

**Tar Heel Politics: An Overview of North Carolina
Political History in the Twentieth Century, 1900-1972**

Submitted to the Institute for Emerging Issues, NC State University

March 2010

**Karl E. Campbell, PhD, Associate Professor of History, Appalachian
State University**

Introduction

What kind of a state is North Carolina? Scholars may reject the utility of such a vague question but states do have a general personality, or perhaps it is better called an image, a stereotype, a heritage, or a political culture. Whatever label one chooses there are synthetic perceptions that tend to dominate popular opinions about a state. Political leaders operate in a context created, in part, by these historical perceptions.¹

The study of history is one way to document, analyze, and even to shape North Carolina's political context. The slogan of a popular website, the Historians' News Network, reads: "History is not just the past; it is the present and the future, too." William Shakespeare's famous admonition "what is past is prologue" is inscribed over the entrance to the National Archives.² Governors, legislators, and other primary actors in North Carolina's political dramas of the late twentieth century performed on a stage shaped by historical events from both the distant and recent past.

Senator Sam Ervin once explained that there were two ways to teach someone about a horse. You could draw a likeness of the animal and write the word "horse" under it, or you could just draw the picture and let them come to their own conclusions. In like manner there are two ways to explore the political history of North Carolina: Section I will explain the context, scholarly debates, and political theories of Tar Heel politics; section II will draw a picture by describing some of the major political leaders of the state who exemplify these theories.

Descriptions and Theories of North Carolina's Political Past

North Carolina's Historical Nicknames

Throughout its four hundred year history, North Carolina has been portrayed in a variety of ways. Often those perceptions have led to descriptive nicknames and familiar phrases. In the colonial era the region was often called "Poor Carolina." Since it was a refuge for those who could not afford land in the more prosperous colonies it became known as "the best poor man's country." A century later the relative egalitarianism of North Carolina, when compared to its more aristocratic neighbors Virginia and South Carolina, led to the famous quotation that the state was "a vale of humility between two mountains of conceit."³

Even the nickname "Tar Heels" has its roots in the hard work and poverty associated with the state in the 1800s. While a popular myth holds that General Robert E. Lee created the nickname by complimenting North Carolina's soldiers for sticking to their battle lines as if they had tar on their heels, historians have found the term used in print at least thirty years earlier. It appears to have originally been a somewhat derogatory reference to the common men who did hard labor, working with pitch and tar in the navel stores industry along the Cape Fear River. Eventually North Carolinians embraced the stereotype of being regular, good folk—Tar Heels.⁴

During the American Revolution and Constitutional period, and for many years afterwards, North Carolina bragged that it was "first in freedom." The state flag presents two

dates in support of this claim: May 20, 1775, when citizens in the Charlotte area wrote the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence and became the first Americans to declare their independence (although the truth of this claim is highly debated); and April 12, 1776 when North Carolina's legislature passed the Halifax Resolves, the first official statement in support of independence. Later, when other states rushed towards ratifying the Constitution, North Carolina withheld its support until a Bill of Rights was promised to guarantee individual liberties.

North Carolinians also created nicknames to remember and reconstruct their shared sense of identity after the founding of the new nation. In the early national period (1789-1830s) North Carolina earned the nickname "the Rip Van Winkle state." The unwillingness of North Carolina's government to respond to stagnant economic conditions suggested that the state was sleepwalking through history. Indeed, many historians have made a hero out of Archibald Murphey, a young legislator and newspaperman, for demanding that the state wake up and levy taxes in support of internal improvements such as roads, canals, and public education. Other nicknames for North Carolina have included "the Unwilling Hercules" for its reluctant but exceptional contributions to the confederate cause in the Civil War, "the New South" for its dramatic industrialization in the second half of the nineteenth century, and even "the Dixie Dynamo" for its dynamic economic growth and diversification after World War II.⁵

The Progressive Paradox

During the twentieth century North Carolina was often described as a "progressive" state. In the early 1900s the state even earned the label "the Wisconsin of the South" for its dedication to public education, good roads, and clean government (Wisconsin was considered the most liberal state during the Progressive Era, 1900-WWI). A whole generation of Tar Heel historians, especially those who came of age during the intellectual consensus of the post-World War II era, boasted that North Carolina was the most progressive state in the South.⁶

However, not all scholarly analysis has been so uncritical. Indeed, the most famous nickname for North Carolina in the twentieth century was "the progressive plutocracy," a term coined by political scientist V.O. Key in 1949 to describe the paradoxical nature of the state's political culture. Key explained that while the state was progressive in its economic development and forward-looking political leadership, it was dominated by a plutocracy of businessmen and their lawyers who did not share power democratically and did not welcome challenges to their authority.⁷

The paradoxical nature of North Carolina politics has served as the defining theme of the state's history for several decades. As historian William Chafe pointed out in 1980 "throughout the twentieth century North Carolina's progressive image existed side by side with social and economic facts that contradicted profoundly the state's reputation."⁸ North Carolina became the most industrialized state in the South during the first half of the twentieth century, yet it also had the nation's largest rural farm population. The home of nationally respected institutions of higher

learning such as the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke, and Wake Forest, it also had a high school dropout rate of over 32 percent—one of the highest in the country. Known as a leader in political reform, it consistently ranked under forty-fifth in quality of life, thirty-second in per capita income, and twelfth in the number of indigent citizens (approximately 20 percent of its population consistently lived below the poverty line). Often considered “the most liberal southern state,” North Carolina’s congressional delegation earned a reputation as one of the most conservative in Washington. Thad Beyle, a political scientist at UNC-Chapel Hill, observed that these contrasting tendencies “suggest the difficulties in generalizing about the state; it is neither simply ‘liberal’ nor simply ‘conservative.’ North Carolina’s politicians and scholars can agree only in the judgment that the state is indeed a paradox.” Perhaps the best example of this dominant theme of North Carolina history is the recent award-winning book *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics* by journalist Rob Christensen.⁹

But there are problems with the paradox theme. It better describes the first half of the twentieth century than the second. Before WWII the contradictory forces which Christensen described as “progressive impulses” within a “broad conservative streak” resided in the same party and often in the same person.¹⁰ From 1898, when white supremacy created one party rule, until mid-century, when the “Solid South” began to fall apart, there certainly was a paradox between the progressive paternalistic ideals and the conservative anti-democratic actions in both the Democratic party and within certain powerful individuals (Governors Aycock and Morrison being prime examples). But the civil rights movement, the women’s movement, cultural divisions, and dramatically changing economic conditions undermined the solid Democratic South and ended the unity of the Progressive Plutocracy.¹¹

The paradox theme certainly does not fit the new political structure created after 1948 by the growing divisions within the Democratic party after 1972 or by the rise of the Republican party in the South. The tumultuous Democratic primary election for the U.S. Senate in 1950 between Frank Porter Graham and Willis Smith marked the beginning of the end of Democratic political hegemony in North Carolina. Battle lines were drawn between more liberal Democrats such as Graham (and later Terry Sanford and Jim Hunt) and conservative Democrats such as Smith (and later I. Beverly Lake and Jesse Helms). By the late-1960s the emerging success of the Republicans, including their new recruits of former conservative Democrats, created a two-party South in which conflicting values and agendas could be debated in contested elections instead of under one party rule.¹²

By 1972 North Carolina was less a progressive paradox than a political battleground. Progressivism is still a valid word for describing North Carolina at the end of the last century, but the meaning and context of the state’s progressive reputation have changed significantly since an earlier generation of scholars applied the concept so uncritically to the Old North State.

