



# HOTEL STEPHEN F. AUSTIN

Operated By Stephen F. Austin Hotel Company

AUSTIN, TEXAS

## Affiliated NATIONAL HOTELS

Alabama  
Birmingham  
HOTEL  
THOMAS STEVENSON  
Mobile  
HOTEL ADMIRAL SEMMES

★  
District of Columbia  
Washington  
HOTEL WASHINGTON

★  
Indiana  
Indianapolis  
HOTEL CLAYPOOL

★  
Louisiana  
New Orleans  
HOTEL JUNG  
HOTEL DE SOTO

★  
Mississippi  
Memphis  
HOTEL LAMAR

★  
Nebraska  
Omaha  
HOTEL PAXTON

★  
New Jersey  
Clermont  
HOTEL CLOYD

★  
Oklahoma  
Tulsa  
HOTEL ALDRIDGE

★  
South Carolina  
Columbia  
HOTEL  
WADE HAMPTON

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL  
STEPHEN F. AUSTIN

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL EDSON

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL BROWNWOOD

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL CORTER

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL TEXAS

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL GALVEZ

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL JEAN LAFITTE

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL CORONADO COURTS

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL JACK TAR COURT

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL MIRAMAS COURT

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL CAVALIER

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL PLAZA

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL LUSKOCK

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL FALLS

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL CACTUS

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL MENGER

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL ANGLES COURTS

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL MOUNTAIN LAKE

★  
Tennessee  
Nashville  
HOTEL MOUNTAIN LAKE

Welly K. Hopkins, chief counsel for John L. Lewis, and formerly of Gonzales, Texas, and leader of the state Senate, said: "I ~~will~~ <sup>will</sup> not announce myself for Coke Stevenson because of my former friendship for Lyndon Johnson."

August -- To the Hon. C., xxx Hotel, xxxxx, Texas

1--Wise-cracker named Thompson should be sued. He says you are an expert on magnolias. Can you send correction of this libel. It would do good here.

2--Please deny you met with Butler and Starnes when war time Governor, to plot over-throw of war time President Roosevelt. Please wire your xxxx county campaign manager name of fourth man in room and your denial.

Roy Lumpkin

3--Please have your office send photo of Mr. So and So leaving Governor's Mansion with pardon in hand. I always believe in humanity. I think this photo would do you good down here. Please mail to Pete Smith, rfd #4, c/o Lizzie Thompkins.

4--Your supporters here also used to support Ferguson. Please have someone in authority write me how many more pardons you gave than Ferguson. We can use it down here. You should tell on radio about Mrs. Ferguson not supporting you. You should say she should remember how you got O'Daniel elected Senator when you wanted to become Governor. Over here we know it all. We have always loved Jim and you, so let's have it out on the radio and shut up Ma.

5--The Johnson folks are hitting under the belt. They say you have lost O'Daniel support because O'Daniel would not see you when in Washington. Please tell why. Your next radio address will be listening.

6--This to both Coke and Lyndon (?)

Why aren't you candidates forthright on Truman's free opportunity to all program? People here want to know where you stand on white supremacy at once. No more mealy-mouthed business. They are calling Coke mealy-mouth and say that Johnson has not gone far enough.

7--Please hurry and endorse Johnson's plan for States Rights, over Truman's race proposal. All here believe in home rule on this question and that Johnson has the answer.

A well wisher

8--From Brazoria County

Please get denial from ex-convict Pete Smith and have it witnessed that he has never had breakfast with you in the Mansion. Could also deny that he knew your brother and worked through him as a negotiator of pardons. This very serious and must be scotched at once. This man very well known down here.

9--From El Paso

Please be vigorous at once about rights of Mexicans and negroes to full citizenship. Johnson says state will handle this for us. What do you propose? Please counteract through your El Paso office and have same prominently put in papers here.

A Friend

10--From Pampa

Please give us your low down opinion on why Peddy sat with Lyndon at Center.

11--From Lubbock

We need much better organization in south plains. I am afraid we are slipping.

12--From Sulphur Springs

The older people are nervous about high cost of living. They say you want economy and will reduce federal pensions. We would starve to death if you did. Please deny through your agents up here. If time, would appreciate personal letter.

13--From Kerrville

Wool people believe you should soft peddle on your present holdings of wool. They mix it up with the subsidy business and think you are hogging a bit.

14--Disturbed. Would have written you at Austin but afraid you would not get it. So here goes. Will veterans get anything at all from you? You have been very weak and silent.

15--From Comanche

Were you a preacher in the first world war and why? I love God.

16--Please give your World War I record prominence in next broadcast. Some nasty rumor says you wore special uniform. Please clear up as all godly people honor you for not fighting out being for humanity and succoring the dying.

Mrs. Nancy Ridenacker.

17--From San Antonio

We devout church goers are pleased with your big vote in San Antonio. If you have a photo of yourself in World War I in priest's uniform of our church, please tell us here, we could get 1000 for local distribution. Should I contact your Beyer County office on this will be glad to pay for 1000 if price is not too much. I can put them where they would do real good.

18--Are you certain of 100% loyalty in your Austin office?

19--What has caused east Texas to go for Johnson? Thought you said you had Peddy vote. Please push Peddy strong next broadcast. Love him to death.

20--You should protest to ex candidate Peddy. He said he would be neutral. Why ain't he? Ask him on radio.

21--Please have your headquarters get copy of letters Peddy is sending out. They are awful. Stop him.

22--From Orange

Your stand on labor was all right first primary. Please hurry and deny CIO or Goats. They don't like it anywhere along this whole coast. Please correct former statement/ you like only AFofL. Please add Railroad Brotherhoods who don't like it either.

23--From Denison

The enemy are making much capital here that you don't like CIO or Railroad Brotherhoods. They say you are only AFofL. Please move in fast on this one. It is spreading down the Katy.

24--From Houston

Why are all three daily papers here against you? Hear Jones is way up north but his editors are knifing terribly. Get Jones to straighten them out.

25--From Houston.

Why is Walter not fired as editor of the Chronicle? The town says he is for Johnson and is apologizing all the time.

26--Wire to Jesse Jones

Please, Mr. Jones, help our friend Coke. You should sign an editorial ~~an editorial~~ and put it on your front page or we are licked. Only your great name can save Coke now.

27--Spend three solid days in Harris County or take the consequences. Important.

28--From San Antonio

Where has your vote gone? The Mexicans are acting funny. Please send help.

29--From Amarillo

We strong hearts are standing fast in Amarillo. Please pour it on Johnson stronger. He won't get all Peddy's vote.

30--From Abilene

We have scotched that horrible story about oil leases. The church folks are divided on it. The best people here say you are not a crook.

Your Friend

31--From Denton

Our class in ethics is considering staging a debate. I shall have the negative. The subject will be: "Has Johnson a better record for honesty than Stevenson?" Please send Johnson's radio record to oppose the opponent's attack on you for oil graft and pardon selling.

Elizabeth Ryerson, c/o School

Statement of Lyndon B. Johnson  
August 5, 1948

In speaking in Dallas a few days ago I called attention to the say-nothing, do-nothing character of the campaign of my opponent was making for the United States Senate where he was absolutely refusing to declare himself on any controversial issue. I pointed out that thus far he had absolutely refused to tell the people of Texas how he stood on the Taft Hartley labor law, and then I predicted that this was an issue that the people of Texas were not going to allow any candidate to duck and that it would be a peculiar circumstance if at this late date he should now decide after visiting Washington that he is in favor of the Taft Hartley labor law.

Well, my friends, the people of Texas are tired of the rule of bosses, and the people are not much concerned about whether these bosses are AFofL bosses, or CIO bosses, or big business bosses, or corrupt pardon-peddling bosses. They simply don't want any bosses in control of public affairs in this state. This opponent of mine, who has been a veteran in public office for 30 years, campaigned up until the first primary without finding out how he stood with reference to the endorsement which the labor bosses had given him. NOW he comes out in a brilliant statement in which he says he is opposed to the CIO bosses, BUT he is strangely silent about the AFofL bosses. He is equally silent as to how he stands on the Taft Hartley labor law. Is he standing or is he slipping? All labor should know.

You know I said the other day if any of you folks had ever been present at one of these West Texas brandings you had seen a steer after he was branded run over to the fence and try to rub the brand off. This is exactly what my opponent is now trying to do. He has made a straight dive for the fence. He is now trying to get the CIO boss brand off of the right hip. We may soon have him trying to get the AFofL boss brand off of the left hip.

Labor bosses are not labor. They boss labor. I have always been a friend of all labor, whether members of a labor union or not members of a labor union. I expect to continue to maintain this policy, but I want you to know one thing definitely: I shall welcome the support of honest laboring men, even though some of their bosses are trying to purge me because I have dared to vote for some measures that they did not like.

Now, I have told you how I stood on this labor question. I have

made it clear that I voted for the Taft Hartley labor bill. I have told you that I voted to override the President's veto on the Taft Hartley labor bill. Experience may improve this law, but if I ever vote for an amendment to the law it will be for an amendment to improve the law. Let the little John L. Lewises make the most of it.

Now, folks, I am opposed to coercion whether it is practiced by business or labor, and I am opposed to it practiced in Wall Street or by a petty Petrillo.

Here is another thing that I would like to call to your attention: While my opponent was your Governor the Texas Legislature passed a labor bill. It was generally referred to as the Manford Bill, but what did your Governor do when this bill came to his desk? Did he sign it? No, he did not sign it. Did he veto it? No, he did not veto it. But, what he did do was to adopt the same pussy-footing, fence-straddling tactics--he filed it with the Secretary of State without his signature. Then, as now, he tries to be all things to all men. So now it is "yes" to AFofL and "no" to CIO. Sort of a slipper fellow, what?

Now, I want to call your attention to something else. Right at that same time while he was taking that kind of action, I, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee working with other members of the House aided in passing through the House what was generally referred to as the Smith-Connally Bill to try to better regulate and control war production and stop strikes in war plants. When this bill was vetoed by President Roosevelt I voted to override the veto. This, my friends, is my record. I am the friend of labor. I have always been and always will be. I am the opponent of the bosses. I always have been and I always will be.

Now, you folks just follow this campaign and watch what I tell you. We are going to thaw this gentleman out between now and the run-off primary. He is already showing evidence of learning a few things. Well, between now and the primary I think we will be able to get him to the point that he will actually endorse the Taft Hartley labor bill. Certainly the brass hats of union labor may now be uneasy. No matter what, and when, and why they have bought and sold in the shoddy merchandise of secret and so-called practical political trading. The brasses should be uneasy. For when has Coke in 30 years ever delivered the goods when paid in advance? Ask the oil companies.

Lynden Johnson

August 9, 1948

### Suggestions for Bringing out Betting Odds:

A five or fifteen minute radio the last week on a regional basis, putting prominent people on a quiz program.

MC says: "Well, the race between Johnson and Stevenson may come out like a photo finish like Johnson did with O'Daniel six years ago." (We will call the mobs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

1--"I thought Johnson won that one."

2--"No use crying over spilt milk."

3--"August 28 ain't far off."

4--"Coke was the only winner that time. The winner got counted out and Coke went from Lieutenant Governor to Governor."

MC--"Well, quit quarreling about what ain't here now. Let's get on for what we are here for. Who's going to win? That's the title to this broadcast."

1--"I am not a betting man."

2--"You bet I am."

3--"I will bet a Stetson Coke wins."

4--"You're on."

5--"I think it ought to be two Stetsons to one on Coke."

MC--"Well, I think money talks. I'll make the odds. etc. etc."

\*\*\*\*\*

Probably the above can't even make a radio but the essence of it might be put in a dialogue between a Johnson and a Coke man and a proper MC.

A substitute for the Coke-Johnson-MC on a "How's it going to end" program might be the man on the street technique where 20 people are asked to say who's going to win. This makes about 30 minutes giving each fellow about 90 seconds to say, "I think Johnson is going to win because ---" and "I think Coke is going to win because ----".

If this is successful the newspapers <sup>own</sup> enough stations to do it as a feature without pay. The man who gains by such a feature is the man who sets it up.

Third on the betting technique is letters to the editors on all papers saying, "Why is Johnson gaining?" "I am a Stevenson supporter and I think this Johnson stuff is being planted everywhere" and "I did not have much faith in Johnson and voted for Peddy. With Peddy out I am for Johnson and am on a winner this time."

"Our room in the auto plant has 47 workers. They were split three ways about on the first primary. Now the dope is Johnson 30, Stevenson 17." etc. etc.

Fourth method: Reporters from all papers favorable to Johnson take honest city and country polls in their territories and exchange, having Austin through the Austin American tabulate. This is a check on the Belden Poll and can be printed faster and ahead of him. Personally I am certain that these polls will show that Johnson has gained in the cities and that enough Peddy vote is moving his way to give him an off-set to the Stevenson bandwagon talk. Whenever a bandwagon talk is questioned it slips awfully fast. There is no news in a man who is in the lead. The talk in a second primary is always about the runner-up--whether he is slipping or gaining. Therefore this method and those above are all designed to get the Johnson-gaining stuff ahead of "Why lose your vote and not own a piece of your next Senator."

Reporters from all the major papers should also begin to quote actual bets as news items such as "Commissioner Blank says -----" if you are talking about cities such as Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth. If you are talking about places where they do not have such people and the lesser towns, "The betting on the street is today even money. Two bets were laid at Drug Store. Today 50-40 on Coke." etc.



August 9, 1948

### Suggestions for Bringing out Betting Odds:

A five or fifteen minute radio the last week on a regional basis, putting prominent people on a quiz program.

