NOTE ON METHODOLOGY
AND DATA SOURCES

The basic research for this study of southern politics was the collection and analysis of county and precinct election returns. To organize and interpret what ultimately amounted to a massive accumulation of data, we sought a research design which would be applicable to the South as a whole and which would permit state-to-state comparisons of the voting behavior of the South’s geographic and cultural subregions over time. In devising such a model, we were influenced by Bernard Cosman, who, in his study of the 1964 presidential election in the South, divided southern counties into 4 “sectors”; Perry H. Howard, who divided Louisiana’s 64 parishes into 9 “voter type areas”; and Numan V. Bartley, who divided Georgia’s 159 counties into 8 analytical categories.1 For this study we constructed an ecological model which assigned the 1,109 counties and 25 independent cities2 in the South to the following eight subregions:

1. The mountain South. This category is defined both geographically and politically. Geographically, we included the 118 southern counties listed in Thomas R. Ford’s standard study, The Southern Appalachian Region,3 plus 37 Arkansas counties in the Ozarks and Ouichitas. Addi-


2The figures reflect the total number of counties and independent Virginia cities in 1948. This number varies because Virginia’s peculiar annexation and incorporation laws have encouraged the creation of independent cities which report their election returns separately from the county in which they are located; occasionally entire counties are annexed by cities and thereby removed from the county list. In 1948 Virginia contained one hundred counties and twenty-five independent cities; by 1970 the count was ninety-six counties and thirty-eight independent cities. See Chester W. Bain, Annexation in Virginia (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1966); and idem, “A Body Incorporate”: The Evolution of City-County Separation in Virginia (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1967). In 1960 the total number of counties and independent cities in the South was 1,142; in 1970 there were 1,143.

3Thomas R. Ford, ed., The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962). We, of course, excluded the 72 counties in Kentucky and West Virginia, bringing the number of counties down from Ford’s 190.
tionally, we expanded this definition to include 22 highland "traditionally Republican" counties, which were generally contiguous to the Appalachian mountain counties and which, in our judgment, behaved politically more like mountain counties than like counties of any other category.\textsuperscript{4} The result was a 1960 total of 177 mountain counties and 7 independent cities that cast just under 17 percent of the total southern vote for president in 1948 and 10.8 percent in 1972.

2. The Piedmont South. Piedmont counties are defined as those counties located between the fall line and the Appalachian Mountains, including the Nashville Basin but excluding any county which according to the 1960 Census was 40 percent or more nonwhite in population. This definition encompassed a 1960 total of 163 counties and independent cities that in 1948 cast just over 16 percent of the southern presidential vote and in 1972 cast 16.8 percent.

3. The black-belt South. Any county containing a 1960 nonwhite population of 40 percent or more was placed in this category. In addition, several Deep South metropolitan counties located in the arc stretching through the southern black belt from Montgomery, Alabama, to Columbia, South Carolina, were included in this group even if they did not contain 40 percent nonwhite population.\textsuperscript{5} The black belt in 1960 included 244 counties and independent cities that in 1948 cast just over 9 percent of the southern vote for president and 12.4 percent in 1972.

4. The white-belt South. A residual term of convenience, this subdivision designates those counties of the tidewater, coastal plains, delta, and gulf slope—the white lowland counties generally—whose populations are over 60 percent white. This category in 1960 contained 320 counties and independent cities and in 1948 tallied approximately 31 percent of the presidential vote and 30.3 percent in 1972.

5. South Florida. This area includes the 30 Florida counties lying south of the northern boundaries of Volusia, Lake, Sumter, and Citrus counties and roughly defines a rapidly developing area in which the political culture has differed qualitatively from the more Deep South pattern associated with northern Florida.\textsuperscript{6} Although a peripheral region, south Florida cast 7.5 percent of the total southern vote for president in 1948 and 13.4 percent in 1972.

\textsuperscript{4}These twenty-two counties are Madison and Green in Virginia; Surry, Stokes, Yadkin, Davie, Catawba, Lincoln, and Polk in North Carolina; Pickett, Carroll, Henderson, Decatur, McNairy, Hardin, Wayne, and Lawrence in Tennessee; and Cherokee, Walker, Winston, Marion, and Franklin in Alabama. Otherwise, occasional isolated "traditionally Republican" counties or small clusters, such as the "German counties" in central and west Texas, were categorized within whichever geographical group they fell, as discussed below.