Theories of Political Culture

Behind the candidates, campaigns, policies, and events of Tar Heel politics is North Carolina's political culture—a term scholars use to describe the combination of ideas, attitudes, values, and beliefs that shape a people's orientation to society in general and politics in particular. Theoretical discussions can become excessively detailed, but a quick review of two major explanations of North Carolina's political culture in the twentieth century can help to clarify the events of that era.

Daniel Elazar has described the dominant political culture of the first half of the twentieth century as being “traditionalist” with a strong “moralist” strain. Elazar, a well-known political scientist, created an elaborate theoretical model to understand the various political cultures of different states. He suggested that between 1900 and 1948 North Carolina best fit into his traditionalist category. Traditionalist political cultures contained four elements: paternalistic elitism; a positive but limited role for state government; restricted political participation of many of its citizens (especially African Americans and poor whites); and political competition that was restricted to factions within the dominant Democratic party. But unlike most other southern states, Elazar argued, North Carolina also had an element of a moralistic political culture. The moralist belief system included ideas such as seeing government as a positive force in human behavior that can help pursue a common good for all of its citizens. When Elazar's theory of North Carolina's political culture is added to V.O. Key's idea of a Progressive Plutocracy a clear picture emerges. The Tar Heel state was governed in the first half of the twentieth century by a paternalistic, self-perpetuating elite that was willing to use government to promote the common good only as long as it did not threaten Democratic power.¹³

Two political events in the middle of the century fractured the ruling Democratic party machine and led to the emergence of a revised political culture. In 1948 the election of Gov. Kerr Scott, a liberal insurgent within the Democratic party, successfully challenged the majority elite political machine called the Shelby Dynasty. Two years later Willis Smith won a dramatic contest for the U.S. Senate against liberal Frank Porter Graham. Together these two elections signaled the start of a lengthy battle between two factions within the Democratic party. This contest would eventually lead to a legitimate two-party system.

During the second half of the century the state's political culture is best described by sociologist Paul Luebke as a contest between “modernizers” and “traditionalists.” Modernizers favored moderate reform of the state's social and economic relations in order to advance the growth of new business opportunities in technology, finance, and manufacturing. They tended to come from the urban areas of the state, especially the industrial piedmont. Traditionalist resisted any alteration in southern racial, economic, or social relations. They were based in the state's small towns and in rural and agrarian sections. Traditionalists enjoyed the support of the established industries such as textiles, furniture, and agriculture. While modernizers supported an activist government to promote infrastructure and especially education, the traditionalists favored

limited government, fewer taxes, and old-fashioned family values. Modernizers may be more willing than traditionalists to accept African Americans and women into their ranks, but they are not enthusiastic supporters of social movements that challenge the status quo.¹⁴

Indeed, Luebke argued that while there are significant differences between modernizers and traditionalists they are actually “two sides of the same coin” since they represent two different brands of conservatism. Neither modernizers nor traditionalists support the liberal or populist agenda of expanding equality or redistributing wealth and power at the expense of the paternalistic but self-sustaining elite. Luebke also warned against thinking of modernizers and traditionalists as synonymous with Democrats and Republicans because elements of both groups can be found in both political parties. For instance, Republicans included both modernizers such as Governors James Holzhouser and traditionalists like Senator Jesse Helms, while the Democrats included both traditionalists like Senator Sam Ervin and modernizers such as Governor Jim Hunt. By the end of the century, however, modernizers dominated the Democratic party while traditionalists and conservative-leaning modernizers battled for control of the Republican party.¹⁵

II: A Narrative and Biographical Overview

The Election of 1898 and the Wilmington Massacre

The most important political event of the twentieth century actually occurred two years before the century began. In 1898 a violent uprising in Wilmington marked the turning point of a political realignment that would shape North Carolina politics for over seventy years. The birth of the solid Democratic South, the disfranchisement of African Americans and many poor whites, and the establishment of Jim Crow segregation all flowed directly from the racial violence and intimidation surrounding the election of 1898.

North Carolina had a vibrant two party system in the three decades following the Civil War. The Democrats, who represented conservatives and former Confederates, held the majority but never won more than 54 percent of the vote in gubernatorial elections. The Republican party, made up of former unionists, African Americans, and some white reformers, held local power in areas across the state but could not win statewide elections. The drop in tobacco and cotton prices in the 1880s and 1890s increased the suffering of farmers and drove them into a new political movement that culminated in the Populist Party. In the 1890s the Populist and Republican Parties cooperated to elect a fusion ticket that broke the Democrat’s hold on state power. By 1896 the fusionists controlled both houses of the legislature and the governor’s office.¹⁶

The Democrats turned to Furnifold Simmons to lead their political comeback. Simmons was born on a plantation down east before the Civil War and he retained a deep set anger at having been defeated by a black Republican for Congress earlier in his career. In 1898 Simmons set his party on a blatantly racist campaign to restore white supremacy. He recruited speakers who traversed the state to warn of the dangers of “Negro Rule,” the most notable being future

gubernatorial candidate Charles B. Aycock. Aided by editorials and sensational cartoons in partisan newspapers like the *Raleigh News and Observer*, the Democrats warned that the fusionists' success had put black politicians in power who failed to stop lustful black men from sexually exploiting innocent white women. Simmons sent a letter to 100,000 voters making the case for voting Democratic in the election: "North Carolina is a WHITE MAN'S STATE and WHITE MEN WILL RULE IT, and they will crush the party of Negro domination beneath a majority so overwhelming that no other party will ever dare to establish Negro rule here."¹⁷

Fearful that their racist campaign would not be enough to ensure victory, the Democrats organized Red Shirt brigades of vigilantes to intimidate blacks and poor whites from voting for the fusion ticket. Wearing bright red shirts and carrying rifles they rode on horseback through Republican and Populist neighborhoods and disrupted fusion political rallies. In Wilmington, on the day before the election, a former Confederate and failed politician named Alfred Moore Waddell yelled out to a gathering of Red Shirts numbering over a thousand that if they found "the Negro out voting" they should warn him to leave, and "if he refuses, kill him, shoot him down in this tracks." "We will win tomorrow," Waddell shouted, even "if we have to choke the current of the Cape Fear River with negro carcasses."¹⁸

