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CHAPTER 1
HOUSTON: PEOPLE AND POLITICS

The state of Texas underwent a transformation in the post-World War II era from a state dominated by the Democratic party to one that became increasingly Republican. This paper will examine, as a case study, the state’s largest city, Houston, which played a prominent role in this transformation. It is the thesis of this paper that there were several vital factors to this transformation. First, economic and demographic changes in Houston led to increased voter participation in elections. Second, the Republican party was invigorated by new leadership and a changing organizational structure that allowed the party to grow. Finally, the party was boosted in a series of successful elections that attracted conservative voters from the Democratic party.

Houston, Texas, experienced both an economic and a population boom from the 1940s to the 1960s. The city lies an hour from the Gulf Coast and is the largest in Texas. Although it encompasses several counties, the greatest part lies in Harris County. The Port of Houston and the Houston ship channel provide ample access to fresh water, which allowed for a shipping boom prior to World War II. Early in the twentieth century, Houston experienced tremendous population growth. By 1930, it had become the largest city in Texas with a population of nearly 300,000. A quarter of the population was made up of Latinos and African Americans. This ratio stayed fairly consistent, despite steady population growth throughout the next three decades. While the state’s overall African-American population was low in comparison to other southern states, the city of Houston had the largest black population of any city in the South. The overall
population grew by 54 percent in the decade between 1940 and 1950, and by the mid-1960s the population had reached over a million in Harris County.¹

Houston’s economy was consistently strong and able to adapt to economic changes and shifts throughout this era. Its economic base was made up of a variety of economic sources, including oil, the petrochemical industry, manufacturing, and later commercial and corporation interests. The Port of Houston and the Houston ship channel, which were expanded with federal aid, also played a large role in the city’s economy. By 1948, it was second only to New York in the tonnage that it handled, and it represented 11 percent of the labor force. The city of Houston and its labor force were aided by constant, steady growth and low unemployment rates. Even during the Great Depression, the economy of Houston managed to show marginal growth. The economy began to boom again with World War II production. Houston had oil reserves, which due to shortages on the East Coast, resulted in major pipeline production. In addition, Houston also provided 50 percent of the nation’s synthetic rubber during World War II.²

People were also attracted to the city by its low unemployment rate and economic opportunities. While the unemployment rate for minorities was quite a bit higher than for whites in Houston, it was still well below the national average. During the decade from 1940 to 1950, bank deposits in the city grew by 252 percent. In the

late 1950s and early 1960s, whites in Houston made 140 percent of the national average for whites. African Americans in Houston, while making 70 percent less than their white counterparts, still made well above the national average.³

Political participation and voter turnout in Houston lagged far behind the national average. This was especially true in local elections, where Houston was behind even some other southern cities. Local Houston politics during this era were relatively non-partisan and both of the political parties refrained from becoming involved in local elections and issues with a few rare exceptions. Due to these factors, voter turnout was bleak, which resulted in a local government being run by a pro-business elite. This government typically favored a hands-off economic policy, which led to low taxation, few regulations, and barely adequate social services. On average, turnout in local elections was around two-thirds of the national average.⁴

An exception to this low level of political participation occurred in the 1952 presidential election. The turnout greatly exceeded the most optimistic projections and represented a doubling of the vote total from the presidential election of 1948. In this race between Democrat Adlai Stevenson and Republican Dwight Eisenhower, the latter overwhelmingly carried Harris County. Not only did Eisenhower carry the vast majority of cross-filed Democratic votes for president, in which he appeared as the Democratic nominee, but he also received 70,000 votes cast on Republican ballots in the county.

