

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Publications

Civil Rights Archive

11-1-1971

Southern Journal, November 1971

L. Q. C. Lamar Society

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/civ_pubs



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

L. Q. C. Lamar Society, "Southern Journal, November 1971" (1971). *Publications*. 91.
https://egrove.olemiss.edu/civ_pubs/91

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Civil Rights Archive at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.



W. J. Michael Cody, immediate past president of the Lamar Society, shown addressing the growth board meeting.

SOUTHERN GROWTH BOARD
(continued from pg. 3)

lead the nation are why he has "stayed in the South and plans to stay here." Kentucky State Senator William Sullivan related the growth problems developing in his state and said he could visualize the utility of the board in coping with them. Dr. Albert N. Whiting, president of North Carolina Central University, praised the "helpful and promising concept" of a Growth Policies Board and commended the L.Q.C. Lamar Society for its "perspective and thrust" in actively working for the board's establishment.

COMMITTEES REPORT

In the plenary session following committee meetings, conferees adopted the proposed budget of \$261,080 for the first year of Southern Growth Policies Board operations. Funds for the initial staffing and operation will come from foundations. After the first two years the Board will be supported by appropriated funds from the various legislatures as they meet, enact the agreement between the states, and vote the funds.

On the recommendation of the committee on interim policy, an Interim Steering Committee under the chairmanship of Governor Linwood Holton of Virginia will conduct the business of the Board until its first regular annual meeting. Membership will include each governor or his representative as well as legislative representatives from each state. This committee will be responsible for seeking staff, preparing proposals for foundation financing, and explaining the interstate agreement to the various state legislatures.

The committee on by-laws proposed extending an invitation to join the

Southern Growth Policies Board to four additional states — Maryland, Delaware, Oklahoma, and Missouri. The resolution was approved by the thirteen states participating in the conference (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia).

PLANS TOOK SHAPE

Extensive planning preceded this month's conference. Following the Atlanta Symposium, the Center for Southern Studies at Duke University received a grant from the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation to assist in planning for the establishment of the Board. Additionally, the Lamar Society was the recipient of planning grants from the Louisville Courier-Journal Foundation and Mississippi Chemical Corporation to use for the same purpose.

In August, governors' aides, foundation representatives, consultants, and members of the Lamar Society met with President Sanford at Duke to make final preparations for the Growth Policies Board conference. Present from the Society were H. Brandt Ayers, president; William L. Green, director of public relations at Duke; Gerry Hancock, associate director of the Society; Tom Naylor, executive director of the Society; and John Ritchie, executive assistant to Governor Holton and a member of the Lamar Society board.

From the working session emerged the final concept of an agreement to be approved by states joining the Southern Growth Policies Board. This agreement as modified by the October 3 conferees must now be passed by each state legislature. From the enthusiasm expressed by the states' representatives at Duke, it

appears that the Southern Growth Policies Board will be high on the agenda in coming legislative sessions.

Members of the Lamar Society, through their state chapters, will be actively involved in the coming months in educating the public to the goals of the Southern Growth Policies Board and interpreting it to the state legislatures.

-----Kay Martin and Katherine Savage

"STYLISH-SWITCH" (cont. from pg. 11)
Mississippi, some observers feel, rather than a knee-jerk "It's not true about this grand and glorious state!" response to talk of Mississippi's ills. There will be some integration of state agencies, and some blacks will gain places on state policy agencies. But not many.

Waller probably will work toward conciliation in the Democratic party. He considers himself a national Democrat, ready to lead the state back toward a working arrangement with the national party. The political columnists Evans and Novak say Waller has indicated he will support the presidential nominee of the Democratic party, but it's hard to envision such support except in the way it's also grudgingly given by Eastland and Stennis. Waller says he has "never flirted" with third-party politics, however, so support of Wallace seems out.

While Waller is new, the men behind him are not. Two of his chief campaign aides were honorary colonels under John Bell Williams. While Waller feels a special concern for Mississippi young people, the fact remains that he was put in office by the middle-aged, the middle-class, a group united only by their feeling that something has gone wrong.

Waller played strongly on that feeling in his campaign. What he does when it comes time to replace platitudes with programs is the test Waller faces if he makes it past November into January.



Among Southern leaders attending the one-day conference to plan for a Southern Growth Policies Board are, left to right, Governor Arch A. Moore of West Virginia, Governor Robert W. Scott of North Carolina, Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia, and Lieutenant Governor Robert C. Riley of Arkansas.

Southern Journal
P. O. Box 4774, Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

FIRST CLASS
U. S. POSTAGE
2 Oz. PAID
NEW ORLEANS, LA.
PERMIT NO. 818

FIRST CLASS MAIL

Dr. John Crews
Department of English
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi 38677

Southern Journal
November, 1971 PUBLISHED BY THE L.Q.C. LAMAR SOCIETY

In This Issue:
Southern Growth Policies Board Launched
Eight Southern Governors Endorse Society
Excerpts From Comments At 2nd Annual Symposium
Mississippi's "Stylish-Switch" In Gubernatorial Campaigns



Lamar Society President H. Brandt Ayers and immediate past president Michael Cody chat with North Carolina Governor Robert W. Scott and former governor Terry Sanford, now president of Duke University, at a breakfast meeting on the Duke campus October 3 to propose a Southern Growth Policies Board. Left to right are Ayers, Scott, Cody, and Sanford.

Southern Growth Policies Board Launched

The seed planted by Duke University President Terry Sanford at the Lamar Society's 1971 Symposium came to fruition as governors and legislators from thirteen Southern states gathered in Durham, North Carolina, October 3 to form the Southern Growth Policies Board.