The Democratic strategy of racism, intimidation, and in some cases outright violence succeeded. Fusionist lost control of the legislature and many of the Republican local strongholds went Democratic. In Wilmington, where the fusion coalition maintained its majority at the polls, Waddell led a band of armed men in a rampage through the city, burning and shooting their way through the black section of town. Estimates of black fatalities range from twenty five to sixty. Over the next few days many African Americans were forced to leave the city and to forfeit their property. The Wilmington Massacre left the city under white Democratic control and Waddell established himself as mayor. A major political realignment had occurred in North Carolina. The *Raleigh News and Observer* proclaimed that "Negro rule is at an end in North Carolina forever."¹⁹

The Simmons Machine, 1898-1930

After their victory in 1898 Furnifold Simmons and the Democrats set out to make sure that their power would not be challenged again. The newly elected Democratic legislature passed the first Jim Crow law in 1899. Simmons also urged the legislature to propose a constitutional amendment to disfranchise black voters through literacy tests and poll taxes. To reassure poor whites, who feared that they might also lose their vote, the Democrats proposed a temporary grandfather clause. Simmons led the campaign for the amendment's ratification during the election of 1900. He regarded its passage by a margin of 59 to 41 percent as one of the greatest accomplishments of his life. "Until we were rid of the incubus of the Negro balance of power," he remarked in the 1930s, "there could be no progress in the state."²⁰

Simmons was also on the ballot in 1900, running for a seat in the U.S. Senate. He easily won the election and served in Washington for thirty years. But Simmons never let go of the reins of power back home in North Carolina. Through his control of election machinery, the

financial support of the business community, a network of aspiring local politicians, and most importantly the unifying theme of white supremacy, Simmons built a powerful political machine that dominated North Carolina government for the next three decades.²¹

Charles Aycock: The Education Governor

The election of Charles Aycock in 1900 marked the beginning of the Progressive Era in Tar Heel politics. Aycock exemplified the traits that gave North Carolina its progressive image during the first half of the twentieth century. The issues he championed were the issues upon which a whole generation of Democratic leaders would build their reputations—efficient pro-business government, prohibition, white supremacy, paternalistic benevolence towards the needy, supporting infrastructure for economic growth, and improving public education.

Aycock had long been involved in Democratic party politics, but he rose to stardom during the white supremacy campaign of 1898. By far his party's most inspiring orator, he infused the usual racist rhetoric with high sounding themes of reforming state government and saving American civilization. He campaigned tirelessly in 1900 not only for himself but in support of passing segregation laws and ratifying the constitutional amendment disfranchising African Americans. He argued that once blacks were removed from politics, and the state was free of their corrupting influence, the path towards a better tomorrow would be open. However his most important campaign pledge was that he would “devote the four years of my official time to upbuilding the public schools of North Carolina.”²²

Aycock's promise of schools for all of North Carolina's children reassured illiterate whites who feared that they, too, might be kept from voting in future elections. As it turned out poor whites had reason to worry. Total voter turnout in North Carolina dropped 46 percent between 1896 (the height of the fusion movement) and 1904 (the end of Aycock's term). Black turnout fell almost 100 percent while white turnout was reduced by 23 percent, suggesting that the poll tax, literacy tests, and on-going intimidation disfranchised citizens of both races.²³

Aycock's promises of expanded public education were more than just a rhetorical cloak he wore to hide his inner racism. First, he expressed no apologies for his white supremacy. Second, like other progressives of his time, Aycock believed that universal public education would create the foundation of an enlightened citizenry upon which all other reforms could be built. His accomplishments were significant. He pushed legislation that doubled state funding for education during his first year in office, consolidated schools, and encouraged local governments to increase taxation for their schools.

He also advocated for longer school terms (beyond the typical three to four months a year), more years of required education for each student, higher teacher standards, better textbooks, building more high schools, and equalizing spending between the wealthy and poorer counties. When legislators tried to segregate tax revenues by preventing white taxes from

supporting any black schools, Aycock stood firm in his commitment to educate all of North Carolina's children—albeit in separate and unequal facilities.²⁴

After leaving the statehouse in 1905 Aycock became a nationally recognized educational reformer. He stayed away from politics until 1912 when he entered the Democratic primary for the U.S. Senate. During a speech on education later that year he boasted: “I am proud of the fact that we have built a school-house in North Carolina every day since I was inaugurated as Governor,” and that “I canvassed the State for four years on behalf of the education of the children of the State. Sometimes on Sunday they would ask me down to the church to talk, and I always talked about education.” At that moment he collapsed on the stage from a sudden and fatal heart attack.²⁵

For most of the twentieth century, Aycock's crusade for public education stood as the symbol of North Carolina's progressivism while his white supremacy campaign was politely left out of political speeches and history textbooks. In recent decades, especially since the civil rights movement and the general rejection of explicit racism, Aycock has come to symbolize North Carolina's progressive paradox.

Cameron Morrison: Good Roads Governor

By 1920 the conservative business elite—the group that V.O. Key would later call the Progressive Plutocracy—had been running state government for two decades. While there was some interparty factionalism between the more conservative Democrats in the Simmons Machine and a smaller group of insurgent moderates, the foundation of North Carolina's version of progressivism was well established. So, too, was the paradox of the Progressive Plutocracy. On the one hand its members supported white supremacy and restricted democratic participation while on the other hand they invested in public education and other government programs to improve the lives of many North Carolinians.

In each of these areas Governor Cameron Morrison followed in the footsteps of his predecessors. A lawyer from Charlotte long active in party activities, Morrison had been hand-picked by Simmons to run for the Governor's Mansion in 1920. Simmons was worried that O. Max Gardner, a popular critic of his political machine, might win the Democratic primary, but Morrison pulled through the first ballot by a few hundred votes and won the second by a comfortable margin. Once in office Morrison distinguished himself by expanding public services. During his administration school expenditures almost doubled, and he significantly increased the state's financial support of its growing public universities.

Like Aycock before him, Morrison argued that better educated citizens would be better able to participate in the expanding industrial economy. The governor demonstrated a strong paternalistic streak by improving the quality of the state's mental institutions, prisons, and health services.²⁶ But new challenges confronted Morrison and the Simmons Machine in the Roaring Twenties. African Americans continued to pressure the government for civil rights and workers

began turning to unions, and strikes, to force better working conditions. Morrison, a former Red Shirt and a personal friend of many textile mill owners, opposed both.

