elections. Do you think that's changed substantially?

F.G.: I don't know about the south as a whole. I suppose it's in the process of changing. I don't think it's been left out yet. In North Carolina you said it was different, and North Carolina was more progressive, and North Carolina race wasn't much of an issue and North Carolina was a great progressive state. Do you think that still holds?

F.G.: From what I can tell I think North Carolina's progressive image is more outside the state than inside the state. North Carolina's image increases the further you get away from it.

J.B.; In other words, North Carolina is not really that different.

F.G.: I found a lot of stuff here that I didn't expect, the low wages, I'm totally unprepared for the low wages that they pay here. Textile industry and all that. As much as I've read about it I was just totally unprepared of that. To be honest with you. I'd been led to expect, and I suppose it's true if you compared a lot ~~X~~ of things, that North Carolina State Government is progressing, moving forward and everything, and I suppose that Sanford and Bob Scott and ~~Bob~~^{Kerr} Scott were progressive men and within Republicans Jim Holshouser I think fairly a progressive guy but I think the government as a whole and especially the general assembly and you got to focus on it a little too, because what it says becomes law no matter what the governor says about it, he doesn't have the veto power, he can't succeed himself so there is no way to test by the vote or all those kind of things. What the governor proposes other than by the general assembly. In this state the governor comes in at the beginning of the session, he makes a speech, and then he can pull and tug, he can trade jobs, try to convince

people one way or the other. But when it comes down to it, the power's in the general assembly because it passes law and when the speaker or the lt. governor as presiding officer of the senate says I order this bill enrolled, it becomes law. It doesn't make any difference what the governor says or anything else. As soon as they do that it is law. My experience with the legislature now runs about a year and I don't find a whole heck of a lot of vision there. ~~They~~ There are some good people in there, some good young people who if they emerge as leaders and all that kind of stuff could make a significant effect on the state. But I find the legislature much more conservative than the progressive image of the state leads you to expect. Their rhetoric notwith^hstanding because I find this state - ~~Keith~~ Key talks about it about how it's oriented to businessmen and all that kind of stuff and how the business sort of ethic has sort of kept it honest but at the government has always protected the business interests of the state I find it sort of works another way too, in my experience. ~~They're~~ They're always worried about the bond market and about whether we can sell our bonds and whether we stay with the budget has to be balanced, but ~~how~~ how they estimate tax collections very conservatively, how they're very careful to balance out. And we get all this talk about can we live within our means, or can we afford to float bond issue, or do we have a triple A bond rating and all that, and there is no connection between all that talk and the fact about half the blacks according to a study I was just looking at, in the state live in substandard housing, about 400,000 families in this state live in substandard housing. You don't get any relationship to this conservative financial thing and how that affects whether you're paying teachers enough or whether mental health care here is adequate enough. They ~~also~~ always worried first about the bond market, about the conservative financial estimates, and all that instead of, in my view, they ought to switch it around

they ought to see what people need first, and then work that out. So that they set up a housing corporation for four years ago, and they didn't put the faith and credit of the state behind the bonds or anything. They made the bonds, they backed the bonds with the mortgages they sold. Big deal, that's no power to go out there and solve problems. It was a very conservative sound ~~X~~ financial thing. So how much housing did they provide, \$250,000 worth of loans, that's all, nothing, practically nothing. So that's how I see the general assembly. You know, it's a very limited sort of group of people because they don't take a big vision of things, they don't - they just see what they can work out, what they can get by with. They don't have a good staff, the lobbyists there have great power, not because ~~they~~ buy and sell ~~X~~ but just because they are the only people there with information and the regular folks in the state just don't have any voice up there, don't have any on-going way to get their views and needs known.

J.B.: What are the most powerful lobbies in the state?

F.G.: I think the banks are undoubtedly the most powerful. Senator Gordon Allen said the other day that in the '73 session there was a bill to put collision coverage in a plan to shift from the assigned risk plan to what they call a facility plan. It~~XX~~ was a distinction between way how to handle high risk drivers the details are unimportant. Well, anyway the banks oppose putting collision under the thing because the banks run a lot of these side firms that have collision. Well, anyway, something Gordon Allen said that over one week-end, from Fri. when the session was over to Monday night when it was 39 votes out of 50just cut it out. That's not bad.

J.B.: Who would be number two?

F.G.: Well, I don't know if the banks are number one but they're pretty high up there. Number two, I don't know. Textile people keep a low profile

but the state takes care of it as much as it can.

J.B.: How about tobacco people?

F.G.: I don't know. In my experience they haven't been overpowering at all. Bob Scott got the tobacco tax through and the legislature has withstood pressure to take it off. That's the only thing in my experience. They are obviously aren't going to do anything to endanger the tobacco interests and they all run around with little tobacco leaves in their ties saying that I say support cancer and all that kind of stuff. But they aren't going to do any of that. Textiles, you remember when I was telling you about when Holshouser meeting with those southern chairmen when they went up to Wash. and Clark Reid went up there? He said in the interview I had with him the other day that that was one of the main things that he was involved in ^{that} and was assuring/~~the~~ federal policy took care of the tobacco growers and textiles. You know the import fight they had in the early days

J.B.: I ~~h~~ presume the electric utilities is a powerful lobby, insurance industry.

F.G.: No, the insurance industry I wouldn't say. Insurance industries is sort of mixed. The attorneys there have been able to fight the insurance people off. The insurance people have been the ones supporting the no-fault insurance thing. But they haven't gotten it passed. And if they were as powerful as the banks or utilities it certainly would have gotten passed. I don't see a lot of activity in the utilities in the general assembly but I think it's clear that the utilities have a lot of force in other agencies of the state.

J.B.: Who are the real powers in the legislature?

F.G.: There are very few real leaders. I

J.B.: If I were a guide of representative of special interests and really had some legislation I wanted to get through who would I do see?

F.G.: Jim Ramsey you'd go see first, the speaker of the house, Roxboro, Person County. He's got ambitions I guess to run state-wide in '76 probably for governor. Ramsey's undoubtedly an important man.

J.B.: What the source of his power, as speaker of the house, he's able to do what, appoint committees?

F.G.: Yes, he appoints committees and names the chairmen. The speaker, too, as I understand it has been traditionally sort of been the leader, too. The caucus leader. When the Democrats have a caucus the majority leader named William Watkins from Granville County presides over the meetings. Because everybody knows that Watkins is Ramsey's man and they work very close together. And it's pretty clear that Ramsey's the central man there. So that he has sort of an intangible power you know, to set the agenda, to know~~xxx~~ what's going to be discussed, this tax reduction package that they voted the other day Ramsey was the one behind that. I think it's fairly clear about that.