MC says: "Well, the race between Johnson and Stevenson may come out like a photo finish like Johnson did with O'Daniel six years ago." (We will call the mobs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

1--"I thought Johnson won that one."

2--"No use crying over spilt milk."

3--"August 28 ain't far off."

4--"Coke was the only winner that time. The winner got counted out and Coke went from Lieutenant Governor to Governor."

MC--"Well, quit quarreling about what ain't here now. Let's get on for what we are here for. Who's going to win? That's the title to this broadcast."

1--"I am not a betting man."

2--"You bet I am."

3--"I will bet a Stetson Coke wins."

4--"You're on."

5--"I think it ought to be two Stetsons to one on Coke."

MC--"Well, I think money talks. I'll make the odds. etc. etc."

\*\*\*\*\*  
Probably the above can't even make a radio but the essence of it might be put in a dialogue between a Johnson and a Coke man and a proper MC.

A substitute for the Coke-Johnson-MC on a "How's it going to end" program might be the man on the street technique where 20 people are asked to say who's going to win. This makes about 30 minutes giving each fellow about 90 seconds to say, "I think Johnson is going to win because ---" and "I think Coke is going to win because ----".

If this is successful the newspapers <sup>own</sup> enough stations to do it as a feature without pay. The man who gains by such a feature is the man who sets it up.

Third on the betting technique is letters to the editors on all papers saying, "Why is Johnson gaining?" "I am a Stevenson supporter and I think this Johnson stuff is being planted everywhere" and "I did not have much faith in Johnson and voted for Peddy. With Peddy out I am for Johnson and am on a winner this time."

"Our room in the auto plant has 47 workers. They were split three ways about on the first primary. Now the dope is Johnson 30, Stevenson 17." etc. etc.

Fourth method: Reporters from all papers favorable to Johnson take honest city and country polls in their territories and exchange, having Austin through the Austin American tabulate. This is a check on the Belden Poll and can be printed faster and ahead of him. Personally I am certain that these polls will show that Johnson has gained in the cities and that enough Peddy vote is moving his way to give him an off-set to the Stevenson bandwagon talk. Whenever a bandwagon talk is questioned it slips awfully fast. There is no news in a man who is in the lead. The talk in a second primary is always about the runner-up--whether he is slipping or gaining. Therefore this method and those above are all designed to get the Johnson-gaining stuff ahead of "Why lose your vote and not own a piece of your next Senator."

Reporters from all the major papers should also begin to quote actual bets as news items such as "Commissioner Blank says ----" if you are talking about cities such as Houston, Dallas, Fort Worth. If you are talking about places where they do not have such people and the lesser towns, "The betting on the street is today even money. Two bets were laid at Drug Store. Today 50-40 on Coke." etc.

August 9, 1948

Memo For Governor Hobby:

Will:

Please put your own man with Coke at once for two weeks. This will cost you about \$300. I have checked into Coke and he has all of the whiskey soaks who have known him for thirty years sitting on their fannys from morning to night wherever he goes waiting for him to come in and say what he did that day, and then they say what he tells them. We have statistics on the number of people Coke shakes hands with and what these boys write in the papers after Coke tells them.

I think you have got a chap named Mawhinney. I have read some of his by-lines and I think he has some drive. He will tell the truth and follow Coke around wherever he goes. I suppose the man you have got with Lyndon is sufficient. It does not do us any good to cover the favorable candidate if we do not cover the opposition.

Enclosed find editorial. This is from your favorite author! He wants it on page one next Sunday. He knows it won't be there! You will get the fill-in list of Johnson's state-wide activities in Washington.

CEM

August 10, 1948

If the Houston Post initiates this editorial, Brooks should be sure to clip it for all papers. W.P. Hobby should particularly enclose it in a personal note to Amon Carter and to Tom Wooch. I believe their papers will reprint with credit if the publishers hear directly from the Governor. The editorial follows:

THE TEAM SHOULD BE CONNALLY AND JOHNSON FOR A SIX YEAR PULL

In this democratic government each state sends two representatives to the Senate. The well known senior Senator Tom Connally has served Texas long and ably.

There is a vacancy. The talents of a Connally will not be soon equaled by either Coke Stevenson or Lyndon Johnson. It takes seniority--long, long years in the Senate--to reach the chairmanship of a Foreign Relations Committee. Naturally Texas is honored that the great names of this nation in foreign affairs include Tom Connally.

But how about the plain every day business of seven million people? Texas willingly gives up Connally to the world for the peace we seek. With Marshall and Vandenberg our Texas Senator shares the glory. And sheds glory upon the Lone Star State. But again how can we expect any human being to take care of the myriad of daily needs for representation that seven million busy Texans need in Washington.

The Houston Post submits that the proper team in Washington for the next six years consists of Connally and Johnson--Connally old and wise and genial, and Johnson young and eager and a driving force.

Yes, The Houston Post is willing to be accused of interest in the material prosperity of Texas. We believe such material prosperity is threatened unless Lyndon Johnson gets the six year job ahead as chief salesman for Texas to this nation.

We must examine the record of Lyndon Johnson as the greatest salesman Texas ever had if we are to support Johnson on a purely material basis. There are many other reasons for supporting Johnson--youth, and driving and an almost fanatic eagerness to vote right. A personal colleague of Johnson for ten years in Congress, Estes Kefauver, has just been elected Senator in Tennessee. Kefauver, voted the most effective Congressman on the liberal Democratic side, has voted 90% of the time as has Johnson. Kefauver for Tennessee has not been the personal salesman for Tennessee that Johnson has been for Texas. But the people of Tennessee primarily elected Kefauver to the Senate because

consistently, intelligently, and always on the job he fought the enemies who would crush the TVA. In Texas Johnson has just done this on the little TVAs which have impounded Texas streams for light and power and flood control. There are so many, many effective jobs that Johnson has done for Texas that there is no space here to name them all. As 10th District Congressman he naturally build millions and tens of millions of new value into the Austin Colorado River District. But let's examine how this super-energy salesman functioned for the other districts of Texas--districts which he did not even represent. He is now getting the dividends of good will on the big up swing which may put him in the Senate August 28th. A month ago the possibilities of Lyndon Johnson beating Coke Stevenson seemed remote. Some said it could be a miracle if Coke did not win. Some are now whispering that the miracle has grown to more than a full size rumor. Some in the vernacular are saying, "Lyndon has got Coke on the ropes."

But in a political contest mere physical strength and youth usually do not beat old age and political cunning or know-how.

You all know that Coke four and six years ago was an unbeatable person in any state-wide race except possibly opposed to Senator Connally. He got 68 (?)% of the vote for Governor against 14(?) candidates when he faced the people on his first campaign after reaching the Governorship through the O'Daniel vacancy which occurred six years ago. On his next race he got 58 (?)% against 4 (?) candidates. In the first primary for Senator just ended Coke got a scanty 39%, Johnson 33% plus, and George Peddy out Houston candidate 20%. The figures do not lie. Coke has slipped badly in voter appeal. Perhaps the returning soldiers had something to do with it. Perhaps the old age folks did not get from Coke what they were led to believe. But above all perhaps the solid business forces of the state who do not participate in politics, have noticed a lack of energy or know-how in Coke Stevenson as a salesman for Texas in getting things done in cooperation with Washington.

So now we come to the person who really got the job done--neither a Governor nor a Senator--merely a young man hitting the ball when asked to do any constructive job--no matter whether asked by Houston, Austin, Fort Worth, Dallas, San Antonio, El Paso, or the Sabine District. The record is amazing. Those that really know are unanimous that the personal work of Congressman Lyndon Johnson has literally brought hundreds of millions of Federal activity into Texas. He has fought the

good fight for ten years in competition with Congressmen and Senators from all the other states. If it is a crime to pork barrel or log roll for Texas, then Congressman Johnson may be an arch criminal. But The Houston Post very definitely believes that a representative of Texas at Washington has as his main duty to see that Texas gets her just dues at Washington. If Lyndon Johnson has been the prize champion in war and peace, in depression and prosperity, in getting things done for Texas at Washington, it seems to us that it is not a crime but a most commendable thing. This editorial may be over-long but the list is so long of the things that Johnson has done for Texas that we will name an even dozen. Should this energy cease? Should Texas interests lose this super-drive in the next six years? Let this list answer for you.

NOTE: Six years hence Tom Connally will be 74 (?); Coke Stevenson will be 69 (?); Lyndon Johnson will be 47 (?). That is one reason why this editorial is headed--~~Stevenson-or-Johnson~~--"Connally and Johnson--Wisdom and Drive."

Saturday night speech to be air mailed from Austin, Thursday night for release early Sunday morning to all headquarters; for delivery Saturday noon in person to the city or political editors of every major paper. Buck should handle this himself, preferably with a new picture of Lyndon in mat form, the caption headed, "Johnson today" and the lines underneath, "Lyndon Johnson as he looked this week much more serious than when O'Daniel beat him by 1500 votes six years ago. Now aged                      , he opposes Coke Stevenson aged                      as they open down the home stretch for a six year term at Washington."

If Green and Buck agree, I suggest also a picture of Coke Stevenson--his most recent--when publishers plan to use a Coke Stevenson speech and a Lyndon Johnson speech with art for their Sunday papers. Naturally this latest Coke portrait facing Lyndon, should not do any harm if coupled with a six year stretch and the line "Whom are you going to hire?" on the top caption. As a reader I am suggesting to myself one face is old and wily and the other is in middle age and full of determination. Remember pictures are worth ten times as much as words saying the same thing. This may be arranged Wednesday at Fort Worth if Charles Green or Buck can get there with the suggestion to Rhem Howard, Jimmy North, Houston Harte, and Bernard Hanks. I should not suggest this. It is an editorial matter. Now to the speech.

Statement of Lyndon B. Johnson  
August 5, 1948

In speaking in Dallas a few days ago I called attention to the say-nothing, do-nothing character of the campaign of my opponent was making for the United States Senate where he was absolutely refusing to declare himself on any controversial issue. I pointed out that thus far he had absolutely refused to tell the people of Texas how he stood on the Taft Hartley labor law, and then I predicted that this was an issue that the people of Texas were not going to allow any candidate to duck and that it would be a peculiar circumstance if at this late date he should now decide after visiting Washington that he is in favor of the Taft Hartley labor law.

Well, my friends, the people of Texas are tired of the rule of bosses, and the people are not much concerned about whether these bosses are AFofL bosses, or CIO bosses, or big business bosses, or corrupt pardon-peddling bosses. They simply don't want any bosses in control of public affairs in this state. This opponent of mine, who has been a veteran in public office for 30 years, campaigned up until the first primary without finding out how he stood with reference to the endorsement which the labor bosses had given him. NOW he comes out in a brilliant statement in which he says he is opposed to the CIO bosses, BUT he is strangely silent about the AFofL bosses. He is equally silent as to how he stands on the Taft Hartley labor law. Is he standing or is he slipping? All labor should know.

You know I said the other day if any of you folks had ever been present at one of these West Texas brandings you had seen a steer after he was branded run over to the fence and try to rub the brand off. This is exactly what my opponent is now trying to do. He has made a straight dive for the fence. He is now trying to get the CIO boss brand off of the right hip. We may soon have him trying to get the AFofL boss brand off of the left hip.

Labor bosses are not labor. They boss labor. I have always been a friend of all labor, whether members of a labor union or not members of a labor union. I expect to continue to maintain this policy, but I want you to know one thing definitely: I shall welcome the support of honest laboring men, even though some of their bosses are trying to purge me because I have dared to vote for some measures that they did not like.

Now, I have told you how I stood on this labor question. I have



made it clear that I voted for the Taft Hartley labor bill. I have told you that I voted to override the President's veto on the Taft Hartley labor bill. Experience may improve this law, but if I ever vote for an amendment to the law it will be for an amendment to improve the law. Let the little John L. Lewises make the most of it.

Now, folks, I am opposed to coercion whether it is practiced by business or labor, and I am opposed to it practiced in Wall Street or by a petty Petrillo.

Here is another thing that I would like to call to your attention: While my opponent was your Governor the Texas Legislature passed a labor bill. It was generally referred to as the Manford Bill, but what did your Governor do when this bill came to his desk? Did he sign it? No, he did not sign it. Did he veto it? No, he did not veto it. But, what he did do was to adopt the same pussy-footing, fence-straddling tactics--he filed it with the Secretary of State without his signature. Then, as now, he tries to be all things to all men. So now it is "yes" to AFofL and "no" to CIO. Sort of a slipper fellow, what?

Now, I want to call your attention to something else. Right at that same time while he was taking that kind of action, I, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee working with other members of the House aided in passing through the House what was generally referred to as the Smith-Connally Bill to try to better regulate and control war production and stop strikes in war plants. When this bill was vetoed by President Roosevelt I voted to override the veto. This, my friends, is my record. I am the friend of labor. I have always been and always will be. I am the opponent of the bosses. I always have been and I always will be.

Now, you folks just follow this campaign and watch what I tell you. We are going to throw this gentleman out between now and the run-off primary. He is already showing evidence of learning a few things. Well, between now and the primary I think we will be able to get him to the point that he will actually endorse the Taft Hartley labor bill. Certainly the brass hats of union labor may now be uneasy. No matter what, and when, and why they have bought and sold in the shoddy merchandise of secret and so-called practical political trading. The brasses should be uneasy. For when has Coke in 30 years ever delivered the goods when paid in advance? Ask the oil companies.

August 4, 1948

Dear Lyndon:

I have listened to you for about 7 minutes where you are talking entirely of your experience in connection with foreign affairs. You will not gain on Stevenson without coming very much closer to home.

Thus far there has not been a cheer in my system. I would just as leave read Walter Lippman.

