

This is an interview with Charles Ravenel of South Carolina. Mr. Ravenel is the Democratic nominee for Governor. The date of the interview was August 26, 1974. The interviewer was Jack Bass and the transcriber was Susan Hathaway.

J.B.: Let's start a little more at the beginning. What was Pug Ravenel's early childhood like? How did you get interested in politics and when did it first cross your mind that you might want to be Governor of South Carolina?

Charles Ravenel: When I was about 16 years old, I got the feeling that I wanted to go into politics. I never talked about running for some specific office, I just never thought in those terms. I didn't know what office it would be, but I am a competitive man, and I always knew that I wanted to run for the highest office available to me. If I was going to go into the political field, I was going to rise to the most challenging and responsible position that I could in that field. So from the time I was 16 on, I always knew that I would get involved somehow, some day. I

didn't know it, I believed it. Even going through college, when I would write my resumé's and things, I articulated that. The same through graduate school. I said it all during my business career, and said it in my White House Fellows application. I always knew. Now don't ask me why I liked politics or the political process. Why do you like peanut butter or the color blue? It is just there or not there. I want to serve, I want to make a contribution, and I like the process itself. But I always wanted to run on my own terms. That is, I wanted to be able to afford to lose, and I wanted to be my own man, I wanted to be independent, I wanted to be able to be subject to no financial pressures at all in making political decisions. It costs money to run for office, and the only way you can do that is to achieve some measure of financial independence yourself. So I set out and tried to make enough money to become independent enough to run for office when the time was right. Now there are two ways to get involved. One is to start to have a split personality, in effect work in your business career and start your political involvement at the same time and then gradually shift from one end to the other. The other way is to work 100% of your time focused in on what you are doing at the time, your business career, and then finish that and go and spend

100% of your time on your political career. I chose to do the later. I never had any political involvement to speak of until this year. I was a poll watcher in 1972. Now . . .

J.B.: How many children were there in your family?

Ravenel: Three. I have a brother two years younger, and a sister four years younger. So it just started way way back. I don't know, I was kind of the highest elected office in the high school, at Bishop ^{England} ~~Payne~~ High School it was the Student Council Judge, and I held that office as a senior in high school. That may have had something to do with it. It was just an expression of a desire that I first became aware of when I was 16.

[Interruption] How did this all start? I think it started way back then.

J.B.: How about at Harvard when you were there? You were at Harvard on a football scholarship, am I right?

Ravenel: No. There are no football scholarships at Harvard. Somebody said that recently and I was mad at them. I should have said that tonight, make up stuff. Like Newsweek magazine saying that I lived in a split level home in the suburbs, which I don't live in. Anyway, at Harvard I got a scholarship, and there are no athletic scholarships at all at Harvard. There was no requirement whatsoever that I play football. If I had

chosen not to, my scholarship would not have been impaired at all. So, it was not an athletic scholarship. There is the other point I'd make on this thing about politics to carry it through to the conclusion, is my getting to a point where I could be independent before I ran was important. And also politics is a very mercurial business in my opinion. You are subject to so many uncontrollable factors in terms of timing. I see it like a football line. You know, the hole opens and closes like that. You are either through it or you're not. If you are not through it, there ain't no way you are going to get through. If you get through, you pick up eight or ten yards and the whole business of football is whether you get the back there at the hole the minute it opens. But you never know where the hole is going to be. You head for one point in the line but the guy may be stunting so you may have to shift over that way or he may head straight ahead or you may have to head inside. So the guy couldn't block him the way he thought he was going to block him, he just had to take him the way he was going, etc. So, the back has to hit the line and be willing to move instantly to where the hole is, where the daylight is, and then the daylight is there for an instant and then it is gone. Well, the analogy holds for politics. I got this instinctual feeling in 1971 that it was time to get

down here, get home. I wanted to come home because I wanted to get back to my roots, and to my family, my sense of community and New York was getting on me. But more importantly, I just had the feeling that if I was serious about politics, then I better be here in case that daylight opened. I got to get on with it instead of just talking about it. Because I see it and characterize it then when I was in New York, that it was like an open window. You stand in front of the window for years and years and years and decades maybe, and then it will open and shut, bang, in a very short period of time. If you are not there ready to run, you may not get another chance in another generation. Doggone if that isn't what happened. Because this year, you know I was just barely here long enough to be able to run and win. Had I come just last year, it would have been impossible. I got here and the window opened and I saw it and moved to the daylight, and was able therefore to make a major move towards something that I have wanted to do all my life. Some people might regard that as opportunism. I don't see it that way. I think it is kind of my life's ambition or my personal way of making a contribution.

J.B.: If Jim Mann had run for Governor this year instead of ~~Bryan~~ Dorn, would you have gotten in that race?

Say if Jim Mann had run and Earl Morris and Bryan Dorn had not.

Ravenel: Probably not. I'd say that the odds would have been 80% that I would not have done it. The reason why I decided to run was that all across the nation old time politicians were being turned out of office. But it hadn't happened in South Carolina in any meaningful way.

J.B.: Except for John ~~Monroe~~ McMillan.

Ravenel: Except for John ~~Monroe~~ McMillan. But then, you know, that daylight was opened and shut, bang. When Ed Young came crashing through. He didn't really make it because they ganged up on him. He shocked them, but then it closed the ranks. That is why we can't be very cavalier about what is going to happen this November. But I'd say that if Jim Mann had run and Bryan Dorn had not and Earl Morris had not, the chances are 80% to 90% that I wouldn't have run. I'll tell you this too. If Alex Sanders, or Isadore Louie, or Brantley Harvey had run for Governor, I wouldn't have run. [Interruption]

J.B.: . . . Had announced early that you would run. How about just briefly summarizing your career?

Ravenel: You mean chronologically?

J.B.: Yeah, it might be easier just doing it chronologically.

Ravenel: Starting when?

J.B.: Okay, after being in high school.

Ravenel: I was too little to get any football scholarships to any colleges in South Carolina, which is really what I wanted to do. So I won a newspaper boy scholarship to Exador Academy in New Hampshire and I repeated my senior year there. Graduated from Exador in 1957.

