

Host:

I'd like to start first on the – the general political arena. First could we go to the Republican Party, who would you prognosticate; who would you think is going to win the – the Republican nomination and do you think this man will – will garner the – the support of the Conservatives in this country?

Billy Hargis:

Well let me say this that I will not now, nor at any time this year, endorse any political candidate. As head of Christian Crusade my first obligation is to represent our organization. In 1964 we were falsely accused by the Internal Revenue Service of endorsing Senator Goldwater. I knew that we didn't, I knew every broadcast I made, I knew every article I wrote, and I knew there was never any endorsement of Goldwater implied or otherwise. So when the Internal Revenue Service revoked our taxing status, that is of Christian Crusade the organization I head with headquarters in Tulsa, Oklahoma, I immediately filed suit against Internal Revenue Service for return of our taxing status.

And quite frankly I think we're going to win the lawsuit. We're very much encouraged with the results thus far, and the federal courts in Oklahoma thus far have seen to decide in our favor. So I am not going to endanger this law suit that Christian Crusade is presently in with Internal Revenue Service by making a personal political endorsement. But if you want to talk to me as an individual and – and we just discuss this political thing and I can give you some opinions – and they're merely opinions – as far as the Republicans are concerned, I – I must admit that I think that Nixon will get it. Possibly even on the first ballot.

I will say this: that in my own personal opinion that I should imagine as of right now that Governor Mark Hatfield of Oregon, the Senator - former Governor now Senator, will probably get the Vice Presidential nomination Republican ticket. If not Hatfield, I imagine it will be Percey of Illinois, or Congressman Bush of Houston, Texas; one of these two men. I have no doubt in my own mind that – that Rockefeller will not support Nixon.

I personally think that – that it's quite possible that Rockefeller and McCarthy will get together with a – a new party. I don't believe the followers of Senator McCarthy, and I must admit I don't believe the followers of the late Senator Kennedy will be pleased, and the rank and file will be pleased either, with the Nixon or Humphrey. And I think it's a foregone conclusion that Humphrey is going to get the Democratic nomination. So I think that this restless political spirit that we have, and these dissident, or divisive, elements in both these political parties, I think they'll demand a representative candidate – more representative candidate to their left of center views.

And I – I wouldn't be at all surprised to see Governor Rockefeller and Senator McCarthy team up on a – this will be a fourth party wouldn't it? We have a third party with Governor Wallace, and we have a fourth party. I will say this: I – I've been afraid that the candidacy of Governor Wallace might tend more to help the Democrats rather than hurt the Democrats. But I think it would be a very good thing for there to be four tickets, to be honest. I'd like to see it; as a conservative I've like to see the Democrats, the Republicans, the Wallace Party, and still a fourth party. Because then, it would be anybody's ball game. I think with – with – with a three-way split, Wallace's campaign could very well help the Democrats. But with a four-way split, this would be an ideological war, literally.

Now I think we had a – I think we had an ideological political campaign in 1964. Although I am a conservative, I believe the American people, for reasons of their own, clearly wanted a liberal president in 1964. You can't fight the facts, you know? You can't fight statistics. And the American people knew quite well what they were voting for. Goldwater was an excellent spokesman for the conservative position and

the people didn't want that. Now, have – have the people changed; have they – do they recognize the failures of – of liberalism to either stop Communist aggression, or to win this so-called limited war in Vietnam, or to solve our problems at home, or prevent college insurrections and riots in the streets; have are – are the – are the liberals able to either correct these situations or cure these problems, or are the liberals even able to contain these situations? And the answer is an emphatic “No.”

Since President Johnson was elected you've had more evidences of revolution in the United States, and insurrection, and – and a greater degree of a no-win policy internationally than ever before. So I think personally that it would be a good situation for this country to have a four-way try at the people. I think it'd be a good situation for McCarthy and Rockefeller to team up because I don't think Rockefeller is really a Republican. I don't think he belongs in the Republican ranks; he's too liberal. The Republican Party is not a liberal party; not liberal in the present sense. In the original sense, the Republican Party is liberal; by that I mean they believe in the best governed – the least – the best governed people are the least governed people. They believe in less federal control and more freedom and more individual responsibility, too.