You need a speech. You need a change in tempo. On the foreign policy you should say:

"The plain people from Texas--the million people who will vote on August 28--know the score on Russia. Texans have never been pushed around. I have had 12 years at Washington in war and peace. I do not think there will be a war with Russia within five years. But certainly you need a Senator down there in Washington who knows the score from Marshall to Forrestal, from Roosevelt to Truman. I shall act for peace always--slowly until and if Moscow Communists try to push us around.

"And if we are pushed around you should have a Senator in Washington experienced and cool. I have been for the Marshall Plan. I do not think the Marshall Plan is tough. I think it is realistic. I believe under Marshall there is a better chance for peace than under Wallace or Dewey. I believe that under a democratic continuance under Marshall leadership, we have the best chance of all--Certainly better than under Dewey and Dulles or Wallace and what, or what not." end.

Then on to Texas.

"The part of Texas in war and peace has always been greater than its oil and its cotton and its wheat and its cattle. Texas is paramount in its pioneer spirit. You all remember that before the draft Texas supplied more volunteers for World War II than any other state. Texans were all around the lot in the Marines, in the Navy, and in the Army before New York and Pennsylvania and Illinois got through talking about the business of whether they should or should not fight. You may remember that Congressman Lyndon Johnson was in uniform within 24 hours after Pearl Harbor. That is the spirit with which Texas met the national peril. If war again should come--and let us pray to God and work with common sense for peace--the same Lyndon Johnson will seek to place again his services in the armed forces.

Saturday night speech to be air mailed from Austin, Thursday night for release early Sunday morning to all headquarters; for delivery Saturday noon in person to the city or political editors of every major paper. Buck should handle this himself, preferably with a new picture of Lyndon in mat form, the caption headed, "Johnson today" and the lines underneath, "Lyndon Johnson as he looked this week much more serious than when O'Daniel beat him by 1500 votes six years ago. Now aged                      , he opposes Coke Stevenson aged                      as they open down the home stretch for a six year term at Washington."

If Green and Buck agree, I suggest also a picture of Coke Stevenson--his most recent--when publishers plan to use a Coke Stevenson speech and a Lyndon Johnson speech with art for their Sunday papers. Naturally this latest Coke portrait facing Lyndon, should not do any harm if coupled with a six year stretch and the line "Whom are you going to hire?" on the top caption. As a reader I am suggesting to myself one face is old and wily and the other is in middle age and full of determination. Remember pictures are worth ten times as much as words saying the same thing. This may be arranged Wednesday at Fort Worth if Charles Green or Buck can get there with the suggestion to Rhea Howard, Jimmy North, Houston Harte, and Bernard Hanks. I should not suggest this. It is an editorial matter. Now to the speech.

August 9, 1948

Memo for Helen:

Enclosed speech is on its way to general approval by Houston Post Hobby, Peddy the Houston 3rd candidate who was eliminated out had 20% of the votes, and the substantial working editors of the state who will whip it into shape Wednesday for Saturday night state-wide Johnson radio delivery.

Obviously you know libel attorneys will take some of this out; also the inaccuracies in the labor statements will be cut out and thus the punch weakened, but I purposely left this stuff in there to get the punch over that CIO has been cleaning out. Incidentally I wanted to give a labor education 1948 style to some of the bourbons in high places in Houston and the Fort Worth and Dallas districts.

I suggest that this speech be read by Drew Pearson so that Drew may get the low-downs on Coke. The Magnolia business has to do with the Magnolia Petroleum Company which is a producing company for Socony as is the Humble for Standard Oil of New Jersey. The record shows Magnolia bought the leases of Coke Stevenson's ranch for substantial sums although no oil sits around that ranch country and as far as we know, neighbors' ranches were not so favored. This ought to be good for Drew as it is well known in Texas but not nationally. It is also good for Drew because it is the real kick-off on Lyndon's run-off campaign (Saturday night) which means that he will have exclusive news value of this item on his Sunday broadcast as the big Sundays in the east go to press too early to catch.

I believe Kroll should be shown this speech and possibly the personal comment regarding Murray should be sent him by the proper person. Whether or not Johnson gets this into his radio broadcast is unimportant as we know he wants to say it and will be saying it among big labor employers such as the oil company top lines and the Browns--the fellows really above who have their own labor negotiators.

If we have not done anything else down here except to get the papers stories in Texas into better light, the trip would have been worth while.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON SPEECH  
Friday, August 6, 1948

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm proud to be with you tonight, at this rally arranged by friends and supporters of George C. Peddy. As you folks over in East Texas say, this meeting has "pleasured" me more than any other meeting could, except possibly a meeting in my own home county of Blanco. I didn't come over to Shelby County in the first primary. I knew you folks had a native son in the race, and he was a man I liked and admired. I liked that man because he always took a forthright position. He always was willing to stand up and be counted. We were in agreement on what kind of foreign policy our nation should have. Neither of us is an isolationist. When I went down to Houston where Colonel Peddy lives now, I told the voters in Houston that I wanted his friends and neighbors to know that I had not and would not speak an unkind word about Colonel Peddy. I told the folks in Houston that I was in a Senate race with him and I wanted to contest him for votes, but that Colonel Peddy and I agreed on almost all of the issues in the race. So, as far as Colonel Peddy was concerned, the only claim I advanced over his was the fact that I had eleven years of experience in Congress.

Colonel Peddy couldn't have been other than forthright and honest in a political campaign, because that's the kind of people you produce over in Shelby County and this part of Texas. The men of this section have always been willing to stand up and be counted; they have always fought for the principles they believed in. They may have been wrong at times, because there isn't any man who is right all the time; but they never dodged. They don't hide. They're not slackers when duty calls.

My forefathers stood up with men of this section at San Jacinto, and at the little blacksmith shop on the banks of the Brazos where the Texas Declaration of Independence was written. They stood with men of this section with Lee and with Jackson; and they didn't quit until Appomatox. Your folks and my folks stood up against the Kaiser and against Hitler. That's our tradition, and when I'm standing with George Peddy's folks I feel like I'm at home.

You know, this has been a most peculiar campaign. When we started out there were three leading candidates in the race. Colonel Peddy and I, from the very first day we announced, were willing to stand up and be counted. We each had a program and we each had a platform. The third candidate said he was running on his record and he belittled anybody who ran on a platform. When we discussed his lack of a platform and his refusal to take a stand on public issues, he started to holler - "Mud slinging." When we called on him to take a stand on public issues, he whines - "Mudslinging." When we took him at his own word and discussed his public record, he cried - "Mudslinging."

Now what does it mean when a candidate for public office doesn't want his public record brought out in the light of day? What are voters to think when a man refuses to answer plain simple questions? What does it mean when he replies "mudslinging" to every public discussion? Does it mean he wants the voters to close their eyes to his public record, his public utterances and his evasions?

Others may follow the dictates of their own conscience. As for me, I want Texans to know that I am willing to stand up and be counted. My record is open. I will not whine or cry "mud-slinging" when that public record is criticized -- and I'll go further. I haven't talked about my opponent's private life; I've not mentioned his business dealings or any of his kin. Nevertheless, I'll throw down the bars and say that my opponent can discuss my public record or my private life, from the day I was born. All I demand is that anyone who has anything to say about me shall say it openly where I can answer it openly.

During my last campaign for Congress two years ago, my opponents circulated many slanders about my private life and conduct. They hurt; but I will say this: Those opponents never stooped to insinuations or innuendos; they never circulated anonymous charges. What they had to say about me, they said it in public. And I met those charges in public. The voters of my district passed judgment on their merits by giving me 70 per cent of the votes in that election.

I know of no better testimony to a man's character and integrity and his public service than the votes of his home folks. You people in Shelby County testified overwhelmingly to the character and integrity of Colonel Peddy. Down in my district where my opponent has served as a public official for some 30 years, and where he lived in the Governor's Mansion for some five or six years, the voters gave me 65 per cent of the votes this year, to 26 for my opponent.

Whenever I have been a candidate for office, I have always told the folks honestly and frankly just where I stand on

every issue. I've been willing to stand up and be counted. A candidate always will lose some votes that way, because some people are going to disagree with him. But I believed the people could make up their minds only if they knew how candidates stood. When I announced for this high office of Junior Senator, I told you my views. I outlined a program which I believed would spell out Peace and Progress through Preparedness. I told you I would answer every question. I knew then, and I know now, that some will not want to spend money to make us strong enough to protect us from any international bully. I knew that some were unwilling to be taxed to carry out the Marshall Plan to give us strong allies who will be a first line of defense against Communism. I knew some people want to cut out farm price supports and leave the farmer at the mercy of the speculator. I realized that some people who are willing to spend money for super-highways don't want to be taxed to build the farm-to-market roads. It was no secret that many voters don't want our farm homes electrified; and there are others who would let our old folks continue a miserable existence on a miserly pittance. Nevertheless, I told the people exactly where I stood.

Now when my opponent announced, a lot of folks may have wondered what he stood for, but at least he didn't step on a single sensitive toe. As I told you, Colonel Peddy and I commented on this curious state of affairs, to be met with the charge of "mudslinging." But today the tune is the same but the words are changing. When my opponent read the election returns he learned that Colonel Peddy and I received 61 per cent of the



votes, over a man who had been in public life for some 30 years. So he announced he would go to Washington. He would observe. He would find out all about the world.

He spent exactly 14 minutes with the Undersecretary of State, Mr. Robert Lovett of Texas, and decided he was not an isolationist; and that he's for the Marshall Plan. He broadly hints that anybody who brings our bipartisan foreign policy into a political campaign is unpatriotic.

Yes, he's for the Marshall plan today; but on January the first, 1948, before the Marshall Plan was passed with its proposed expenditures, he told you the government was spending too much money, and he would stop it. He specifically said the government was spending too much money abroad, and he would stop it. He said, in effect, I'll give the tramps an axe and show them a woodpile. If it's unpatriotic to bring foreign policy into this race, I ask the voters to decide whether it was brought into the race by the man who wanted to give the tramps an axe and show them the woodpile -- those "tramps" who fought, bled and died to hold back Hitler while we were preparing; those "tramps" who died so that more of us might live.

The Marshall Plan was very much a political issue when he called for giving them an axe and showing them the woodpile. It was an issue in the halls of Congress. It was an issue up to a very few days before the regular session adjourned -- it was an issue when the Republicans tried to skimp on the sums we would spend in Europe. Now by some curious hocus-pocus it has ceased to be an issue to the man who said we were too prodigal with our

money even before the Marshall Plan was passed. And in his view, all who say it is an issue are unpatriotic. I tell the people of Texas support of our bipartisan foreign policy will continue to be an issue so long as those unkind words about the nations who fought with us are allowed to stand. I tell you as the good book tells you that the leopard cannot change his spots.

Now let's see what else happened in Washington. My opponent spent a few minutes with a brass hat or so, and then told the world that he would be a rubber stamp for their recommendations -- this from a man who has been trying to brand Lyndon Johnson a rubber stamp. Woe to this nation when Congressmen or Senators blindly accept all the recommendations handed to them by any group, official or unofficial. Had we done that, we wouldn't have a great air fleet of jet bombers and fighters building today, because to get our 70-group air force, we had to stand up and fight the recommendations of the same people my opponent has promised to rubber stamp.

This candidate who in thirty years in public office has found it so hard to make up his mind, made it up quickly in Washington on a couple of issues. Then he hurriedly caught a train for home, and it may have been that had he stayed a little longer, we might have learned how he stands on other issues.

You voters might have discovered how he stands on supporting farm prices and making loans for REA electricity in farm homes. You might have discovered how he stands on socialized medicine and reciprocal trade agreements. You might even have found out what he proposes to do about the high cost of living

other than to say he's against it.

His answer to high prices is to live within your means. To quote from the Fort Worth Star Telegram of April first, 1948, he is quoted as saying that the way to fight inflation is, quote, to live within your means, end quote. Now that's a simple formula for you farmers and laboring men and people on small salaries, when steak costs a dollar a pound. You can live within your means -- if you're willing for your family to go hungry and do without clothes and medical attention and schooling.

But the contempt which he shows for the intelligence of the people is best shown by his position -- if you can call it a position -- on the Taft-Hartley Act.

Now the Taft-Hartley Act is an issue before the American people, and so far my opponent hasn't said that it's unpatriotic to discuss it. In fact, he hasn't said anything about it.

My record on that bill has been made. I frankly stated it to the voters. I said my attitude toward amending it would be determined by the recommendations of a joint committee of Congress set up to study the law in action. That was a principal feature of the law. Congress, in passing it, recognized that the Taft-Hartley Bill is no more perfect than the old Wagner Act, which is carried forward in the bill. It may need amendments, just as the Wagner Act needed amendments. I said I would consider any recommendations of the committee -- except one. On one section of that law, my opinion will not be changed. That's the section which requires the head of any labor union who seeks an advantage

under the Act, to file an affidavit that he's not a Communist, or a member of the Communist party. I believe that every person and every organization doing business with the government -- particularly those seeking help from the government -- should be required to take a solemn oath that they are not Communists. I have to make that oath to be a candidate for Senator. Does any one of you consider that's an unreasonable requirement?

As I say, I've been frank with the people -- I haven't dodged or evaded this issue. I've always had many friends among the laboring people; and I knew that many of them would disagree with me. But I believed the working man wanted me to be honest and truthful with him. Now I don't know what commitments my opponent has made, privately and in hotel rooms. All I know is that a group of labor leaders met in Fort Worth and adopted him. Whether he made them any promises is between him and them. But I do say that all the voters have a right to know whether he is for or against the Taft-Hartley law; whether he will repeal it; whether he will amend it to allow labor leaders to have secret Communist affiliations. Those are questions for all the voters. You members of organized labor may have been told by your leaders that my opponent made a secret promise in a private meeting. If they have told you that, call on them to tell you where and when the promise was made. You and I know that a man who is afraid, or ashamed, to repeat in public any commitment he has made in private on any public question, can't be trusted. You cannot trust a man who is afraid or ashamed to tell the world what he believes and what he proposes to do on a question that effects

you. You cannot trust a man who by silence or evasion seeks the favor and the votes of people of opposing beliefs. No man can serve both God and Mammon; no man can serve two masters.