He also disapproved of woman's suffrage and had publically condemned the 19th Amendment during North Carolina's debate over ratification the summer before his election. O. Max Gardner, his opponent in the Democratic primary, supported giving women the vote. The state legislature had been so hostile to women's suffrage that it once sent a bill supporting women's right to vote to the committee regulating insanity. In 1920 North Carolina had the chance to be the final state needed for ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment but once again the General Assembly turned the suffragettes away only to have the amendment passed by Tennessee later that summer and become the law of the land. The legislature did not officially change its opposition to women's suffrage until it passed a meaningless resolution to support the Amendment in 1971, over 40 years later.²⁷

Women had been active in Tar Heel politics long before they received the vote in 1920. Although barred from elective office, women served at the forefront of several important Progressive Era reform movements, including the prohibition of alcohol. In 1908 North Carolina became the first state to banish the sale of liquor by popular vote, eleven years before the nation ratified the Eighteenth Amendment in 1919. Women's clubs and voluntary organizations had played a significant role in pushing reforms in education, public health—especially the fight against hookworms—and child labor.²⁸

Indeed, it was a woman activist who helped push Governor Morrison towards his most notable accomplishment. In the early 1920s Harriet Morehead Berry was considered the best woman politician in the state. A graduate of the State Normal and Industrial School (now University of North Carolina-Greensboro) she became the secretary and later de facto head of the North Carolina Geological and Economic Survey which was responsible for the conservation of natural resources and the building of better roads. More than any other person, Berry led the crusade for road building in North Carolina. Through public speaking, letter-writing campaigns, and lobbying efforts in the legislature, she paved the way (to borrow a phrase) for Governor Morrison to embrace her goal of connecting every county seat to a web of hard surface roadways. By the end of his administration 6,200 miles of North Carolina's roads had been improved and 1,480 miles resurfaced or under contract to be paved. With Berry's help Morrison earned the title "The Good Roads Governor," although he personally wished to be remembered for his education and institutional reforms.²⁹

O. Max Gardner and the Shelby Dynasty

The election of 1928 represented high drama on both the national and state political stage. The presidential election pitted Republican Herbert Hoover against Democrat Al Smith. The differences between them were stark. Hoover, a Quaker and a conservative, ran on a ticket of continuing the pro-business, laissez faire policies of the Republican party. Smith, a Catholic and a moderate, opposed Prohibition and supported immigration and racial tolerance. In North

Carolina Furnifold Simmons disliked many things about his party's nominee, but he emphatically could not support Smith's Catholicism and "wet" position against Prohibition. Simmons threw the weight of his Democratic political machine against Smith and managed to help the Republican Hoover carry North Carolina on his way to the White House. The resulting schism within the Tar Heel Democratic party ended Simmons' dynasty. The upstart O. Max Gardner, who had earlier unsuccessfully challenged Simmons's choice for Governor, Cameron Morrison, became governor in 1928. Two years later Simmons lost his Senate seat. Within a few years Gardner would replace Simmons as the most powerful politician in the state. Historians of United States history remember 1932 and the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt as the major political realignment of the twentieth century, but historians of North Carolina point to 1928 as one of the pivotal changes in state politics.

In many ways the election of Gardner marks a departure from the first three decades of the Progressive Plutocracy. Gardner's support came more from the growing industrial Piedmont than the rural agrarian sections of the state. He was also the first gubernatorial candidate that did not run against the Reconstruction or evoke fears of "Negro domination" associated with the Wilmington Massacre. Gardner wanted to reform politics by adopting the "Australian" or closed ballot which would make the heavy-handed ballot stuffing of the Simmons Machine more difficult. He advocated workman's compensation and centralizing the functions of state government. Due in part to the crisis of the Great Depression, Gardner pushed through a sweeping reorganization of state government, based on recommendations he requested from the liberal Brookings Institute, including state assumption of local debts for roads and especially schools. He also won legislative approval to consolidate the state's three universities—UNC Chapel Hill, North Carolina State College in Raleigh, and Women's College in Greensboro—under one administrative umbrella, achieving substantial savings.³⁰

In other ways, however, Gardner represented a continuation of the Progressive Plutocracy. When faced with violent labor strikes in Marion and Gastonia the governor called out the National Guard to protect both the private property and the power of the mill owners. Concerned for the increased suffering of the average Tar Heel during the Depression he expanded government paternalism more than he empowered citizen action. While he decried the outspoken racism of his political opponents, and supported social programs for African Americans, he did nothing to advance civil rights during his political career.

In spite of Gardner's earlier criticisms of the Simmons Machine he established his own political machine through his use of patronage and control of the newly centralized state bureaucracy. The "Shelby Dynasty," named for his hometown in Cleveland County, dominated North Carolina politics for over twenty years. Gardner not only chose his own successor, J.C.B. Ehringhaus, but then orchestrated the election of his brother-in-law, Clyde Hoey, to the Governor's Mansion. Gardner's son, Ralph, wielded significant power as a major figure in the General Assembly. With several notable exceptions, such as the colorful populist challenge of

Senator “Our Bob” Reynolds, few statewide politicians gained their positions without the support of the Shelby Dynasty.³¹

After leaving the Governor’s Mansion in 1933 Gardner moved to Washington D.C. where he practiced law and became a friend and advisor to President Roosevelt. A man of deep faith, personal grace, and a quick sense of humor, Gardner became a central figure in the Washington social and political scene. In a tragic parallel to the first famous governor of the Progressive Plutocracy, Gardner died in 1946 from a sudden heart attack the night before he was to set sail for England to become the ambassador to the Court of St. James.³²

Kerr Scott: Liberal Insurgent

William Kerr Scott’s family had been active in North Carolina politics since before Governor Aycock came to office in 1901. Kerr Scott ran the family farm near the Haw River in Alamance County until he entered politics as state commissioner of agriculture in the middle of the Great Depression. Scott built a reputation as a tobacco chewing good ol’ boy who was fond of eating “possum ‘n’ taters.” His willingness to fight for the common man earned him a significant following in the rural areas of the state. In 1948 he surprised the political establishment by running for governor against the hand-picked candidate of Gardner’s Shelby Dynasty. He surprised even more people when he won. Scott’s victory, and his subsequent actions as governor and later as a U.S. senator, represented a significant challenge to the ruling elite. Scott exaggerated only a little when he described his political success as “the bottom layer overturning the top.”³³

Governor Scott was significantly more liberal than his predecessors in the Progressive Plutocracy. He represented a different strain in Tar Heel politics built on a more populist and egalitarian ideology. His “Go Forward” program included paving 15,000 miles of farm to market roads, new school construction, new public health programs, expanded port facilities, increased rural electrical service, and more than 75,000 rural phone installations. Of course these programs cost money and the governor spent the state’s surplus in two years. When conservatives complained about his call for modest tax increases Scott shot back, “The people are demanding that something be done to lift them out of the mud.”³⁴ Governor Scott demonstrated his progressivism in other areas as well. He appointed Susie Sharp as North Carolina’s first woman superior court judge, assigned the first African American to the State Board of Education, and pushed the legislature to fund the North Carolina Museum of Art. He also supported equal pay for black and white state employees, lowering the voting age to eighteen, and repealing the anti-union right-to-work law, although these recommendations had little chance of succeeding during his administration.³⁵