Sanford, former governor of North Carolina, was host for the one-day conference, which included a breakfast meeting at Duke University, a tour of the nearby Research Triangle Park, and afternoon committee meetings.

Members of the Lamar Society were active in laying the groundwork for the conference. It was at the Society's last meeting in Atlanta that President Sanford first introduced his proposal for a joint effort by the Southern states "to impose order on . . . growth in population and technology." According to Sanford, "The areas of (the) board's inquiry could be as broad as the needs perceived to be links in common regional interests — transportation, tax structure, population groupings, health, industrial location."

The tone of the conference was set by President Sanford's keynote address, in which he expanded and explained his original proposal. He called for an effort "to bring the combined mind of the South to bear on the expression and fulfillment of its destiny. The elected

leadership of the Southern states can work cooperatively in deciding what sort of a future we want and need, how to get there, and then get on with the business of getting there."

What the governor envisions is a compact among the Southern states, similar to the Southern Regional Education Board, to be governed by the region's governors and representatives from each of the states' legislatures. Its mission would be to propose strategies for orderly and healthy growth of the South's cities and development of its rural areas. It would take into account how the over-all objective might be affected by specific concerns.

Activities of the Growth Policies Board would fall into five categories: communication, research, priority setting, programming and politics. Sanford noted, "It will be for the governors and legislatures, the mayors and the city councils, the county commissioners and the school boards to carry out the activities of government — with the added resource which a Growth Board can provide."

In closing, Sanford challenged participants to "use the time we have, the answers we get, the policies we suggest, the programs we create" to produce "a truly post-racial society." The South should be a leader in the nation and the world in achieving this goal.

THREE GOVERNORS ATTEND

Governor Robert W. Scott of North Carolina chaired the plenary sessions. Serving as committee chairmen were Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia, committee on compact and by-laws, assisted by William Winter, Democratic nominee for lieutenant governor of Mississippi; Lieutenant Governor Robert C. Riley of Arkansas, committee on budget, financing and staffing; Governor Arch A. Moore of West Virginia, committee on interim



Dr. Samuel Cook, left, professor of political science at Duke, and No. Carolina State Representative Henry Frey en route to meetings at Research Triangle Park.

Eight Southern Governors Endorse Society

H. Brandt Ayers, Lamar Society president, has announced that eight Southern governors have given their personal endorsement to the Society

Among the eight are four who served on the Governors' Panel at the Lamar Society Symposium in Atlanta in April of this year: Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia, Governor John C. West of South Carolina, Governor Dale Bumpers of Arkansas, and Governor Reubin O'D. Askew of Florida. As a result of that contact, Governor Bumpers said, "Since my initial involvement with the Lamar Society almost a year ago, I have supported its aims, means and leaders. As a major new force in the South which seeks constructive change and practical solutions to our region's major problems, I hope all progressive Southerners will lend it their support. If the South is to achieve its potential in the twentieth century, it is essential that we provide leadership from among our ranks. The Lamar Society holds forth great promise for future leadership." Gov. West added, "Even during its relatively short period of existence, the Lamar Society has established itself as a vital catalyst for the progressive and enlightened development of the South. I salute its goals and purposes and hope for it a bright and productive future."

Governor Carter, who also participated in the Southern Growth Policies Board conference which grew out of the Atlanta Symposium, offered the following endorsement of the Society: "I believe strongly in the importance of open and frank discussions among Southerners of all political parties and persuasions in an attempt to bring out the best in our Southern people. In its attempt to promote this sort of productive discussion and creative thought, the Lamar Society merits the

support of all Southerners." Florida Gov. Askew declared, "The L.Q.C. Lamar Society is finding new ways for Southerners to express their traditional concern for each other and for our part of the country."

Taking a leading role in the formation of the new Southern Growth Policies Board, first unveiled by Duke University President Terry Sanford in a speech before the Lamar Society, are Governor Linwood Holton of Virginia and Governor Robert W. Scott of North Carolina. Scott, who chaired the recent one-day Growth Board meeting at Duke, praised the Society for the projects it has undertaken. "The efforts of the Lamar Society hold great promise for the South," he said. Gov. Holton also believed, "The initial efforts of the Lamar Society to work for a better South have been most impressive. It can supply important leadership for the South." Holton has agreed to serve as chairman of the interim steering committee for the Growth Policies Board.

Adding their endorsements are two more Southern governors who have evinced interest in the work of the Society by sending their personal representatives to its meetings. In Tennessee, Governor Winfield Dunn states, "I have been very impressed by the efforts of the Lamar Society." The latest chief executive to affirm his support is Governor Preston Smith of Texas. "It is an honor for me to join in congratulations to the Lamar Society. In a short time it has become an important voice in the South," he announced.

policy, assisted by State Senator William L. Sullivan of Kentucky; H. Brandt Ayers, president of the L.Q.C. Lamar Society, committee on objectives.

Every governor invited to the meeting sent a representative if he were unable to attend personally. In addition, North Carolina's Governor Scott was joined by a number of interested state legislators, including Representative Henry Frye and Representative McNeill Smith.

The Mississippi delegation was second in size only to that of the host state. Besides Lieutenant Governor-nominee William Winter, the state was represented by State Senator Bob G. Perry and State Senator Ben Stone, representatives of Governor John Bell Williams.