I played football, basketball, baseball, struggled through a terribly difficult academic regimen, and grew about 15 pounds. Applied to go to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, was promised a scholarship by Jim Tatum, then the football coach, in April. He renigged on the scholarship, and I had withdrawn from Harvard College which I had already accepted, I withdrew my application. Then was informed by him in late May or early June that I could come but I couldn't get the scholarship because he had allocated too many. If I made the team I could get one, but if I didn't I was on my own and I couldn't afford to do that.

J.B.: You weighed how much then?

Ravenel: Oh, about 150. So I hastily recontacted Harvard University. I still didn't want to go to Harvard. I enrolled in Washington and Lee. I was so against going to school in the North. When I got home though my father told me that I was a fool if I had an opportunity to go

to Harvard and didn't go, and then by then I was so disappointed and fed up with the whole business of the rejection that I got from the University of North Carolina, and I had no interest at all in the University of South Carolina football scholarship that I said, "To heck with it."

J.B.: Who was the head football coach then, ~~Giese~~ ^{Giese} ~~Geezik~~?

Ravenel: Yeah, I think so. No, yeah, ~~Giese~~ ^{Giese} ~~Geezik~~ was.
Who followed ~~Emory~~ ^{Enrich}?

J.B.: ~~Giese~~ ^{Giese} ~~Geezik~~.

Ravenel: Yeah, ~~Giese~~ ^{Giese} ~~Geezik~~. So I said, "To hell with it, if Harvard will take me, I'll go." So I went. I called them up and said, "I don't know why you should have anything to do with me. You accepted me, then I rejected you, now I am calling you up at the last minute and asking you to let me in." They had a great Admissions Officer and he said . . . his name was Bill Bender and he was a genius. He concentrated greatly on balancing Harvard's student body, by accepting people who earned their way by their academic brilliance and sprinkled that population with people like me that he was willing to gamble on, that didn't have the academic credentials at all, but had something else that he defined as leadership potential. He would just arbitrarily make those decisions. He said, "This guy's scores are terrible, but I think he has

got it and we are going to let him in." He was successful at it. So then I went to Harvard in 1960, concentrated totally on playing football and baseball, was terribly unhappy my freshman year, lonely, not turned on to the academic environment. My sophomore year I got in with a group of three or four, four, five, really good roommates and had a tremendous time all through the rest of my college career. I carried four jobs through college and borrowed money in addition to my scholarship because the scholarship just wasn't enough.

J.B.: What were the jobs you had?

Ravenel: Well, I slopped food in the kitchen. I refereed intramural sports. I sold clothes for a wholesale clothier among the student body. I had the newspaper concession at the college. I was responsible for the sale of the Boston and New York papers amongst the student body.

J.B.: Was that primarily the Times?

Ravenel: Primarily the Times.

J.B.: You would have people working under you?

Ravenel: Yes, I was the manager of the newspaper concession.

J.B.: You were doing all of these simultaneously?

Ravenel: Yeah. But you see the newspaper thing was in the morning, and I had it set up so I didn't have to do it except for Sunday morning, and a few weeks in

the early part of the year to get everything set up. The clothes I kind of did while I was sitting at meals or walking to practice or just selling among friends and people that I knew. They were Harris Tweed sport coats and top coats that I got at a wholesale price and sold at a wholesale price. Then the refereeing I did in the afternoon in the winter time when I wasn't playing basketball or football, football or baseball. The food I only had to do at lunch and dinner. But I mean it was a full schedule. But I concentrated heavily on the sports and having a good time.

J.B.: How about studies?

Ravenel: You know, I studied enough to get by, but I was no academic giant. I finished in the bottom half of my class. I don't hate to say it. You know, I got two B's and two C's, and I took a lot of courses that I got a great deal out of, like music and architecture, fine arts. I got a very broad scale education.

J.B.: Did you have a major as a subject?

Ravenel: Yeah. I majored in history, Modern European History, but I just barely satisfied the requirements. I didn't write a thesis or anything like that. I had a terrific time. I think I had a motorcycle, great roommates, and I won the Bingham Award which goes to the school's most outstanding athlete, and I was the First

Marshall of my class, which is Harvard's equivalent of President of the senior class. I used to get teased that I'd have to go out and go to work and take a cut in pay because I was making money with my jobs. I was always hustling. So, when I graduated from Harvard College . . .

J.B.: Didn't you beat Yale twice in a row?

Ravenel: Yeah. We beat Yale as freshmen, sophomores, and juniors and then lost my senior year.

J.B.: Were you starting quarterback four years?

Ravenel: I started as a freshmen, and then my sophomore year there were two senior men, lettermen with letters for two years previously and were seniors. So I started the season third string and got in for about the last four minutes of the first game. Then I got in for the last three quarters of the second game, and then I started the third game and started ever since.

J.B.: But you started as a freshman.

Ravenel: Well, the freshmen could not play varsity.

J.B.: Oh I see, you started on the freshmen team.

Ravenel: Yeah.

J.B.: Am I correct that that was the last time up the scale that Harvard has beaten Yale twice in a row?

Ravenel: I don't know. I just don't remember that. But, we were supposed to go undefeated and I was very

excited to have been chosen an All-American candidate by Street and Smith Football magazine before my senior year, and I never felt stronger. I felt terrific. We had a very good team. We were chosen to win them all. They thought we had a good chance of being undefeated, one of Harvard's best teams. Then I got this thing.

J.B.: What happened?