W.D.: Could I ~~hx~~ ask you a little bit about Holshouser?

F.G.: Yes, let me just name a few other important people. Ramsey is pretty important. Liston Ramsey is sort of middle important. He's from the mountains, he's the chairman of the finance committee of the house. The Senate, Gordon Allen is important. He's the majority leader.

J.B.: He's more important than the finance chairman?

F.G.: In a way, yes. He's from Person County. Ralph Scott from the Senate is a fairly important guy. He's not going to, I'm not sure that special interests people are going to go get him too often because he's a very

independent guy, but he's the chairman of the appropriations committee and a very shrewd political sort ~~wh~~ within the assembly. I'll talk about Jim Hunt later, because he's a special case.

W.D.: First he's the first Republican governor in 74 years. What's happened in other states is that when a Republican governor does get elected there is a certain period of reform that occurs. Looking back over this year, has the Republican administration been able to make as much reform as you think it should have (a) (b) would the situation have been an different with Democratic or Republican. In other words I'm trying to get that it seems to me that in the first year of this guys in office he makes his major moves from now on in terms of the legislature, it's got to be down hill. At least~~x~~ it's got to be coasting, I may be wrong on that.

F.G.: You'd better give him another year on that. Well, I'll explain that.

W.D.: Did we have the kind of social change that you thought we were going have and I think the people ~~W~~ of this state thought they were going to have?

F.G.: Not the kind that I would have wanted. Okay. Whether it was what I thought we were going to have. I don't know. Well, let me start again. Give me ~~q~~ question a again that I answered no to immediately.

W.D.: Did you have the kind of change in this year that ~~XXXX~~ you thought they were going to have?

F.G.: That I thought they were going to have? Political change, yes, social change, no. I knew they were going to shake things up a little bit, yes. I think that was clear from the beginning.

W.D.: What about the direction of state policy in education, in mental health, in roads, and so on.

F.G.: I don't see it going too many places, yet. He's proposed a new roads plan and we'll see how it works out. Let me just go back to square one and

kind of watch out about him. I don't know if it would have been much different with Skipper. Okay, obviously Skipper has some stuff in education that he would have liked to have done that Holshouser is certainly not going to do, whether Craig Phillips can do it or not is another thing. It is obvious that Skipper would have allowed Craig Phillips to do it or would have sought the authority of Craig Phillips to do it. And he, Skipper may not have wanted everything that he wanted to but he would have made the effort and the issue would have come out in the public discussion much more forcefully these folks here in the editorial department would have still fought it but I think Skipper would have accomplished some of it if not all of it. There was a lot of money last time, well, there still is a lot. The legislature was in the mood to ~~spend~~ spend a lot of money for education as they proved but if the Democrat would have been elected you would have seen the spending on a different priority scale within the education budget. I think if a Democrat would have been elected you obviously wouldn't had the political the seeming political turmoil that at least appears to be envelopedI think a lot of the fights would have been on the issues themselves as opposed to on whether he's a Republican, of course and all that kind of stuff. I think Bowles would have given a different tone to the government under Bowles, but I don't think it would have been the same tone as Bob Scott but it would have been different from what Holshouser has made it. Now Holshouser--in my columns and everything I have probably been fairly kind to him from this perspective--if you are going to have a Republican you might as well have one like him. I sense a sort of tension within the Republican Party of the State. Nobody admits to it, but it is sort of a tension between the bedrock

Republic~~ans~~ans (Holshouser from the mountains, you know, came up through his father was a Republican and his grandfather was, I suppose; and his grandfather before that). So you have that sort of oldtime traditional Republican. Then you've got the suburban Republicans who ~~xxxxxxx~~ split between the two camps that I'm getting ready to describe. And then you've got the disenchanted Democrat types that Frank Rouse talked about. Frank Rouse particularly wanted to ~~xxxx~~ attract to the party. I think the suburbanites sometimes split between ~~the xxxxxxxxxx~~ these two camps. There is some suburbanites, you know, Frank Rouse types and some suburbanites do themselves more of the traditional public types, many of them have moved here from the North (I don't know how many numbers). Anyway, I sort of sense a tension within the party over whether the party is going to be a party of Democrats who don't like what the Democratic Party has to offer and who have come to the Republican Party because they feel the Republican Party is more in line with their .. frankly I think they come from the Republican Party because they feel the Republican Party will maintain the ~~xxxxxxx~~ social status quo as opposed to a political status quo. ~~xxx~~ Holshouser on the other hand, the way he has acted, leads me to believe that he sees the way to build a party is by running a fairly decent state government, one that keeps things in order, that doesn't cause a lot of trouble, that keeps away from as much scandal as it can, that dispenses the goodies around, ~~xxxxxxx~~ Mental Health gets it share, parks gets it share, ports gets its share, teachers get their share. You know he sort of runs a fairly clean ship, he gets business folks together and they run an ~~efficiency study~~ efficiency study and he is out there for efficiency and he will put into effect some of the things that are in the report. He'll be very honest

about supporting the Board of Governors in a fight even though it might lose him a lot of supporties, he's in favor of that type of government organization. Good government have afford to set the priorities and all of that.

Frank Rouse would ask, "Who else can we get party leader to build up the party from? If its not giving Democrats to switch over." He might be right, but there is a way of approaching that quest as I see as different, so on the one hand you've got Jessie Helms' approach, though I don't think ^{Jesse}~~Jessie~~ is really interested in building a party and all of that very much. He's the theology type and really not all involved in party affairs. And you've got the Holshouser type proven so the people of the Helms' wing..

J.B.: Would that really be the Rouse wing?

F.G.: Yeah, Yeah, I don't think you can ~~xxxxxxx~~ consider Rouse a leader of it now. I think he has been beaten.

W.D.: What about Gardner?

F.G.: I don't see a whole lot of Gardner stuff right now. Gardner sort of slipped out. In fact, ~~we~~ I was getting kind of worried during the campaign; you know, the Rouse-Bennett campaign that we kept writing in our stories of Frank Rouse supported Gardner last time, etc. as though that was the cause of the problem. But I sort of see Gardner as sort of out of it now. Not a lot of heck of whole lot of ~~Gardner~~ Gardner activity.