\textsuperscript{5}These counties are Montgomery in Alabama; Muscogee, Bibb, Richmond, and Dougherty in Georgia; and Richland and Charleston in South Carolina, which along with Hinds County, Mississippi, comprise the black-belt metropolitan counties.

6. *Catholic Louisiana.* The 19 non-black-belt Louisiana parishes estimated to contain a population more than 50 percent Catholic inherited a French Catholic culture which in many ways has differed significantly from that of Protestant north Louisiana or the Protestant South generally. These counties cast something over 4 percent of the southern presidential vote in 1948 and only 2 percent in 1972.

7. *West Texas.* Another peripheral region, west Texas shares much in common with the Great Plains states. For this study, west Texas was defined in a negative way as that portion of Texas left over after eastern Texas, which is historically and culturally "southern," and Mexican-American Texas, described below, were removed. As defined here, west Texas contains 146 counties that in 1948 cast just over 13 percent of the southern presidential vote and in 1972 cast 12.4 percent.

8. *Mexican-American Texas.* The 36 southwestern counties clustering along the Rio Grande River that in 1950 were estimated to contain a Latin American population of 40 percent or more were designated Mexican-American Texas. These counties reported approximately 2 percent of the total southern vote for president in 1948 and under 2 percent in 1972.

While recognizing the South's constituent parts insofar as cultural geography is concerned, this eight-dimensional taxonomy was a horizontal division and did not take into account rural-urban differences within the region and within subregions. Consequently, we designated all counties according to the following demographic criteria:

1. *Metropolitan,* which includes counties containing a city of greater than 50,000 population in 1960, as well as such obviously metropolitan suburban areas as Jefferson Parish in Louisiana and Chesterfield County in Virginia. In 1960 there were 85 metropolitan counties, which in 1948 cast almost 37 percent of the southern presidential vote and in 1972 cast 48 percent.

2. *Urban,* which includes counties containing a city of between 20,000 and 50,000 population in 1960. As expected, the counties in this category (109 in 1960) cast a limited share of the southern vote—approximately 13 percent in the presidential election of 1948 and 13.3 percent in 1972.

---


8The east Texas region encompasses the coastal and blackland prairies and the timber and piney woods region originally settled primarily by migrants from Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee. It contained the bulk of the plantations and slaves at the time of the Civil War, and it includes all counties that in 1960 were 16 percent or more nonwhite in population, with the single exception of Gonzales County. See William T. Chambers, *The Geography of Texas* (Austin: Steck, 1946), pp. 1–110. We did choose to consider the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan complex as an entity and for that reason assigned Dallas County, usually considered an east Texas city, to our west Texas category.

3. **Rural-small town**, which constituted all remaining counties (948 in 1960) and cast just over 50 percent of the vote for president in 1948 and 38.6 percent in 1972.

Thus, all southern counties were assigned both a geographical-cultural and a demographic code, in addition to their individual and state codes. Naturally, this model fits some states considerably better than others, and, in any case, it properly invites subcategorization into smaller and more variegated dimensions, such as the Tennessee Valley counties of north Alabama, the Florida parishes of Louisiana, the Southside counties of Virginia, and so on. Our purpose in describing the model in some detail is not to defend it but to explain our overall approach to the problem of politically analyzing a vast and complex region and to identify the units of analysis in the ecological correlations that appear in the text. We did compute correlation coefficients utilizing election returns from each county, most massively by comparing county returns in successive presidential elections in the South, which of course involved more than eleven hundred units of analysis in each computation. Most of our correlation analysis, however, was based upon ecological units and was intended to test for continuity and discontinuity in state and regional voting patterns. Not surprisingly, the ecological correlation coefficients, positive or negative, tended to be higher than county coefficients, but, for the most part, the differences were small.¹⁰

But what concerned us more than our unsophisticated methodology was the crudeness of the data. For all its potential, political ecology based upon county-level data is inherently limited by the aggregate nature of the total county vote. Most counties contain both affluent and poor voters and both black and white voters. Our county topology does not distinguish between wealthy and poor counties, but even if it did, it is uncertain precisely what could be concluded from such a division. The poorest counties in the South, generally speaking, are the black-belt and mountain counties, but during most of the period covered by our study, the voters in the black belt were not for the most part the poor blacks but the whites living among them, who were not always poor by any means. Obviously the electorate has changed in the black belt, as it has to a lesser degree in the mountains, since a higher percentage of mountain whites also have voted in recent years than in the past. Thus, even with sophisticated methodological techniques, it would be difficult to generalize about poverty and voting behavior over time on the basis of county and subregional data alone.