Ravenel: That was in the second game. I was throwing a block, you know, and I had my knee out like that pushing, and somebody fell on it that way and cracked it in. It's like bending your elbow that way. It tore all of the ligaments that go down here. I just had it operated on a year and a half ago, so I twisted it. I had to have two steel pins in there, oh, it is just a mess. So that ended that. I did get in a little bit of the last game, the Yale game, but I didn't do anything. Then I got one of ~~twenty~~ ^{Coming} Glassworks Travelling Fellowships. That was brand new that year and kind of created around the opportunity that I had. It was designed for people who had the potential to be leaders, but were not academic giants. There were scholarships and fellowships available for journalists and for people in biology and chemistry and science and English majors, but none available for just Joe Blow with two B's and two C's who is probably going to go in the business world and

make something of himself. So Amo Hotten, who was President of Corning Glassware, and Dean Leslie Rawlings from the Harvard Business School inaugurated a scholarship called the Corning Glassware Scholarship, which was designed to be used for education abroad. But one of the Deans at Harvard said, "Heck, if I had this scholarship I wouldn't go study at the Sorbone¹, or Oxford where they were trying to get me to go, but I'd go around the world." He whipped out this map and said, "I'd go here, there and there." So I said, "Gee, do you think they will let me do that?" and he said, "Why don't you ask them." So I did.

J.B.: Who was the Dean.

Ravenel: Dean John Monro~~ge~~, who is now the President of Miles College.

J.B.: He is not the President. I have regards from him to you. I talked to him down in Birmingham last month.

Ravenel: Oh, do you. That's really nice. Did you? really? Well, if you see him again, you tell him that he is the one that suggested that I go around the world.

[Interruption] So I went with Peter Benchley, who just wrote Jaws, the best selling novel about the great white shark, it was on the best seller list for 25 weeks or something like that. He wrote a book about us, by the way, called Time and a Ticket. It was terrible. It only sold about 50 copies, half of which was bought by his family,

and the other half by mine. But I got back from that and worked in the summer time, and then went to Harvard Business School.

J.B.: Didn't you get caught behind the Iron Curtain?

Ravenel: Yeah, I was going through Europe and we got detained for a while, a couple hours. But you don't want me to go into that.

J.B.: No, not unless it left some indelible memory or something like that?

Ravenel: Each summer I worked in the, I worked in Corning Glassworks the summer before I travelled. I worked at Kinsey and Company, a management consulting firm in New York City, when I got back before my first year in business school, and then I worked at Donaldson and ~~Upton~~ ^{Lufkin} my summer between my two years in business school. I went to business school in '62, got out in '64, went to work for Donaldson, ~~Upton~~ ^{Lufkin} and ~~Jenrette~~ until '66. I applied for a White House Fellowship, won it against the advice of a lot of people who said it was a bad time to leave my firm. I left anyway. I worked in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury as special assistant to the Under Secretary, Joseph W. Bar, who later became Secretary. That was an extraordinary program. Went back to work for Donaldson, Upton and ~~Jenrette~~ .

J.B.: What was the effect of that year in Washington?

Did it intensify your feelings about going into politics?

Ravenel: Absolutely. It just made it clear, it solidified the feeling.

J.B.: What was it about it?

Ravenel: What was it about?

J.B.: What was it about the experience that made you even more determined.

Ravenel: When you go to Washington, you became aware of the tremendous responsibility and impact that government has on so many millions of people. A lot of people that live outside of the framework of the government are not aware of what it does or how it does it or what influence they might have upon it. Working with the government I saw its power, its influence, its ability to do good, or its ability to do evil, and I just wanted to play a role, a part. I also learned that all people who ran it weren't as super-human as I thought they were. So . . . we got to talk to everybody who was anybody in Washington. Those fellows met privately and off the record. We all had top secret clearances. We met with the CIA, we met with the Editorial Board of the New York Times. We met with Mayor Daley and John Lindsay and David Rockefeller. We met in Washington with General Mathew Ridgway, and Secretary McNamara, and Dean Rusk, and Bobby Kennedy, and the President. I mean everybody.

J.B.: How many Fellows were there?

Ravenel: 18. An incredible experience, really.

J.B.: Then you went back to New York.

Ravenel: Back to Donaldson, Uptom and to try to make some money. I didn't have a nickel. I think my experience in going to Washington cost me at the minimum \$200,000. Because I would have bought stock in the company earlier, had a lower price, made more money. But it was worth it. So I came back and worked until December of 1971, when I told everybody I was going to leave and go in the spring of '72, and I left. Went down to Charleston and opened up a . . .

J.B.: What was your position when you left?

Ravenel: I was a Vice-President. We opened up a office in Charleston. They tried to persuade me to open up an office in Atlanta, and that is the logical place to open it up if you are going to have one in the South, except that I wanted to be in South Carolina. I not only wanted to be in South Carolina, but I wanted to be home in Charleston. So I talked them into doing that and they were willing to try it. That worked for about a year, then they wanted me to work on more traditional investment banking functions, such as getting bond business, and stock business and big companies. I wanted to become involved in the raw end business, long term

investment and raw acreage with no development. They wouldn't do it my way, and I wouldn't do it their's so we parted company on a friendly basis. We set up Ravenel, Dawson and Hasty, Inc., which was profitable in its first year, July 1, 1973 to July 1, 1974. We made money, which is a nice record of success. Stewart Dawson is a graduate of the University of North Carolina, and Duke, has a Masters Degree in psychology, and a Masters Degree from the Harvard Business School. Trenton Hasty is a summa cum laude from Princeton, New Jersey, and a Harvard Law School graduate and really good. But they knew all along that I was going to run for office sometime. I told them that before we set it up. They didn't know what office and neither did I, and they didn't know when. My original plan was to run for the house this year. As a matter of fact, I let it be known that I would be interested in Charleston County Council seat that was available when Mitch Graham, an incumbent, died. But I didn't push it and I was late in letting people know that I was interested. As a result, I wasn't seriously considered and I didn't really run and I didn't get it. So then I was going to run for the house. But I thought about that. I thought about that, and decided, you know, that the house responsibility is really a legislative law making role. I am not a law maker, I

am a businessman. So, I belonged in the Executive Branch of the government. I wanted to run for, most of the Executive Branch of the government is state-wide, any of the significant jobs are state-wide. So I looked around at the state-wide offices and first considered the Treasurer's job because of my financial experience. But I did a good job; I didn't offer very much and I looked at the gubernatorial Lieutenant position, and I saw a lot of good men running, relatively young, relatively progressive, relatively encrusted politically. I didn't stand a very sharp [chance], and the gubernatorial seed started growing in me about November. I kept waiting for somebody else to seek it, to see the, you know, the possibility of someone else. But nobody did. Then I had Marvin do a study in late December and I made the emotional decision in January and practical decision in February, late February, and then announced officially in March, and that is what happened.