W.D.: Do you see those tension decreasing or increasing between the two wings of the party? Do you think now that the fight for chairmanship is over that the tension is going to ~~xx~~ slowly disappear?

F.G.: I'm not sure... I don't know, it's one of those ~~things~~ reasons I that I haven't written this Sunday's column yet, because I haven't figured it out. I was at the meeting with Jack over the weekend and I found the

trends there very much to the Frank Rouse-Jessie Helms type, you know. The Democrats over here tell them we are going to treat the South just like the rest of the nation and all the code words and I didn't see Holshouser or Bennett really taking part in type of stuff. Okay, I didn't see Holshouser making those kind of remarks to people and all that kind of stuff. In fact, I rode back with him from the airport and he made a couple of little remarks on the side that indicated to me that he wasn't really pleased with the way some of the speeches went. Not necessarily with the big names, but some of the congressional people and all that that were up there. He ~~wasn't~~ wasn't quite at home with that. Okay.

W.D.: Are you saying that there is more of that in the South than Holshouser types?

F.G.: From my experience, yeah. The only problem is, you see, what I haven't sorted out Walter is whether Holshouser won the fight within the party simple because he's governor. The only reason, he's the governor. Now, the implications of him winning go much further. Okay, but that's why people voted for Bennett, because the governor was there and you just can't buck him and all this stuff that the newspapers had about them on twisting and all of that, that didn't make a bit of difference. All he had to do was pick up the phone and call a county and say, "I'm Jim Holshouser, and I would like your support." That's all it took. That's ~~on~~ twisting. They just couldn't beat the governor. You know, it's their first one and it was too much a risk for them to take to beat him within his own party. Okay, so the reason that I don't know which way the Republican Party in North Carolina is going to drift is this. I saw the rest of the Southern state more on the Rouse-Jessie Helms side. Okay, and I saw Holshouser not necessarily a part of that. Okay, now I don't know which pressure is going to be the more prevailing--whether the pressure

from mad national Republican source, whether the pressure from other Southern States and all that kind of stuff is going to spill over into North Carolina. Or whether Holshouser within the state is going to be able to hold the party to his sort of image. Holshouser described to me in the interview other day that I did with him (and I'm working ^{on} an article, you know, about the Republican Party of the South ^{the} "Southern Voices") and I interviewed Holshouser the other day in connection with the article and I haven't transcribed my tape yet, but I remember what he said correctly-- his image of the party is to have ^a fairly moderate party with conservative coalitions. That's his view to have ~~the~~ a basic moderate party and to have coalitions with the conservative elements. That's the Republican Party in his view.

W.D.: Is that the way he sees it going? Or, is that his idea of what it ought to be?

F.G.: That's his idea.

W.D.: When you put it into historical context, is that where its going?

F.G.: Let me explain, from what I saw in Atlanta over the weekend and in my prior experience, I see the Republican Party in the South as more of a conservative with a few moderate~~x~~ coalitions. Okay, and I think that there's a distinction there. I hope I made myself clear with all this poppy junk after you get through with it, ~~but~~ because my experiences are so limited and this is the first time I have ever lived in a state with a Republican. So I don't know which sort of drift is going to prevail yet.

W.D.: You use the word drift, do you really mean that? Don't you see him actively taking the role of party leader in North Carolina and even enlarging that to the other Southern States and indeed even beyond that ~~in~~ in the wilder moments to the entire country?

F.G.: Philosophically speaking I would like to see him do that. I don't know if he will or not. I think he is becoming visible and I don't see him yielding to conservative pressures within his own party. You know, just the other day he said he wouldn't favor cutting taxes or anything like that. He going to come with programs to increase spending in education and mental health, parks and a bunch of other things. He going to go for this 25-30 million dollar rural health education center thing. So ~~XXXXX~~ its hard to judge his impact ~~XXXXXX~~ yet because he keeps a very low profile, he doesn't talk in philosophical terms and all that kind of stuff. I find him very pragmatic, I don't find him a pusher and a shover. People told me that Bob Scott (the way he would work) was that he opposed something big and really put the issue in front of the people and say look we've got a massive problem here and we have got to really get out and attack it. Holshouser ~~XXXXXX~~ doesn't work that way. He goes to all of these little committee meetings and he gets a little piece in here and he goes to another committee meeting and he gets a little piece in there and his public ~~speeches~~ speeches tend to be very dry and bland and just sort of keep ~~the~~ things calm and smooth and show people that we are getting there. And so, I don't know if he's going to be effective, his ~~style~~ style is very much of lets work together, lets see what we can do over here. Maybe he has adopted that because he's in a minority position, maybe he feels that he's got to

W.D.: But is he doing what you think has to be done to build the party in this state? Is ~~he~~ he bringing people floor of prominence, is he building potential leaders, etc.? Do you see that kind of active effort in the party?

F.G.: Just beginning.

W.D.: What, does he have to get this other thing behind him first?

F.G.: Yeah. Just beginning. I don't know whether he would have begun to do it before the fight, but I just see the beginnings of it. You know, the fact that he selected Bennett was sort of one. He reached down and pulled out a bright young man and put him up there. And I've seen evidence that if not the governor himself, but his people are going to be involved in recruiting candidates to run for congress, general assembly and that kind of stuff. But he is also pragmatic, I don't

J.B.: Do you see him picking moderate types, people with his philosophy ~~xx~~ so far as building that sort of a party, or is it too early to tell?

F.G.: I'm not sure yet, I'll tell you the first time I heard Mizell's name mentioned. I think the first time, was from a Holshouser ~~xxx~~ guy who suggested him as a real possibility and I don't know what that means. Whether they are just thinking pragmatically to get the votes out or whether _____ you pick liberal candidates to run on a local level for mayors and that sort of thing, you moderate candidates to run on state ballot, like governor and council of state and all of that. And you pick conservative to run on national level. I don't know quite what to make of that. It just doesn't strike me right and it doesn't make sense.

J.B.: What does it mean?

F.G.: I don't know, but what it basically means is that you run Jim Holshouser and Jim Gardner for governor, it maybe, I don't know, that you run Mizell rather than Charlie Jonas for the Senate. I don't know. It may mean that you run and it is okay to support Howard Lee. He's a bad example. It's alright to support ~~ex~~ Clarence Lightner in Raleigh.

W.D.: You have all you can think about then, hypotheses. The more visible the office, the more the officeholders tends to be ahead of the

people, he is more liberal and progressive than they are. The lower you go down the belt the reverse is true. They tend to be further and further ~~xx~~ behind. Back to ANDERSON, if you are looking for the key to Holshouser-- how he got here and where he's going--who do we go see?