RESPONSES TO ADDRESS

In responding to Sanford's address, Winter called for Southern states to "join together in a positive purpose whereas in the past we have been joined in a negative purpose." He re-emphasized the need for action by the individual states as a follow-up to the meeting.

Representative Frye, noting that he had lived in the North and seen its mistakes, endorsed the plan for the Growth Policies Board. His faith in the region and his belief that the South can

(continued on page 12)

William Winter, Democratic nominee for lieutenant governor of Mississippi, responding to Sanford's key note address.



Letter to the Editor

The following is the first Letter to the Editor to be printed in The Southern Journal. The Lamar Society welcomes comments of broad interest to its members and to readers of the Southern Journal, and, as space permits, the Journal will attempt to publish such letters. Anonymous letters not accepted for publication.

Dear Sir:

Your recent article, "Free Trade or Protectionism?" started with a false premise and moved down hill through a series of out-moded concepts, which, if followed to the conclusion recommended by the authors, would seriously harm the South's most basic and essential industry.

The statement that "most economists" are free traders simply cannot be documented. In fact, there is considerable evidence that more economists and other thought leaders favor a more realistic approach to international trade than the out-moded and impractical concept of "free trade."

Last year, the free trade-oriented Committee for a National Trade Policy, made quite a thing of the fact that "4,390 economists" had signed a statement opposing import controls. The original endorsers included 20 well-known economists and 2 lawyers. The mailing list of the American Economic Association was used to solicit signatures. The AEA has approximately 18,000 members. Would it be fair to conclude that the 14,000 who did not sign the petition are in favor of import quotas? Perhaps not, but, it would be just as logical a conclusion as the one reached by your authors.

From that point, the article goes downhill, in terms of both facts and logic.

Anyone who knows anything about the size and scope of the textile industry could not conclude that adjustment assistance is the answer to the textile import problem. Last year, a top Commerce Department official calculated that adjustment assistance for the people put out of work in the textile industry in a single year would cost the government \$265 million. That is the cost in dollars alone. It does not take into consideration the equally important human consideration of hundreds of thousands of people who would have to be laid off of work, retrained, and perhaps forced to leave their lifetime homes to find employment.

Messrs. Avinger and Kincaid may think that "tariffs are decidedly superior to quotas" but apparently they are quite alone. All of the major trading nations of the world, including the United States, are, as a result of the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations, committed to reducing tariffs. Other nations have replaced tariffs with quotas, licenses, value-added taxes and an entire series of non-tariff barriers. The United States, has remained the only virtually free market for textiles in the world. As a result, our textile trade deficit grows every year, with the resultant loss of jobs in this country, while other nations expand their industries at our expense.

I respectfully suggest that it is your authors who are guilty of being "myopic."

Sincerely yours,

Jack Childers, President
N.C. Textile Manufacturers Association

Southern Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE L.Q.C. LAMAR SOCIETY

VOL. 1, NO. 3

NOVEMBER 1971

Editor: James H. Chubbuck

Contributing Editors: Charles Ferguson,
Brandt Ayers, Mike Cody, Tom Naylor

Southern Journal is a publication of the L.Q.C. Lamar Society, a non-profit, tax exempt educational organization composed of Southerners committed to bringing constructive change in the South. It was formed in 1969 by individuals of diverse background and political persuasion. The common bond among its members is a desire to see the South reach its full potential.

The views expressed are those of the individual authors, and not of the Lamar Society. The Journal is being published by the Society as part of its objective to create greater communication and dialogue on events and subjects of importance in the South.

The Lamar Society Office
P. O. Box 4774, Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

JANUARY MEMBERSHIP DRIVE


The Lamar Society will embark on a major membership drive in January. We welcome all Southerners who are sympathetic with the objectives of the organization. Present members are requested to notify the central office of prospective members. Anyone interested in helping with the drive to broaden the membership base should contact President Brandt Ayers, Editor & Publisher, The Anniston Star, Anniston, Alabama 36201. Membership information can be obtained from the Executive Director, P. O. Box 4774, Duke Station, Durham, North Carolina 27706.

YOU CAN'T EAT MAGNOLIAS

You Can't Eat Magnolias, a collection of papers dealing with specific Southern problems, will be published by McGraw-Hill in January 1972. Brandt Ayers and Thomas Naylor are editors of this book which includes essays by Wallace Alston, Jack Bass, Norton Beach, Ronald Borod, Virgil Christian, Reese Cleghorn, James Clotfelter, Michael Cody, James Ferguson, Joel Fleishman, Wayne Flynt, Richard Goodwin, Curtis Graves, Roger Hall, William Hamilton, Maynard Jackson, Ray Marshall, Willie Morris, Luther Munford, Reynolds Price, Frank Rose, Terry Sanford, Frank Smith, Alan Steelman, and Ed Yoder.

THIRD ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM

The third annual symposium of the Lamar Society will be held in Birmingham, Alabama, April 21-22, 1972. The conference will focus on southern growth with emphasis on rural redevelopment and will be under the direction of Dr. J. F. Volker, President of the University of Alabama in Birmingham.



Excerpts from Comments at 2nd Annual Symposium

On April 30-May 1, 1971, the Second Annual Symposium of the L.Q.C. Lamar Society was held in conjunction with Emory University and Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia. Following are excerpts from addresses delivered at the Symposium.

Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine

... There was a time when I saw some irony in requests that I speak as an authority on cities. I grew up in a small town in a rural state, and I turned down a chance to practice law in New York City. I ran for mayor of Waterville, Maine, once, and was defeated. Waterville's gain turned out to be the Senate's loss, and the Senate gave me a chance to learn about cities — among other things.