J.B.: When did you first become aware of the residency question?

Ravenel: About 2 a.m. on the morning of . . . when my wife was reading a League of Women Voters manual, and I guess that must have been about the middle of March. No, that must have been about the first week in March. Because I had an appointment to see Governor John West and Crawford

Cook, the next day. She told me about it. Woke me up to tell me about it. I go to bed about 11:30 or 12:00, she is a night owl. She woke me up and said, "Well, what about this." And I said, "Well, what am I going to do about it at 2 a.m. Show it to me in the morning." So when I woke up in the morning I read it, and asked the Governor and Crawford Cook about it. They both expressed tremendous concern that . . . you know, like it was just an impassable hurdle. First of all, the practicalities of running seemed dubious to them. Crawford flatly predicted and said that I just couldn't win. He said as far as the primary was concerned, that 45% of the primary vote is controlled, they said. They said I couldn't get any of the black vote. Then, . . .

J.B.: Wasn't he already committed to Dorn's race then?

Ravenel: No, not then. He said that he had already turned Dorn down. What Governor West said, that the constitutional lawyers were Harry Lightsey and Haywood ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{Belser} ~~Bowser~~. We went to see Haywood ^{Belser} ~~Bowser~~ because John Trask, my friend, knew him personally, and that is how it started. The real story of this thing is the gambles that we made. We had residency problems staring us in the face and we announced anyway on March 25, because the state-wide Democratic convention was March 27. We

wanted to have a presence at that convention, the presence of an announced candidate. So we made the announcement and showed up at the convention uncertain as to whether the Democratic party would accept my filing fee. In fact, everybody said they wouldn't. You know, "Who the hell was this guy coming in here." So at the convention, we were scheduled to have a meeting at the close of the convention at 5:30 with the Executive Committee and people were making books that morning that they had flatly turned me down. In fact, we had heard that a week before, but we wanted to bring pressure on them by having an announced candidacy, having publically said that we were running, and then putting them into a position of saying against the public announcement, you know, "We are not going to accept him," which they politically could not do. I mean, how can you turn a guy down who wanted to run, especially in the year when incumbents in the establishment, etc., were suspect anyway. So then I made a speech to the Executive Committee, and nobody in the world thought I could win it in case. So they accepted my filing, they said they would accept my filing subject to a resolution of the issue in a court of law. If I can get it resolved before the printing of the ballots, that I would agree not to run, and they asked and I gave them the agreement that if I did not get court adjudication of this matter before the printing

of the ballots for the Democratic primary, that I would not run for Governor in any party or in any capacity. In other words, that I wouldn't run as an Independent. They asked that, and I gave it because they thought first of all that we were then talking about a June primary. At that time it was almost the first of April, and there was no way that we'd even get through the courts. Then the Attorney General who had been sitting on a request for a ruling for 47 days issued shortly after that his ruling which was no ruling. He said that he had grave doubts as to whether I was eligible, but it would have to be decided by the courts. So then we had a court trial. Most every lawyer in the state had pronounced me guilty until proven innocent, but they didn't know any facts in the case. We brought eleven witnesses to bear, and Haywood ~~Bowser~~^{el} argued beautifully and presented the case. And the case turned on the question of definition of residency. The Constitution requirement was that the Governor must be a citizen and resident of the state for the five years actually preceeding the day of his election. I had physically only been present for two and a half years. So the question was legally was I a resident for the last two and a half years of my physical presence in New York. We contended that I was because the principal determinant of residency is

where one intends to make one's permanent home regardless of where you are physically. There are indicies of intentions, such as where you pay taxes, where you have a drivers license, where you vote, where you live physically, how often you return to the state, etc. But it was a fact, and it remains a fact that I had an unrelenting intention to make South Carolina my permanent home.

J.B.: Am I not correct that on your marriage license application, you put Charleston as your home?

Ravenel: Yes, that's true.

J.B.: Was this part of the evidence?

Ravenel: I think that was part of the evidence. I don't remember all of the evidence, but I think that is true. But that was '63, way back. We proved beyond a shadow of the doubt that I had a constant and unshakeable intention to return to South Carolina. Judge Grimball ruled from the bench that I was a resident.

J.B. Now, what do you think your winning the election means, presuming you win in November?

Ravenel: I think if I win in November, I think it means that the people of South Carolina want a change for the better in the way the government acts to serve them. We have said that we want to change a lot of things. We want to change the emphasis on education. I think people want that. We want to change the political buddy system, which has existed in South Carolina politics at the state-

wide level for generations. I think the people want that changed. We want to change home rule as a reflection of that. The constitutional change voted it in and the powerful senators that don't want it to come in say the people didn't know what they were voting for.

That is arrogance. It just simply won't be tolerated anymore. The people haven't had a choice, an alternative before. As soon as they were presented with one that was viable and made some sense, they were willing to step up to the place. I think really the people were in front and the politicians lagged them. We provided the answer to what they have been wanting for some time. So I think what the victory means is that they've made a statement that they want to change the way that South Carolina's politics work.

J.B.: You said tonight, I think, that Watergate was very important. Is that basically correct?

Ravenel: Yes.

J.B.: From the standpoint of setting a climate?

Ravenel: Yes, but Watergate alone wouldn't have been enough. We would have had to have Watergate-like circumstances here in South Carolina. We had them Charleston County Council, the Chairman of the Charleston County Council was convicted of extortion last December or January, maybe even later. The Judge, Ken Love, here,

the Magistrate, pleaded guilty to two counts of bribing a policeman. An elected County Council member was convicted of embezzlement. He was fired from his county council position. There is a judge down in Orangeburg with 27 counts against him by the [grand jury] that they are working out. Hundreds of people, hundreds of thousands of people have been aware of the fact that you can get a drunken driving ticket fixed in South Carolina if you go to the right person, that certain members of the legislature with low license plates openly disobey the speeding limits and never get caught or called down for it. There has come a laxness in the government's sense of accountability to the people. So not only was the Watergate environment at a national level, but some sort of repetition of that environment on the state level was made possible.