F.G.: Anderson, yeah.

W.D.: What happen proposing?

F.G.: I don't know. I don't know. I think he can try.

W.D.: What is the key? Why is there just one guy around the governor?

As a matter of fact, if you think about the executive office only one name comes to mind. Maybe two, maybe Childs because he gets ~~xxxxxx~~ a visibility as a press secretary. Beyond that, as well as one or two guys in administration and that's it after a year.

F.G.: That's it, that's right. And uh.. something...

W.D.: How does that strike you?

F.G.: Well, I wrote a column about four months ago and the folks over there bring it up all the time, ~~xxxxxx~~ "premature" they say. I still think I'm right. Even after four months of experience. The drift of the column was the governor made a comment on an interview with Dick Hatch that "If I'm remembered for ~~xxxx~~ anything, I would like to be remembered as the Governor that brought efficiency to North Carolina State government." My whole column was about, "is that all". You can't think of anything else. Why limit yourself so, and I still think that's true. Is that the man, running a fairly decent ship, you know. You can't oppose. There is very little to oppose about what he proposes and all that kind of stuff. O kay. It is just that he doesn't propose a lot, you know. He picked when he made his ~~x~~first message to the General Assembly. Basically the things that people are going to vote for anyway.

And the big decision that he really made was at least to propose it all. Now the came back a few months later and proposed a little bit of a tax cut. Soft drink taxes, which was sort of a step back, I thought. But I don't see him laying out an ~~agenda~~ agenda for the state. Now those and lofty words and would laugh in my face over there if I told them that in those terms. But I don't see this germinating of ideas over there, I don't see this

W.D.: Is it just his character?

F.G.: I think it is partly that. I think that it is party that he hasn't brought anybody around with him to do that.

W.D.: Why not?

F.G.: Partly because of his character, I think.

J.B.: Wouldn't this be some sincere contrast with ~~Sanford~~ Sanford, when Sanford was governor?

F.G.: That's what I was trying to get out, you make ~~it~~ a judgment.

W.D.: Seems to me you buy a politician. Does he set a agenda?

If he doesn't, he's going to be a caretaker. O kay.

But the second thing is, who does he surround himself with? What is his perception of reality? Who gives it to him? When you come to this state "_____everybody worked for Sanford, everybody has been on his staff, they've all gone to school ~~with~~ with him or worked with him. But that's not the point. The point Jack made is that there was an effort in that administration to bring in a whole lot of people with ideas.

I'm trying to assess the impact. (I'm talking to myself.) That administration, say in a 25 year ~~period~~ period. One would have to conclude, I think, after a closer examination it had an ~~enormous impact~~ enormous impact.

F.G.: Yeah, and it's still having it.

W.D.: My question to you, isn't that the kind of thing this Republican administration could have done this past year or should have done.

F.G.: Oh, no doubt about it. It should have. Yes indeed.

W.D.: Do you see

F.G.: Yeah, if I were an editorial writer, of course.

W.D.: What are you looking at whenx you think of their failure and achievement or accomplishments over one year? That should be the basis, shouldn't it Ferrell for where its going in the next three years.

Once this administration has been in office for a year you kinda set the pattern.

F.G.: I think you are right about that, yeah. The only reason that I cautioned you a little bit at the beginning was because I tend to think of it in terms of sessions of the General Assembly and they've got another one coming back. Okay. So a previous governor now would have been able to act in such a way without one factor in his judgment being a session is coming up. He has had that to consider. But I'm not convinced that it made in his case a difference. I agree with you that there is no question that if you are going to make a change into a campaign and its time for a change, make it man. Go to it.

W.D.: Do you remember that was the number one reason people voted for Holshouser is that they really believed that he would make more changes than would the Democrat in this case Bowles.

F.G.: ~~Well~~ That's right. Well when he ~~proceeds~~ proceives his changes, very much administrative type changes.

W.D.: Do you mean in the delivery of services?

F.G.: Yeah, in who runs things and how efficient they are running and all that kind of stuff. I think it is pretty obvious once you take a

look at it. The people that he appointed as cabinet officials-- secretary of social rehabilitation controls, secretary of administration-- Bondurant is probably the brightest one of all and has no political ambitions whatsoever registered Democrat. Bill Bondurant, Secretary of Administration, is probably the brightest guy of the lot. The types that he brought in were administrative types, guys who worry about ~~whether he is reliable or not~~ well now let's see is this guy reliable over here and ~~is~~ is he going to get his work out before this guy and is he going to give me a good days work and is he going to follow my instructions efficiently and all that kind of stuff. He didn't bring in thinkers. He didn't bring in men with big visions and all that kind of stuff. Some of them may have some political ambitions, I think ~~Flarity~~ ^{Flarity} does.

W.D.: Do you think that it is really in some cases an obsession with the prosodies and mechniry of government? If that's the case can you generalize from that...

F.G.: Obsession maybe too strong a word but... certainly too much of fondness for all that.

W.D.: Didn't that carry over in a sense for the fight for party chairman?

F.G.: Perhaps it does. I hadn't thought about it that way, but perhaps.

W.D.: It's a way of looking at life, isn't it? Not just a way of looking at government.

F.G.: Yeah, I think Holshouser is very much a man of mechanics and procedure and all that ~~from~~ from what I know about his experience ~~in~~ in the General Assembly was very much that type, you know. You knew when to knock on someone's door and all of that. Look, the guy (they tell me) sits over there and really ponders over who he is going to appoint to things. It took him an enormous amount of time to just appoint people.

You know, he was ~~waiting~~ way late in appointing a lot of boards and commissions.

W.D.: I think an example that came to mind was the ~~school textbook commission~~ School Textbook Commission. It seemed to be a fairly easy kind of..

F.G.: Yeah, okay. Let me use ~~a~~ the Textbook Commission to ~~make~~ make two points. Okay, first is it takes him a long time to make appointment. Okay, part of that problem I suppose is is the difficulty of setting up a Republican administration. He really didn't have a shadow cabinet readily available. Republicans are fairly rich and they don't really pay a lot over here, so that has some consideration to it. Okay.