³ Thomas and Murray, Progrowth Politics, 69-76.
⁴ McComb, Houston, Chapter 6; Thomas and Murray, Pro-growth Politics, 69-76.
This represented a dramatic breakthrough for the Republican party in Texas and in Harris County.⁵

There have been several prominent studies covering southern and Texas politics and the history of the city of Houston. These studies have been written by both historians and by political scientists. The four books examined here are V. O. Key’s *Southern Politics in State and Nation*; Chandler Davidson’s *Biracial Politics: Conflict and Coalition in the Metropolitan South*; Robert D. Thomas and Richard W. Murray’s *Progrowth Politics: Change and Governance in Houston*; and finally Ricky F. Dobbs’s *Yellow Dogs and Republicans: Allan Shivers and Texas Two-Party Politics*.⁶

In 1949, V. O. Key, a political scientist, authored a groundbreaking study of politics in the South called *Southern Politics in State and Nation*. He argued that the Black Belt elite had been setting the political agenda in the South and maintained this rule through one-party factionalism. He believed racial unity throughout the South was greatly exaggerated in other parts of the nation. Furthermore, he argued that the South had no real parties, only factional chaos that represented an agenda or specific ideas.⁷

Key argued that the race question and one-party politics represented the worst features of the southern political system. First, he evaluated the eleven states of the old Confederacy and showed that despite the variations in these states, there were also common threads that held these states together. He then looked at the effect southern

⁵ “1952 Election Returns By County”, Box 1989/064-9, Texas Secretary of State Elections Division, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, TX; see further explanation of cross-filing on pg. 12-13.


politics had on national politics with an emphasis on southern congressional leaders. He argued that the one-party system had been very detrimental to the South and found reasons for its continuing existence among the many methods of disenfranchisement the South used. Finally, he argued that the South was changing, even if it was only a glacial change, and that many of the misconceptions about the South were untrue.8

Key argued that race gave southern politics its peculiar structure and that this influence was not always noticeable to its participants. He states, “The race issue broadly defined thus must be considered as the number one problem on the southern agenda. Lacking a solution for it, all else fails.” He based this argument on a variety of factors. First, the dilemma of race in the South was the dominant issue and took attention away from other issues that needed to be addressed, such as economics. Also many of the methods used to hold down black enfranchisement prevented the South from having an effective two-party government. This was due in large part to the fact that many poor whites were disenfranchised as well. He argued that if these two factors were to be removed from southern politics, the South would have great potential.9

Despite the variances from state to state, Key also found common threads among the states. The biggest was the rejection of the idea that there were two “parties” within the Democratic party in the South. They were little more than factions within the party, with the exception of a few states l Virginia. These factions lacked the permanence of a typical two-party system. This was due in part to not having a firm base of support or money from election to election. He saw great shifts in the

---

8 Ibid, 386-488.
9 Ibid, 675.
population as to who they would vote for from election to election. He also argued that the Democratic party did not exist at the local level due to this high level of fragmentation. On the national level it functioned as a party only to achieve “The solid front of the South on issues of peculiar regional concern.”

This also led to the rise of what Key calls “friends and neighbors” voting. This occurs when counties overwhelmingly support the local candidate instead of identifying with a particular ideology or set of issues. This kind of factionalism or free-for-all could elect a state government made up of many different factions. This was most common in Florida. He criticized this form of government because politics were personality-based instead of issue-based. Subsequently, issues were sometimes ignored.

Then there were other states that divided along sectional lines. Tennessee was still divided the way in which it voted for or against secession before the Civil War. Some states like Mississippi were divided between the Black Belt and other predominantly white regions. Texas had begun to divide along conservative/liberal lines. Despite these differences, similarities remained. Voter turnout in the South was anemic among the small part of the population that was allowed to vote. The results of the elections produced a government that was quite factionalized. These two factors have led to governments not representative or responsible to the majority of its citizens.

Key also disputes the notion that poor whites were responsible for the disenfranchisement of blacks and that they chose candidates that reflected their white supremacy sentiment. He concluded that it was the Black Belt that was the most

---

10 Ibid, 392.
11 Ibid, 392, 509-532
12 Ibid
discriminatory area of the region, and it pushed for the disenfranchisement of not only blacks but also poor whites. In addition, the Black Belt had come to dominate sectional politics: “The black-belt counties can be regarded as a skeleton holding together the South. They have, in a sense managed to subordinate the entire South to the services of their peculiar local needs.”