Scott’s successes pointed to the potential for a more genuine liberalism in state politics, but his failures illustrated the power of the resistance to that liberalism in North Carolina. His uncompromising rhetoric of fighting for the little guy inspired an entire generation of young politicians. “There was a fervor and a passion about Kerr Scott and the change he would make in

our lives,” future Governor James B. “Jim” Hunt, Jr. later recalled. “[T]hat is very unusual in politics.”³⁶ Many of the state’s more liberal politicians launched their careers from Scott’s political organization, nicknamed “the branch head boys” because it was made up of those who lived in the rural areas at the branch head of the rivers, not the city dwellers who lived down stream. But Scott also revitalized the conservatives who rallied against his second set of Go Forward proposals in 1951 and managed to greatly reduce his effectiveness during the last two years of his governorship. Scott and his branch head boys even failed to elect his chosen successor who lost to the conservative and colorless William Umstead in 1952. Scott’s left-leaning coalition of farmers, organized labor, and black voters proved to be vulnerable to the same kind of race and class based attacks that had brought down the Populist-Republican fusion movement in 1898.

Frank Porter Graham and the Limits of Liberalism

Scott faced an early challenge when Senator J. Melville Broughton died soon after the governor took office in 1948. In a surprising move Scott named the state’s most prominent liberal, Dr. Frank Porter Graham as Broughton’s replacement. Dr. Frank, as he was affectionately called by his many admirers, was the President of the University of North Carolina and had been an outspoken ally of textile workers’ right to unionize. His defense of the University as a place of free expression, even for African-American intellectuals such as the black poet Langston Hughes, had angered many of the state’s leading conservatives who looked on him with suspicion. Graham had also worked for both the United Nations and the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies — the first suspected by conservatives to be a den of communists and the second a repository of some of the nation’s most sensitive atomic secrets — which made him a target of national conservatives who feared he was too “pinkish” to be trusted. Governor Scott’s appointment of Graham to the Senate set off an explosion in Tar Heel politics.³⁷

Graham took his Senate seat in 1949 and immediately faced a campaign for reelection in 1950. His opponent in the Democratic primary, Willis Smith, an attorney and former president of the American Bar Association, represented the mainline conservative interests in the state. In order to convince working class whites to vote against Graham who better represented their economic interests, the conservative operatives in the Smith campaign suggested that Graham was a closet Communist and that he secretly favored racial integration. (Graham was a moderate on racial issues, but not an integrationist). In spite of the smear campaign Graham earned 48.9 percent of the vote, just short of the 50 percent necessary to win the primary, and Smith seemed reluctant to call for a runoff.

Then things turned really nasty. A conservative newsman named Jesse Helms ran radio advertisements urging Smith supporters to rally at the candidate’s house. That night a large enthusiastic crowd convinced Smith to challenge Graham in a second primary. A group calling itself the “Know the Truth Committee” circulated placards which in part read:

WHITE PEOPLE

WAKE UP

Before it is too late

You may not have another chance

DO YOU WANT?

Negroes working beside you, your wife and daughter in your mills and factories?

Negroes eating beside you in all public eating places?

Negroes riding beside you, your wife and your daughters in buses, cabs and trains?

Negroes sleeping in the same hotels and rooming houses?

Negroes teaching and disciplining your children in school? . . .

WILLIS SMITH for SENATOR

He will uphold the traditions of the South³⁸

Not since the white supremacy elections of 1898 and 1900 had race been injected into a political campaign in such a crude and dishonest manner. Smith supporters fabricated stories, lied about Graham's record, and even passed around a doctored picture showing Mrs. Graham dancing with a black man. The attacks worked and the voters of North Carolina elected Smith by a substantial majority.³⁹ The inflamed Senate campaign of 1950 widened the split in the Democratic party begun by Kerr Scott's election in 1948. Smith died in office only a few years after his election, but his supporters, including Jesse Helms, became the core of a new more aggressively conservative branch of the party, many of whom would eventually follow Helms into the Republican party. Graham's supporters, including future Governor and Senator Terry Sanford, became the nucleus of the moderate wing of the Democratic party. The election marked the end of a clearly recognizable Progressive Plutocracy in North Carolina and the beginning of a contest between two rival political cultures -- traditionalists and modernizers. For a time that contest would stay within the Democratic party, but it would eventually burst into a new two-party competition between the Democrats and a revitalized Republican opposition.

The Transitional 1950s and Luther Hodges

For many years textbooks portrayed the politics of the 1950s as a docile time of consumerism and consensus. According to the traditional narrative, President Dwight Eisenhower led the nation through a period of moderate pro-business conservatism in which Americans embraced suburbia, materialism, and a staunchly anti-communist foreign policy. North Carolina textbooks presented Governor Luther Hodges (1954-1961) as an example of the Progressive Plutocracy at its best, citing his moderate response to the *Brown* desegregation ruling, his recruitment of high tech industries to modernize the economy, and his support of the new Research Triangle Park.⁴⁰ More recently, however, scholars have looked beneath the surface of this happy narrative and have found strong currents of conflict pushing the nation and the state toward a major political realignment. In the 1950s the African American freedom struggle undercut white notions of

black contentment with the racial status quo while a rapidly changing economy threatened the security of the rising middle class.⁴¹

Governor Luther Hodges became the state's chief executive in 1954 when the last candidate of the Shelby Dynasty, William Umstead, died in office after serving only two years of his term. A man of great competence and managerial skill, Hodges's historical legacy is open to debate. On the one hand he is praised by conservatives as the governor who saved North Carolina's progressive reputation by his balanced response to the *Brown* ruling. On the other hand he is condemned as the segregationist who hid the state's racism under a false banner of moderation. Hodges, who was nicknamed the "businessman governor," had served most of his life as a textile executive and did not have strong ties to any political organization. Indeed, Hodges, who was elected in his own right in 1956, ran the state more as a businessman than as a politician, leaving a political vacuum to be filled by the political contests of the 1960s.⁴²

Terry Sanford and the Rise of the Modernizers

In 1960, ten years after the bitter Graham-Smith Senate campaign, Terry Sanford walked into the Board of Elections to file his name as a candidate for governor. Sanford, a protégée of Kerr Scott, was making a secret, symbolic declaration of political war against the conservatives who had smeared Graham in 1950. Under his lapel, just out of sight, Sanford had pinned a Frank Porter Graham for Senate button to his suit. Sanford's gesture illustrates both the emotional legacy of Graham's defeat and the emergence of a major realignment in North Carolina politics.⁴³