But at the same time the government has some attractiveness to it that money .. that you can't put money off to the side. Okay, so that problem--is that the pool of manpower just wasn't that big--even now he has had to switch his Secretary of Commerce to the Utilities Commission, he has just switched the head of the Division of Registration and Motor Vehicles to the Efficiency Coordinator. He switched his ~~personnel~~ personnel man to the Personnel Office and Transportation. He took the ~~assistant~~ Assistant Secretary of Commerce and put him back in his office. You know, it is all this working around that leads me to conclude that he ~~doesn't~~ doesn't really have a lot of people to draw on. He is having to use his own people to switch them around to fill spots. Okay.

W.D.: Does that go back to the original pluck that the pool of talent is not there?

F.G.: That's.. Let me make my second point. I think that's one factor. The other factor is that ~~that~~ that is what he likes to do. Not that he likes to switch people but that he spends a lot of time on that type of matter. Who goes where? Who gets appointed to what? Should I put this guy over

here? Or this guy over here? He spends a lot of time with who works ~~where~~ where, and I think it is part of his .. and I think the same characteristics ~~flow~~ flow into it. As I said earlier, he spends a lot of time with committee meetings.. The son-of-a-gun presided the other day over the Capitol Building Planning Committee. That's fairly important, okay. But it is no big deal. It does have a lot to do with money and how the State Government complex is going to look and there is an issue in there as to whether you tear down an old house and whether you put the art ~~the~~ museum in downtown or out in the suburban areas. You don't necessarily need a governor there for that. Though if the issue was really joined, maybe the governor would want to be there. I'm ^{sure} Skipper would have gone up there to that meeting.

W.D.: He would have gone.

F.G.: No he wouldn't. He would have sent his man there for a specific instructions, this is my view on this and you tell them and you do everything you can to carry out my instructions. Bob Scott didn't sit in the budget meetings but Jim Holshouser did. At everyone of them he was there.

W.D.: Do you see any significant change in the operation then of this administration over the next three years based on the last year? Do you see...

F.G.: I would like to see something.

W.D.: Do you see writing an agenda for the State?

F.G.: No, no. He set up..not he set up but actually some of the others..

J.B.: But is his objective to do that or his objective, which is based on his whole political history that has been basically one of party building. Is his objective to try and establish firm control of the political machinery of the state in the hands of the Republican Party

and in the Republican Party fits his image of what he wants that party to be philosophically, which is a basically sort of moderate ... sort of..

F.G.: This what I think is .. ask him. I think his objective is to go through four years without any major problems to show the people of the state that if you elect Republicans things are not going to fall apart, that government is going to provide you with some services, its going to do it as efficiency as it can, as well as it can, cut out waste, its going.. it's just going to be a business like, sound, stable, concern that if you elect Republicans you'll get people in there that you don't have to be nervous about, that you can rely on and keep their promises. Promises aren't going to be some grand visions, no great societies, just keep government rocking along. We are going to change things, we are going to change some employees around, we aren't going to pave road just because of the way you vote on your road. You are going to get a road if you deserve a road. He is fairly well carried through on that sort of thing. Spread services around, mental health over here, put some parks over here and all that kind of stuff. And what I see him doing is very methodical type, you know, build a little here, build a little there.

J.B.: But is he also now going to try to start build . . scheming for increasing Republican minority in the Legislature, to have another Republican governor after him who's got a Republican majority in the Legislature....

F.G.: I don't think there is any question about that. You go over ~~the~~ to the basement of the Hilton right now and they have got three staff members. They are Tom Bennett, Grady Franklin who is party executive director and one other guy over there and I can't think of his name right now. But you ask him, what are you doing here? He says, "I'm in charge of legislature ~~recruitment~~ recruitment. So I don't think....

J.B.: What have the Democrats been doing since they got beat?

F.G.: They don't know. I don't think ... the Democrats have any clear idea what in the hell is going on.

W.D.: Do you really think that they believe they were beaten and that 1972 was not some kind of aberration that is going to go away?

F.G.: I'm not sure whether they believe that or not. I don't know.

I think that ... we are just focusing on the Republicans because they are in power right now but it's all confused, they don't know what's going on. I don't think the Democrats have a sense of what their party is right now. I tried to list the other day all the wings in the Democratic Party, all it has got is wings and no body and it's just flapping. You know, it's got Sanford wing, Bowles wing and a McGovern wing, a labor wing and a Black wing, and a rural wing, and a city wing, and a western wing, and an Eastern wing and it has got some women out here and it's got some people in Greensboro that are little bit different from the people out here. And it's got the ~~xxx~~ oldtime guys, the courthouse wing, and nobody has brought that all together.

W.D.: I like that description.

J.B.: That's a beautiful description. Ha Ha'.

F.G.: Man, listen. Give them a body and maybe it needs a head before it gets a body, but I know..it's just .. you know...I... had a lot of trouble ~~describing~~ describing the Democratic Party in this state. It just.. you know, they go and get Wallace, like you know, man that's going to bring rest ----- back in. It ~~xxx~~ ain't going to ~~xxx~~ bring them back in. One visit by Wallace, so they go get Dale Bumpers. Bumpers made a pretty decent speech, he really did. He put some thought into it and I haven't *heard* one of ~~them~~ mention his speech since then.

W.D.: Is it apt to go any other place in say--the next three years?

You've got one contest in 1974 that might bring them together.

F.G.: Yeah, if Sam Ervin runs and everybody else drops out.

W.D.: But the way things ~~w~~ look now, he's not going to run. So what you'll have then is a lot of personality politics.

F.G.: Are you sure.

W.D.: Everything I hear is that a winner at the top like top where else would you go.

F.G.: I've been getting different signals, well....

W.D.: But you're right, the only thing that can hold them together would be that candidate.

F.G.: But yeah, see Sam Ervin isn't "a party man" for all the speeches that Sam Ervin has been giving about I'm a Democrat and all these jokes-- he tells about Uncle Fiddle Diddy knocks on a guys door at night and says I'm not praying for you because you're not a Democrat and all that kind of stuff, he's really not a party building man.

J.B.: No, but he's a unifying force.

W.D.: He not unifying, but keep them from each others throats.

F.G.: Until Nov. 6, 1974 and they will be at it again.

J.B.: There is something about which all the various factions can rally around as a rallying point.

W.D.: No, they don't rally around him.

F.G.: No, they don't rally around him, they accept him because he is no one to fight. You know, it's a negative sort of thing, rallying around.

W.D.: Think down the road to 1976. If you are rallying or unifying anything you have to be thinking of say early 1976. You know, that's a couple years away. So what is there on the horizon to suggest that there is going to be a way to unify that party? They talk in cosmetic terms, they've got to get together again. ..