There are some advantages in coming on the problems of the city from a rural perspective. You know what a sense of community can mean, and you can understand the attraction and the horror of first encounters with a large city.

There is excitement in the life and movement of the city. There is also fear and loneliness.

A city generates a sense of power, while many of its residents feel powerless. The city holds great promise, but too many of those who rush to it feel cheated.

Thomas Jefferson feared the city, and hoped his country could avoid its horrors. We know that cities cannot be avoided, but we have not yet learned how to make them places of hope...

... If we are looking for signs of hope that our nation can deal with its enormous social problems, we will find some of those signs in the South. That may sound like a sardonic statement to many of you who have been through the agonies of the past fifteen or twenty years. But the history of the South during the past decade offers proof that it is possible to achieve fundamental social change in this country. Customs and practices which seemed fixed in concrete have been overturned, however painful.

The changes in the South have proved that personal courage, among whites as well as blacks, can make a difference. Out of a troubled and tortured past, you are creating a brighter future for yourselves, and you have a chance to show the way for the North...

... Your symposium marks one of the most hopeful signs in the struggle of thoughtful Americans toward the creation of cities — and communities — of hope. I suggest that you carry your discussions beyond this point; that you explore the possibilities of "urban conventions", within your regions and within your states.

These urban conventions could bring together governors, legislators, mayors, county executives, and other leaders from public and private life, all dedicated to the goal of cities of hope in the new South.

The agenda at such conventions would be full, but your work would be given direction and purpose by your goal — the goal of planning the basic changes in government needed to create humane, livable cities of tomorrow.

You could tackle the problem of creating and implementing a state urbanization policy, in which zoning authority, land use and building regulation, and other fundamental determinants of the quality of urban life would be shaped to serve public needs.

You could go to work on building a high-quality state-local tax system, effective in its capacity to raise revenue, efficient in its administration, and fair in its impact on the tax-paying citizen.

You could deal with the question of disparities in public services between neighborhoods of different economic and social character, and you could consider the development of enforceable minimum standards designed to achieve fairness in the provision of services in education, sanitation, and other areas of fundamental human need...

... If we are to make our cities places of hope, we must have more than efficiency, important as that is. We must insure that in our cities, as in smaller communities, individual citizens have a measure of control over their lives. They must have a real voice in the shaping of their neighborhoods, the patterns of transportation, the educational opportunities for their children, and their exercise of law enforcement authority. They must have a direct relationship with their elected representatives, and those representatives must have an effective voice in the governing of the city.

And so, as we consider expanded, simplified metropolitan-wide government, we must also consider new ideas for neighborhood government, to overcome the alienation between big city government and its citizens. It has been suggested that state legislatures authorize city and county councils to establish neighborhood sub-units of government, each with an elected council, and with power to undertake self-help projects and to influence city actions having special impact on the neighborhood. Each neighborhood district could also elect its own representatives to the overall governing body of the metropolitan area, and each could serve as the focus of community, political and social contact. These ideas, their promises and their problems, are all part of the agenda for your urban conventions.

You have before you, then, an opportunity to make the South a laboratory for the future, rather than a reminder of a troubled past. Your urban conventions can be the preparation,



Southern Governors Panel From left, Gov. Dale Bumpers, Arkansas; Gov. Reubin Askew, Florida; Hon. Terry Sanford, president of Duke University and former Governor of North Carolina, who was panel chairman; Gov. Jimmy Carter, Georgia, and Gov. John West, South Carolina.



Panel: Cities Designed for People At left, Moses Burt of the National Urban Coalition. Center is Richard Pettigrew, Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives. On the right is W. Wyche Fowler, member of the Atlanta Aldermanic Board and chairman of the panel.



Panel: Role of the Lamar Society in the Urban South L. to r., H. Brandt Ayers, Editor and Publisher, *Anniston Star*; Norton Beach, Dean of the School of Education, University of North Carolina; Rep. Benjamin Brown, Georgia State Legislature, and Dr. James Clotfelter, Professor of Political Science, Emory University.



Panel: Practical Implementation of the Humane City Joel Fleishman, Vice Chancellor of Duke University and panel chairman is shown at the lectern. Seated, l. to r. are Mayor Russell Davis of Jackson, Miss.; George H. Deyo, Assistant Mayor of Anniston, Ala.; Mayor Moon Landrieu of New Orleans, Richard Lee, former Mayor of New Haven; H. Foster Pettit, candidate for Mayor of Lexington, Ky., and Mayor R. Cooper White of Greenville, S. C.



Part of the crowd attending the televised Governors Panel

A Pictorial Review of the L.Q.C. Lamar Society 2nd Annual Symposium Atlanta - April 30-May 1, 1971

*THEME - The Urban South:
Northern Mistakes in a Southern Setting?*
PANELS • SPEAKERS • PARTICIPATION



H. Ross Perot is pictured addressing the May 1 luncheon.



Sen. Edmund Muskie of Maine, who addressed the symposium on Friday evening, is pictured with H. Brandt Ayers (left), newly elected president of the Lamar Society and W. J. Michael Cody (right), Memphis attorney and immediate past president of the Society.



Gov. Bumpers, Terry Sanford and Gov. Askew accept congratulations following panel of Southern governors.

Helen Oldham of the Carolina Population Center, Chapel Hill, N. C., makes a point to John Osman, right, of the Brookings Institution. In the background are, left, Heathcote Wales, Professor of Law, U. of Texas, and Rep. Curtis Graves, Texas State Legislature.



