

This is an interview with Governor James B. Edwards of South Carolina. The interview was conducted by Jack Bass and Walter DeVries on March 3, 1975. The interview was transcribed by Susan Hathaway.

JACK BASS: To begin with, why don't you tell us a little bit about how you got involved politically, and a little bit about how you grew up, and what your parents did. Wasn't your father a school teacher?

JAMES EDWARDS: Yes, Jack. Both my mother and father were school teachers. My mother taught 50 years and my father taught 48 years. I think between the two of them they had over 99 years. I grew up on a farm in lower South Carolina and led the usual good and happy life that a farm boy enjoys. I was educated in the schools in Charleston and then went to sea during World War II as a Merchant Seamen. I then came back to the College of Charleston and then on to graduate school and came back to South Carolina in '60 to practice Oral Surgery. I never dreamed that I would become so involved in politics as I have ultimately become. I first started out to try to just participate in the background because I was fed up with all of the things that were going on in America back in the



early sixties. Things were going on that I was irritated by, the rioting, the campus riots, the street marches, the revolutionary type stuff, the anarchy, the irresponsible government is the way I like to describe it where there is no regard for the taxpayer's money and the experiment with all the great schemes that came out of Washington in the sixties. I just got to the point where I felt like why doesn't somebody do something and then I realized I couldn't expect somebody else to do something unless I did it myself. Two books had an influence on me and it is right interesting because it is hard to realize the two books because they are on opposite ends of the spectrum. The authors were, not the books themselves. The books were quite similar in nature basically and fundamentally. One was Profiles of Courage. I don't know who wrote it, but it was supposed to have been . . . you probably know who wrote it, it was supposed to have been written by Jack Kennedy. The other one was . . . I read that my senior residency year at Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit. The other book was The Conscience of a Conservative; that was supposed to have been written by Barry Goldwater. I've never heard anybody say that it wasn't. But those two books sort of drew my attention to what was going on in American politics along with the daily press and the headlines; so I guess this is what stimulated me into getting involved to start with. I attended my first political convention when Tower spoke in



Charleston on the behalf of Bill Workman's candidacy for the U. S. Senate, but I never really participated. I just attended this fund raising session at Old County Hall. Then the next time I became involved was during the Goldwater years because his philosophy appealed to me, his candor, his forthright approach, outspoken nature, I just felt that he would have been good for America. I became involved in that campaign, and then when he was defeated, I was asked if I would be the Republican party chairman in Charleston County. I realized that any country that had turned down Barry Goldwater for who they got was in worse trouble than I thought they were and I just decided that I would dedicate some spare time to try to correct it. I took the job as Chairman and you know what has happened since then, it has just sort of gone from bad to worse, and here I am.

W.D.: If somebody had told you a year ago that you would be sitting in this office today, what would you have told them?

Edwards: I would have told them they were crazy.

W.D.: What happened to get you here?

Edwards: Really, the Republican party in South Carolina was more or less dominated by a small group of people and if you didn't go along with them and do exactly what they said they would excommunicate you from the leadership of the party. When we decided to have our state-wide primary for Governor, I



decided that there was no need anointing anybody just hand picked and chosen for this job, that I thought we should have a real meaningful primary and it would probably do one thing, this is the thing I thought it would do, I thought it would give Westmoreland the publicity he needed to probably go ahead and win in November. The second thing, it would give some real competition in the primary and no one would be just given the nomination. The real gutsy people in the party, the people that did the work, and the ones that got nothing in return for it, they would be the ones to decide who the nomination should go to. Of course, in the back of my mind the vague possibility that if we did happen to win the primary, which I really didn't think we would, if we did happen to win the primary, it would give us the recognition that we would need to go on and a vague possibility to win in November. So this was the thing that sort of drove me into that. I thought it would be good for the Republican party and two party politics, which we need very badly in the South.

W.D.: Well, what happened in South Carolina that allowed the Republicans to win? A year ago there wasn't even the possibility.