He argued that the counties dominated by whites actually elected candidates who were more racially moderate than those in the Black Belt counties. He used the Hoovercrats and Dixiecrats to illustrate this example. In 1928, several southern rim states voted for President Herbert Hoover due largely to nonracial issues like prohibition and religion. However in 1948, the Dixiecrats received support from several Deep South states after the Democrats adopted a strong civil rights position. He did, however, argue that race gave the South an image of false cohesiveness. Southern Democrats in Congress opposed the Republicans more often than non-southern Democrats. He disputed the notion of a northern Republican/southern Democrat coalition. On the other hand, there was a lack of consensus among the southern states beyond their views on race relations.

Key argued that it was the white primary, not the poll tax, that had been so discriminating against African Americans. The people that suffered the most from the poll tax were poor whites. The literacy test had mainly been used as a weapon of fraud throughout the South. However, the white primary had devastating effects on the black population in the South and their position in southern politics. The Supreme Court ruled

---

13 Ibid, 666.
14 Ibid
in *Smith vs. Allwright* in 1944 that the all-white Democratic primary was illegal. Despite this decision, some states had not complied. Most of the outer rim states had, including Texas, while the Deep South states continued to look for a legal substitute to the primary.\(^{15}\)

Key concluded that in order for the South to move forward both economically and politically, it needed to become more democratic in terms of black suffrage and the inclusion of a true two-party system of government. He concluded “that the struggles of politics take place within an institutional framework fixed by considerations of race relations.” He blamed the overrepresentation of rural areas in state politics for helping to maintain the dominance of the Black Belt counties. He argued that population movements - the migration of blacks from the South and middle-class Republicans coming in - would eventually bring about a shift in southern politics. While Key acknowledged the strength of southern loyalty to the Democratic party, he saw an opportunity for Republicans to challenge the Democrats’ dominance. The Republicans had made little effort in the South to convert southern Democrats. Yet if the balance of power required that the Republican party start contesting southern elections, they were likely to find an electorate willing to be persuaded.\(^{16}\)

He also saw class as being an overlooked problem, especially in Texas. He conceded however that the presence of African Americans was often used to “divert attention of the electorate from nonracial issues.” He believed this was not really the case in Texas, where the primary issue was normally the economy. Even though Texas

\(^{15}\) Ibid, 619-644
\(^{16}\) Ibid, 509-28, 664-675
was still a one-party state, he saw real differences between the liberal and conservative
Democrats, whom he defined according to their economic philosophy and their New
Deal stance. He also argued that diversification in the economy, including the growing
importance of oil, urbanization, and the development of West Texas, were reasons for
this change. He noted that in this process the ties between the state and the
Democratic party had become strained and suggested that this could be permanent,
leading to the rise of a second party in the state.17

The impact and effectiveness of minority voting is studied by Chandler Davidson
in his 1972 work, *Biracial Politics: Conflict and Coalition in the Metropolitan South*. He
focused on a case study of Houston and the use and rewards of the vote by African
Americans to improve their status. He attempted to determine if the “pluralist theory” --
that voting gives a minority group greater access to political benefits and brings them
into the main stream-- was accurate. He argued that Houston, and Harris County
specifically, made a good case-study for a couple of reasons: first, the black population
of Houston was larger than in any other southern city; second, after the 1944 United
States Supreme Court ruling that outlawed the white primary, blacks were able to vote
at a rate that would be achieved in other southern cities only after the Civil Rights Act
of 1964. Given the twenty-plus years since this occurred, the effects of this
development should be obvious according to the author. Davidson concluded that black
voting in Houston was impressively high, especially when comparing their
socioeconomic status to whites during this era. Despite this achievement, he argued

that African Americans were unable to achieve notable political and economic gains, and that progress was being made at a glacial pace, but that biracial coalitions based on economic similarities should be possible in the future.\textsuperscript{18}