What was needed, then, was a more precise method for determining the behavior of voter groups, a quest which led us into the most difficult and demanding part of the research in this study. We obtained precinct returns for presidential, gubernatorial, and senatorial primary and general elec-

¹⁰The units of analysis for the ecological correlations were: white-belt metropolitan, white-belt urban, white-belt rural, black-belt metropolitan, black-belt urban, black-belt rural, etc.
tions since 1948, and we included other selected state and local elections, constitutional amendment votes, and various referenda which offered (or seemed to offer) voters an opportunity to express fundamental social and political preferences at the polls. Precinct returns were obtained for the following 27 cities:

- Alabama: Birmingham, Gadsden, Mobile, and Montgomery
- Arkansas: Little Rock
- Florida: Jacksonville and Miami
- Georgia: Atlanta and Macon
- Louisiana: Baton Rouge, New Orleans, and Shreveport
- Mississippi: Jackson
- North Carolina: Charlotte, Greensboro, High Point, and Raleigh
- South Carolina: Charleston and Columbia
- Tennessee: Memphis and Nashville
- Texas: Fort Worth, Houston, and Waco
- Virginia: Norfolk, Richmond, and Roanoke

These cities were chosen somewhat arbitrarily but generally with an eye toward a reasonable sampling of cities from the states and subregions of the South.

Within each city we constructed a five-dimensional taxonomy of precincts: (1) black, 11 (2) lower-class white, (3) lower-middle-class white, (4) upper-middle-class white, (5) upper-class white. These classifications were based on U.S. Census of Population: 1950 Census Tract Statistics and U.S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960 Census Tracts (PHC series) and then were checked against the 1970 census tracts, which began to appear after this study was in progress, and adjusted when necessary. Census tracts were first divided by racial composition. Predominately black tracts were designated as such, and racially mixed tracts were eliminated. For the predominately white tracts, an index was constructed which gave equal weight to median family income, median house value, and median years of education. These indices were then broken down into quartiles and designated lower-class, lower-middle-class, upper-middle-class, and upper-class. The tracts were transcribed on transparent sheets and laid over precinct maps, and rarely did tract and precinct lines coincide. Fortunately, the tracts were normally larger than the precincts, and what made the entire procedure feasible was the lack of necessity for classifying

11For various reasons no attempt was made to divide black precincts by socioeconomic class. In part, this decision was based on practical considerations. During the post-World War II period, the socioeconomic composition of black neighborhoods has tended to change more rapidly than that of white neighborhoods, and the problems associated with accurate categorization of black precincts of socioeconomic class for twenty-seven cities were awesome. Equally important, the politics of the Second Reconstruction only occasionally permitted black voters the luxury of dividing along class lines. See Bartley. From Thurmond to Wallace, pp. 35-56.

12In a number of smaller cities included in this study, there were no published Census of Population tracts for 1950, and information in the Census of Housing was substituted.
all precincts. When in doubt about the socioeconomic composition of a
precinct, we threw it out. We were particularly careful to maintain a cordon
sanitaire around the black precincts, given the rapidity with which neigh­
borhoods have changed their racial composition. Some cities maintain
registration records by race, which greatly simplified this problem. In any
case, our procedure categorized the precincts of each city relative to that
city's particular socioeconomic profile, and, of course, cities differ, not only
in size and wealth but also in political and sociological personality.

Our precinct data are not surgically clean, and, even if they were, they
would still be relatively crude. It is easy enough, at least since the mid­
1960s, to locate all-black precincts and thus to be able to speak with some
assurance of black voter behavior. But, even here, generalizations are open
to suspicion. That black voters in Charleston and Columbia voted for cer­
tain candidates is not proof that blacks residing in rural areas or smaller
towns or, for that matter, other South Carolina cities voted in a like fashion.
In white neighborhoods the problems are greater. It is true that, by and
large, cities tend to be residentially segregated by class as well as race
(cities generally have high prestige and low prestige neighborhoods). But
residential homogeneity is by no means complete. For example, a precinct
properly classified as lower-status white may contain apartment com­
plexes housing people of different socioeconomic characteristics. Even if it
is assumed that precinct categories do accurately reflect the socioeconomic
status attributed to them, the fallacy inherent in generalizing from some
upper- or lower- or middle-class white precincts to others, as in the case of
blacks, is still applicable. Nevertheless, taking into account the pitfalls and
fallacies to which political analysis is heir, the precinct data, viewed in the
aggregate, provide that crucial access to racial and class patterns of voting
that county returns generally lack and without which an analysis of south­
er politics would be necessarily superficial.