Edwards: Well, I think a lot of things happened really.  
✓ Number one, Westmoreland proved to be a very clumsy political



candidate. He didn't have it politically. I am sure that he is a great American, a great general, but when it came to politics, he didn't have it. A lot of people were turned off by this group of people that had been dominating the Republican party in South Carolina for so long and they voted against the group and Westmoreland was a symbol of this group of people. That took us through the primary, and then in the general election we had some breaks. Let's face it, we had some pretty good breaks. The opposition was confused. A lot of people feel that Pug would have beaten us two to one. I am not so sure of that because anybody that had spent \$750,000, or whatever it was, in the primary, what did he spend, between \$500,000, there are different estimates, anybody who spent that much money had an electronic blitz that he had and the professionalism that he had, and the emotional upswing that he had that could only stimulate 180,000 people to come and vote for him. I don't know what the outcome would have been in the fall. I know that in recent weeks it has been brought to my attention that hundreds of people, I would even say thousands of people, wanted to vote in their local elections for the Sheriff or the Clerk of Court, and while they were there they voted for Pug because he would be the one easiest to beat in the general election. They fully planned to come back and vote for the Republican in the general election. So



I am not sure of this argument that it would have been an impossible task to win. In addition to that, he had offended all of the state senate and the state senate probably would have . . . as a matter of fact, a lot of them had come over and pledged their support to me against Pug in their counties. This is a pretty strong force and whether you like the senate or not, you'll have to admit that all but four, five of these men, I guess, had pledged their support to me in the general election.

W.D.: Is the '74 election an aberration, or is it a basic change in South Carolina politics?

Edwards: I am going to leave that up to you all to figure out. I am not being a political analyst, I am just a neophyte that has just gotten involved. I am a dentist who is concerned and came out here. You all will have to analyze that.

W.D.: Yeah, but you have been involved in Republican politics for a long time in this state. From that perspective, is the party that much stronger now than it was in the early sixties? Has there been a basic change that has occurred during that period?

Edwards: There has been a gradual strengthening of the Republican party. George Wallace and that movement, in my opinion, set us back four years in the Republican party. Because when Wallace and Nixon and who was the other, Humphrey,



wasn't it? In '68 when those three people ran, we had the Republican party really coming up to a peak and we were getting ready to become the majority party. But we had the normal Wallace voter with the Republicans, the racist type voter was voting Republican in those days, but they were turned off during this campaign by the fact that we were pushing Nixon and just by the nature of the type of individual that they are, they said " I am going to show those scamps, those Republicans pushing Nixon, I am going to vote for Wallace and I am going to vote straight Democrat the rest of the way." They did it in droves. They wiped the Republicans out all across the South. In 1970, we started climbing out a little bit, in 1972 we finally got back to where we were in 1968. This is just my layman's view of what really happened to the Republican party in the South. George Wallace set it back that far. Since the racist element, most of them, left us for Wallace, it did give us a better foundation of responsibility rather than race to build a party on. So it probably cleansed us of this element and gave us a real foundation to work from. We started building back on a different type of foundation.

W.D.: Did '74 represent then a continued growth?

Edwards: I think '74 represents a gradual continual



growth.

W.D.: Where do you see it going in the future?

Edwards: We will be the majority party in two more elections in the South barring any unforeseen calamities or catastrophies. Now Watergate has set us back again, there is no question about that. Watergate may have set us back further than I think, so it may take four more elections to become the majority party. But if it hadn't been for George Wallace and Watergate, we would be the majority party in the South today in my opinion. Because philosophically the southern moderate or conservative, or how ever you want to describe him, I don't like to use labels as Jack knows, but philosophically the people in the South can't buy this further left movement of the national Democratic party, and there is only one place in the South . . . people are leaving the Democratic party in droves. They don't want to be seen voting in the Democratic primary. They are not quite ready to vote in the Republican primary as shown by this state-wide election, but they are not going to vote as a Democrat because that labels them. Southerners are inherently real independent people, as you know. They don't want to be either one. They don't want to be either Democrats or Republicans. But that leaves a Democratic party with a bunch of radical renegade militants in charge that are going to continue to move it to



the left, like kicking out ~~Ebert~~ <sup>Hebert</sup> for example. This is an example of how they are continuing to get rid of the old southern moderate, conservative if you will, I hate to use the term, and they are going more to an irresponsible position. With this leftward movement, I think the Republicans will grow stronger and stronger and stronger in the South.