J.B.: Am I correct that you have met both of the senators, Gressette and Dennis?

Ravenel: I have not met with either one.

J.B.: You have not met with either one of them?

Ravenel: No.

J.B.: Do you plan to before the general election?

Ravenel: I am going to meet with as many people as possible, and I want to meet with them because they will be, they are important leaders in the senate and we are

going to have to deal with each other if I win. So, I am going to go see them.

J.B.: There are those that have a feeling that the legislature has already indicated, the senate at least, has already indicated it's more or less sharpening its knives. They ~~made SLED~~ an independent agency, taking the appointed power away from the Governor as the chief.

Ravenel: The Governor no longer appoints the Chief of ~~Staff~~ SLED,

J.B.: Appoints him with the advice and consent of the senate under this recent bill as I understand it. Absolute appointment. It also removed it as an agency of the Governor's office. So it is now an unregulated police agency in effect.

Ravenel: Is it really?

J.B.: That is my understanding. Passed in this special session.

Ravenel: I haven't seen that bill.

J.B.: It didn't get a lot of attention. Senator Dennis, who made noises there for the primary, and needs ethics legislation, and that he is going to recall the bill, then 15 minutes before adjournment makes an amendment that has the effect of killing the bill because it is so late, the house can't consider the whole bill. What happens if you get that sort of

reaction and response from the senate as Governor the first two years?

Ravenel: Well, first of all, you try to present programs that are so well put together and so well presented and so persuasive in their own right, that the senate wants to pass them. Secondly, you lobby in the senate to try to beat them on the votes if you can't do that. If you can't get everybody behind you, you try to get enough votes to get your legislation through even if that means bucking the establishment, which in the past, if that is any guide, is what it is going to mean. If that doesn't work then you fight. You get in the ring and take off your gloves and fight it out with your bare knuckles, which means that you go before the people and you say, as I would have said on ~~Beckford's~~ ^{ethics} legislation, "I think we need it, I think it is a travesty that we don't have it. I want everybody to know who the Senators are that voted against it. Here they are, Senator so and so from such and such, no ethics. Senator so and so from such and such, no ethics. If you believe like I do that this is a disgrace, unbecoming to the State of South Carolina, write them a letter, go see him, send him a telegram. But most importantly, let's remember it at next election time. No on ethics, and I think that is a mistake, and

I want you all to know that I think it is a mistake, and if you believe so, let's do something about it."

J.B.: The South Carolina senate is the only, apparently it is the only legislative body in any southern state that operates on the principle of seniority.

Ravenel: Is that true? I can't believe that.

J.B.: I learned that. It kind of surprised me, I didn't realize that.

Ravenel: I thought every legislature . . . I don't think it should.

J.B.: No other southern state has either house operate on seniority. My next question is that if it gets down to the bare knuckles, if it gets down to that, does it mean then working for senatorial candidates who would then presumably get 25 members of the senate, and they vote rules to change the procedure. Then you end up with structural procedural change.

Ravenel: I would be willing to do that if that were necessary. Nobody recognizes that that was the historic and dramatic . . . [Interruption]

Begin Side Two, Tape 1

Ravenel: Kennedy's most significant accomplishment in three years was that he changed ~~and~~ ^{the makeup of} the Rules

Committee in the House. Before, you couldn't get a rule for a bill, you couldn't get it out on the floor. It didn't even get assigned to a committee, I don't think, until you got a rule first, and if the Senate Rules Committee Chairman didn't like it, he didn't give it a rule. So, the first thing that Kennedy did was to get Sam Rayburn's help and they packed the committee and changed its make-up and blew the dam wide open and changed the structural make-up.

J.B.: What kind of people do you plan to bring into state government.

Ravenel: As many good people as possible from wherever I can find them. I think that is very crucial. We don't owe any political patronage, we have a freer hand than any gubernatorial Governor-elect will ever have had. We had a chance to put three people on the Consumer Affairs Commission and that tells you something right there. One of them was a high school teacher and tennis coach from Anderson, South Carolina, about 33 years old named Dwayne Lofus. Another was a black woman named Frances Morris, who is about 54 or 55, has eleven children was on welfare from Charleston. The third was Rita McKinney from Greenville, and outgoing President of the South Carolina student body. Those were our three appointments to the Consumer Affairs Commission, and all the

rest of them were the typical savings bank president, industrialist, etc. So we are going to make a heck of a lot of changes if we get in. Especially the operating people in agencies. I have to be wheels ~~so~~ up at 7:15 tomorrow, which means that I have to get up at six o'clock. Can we carry on then? Can you come with me? [Interruption. Obviously the interview is picked up in an automobile.]

J.B.: I wanted to ask you about the black vote in South Carolina. The conventional wisdom as you heard it, and what must be done, and what you heard about your chances of getting, and what you did insofar as the black vote is concerned, and what the results were?

Ravenel: Well, I had been told that the conventional wisdom that the black vote can't buy it. I was even told by one fellow that the price would be \$60 to \$80 thousand dollars on election day out on the streets. I don't think anybody has sufficiently written, or I haven't seen it, how the black vote has worked in South Carolina politics. I think that is a shame because I think it is part of the way things have been for a long time.

J.B.: What did they tell you on this? Go ahead and elaborate, how it does work?

Ravenel: Well, you round up the black leadership

across the state and everybody knows who they are, and you agree to pay them money theoretically to get help from workers on election day to drive, to pay drivers to drive voters to the polls who can't get to the polls, to distribute literature, to hand out the ticket. The marked up ballot which tells people how to vote, and the leader that you give the money to, takes off, you know, you give him \$5,000, he rakes off about \$1,000 or \$1,500 for himself and pays everybody else. It is a tiered system, and it goes down to the guy who is driving the car or watching the polls, getting paid for voting one way or another. Well, first of all we thought that was wrong and weren't going to do it.