On the streets of Houston yesterday, I met an old friend who belongs to a Union. We saw eye to eye in the past on many issues. But he was mad at me because of my vote on the Taft-Hartley Bill. When we met yesterday, he stopped me. He said, "Lyndon, I've been thinking over our disagreement. I've decided I'd rather have a man tell me honestly where he stands than to refuse to tell me anything. Some of my officials told me your opponent had agreed to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The next day I read in the papers that he said he had made no promises. Now, I've decided that somebody is trying to play me for a sucker -- I've decided your opponent is playing both ends against the middle. And I'm afraid that I'll end up in the middle."

Well, I would amend my friend's statement just a little. When any public official or any candidate plays both ends against the middle, you, the people, end up in the middle -- the middle of a bad fix.

I predicted that my opponent would act like a newly branded Texas steer and try to rub off his brand on the first fence he came to. Wednesday night he tried to do it by denouncing the CIO. That is an old political dodge in Texas. I recall when membership in a certain secret order was a political issue in Texas. A candidate for office who wished to mislead the public would draw a red herring across the trail by denouncing the society to which he belonged.

If my opponent really desires to get rid of his brand, if he really does not want the support of organized labor, both CIO and AFL, he needs only to come out clearly on the Taft-Hartley Act. If he is courageous enough to say that he would have voted for the Act and would vote against its repeal if he got elected to the Senate -- which he won't -- then you may take his denunciation of the CIO at face value. Otherwise, you may know that he is engaging in a sham battle to fool the voters. But he is fooling nobody.

If you think my opponent stands boldly on principles listen to what he had to say during the observation trip to Washington. He made up his mind fast, after the 14-minute interview with the Undersecretary of State, and the few minutes with the Secretary of Defense on Peace and Preparedness; but he was mighty slow on the trigger when it came to the Taft-Hartley Law. At 12 o'clock Noon, on July 29th, he had a press conference. Five times the reporters asked him how he stood on the Taft-

Hartley Bill, and he told them that they would have to read the Texas newspapers. Six hours later, at 6 P.M. on the same day, he had another Press conference, and during that six hours the reporters had wired their editors and were unable to find where he had said anything about how he stood on the Taft-Hartley Bill. So, the following conversation occurred, and I quote from the reporter's transcript, printed in the newspapers. Here it is:

A reporter said, "Look, Governor, you told me to look in the files of my newspapers. My editor searched his files and we can't find anything."

My opponent: "I am not going to let the Times Herald shape up my campaign. I have said all I am going to say."

Reporter: "What did you say?"

My opponent: "I could not repeat it from memory."

Reporter: "Could you give us the gist of it?"

My opponent: "I might be able to but I don't think I will."

Reporter: "What is your objection to repeating it?"

My opponent: "I object because you all catch me here away from my notes and put me under cross-examination."

Reporter: "It seems like a simple thing to remember how you stand."

My opponent: "Maybe the people of Texas know."

Reporter: "All I want is yes or no."

My opponent: "I don't want to discuss it. I am the candidate in this race."

And that was the interview which is printed in the

newspapers. Has Texas come to the point where refusal to discuss a public issue can be excused because, quote, I am a candidate in this race?

The truth is that he is afraid that if he says one word to indicate that he favors the Taft-Hartley Bill, he will lose the support of those who oppose it; and that if he even hints that he's against it, he'll lose the support of union labor. I tell you that neither labor nor employer can afford to put their trust in such a candidate. His efforts to be all things to all people; to be on all sides of all questions, and to take issue with no one, reminds me of the fate of the chameleon in the old story. The chameleon is a little lizard that changes its colors to fit its background; for instance it was red when it got on a red carpet, or green, or black, or whatever fitted into the crowd. This lizard finally was put on one of these old fashioned patchwork quilts -- and it busted itself wide open trying to make good.

If my opponent ever got to the Senate -- which he won't -- he'd bust himself wide open trying to make good with you farmers, on the one hand, and commodity speculators on the other; with organized labor on the one hand, and employers on the other. And that won't do anybody any good.

Now I didn't mean to take up quite so much time talking about little things. Enough of my opponent. This country must meet its destiny. We must look doward. We must take a stand. We must be unafraid. Destiny has thrust into our hands the leadership of this world.

To meet our rendezvous with destiny, we must go



forward and we must be strong. We are going to have a program of Preparedness, Peace and Progress. We'll have a 70-group air force of jet fighters, and more if necessary. We'll have the strongest navy, and the best equipped army, and we are going to be so strong that no nation ever will challenge us.

We'll win the peace with the Marshall Plan and stop the march of Communism. And when peace is assured, when the channels of world trade are reopened through our reciprocal trade agreements, we are going to march forward at home.

My opponent has said that you must look to the county courthouse. Well, we are going to look to the courthouse for those things it was intended to serve us with, but we are not going to the courthouse to control the hoof and mouth disease in Mexico which threatens our livestock industry. We are not going to the courthouse to support our farm prices and prevent a return of 5-cent cotton and 25-cent wheat. We'll go to the courthouse to talk with the county agent about soil conservation on our farms, but he'll continue looking to Washington to carry this program forward. We won't ask the county courthouse to make loans for rural electrification. For five years, the old folks looked in vain to the statehouse in Austin for adequate provision for their declining years. We're not going to the statehouse, or the courthouse to help the deserving senior citizens, and we're not going to allow them to return to the county poorhouse!

We're going to do these things and we're going to be just as consistent as we've always been in protecting all the rights of our local governments and our state government. There

is no man in Texas whose record in Congress has been more consistent than mine when it comes to protecting those rights of local and state governments. I vigorously joined in the opposition to the Federal government's attempt to destroy our rights by taking over our tidelands. I have vigorously fought the efforts to substitute the police power of the Federal government for that of the local and state governments. If I had time I could enumerate my record within this field. But my friends, I think I know the difference between a local problem and a state problem and a National problem. I think I know the difference between the problems that can be handled on a statewide basis, and on a county-wide basis, and I say to you that there are many problems confronting the people of this nation which must be dealt with by the Federal Government. There is one thing I have always contended for and shall always contend for, and that is, in the handling of these things, the supreme right shall be the right of the individual.

Others may tell you how every "t" is crossed and every "i" dotted in the constitution. Well, Lyndon Johnson has studied that document, as a school boy, and as a man and a member of the Congress. I found my principles in the immortal Bill of Rights, that section which was laid down by our forefathers to protect the rights of common men and women.

The American people have made great progress in the last decade, under the inspiration of a man who held that Bill of Rights most sacred. During those years we have seen our National income mount to heights never before dreamed of; we have seen more men employed, at higher wages, and more people winning a better

standard of living, than any man would have believed possible.

The man who started us on that road was our great leader in peace and in war, the man whose vision was broad enough to give birth to the atomic age -- Franklin D. Roosevelt. I am proud to have fought shoulder to shoulder with him, for the rights of men -- to make every man free from pressures -- from big groups within the government or outside of it. He believed, and I believe, that we must let nobody push us around. And we will be a great nation so long as we keep the freedom of the individual, the freedom of our enterprise system, and the freedom of labor. There are heights unscaled for those with daring. Americans will win to those high summits.

Released early edition Sunday. Lyndon Johnson speaking Saturday night,  
at said:

I have been asked all week whether I believed I would win the Senatorship race on August 28th. I do.

There is no news in this. Every candidate says he is going to win. But a million voters have a right to know why I say this.

I am confident of winning because Coke Stevenson is pushing me into the Senatorship. He is against the Hoof and Mouth disease in Mexico. But certainly he has been putting his foot in his mouth with enthusiasm.

What has Coke been doing since the rather warm first primary? He has been in Washington correcting his foreign policy position in 14 minute interviews. He now agrees with Peddy and myself. He has turned from soft to hard, from wealy-mouth to tough. He has been out on his farm catching up with his personal business. He says he has been arranging to shear his wool. He certainly has lots of it stored away for a rainy day and when he gets to Washington he is certain to vote for the highest possible tariff on wool regardless of what any of the million voters of Texas will pay for suits and shirts and socks and blankets and the things that keep families warm in winter time.

And because Coke is a good business man he has stated on returning from Washington that he believes in economy. He will not, of course, believe in economy in the wool prices. But he certainly, as a good business man, is against any waste wherever he is not concerned. He has said nothing about the high cost of living as far as it affects the old age pensions and the veterans needs. Coke will not need any old age pension. HE can pay for dollar a pound beef. He is a specialist in magnolias and oil leases which are of course, not always productive but very profitable should the base buyer pay off and then not drill at all.

Coke will not need any veterans as istance for he has never been a veteran. He was honorably engaged as a preacher in World War I. He succored many of the wounded but was never wounded himself. He was in vigorous manhood, in his early thirties. He was saved for thirty years of public office.

We should not blame Coke for being slightly out of touch with the high cost of living. We should not blame Coke for not fully understanding

the housing situation. Personally he has not been touched by it when wool and magnolias are so plentiful and so dear.

But where and when Coke got his foot in his mouth is fantastic--almost incredible--for one who has so successfully maintained his official status, climbing, climbing to the top of the ladder as Governor. How could he so late in life become so rank an amateur?

I know and he knows that the Taft-Hartley Bill is a matter of vague controversy. He and I both know that not more than one out of five people know just what it is all about. He and I know that some labor bosses have called it a slave labor act and that some employer bosses have called it the new freedom. So there is a big line of thought between these folks--both wrong.

Certainly the Taft-Hartley act is only designed to free the consumer from unnecessary strikes and to free industrious labor from boss-driven idleness.

Both of us know that since the Taft-Hartley became a law there has been less than 30% of the strike idleness that there was before. I submit that the workers themselves have had more take-home pay since Taft-Hartley than they ever had before--take-home pay to pay for beef and for blankets and for house payments. This may be called slave labor, but we have had the facts. We all know them. And 90% of all industrious Americans hate strikes and 90% of all Americans hate to be pushed around by labor bosses or by business folks.

But how does Coke get his foot in his mouth? In the first primary Coke got about 80% of union labor votes in CIO, AFofL, and the Railroad Brotherhood. Paddy and myself got the rest.

I shall not say there was a deal. I shall merely say that Coke said nothing about any labor matters whatsoever. I frankly admit that labor bosses from Washington and labor bosses sent to Texas were determined to purge me from public life because I believed Taft-Hartley would lessen strikes, provide more time for fair negotiation of differences, and thus add to the take-home pay of workers everywhere, adding to the prosperity of all from butcher to baker and builder and the grower of things. I can not defend. I need not apologize. The record is here before us

all. And should and when a time comes when any law maybe improved (and of course most laws are or may be improved) I shall be the first to follow

a responsible Democratic leadership when Committee operation submits a proper Bill or amendment. I shall not follow Taft nor shall I follow Truman on this point. I shall follow my conscience and my belief in the prosperity of Texas itself. If this be treason to Texas let the labor bosses purge me.

But what did Coke do since the first primary and what has he said about labor? When he arrived in Dallas from Washington, employers met him--the so-called elite of Dallas. They demanded that he speak yes or no on Taft-Hartley. Coke, the great negotiator, met them half way. He said, "You know me, Al. I am for you elite and I have always been your friend. But this is politics."

I quote the essence from those that heard him. "I shall be for the AFofL but I shall give the CIO Hell." So Coke has done so. It is proper that we now examine what labor is in bed with Coke and what labor is not in bed with Coke--what labor he loves and what labor he is making the goat. Coke loves all AFofL. This means that he loves Caesar Petrillo because Caesar Petrillo is the head of an AFofL union which has been most successful in defying the government of the United States for greed and feather-bedding--the other name for idleness and pay without work. Of course, most of us do not care whether the Metropolitan Opera Association tour has been abandoned for Dallas and Houston--that the merchants will not see as many dresses and the gala trade will go to other places and amusements outside of the state such as racing in New Orleans and the Mardi Gras and Hollywood in California. Dallas won't care nor will Houston. But the point is, why should Coke, a slightly non-musical force--be so friendly with Caesar Petrillo, the great AFofL leader? He has made idle many stagehands and many supplemental musicians for the coming year--a part at least in Texas.

But from this small-fry stuff, let us ask why he so loved John L. Lewis? John L. Lewis is now the directing and principle force in the American Federation of Labor as President Greene reaches toward his 80th year. John L. Lewis is a keen, forceful, labor boss. He pays dues into the AFofL for 400,000 miners. And Coke, foot in mouth, has endorsed this man.

And who can explain why Coke has endorsed the 100% communist leadership in the electrical workers union. This union is also 100% behind

Henry A. Wallace. So will anyone tell me how Coke at Washington in 14 minute interviews went so screwy as to come back for Wallace's communist friends, for John L. Lewis, and for Caesar Petrillo? That is funny.

And without wishing to sore you, I would feel incomplete if I did not ask Coke why he, the great sheep man, calls CIO the goats. The facts are that CIO less than a year ago in convention ordered all communists out of CIO. They had a purge which was a purge. It was led by Phil Murray, a very devout church man, and Walter Reuther, the auto man of Detroit who was shot because he purged the auto workers of the communists, and Jack Kroll, a temperate reasonable, and sincere operator in the political in the political field. These are strong days. These are tough days. These are no days for those who wool gather in fear of loss of votes.