To continue this thought a little bit, I think if there were four presidential as – aspirants in 1968 they would be good for the country. I think then the people could really make a selection along ideological or philosophical persuasion lines. I think the people should be given the choice; I – I would personally think that Governor Wallace would make a good President. I personally think that Vice President Nixon would make a good President, I think that Governor Reagan would make a good President; I don't think that we're void of leadership in this country. I think there's a lot of conservatives in both the Democrat and Republican Party who would make a good Presidents. And I think that there should be a test of the strength of McCarthy and Rockefeller's views. I am convinced that Humphrey, of course, is much closer than McCarthy and Rockefeller viewpoint than Nixon is, and certainly closer than Wallace.

Host:

Do you think that – there has been some talk about the Wallace campaign, especially that the Wallace campaign will pull so many votes over to the Wallace ticket that the election will have to be thrown into the House of Representatives. Now with four-parties do you foresee this as a – a greater probability than if there were only three parties?

Billy Hargis:

I think it's a sure thing that if there were four parties they would be throw in the House of Representatives. But then, the Congress would not vote – would not vote for final decision on the basis of a political party allegiance. Because as it is now, let's say that Governor Wallace runs and Humphrey and Nixon run and it's thrown into – into Congress, you and I both know the outcome: if – if the majority of Congress is Republican, Nixon will be the President, if the majority of Congress is Democratic, Humphrey will be the President. It's just that simple because actually we're – Congress will be the one that decides, not – not a popular vote. Not even an Electoral College, but Congress will decide and they will, of course, vote according to their political affiliations.

Let me give you a case and example – point. If you recall in the state of Georgia in their last gubernatorial campaign, it was thrown into the House of Representatives in the state of Georgia. Bo Galloway who ran on the Republican ticket had the majority of the popular vote, Governor Maddox had the minority, but Bo Galloway's majority was not sufficient according to the laws of the state of Georgia to determine who would be the governor. So naturally, the legislator – the legislature in Georgia being Democratic, they're

going to vote for the Democrat. Now I personally like both men: I liked Maddox, and I liked Galloway. And Ga – Galloway, that's right, Bo Galloway –

Host:

Callaway.

Billy Hargis:

Callaway – Callaway. I like both men and I hated to see one hurt, frankly, because I thought they were both good men and – and fundamentally conservative. I personally like both Nixon and Wallace, to be honest with you, and I would hate to see either one of them hurt. I tell you one thing though about Governor Wallace: if these liberals continue demonstrations against him, like the one in Minneapolis the other night, they're only going to make him a martyr. The American people love the underdog, that's been our spirit in this country: if you persecute somebody in America, the people flock to them. And these liberals, I don't think they're aware of it. For instance the college professors in Minneapolis who – who are now allegedly behind this demonstration in Minneapolis this week against Wallace, they couldn't help Wallace anymore than what they did; because even the President of the United States felt compelled to apologize to Wallace yesterday.

And the Mayor of Minneapolis who – who ordinarily wouldn't give Wallace the time of day felt compelled to apologize to him. Now these liberals are going to find out that we are a law abiding people and dissent does not give you the right to interrupt or prevent freedom of speech. If these liberals continue to prevent Governor Wallace from having his day before the public court of the land, the people, they're going to help him. And you're going to find people all across this country that are going to be attracted to his cause because he's being treated so unfairly.

I really believe with all my heart that it is a shameful day in American history when we will not allow an opponent freedom of speech. I do not know of any conservative, and I want to emphasize this, I do not know of any conservative that has ever prevented a liberal from speaking in one of his own meetings. Now Governor Wallace's group paid for that auditorium, they got together that meeting, he had a right to speak to them under the Constitution of the United States; he has the same right to freedom of speech as McCarthy had. I do not know what the followers of McCarthy - of Wallace ever broke up a McCarthy meeting, or a Rockefeller meeting, or a Humphrey meeting; and this – this unfairness and this lack of fairness, and this un-American attitude of – of disallowing your opponent freedom of speech will help the conservative cause and specifically will help Governor Wallace.