Opposing Sanford in the Democratic primary of 1960 was I. Beverly Lake. Lake had worked in the Hodges administration and had helped to shape the state's legal reaction to the *Brown* ruling, but he had become increasingly disillusioned with the moderate tone of North Carolina's anti-integration strategy. Lake was an uncompromising and unapologetic segregationist and he intended to turn the state hard to the right. He had the support of Jesse Helms and other conservative leaders within the Democratic party.⁴⁴

Both Lake and Sanford knew that the outcome of the Democratic primary depended on the issue of race. Lake tried to define the contest as a choice between Sanford's supposedly pro-integration views and his own staunch opposition to civil rights. Sanford countered by suggesting that Lake would move the state in a radical direction that would endanger its public schools, growing economy, and moderate reputation. Lake warned about the horrors of racial integration. Sanford pledged to improve public education. Lake had enough support to force a second primary, but Sanford's well-organized campaign, and his assurance that he was not an integrationist, brought him a solid victory. When he moved into his office in the Capitol, Sanford once again made a symbolic gesture to identify with the progressive tradition in Tar Heel politics. He hung four portraits in his office: Charles Aycock, O. Max Gardner, Kerr Scott, and Frank Porter Graham.⁴⁵

Both Sanford's campaign and his term as governor exemplify what sociologist Paul Luebke has called the modernizer political culture in North Carolina. Sanford did not actively

push for integration, but he did accept the new reality that the civil rights movement was bringing to the state. Like other modernizers who followed him into the Governor's mansion, Sanford put expediency above ideology. He thought that winning elections and achieving a realistic legislative program was more important than maintaining fidelity to his personal liberalism. Sanford significantly increased support for public schools, although he passed a food tax to fund it, and he responded with considerable moderation to civil rights protests and the backlash against them. His Good Neighbor Council (an interracial commission to work toward reducing racial discrimination), and the North Carolina Fund (the first statewide anti-poverty program in the nation) became models for other states and national programs. He also started the North Carolina School for the Arts and created a state commission on the status of women. In each of these actions Sanford led North Carolina in a progressive direction while trying not to push beyond what the state's electorate, or business leaders, would accept.⁴⁶

Yet even Sanford's careful modernizer agenda proved to be unsustainable. Like his mentor Kerr Scott, Sanford was unable to choose his own successor. In a clear rebuke to Sanford, the conservative bloc in the Democratic party managed to turn back his candidate, Judge L. Richardson Preyer, and to elect a champion of the status quo, Dan K. Moore, as the state's next governor. Moore presided over the tumultuous years from 1964 to 1968 with a steady conservative hand, but he could not control the escalating challenges coming from the civil rights movement, a restive younger generation, worried evangelical Christians, or working class whites fearful of a changing economy. The explosive events of the 1960s polarized the electorate and created an opening for a more reactionary movement to emerge in Tar Heel politics.

Jesse Helms and the Traditionalist Reaction

In 1970 Jesse Helms left the Democratic party. Upset by the increasing liberalism of the national Democrats, and frustrated by North Carolina's mainline conservative Democrats--who he thought had "surrendered to the enemy"-- Helms officially became a Republican.⁴⁷ Two years later he launched his campaign for the U.S. Senate. Building on his reputation as an uncompromising conservative, which he had cultivated over twelve years as an editorialist on WRAL television, Helms ripped into the intrusive federal government, the "loafers and parasites" on welfare, the "so-called civil rights movement," and socialistic liberals with their deteriorating moral standards. His message connected with many anxious, white, rural, and small town North Carolinians.⁴⁸ According to Paul Luebke, Helms was the archetypical traditionalist. He represented those who wanted less government, fewer changes in southern race and gender relations, the preservation of current economic structures, and the dominance of old-fashioned, evangelical, protestant morality.⁴⁹

Helms had chosen the right moment to run for office as a Republican. President Richard Nixon was also on the ballot, running for his second term in the White House. Nixon's Southern Strategy, aimed at attracting angry white southerners into the Republican party, fit well with Helms's campaign. The Republicans nominated a young moderate conservative from the

mountains of North Carolina, James Holshouser, for governor. While Holshouser did not share his Republican colleagues' divisive campaign style, the three candidates presented themselves as a team against a weak Democratic ticket. George McGovern, the Democrats' presidential nominee, was very liberal and unpopular in North Carolina and in the rest of the South. Hargrove "Skipper" Bowels, a protégée of Terry Sanford, won a surprising victory in a contentious Democratic gubernatorial primary that left the party badly divided. Nick Galifianakis, the Democrat's nominee for the Senate, had also won a hard fought primary campaign. Although he had served in both the North Carolina and U.S. legislatures he was not well known across the state.⁵⁰

Helms took full advantage of the weaknesses and divisions within the Democratic party. He ran political ads tying his opponent to the more liberal national ticket: "McGovernGalifianakis ONE IN THE SAME," "McGovernGalifianakis welfare giveaways" (which was taken by many as a coded reference to race). In addition, Nick Galifianakis, the son of a Greek immigrant, had a name that some Tar Heels found difficult to pronounce (he joked that "it began with a gal and ended with a kiss").⁵¹ The Helms campaign slogan, "He's One of Us," played on both his conservative affinity with many voters and their discomfort with Galifianakis's ethnicity.⁵² One political sign read, "This is not Greece." According to one contemporary observer, the 1972 Senate race had become "so bitter and so hotly contested" that it had "all but overshadowed other political races in this election year."⁵³

The election of 1972 marked the rebirth of the Republican party in North Carolina. Nixon carried all but two of the state's counties winning an amazing 71 percent of the vote. Nixon's coattails were long enough to carry both Helms and Holshouser to victory. Helms earned 54 percent to become the first Republican elected to the U.S. Senate from North Carolina since 1895. Holshouser squeaked by with 51 percent to become the state's first Republican governor since 1896. For the first time in the twentieth century North Carolina had a viable two party system.

Political Realignment

The realignment of Tar Heel politics that began with Kerr Scott and Frank Porter Graham's challenge to the Shelby Dynasty in 1948-1950 reached a turning point in 1972. What began as a progressive challenge to the paternalistic conservatism of the Progressive Plutocracy evolved into a more sharply drawn ideological battle between modernizers and traditionalists. That debate played out within the Democratic party throughout the 1950s and 1960s — Kerr Scott, Frank Porter Graham, Terry Sanford, Richard Preyer, and Nick Galifinikis on the modernizer side; Willis Smith, I. Beverly Lake, Dan K. Moore, and Jesse Helms on the traditionalist side. The defection of Helms and his conservative followers from the Democratic party into the Republican party transformed the modernizer-traditionalist contest into an ongoing two party rivalry.