J.B.: You have been described at times, the term has been used of "Accidental Governor" because the events of the fall. I just wonder how you react to that?

Edwards: Oh Jack, it doesn't matter to me. We had some things that helped us, I think. The thing that helped us as much as anything else was the confusion. I have gotten away from making this point, but a lot of these people, these state senators for example, when Republicans , when they were going out into their areas, their districts, "Jim Edwards is a real fine fellow" type of thing "I know him from the senate. He is real responsible, blah, blah, blah, and this Pug is real dangerous. You can't trust him, he is too radical and too far to the left." And then after they had sold me for two or three weeks that Pug was in the race, and then all of a sudden Pug was no longer in the race and they had to go back and quit selling Jim Edwards and said that "He's a real SOB, you've got to vote for my man Bryan Dorn." This happened particularly in the black community. In the black community the ministers, as you know, control the black



vote. They were going around saying what a wonderful person Pug Ravenel is, and what an SOB Bryan Dorn is. Then three weeks later, they were back in there saying, "No, we didn't mean that at all. We meant that Bryan Dorn is a fine fellow. Don't vote for that radical Republican over there." Then two weeks later they were trying to sell Bryan Dorn and telling them what an SOB Jim Edwards was. This is where we had the advantage. There is no question about that.

J.B.: Organized labor is a great confusion factor because as you will recall last year when we were in South Carolina we saw the so-called smear sheet of Bryan Dorn from labor.

Edwards: They were the ones that put it in all of the black churches with all of his racist votes from 1948. After those smear sheets had been in every church pew, every black church pew in South Carolina, three weeks later they were pulling those things out, tearing them up saying that he was a great guy and they didn't really mean it.

J.B.: At the same time that you got elected, a Democrat got elected to Lieutenant Governor, the Republicans lost one seat in Congress, and they lost four or five seats in the house despite single member districts and elsewhere in the South, in most states, the losses were far greater.

Edwards: Not just in the South, all over the nation. I think Watergate did that.

J.B.: You view that as a temporary set back?



Edwards: Oh yeah. There was a mandate given to Nixon by the American people in 1972 and that was a moderate middle of the road mandate and that mandate still lives in the hearts and the minds of Americans today. You just don't change your philosophy and your basic thinking that quickly. Now whether the Republicans can put it all back together again to take advantage of this mandate that is still out there, I don't know. That is one of the things that I am wondering about whether we should use to try to do it under the Republican banner or maybe move to a third party, fourth party or whatever you call it. But if we could realign the two major parties today, there would be no question about which one . . . if you could realign the parties and say this is the conservative party and this is a liberal party, there would be no question in my mind which party would be the majority party in America.

J.B.: You agree with Senator *Helms*?

Edwards: What does he say? I was accused of attending a meeting that he called the other day and I wasn't there.

J.B.: I just happened to see him on the Today show and he said that if you realign that there is no doubt in his mind that you would find the majority on the conservative side. Well, you think then that there has been a change in outlook since the '64 election when that thesis was last tested?



Edwards: That thesis wasn't given a good test. They painted Barry Goldwater not as a responsible, middle-of-the-road man of ability and capacity. They painted him as a wild man, a gun-slinger that was going to pull the pin on the atomic bomb and this is where the absolute unfair political campaign techniques devastated a man. Of course he didn't help. His straight forwardness, his sincere heart, he didn't help himself much. I was trying to compare his campaign with McGovern but McGovern did most of the damage to himself, I think, instead of campaign techniques.

J.B.: How do you view your two years in the state senate? Did it make any changes in your outlook towards government, government's role, how it operates, how you viewed the state government in South Carolina, and also the difference it has made in your view of your function as Governor as opposed to if you had not served in public office?