F.G.: Right.

W.D.: What to hell does that mean, that we've got to get together again? And nobody knows what it means. You bring Wallace in, that's one thing you're doing. You bring ~~RM~~ Bumpers in, that's another thing you're doing. But how do you reunite all these wings and make something out of them realistically?

F.G.: I'm not sure they have the people can do it. Uh, I think the way they should, or could do it is to begin through their ~~ex~~ecutive committees, through their people getting out and making speeches, through - maybe even running around the state making speeches, getting county chairman together instead of having the county chairman..to let them talk and bring in people, you know..

W.D.: But who can do that?

F.G.: Let me just say what else they ought to do and then. And what I think they (Democrats) should be searching for ~~XX~~ is an agenda for themselves. They've got to find issues which ~~g~~ kinda bridge all these gaps it seems and sort of ~~hm~~ put the cartilage between all the wings and all that kind of stuff, and I think they can find these issues. I think economics has been a long or traditional democratic issue and I think in this state that it can be an effective issue the ~~wayxxxxix~~ wages are low and all that kind of stuff. And... Wait a second. And they look upon Wilbur as a kinda funny old duddy over there, you know, but if they begin to work with him a little bit, not write him off too ~~when~~ soon. This is advice I ~~xxx~~ shouldn't dispense to anyone, but if I were campaign chairman of a democratic candidate, I would run up and down the state yelling health care all over the place.

J.B.: But what do the Democrats do?

F.G.: Just ECU Med School, nothing else.

W.D.: That's a crushing blow to most people.

F.G.: No, I don't think so. That personal judgment, I have had not expertise.

W.D.: I would much rather hear a guy talk about health care services than to talk about Leo Jenkins and his medical school.

F.G.: Well, I wouldn't put it in quiet those terms. I would say, look you can't get a doctor, you know, and your hospital is over crowded and you can't get an ambulance services when you need it and all that kind of stuff. It takes some research to find out how to approach the issue.

J.B.: Do you see Leo Jenkins as a potential candidate for governor.

F.G.: No. Well, he is potential but I don't know if he can build on that basis.

W.D.: Go back to your general....

F.G.: Well, health care is one thing, the economy is another and education and certainly education. For all the money that has been put into and all the stuff that has been done about it. Really, what did Holshouser do. He gave it all to the teachers. He raised their salaries, gave them a longer work time and he reduced the size of the ~~xxxx~~ class, all that adds up to is more money in the teachers' pocket. It will help the kids a littlex~~xxx~~ bit, you know, fewer ~~xx~~ kids in the class will help. And if some of the teachers use the extra time it may make them better teachers. But it is the same teachers, so education- all sorts of new things there. If they put all the money in education into building new building and giving it to teachers. Okay, I am not saying that career education is the answer either, but they've got all sorts of things you can do in ~~xx~~ there, you know. Really, this area of health and education thing has got a thing going between the technical institutions and the hospital over there to ~~xx~~ train nurses. They've got all sorts

of arrangements like that all over the state. You can see it working. You know, a class of 20 student nurses that came about as an arrangement between a technical institute and a hospital, seems to ~~h~~ me you can get into all sorts of trouble with things going on like that. I don't know, I'm not very smart about these things. Okay. So, what I think Democrats need to do is go around and try to figure out which issues, those are some that suggest themselves to me. But which issues are of concern to the guys out east and the guys in the mountains that the people in the Sanford wing wouldn't mind putting their efforts into. That would appeal to the Blacks, that would appeal to the labor folks and I think that there are certain issues that you can isolate that will appeal to all of those types of people. I maybe wrong, but I think they can do that.

W.D.: Do think that can overcome all of these personal factions you now see.

F.G.: I don't know. Okay, I don't know. But I think if they ~~begin~~ begin to isolate what they are talking about. Okay, they can bring them together. Okay, now whose going to do it. Right. Is that the next question?

W.D.: No, ~~what~~ what I was going to say was was there factions. The assumption was that one of the reason ~~axpaxkxx~~ the party went down in defeat was ~~thaxx~~ because there were personal feelings of Bowles faction, Sanford faction, etc. But we use to think that when that happened and the party was defeated that somehow the factions would ~~sh~~ somehow reunite.

F.G.: Yeah, I'm not sure. We described the factions by the personalities. But I'm not sure that it is just on personality that the factions work.

W.D.: Is the identification with personalities?

F.G.: With personalities, yeah. I think there was a difference between

the Taylor faction and the Bowles faction. I think the Taylor people sort of feared the ~~Bowles~~ Bowles people. You know, the Taylor people were sort of the older folks, the courthouse and everything, and here was this guy Bowles, you know, all of a sudden. You know, put on all this stuff. Television, how dare him ~~put~~ put us in modern times and all that. You know. And so, I think there was more than ..I think the Democrats feared that Bowles would shake things up too. Just like Holshouser is doing. Maybe not in quite the same way. But I think they perhaps feared that he was ~~going~~ going to shake things up too. You see. And I think also that a lot the Democrats felt that Bowles didn't come over and hide themselves and pat them on the back enough. You know, and bring them into him. That he ran his own campaign, you know, and he used expert from Michigan and all that kind of stuff. I think there was a distrust there that went beyond the personalities. You know, that ~~was~~ went into the style of government and the style of the campaign, and I think that had something to do the issues in the campaign. Here was Bowles pushing career education, you know, what is that going to mean to my ~~ix~~ kids. You know, what is all of this going to be.? What is all of this high powered type of stuff going to mean to the way roads are going to be built around here? Is he going to listen to my commissioner over here and build the roads, or is he going to go out there and just listen to his experts and all that kind of stuff?

W.D.: Do you think now to bring this back together is ~~is~~ based on issues. But that runs contrary to what we have learned in the past. That infaction on politics is the emerging of a strong personality that pulls it together. ~~Yeah~~.

F.G.: Yeah, That's why I maybe all wrong.

W.D.: Let's follow that for a moment. Who would then do it? Who could do that in the Democratic Party?

F.G.: I don't see that strong a person right now to be honest with you. Uh, If Jim Hunt were maybe ten years older and ~~xx~~ ten years wiser he might be able to do it. Hunt's got a good head. Hunt might be able. Jim Hunt, talking about Lt. Governor. Hunt is not dumb and Hunt has a grasp of what is going on, what people are interested in and all that kind of stuff. I'm not sure he's the man to do it now. I'm not sure he's got the style to do it or he's got the confidence of the other party leaders to do it. And I don't know.