J.B.: You were told this by whom? Not necessarily the name, but an active politician?

Ravenel: A black, for example, a party official, Democratic party official, two defeated candidates, and a successful candidate for office in 1972. It is the great unspoken, unwritten rule. I was told that we couldn't win because those leaders had already committed to Bryan Dorn or Earl Morris, and I couldn't get them, even if I paid them, I couldn't get them. Well, that's not true. They figured if I paid them enough, I could get some of them. But we didn't want

to do that and we believed that the old system didn't work anyway. The black electorate is a lot more sophisticated than people give them credit for. In fact, people would walk into the black precincts with an Earl Morris ticket in their hand and say, "How do I vote for Ravenel to the poll watcher?" So we relied on television with black spots as well as white, and our ads were cast to everybody, not just to blacks or to whites, and it worked. Blacks responded to our campaign the same way that whites did.

J.B.: What facets of the campaign do you think they responded to?

Ravenel: Well, you know, what we want to do is . . . the major theme of the campaign was that we wanted to work to try to give everybody a fair chance. Most of the people that don't have a fair chance are the poor, and most of the poor are black. It naturally appealed to them more than it did to the average white, because the average black is a lot poorer in this state. Our estimate is that we have 65% to 70% of the black vote.

J.B.: This was in the run-off.

Ravenel: In the run-off.

J.B.: How about the first primary?

Ravenel: Around 30%.

J.B.: In effect then, you picked up the black vote that went for Morris?

Ravenel: Yeah. I think the black vote wanted to vote for us from the beginning but were afraid that we couldn't win, and they can't afford to back a loser. They had a lot at stake.

J.B.: What did you do between the first and second primary insofar as the black vote is concerned? In dealing with blacks and talking with them.

Ravenel: Yeah, but no more than we had before the first primary. But in the second primary, they were listening. The black leaders were listening. The black people listened all the way along the line, and . . .

J.B.: You didn't put any money at all into the traditional car pool, this sort of thing?

Ravenel: We had the sum total of \$2,000 available that day for payment for gasoline on a voucher basis only. Come in with a gasoline receipt. We couldn't ask people to carry people to the polls on a volunteer basis with the price of gasoline as it exists today. So there was \$2,000 for the entire state to be paid out on a voucher basis only for gasoline, and that was it.

J.B.: What long range effect do you think that this is going to have on South Carolina insofar as politicians dealing with "the black vote" is concerned.

Ravenel: Well, a historic change has taken place. No longer can the black vote be bought, never again, nor can it be influenced by paying money to the leadership. Where our preference was the basic alienation that exists between leaders in institutions, and their constituencies.

It exists in the black community as well. In fact, there was great discord in the black community when ~~and~~ Newman supporting Bryan Dorn and Oscar Butler supported Earl Morris, they split the rest of the leadership. So, there is a great alienation in the land, I think, across the nation and in South Carolina between leaders and the people who are supposed to have chosen those leaders. The great feeling about leadership in the institution of authority don't care about me, my opinion doesn't matter. I don't have any influence over them and I can't make any difference. That same feeling exists in the black community. So the black leadership has less ability to control those people than ever before.

J.B.: You were talking last night when we broke off about the story that can be written about the campaign itself. What is that story? What made it different?

Ravenel: Well, I think first of all the risks that we took. We started late in the first place by not declaring until March 25 when everybody thought there was a good chance that we would have a June primary. On top of that, I had a residency uncertainty, and we took a big risk there, gambling that we would win it. The third big risk was a financial risk. I took out a second mortgage on my home and put up the first \$30,000 of campaign expenses, because I didn't feel it was right to ask other people for financial risk if there was a

residency problem. You take enough risks in thinking that you could lose. We took a giant risk, a strategic risk by announcing before the Democratic convention and then gambling that the state Democratic committee would accept my filing when the rule of thumb that morning was that they would not. Then what would we do, if they refused to accept the filing, would I run as an Independent or not? We were prepared to do that if we had to. The risk that we would get a ruling in time to clarify the matter before the election, in that we gambled that we would get a primary that was later than June, and we desperately needed that extra time. We gambled that not only would we receive the court ruling that would be favorable rather than unfavorable. results would be favorable rather than unfavorable. Everybody said, "Even if you win, you will be branded as a Carpetbagger. It will hurt you politically." In fact, it helped us. People saw us as an underdog being beseiged by the establishment. "Why don't they let this boy run," is what everybody said.

J.B.: Was that perception heightened by the fact that Westmoreland being similarly situated except that he had never voted in the military?

Ravenel: Was what feeling heightened?

J.B.: Of them picking on you, you know.

Ravenel: Yeah, I think a little bit. Well, they would say, "If he's got the problem, why doesn't Westmoreland?" A little bit, yeah. We took the risk that here we were with no political base at all, we took the risk that we could put one together, a coalition of the disenchanted. We had no built-in party, no built-in loyalties around the state on which we could call for help. We had to create out of thin air an organization. The gamble was that that could be done and it was. I took a personal risk by signing these notes for around \$75,000 to \$200,000, which meant that if I lost, I would be bankrupt, personally broke, absolutely dead busted broke. I took that risk. It is a story of risk. All the convention was that you got to use billboards. Brian Dorn used billboards, Earl Morris used billboards, Ken Oliver used billboards. Everybody is always using billboards. We used none. Everybody always uses direct mail, we used none. Everybody put money on the street to buy the black vote. We used none. Instead we put it all on the television, and it worked.

J.B.: The other thing that you did different was to bring in an outside campaign consultant?