H. Foster Pettit exchanges views with a member of the audience following the panel on "Practical Implementation of the Humane City." On the right, Mayor White of Greenville, S. C., leans forward to converse with other members of the audience.



Senator Muskie greets one of the younger set during Friday evening reception which preceded his address.



and the inspiration, for national urban convention, which could mobilize our energies to build the new America of the third century of our history.

In making this suggestion tonight, I speak for the millions who live and work in the cities of this land, who have witnessed the death of civility and the loss of a sense of belonging. They are the millions of Americans who suffer from loneliness in the midst of crowds, while their retreats of privacy are destroyed . . .

**H. Ross Perot, President, Electronic Data System,
Dallas, Texas**

. . . I am fascinated when I visit college campuses and see students – “children,” I think, is a better term – preoccupied with this problem of pollution. This is a problem of technology. And when I talk to them about this and say “Is there any question in your mind that we could not lick that?” – there is not, they know we can. It is the kind of problem we are best equipped to handle. They know it will be done. The disappointing part is that instead of seeing this as a great opportunity and going back into those great laboratories that exist in the colleges today, (that didn’t exist when these great inventions were first made) . . . the whole premise is – let’s do something about this problem, let’s go out and buy a new car and let everybody hit it with a sledgehammer for a dollar and then bury it. And if that’s mature thinking, then I’ll pass.

I’ll never forget the group that came to me and wanted \$2500 to work on ecology. I said, “What are you planning to do?”. They planned to buy a car, and go through this process of just scrapping it. And I said, “Well, wait a minute. What’s your objective?”. They wanted to dramatize the problem. And I said, “Is there anyone interested in working on a solution?”. Well, it was a General Motors problem. You know, “Let’s pound the shoulders of General Motors three times in a public place, and then we’ve done our job.” Obviously, they didn’t get the money! Somehow we have these capabilities and, of course, the problems we cause are the problems we solve. The interesting thing, and this is something we’ve got to communicate to our young people, the solution – the pollution-free internal combustion engine – will be hailed with the same excitement that we hailed the development of the electric light. Twenty years from now it is going to be creating a whole new set of problems for this country, because of something that none of us foresaw. Maybe it will make your ears turn green – I don’t know. But that’s the way life is. We are imperfect human beings and we do the best we can and our challenge is to do what others have always done: to move things forward and to make things better. Now we are in a unique position that the others didn’t have. We have the most fascinating array of resources and technology that the world has ever seen. But we are like the children of third-generation wealth – surrounded by everything it would take, instead of planning, organizing, executing, we fret, and progress was never made through fretting and problem definition alone. Somehow we have moved into an environment where we are training our young people and convincing ourselves that the thing is the definition. As I have said so many times on college campuses: You don’t need an advanced college degree to recognize polluted rivers. All you need is a good nose.

The future of this country is in the hands of the person who sees the river is polluted and who says, “All right, a river flows, it flushes itself. All right, I can identify the sources of pollution. Getting the sources deferred is going to be complex and tedious and is going to take time and effort, but I will

commit myself to that.” And he proceeds to do it. And then over a period of a few years, we find ourselves in a position of having had our cake in having had this massive industrial capability and having had been able to eat it too because the river is clear. Contrast this alternative, which is a simple alternative, (solving that pollution problem is a simple alternative), to having the problem of living in an undeveloped land, having to create the industry. You know, take your choice: one is a five-year problem and the other is a 100-year problem. Give me the five-year problem – we’ll solve it. We can be the generation that makes these myths that were written down, or these “noble dreams” is a better phrase, these noble dreams that were written in our Constitution materialize. We can really make all that materialize because of all the work that has been done before us, if we have the will to use the resources and the technology that was handed to us as we came into the ring to assume the responsibility for this country . . .

The Hon. Jimmy Carter, Governor of Georgia

. . . I think Southerners now have realized that the solution of our problems is our own, and that we can no longer berate the federal government, the Supreme Court, or any other ‘outside group’ for our own problems, our own needs, our own shortcomings . . . the obstacles we have to overcome. There is a new awareness of the personal responsibility that we share for solving our own problems . . .

. . . Now I and these other governors see a very close attention to the needs of the people who ought to be served by the state government and, at the same time, to the political inclinations of them. *The challenge is to harness the efforts and the understanding and the needs and the personal involvement of the poor and the weak . . . and at the same time not lose the enlightened leadership of those who, because of luck, are in a position to be more discerning* – with a better education, time on their hands, political influence and financial security.

This analysis transcends all our problems and, I think, it is a fairly good analysis, according to my own impressions, of what is happening in the South. And any governor now who faces a potential election without realizing that the power has shifted from the local newspaper editor or the sheriff or the clerk or the auditor or the bank president to the person in the shopping center and the factory shift line is gonna get beat . . .

**Terry Sanford, Former Governor of North Carolina
and President of Duke University**

. . . I would have us in the South start a new approach toward saving the nation. We, that is all the citizens acting through their governments (state, local, and national) must have something to do with arranging where people are going to live. Please note carefully that I do not mean that we are going to have to tell people where to live. But right now forces not directed by anyone tell us where to live. I would have us bring those forces under our own control.

Cities act as natural magnets, drawing more industry, more commerce, more people, more jobless, more welfare recipients, more problems. Far from offsetting this magnetic force, we encourage it. What mayor (now a few hopeful exceptions) does not want to see his city grow and grow? What Board of Realtors does not feel the divine mandate to add and add to the city? What Chamber of Commerce does not want to jump from 32nd largest city to 24th largest city? What city promotional brochure does not boast of size?