No one has wired from Washington that Coke saw John L. Lewis or Caesar Petrillo. He certainly did not go to Pittsburgh to see Phil Murray. He would have found there that the communist purging Murray is rated the most valuable citizen of Pittsburgh today, loved by big and little--by rich and poor. He has developed into a great labor statesman according to the Pittsburgh community. He has maintained peace in the steel industry while Lewis has been attempting to wreck this country in the coal industry. Phil Murray is considered the most valuable person in education in western Pennsylvania. Although a Catholic, he is a member of the Board of Education of the free school system of Pennsylvania. He is respected by one and all. But Coke, who by-passed Pittsburgh, attacks Murray as a sinister and horrible thing, while he puts his arms around Caesar Petrillo and John L. Lewis and the communist leaders around Henry Wallace.

I would not insult you by stating a simple truth. Anyone who would divide Texans into groups or classes is an enemy of the state. A Texan is a Texan and a citizen is a citizen and this is a political contest. If Coke Stevenson wishes to divide the CIO from the AFofL and say nothing about the Railroad Brotherhoods, I say let him do it. But I say a good citizen of Texas is one who works for his family, his state, and his country. He may be a member of the CIO or the AFofL or a non-union worker or a farmer or a butcher or a grocer or a doctor, so what? I am against no person. I am for all good citizens. But I am passionately against Texas citizens being pushed around by anybody.

I said that all this was funny. I said that a wool gathering, ante-dated, and ignorant man in 14 minute interviews must have gone screwy. But now I think I must apologize. I do not think all this so funny. I think it tragic. I think it tragic although the man is electing me to the United States Senate, with every word he utters. So you people hearing me tonight must not give me too much credit for the so-called rise in Johnson stock; you must not give me too much credit for adding to mine four-fifths of the Peddy strength. I am merely Lyndon Johnson. Coke Stevenson is merely Coke Stevenson. But I know enough about one million Texas voters to repeat the old Barnum stuff. Coke can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but on August 28, the record will show that wool gathering and foot in the mouth and separating the wrong people for his bedroom companions and the right people into the outer darkness, is no way to go to Washington from here. Back to the ranch and to the wool and the sweet agnolias for an outdated mind.



NOTE: This should be the basis of the speech sent out to newspapers and as I have said before, present it to the desk with enthusiasm and make the guy on the desk read it. I am sure that Green and/or Buck may write a proper lead and headlines for those papers who desire it, but I would leave it in this form because it will go to many papers like The Dallas News who will reject any suggestion for a headline or a lead.

But there will be many friendly papers from Carl Estes on through San Angelo who may want more. It is old "pour it on 'em" technique. This speech should warm up somebody to the point where they would like to hear some more. So I will go on on this theory:

I dislike to discuss convicts. After all I believe, and I think most of us believe, that a convict is an unfortunate person. Most of us even dislike to see a bird or a wild animal in a cage. So to say that Coke Stevenson is a more enthusiastic pardoner than Jim Ferguson would not necessarily mean that he was a corrupt or a bad man. He may be a great humanitarian and besides we have a pardon board and Coke has had nothing to do with pardons----such.

But perhaps to allay the confusion that always rages about humanity and corruption in relation to pardons, we should review the question a bit.

I ask Coke whether he is an intimate of ex-convict P.J. Snorts of Brazoria County. I ask Coke whether he ever discussed any pardon with P.J. Snorts of Brazoria County. I ask Coke whether his brother ever received a check from anyone at the suggestion of P.J. Snorts of Brazoria County. Let him speak. I shall not ask Coke Stevenson to produce any picture of ex-convict P.J. Snorts of Brazoria County leaving the Governor's mansion before or after 8 o'clock in the morning when Coke normally has coffee.

We all know that checks are funny things and used for many purposes. We all know that lawyers can write checks for legal fees without a bank clerk giving it other than a routine glance. But I ask Coke whether he and his brother are willing to let one million voters see photostats of their income tax returns. These returns are secret and closed to me. These returns are secret and closed to you. But these returns may be obtained by Coke Stevenson and by his brother Jimmy and by ex-convict P.J. Snorts of Brazoria County.

At the risk of boring you, let us hasten on a bit. All men that have been in office 30 years have collected friends both secret and

public. Outside of Jim Ferguson it is questionable whether there has been a more popular visitor to barbecues than hand-shaking Coke. He always dresses and acts as honest Coke. But what is his manner in the Adolphus and the Baker hotels in Dallas? What does he do and say in the upper suites where men meet to plan what is to come before it comes? Well, many hundreds of men who meet in suites in the Baker and the Adolphus at Dallas, in the Menger at San Antonio, in the Lamar at Houston, can testify to the genial, to the business-like, and completely keen mind of Coke Stevenson.

Coke Stevenson knows the language of the Texas Power and Light Co. Coke Stevenson intimately called by first names those in control of the Rio Grande Valley Power set-up.

Certainly Coke has always been a welcome guest where Railroad lobbyists met. They like his style of pitching. He makes no bones about anything. In private, in hotel suites, he has generally been found to be trustworthy regardless of what he might say when campaigning. His word has always been taken as his bond in private merchandising. Men have often said that they would rather take Coke's private word in preference to his public utterances. These big boys have always banked on Coke.

It brings to my mind a testimonial dinner given Coke when he was Lieutenant Governor, in Dallas. The whole thing was put on by the public relations crowd of the Rio Grande Valley set-up. They paid all the bills.

Many most excellent men--the leaders of utilities, railroads, the banks that center in Houston--rose to present him. But it did not cost Coke a cent. The Rio Grande paid off for this one.

Since a man should be known for the company he keeps, it becomes easy to see why Coke's first returns showed the trend of his slight margin in the first primary. He got the votes from the big homes in Dallas, Houston, Fort Worth, and San Antonio. Look at it yourselves--Alamo Heights (San Antonio); Highland Park and River Cliff (Dallas); River Oaks (Houston);

(Fort Worth). These intelligent voters know Coke is reliable and that his private word is his bond--even those in charge of the Magnolia Building at Dallas know that his private word is his bond.

So who are we to know whether Coke, the sheep man, ever wears wool

clothes when humanity is at stake. and when the young veterans and the veterans wives go to the polls August 28, shall they remember the story

of Little Red Ridinghood? For Coke undoubtedly has the best technique since a long time ago among those who say, "The better to see you with, my dear." But these young people who are fighting the grim fight for housing and food and their fathers and mothers and grandparents who are fighting the grim fight for high cost of living, may wonder whether Coke has time for them--their pensions (old age) or their veterans' rights. I, of another generation perhaps, have no right to criticize Coke, the successful politician of a yesteryear. He can not quarrel with success. We may be needing a change.

September 25, 1948

*Sydney Johnson*

Verify whether five man Court at Atlanta or three man as it used to be when CEM was active and knew about these things.

Whichever it is, he wants to recheck the mentality of all three or five to determine in advance whether Hutcheson gets a unanimous Court decision against Johnson on October fourth. If he decides Hutcheson can not get a unanimous decision (which is quite possible if a five man Court) he will know that we have a final appeal to Justice Black for a Supreme Court stay against the injunction. This must come on October fifth and Black's mind must be prepared in advance to catch the ball and his decision should be written in his mind for him by virtue of presenting to him in advance all the facts. This will be done by and the sooner the better after we have checked the Atlanta set-up on October fourth. If the probabilities are a unanimous decision at Atlanta against Johnson, there is no use in bothering about it for Washington, for the whole thing stops at Atlanta and Johnson is out judicially with only a month to go.

NOTES:

*Lyndon Johnson*

THE DESCENT OF MAN: Editorial regarding the career of Dan Moody which will take him from the flaming defender of the rights of individuals threatened by Ku Kluxers to the 1948 edition-the defender of those who would see the ruin of the Democratic Party which so honored him. The Descent of Man--two decades covering the rise and fall of a former Governor.

\* \* \* \* \*

Record of Dan Moody and Stevenson in Duval County in their races.

\* \* \* \* \*

Record of vote in Duval County the last 20 years.

\* \* \* \* \*

Squealers, Polecats, and turncoat Democrats who want Dewey to win and who met in secret during war to snafoo a war President.

September 26, 1948

Lyndon B. Johnson

Whereas on September 13th the state Democratic Executive Committee duly met at Fort Worth, Texas, to canvass the returns of the 1948 Primary; and whereas after duly canvassing the August 28th Primary results as certified by each of the county chairmen of the state, the state Democratic Executive Committee certified Lyndon B. Johnson as the nominee of the Democratic Party for the office of United States Senator from Texas; and whereas on the following day the state Convention duly assembled, at Fort Worth, Texas, through its canvassing committee, the chairman of the state Democratic committee, did lawfully certify to the secretary of state of the state of Texas, the name of Lyndon B. Johnson as the Democratic nominee for the office of United States Senator.

Notwithstanding this action by the lawfully designated bodies with power to so act under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of Texas, a federal Judge has enjoined the secretary of state and the election boards of all 254 counties in Texas from placing on the ballot for the general election, the duly elected and certified nominee of the Democratic Party in violation and in contempt of the Constitution and laws of the United States and the laws of Texas; whereas in the years of American jurisprudence there is not one single instance where a federal Judge has usurped the powers of the state and taken unto himself the responsibility of naming a United States Senator, and whereas it is abundantly clear under the Constitution and laws of the United States that the United States Senate and not the federal courts is the final authority to determine its own membership, therefore be it resolved by this Executive Committee and the individual members thereof, that we are in contempt of the actions taken by this federal Judge in contempt of the constitutional laws of the United States and of the state of Texas; and whereas Texas has always been a defender and an ardent exponent of states rights, we deplore the action of the Governor of this state, the Attorney General

of this state, and the secretary of state in permitting the democratic processes to be usurped by a federal Judge without so much as raising a voice to protect the rights and privileges of the Democratic Party and the rights reserved to the state of Texas by the Constitution and laws of the United States. We recognize that the Governor, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State are courageous state officials, all Democrats. We recognize that no nominee duly certified by this committee has ever been refused the right to have his name placed on the ballot in the general election by any Secretary of State. We therefore strongly recommend that the Secretary of State and the other lawfully designated Democratic officials and officers of this state, take such steps as are necessary to place the name of the man duly elected and certified by this committee on the ballot in the general election for the office of United States Senator from Texas and that they resist to the utmost the attempt of a federal Judge to usurp the powers and rights of the state of Texas and of the United States Senate to name a United States Senator from Texas. And further should any presumptuous act be taken by any federal Judge to prevent by imprisonment a state official from certifying the nominee of this committee for the office of United States Senator, that this committee shall be empowered to raise funds for his defense through habeas corpus, and, if necessary, to obtain through actions in state courts his physical release by the use of the Texas Rangers.

OR

And further should any presumptuous act by a federal Judge cause any bodily restraint through a United States Marshall or any other agent of the court to certify the duly elected and certified nominee of the Democratic Party, that it be recommended to Governor Jester that he call out the Texas Rangers to protect the body and the freedom of the Texas citizen from any United States Marshall.

INSERT TO JOHNSON ANNOUNCEMENT:

So now Sunday I see by the papers that the federal Judge injunction of Davidson has been footballed to Atlanta, Georgia, for a two day too late decision. The men who would not put the original squeal before a state court have started this awful train of injustice to the sovereignty of one million Texas voters.

With a remedy for erring at Austin five Judges--four of whom must vote in absolute ignorance--will follow Hutcheson somewhere.

But the remedy is really within the people of the state of Texas. The state of Texas has never taken anything lying down from federal robed Judges in ignorance. If this be contempt of the federal court I am willing to take the rap for the sovereignty of Texas and its right to send its own representative to the bar of the United States Senate where there is another remedy for any squealer, or any Republican, or any Dewey well-wisher who wants a one vote victory for Republicans to organize there a Republican solidity in foreign affairs and in domestic financial policies through control of the Finance Committee of the Senate. So Wall Street will win perhaps under judicial federal robes as will Dewey if he is elected. These stakes are very great. I leave them to the voters of this state, and to the state Democratic committee who has certified me as the nominee. If and when elected November 4th I shall face the bar of the Senate of the U.S. to be sworn to serve my native Texas for six years. If the cards fall the other way through federal judicial injunction, I shall not in good and with a smile, hating nobody, go on within Texas as a citizen here.



September 25, 1948

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LYNDON JOHNSON AFTER TRUMAN PASSES THROUGH:

Naturally Mrs. Johnson and I remained in Austin to be Tenth District hosts to President and Mrs. Truman.

We enjoyed their visit very much. We are leaving now for a rest in west Texas to prepare for the duties which we will have to face.

I wish all my friends and the state's friends to recognize the honesty and good intent of Federal Judge Davidson.

I point out to those who have been rather violent in speaking to me of judicial interference through injunction in Texas, that this is a democratic country and that anyone is entitled to seek redress at law.

The fact that no one before has fought a Federal injunction in an effort to supersede the authority of the state central committee in certifying the validity of the Party primary result, does not supersede the right of Governor Stevenson to complain to a Federal Judge.

The fact that Governor Stevenson is well acquainted with many persons in Duval County and has been for 20 years, does not overcome his right through his own experience to complain this time of those whose favors he so frantically and willingly sought in recent years.

The vote for Stevenson for Governor in 19    shows these precincts of which he is complaining 460 and his opponent 2. The same precinct on the second election gave Stevenson                      and his opponent                      .