Ravenel: Yeah. I believe in getting the best there is, I don't care where in the hell they come from. *Martin Chernoff*
~~Robert Churnoff~~ was the best in this nation. Now, see it

is not such an evil thing. John ^{Jeunette}~~Generent~~ has a guy from Ohio running his campaign. Everybody said that all of these peripheral things made a difference. ^[If you've]~~Haven't~~ voted in New York, you have a residency problem. You have an outside campaign manager. You don't have any political scouting for you. You don't have the black vote for you. All of those peripheral things didn't matter. Those theses left out the fact that, assumed that the people of South Carolina are kind of stupid, and the primary vote was locked up, out of control. Now the people are a lot smarter than anybody gives them credit for. We simply presented a campaign which addressed the issues that we knew the people were worried about because we told them to find out, and gave our answers to those problems and made sense. We believed in the people.

J.B.: Why did you take your position on capital punishment, which the polls showed was an unpopular position?

Ravenel: Why was it unpopular?

J.B.: The polls showed your position was basically an unpopular position.

Ravenel: Yeah, but not by a dramatic amount. I remember that it was 56% against capital punishment, I mean 44% was opposed. So it wasn't . . . in the white

communities there was a large dissatisfaction with my stand. Not large, but some dissatisfaction with my stand. But in the black community it won a great deal of support. Now I did it because that is the way I feel, not to get any votes. I think on the ballot, it hurt me, but not so much. People would much rather know where you stand, even if they disagree with you than to have you wishy washy on the thing. I mean, Morris and Dorn said, "We believe in limited application of capital punishment, in some cases but not others." Well, I mean, you are either for it or against it. I think that approach was keyed to the treatment we got from the press with only one exception. The press was treated absolutely straight forwardly, modestly, we answered every single question put to us, and we didn't give up , and we got fair treatment from them.

J.B.: With the exception of the Ziegler thing?

Ravenel: Yeah. I learned something from that.

That was damaging.

J.B.: What did you learn? What was the lesson?

Ravenel: Well, the first lesson was all this stuff about getting somebody else, what somebody else does is almost totally irrelevant. It is what you do that matters. So my talking to him or trying to suggest that he drop out and support me, you know, *[was a large risk for a]* small

return. The second thing that I learned is that when I am asked a question that I don't want to answer, I am going to say, "I am not going to answer that." Instead of getting cute and sophisticated about giving an answer which is a true answer, but leaves the wrong impression. That is what I did on that because I gave Nick Ziegler my confidence and I wouldn't tell anybody about our conversation. So when I was asked point blank "Have you had a conversation with Nick Ziegler?" I felt a higher obligation to maintain that confidence without giving him my word, than I did to answer the spirit of the question. Instead I answered it, gave a technically correct answer, but a misleading one in terms of the question that I perfectly understood. Well, you have got to go back. I saw Nick Ziegler on Friday in Florence. I was in Florence on Saturday but did not see him. I saw Nick Ziegler on Sunday night in Pulman. So I was asked, "Have you recently talked to Nick Ziegler about dropping out and supporting you?" I said the following, "The last time I saw Nick Ziegler, no." I said "The last time I was in Florence was Saturday at a cancer tennis clinic, and I did not even see Nick Ziegler. And then the last time I saw Nick Ziegler was on Sunday night and he and I didn't discuss it." Both of those statements were true. But I left off the fact that I saw him on Friday. I knew what

the hell he was getting at, and he knew and he trusted me to answer fully and correctly and I didn't do it. But my fear was that if I had said, "I don't want to comment on it," that they would immediately know that I had done it. I would have violated the spirit of the agreement with Nick Ziegler.

J.B.: What do you think your victory is going to have on the type of candidate who runs in South Carolina in the future?

Ravenel: On the what kind of candidate?

J.B.: On the type?

Ravenel: I think it is going to change dramatically the type of candidate because there are going to be a lot more young people, fresh people who will run and will be undisturbed by the fact that they have had no political experience. I think secondly of some of the old pros who used to run with impunity are going to change the way that they do business because they will never know when there is a Pug Ravenel, or somebody like that, breathing over their shoulders, and they better be more responsive.

J.B.: Do you think this is going to make a substantive difference in the state legislature in the next two to four years?

Ravenel: Yes. I think it will make an important

difference. Different kinds of people who heretofore have never run will run, I hope.

J.B.: What sort of role do you plan to play insofar as the Democratic party is concerned?

Ravenel: That is a tough question. The Governor is the leader of the party, particularly in practical terms. It is a great challenge to try to bring some coherence to a party in an era when people don't have the same party loyalties that they used to have. The people vote Independent, they vote the man. That makes parties sort of an anachronism. However, I believe that even though it is an anachronism, I guess you could say about it what Winston Churchill said about democracy. "The two party system is the worst system, and it is terrible. It is the worst possible system except for all the rest." So I believe in a two party system and therefore, I think my role will be to open up the party and invite in all these fresh people who are thinking about running, and encourage them to run within the framework of a two party system and to come into the Democratic party. I think that will be my principal goal and objective.

J.B.: All right. Let's assume that you win in November. I think you made some comment whether or not you would run against Strom Thurmond.

Ravenel: In 1978, I don't know what I am going to

do. In 1978, I don't know if Strom Thurmond is going to run for re-election. I don't even know if he is going to be there. I may be fed up with the political process. I may have taken so many unpopular stands that I think I couldn't possibly win. I think it is ridiculous to speculate about four years from now. But I wouldn't rule out the possibility that I would run in '78 against him if he is the Republican nominee. I would try, it's possible, that I would try to do that. I have in no way, have that as a target right now, any more than I had as a target to run for Governor. Obviously, if I had a target to run for Governor, I would have gotten my ass down here sooner so I wouldn't have had a residency problem. So I don't think you can plan more than six months ahead in the long term. If I do a good job, if I am still interested in the political process, if I think I can win, if I think the people of South Carolina would vote for me, then I may do it.

J.B.: What do you think would have to happen for the Democrats to carry South Carolina in the Presidential election next time?

Ravenel: What would have to happen to make that happen?

J.B.: Yeah.

Ravenel: A real good Democratic candidate.

J.B.: Such as?