Edwards: Jack, really, I can't say that it changed my view of what government was, because I really never had had a view. You know, you never, you can work in politics all of your life, but until you serve in an elected office in the halls of the senate or the house, you really don't understand the system. You could study all of the texts . . . I guess maybe you could learn it in text books, I don't know. I doubt if you can. I'd read about the legislative



system and that type of thing, but you never really know until you have been in it and it certainly helps me understand more fully the legislative process, which is most important to this [state], but I think you either, as a man you have it, a basic fundamental philosophy, belief, that should be unchangeable. Now the issues, your positions on issues may change from time to time, and I think it is a sign of a man of some courage and capacity if he is willing to change, and I think of a mind that is not frozen in one narrow train of thought. Certainly I have gotten more flexible and I realize that I have been more willing to accept things as being those I can not change and going ahead and living with them and not worrying about them and worrying and concentrating on those things that you can change, that type of thing. The legislative experience has allowed this to develop a little more.

J.B.: What were some of the impressions that you got during those two years that were different from the time that you went in to the time that you left? Surprises and so forth.

Edwards: The biggest surprise was that up until that time, I had been thinking Democrat - Republican all the way, and as party chairman and as the district party chairman and going to the Republican convention in '68 and '72, I had grown to believe that all Republicans had white hats and all Democrats had black hats and when I got up here I realized that



there were some pretty responsible fellows that were wearing the black hats. That the Democrats weren't all bad, and also after the Watergate years, I realize now that all Republicans don't have white hats. This is one of the things that I guess was brought home more fully by my experience in the senate. We've got some pretty sound thinking Democrats down there on the floor of the senate and the house, which once again confuses the issue when you try to separate everything by party lines. One of the things that I think is happening in America with the American people, I think that they are sick and tired of partisan politics bringing a halt to all progress in America, and that is exactly what has happened today. I think that people are hungry for leadership and are willing to forget about party lines and worry about problems and getting together Republicans, Democrats, Independents and moving on to solve problems. I think, one of the things that was asked of me recently, "What can we do as Republicans to once again become the majority party?" There isn't but one thing to do and that is to forget about politics and start solving the problems facing the American people and if you do and if you grasp the leadership and do that, you will automatically become the majority in America. You won't have to worry about how you do it, the technique involved, you'll just do it. The American people will make sure that you are the majority party.



I think that is one of the reasons that we are in the box that we are in. We don't have the leadership. Up there at the Republican national meeting the other day, not the meeting but the national committee brought over their experts to tell us how they were going to become the majority party, and with that kind of leadership, there is no way in the world that we'll ever become the majority party.

J.B.: What was their formula?

Edwards: They wanted to put on the television a program to show who was on the national committee.

W.D.: That has got to be about the biggest waste of money ever conceived by man.

Edwards: They were going to give all the Governors a five minute blurb at the end to do their thing. I said, "Leave me out. I don't want to have a thing to do with it because I sure don't want to be associated with that bunch." They asked me what I would do. I said, "Listen, I'd go out in the street, I'd go out into the factories, and I'd have somebody talking to that blue collar worker, and I'd have somebody letting that blue collar worker tell me what complaints he has about America and then right on top of that I'd propose things to do to correct those deficiencies that this blue collar worker has. I'd go out on the farm and talk to the farmer, and go out on the street and talk to the man on the street." Hell, nobody cares who serves on the



Republican national committee. The whole program was oriented, The Republicans did this and the Democrats did this, the whole program for thirty minutes. It is the biggest bunch of BS I had ever seen in my whole life. It is the worst thing that could happen and I am going to do everything that I can to kick it in the head.

W.D.: It is a digression but I think it is going to work against them because it is the very kind of partisan politics that you suggested. People don't want to hear about the bad guys and the good guys. They don't believe it to start with and who is going to watch it?

Edwards: That is the absolute truth. It just tore me up to sit there, and I had wasted a half day anyway. I wanted to come back and get on with the business of the state and they kept me up there Friday morning to the end of that long wasted Governors conference. I guess they caught me in a bad mood, but when they gave me that it was just more than I could take, it is horrible. They had a sample of the show.

W.D.: Can I go back to the '74 election again. You are the first Republican Governor this century in South Carolina which has got to be . . .