The accumulation of this mountain of data involved three basic prob­
lems: the location of precinct maps, precinct returns, and county returns.
Of these, the precinct maps presented the greatest obstacles. Cities redraw
precinct lines, renumber existing precincts, and otherwise bewilder re­
searchers to accommodate population shifts, changes in voter registration,
or sometimes, one suspects, the whim of city or county officials. In the
larger cities such changes are usually frequent; in the smaller cities precinct
boundaries may remain unchanged over a period of several years. In any
case, analyzing precinct returns over a period of more than two decades re­
quires any number of precinct maps for each city. Often the search for long
outdated precinct maps proved a frustrating experience. Municipal and

1Best of all was the city of Macon, Georgia, which decreed Jim Crow voting booths and
reported election returns as “white” and “colored.” Alas, this fine old practice, which appealed
to both white supremists and political analysts, fell victim to the 1964 Civil Rights Act, com­
plicating the chores of precinct classification.
county governments are not organized to ease the professional problems of academic researchers, and especially not historians. One learns to glow with appreciation and the joy of belated discovery when one finally locates those marvelous little old ladies of both sexes whose habit it is to hide away in some dusty corner copies of the old precinct maps at the time new ones are being drafted. One learns, also, to regard with a shudder the gleaming edifice of a new government office building, as the movement into it often consigns such out-of-date records to oblivion. As one retreats into the 1950s and the 1940s, the availability of precinct information becomes ever more limited. In at least one city in every state, however, we managed through luck and assiduous scavenging to carry our analysis back at least to the early 1950s and in most cases to the late 1940s.

The collection of precinct returns presented similar though somewhat less severe problems. Local governmental officials are more likely to retain the precinct returns than the maps needed to interpret them, and newspapers in many cities conscientiously print precinct tallies for significant elections. No other southern state remotely matches Louisiana, where the secretary of state performs a yeoman service by compiling and publishing parish precinct statistics for all state primary and general elections. For Texas elections in 1966 and 1968, Lance Tarrance has edited two editions of *Texas Precinct Votes*, which include not only precinct returns but also precinct maps for all 254 Texas counties. During recent years, public record keeping, at least in the larger southern metropolitan counties, has undoubtedly improved. But despite developments that promise to simplify precinct data acquisition in the future, historians still face challenges, as anyone who has scrounged around some of the more unkempt metropolitan courthouses and city halls in search of precinct returns can testify. Occasional gaps in our precinct data resulting from inability to locate election returns in some cities are further testimonial.

County-level returns are considerably easier to acquire, although even here locating returns from primary elections held in the early 1950s can be troublesome. Alexander Heard and Donald S. Strong's *Southern Primaries and Elections, 1920–1949* is invaluable for the early postwar period, and Richard M. Scammon's multivolume *America Votes* is equally helpful for general-election returns during the 1950s and 1960s. Most of the county-

14 Newspaper returns do present problems. To beat publication deadlines the newspapers sometimes go to press with incomplete returns, and the reprinting of election results offers one more opportunity for errors. Nevertheless, in a number of cases newspapers were the only sources available.
15 Wade O. Martin, Jr., comp., *Primary Election Returns and General Election Returns* (Baton Rouge: Office of the Secretary of State, 1948–).
level general-election data used in this study were supplied in machine-readable form by the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, University of Michigan, which has extensive general-election holdings and was provided by the authors in machine-readable form the county-level primary-election returns collected for this study. The only published collection of Southwide primary election statistics during the past two decades is Richard M. Scammon, comp., *Southern Primaries '58.* The following sources for election statistics by state proved helpful:

**Alabama**

*Alabama Official and Statistical Register*, published quadrennially by the State Department of Archives and History, Montgomery

**Arkansas**

*Arkansas Almanac*, published biennially by Arkansas Almanac Company, Little Rock

**Florida**

*Report of the Secretary of State of Florida*, published biennially, Tallahassee


**Georgia**

*Georgia Official and Statistical Register*, published biennially by the Department of Archives and History, Atlanta

**Louisiana**

*Report of the Secretary of State*, published biennially, Baton Rouge


**Mississippi**

*Mississippi Official and Statistical Register*, published quadrennially by the secretary of state, Jackson


19 For a statement on servicing policies and a summary of data holdings of the Survey Research Archive, see *A Guide to Resources and Services* (Ann Arbor: Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, updated periodically).
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North Carolina

North Carolina Manual, published biennially by the secretary of state, Raleigh

South Carolina

Supplemental Report of the Secretary of State, published biennially, Columbia
South Carolina Almanac (Columbia: Pramac Associates, 1968–)

Tennessee

Tennessee Blue Book, published biennially by the secretary of state, Nashville
_____, Fifty Years of Tennessee Primary Elections, 1918–1968 (Nashville: State Government, n.d.)