But the process of political realignment did not stop in 1972. Both parties continued to sort out their ideological identities well into the 1980s and 1990s. While Jesse Helms and his

political machine, the Congressional Club, became leaders of the conservative revolution in both North Carolina and the nation, not all Tar Heel Republicans acquiesced to their traditionalist program. Conservative leaning modernizers such as James Holshouser, and later James Martin and James Broyhill, continued to challenge Helms for control of the Republican party in North Carolina. The Democrats also had their internecine battles between traditionalists and modernizers, although the emergence of Governor James B. “Jim” Hunt, Jr. as the party’s leader helped to solidify modernizer control.⁵⁴

The relative strength of the Democratic and Republican Parties has also remained in flux. The Tar Heel state is unique in the South for maintaining a competitive two party system when most of the other states of the former Confederacy have trended heavily Republican since the 1970s. While Republicans have won the majority of national races in North Carolina, the Democrats have generally managed to keep control of state government. But by the beginning of the 21st century even that generalization is open to debate as Democrat Barack Obama carried the state in the 2008 presidential election while the balance between the two parties in the state legislature is almost even. Today North Carolina boasts a dynamic two party system in which neither Democrats nor Republicans hold a clear majority.⁵⁵

The Progressive Tradition in North Carolina

It is not a coincidence that scholars began to question North Carolina’s progressive reputation at the same time that the political realignment of the 1970s produced a revitalized and traditionalist Republican party. What had long been a given in discussions of North Carolina politics — that the state was the most progressive in the South — could no longer be stated with certainty. The demise of the Progressive Plutocracy and the emergence of the much more strident conservatism associated with Jesse Helms, led one historian to argue that North Carolina had gone “from progressive to reactionary.”⁵⁶ In 1976 journalists Jack Bass and Walter DeVries characterized North Carolina as “perhaps the least changed of the old Confederate states” and concluded that its progressive reputation was a “progressive myth.”⁵⁷

Yet the progressive tradition remains a factor in Tar Heel politics. The growth of a reactionary movement does not mean that progressivism does not exist. It may even be proof of progressivism’s continuing relevance. North Carolina remains a very politically competitive state, perhaps the most competitive two-party state in the South, where neither Republicans nor Democrats, modernizers nor traditionalists, have been able to dominate the political culture. Instead, the middle has held. Senator Helms’s brand of hard right conservatism never controlled state politics, or even all of the Republican party. And, as Paul Luebke has argued, the modernizer political culture did not embrace transformative liberal reform, but remained within the moderate tradition shaped by the Progressive Plutocracy.⁵⁸ Scholars may question the veracity of North Carolina’s progressive reputation, but they have not stopped writing about it. In just the past year two major books have been dedicated to resolving the progressive paradox of North Carolina.⁵⁹ It seems that the historical legacy of progressivism, however one defines it, still

casts a shadow over North Carolina today, influencing both politicians and those who write about them.

Conclusion

There are ghosts in Raleigh. Workers in the Old Statehouse have suspected as much for years. Inhabitants of the Governor's Mansion and their late night guests are sure of it. Even the Legislative Building, a comparatively recent addition to the central downtown area, appears to be haunted. Rumors of squeaking floor boards and legends of unexplained shadows seem to confirm that something invisible is bearing down on those who work in the government buildings of the Tar Heel state.

In 2003 paranormal researchers set up shop in the state Capitol to see what they could find. Using the latest in infrared video cameras, electromagnetic field detectors, and thermal probes, they sighted a figure in Reconstruction-era clothing sitting in the third chair in the third row of the old House chambers. The equipment also picked up several floating orbs of energy and even a recorded whisper. "I don't know that I would say I'm a ghost-believer at this point," said Capitol historian Raymond Beck, "but there is some fairly compelling evidence that there is something paranormal going on here."⁶⁰

Whether or not one believes in the paranormal there is undisputed proof of a different type of ghost walking the halls of power in Raleigh. The legacy of those who served the state, whether as a governor, advisor, employee, or voter, is part of the inheritance of each new generation of North Carolinians. Whether or not political leaders are aware of the specifics of the history that surrounds them the past impacts their beliefs and their actions in countless ways. History literally haunts them, shaping the context in which they live and work. The more we can learn about the history of our state the more we are able to leave our own legacy for the future.

NOTES

¹ The author would like to thank M. Allison Jobe who provided excellent research and editing assistance for this paper.

² George Mason University's "History News Network," <http://hnn.us/> (accessed 12 January 2010); William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, lines 253-54.

³ A. Roger Ekirch, *Poor Carolina: Politics and Society in Colonial North Carolina, 1729-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981).

⁴ North Carolina Museum of History, "State Nickname, The Tar Heel State," <http://www.ncmuseumofhistory.org/collateral/articles/Tar.Heels.pdf> (accessed 12 January 2010).

⁵ For a general overview of North Carolina history consult one of the following recently published textbooks: Milton Ready, *The Tar Heel State: A History of North Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2005); Pamela Grundy, *A Journey Through North Carolina* (Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith Publisher, 2008); William A. Link, *North Carolina: Change and Tradition in a Southern State* (Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan-Davidson Press, 2009).

⁶ Hugh Talmage Lefler and Albert Ray Newsome, *North Carolina: The History of a Southern State* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954); William S. Powell, *North Carolina: A History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977); William S. Powell, *North Carolina Through Four Centuries* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989).

⁷ V.O. Key, *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1959), 205-28.

⁸ William H Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 5.

⁹ Neal R. Peirce, *The Border South States* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1975), 113; Stephen Klitzman, "Senator Sam Ervin," in *Citizens Look At Congress*, (Washington: D.C.: Ralph Nader Congress Project, 1972), 2-3; John Gunther, *Inside USA* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), 718; Merle Black, "Nominal Democrats and Real Republicans: The Voting Behavior of North Carolina Congressmen," in Thad L. Beyle and Merle Black, eds., *Politics and Policy in North Carolina* (New York: MSS Information Corporation, 1975), 157-77; Thad L. Beyle, "The Paradox of North Carolina," in Beyle and Black, *Politics and Policy in North Carolina*, 3; Rob Christensen, *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics: the Personalities, Elections, and Events that Shaped Modern North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

¹⁰ Christensen, *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics*, 2.

¹¹ The best example of this interpretation is Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights*. For discussions and examples of the historiography of North Carolina history since WWII see: Thomas C. Parramore, "Sit-Ins and Civil Rights," in Lindley S. Butler and Alan D. Watson, *The North Carolina Experience* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 403-425; H.G. Jones, "North Carolina, 1946-1976.: Where Historians Fear to Tread," in Jeffrey J. Crow and Larry E. Tise, eds., *Writing North Carolina History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979); Jeffrey J. Crow, Paul D. Escott, Flora J. Hatley, *History of African Americans in North Carolina* (Raleigh: Office of Archives and History, 1992).