Ravenel: Who knows? Dale Bumpers, I don't know, some fresh new surprising star. I don't see that person being Ted Kennedy certainly. I don't see it being Hubert Humphrey, I don't see it being Scoop Jackson. I don't see it being Mike Mansfield, he's too old. I don't see it being any rising star on the national Democratic scene. ~~Floyd Benson~~ ^{Lloyd Benson}, maybe. Walter Mondell, I don't know, I haven't met him.

J.B.: Do you see anyone like Terry Sanford being any real possibility?

Ravenel: I think Terry Sanford is a terrific guy, but I think his day has passed. But you never know, you know, you can't, you just never can tell.

J.B.: The Ravenel name from Charleston suggests a great aristocratic background. Where do you fit in with the Charleston Ravenels?

Ravenel: Well, I share their name. There are Ravenel's with financial means in Charleston, and there are Ravenel's without it, and my family is the Ravenel's without it. It was lost back in the Civil War. I am proud of the name, and I am proud that it is clearly identifiable as a South Carolina name. I feel an extra sense of responsibility to live up to what South Carolina and Ravenels throughout

history have meant to each other, and I would really like to play a role in giving substance to that connection.

J.B.: I've read that your father was a sheet metal worker.

Ravenel: My father is not now a sheet metal worker. He was a sheet metal worker for 17 years when he started in the Depression and times were tough. He became a leading man and had people working for him, and later became an industrial relations specialist, which means that because he had been a working man, working between management and labor helping to mediate disputes. But all in my growing up period he was a sheet metal worker, but then when I was about 16 or 17, or 18, he became an industrial relations specialist.

J.B.: Is that what he does right now?

Ravenel: No. He is retired now.

J.B.: Who did he work for at that time?

Ravenel: He worked for the same people that worked for the navy yard, he was a civil servant. He worked for the Civil Service in the navy yard in Charleston.

J.B.: Let me ask you a philosophical question. We talked a little bit about this last night. What do you think your election means insofar as southern politics is concerned?

Ravenel: Well, I think my election is just another example of a change in the political patterns that have

existed in the South since the Civil War. Before, there was a small group of very powerful people who controlled the state by controlling their successors. My election, and the election of other people like me, Jimmy Carter and some others in Georgia, Dale Bumpers and Rubin Askew and Lawton Childs, has broken that system of self-fulfilling destinies, whereby people choose their own successors and therefore maintain control.

J.B.: What does it mean insofar as the politics of George Wallace?

Ravenel: Well, I think the thing that George Wallace and I have in common in terms of strategy is that we both have said the institutions and the individuals in authority have forgotten about the little man, and forgotten about you and me, and let's not let them get away with it. Let's change it. He said that and I said that. It has worked enormously for him and it has worked enormously for me because it is the way people feel, and it is right that the institutions and the leadership have tended to forget about the people who have put them there. So it is appropriate, and it is proper, I think, to change that. Thank God for the ballot box which makes it possible to bring about these changes. That is what George Wallace was all about. He represented the articulation of the feeling of alienation that most people have between themselves

and the institutions and the individuals in authority. I feel that was the single most important feature of my campaign.

J.B.: Where do you see yourself as being different from Wallace?

Ravenel: Well, my perceptions of Wallace's stand on civil rights, is that he is relatively conservative. Even now, in spite of the fact that he has changed somewhat from the old days when he stood in the door of the school. I think I tend to be more moderate on civil rights than he. He tends to be more conservative and less flexible than I, if I understand properly his philosophy. I think that is the main difference. Also I think, you know, I have been a businessman, and I have never been in politics and my expertise is trying to protect taxpayer's dollars by better and more efficient management in the administration and the technical capabilities to run an administration. I don't know if he has that.

J.B.: How many paid people worked in your staff?

Ravenel: 33 were working there on election day.

J.B.: How many were black?

Ravenel: I counted up once. I think about eight. No, Francis Morris, Hilda Jefferson, Harold Hill, Jim Self, and Atlee Prince, Ben, no, I've forgotten, Joe

Strickland, seven, who else, let's see, Bob Hartley, Bob Hartley was eight. About eight out of the 33. We had a hard time getting them, you know. They were afraid of backing a loser, and then Jim Blake so that is nine. Anyway, eight or nine or ten.

J.B.: Your statement about governments that reflect the population in terms of around the 30%. If you are elected do you plan to apply that to the Governor's office?

Ravenel: Yeah, I'd like to move in that direction. Yes, I do.

J.B.: In other words, you think the Governor's office should set an example?

Ravenel: Sure. I think it must. I intend to see that it does. See, we can afford to do that. That is the really important thing if I win. If we win, I don't owe any people anything. There are people who have helped me, but everybody has helped me voluntarily. There are no huge political favors that I owe anybody, no big h^oancho supported me, whose wishes I have to respect. I'll be the freeist of the gubernatorial office holders perhaps in South Carolina's history. That is really important.

Jim Edwards said,
 [Interruption] "We've got to get the hogwash out of education." When I asked him what that meant he was reluctant to say apparently, but then said, "Well, you know, the hogwash. My children come home with all this art and

drama and painting and stuff. We've got to get rid of all of that. Get back to reading, writing and arithmetic."

J.B.: So you plan to make a major effort and that would include what, adding art teachers in the schools?

Ravenel: No, that would include support of the arts throughout the state, who are trying to bring the arts to the educational process. You just can't simply afford to put art teachers in every school. You should start the process by doing things like . . . [Interruption]

J.B.: What is the biggest surprise you have had out of this race from the whole standpoint of entering politics, and from the political experience as a candidate?

Ravenel: Biggest surprise? The tremendous amount of emotional pressure that you have to go through. The distance in feeling in one hour that there is no way I can lose, to knowing in the next hour that there is no way I can win. The absolute tremendous pressure that that puts on so many people who have worked so hard all over the place, and the pressure not to betray that or make a foolish mistake that blows the whole thing. Just the whole emotional risk of the whole thing.

J.B.: Any regrets?

Ravenel: None. Oh yeah, I've done some things wrong, I wish I had never done, like I said last night.
End interview with Pug Ravenel.