If I were to declare public policy at any level, state or local, I would decide that first, before we decide how to get better garbage collection, before we decide how to cut down on air pollution, before we decide how to get another freeway stretched across the city, we would declare one aim: *Stop the growth syndrome*. We need growth, and will get it in any event; but growth cannot be our primary ambition. We must learn to control the direction and rate of growth.

Let the mayor of every city declare that they have enough quantity and that they now seek quality . . .

. . . I want to present an idea that we as Southern states might undertake together, as a regional endeavor; then I want to suggest one project as an example of what a state might undertake on its own.

Let us develop our own cooperative effort among the Southern states using the familiar interstate compact as our means, much as we developed the Southern Regional Education Board to look to our cooperative needs in higher education. Why not have a Southern Regional Growth Board? The governors could organize it, and together the governors could make it work.

A Southern Regional Growth Board, acting for, of, by and through the states, would draw interest and help from the national government. It could take care of our own regional growth opportunities, and, moreover, it could set an urban pattern for the rest of the nation . . .

. . . A regional approach is feasible. No state can take the necessary steps alone. We are too interrelated, and, in a sense, states are too competitive. On the other hand, a national plan would be too cumbersome, and it would take too long to set it in motion. We can start a regional growth-planning operation immediately.

The main function of a Southern Regional Growth Board would be planning – in particular, planning for the location and quality of population groupings. The execution would be left largely to state and local initiative, and the Board would have only the authority granted it by the states entering into the compact for its creation. The Board, just as the Southern Regional Education Board, really needs no powers in itself, since the power, force, and authority of the individual states must be relied upon in any event. In addition to planning, the Board would assemble the expert advice needed for execution and furnish the coordinating devices the individual states would need as they followed a general overall regional plan of population placement.

Planning is no longer a feared word, or a feared undertaking. It is now an undeniably essential part of any sensible approach to complex societies. The only questions remaining are whether or not we make the effort to plan – or to whom we forfeit if we neglect to plan – and whether we, collectively, can muster the desire to make plans for our future . . .

Richard Lee, Former Mayor of New Haven, Connecticut

. . . Urban life in America is in crisis and make no mistake about it. Cities large and small are in a fight against extinction. Cities are almost bankrupt and yet state governments, the Congress, the President, as yet, pay only minimum attention to the urban dilemma.

Yet this isn't the cities' only burden. In addition, our cities are often powerless to expand their geographical boundaries. They can do virtually nothing to stop the flight of their citizens to the suburbs, and they have no ability to get at the financial resources of these people. In some American cities today, the hard reality is that literally the only people who remain as city dwellers are those who cannot afford to leave.

And so, at least to cultivate a feeling of community, an atmosphere of continuity is needed. People must feel a sense of belonging, a feeling of common understanding which will last and which has meaning. Many cities in the South cling to that sense of community. But for most American cities, that wonderful feeling is only a pale memory, a stark reminder of a time when there was a real commitment to the idea of life in the city.

To make matters even worse, many of those who honestly care about the cities are being diverted today by a new catch phrase – ecology. Do not misunderstand me. We must face up to the immense task of cleaning up the air and the water which we have fouled through ignorance and neglect. But the major ecological disasters in today's American cities are not alone just dirty air and foul water, but dismal poverty, joblessness, lack of a decent quality of life, a lack of equal opportunity, and decayed housing as well as stagnant school systems. There is a feeling of both helplessness and hopelessness in the lives of millions of people all over the land. . .

. . . There is still hope left, especially here in the South. Significant action is still possible in the South today while waiting and working for federal assistance which the cities so desperately need.

The reason for hope is best spelled out by Pat Watters, in *The South and the Nation*. "It was possible in Atlanta in the late 1960s to sit, on a late spring evening, in a residential section no more than ten minutes from downtown and to breathe the air of a small-town America (not suburbia) of the American past."

Nostalgia, of course, is no panacea. The small-town America of the Southern past was often a fine memory for the white man, and a source of fear and rage for the black man. Yet that same small-town America, if stripped of its racial fears and hostilities, can be a great teacher for all America.

The sense of community in the small American town of the past can never be duplicated. Yet the South has the opportunity, if it so wills it, to give America the model of a growing urban society which has drawn the best from its heritage. The cities of the South, under progressive leadership, can plan their growth in ways which we in the North can't often do. . .

PROGRAM PLANNED FOR LAMAR CHAPTERS

At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Lamar Society in Durham on October 2, President Brandt Ayers appointed Mike Cody as chairman and Alan Steelman as co-chairman of a committee which will coordinate the development of state and local chapters.

President Ayers also announced the appointment of George Godwin of Jackson, Miss., as chairman, and Stewart Gammill III of Hattiesburg, Miss., as co-chairman, of a program committee for state and local chapters. This committee will work with state and local chapters to define community goals. Each chapter, a broad-based group of citizens from the area, would then concern itself with seeking practical solutions to the problems of the local community which are compatible with community goals. This committee will work closely with Mr. Cody in his efforts to organize Lamar Society chapters.

Mississippi's "Stylish-Switch" in Gubernatorial Campaigns

A Report from the Institute of Politics

Bill Waller, the burly, boyish Jackson lawyer who in August won the Democratic nomination for governor of Mississippi, sees himself as another New Southern Governor, cast in the same mold as Carter of Georgia and Bumpers of Arkansas.