Host:

Governor Wallace in his - in his press conference in Boston about two weeks ago, he flew into Boston – no it was last week – he flew into Boston Friday and he spoke in – in four cities in – in the Massachusetts area. Now he was talking about his presidential candidacy and he was very hopeful that he could actually win. And he gave out some figures – he said that there's a very good chance that he will take the 11 states of the old confederacy and all he needs is the electoral votes for those states, and then any four of the large industrial states - and I think he named California, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan as the four key states that if he could take any four of those he could win the election. Do you think that this is a very accurate projection on the part of the Governor; do you think that he has a really good chance in these – any one of these four states?

Billy Hargis:

Well all I know is this: I'm sure that he knows far more about his political chances than I do. I am not in politics, I've never been in politics, and I only have a cursory interest in – in – in politics. I'm interested in – in getting a conservative Congress, I'm interested in getting a conservative President be he Democrat, Republican, third party, or whatever. I am interested in seeing the American people give the conservatives a chance to solve our economic problems, our sociological problems, and our international problems. And I think that the liberals have failed, they continue to fail, they mount failure on failure and I think that we must give the conservative a chance to – to solve these problems in the United States. And whether or not he could win, I don't know. I will say this, as I said before: I feel in all my heart that Governor Wallace is in the conservative camp, but I also feel that Vice President Nixon's in the conservative camp and I also feel that Governor Reagan is in the conservative camp. And I'm not going to endorse a candidate, if Governor Wallace feels that he can win or if Nixon feels that he can win, well then that's their opinion they're certainly entitled to it; but I just hope and pray to God that some conservative wins, that's all I hope.

Host:

Well the problems that you are talking about what would be the, as far as your concern, the single or the – the major problem or problems that are confronting the United States today? As a conservative, which ones do you think are the – the basic problems – the basic things that are wrong with the United States?

Billy Hargis:

I feel that the spirit of rebellion, or insurrection, or revolution which affects our foreign policy and which affects our internal policy is our greatest problem; there's a spirit of lawlessness today. There must be an enforcement of the law; we must return to a – to the law. We cannot take the law into our hand, I think that civil disobedience, so called, is – is lawlessness, I think it's un-American, I think it's tragic because it encourages people to take the law into their own hand and break those laws they disagree with. I feel that we must have an administration from the White House to the for – to the Court House that will enforce the law.

I feel that – you know, I don't even think we need new – need new legislation to deal with the Congress problem internally; I think we'd have adequate legislations if we had an Attorney General and a – and a federal administration that would enforce it. I'm saying give us an administration in Washington that will quit playing politics. I have no doubt in my heart that President Johnson has allowed these minority groups to do things that irked him and greatly concerned him. But he was very politically wise. He realized he had to have the – the political support of these minority groups for his own reelection and for the reelection of his party; I think President Johnson is probably the most expert political we've ever had in the White house.

And I think he's been playing politics as a time when we needed acts of statesmanship and not acts of opinionated politics in the White House. I don't really believe that – I can't believe that a man who said when he was a Senator from Texas 20 years ago that – that the civil rights movement in America was Communist inspired and who says today – who sings today, "We Shall Overcome." I can't believe that that man is altogether sincere.

I believe that he has played politics with the future of our nation. President Johnson's background was one of either conservatism or pro-conservatism and it seems now that he is – his political philosophy is whatever is politically advantageous to him. When he was Senator it was politically advantageous – advantageous to be a conservative, now that he's President it's politically advantageous to be a liberal.

I'm afraid of a man that way. At least with, let's say, Senator Kennedy and Senator Humphrey you know where they stand.