The fact that ex-Governor Dan Moody appeared before the Federal Court seeking an injunction against alleged frauds in Duval County does not warrant the statement that he has forgotten the details of his own races for Governor and Attorney General. In 19 Moody

got and his opponent got . When Moody ran in 19  
 against Ferguson, Moody got and Ferguson got . When  
 Whitfield Davidson, the Federal Judge granting this fishing inves-  
 tigation, ran for Governor in 19 , the voting score was against

Texas people who have lived even two years in this state, have  
 recognized that the Spanish-American groups seek leadership and  
 voted almost in blocks and always have. If this constitutes a novel  
 procedure then the Federal Judge Davidson, the complaining Stevenson,  
 and the prosecuting Moody seem unusually blind to a set of facts  
 for which all except Stevenson have been beautifully rewarded in  
 their own campaigns for state-wide office.

There is no reason for going into the broad justice and rights  
 of a set of facts. Certainly Lyndon Johnson six years ago, running  
 for the United States Senate, felt Saturday night that his 15,000  
 lead against candidate O'Daniel was equivalent to nomination. The  
 final certified returns gave O'Daniel the Party's nomination by  
 about 1300 votes.

I merely submit, "Did Lyndon Johnson squeal?"

To all my friends I say, "Let's be calm. It is inconceivable  
 that Judge Davidson does not know the above facts. Certainly I  
 have heard no one who has ever said that Federal Judge Davidson was  
 stupid; I have certainly heard no one that has ever said that Circuit  
 Court Judge Hutchison was uninformed on political matters in Texas.

So I say with confidence as I leave on a short rest, that no  
 Federal injunction will prevent my friends voting for the Democratic  
 candidate Lyndon Johnson on November second.

September 25, 1948

SUGGESTION:

Drew Pearson might want to make a small speculation on Dewey appointments to the Supreme Court after the elections.

A perpetual candidate for the Supreme Court and from Texas circles sometimes spoken of as a probable appointment as the Chief Justice, has been Circuit Court Judge Hutcheson.

Hutcheson has enjoyed a reputation of being an extremely forceful personality, generally carrying other Judges' opinions in his vest pocket relating to all matters relating to Texas.

Hutcheson will preside October fourth at the opening fall meeting of the southern Circuit Court. He has announced his first order of business will be to decide

Informed circles have picked Hutcheson for both Democratic and Republican endorsements to Dewey, should Dewey's expected election occur. Prominent financial and political interests consider him safe and able.

September 25, 1948

Verify whether five man Court at Atlanta or three man as it used to be when CEM was active and knew about these things.

Whichever it is, he wants to recheck the mentality of all three or five to determine in advance whether Hutcheson gets a unanimous Court decision against Johnson on October fourth. If he decides Hutcheson can not get a unanimous decision (which is quite possible if a five man Court) he will know that we have a final appeal to Justice Black for a Supreme Court stay against the injunction. This must come on October fifth and Black's mind must be prepared in advance to catch the ball and his decision should be written in his mind for him by virtue of presenting to him in advance all the facts. This will be done by and the sooner the better after we have checked the Atlanta set-up on October fourth. If the probabilities are a unanimous decision at Atlanta against Johnson, there is no use in bothering about it for Washington, for the whole thing stops at Atlanta and Johnson is out judicially with only a month to go.

September 25, 1948

## STATES RIGHTS VERSUS LEGAL ROBES

Resolution State Committee will say:

- 1- Federal injunction has stunk in the noses of labor for thirty years. Restriction by law of the rights of human beings by corrupt or narrow and prejudiced judges.
- 2- Now the revival of Federal injunction in new and strange manner is not only affecting individuals but also state.

Rule by injunction is issue. Texas always has been a defender of states rights. This committee, the highest judicial body in the Democratic Party, is more than indignant at this attempt to rule by injunction by federal courts.

We strongly recommend action by Secretary of State Brown certifying Johnson as candidate in the elections November second.

We recognize that Secretary of State Brown is a courageous state official appointed by the Governor--both Democrats. No nominee certified by this committee has ever been refused by any Secretary of State to be on the ballot.

It is unthinkable that Brown will not pay any attention to any injunction whether it comes from District, Appellate, or Supreme Court Judges.

Texas is supreme in its own rights. Only the Senate of the United States has any right to judge after a Senator is seated. No one in judicial robes has any rights to interfere.

September 25, 1948

## STATES RIGHTS VERSUS LEGAL ROBES

Resolution State Committee will say:

- 1- Federal injunction has stunk in the noses of labor for thirty years. Restriction by law of the rights of human beings by corrupt or narrow and prejudiced judges.
- 2- Now the revival of Federal injunction in new and strange manner is not only affecting individuals but also state.

Rule by injunction is issue. Texas always has been a defender of states rights. This committee, the highest judicial body in the Democratic Party, is more than indignant at this attempt to rule by injunction by federal courts.

We strongly recommend action by Secretary of State Brown certifying Johnson as candidate in the elections November second.

We recognize that Secretary of State Brown is a courageous state official appointed by the Governor--both Democrats. No nominee certified by this committee has ever been refused by any Secretary of State to be on the ballot.

It is unthinkable that Brown will not pay any attention to any injunction whether it comes from District, Appellate, or Supreme Court Judges.

Texas is supreme in its own rights. Only the Senate of the United States has any right to judge after a Senator is seated. No one in judicial robes has any rights to interfere.

September 25, 1948

Verify whether five man Court at Atlanta or three man as it used to be when CEM was active and knew about these things.

Whichever it is, he wants to recheck the mentality of all three or five to determine in advance whether Hutcheson gets a unanimous Court decision against Johnson on October fourth. If he decides Hutcheson can not get a unanimous decision (which is quite possible if a five man Court) he will know that we have a final appeal to Justice Black for a Supreme Court stay against the injunction. This must come on October fifth and Black's mind must be prepared in advance to catch the ball and his decision should be written in his mind for him by virtue of presenting to him in advance all the facts. This will be done by and the sooner the better after we have checked the Atlanta set-up on October fourth. If the probabilities are a unanimous decision at Atlanta against Johnson, there is no use in bothering about it for Washington, for the whole thing stops at Atlanta and Johnson is out judicially with only a month to go.

September 25, 1948

SUGGESTION:

Drew Pearson might want to make a small speculation on Dewey appointments to the Supreme Court after the elections.

A perpetual candidate for the Supreme Court and from Texas circles sometimes spoken of as a probable appointment as the Chief Justice, has been Circuit Court Judge Hutcheson.

Hutcheson has enjoyed a reputation of being an extremely forceful personality, generally carrying other Judges' opinions in his vest pocket relating to all matters relating to Texas.

Hutcheson will preside October fourth at the opening fall meeting of the southern Circuit Court. He has announced his first order of business will be to decide

Informed circles have picked Hutcheson for both Democratic and Republican endorsements to Dewey, should Dewey's expected election occur. Prominent financial and political interests consider him safe and able.



September 25, 1948

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LYNDON JOHNSON AFTER TRUMAN PASSES THROUGH

Naturally Mrs. Johnson and I remained in Austin to be Tenth District hosts to President and Mrs. Truman.

We enjoyed their visit very much. We are leaving now for a rest in west Texas to prepare for the duties which we will have to face.

I wish all my friends and the state's friends to recognize the honesty and good intent of Federal Judge Davidson.

I point out to those who have been rather violent in speaking to me of judicial interference through injunction in Texas, that this is a democratic country and that anyone is entitled to seek redress at law.

The fact that no one before has fought a Federal injunction in an effort to supersede the authority of the state central committee in certifying the validity of the Party primary result, does not supersede the right of Governor Stevenson to complain to a Federal Judge.

The fact that Governor Stevenson is well acquainted with many persons in Duval County and has been for 20 years, does not overcome his right through his own experience to complain this time of those whose favors he so frantically and willingly sought in recent years.

The vote for Stevenson for Governor in 19      shows these precincts of which he is complaining 460 and his opponent 2. The same precinct on the second election gave Stevenson      and his opponent

The fact that ex-Governor Dan Moody appeared before the Federal Court seeking an injunction against alleged frauds in Duval County does not warrant the statement that he has forgotten the details of his own races for Governor and Attorney General. In 19 Moody

got and his opponent got . When Moody ran in 19  
 against Ferguson, Moody got and Ferguson got . When  
 Whitfield Davidson, the Federal Judge granting this fishing inves-  
 tigation, ran for Governor in 19 , the voting score was against

Texas people who have lived even two years in this state, have  
 recognized that the Spanish-American groups seek leadership and  
 voted almost in blocks and always have. If this constitutes a novel  
 procedure then the Federal Judge Davidson, the complaining Stevenson,  
 and the prosecuting Moody seem unusually blind to a set of facts  
 for which all except Stevenson have been beautifully rewarded in  
 their own campaigns for state-wide office.

There is no reason for going into the broad justice and rights  
 of a set of facts. Certainly Lyndon Johnson six years ago, running  
 for the United States Senate, felt Saturday night that his 15,000  
 lead against candidate O'Daniel was equivalent to nomination. The  
 final certified returns gave O'Daniel the Party's nomination by  
 about 1300 votes.

I merely submit, "Did Lyndon Johnson squeal?"

To all my friends I say, "Let's be calm. It is inconceivable  
 that Judge Davidson does not know the above facts. Certainly I  
 have heard no one who has ever said that Federal Judge Davidson was  
 stupid; I have certainly heard no one that has ever said that Circuit  
 Court Judge Hutchison was uninformed on political matters in Texas.

So I say with confidence as I leave on a short rest, that no  
 Federal injunction will prevent my friends voting for the Democratic  
 candidate Lyndon Johnson on November second.

INSERT TO JOHNSON ANNOUNCEMENT:

So now Sunday I see by the papers that the federal Judge injunction of Davidson has been footballed to Atlanta, Georgia, for a two day too late decision. The men who would not put the original squeal before a state court have started this awful train of injustice to the sovereignty of one million Texas voters.

With a remedy for erring at Austin five Judges--four of whom must vote in absolute ignorance--will follow Hutcheson somewhere.

But the remedy is really within the people of the state of Texas. The state of Texas has never taken anything lying down from federal robed Judges in ignorance. If this be contempt of the federal court I am willing to take the rap for the sovereignty of Texas and its right to send its own representative to the bar of the United States Senate where there is another remedy for any squealer, or any Republican, or any Dewey well-wisher who wants a one vote victory for Republicans to organize there a Republican solidity in foreign affairs and in domestic financial policies through control of the Finance Committee of the Senate. So Wall Street will win perhaps under judicial federal robes as will Dewey if he is elected. These stakes are very great. I leave them to the voters of this state, and to the state Democratic committee who has certified me as the nominee. If and when elected November 4th I shall face the bar of the Senate of the U.S. to be sworn to serve my native Texas for six years. If the cards fall the other way through federal judicial injunction, I shall meet in good and with a smile, hating nobody, go on within Texas as a citizen here.

CEM:

When you see Tom Gooch:

Taft-Hartley open shop employers Dallas County--a real  
crusade.

# Lyndon Johnson

## DISTRICT I.

| COUNTIES  | JOHNSON |          | STEVENSON |          | FEDDY |          |
|-----------|---------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|----------|
|           | Votes   | Per Cent | Votes     | Per Cent | Votes | Per Cent |
| Bowie     | 2,310   | 26.5     | 4,671     | 53.4     | 1,756 | 20.1     |
| Cass      | 1,061   | 31.3     | 1,650     | 48.7     | 676   | 20.0     |
| Delta     | 927     | 34.4     | 1,179     | 43.6     | 595   | 22.0     |
| Franklin  | 597     | 31.0     | 806       | 41.0     | 552   | 28.0     |
| Harrison  | 2,640   | 41.3     | 2,593     | 40.5     | 1,162 | 18.2     |
| Hopkins   | 1,774   | 30.6     | 2,779     | 47.9     | 1,247 | 21.5     |
| Lamar     | 2,795   | 36.4     | 3,900     | 50.8     | 979   | 12.8     |
| Marion    | 755     | 52.1     | 529       | 36.5     | 165   | 11.4     |
| Morris    | 666     | 34.9     | 656       | 34.3     | 588   | 30.8     |
| Red River | 1,375   | 29.8     | 2,153     | 46.6     | 1,088 | 23.6     |
| Titus     | 1,215   | 34.1     | 1,598     | 43.7     | 813   | 22.2     |
| Totals    | 16,145  | 33.5     | 22,514    | 46.6     | 9,621 | 19.9     |

## DISTRICT II.

|               |        |      |        |      |        |      |
|---------------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| Angelina      | 2,539  | 29.1 | 3,588  | 41.2 | 2,591  | 29.7 |
| Hardin        | 1,129  | 33.7 | 1,368  | 40.9 | 857    | 25.4 |
| Jasper        | 603    | 19.4 | 1,361  | 43.7 | 1,153  | 36.9 |
| Jefferson     | 9,742  | 43.1 | 9,093  | 40.2 | 3,794  | 16.7 |
| Liberty       | 666    | 13.9 | 1,799  | 37.7 | 2,318  | 48.4 |
| Newton        | 266    | 16.7 | 698    | 43.7 | 634    | 39.6 |
| Orange        | 1,052  | 17.1 | 3,313  | 53.8 | 1,788  | 29.1 |
| Sabine        | 375    | 16.9 | 532    | 23.9 | 1,315  | 59.2 |
| San Augustine | 543    | 24.3 | 635    | 28.3 | 1,063  | 47.4 |
| Shelby        | 339    | 6.9  | 543    | 10.9 | 4,111  | 82.2 |
| Tyler         | 415    | 21.9 | 744    | 39.3 | 736    | 38.8 |
| Totals        | 17,669 | 28.6 | 23,674 | 38.4 | 20,360 | 33.0 |