Whether his self-perception is accurate remains to be seen, but there's no doubt he's a stylistic switch from Mississippi's most recent governors, Ross Barnett, Paul Johnson, Jr. and John Bell Williams.

Their campaigns were models of the anti-Washington, anti-Negro demagoguery which has been standard stump fare for Mississippi politicians since Reconstruction.

Waller's campaign was different. He hired the West Memphis public relations firm of Deloss Walker, which engineered Dale Bumpers' conquest of Orval Faubus and Winthrop Rockefeller in Arkansas last year, then started what most political observers considered an impossible race to overtake Lt. Gov. Charles Sullivan.

Sullivan, now 46, burst on the state political scene in 1959, a Clarksdale district attorney who committed the political heresy of preaching legalization of liquor in a state that cherished its prohibition laws while bootleggers prospered. He called for reapportionment of the legislature, which had ignored the state constitution and left legislative districts virtually untouched since 1890. Sullivan finished a strong third and marked himself as a maverick with a political future.

In 1963 he again finished third. In 1967, he won the lieutenant governorship and embarked on a four-year march toward the governor's mansion.

By the Spring of 1971, Sullivan looked unbeatable. Seasoned politicians talked of a first-primary victory. When former Gov. Paul Johnson decided to stay home in Hattiesburg, and William Winter, runner-up to John Bell Williams in 1967, announced he'd run for lieutenant governor, Sullivan supporters started thinking about the inaugural ball.

There was no shortage of opponents, however. There was Jimmy Swan, a

short, balding, former country & western disc jockey whose fiery oratory quieted crowds wherever he spoke. If Sullivan had been campaigning four years, so had Swan, who had come from nowhere to finish third in the governor's race four years earlier. Swan's frequent paens to the "little governor from Alabama", his attacks on the federal bureaucrats, his disgust with homegrown fat-cats who he said ran Mississippi with no regard for the little man, made him the pick of the poor whites.

There was Ed Pittman, a progressive, 36-year-old Hattiesburg lawyer and two-term state senator who probably knew more about government than anyone else in the race but who suffered financial famine from the start.

There were Roy Adams, a former state highway commissioner; Marshall Perry, a dedicated, if dull, white supremacist; and Andrew Sullivan, a Jackson lawyer and oilman who was suspected of being in the race to promote confusion at the polls and draw votes from the better-known Sullivan. And there was Charles Evers, mayor of Fayette and the first black ever to mount a statewide campaign for governor, waiting to run as an independent in November against the survivor of the August Democratic brawl. The Republicans didn't field a candidate.

When Bill Waller stepped in in May, he looked like just one more sure loser.

Waller was born 44 years ago near Oxford in Lafayette County, whose red clay hills and white yeomenry inspired the Yoknapatawpa tales of William Faulkner, another Oxford boy.

Waller ventured north and worked part-time in a funeral home while earning his degree from Memphis State University, then received a law degree from Ole Miss. He served in the Army, then borrowed \$400 to set up a law practice in Jackson, the state capital. In 1959 he was elected district attorney; in 1963 he gained re-election without opposition, in 1964, he gained national attention with his vigorous, but unsuccessful, prosecution of a white man accused of

slaying civil rights leader Medgar Evers in Jackson.

Waller gave up the DA post in 1967 to run for governor. He finished a weak fifth in a field of seven, but made a good impression on many voters. "The only reason I can't win is that people are reluctant to vote for me because they think I can't win," a supporter recalls Waller lamenting.

Waller has been hard to peg, politically. In a 1967 speech at Laurel, he branded the Ku Klux Klan as "hooded cowards", and declared that all organizations which advocate violence should be banned. A few years later, Waller defended an alleged Klansman from Laurel who was convicted of the 1966 firebomb slaying of a black man. By 1970, Waller was saying turmoil in the public schools would push 200,000 seekers of quality education into private schools. That prediction proved about 100,000 too high and earned him criticism from beleaguered public school supporters. Waller had quietly enrolled his children in private schools.

But on one issue Waller did not waiver: He contended that "selfish political machines" had been running Mississippi for years, and he said he was the man to demolish those machines.

Sullivan, meanwhile, was collecting disparate and powerful supporters, many of whom had opposed him in past races. But most representatives of special interests, given the choice, would side with any winner rather than a loser, and the choice seemed clear. So Sullivan wound up with the support of the big banks, most utility companies, most of the big-business law firms, many industrialists, the labor leadership, and the Hederman family, publishers of the state's two largest daily newspapers.

Sullivan strategists were banking on his powerful supporters, his governmental experience and his familiarity to the voters to boost him to the statehouse.

But in a dozen years in state politics, Sullivan had made powerful enemies. In 1960 he had publicly berated Sen. James O. Eastland for quietly supporting the

national Democratic ticket instead of taking the third-party route. Eastland shares the elephant's memory but not his thick skin--the senator's anger was piqued and his eternal animosity assured by Sullivan's criticism.

In 1963, Sullivan, defeated in the gubernatorial primary, had thrown his public support to former Gov. J. P. Coleman in the run-off against Paul Johnson, Jr. Johnson won; Coleman abandoned politics for a seat on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and Sullivan had another powerful enemy. Eastland and Paul Johnson, Jr. are longtime political allies--Paul Junior's father was the governor who appointed Eastland to fill an unexpired Senate term in 1941, and Eastland has been in Washington since.

Waller, in his battle against what he termed "the Capitol Street gang", wasn't without a machine of his own. While neither Johnson nor Eastland publicly endorsed him, their tacit support gave candidate Waller two things he didn't have in 1967--a skeletal organization in every county, and money.