Now let me hedge a little bit on that. Now Senator Kennedy, of course, jumped the – the spectrum, too: he started out as an anti-Communist conservative associated with Senator McCarthy and so forth, and for – for political reasons or philosophical reasons he became a liberal. But Humphrey has always been a liberal. And – and although I – I'm afraid of this man and the welfare state theory he espouses, because I think it would destroy America economically and morally. Yet I have to admire him because he has always been a liberal and he's never changed his stance, not even for political reasons; he's always believed in the welfare state, he's always been an internationalist, and he was this when he went into politics, and he's that today.

On the other hand, President Johnson has changes his stand to whatever was politically advantageous. I – I think that the greatest issue confronting America today is one of returning to constitutional law. I think that we should curb the Supreme Court, I think the appointment of Abe Fortas as the Chief Justice of Supreme Court was a great mistake. In the first place, Mr. Johnson should have been bigger than this. He was guilty of both, in my opinion, of a political payoff and cronyism, both acts; and- and this is not becoming to the President of the United States. I must agree with the Senator from Michigan who said that, "Senator – President Johnson should have let the next President make this decision and make this appointment in the Supreme Court," and I agree with that. I – I think this is – I think this is mad display of pol – of political arrogance.

But I am convinced that we're going to have to elect a Congress, and only a conservative Congress will do it, to curb the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has been protecting the criminal, not the innocent, and more or less they've been disarming the police, and limiting their power to enforce the law and I feel that there's going to be a Congress that will enact some kind of a constitutional amendment to curb the Supreme Court.

I don't know if you remember Senator Jenner of Indiana many years ago proposed a constitutional amendment which was defeated by, I think, two or three votes which was commonly called the "Jenner Amendment" which would have curbed the Supreme Court. One, as I recall the Jenner Amendment, it would have limited the term of office of the members of the Supreme Court; second, it would have – they would have been sub – subjected to a – to a review board of judicial peers. This was a problem with Chief Justice Earl Warren, he had no judicial background. Many Americans forget this that Earl Warren had no judicial background. How in the world could I – it would be the most ridiculous thing in the world to put me on the Supreme Court, but it's no more ridiculous to put me in the Supreme Court that put Earl Warren in the Supreme Court. His past was politics, he had been in politics his whole life, he had no judicial background; how in the world could he interpret the constitution?

There are men are the Supreme Court – the majority of the Supreme Court, they had no judicial background whatsoever. And this is wrong, and Senator Jenner said that the members of the Supreme Court should be made up of men with judicial background, with that I agree. Men who have had training of the law would understand the law. And furthermore, he felt that the term of offices should be limited, and I agree to that; and he also suggested that a review board be set up of the great judicial minds of America to review the past decisions of the Supreme Court, say, for the last 20 years, or 10 years and – and to determine whether or not - recommend to Congress whether or not these decisions should be changed by legislation, whether or not they were Constitutional.

We are being run today by men who are – who are – have a – a philosophy of life and men who are determined that we must change, that our system must change, and I – I feel that the great – the great

need today is to go back to the Constitution, go back to the laws, enforce the laws. I think we need to put emphasis again upon responsibility of the individual, and I – I think we should quit playing politics so much and – and try to act like statesmen. I remember these liberal Congressmen and Senators a year ago they were talking about the Rat Bill and how the rats were taking over the ghettos and everybody got emotionally involved about a – an invasion of rats from Mars or something. And after that bill was appropriated, not one dime has ever been spent for rat control. So this was – this was political; strictly political.

This made the Johnson Administration sound humanitarian. They were trying to – “Rats will bite little children,” I’m sure they are. But I think this is an example of gross betrayal of American ideals to use an emotional issue like this for political purposes, and then not follow through. The money was appropriated for rats; it’s never been spent for rats. The money lays there. And I would think if a man was a true – if the liberals were as sincere as they claim to be, why hasn’t one of them lashed out against this. They were concerned a year ago about rats biting little babies, aren’t they still concerned? Or are they concerned or the fact that the money is there and it hasn’t been used yet?

There have been no effective programs organized to get rid of the rats. In other words, I’m afraid that some of this humanitarianism of the liberals is political, if I’m getting that across to you. I think Mr. Johnson’s concern for civil rights is political. I have to admit that.