## DISTRICT III.

|           |        |      |        |      |        |      |
|-----------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| Camp      | 543    | 28.7 | 763    | 40.3 | 589    | 31.0 |
| Gregg     | 3,958  | 44.7 | 3,592  | 40.6 | 1,237  | 14.0 |
| Panola    | 915    | 20.1 | 738    | 16.1 | 2,969  | 64.3 |
| Rusk      | 1,733  | 19.2 | 4,988  | 55.0 | 2,346  | 25.8 |
| Smith     | 3,634  | 32.5 | 4,709  | 42.0 | 2,864  | 25.5 |
| Upshur    | 1,781  | 38.9 | 1,720  | 37.6 | 1,075  | 23.5 |
| Van Zandt | 2,183  | 39.7 | 1,483  | 27.0 | 1,832  | 33.3 |
| Wood      | 1,587  | 33.7 | 1,929  | 40.9 | 1,198  | 25.4 |
| Totals    | 16,334 | 32.5 | 19,922 | 39.5 | 14,110 | 28.0 |

## DISTRICT IV.

|          |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|----------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Collin.. | 2,124  | 32.1 | 3,038  | 45.8 | 1,466 | 22.1 |
| Fannin   | 3,106  | 41.6 | 2,965  | 39.7 | 1,392 | 18.7 |
| Grayson  | 4,153  | 34.7 | 5,763  | 48.0 | 2,079 | 17.3 |
| Hunt     | 1,836  | 27.9 | 3,292  | 49.8 | 1,473 | 22.3 |
| Kaufman  | 1,796  | 31.5 | 2,738  | 48.0 | 1,168 | 20.5 |
| Rains    | 482    | 36.9 | 463    | 35.5 | 361   | 27.6 |
| Rockwall | 567    | 37.9 | 486    | 32.6 | 440   | 29.5 |
| Totals   | 14,064 | 34.2 | 18,745 | 45.5 | 8,379 | 20.3 |

## DISTRICT V.

|        |        |      |        |      |        |      |
|--------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| Dallas | 21,020 | 32.0 | 30,315 | 46.0 | 14,521 | 22.0 |
|--------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|

DISTRICT VI.

| <u>COUNTIES</u> | <u>JOHNSON</u> |                 | <u>STEVENSON</u> |                 | <u>PEDDY</u>  |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|
|                 | <u>VOTES</u>   | <u>PER CENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u>     | <u>PER CENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u>  | <u>PER CENT</u> |
| Brazos          | 1,915          | 35.9            | 1,699            | 31.9            | 1,711         | 32.2            |
| Ellis           | 2,286          | 32.3            | 2,941            | 41.5            | 1,859         | 26.2            |
| Freesburg       | 990            | 27.6            | 1,664            | 46.4            | 932           | 26.0            |
| Hill            | 2,453          | 37.7            | 2,470            | 38.0            | 1,573         | 24.3            |
| Lea             | 683            | 29.3            | 957              | 40.9            | 699           | 29.8            |
| Limestone       | 1,953          | 37.6            | 1,990            | 38.3            | 1,257         | 24.1            |
| Navarro         | 2,013          | 28.8            | 3,371            | 48.2            | 1,609         | 23.0            |
| Robertson       | 1,104          | 31.8            | 1,242            | 35.7            | 1,133         | 32.5            |
| Totals          | <u>13,397</u>  | 33.1            | <u>16,334</u>    | 40.3            | <u>10,773</u> | 26.6            |

DISTRICT VII.

|             |              |      |               |      |               |      |
|-------------|--------------|------|---------------|------|---------------|------|
| Anderson    | 1,214        | 19.5 | 2,924         | 46.7 | 2,114         | 33.8 |
| Cherokee    | 1,302        | 25.2 | 2,520         | 48.5 | 1,365         | 26.3 |
| Grimes      | 388          | 22.2 | 650           | 37.1 | 713           | 40.7 |
| Henderson   | 2,001        | 31.5 | 2,531         | 39.9 | 1,822         | 28.6 |
| Houston     | 894          | 21.2 | 1,739         | 41.1 | 1,595         | 37.7 |
| Madison     | 354          | 20.4 | 818           | 47.1 | 564           | 32.5 |
| Montgomery  | 766          | 17.0 | 1,669         | 37.1 | 2,069         | 45.9 |
| Nacogdoches | 927          | 14.5 | 1,995         | 31.0 | 3,512         | 54.5 |
| Polk        | 649          | 21.9 | 1,281         | 43.1 | 1,038         | 35.0 |
| San Jacinto | 209          | 22.0 | 329           | 34.6 | 412           | 43.4 |
| Trinity     | 373          | 19.6 | 744           | 39.1 | 787           | 41.3 |
| Walker      | 921          | 29.2 | 1,330         | 42.0 | 911           | 28.8 |
| Totals      | <u>9,998</u> | 22.0 | <u>18,530</u> | 40.8 | <u>16,902</u> | 37.2 |

DISTRICT VIII.

|        |        |      |        |      |        |      |
|--------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| Harris | 21,175 | 21.9 | 31,062 | 32.0 | 44,760 | 46.1 |
|--------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|

DISTRICT IX.

|           |               |      |               |      |               |      |
|-----------|---------------|------|---------------|------|---------------|------|
| Austin    | 581           | 20.5 | 1,502         | 52.9 | 756           | 26.6 |
| Brazoria  | 910           | 18.7 | 2,002         | 40.9 | 1,975         | 40.4 |
| Calhoun   | 121           | 18.9 | 312           | 48.7 | 208           | 32.4 |
| Chambers  | 370           | 22.1 | 792           | 47.0 | 521           | 30.9 |
| Colorado  | 654           | 22.6 | 1,102         | 38.0 | 1,141         | 39.4 |
| Fayette   | 2,100         | 40.4 | 1,958         | 37.6 | 1,139         | 22.0 |
| Fort Bend | 670           | 23.9 | 1,116         | 39.9 | 1,010         | 36.2 |
| Galveston | 3,149         | 22.7 | 8,621         | 62.1 | 2,115         | 15.2 |
| Goliad    | 221           | 20.8 | 626           | 59.0 | 214           | 20.2 |
| Jackson   | 510           | 24.6 | 745           | 36.0 | 815           | 39.4 |
| Lavaca    | 1,293         | 29.8 | 1,863         | 42.9 | 1,189         | 27.3 |
| Matagorda | 283           | 18.4 | 699           | 45.2 | 562           | 36.4 |
| Victoria  | 504           | 15.5 | 929           | 28.4 | 1,832         | 56.1 |
| Waller    | 300           | 17.6 | 590           | 34.5 | 818           | 47.9 |
| Wharton   | 1,430         | 34.5 | 1,519         | 36.6 | 1,202         | 28.9 |
| Totals    | <u>13,096</u> | 24.8 | <u>24,376</u> | 45.9 | <u>15,497</u> | 29.3 |

DISTRICT X.

|            |               |      |               |      |              |      |
|------------|---------------|------|---------------|------|--------------|------|
| Bastrop    | 2,797         | 69.9 | 911           | 22.9 | 286          | 7.2  |
| Blanco     | 694           | 75.9 | 179           | 19.3 | 38           | 4.3  |
| Burleson   | 1,761         | 57.5 | 679           | 22.2 | 623          | 20.3 |
| Burnet     | 1,970         | 77.4 | 460           | 18.1 | 114          | 4.5  |
| Caldwell   | 2,570         | 67.7 | 901           | 23.8 | 321          | 8.5  |
| Hays       | 2,593         | 77.9 | 578           | 17.4 | 158          | 4.7  |
| Lee        | 1,730         | 61.9 | 800           | 28.7 | 259          | 9.4  |
| Trevis     | 17,481        | 63.2 | 7,316         | 26.5 | 2,854        | 10.3 |
| Washington | 2,545         | 51.6 | 1,817         | 36.8 | 590          | 11.6 |
| Williamson | 4,825         | 68.1 | 1,822         | 25.8 | 486          | 6.1  |
| Totals     | <u>38,966</u> | 64.8 | <u>15,463</u> | 25.8 | <u>5,649</u> | 9.4  |

DISTRICT XI.

| COUNTIES | JOHNSON |          | STEVENSON |          | PEDDY |          |
|----------|---------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|----------|
|          | VOTES   | PER CENT | VOTES     | PER CENT | VOTES | PER CENT |
| Bell     | 2,733   | 38.7     | 3,065     | 43.3     | 1,275 | 18.0     |
| Bosque   | 1,234   | 34.5     | 1,681     | 46.8     | 684   | 18.7     |
| Coryell  | 1,467   | 45.5     | 1,260     | 39.1     | 495   | 15.4     |
| Falls    | 1,429   | 33.9     | 1,808     | 43.9     | 983   | 22.2     |
| McLellan | 8,760   | 44.5     | 7,377     | 37.5     | 3,532 | 18.0     |
| Milam    | 1,689   | 33.5     | 2,210     | 43.9     | 1,136 | 22.6     |
| Totals   | 17,312  | 40.4     | 17,401    | 40.6     | 8,105 | 19.0     |

DISTRICT XII.

|            |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|------------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Hood       | 487    | 24.7 | 1,018  | 51.7 | 465   | 23.6 |
| Johnson    | 1,565  | 32.2 | 2,453  | 50.5 | 842   | 17.3 |
| Parker     | 1,223  | 32.8 | 1,854  | 49.6 | 663   | 17.6 |
| Somerville | 190    | 24.1 | 360    | 45.3 | 243   | 30.6 |
| Tarrant    | 16,873 | 36.0 | 23,063 | 49.2 | 6,957 | 14.8 |
| Totals     | 20,338 | 34.9 | 28,748 | 49.4 | 9,170 | 15.7 |

DISTRICT XIII.

|              |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|--------------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Archer       | 1,158  | 55.7 | 701    | 33.9 | 215   | 10.4 |
| Baylor       | 835    | 44.6 | 749    | 39.9 | 291   | 15.5 |
| Clay         | 1,282  | 48.4 | 976    | 36.9 | 388   | 14.7 |
| Cooke        | 1,048  | 23.2 | 2,637  | 58.2 | 850   | 18.6 |
| Denton       | 1,863  | 27.1 | 3,576  | 52.1 | 1,426 | 20.8 |
| Foard        | 280    | 32.5 | 500    | 56.3 | 102   | 11.2 |
| Hardeman     | 633    | 39.2 | 677    | 41.8 | 308   | 19.0 |
| Jack         | 901    | 41.5 | 841    | 38.8 | 428   | 19.7 |
| Knox         | 1,003  | 43.6 | 943    | 40.9 | 356   | 15.5 |
| Montague     | 1,516  | 45.9 | 1,329  | 40.3 | 455   | 13.8 |
| Throckmorton | 590    | 49.4 | 398    | 33.3 | 206   | 17.3 |
| Wichita      | 7,370  | 55.5 | 4,788  | 35.9 | 1,146 | 8.6  |
| Wilbarger    | 1,067  | 35.6 | 1,534  | 51.3 | 391   | 13.1 |
| Wise         | 1,375  | 36.7 | 1,350  | 36.0 | 1,021 | 27.3 |
| Young        | 1,953  | 52.1 | 1,318  | 35.2 | 477   | 12.7 |
| Totals       | 22,874 | 43.0 | 22,317 | 41.9 | 8,060 | 15.1 |

DISTRICT XIV.

|              |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|--------------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Aransas      | 373    | 36.5 | 461    | 45.2 | 187   | 18.3 |
| Atascosa     | 1,298  | 44.0 | 1,316  | 44.6 | 335   | 11.4 |
| Bee          | 1,054  | 35.8 | 1,269  | 43.1 | 621   | 21.1 |
| Brooks       | 566    | 56.4 | 275    | 28.0 | 151   | 15.6 |
| Comal        | 887    | 31.3 | 1,572  | 55.5 | 375   | 13.2 |
| DeWitt       | 1,047  | 29.4 | 1,806  | 50.6 | 712   | 20.0 |
| Duval        | 3,731  | 86.0 | 599    | 13.8 | 10    | 0.2  |
| Gonzales     | 1,364  | 33.6 | 2,077  | 51.1 | 622   | 15.3 |
| Guadalupe    | 488    | 35.3 | 733    | 55.9 | 121   | 8.8  |
| Jim Wells    | 1,876  | 49.7 | 1,348  | 35.7 | 551   | 14.6 |
| Karnes       | 1,578  | 48.2 | 1,240  | 37.9 | 456   | 13.9 |
| Kenedy       | 7      | 11.7 | 46     | 76.6 | 7     | 11.7 |
| Kleberg      | 1,039  | 34.9 | 1,379  | 46.3 | 560   | 18.8 |
| Live Oak     | 563    | 34.8 | 729    | 45.0 | 327   | 20.2 |
| McMullen     | 134    | 41.0 | 156    | 47.7 | 37    | 11.3 |
| Nueces       | 8,372  | 53.3 | 4,656  | 29.7 | 2,673 | 17.0 |
| Refugio      | 156    | 30.1 | 187    | 36.1 | 175   | 33.8 |
| San Patricio | 2,040  | 52.1 | 1,243  | 32.5 | 604   | 15.4 |
| Wilson       | 1,835  | 50.1 | 1,520  | 41.5 | 310   | 8.4  |
| Totals       | 28,408 | 47.4 | 22,652 | 37.8 | 8,834 | 14.8 |

DISTRICT XV.