W.D.: At this point you don't see anybody in that position or emerging.

F.G.: Not right now.

J.B.: Aren't you perhaps somewhat comparable to Florida in 1970 where nobody, Rubin Askew came out ~~xx~~ of the pack as a complete unknown? And then the party apparently just decided that they almost had to go behind whoever won the primary and you had sort of a coalescence there.

F.G.: Maybe so.

J.B.: I don't know.

F.G.: I don't know, I'm not sure. Everybody says Hunt is the frontrunner and all that.

W.D.: You have got a unique situation now, really in a sense now you have a potentially head of the Democratic Party. Skipper Bowles and on the other hand you have Lt. Governor and normally ~~xxxx~~ in this state you go from Lt. Governor to Governor. This time it is ~~x~~ unique. With both guys interested.

F.G.: And secondly, too.

J.B.: You really don't have much of that in North Carolina though.

F.G.: There is another thing here, too. Since Bowles didn't win the council of state ~~x~~people feel independent too. And so, there is Jim Graham making a little noise about running for Governor. He may never run. Why not make a little noise. Maybe, it will be me. You know, you.. The Republican just suggested the other day.. let~~x~~ me just make it.. that if Ervin doesn't run, ~~xx~~ okay, as of now only three names have been mentioned for the Senate. Democratic Party_-Henry Wilson, Bob Morgan and Ervin. That if Ervin doesn't run than Morgan is the answer. You've got two left. Even the Republicans don't think it is going to work out that way. Who's going to go to market free. All sorts of persons are going to want in. It maybe too late for them to plan a really good campaign, but there are enough others ~~xx~~ around. I can't name any of them right now because I haven't heard of any. I don't know if Nick would want to try. I don't know if Pat Taylor would want to get back in, and I don't if Terry Sanford would want back in. But there might be enough of a opening there for somebody. And the party is in such of a...

J.B.. Have you heard if Preyer is a possibility?

F.G.: I've heard his name but I don't know. I saw him the other day and he didn't...

W.D.: Isn't part of the dilemma ^{that} of the party ^{has} practically never ^{been} confronted with ~~in~~ this ~~xx~~ situation? In the history of many of these people's memory.

F.G.. Oh, yes. Certainly. That's the Republican Party's problem too. That don't know how to govern.

W.D.:

F.G.: Not only that but they campaigned that it is time for changes, changes, now ~~they're~~ it's time and they don't what to change too. ~~They~~ They did..

W.D.: They did like this, it is what they call the golly geewhiz school-- here I am governor and I didn't expect to be, now what do I do?

F.G.: Yeah, I think he had certain things in mind. I think he had to put Gene Anderson right here and you know, Dave ~~Blarity~~ ^{Fleahuty} over here.

~~And~~ And I think he knew he wanted something in the budget, you know.

But, he never developed before he became governor any essential vision of the way one is governor.

J.B.: My question really is one of...

F.G.: But the Democrats (just let me finish this) on the other side of course don't know how to act as the party out of power. Though they sort of share it in a way. They are caucuses in the General Assembly, they have what you call caucuses now. People keep telling me, don't worry about them. I said yeah, but, if they get themselves ~~together~~ together they would be a powerful force. They kept saying look there are secret meetings and all of that you had a blast by going into the caucuses. I said no you don't, that's how they put themselves together. That's a way to do it. But they haven't got it, they go in there and they talk for hours and they don't pull it together. Do you know what ~~came~~ out the caucus one time last year? To hold open meetings of committees and then they went out on the floor the next day and ~~had~~ and it passed and it went over to the Senate and it died. But they don't use the caucuses as a way to get themselves together to talk to each other to find out what each other can support and all that. They just chat and that's about it. They don't seem to understand, you know, that they've got a responsibility there of getting themselves together and being a party force. I....

J.B.: My question....

W.D.: ~~Yes~~ Do you think they ever will.

F.G.: Not with the leaders they've got now.

W.D.: Does something ~~xxx~~ else emerge here that you don't see?

F.G.: Yeah, yeah, I don't see it right now. You know, Ramsey is a bright guy and all that generally, but, I don't see him as a....

J.B.: Jim Ramsey is from what county?

F.G.: Person County.

J.B.: And the guy in the Senate is also from Person County. They don't talk to each other much. They aren't best friends or anything.

No, No, it isn't anything like that. There are no big deals, they just happen to live in the same county. Uh, Ramsey is a strong force and all that kind of stuff. But, Ramsey worries about narrow special interest more than he should. ~~Hexxxxxxxx~~

W.D.: He's a legislator. That's what legislators do.

F.G.: Yeah.

J.B.: Let me ask you this question.

F.G.: Yeah, right, and he sees leadership there as leadership statewide and I....

W.D.: That's the old Lyndon Johnson, you know.

F.G.: Yeah, Yeah.

W.D.: The two just aren't....

F.G.: Expect, Ramsey is not Johnson because Johnson every now and then at least had a sense that you vote for the civil rights bill because it was right and you may trade off and may do dirty deeds but you vote for that civil rights bill because it's right. Ramsey would never even think of that. Never even think of voting for the bill. He may trade off on a lot of other things, he's all hot now about cutting inventory taxes and all that kind of stuff because he might make a little money to run next time. You know, those folks will remember him as being .

when, if he got on the agenda tax reform or some other kind of ~~xx~~ stuff he might make the banks mad but he might win a 100,000 extra votes.

W.D.: You said in the executive office we ought to talk with Anderson because he's key. You said in the legislature we ought to see James Ramsey, Liston Ramsey and Gordon Allen. Is there anybody else.

J.B.: And Ralph Scott.

F.G.: I think you ought to talk with Ralph Scott.

W.D.: One of our problems of interviewees is some potential ~~xxxxxx~~ since it has been so long. Who else say in the executive, legislative or even judicial were among your colleagues in the press or other places?

F.G.: I think Childs might be a good person to talk to.

W.D.: Do you think so.

F.G.: Yeah, Childs had the job that I've got now about 4 or 5 years ago and then he went to Duke for about a year or year and one-half. Then he went with the governor. So, uh, he covered Bob Scott. I think he was here part of the time for Luther Hodges. Not Luther Hodges but Dan Moore. So, he may be able to give some of that perspective and then what's going on, you know, he's going to be an apologist for Holshouser. You should take that into consideration.