Sullivan was everyone's target in campaigning up to the Aug. 3 primary. Ed Pittman tagged him "the Man from Glad" because of his white hair/white suit combination. It was Sullivan who recounted the progress of the last four years and sought votes as the man who had learned the state's problems and the way to solve them. Everyone else urged voters to throw the rascals out and bring the government back to the people--or, in the pleas of Swan and Perry, back to the white people.

Waller's effective media campaign in the final days before the voting made it apparent that he was closing the gap, but not until the waning hours of Aug. 3 did anyone guess how narrow that gap had become. Most observers forecast a vote of 40 to 45 per cent for Sullivan, 20 to 25 per cent for the runner-up. The results were shocking to all but starry-eyed Waller supporters: Sullivan drew 38 per cent, Waller 28.

The Aug. 24 run-off was an intensified version of the primary. Waller continued his live TV appearances throughout the state, inviting viewers to phone in questions. He pumped every hand in sight and kept plugging his Time for a New Man, anti-machine theme. Sullivan hit hard on experience.

In the end Sullivan's strengths had become his weaknesses.

The support of the Hederman newspapers possibly did more harm than good. For instance, in an editorial headline "Campaign's Real Issue Is Still Experience Against Inexperience", the Hedermans accused Waller's organization of spreading "vicious and malicious lies" about Sullivan. They didn't explain the

lies, but did point out that Sullivan is a Baptist deacon, son of a Baptist preacher, husband of a "lovely Christian woman."

But Waller...Waller (ohmigod) ran TV programs on Sunday nights, "inviting people to stay home from church and call in questions..." Still have doubts about where Waller stands? Read on: "Bill Waller ran an advertisement in the Gulf Coast Daily Herald inviting people to 'Bill Waller Family Night' on Sunday night, June 20, for 'shrimp, beer'. Mr. Waller approved the advertisement and attended the shrimp and beer party on Sunday night."

Well, that's "Experience Against Inexperience" for you, the Hedermans said. The casting of Sullivan as the sterling Christian gentleman against Waller the shrimp-chomping, beer-swilling infidel was too much for some readers, especially since the Hedermans for years had railed editorially against Sullivan for his anti-prohibition stands.

Public endorsements for Sullivan by legislators and prominent persons made Waller's talk of the machine even more believable.

Legislative progress during the preceding four years had been great, and Sullivan wasn't hesitant to claim credit for his role as president of the Senate.

But in claiming partial credit for the progress of the past four years, Sullivan ran the risk of being linked in the minds of the voters with the incumbent governor. That, most political observers believed, would be hazardous.

A governor can't succeed himself in Mississippi. He spends the final years of his term a lame duck. The real power resides in the legislature, and a governor's place in state history is decided by what he influences the legislators to do--or as often, what the legislators decide to do without considering the governor one way or the other.

This separation of legislative and executive power is not invisible to the voters. Yet often they hold the governor responsible for the legislature's actions.

In the 1967 gubernatorial race, highways were a big issue. Mississippi hadn't undertaken major highway construction since the 1930s, and the crumbling ribbons of asphalt remind motorists of that fact, mile after bumpy mile. South Mississippi, blessed with new federal interstates, is a land of happier motoring, but in the north, highways are dismal. Driving from Tupelo to Greenville is only slightly more arduous than hiking the same route.

John Bell Williams' proposal for a massive four-laning program didn't get past legislative roadblocks; the voters remembered the governor had promised new roads, but aside from some asphalt overlays, the pot-holed two-lane roads remain.

The popularity of the Williams administration, by 1971, was not high. Williams had approved building of a \$130,000 brick wall around the governor's mansion in downtown Jackson. Critics dubbed it "Fort John Bell" and questioned the need for the fence and the cost. A few months later building inspectors declared the 130-year-old mansion a firetrap, so the governor and his family moved out, leaving an uninhabitable building surrounded by a ten-foot-high fence.

There were myriad other troubles: two students killed by lawmen during turmoil at Jackson State College; continued crises at massive court-ordered integration reached virtually every school district; financial hardships as many white parents put their children in segregated academies; the senseless killing of a black teenager by white men at Drew; the list goes on and on.

What did all these things mean to voters? Apparently, that it was time for a new man to run things in Mississippi. That was Waller's line, and he won with it.

Ideologically, the difference between Sullivan and Waller appears small. They didn't disagree on any substantive issues. But in that long, cruel ordeal non-party politics imposes on candidates, Sullivan had been running for governor twelve years, gathering support, making his name known. In the end, it probably beat him.

What now? Waller faces Charles Evers November 2, and anyone with money to put on Evers could get astronomical odds in any smoke-filled room in town.

The Evers candidacy, and what it means in Mississippi, is another story. But a few things should be remembered. In the first primary, Evers urged blacks to vote for Swan, the candidate Evers figured he could defeat most easily. In the second primary, Evers urged blacks to vote in district and local races but not for either Waller or Sullivan.

He met with mixed success. In the counties where Evers' influence is strongest, Swan drew a fair amount of black votes. In the final analysis, it appears that Waller and Sullivan received about the same percentage of the black votes as of the white votes. But in the primary and the run-off, the black turn-out was low. That's not surprising, since in all but a few counties black candidates chose to run with Evers in November. Their chances will rest largely on the number of blacks who vote then.

What if Waller wins? First, there will be a change in attitude in the governor's office. The anti-black, anti-Washington rhetoric of the past probably won't be heard there any more. There will be a public recognition of the problems of

(continued on page 12)