| <u>COUNTIES</u> | <u>JOHNSON</u> |                 | <u>STEVENSON</u> |                | <u>PEDDY</u> |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|
|                 | <u>VOTES</u>   | <u>PER CENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u>     | <u>PERCENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u> | <u>PER CENT</u> |
| Cameron         | 4,914          | 48.4            | 3,400            | 33.5           | 1,839        | 18.1            |
| Dimmitt         | 433            | 36.8            | 547              | 46.4           | 197          | 16.8            |
| Frio            | 430            | 40.9            | 488              | 46.4           | 133          | 12.7            |
| Hidalgo         | 5,398          | 47.0            | 4,371            | 38.2           | 1,703        | 14.8            |
| Jim Hogg        | 312            | 50.3            | 266              | 42.8           | 43           | 6.9             |
| LaSalle         | 525            | 55.3            | 338              | 35.6           | 86           | 9.1             |
| Maverick        | 388            | 47.9            | 336              | 41.5           | 86           | 10.6            |
| Medina          | 350            | 23.4            | 820              | 54.6           | 333          | 22.2            |
| Starr           | 2,212          | 91.0            | 153              | 6.3            | 63           | 2.7             |
| Webb            | 6,476          | 91.5            | 531              | 7.5            | 61           | 1.0             |
| Willacy         | 758            | 35.4            | 948              | 44.1           | 442          | 20.5            |
| Zapata          | 576            | 87.5            | 28               | 4.2            | 55           | 8.3             |
| Zavala          | 492            | 43.9            | 478              | 42.7           | 151          | 13.4            |
| Totals          | 23,264         | 56.6            | 12,704           | 30.9           | 5,142        | 12.5            |

DISTRICT XVI

|            |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|------------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Brewster   | 552    | 36.9 | 782    | 52.4 | 160   | 10.7 |
| Crane      | 374    | 38.4 | 516    | 52.8 | 86    | 8.8  |
| Crockett   | 170    | 30.2 | 360    | 63.8 | 34    | 6.0  |
| Culberson  | 49     | 41.2 | 59     | 49.6 | 11    | 9.2  |
| Ector      | 1,915  | 39.7 | 2,556  | 53.1 | 347   | 7.2  |
| El Paso    | 5,729  | 41.7 | 6,427  | 46.8 | 1,580 | 11.5 |
| Glasscock  | 97     | 31.1 | 198    | 63.5 | 17    | 5.4  |
| Hudspeth   | 186    | 39.5 | 241    | 51.2 | 44    | 9.3  |
| Jeff Davis | 97     | 26.8 | 197    | 54.6 | 67    | 18.6 |
| Loving     | 14     | 20.9 | 49     | 73.2 | 4     | 5.9  |
| Midland    | 921    | 27.0 | 1,837  | 53.8 | 656   | 19.2 |
| Pecos      | 650    | 31.8 | 1,289  | 62.8 | 111   | 5.4  |
| Presidio   | 280    | 31.4 | 540    | 60.8 | 69    | 7.8  |
| Reagan     | 165    | 38.6 | 228    | 53.5 | 34    | 7.9  |
| Reeves     | 500    | 32.7 | 914    | 59.2 | 123   | 8.1  |
| Terrell    | 104    | 19.0 | 304    | 56.1 | 135   | 24.9 |
| Upton      | 135    | 38.2 | 190    | 53.9 | 28    | 7.9  |
| Ward       | 705    | 30.4 | 1,403  | 60.0 | 221   | 9.6  |
| Winkler    | 617    | 30.0 | 1,253  | 61.0 | 187   | 9.0  |
| Totals     | 13,260 | 36.3 | 19,343 | 53.0 | 3,914 | 10.7 |

DISTRICT XVII

|             |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|-------------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Callahan    | 1,048  | 44.2 | 978    | 41.2 | 348   | 14.6 |
| Comanche    | 1,054  | 28.4 | 1,565  | 42.4 | 1,085 | 29.2 |
| Eastland    | 2,271  | 36.6 | 2,624  | 42.1 | 1,321 | 21.3 |
| Erath       | 1,480  | 31.0 | 2,149  | 45.0 | 1,132 | 24.0 |
| Fisher      | 518    | 27.3 | 948    | 50.0 | 432   | 22.7 |
| Hamilton    | 756    | 28.3 | 1,361  | 51.0 | 554   | 20.7 |
| Jones       | 2,078  | 50.2 | 1,574  | 38.1 | 484   | 11.7 |
| Nolan       | 1,673  | 43.5 | 1,652  | 42.3 | 551   | 14.2 |
| Palo Pinto  | 802    | 28.3 | 1,356  | 47.6 | 683   | 24.1 |
| Shackleford | 363    | 28.9 | 694    | 55.3 | 199   | 15.8 |
| Stephens    | 1,105  | 36.9 | 1,518  | 50.3 | 388   | 12.8 |
| Taylor      | 5,115  | 54.4 | 3,495  | 37.2 | 796   | 8.4  |
| Totals      | 18,263 | 39.4 | 19,914 | 43.3 | 7,973 | 17.3 |



DISTRICT XVIII.

| <u>COUNTIES</u> | <u>JOHNSON</u> |                 | <u>STEVENSON</u> |                 | <u>PEDDY</u> |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
|                 | <u>VOTES</u>   | <u>PER CENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u>     | <u>PER CENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u> | <u>PER CENT</u> |
| Armstrong       | 266            | 38.6            | 334              | 48.7            | 87           | 12.7            |
| Briscoe         | 212            | 26.3            | 491              | 61.0            | 102          | 12.7            |
| Carson          | 290            | 24.9            | 697              | 59.7            | 180          | 15.4            |
| Castro          | 486            | 34.6            | 811              | 57.6            | 110          | 7.8             |
| Childress       | 875            | 38.1            | 1,088            | 47.4            | 332          | 14.5            |
| Collingsworth   | 752            | 38.2            | 934              | 47.5            | 280          | 14.3            |
| Cottle          | 602            | 39.7            | 721              | 47.9            | 185          | 12.4            |
| Dallam          | 334            | 25.1            | 907              | 68.6            | 83           | 6.3             |
| Deaf Smith      | 416            | 20.5            | 1,187            | 59.0            | 416          | 20.5            |
| Donley          | 475            | 29.6            | 897              | 55.9            | 232          | 14.5            |
| Gray            | 1,022          | 23.3            | 2,714            | 61.7            | 661          | 15.0            |
| Hall            | 959            | 39.3            | 1,090            | 44.8            | 388          | 15.9            |
| Hansford        | 97             | 13.9            | 425              | 61.0            | 175          | 25.1            |
| Hartley         | 84             | 22.4            | 277              | 73.7            | 15           | 3.9             |
| Hemphill        | 379            | 37.2            | 551              | 54.2            | 88           | 8.6             |
| Hutchinson      | 2,871          | 51.0            | 2,339            | 41.5            | 420          | 7.5             |
| Lipscomb        | 178            | 31.0            | 372              | 64.7            | 25           | 4.3             |
| Moore           | 461            | 25.8            | 1,244            | 69.6            | 84           | 4.6             |
| Motley          | 281            | 29.0            | 597              | 61.6            | 92           | 9.4             |
| Ochiltree       | 268            | 20.5            | 908              | 69.0            | 138          | 10.5            |
| Oldham          | 248            | 49.2            | 220              | 43.7            | 36           | 7.1             |
| Parmer          | 325            | 25.4            | 782              | 61.1            | 173          | 13.5            |
| Potter          | 3,288          | 30.3            | 6,585            | 60.6            | 986          | 9.1             |
| Randall         | 789            | 28.7            | 1,697            | 62.0            | 255          | 9.3             |
| Roberts         | 38             | 8.9             | 351              | 81.8            | 40           | 9.3             |
| Sherman         | 125            | 22.3            | 409              | 72.6            | 29           | 5.1             |
| Swisher         | 500            | 27.8            | 1,043            | 59.7            | 220          | 12.5            |
| Wheeler         | 591            | 30.6            | 1,069            | 55.2            | 275          | 14.2            |
| Totals          | 17,212         | 31.8            | 30,740           | 56.8            | 6,107        | 11.4            |

DISTRICT XIX.

|           |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|-----------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Andrews   | 416    | 40.6 | 551    | 53.8 | 57    | 5.6  |
| Bailey    | 398    | 36.3 | 573    | 52.1 | 128   | 11.6 |
| Borden    | 35     | 26.6 | 83     | 62.8 | 14    | 10.6 |
| Cochran   | 454    | 36.1 | 644    | 51.2 | 160   | 12.7 |
| Crosby    | 1,211  | 55.6 | 686    | 31.5 | 282   | 12.9 |
| Dawson    | 1,502  | 44.5 | 1,425  | 42.3 | 442   | 13.2 |
| Dickens   | 841    | 67.8 | 229    | 18.4 | 171   | 13.8 |
| Floyd     | 1,004  | 36.9 | 1,368  | 50.4 | 342   | 12.7 |
| Gaines    | 598    | 32.4 | 1,063  | 57.4 | 189   | 10.2 |
| Garza     | 384    | 28.7 | 739    | 55.1 | 217   | 16.2 |
| Hale      | 1,453  | 29.4 | 2,654  | 53.6 | 842   | 17.0 |
| Haskell   | 1,495  | 43.8 | 1,275  | 37.3 | 647   | 18.9 |
| Hockley   | 1,835  | 52.9 | 1,430  | 41.2 | 204   | 5.9  |
| Howard    | 2,306  | 45.5 | 2,439  | 48.0 | 330   | 6.5  |
| Kent      | 278    | 51.3 | 213    | 39.3 | 51    | 9.4  |
| King      | 119    | 48.0 | 101    | 40.7 | 28    | 11.3 |
| Lamb      | 1,442  | 44.7 | 1,478  | 45.8 | 306   | 9.5  |
| Lubbock   | 6,397  | 52.9 | 4,290  | 35.6 | 1,391 | 11.5 |
| Lynn      | 1,069  | 40.8 | 1,173  | 44.8 | 378   | 14.4 |
| Martin    | 441    | 37.3 | 587    | 49.7 | 156   | 13.0 |
| Mitchell  | 830    | 34.2 | 1,282  | 52.8 | 316   | 13.0 |
| Scurry    | 774    | 33.6 | 1,032  | 44.8 | 498   | 21.6 |
| Stonewall | 566    | 51.9 | 365    | 33.4 | 160   | 14.7 |
| Terry     | 1,091  | 52.3 | 781    | 37.4 | 214   | 10.3 |
| Yoakum    | 387    | 37.7 | 566    | 55.0 | 75    | 7.3  |
| Totals    | 27,326 | 44.1 | 27,027 | 43.6 | 7,598 | 12.3 |

DISTRICT XX

| <u>COUNTIES</u> | <u>JOHNSON</u> |                 | <u>STEVENSON</u> |                 | <u>PEDDY</u> |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
|                 | <u>VOTES</u>   | <u>PER CENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u>     | <u>PER CENT</u> | <u>VOTES</u> | <u>PER CENT</u> |
| Bexar           | 11,994         | 28.7            | 23,471           | 56.1            | 6,348        | 15.2            |

DISTRICT XXI

|            |        |      |        |      |       |      |
|------------|--------|------|--------|------|-------|------|
| Bandera    | 152    | 15.8 | 678    | 70.4 | 135   | 14.0 |
| Brown      | 2,145  | 33.2 | 3,250  | 50.0 | 1,087 | 16.8 |
| Coke       | 650    | 31.6 | 1,289  | 63.0 | 111   | 5.4  |
| Coleman    | 1,455  | 39.0 | 1,879  | 50.6 | 388   | 10.4 |
| Concho     | 653    | 50.4 | 708    | 44.5 | 66    | 5.1  |
| Edwards    | 208    | 26.2 | 475    | 59.5 | 114   | 14.3 |
| Gillespie  | 255    | 20.7 | 763    | 62.0 | 213   | 17.3 |
| Irion      | 212    | 39.3 | 289    | 53.5 | 39    | 7.2  |
| Kendall    | 131    | 29.4 | 253    | 56.7 | 62    | 13.9 |
| Kerr       | 1,224  | 36.2 | 1,824  | 53.8 | 338   | 10.0 |
| Kimble     | 418    | 24.8 | 1,201  | 71.1 | 69    | 4.1  |
| Kinney     | 51     | 27.6 | 131    | 70.8 | 3     | 1.6  |
| Lampasas   | 946    | 46.0 | 823    | 40.1 | 287   | 13.9 |
| Llano      | 1,075  | 55.8 | 657    | 34.0 | 197   | 10.2 |
| McCulloch  | 1,957  | 55.9 | 1,324  | 37.9 | 219   | 6.2  |
| Mason      | 510    | 29.8 | 1,146  | 66.7 | 60    | 3.5  |
| Menard     | 518    | 37.0 | 790    | 56.4 | 92    | 6.6  |
| Mills      | 794    | 44.6 | 711    | 40.0 | 275   | 15.4 |
| Real       | 242    | 35.7 | 384    | 56.5 | 53    | 7.8  |
| Runnels    | 1,891  | 44.3 | 1,987  | 46.4 | 396   | 9.3  |
| San Saba   | 1,221  | 49.9 | 895    | 36.6 | 332   | 13.5 |
| Schleicher | 304    | 43.1 | 333    | 47.1 | 68    | 9.8  |
| Sterling   | 138    | 49.3 | 126    | 45.0 | 16    | 5.7  |
| Sutton     | 134    | 25.2 | 364    | 68.5 | 33    | 6.3  |
| Tom Green  | 3,503  | 42.5 | 4,062  | 49.3 | 668   | 8.2  |
| Uvalde     | 708    | 26.0 | 1,729  | 63.3 | 295   | 10.7 |
| Val Verde  | 309    | 28.2 | 717    | 65.3 | 71    | 6.5  |
| Totals     | 21,814 | 38.9 | 28,658 | 51.0 | 5,687 | 10.1 |