

The editorial "Lyndon Johnson's Independent Voting Record" in the Sunday Star-Telegram, July 18, 1948, sent to the following:

Honorable Kenneth C. Royall
Secretary of the Army
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Stuart Symington
Secretary of the Air Force
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Gene Howe, Publisher
Globe News Publishing Co.
Amarillo, Texas

VOICES OR AFFIDAVITS?

Will YOU elect a United States Senator on the basis of votes -- legally certified by the proper authorities -- or on the basis of affidavits?

Is the ballot box of YOUR county safe -- if it can be ignored on the basis of ex parte, self-serving affidavits secured with the help of pistol-packing employees of a major oil company?

Shall we abandon the ballot, and go back to the convention system of selecting our candidates for public office?

These are the vital questions which will be decided by the State Democratic Convention,

FEAR OR FRIENDSHIP?

Certainly Lyndon Johnson received the votes of the Latin-American voters in the Lower Valley. He got those votes on the basis of friendship.

Why else do you vote for a man?

Dan Moody got those votes. Coke Stevenson got them -- IN EVERY STATEWIDE RACE UP TO THE PRIMARY OF 1948.

Pat Neff got them. And Ross Sterling. And W. Lee O'Daniel. And justices of the Supreme Court, and the court of Criminal ~~App~~ Appeals.

Attorney General Price Daniel got them. Beauford Jester got them. Ernest Thompson received the Latin American vote. The list is almost endless.

Those votes were cast on a basis of friendship.

Now this convention is asked to throw out these votes -- on the basis of affidavits obtained by FEAR.

IS THAT HOW WE ARE GOING TO DECIDE ELECTIONS IN TEXAS? FEAR....OR FRIENDSHIP? VOICES...OR AFFIDAVITS?

The law is as clear as the Liberty Bell. It says that only a court can try out election contests; and that the party machinery is to canvass the votes only.

2

COURT OR CONVENTION?

Coke Stevenson has made a fetish out of his insistence that we should have a government of law rather than a government of men.

He has pitched a statewide campaign on the argument that we should settle our affairs at the county courthouse.

YET HE IS ASKING YOU TO DISREGARD THE LAW ... AND FORGET THE COURTHOUSE.

HE IS ASKING THE DELEGATES TO THE STATE CONVENTION TO SUBSTITUTE THEIR JUDGMENT FOR THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURTS. AND HE IS ASKING YOU TO DECIDE THE ISSUE ON THE BASIS OF JUST HALF OF THE EVIDENCE -- HIS HALF.

CONSISTENCY ... THOU ART INDEED A JEWEL. ✓

Lyndon Johnson has the votes. HE IS WILLING TO MATCH HIS VOTES AGAINST THOSE OF STEVENSON IN THE PROPER TRIBUNAL ... THE STATE CONVENTION.

Lyndon Johnson has the affidavits. HE IS WILLING TO MATCH HIS AFFIDAVITS AGAINST THOSE OF STEVENSON IN THE PROPER TRIBUNAL ... THE COURTROOM.

LET'S SHIFT THE SPOTLIGHT

Coke Stevenson and his attorneys, some of whom ^{also} are turning against the people who once voted for them, have tried to spotlight one box in one county.

In the proper tribunal ... the courtroom ... we can spotlight other instances. IS COKE STEVENSON AFRAID TO GO INTO THE COURTROOM?

We can tell you of mysterious, after-midnight telephone conversations, asking a certain county to "come through with 200 more votes." ✓ And then we can tell you how the next day's belated returns showed those votes.

We can point up the boxes where -- according to the returns -- NOT A SINGLE VOTER WAS FOR JOHNSON.

We can bring in the story, to the proper tribunal, of the voting machine which fell from nowhere, like manna out of heaven; and of broken seals on voting machines.

AND THEN IF YOU ARE GOING TO DEVELOP A L L OF THE FACTS AND
A L L OF THE ~~THE~~ CHARGES....ARE YOU WILLING TO SIT IN THIS CONVENTION
Johnson
WHILE ~~WE~~ GATHER THOSE FACTS AND BRING THEM BEFORE THIS CONVENTION?

It's important to remember this: Lyndon Johnson's attorneys told
him that all of these matters could be brought out in a court of competent
jurisdiction, and NOW ~~HERE~~ ELSE. So ~~we~~ *they* have not spent days gathering
affidavits. ~~they~~ *they* WERE prepared and ~~we~~ ARE prepared to bring ~~we~~ witnesses before
the proper tribunal where the judge and the jury *they* can judge the integrity of each
witness.

they HAVE NOT KIDNAPED ANY UNEDUCATED AND FRIGHTENED LATIN AMERICANS
AND CARRIED THEM INTO HOTELS WHERE THEY PROBABLY HAD NEVER BEEN BEFORE AND
TALKED ~~THEM~~ TO THEM BEHIND THE LOCKED DOORS OF THESE HOTEL ROOMS. ~~we~~ *They*
HAVE NOT GONE INTO THE HOME OF A FRIGHTENED LATIN AMERICAN WOMAN IN HER
HUSBAND'S ABSENCE TO INTIMIDATE HER INTO MAKING A STATEMENT. BUT ~~we~~ *they* ARE
WILLING TO BRING THOSE TWO PERSONS BEFORE A JUDGE AND A JURY AND LET THEM TELL
THEIR STORIES UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE COURT.

God Willing, we will never do business with the aid of Gestapo or
goon squads. Or special rangers for the major oil companies.