Texas

Texas Almanac, published biennially by A. H. Belo, Dallas

Virginia

Ralph Eisenberg, ed., Virginia Votes, 1924–1968 (Charlotte: University of Virginia Press, 1971)

With the data collected, categorized, and coded in the fashion described, each county and each precinct return was punched on the standard Hollerith card. Given more than 1,100 counties and almost as many precincts, and with presidential elections, senatorial and gubernatorial primaries, runoffs and elections, selected referenda and constitutional amendments, and other local, district, and state contests that for one reason or another tempted our attention, we were working with a data bank well in excess of 70,000 cards. From these data, our arithmetic programs computed total votes and percentages by county and subregion within states (and in the case of presidential elections for the South as a whole) and by precinct category within cities, and these results became the units of analysis for computation of Pearson product-moment, candidate-to-candidate coefficients of correlation.22

21The coding of precincts in a medium-sized city typically would produce around twenty for 1948 and as many as forty by 1972.

22The recent proliferation of literature bearing on the problems and advantages of quantitative history is welcome testimony not only to the increasing use of these techniques by historians but also more generally to the healthy degree to which social scientists have recovered
To serve as a check on our analysis of voting returns and to provide information on an individual level, we commissioned the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan to run a secondary analysis from its survey research data bank. As we had done with our precinct data, we created a five-part taxonomy, with black respondents treated independently and white respondents quartered on the basis of three independent variables: (1) years of education, (2) occupation of head of household, and (3) total family income. As our analysis proceeded, it proved more feasible to collapse these categories into a tripartite division, with the black sample remaining consistent and the white respondents divided by education between those who had completed high school and those who had not; by occupation between those who worked in blue-collar occupational categories (unskilled, service, farm, protective service, unemployed, skilled, semiskilled) and those who labored in white-collar positions (clerical, sales, buyers, agents, brokers, professionals, semiprofessional, self-employed, business managers, officials); and by income according to a sliding scale that varied from, in 1952, those who lived on less than $4,000 family income and those who made $4,000 or more to, in 1970, those families who earned less than $7,500 and those who earned $7,500 or more, which reflected both inflation and the increasing prosperity of the region. This tripartite taxonomy assured that the value of $N$ was greater than one hundred in most categories. For example, the $N$'s for figure 5.1, showing voter turnout in presidential elections by race and education, were: for low-education white, 196 in 1952, 197 in 1956, 226 in 1960, 134 in 1964, and 136 in 1968; for high-education whites, 119 in 1952, 209 in 1956, 275 in 1960, 193 in 1964, and 188 in 1968; and for blacks, 94 in 1952, 69 in 1956, 70 in 1960, 213 in 1964, and 124 in 1968.

As dependent variables we chose the following:

1. A query as to the respondent’s vote in that year’s presidential election.

from W. S. Robinson's shattering blow of 1950. In “Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals,” *American Sociological Review* 15 (June 1950): 351-57, Robinson sought to demonstrate mathematically that ecological correlations, which we have used extensively for this study, could so distort the true underlying relationships revealed by individual correlations that the former mode of social research ought to be abandoned. One finds little fault with Robinson's mathematics. Curiously, however, he seemed quite invalidly to assume that political and social ecologists simply equated correlation with causation, and he demonstrated an apparent blindness to the importance of detecting spurious bivariate correlations and thereby identifying significant third variables. For a more balanced assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of correlation analysis, see Austin Ranney, “The Utility and Limitations of Aggregate Data in the Study of Electoral Behavior,” in his *Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962), pp. 91–102; and Thomas B. Alexander, “Some Natural Limits of Quantification in History” (Paper delivered at the thirty-seventh annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, Houston, Texas, November 8, 1971 [mimeographed]). A more technical critique of Robinson's article is Leo A. Goodman, “Some Alternatives to Ecological Correlation,” *American Journal of Sociology* 64 (May 1959): 610-25.
2. A party identification question, which read: "Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?"