¹² Jack Bass and Walter De Vries, *The Transformation of Southern Politics: Social Change and Political Consequences Since 1945* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1976) ; Alexander P. Lamis, ed., *Southern Politics in the 1990s* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999).

¹³ Elazar's theory, as it applies to North Carolina, is summarized in Jack D. Fleer, *North Carolina Government and Politics* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 15, 46-47.

¹⁴ Paul Luebke, *Tar Heel Politics, 2000* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Paul D. Escott, *Many Excellent People: Power and Privilege in North Carolina, 1850-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 241-262.

¹⁷ Link, *North Carolina*, 270.

-
- ¹⁸ Helen G. Edmonds, *The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1951) 61.
- ¹⁹ Lefler and Newsom, *The History of a Southern State*, 559. The best single volume on the Wilmington Race Riot is David S. Cecelski and Timothy B. Tyson, *Democracy Betrayed: The Wilmington Race Riot of 1898 and Its Legacy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).
- ²⁰ Kenneth Joel Zogry, "Furnifold M. Simmons," in Howard E. Covington and Marion A. Ellis, *The North Carolina Century, Tar Heels Who Made a Difference, 1900-2000* (Charlotte: Levine Museum of the New South, 2002), 418.
- ²¹ Christensen, *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics*, 34-47
- ²² Christine Flood, "Charles B. Aycock," in Covington and Ellis, *The North Carolina Century*, 393.
- ²³ J. Morgan Kousser, *Shaping of Southern Politics, Suffrage Restriction and the Establishment of the One-party South, 1880-1910* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 241.
- ²⁴ Robert Diggs, Wimbley Connor and Clarence Poe, *Life and Speeches of Charles Brantley Aycock* (Garden City: Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1912), 111-139; Oliver Hamilton Orr, Jr., *Charles Brantley Aycock* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), 293-312.
- ²⁵ Orr, *Charles Brantley Aycock*, 345-363.
- ²⁶ Christensen, *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics*, 48-50.
- ²⁷ Heriot Clarkson, Forward to *Public Papers and Letters of Cameron Morrison, Governor of North Carolina, 1921-1925* compiled by William H. Richardson and Edited by David Leroy Corbitt (Raleigh: EB, 1927), xvii-xlvi.
- ²⁸ Link, *North Carolina*, 290-299. See also Margaret Supplee Smith & Emily Herring Wilson, *North Carolina Women, Making History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999).
- ²⁹ Powell, *North Carolina Through Four Centuries*, 469-473.
- ³⁰ Joseph L. Morrison, *Governor O. Max Gardner, a Power in North Carolina and New Deal Washington* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971), 52-83; Allen Jay Maxwell, Forward to *Public Papers and Letters of Oliver Max Gardner*, Compiled by Edwin Gill and Edited by David Leroy Corbitt (Raleigh: Council of State, 1937), vii-iii.
- ³¹ Morrison, *Governor O. Max Gardner*, 52-83; Julian Pleasants, *Buncombe Bob: The Life and Times of Robert Rice Reynolds*, (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
- ³² Morrison, *Governor O. Max Gardner*, 131-169, 241-270.
- ³³ William D. Snider, "The Scotts of Haw River," in Covington and Ellis, *The North Carolina Century*, 519.
- ³⁴ Christensen, *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics*, 116
- ³⁵ Powell, *North Carolina, A History*, 514-15.
- ³⁶ Christensen, *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics*, 153.
- ³⁷ Julian M. Pleasants and Augustus M Burns III, *Frank Porter Graham and the 1950 Senate Race in North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).
- ³⁸ Milton Ready, *The Tar Heel State*, 354.
- ³⁹ Pleasants and Burns, *Frank Porter Graham and the Election of 1950*.
- ⁴⁰ The best example of the traditional view of North Carolina history in the 1950s is Hugh Talmage Lefler and Albert Ray Newsome, *The History of a Southern State: North Carolina*, 3rd ed., (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973), especially the chapter on the 1950s titled "In the Mainstream: A Era of Great Growth and Change," 685.
- ⁴¹ See Timothy B. Tyson, *Radio Free Dixie: Robert Williams & the Roots of Black Power* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); William H. Chafe, *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Black Struggle for Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).
- ⁴² A.G. Ivey, *Luther H. Hodges" Practical Idealist* (Minneapolis: T.S. Denison , 1968); Christensen, *Paradox of Tar Heel Politics*, 156-164.
- ⁴³ Howard E. Covington, Jr. and Marion A. Ellis, *Terry Sanford: Politics, Progress & Outrageous Ambitions* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999), 208.

⁴⁴ The best source on the campaign of 1960 is John Drescher, *Triumph of Good Will: How Terry Sanford Beat a Champion of Segregation and Reshaped the South* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2000).

⁴⁵ Christensen, *Paradox of Tar Heel Politics*, 186.

⁴⁶ Covington and Ellis, *Terry Sanford*.

⁴⁷ William A. Link, *Righteous Warrior: Jesse Helms and the Rise of Modern Conservatism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2008), 112.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 125; Christensen, *Paradox of North Carolina Politics*, 211.

⁴⁹ Luebke, *Tar Heel Politics*, 2000.

⁵⁰ Christensen, *Paradox of North Carolina Politics*, 212-13, 229-30.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 212.

⁵² Link, *Righteous Warrior*, 128.

⁵³ John Kilgo, "Campaign for Senate Promises Hot Finale," October 11, 1972, quoted in Link, *Righteous Warrior*, 129.

⁵⁴ Luebke, *Tar Heel Politics*, 2000; Christensen, *Paradox of North Carolina Politics*.

⁵⁵ On North Carolina's realignment see Rob Christensen and Jack D. Fleer, "North Carolina: Between Helms and Hunt No Majority Emerges," in Alexander P. Lamis, ed., *Southern Politics in the 1990s* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1999), 81-106. On the larger topic of southern realignment see Earl Black and Merle Black, *The Rise of Southern Republicans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003). On contemporary state politics see, Christopher A. Cooper and H. Gibbs Knotts, eds., *The New Politics of North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

⁵⁶ Parramore, "Sit-Ins and Civil Rights," in Butler and Watson, *North Carolina Experience*, 406.

⁵⁷ Jack Bass and Walter DeVries, *The Transformation of Southern Politics: Social Change and Political Consequences since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976) 218-47.

⁵⁸ Luebke, *Tar Heel Politics*, 2000.

⁵⁹ Cooper and Knotts, eds., *The New Politics of North Carolina*, (2008); Christensen, *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics* (2008).

⁶⁰ "Study Finds Ghost at N.C. Statehouse," The Associate Press, 18 February 2003,

<http://forums.techguy.org/random-discussion/119511-haunted-state-house-n-c.html> (accessed 25 September 2009).