Edwards: The first elected Republican Governor ever. The other was appointed by the Occupational Army of the North.

W.D.: So you are the first ever, which, when you think



about politics has got to be traumatic. Could one interpretation be that the people in this state were trying to tell the Democratic party something?

Edwards: Yes, I think, to some extent, yes. More directly, I think that the whipping boy . . . I don't think that they look upon it as the Democratic party, but the whipping boy is the state senate. I think they were telling the old heads in the state senate something.

W.D.: Well, they were telling the old line Democratic party the way that was perceived, is that right? What do you think they were trying to tell them?

Edwards: I think they were trying to tell them that they were sick and tired of all the obstructionist tactics over on the senate side and blocking home rule, the taxation amendment, the local government amendment, you know, all of the other things. Ethics. I think that was the message that they were delivering to them that they wanted some progress, that they had voted on these amendments and then they had been turned down by the senate. The house was clean, you see, because they had sent them over. The ethics bill, of course, when they sent it over they said, "Thank God for the senate." The house members said that because they knew it was an irresponsible ethics bill, they had gone too far in the other direction, but I think there was a message being sent, but I think the focal point was the senate rather than the Democratic



party.

W.D.: So the message was that you represent a real change?

Edwards: I think so.

W.D.: Do you find that sort of interesting, that you have become sort of a state-wide symbol for change in state government?

Edwards: Yeah, I think we do. If I do a good job, and if we do these things that they want done, like ethics and all of these things, and if we have more openness in government and if we have more responsible government and if we can do something about this proliferation of growth of government, if we can do those things, there is no question about the Republicans replacing me when I leave here. But if we don't do these things, and if I fail, they will go right back to the Democratic party because of the old southern person is inclined to go Democratic. If there is no clear cut choice between the two candidates, he will vote Democratic.

W.D.: So you think that one of the major accomplishments of the four years will be to in a sense open up the process, make the government more open by the ethics legislation, by the election reform that you have proposed.

Edwards: Freedom of Information Bill that we proposed in the state of the state address the other day. The



participation of citizens and the participation of government. Cutting down of the proliferation or hold the growth of government to what it is today instead of letting it proliferate or get twice as large in the next four years.

W.D.: As I read that state of the state message, it looked to me like you wanted to concentrate on the process, performing the process more than big programatic goals. Is that correct?

Edwards: This is exactly right because we have had too many big programatic goals that have failed.

J.B.: So if we were here four years from now and we would ask you what was it that you had accomplished in the four years, what would you tell us?

Edwards: Openness in government. I might talk about local government having been passed, the tax amendment having been passed, equalization and reassessment of tax at least well on its way being accomplished. I'd like to talk about the health care delivery system that was well on its way to being a model for the rest of the nation particular in the [rural] area where we need it so badly. I'd like to talk about reduction of crime in the streets of South Carolina. I'd like to talk about the creation and beginning of a transportation system around the state too that I haven't thrown out yet, between our major cities, something about the traffic from the energy consumption. What were the three, education, that's the one. I'd really like to say four



years from now that we had revamped our educational system to the point where we did have kindergartens for all of our students who wanted to go in the public sector, that we had cut down the size of our classes. That there would not be over 20 - 24 students in the first, second and third grades. I'd like to say that we have developed a system of vocational education starting at the ninth grade level that would train these disruptive students and keep them occupied and at the same time train them to be productive citizens, and these are some of the things that I would like to talk about four years from now.

J.B.: You are supporting the proposed amendment on taxation instead of classifications. Why?

Edwards: Number one, we've got to . . . the courts dictate that we have to set the assessment for different, you know the homeowner, commercial and industrial. But then in addition to that, I think that it is only fair and just that we, for example, let me give you a for instance. If a farmer is farming an acre of ground on say the outskirts of say Charleston, and a farmer is farming an acre of ground in Williamsburg County. Don't you think that in the same state, that there ought to be some equalization of the amount of taxes that each one of them pays on his acre so that one would not have the advantage economically over the other?

J.B.: One is going to have an advantage economically



over the other because his land is worth a lot more, isn't he?