3. A New Deal question, which in 1956 and 1960 solicited a response to the statement: "The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job." In 1964 and 1968 the statement read: "In general . . . the government in Washington should see to it that every person has a job and a good standard of living."

4. A fair-employment question that in 1956 and 1960 read: "If Negroes are not getting fair treatment in jobs and housing, the government in Washington should see to it that they do." In 1964 and 1968 it read: "Some people feel that if Negroes are not getting fair treatment in jobs the government in Washington ought to see to it that they do. Others feel that this is not the federal government’s business."

5. A school desegregation question, which in 1956 and 1960 sought a response to the statement: "The government in Washington should stay out of the question of whether white and colored children go to the same schools." In 1964, 1968, and 1970 it read: "Some people say that the government in Washington should see to it that white and Negro children are allowed to go to the same schools. Others claim that this is not the government’s business."

6. Several other questions concerning political efficacy and social attitudes, the results of which were briefly summarized in chapter 6.

The results of six surveys during the years 1952–70 were incorporated into our analysis. As noted above, the wording for some of the questions used in our analysis was inconsistent over time, thus requiring qualifications on their interpretation. To bolster the size of our sample, we included respondents from the border states—Kentucky, Maryland, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia—as well as from the eleven southern states. Compared with some in-depth attitudinal studies conducted in recent years, our design was rather modest. What we did achieve, within the reservations stated, was a view of individual respondents by race and social class over a period of almost two decades.

Finally, over a period of several years we interviewed politicians, staff members, journalists, and generally persons whose credentials suggested that they were knowledgeable about southern political affairs. While a broad range of interviews were conducted, they were not systematic, they did not involve scientific samples or questionnaires, and although notes were taken, the interviews were not recorded or transcribed. A list of persons interviewed is located at the end of this appendix.

For all our interest in and indebtedness to the "new" political history, with its self-conscious concern for a broad theoretical framework, for methodology, and for drawing on a substantial data base, we acknowledge an abiding indebtedness to the "old" political history which emerged from the political mapmaking of Frederick Jackson Turner and Charles A. Beard and was carried on in political science by Wilfred E. Binkley, Samuel Lubell, and V. O. Key, especially in *Southern Politics*. In dealing with so vast a topic, the virtues of simplicity, when coupled with precision, are compelling.

**Persons Interviewed**

Senator James B. Allen, Alabama  
Representative Charles E. Bennett, Florida, Third District  
Representative Ben Blackburn, Georgia, Fourth District  
Harold Bradley, Tennessee House of Representatives  
Representative James T. Broyhill, North Carolina, Tenth District  
Representative Patrick T. Caffery, Louisiana, Third District  
Representative William L. Dickinson, Alabama, Second District  
Edythe Edwards, legislative aide to Representative James Broyhill, North Carolina, Tenth District  
Representative W. Jack Edwards, Alabama, First District  
Guy Friddell, *Norfolk Virginia-Pilot*  
Representative Richard H. Fulton, Tennessee, Fifth District  
Representative Henry B. Gonzales, Texas, Twentieth District  
Senator Albert Gore, Tennessee  
Jim Groot, administrative assistant to Senator Edward Gurney, Florida  
Representative John Paul Hammerschmidt, Arkansas, Third District  
Sam Harris, *Arkansas Gazette*  
Charles Holmes, administrative assistant to Representative Bob Eckhart, Texas, Eighth District  
Thomas Hooker, administrative assistant to Representative William V. Chappel, Florida, Fourth District  
Representative Walter Jones, North Carolina, First District  
Tom W. Lambeth, administrative assistant to Representative L. Richardson Preyer, North Carolina, Sixth District  
Representative Gillespie V. Montgomery, Mississippi, Fourth District  
Ken Morrell, *Nashville Banner*  
Robert Mason, *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot*  
Edmund Orgill, former Mayor, Memphis, Tennessee
Representative L. Richardson Preyer, North Carolina, Sixth District
Representative James H. Quillen, Tennessee, First District
John Seigenthaler, *Nashville Tennessean*
Luther W. Shaw, administrative assistant to Representative Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina, Eleventh District
Representative Floyd D. Spence, South Carolina, Second District
Senator William Spong, Virginia
Representative W. S. Stuckey, Georgia, Eighth District
Senator Herman Talmadge, Georgia
Senator Strom Thurmond, South Carolina
Representative G. William Whitehurst, Virginia, Second District
Representative C. W. Bill Young, Florida, Eighth District
Edwin Yoder, *Greensboro Daily News*