J.G.: Let me ask you ~~x~~ just one question about Holshouser and that is this: You could be a man of vision in that position and say, you know we are to really get something done, that is to build a majority in the legislature, but on this good government and show people that Republicans are sound. Recruit the sort of candidates to build the kind of party I want. Get the kind of leadership and develop programs that will go, or, you could just be sort of doing that because your drifting and there is no vision involved. My question is, ~~what kind of~~ which is the case with

him if one assumes that is the case?

F.G.: Perhaps a little of both. I don't think it's clear. I think he's pragmatic enough that he's going to go out there and get people who can win. Okay, if it takes in a Senate race in Nash County a rock-rib conservative to win, he'll probably recruit him. Okay, Nash County is out in the east. But he will bring him in the General Assembly and then he will do what he can to get him to support his programs. I'll give you an example. A lot of the folks in the Senate are ~~angry~~ angry at Charlie Taylor. Charlie Taylor is the Senate Minority Leader, they say he is too liberal, he is the closest guy to the governor. So if they are saying he is too liberal they are sort of taking about the governor too.

J.B.: Maybe they are.

F.G.: Maybe they are, but they ~~want~~ ^{won't} say it. I sort of sense they are. But they are both in the center as a block. You know, I sort of see party's , ~~I'm probably~~ I'm probably over influenced by Broader. But I sort of see parties as a way to get views expressed that wouldn't ordinarily get expressed, that is, put a few Blacks in here and the party accept them and accepts women and all that kind of stuff. And then they come together with program, you know, do you understand what ..well okay, so the Republicans...so ~~Holshouser~~ ~~Holshouser~~ Holshouser can get his program through or gets his views expressed out because he can bring into.. because he can use the party to go forth with a little bit. So when the Senators, the 15 Senators in the Republican Party vote on a crucial issue they pretty much...when it comes down to supporting a governor or going with an alternative they support the governor. Okay, so he is using the party there, you know, to show up his views and his program. But the conservatives say, "Charlie Taylor is too damn level,

highfalutin speeches and all that stuff", so...

W.D.: Well you could use the escape goat theory on that, couldn't you?

F.G.: I wouldn't be surprised if Holshouser would go recruit a conservative in order to win and take the gruff that they might give to a guy like Charlie Taylor.

J.B.: Yeah, but do you see a chance of Holshouser succeeding in building a Republican Party that gains political control of the state and because of what you saw in Atlanta and what you have seen here with Helms running ahead that it ends up with the conservative wing and then taking over the Republican Party.

F.G.: I don't know, I don't know if one Republican can do it. If one Republican Governor can do it. It may be good for the Republican party to lose in 76. It may be what they need to get themselves really stronger. You know, if they win and they are ready to gear up to win again and lose by a little bit and it gives them that real incentive to go after it the next year in 80. Maybe. I don't know. I don't necessarily see Holshouser being the salvation of the party in terms of really gain...

continuation of *Fenel Guillory*
This is an interview with ~~Claude Sitton~~ conducted on

December 11, 1974 by Jack Bass

Guillory
~~Claude Sitton~~: . . . "I think the leaders that built this party are the niggers."

Walter De Vries: Oh yeah, I'd forgotten that.

FG
~~Claude Sitton~~: . . . or however he termed it.

Jack Bass: Who was it?

FG
~~Claude Sitton~~: A guy named Sims Delap. He was state party chairman in the '40s. And I went down to Lexington and I talked to him one Sunday afternoon for an hour or so. An interview with him about what he thought about the Rouse-Bennett thing.

J.B.: Where was he philosophically?

FG
~~Sitton~~: Oh, he was one of Helms's advisors. But, in the Rouse-Bennett fight, he supported Bennett. Because he's a conservative over here, but he's a party man, too. And so he felt that the Governor should have his man in there. He wrote a letter to the Governor saying that you shouldn't put that black woman there as head of the welfare department.

J.B.: And he told you what?

FG
~~Sitton~~: I can pull his quote out over there, something like that. I've got it filed away.

J.B.: I'd really like to get that.

~~Sitton~~^{FG}: So, I think that Delap is on the right track, I mean as far as his analysis. I'm not sure that it's Holshouser that has built the party. He's obviously been a major force in the party, In the General Assembly, as minority leader, it's clear that he was an important man. In fact, a lot of people have told me that the Board of Governors and a lot of government reorganization wouldn't have happened if it hadn't been for him swinging Republican votes over there and being a solid workman-like leader, you know, in the Assembly. But at the same time, he went over there and fought all those taxes and everything. I don't necessarily, I'm not sure that you can attribute the growth of the Republican party in North Carolina, just to him.

J.B.: I'm not attributing it to him, I'm just asking if he has been the key figure in the mechanical building of the party. The machinery.

~~Sitton~~^{FG}: It's hard for me to say. My gut instinct is no. But I might be wrong. I didn't see him as party chairman.

J.B.: But there is no question in your mind that as of now, he is in control of the party?

~~Sitton~~^{FG}: Yeah. I think that he's in control of the party machinery. I think he's the dominant personality in the party, though he doesn't have much of a personality, but he's the predominant figure in the

party. But having said that, I go back to what I said about an hour or so ago, I'm not sure that the party will necessarily. . .I use the word "drift", but what I really mean is "align". . .in his type of Republican. I don't know who's going to run on the national level in '76, I don't know what kind of senatorial candidate (interruption on the tape). . .^{M. ZELL}~~M. ZELL~~ and he'll run on a race issue and all that. I don't know that yet, o.k. But you know, if a guy like Regan runs in '76, he may, you know, the folks around here may get so enthralled with Regan that they may not support the same way that the Governor might necessarily support if he were free to choose himself. The fact that he's the governor and that he has control of the party machinery, the Republican Party in North Carolina has a better chance of resisting the trend that I've been describing, that I saw in Atlanta, that my experience has shown me. The Republican Party in North Carolina has a better chance of not necessarily going through a southern strategy type party or a party just of disenchanted Democrats who are in the party merely because they are disenchanted. I think the party has a better chance of going another way with Holshouser there, with him in control of the party. But I'm not saying that it's necessarily going to do that, simply because he is there. I think the way the Nixon administration has just sort of set the temper of things and having Jesse Helms around. I think these will have another influence on it. In fact, some people you know

said that. . .I asked some people what they thought about, what the effect will be on the people that lose in the Rouse-Bennett race. They said, "They'll stay in the party. Just look, Jesse's there, they'll stay." The fact that Jesse's there will make it easier for them to stick around. I'm not sure which way the party is going to go. (interruption on tape)