Edwards: Not as long as he uses it for farming. This is the point that I am making.

J.B.: If he owns a lot of acreage on the edge of a city or within a city and used it for farming, it almost amounts to a subsidization for him to become a land speculator. He can just hold that land and plant crops while its value goes up.

Edwards: Well, what is wrong with that? As long as he is using that land for the same purpose as this person in Williamsburg County, there ought to be an equalization of the taxes so this man wouldn't be paying taxes on the basis of \$2,000 an acre and this one in Williamsburg County on the basis of \$200 per acre because we have got to feed the nation. We have got to produce food and fiber for our people and last year Jack, we lost 1,000 farms and 100,000 acres of tillable soil out of production. We have got to do everything we can to keep that farmer on the farm producing food and fiber for the nation and this time with the shortages that we have. Now, in the same lull, I would be willing to go with a roll back amendment to the law, what do you call it? Not being a lawyer, I don't know the terminology, so that when he did sell that land and if he did sell it for a development or for an industrial sight, they would roll it back and he'd have to pay back taxes for



the last three or five years, whatever you built in as the roll back as being, for that land based on the price that he sold it for. But as long as he is using it strictly for farming, I think it is only right and just that farming or timber land be ~~ass~~<sup>ss</sup>essed the same. It should be built in the Constitution to keep the obvious from being up there every year wanting the Pear Growers Association have their land put in. That is a poor example because it is still farming, but something like that.

J.B.: How significant, in your opinion, in the campaign itself in '74, was the fact that Ravenel did not endorse his party's candidate?

Edwards: I don't think that it was very significant really. When you transfer the mantle of political popularity, there is a whole lot lost in the transfer. You can try it, but I never have seen it successful. Have you ever seen it successful?

J.B.: It is hard to compare that election.

Edwards: Well, that is true too. But suppose Strom Thurmond tells you that you ought to vote for Jack Bass because he is a good man. Do you think that would help Jack Bass?

Jack Bass: Yeah, I think it would.

Edwards: I don't think that Fred Sollins patting me on the shoulder and saying this is a good man, I think you ought to vote for him, I don't think it means a hill of beans to those



people particularly if they are in the same party. Now, if Pug Ravenel had crossed party lines and said, "Listen, I don't care about partisan politics, I know that Bryan Dorn is the fellow for South Carolina and in spite of the fact that I am on the other side, I endorse him and recommend him to you the people of South Carolina," then that would have some significance. But people say, "Oh, hell, it is the same old party politics."

W.D.: Speaking about party politics. Do you intend to spend much time and energy and resources helping to build a party in the next four years?

Edwards: All that I can.

W.D.: How would you do that?

Edwards: They have a series of fund raising dinners lined up around the state for me to speak at. I am glad to do it. I am interested in the Republican party. We've taken a shalacking in the last year with the Watergate situation.

W.D.: How about encouraging candidates to run?

Edwards: Oh yeah, I'll do all of that, but this is my last, after this four years, I'll continue to work in the background but I am never going to run for political office. This is strictly from a selfish standpoint. I've got to start preparing for my retirement.

J.B.: How about in terms of appointments?



Edwards:

We've probably appointed as many Democrats as we have Republicans to Commissions and Boards and that type of thing.

J.B.: You don't see that as a means of party

Edwards: Yeah, I do. I think we are building the party that way, but I think it would be the worst thing in the world to kick all of the Boards and Commissions and all of that out and put all of the Republicans in.

W.D.: Is that a change in your position from say ten years ago?

Edwards: Oh yeah, it probably is because you know ten years ago, you know, you don't really have the insight into how the system works and the need for experience.

W.D.: How about a year ago?

Edwards: Probably three years ago when I first came to the senate.

J.B.: You say that the senate was valuable as an educational experience in terms of political education?

Edwards: Oh yeah, there is no question about that.

J.B.: I want to make sure that I have something right. Did you say earlier that after the primary and Ravenel had used the senate as a whipping boy and even called them a den of thieves at one point, had all the senators at least covertly told you that they would support you?

Edwards: Yes, and they were supporting me aroundout in the field. We were well received, the state senators would introduce me in the campaign booths, but the minute



Ravenel was ruled unconstitutional, no more state senators appeared on anything with me. It was just like that. It was all over, but then they had a hard time going back and telling their people what an SOB Jim Edwards was even though they had been selling him. Then in the black community it worked just the opposite. Saying what an SOB Brian Dorn was all during the campaign, putting out the smear sheet and taking it back all the way to 1948 when he made his racist speeches, and then after Pug was ruled unconstitutional, then they had to go back and sell Brian Dorn to the blacks. This was the guy they were telling what a racist he was just three weeks before.

J.B.: Your campaign too took a different turn with the change in what happened from the standpoint of running more from, from giving less emphasis to running as a conservative to running as a reformer. But my question is when you began to project the image of being the reform candidate, did that have any . . .

Edwards: I've always been the reform candidate. The whole reason for my being in politics has been to reform politics. Pug took the things that the Republican party stood for ever since its inception in South Carolina and sold them. I can take you back to the '66 campaign and you can pull some of the things that Pug said were said by Republicans in '66. I can show them to you, the same stand, the legislator



lawyer, you know, practicing before boards and commissions. Ken Powell was the first man that ever made a speech on that in South Carolina to my knowledge. Pug picked it up and had the resources to sell it and the personality. What was his campaign chairman's name? <sup>C</sup>hurnoff.

J.B.: Ravenel ran very strongly in a lot of traditionally Republican areas. Do you think most of that was in response to his message, or how much of that, in your opinion, were people who just went in there and voted for Ravenel because he would be the easiest . . .

Edwards: There was some of both. It was a combination of the fact that Ravenel was saying the things that the public has been thinking for years, and also some of the other.

J.B.: What effect has your election had on the Republican party in terms of factionalism in the party? I mean, you said originally there were sort of the ins and the outs?

Edwards: I have been working to try to bring it all back together. I am probably the only one that could do it. I am not saying that from an egotistical standpoint, but I have always been close to both sides and I have seen both sides. I have stayed out of the fights and arguments except one time I did cross with <sup>[Strom]</sup> Earl Sprong, twice I crossed with him, but that is the only time.

J.B.: Do you see his role strictly in party matters within



the state as diminishing simply because you have a Republican Governor, whether it would be you or someone else?

Edwards: I'd like to get Strom back in and sort of smooth the waters and try to build his image with the party faction again, I really would. We haven't got any room for indivision in our party. If we are going to grow we have to . . . there was a strong Thurmond faction, it was more of a Harry Dent faction and an anti-Harry Dent faction and these were the two factions that were in South Carolina.

W.D.: Do you think that you can smooth that over in the next year or two years?

Edwards: Yes. We have already made great strides towards smoothing that over.

W.D.: So you see in four years a united Republican party?

Edwards: Yeah, in South Carolina and a further divided Democratic party. I predict that there are going to be some switch overs particularly with the things that are going on in the national Democratic party. I see no vote for any moderate coming out of the national Democratic party. Do you? Scoop Jackson would be the best thing that they could do probably, but there is no way in the world that Scoop is going to get the nomination.



J.B.: You were quoted, I just wanted to ask you if it were accurate, but if Reagan did lead a third party candidacy that you tend to support him?

Edwards: I would have a difficult time making that decision. I think Reagan holds a track record that is second to none. He has proved what can be done. He took California from bankruptcy.

J.B.: In 1968 you were the leading Reagan man in South Carolina.

Edwards: That is the first time that I ever crossed with Strom Thurmond. Strom was on the other side.

J.B.: Your view of him then hasn't changed during that period.

Edwards: Since '68 I have gained a greater respect of the man and I had a tremendous respect for him then.

W.D.: Would you consider his administration in California as sort of a model for you?

Edwards: I sure would, and a model for the country too. If we had a Reagan up there we could amend this Constitution requiring us to live under a balanced budget on an annual basis, and that one thing would do more for America than anything that could be done in the next two decades. Think what this country's position would be today if we had been balancing the budget over the years.

End interview with Governor James Edwards.