The city of Houston experienced rapid population growth, growing from 385,000 residents in 1940 to nearly a million by 1960. The proportion of blacks in the city rose from 21 percent to 23 percent, with a total population of 215,000 by 1960. African American political leaders during this time were also heavily involved in the liberal Harris County Democratic party. However, African Americans held few tangible leadership positions in political organizations that were biracial. This, at times, made it hard to achieve direction in the political arena for blacks. While most blacks tended to vote for liberals, inroads could be made in African-American dominated precincts when the Democratic candidate ran to the right of the Republican. This appears to have happened in the United States Congressional race that George Bush won in the 1960s, attaining over 30 percent of the black vote. He was aided by the fact that his Democratic opponent was extremely conservative on racial issues.\textsuperscript{19}

After the white primary was abolished, black registration rose to around 35 percent as compared to whites, who averaged registration rates of 51 percent, but usually were around 46 to 47 percent for most elections. Although this was not a huge separation, blacks only represented about 15 percent of all registrants. This percentage barely rose even during the late 1960s when only three percentage points separated


\textsuperscript{19} Davidson, \textit{Biracial Politics}, 18.
the two voting groups. This problem was compounded by the fact that redistricting dilated minority voting strength in several districts. When the redistricting evened out minority voting levels, every district had less than 30 percent of Black voters. This action resulted in the need for biracial coalitions to elect a favorable candidate to the black community, even if this candidate was not African American. 20

Davidson found in an analysis of a sample of precincts that blacks compared very favorably to whites when the socioeconomic groups were taken into account. This was due to the fact that eligible voters from the lower classes were much less likely to vote than those from the middle and upper classes. This was true regardless of race. Since the majority of blacks were in a lower socioeconomic group, it left their overall voter participation lower compared to whites. However, blacks from the lower classes were more likely to vote than whites from the lower classes. Given the fact that most other southern blacks were unable to vote during this time period, and Texas blacks’ recent enfranchisement, this level of African-American political participation was nothing short of amazing. Despite this leap forward in electoral participation, blacks had difficulty translating this success into political benefits. Biracial coalitions were rare and although African Americans often ran for office, they were rarely elected in the first two decades. Even if they did win political office, they often failed to produce “benefits” for their constituents. A comparison with whites showed political benefits for an upper-class pro-business elite.21

20 Ibid, 87. In 1965, the difference was 39 to 36 percent, with blacks composing 18 percent of the overall vote.
21 Ibid, 52-60.
In another political study of Houston, Robert D. Thomas and Richard W. Murray, both political scientists, examined Houston’s people and politics in *Progrowth Politics: Change and Governance in Houston*. Their study focused on the economic policies of the local government, the effect on the local population, and the relationship with both the state and federal governments. Their study started with the founding of Houston and continued until the 1980s. The primary focus, however, was on the boom years between World War II and the 1970s. They argued that the priority of the local government has been to maintain the economy, even at the expense of social or environmental drawbacks. Houston’s aggressive pro-business decisions caused the city to differ from other urban areas in a variety of ways. The authors also discussed the impact the Civil Rights Act had on the Houston City Council. The act forced the council to change the way members were elected, resulting in fewer at-large seats and more district seats.²²

A main difference in Houston’s development from other cities was the lack of zoning and urban planning by the city council. A primary reason was that Houston’s economy was almost always growing and zoning was not required to maintain growth. In the 1960s the voters overwhelmingly rejected an amendment that would have resulted in zoning. Houston was the only major city at that time that did not have a zoning policy.²³

Economic policy by the Houston City Council favored the upper-class elite, due in large part to the fact that voting participation among lower-class whites was

---

²³ Ibid.
exceedingly low. In fact, it was consistently lower than participation among blacks. This resulted in a low taxation and a low social services policy by the city government. Houston taxation was roughly 50 to 60 percent of the national urban average.24

The economic breakdown paints an interesting picture of Houston’s economic groups. Whites consistently were much better off in Houston than in other parts of the country. There was an economic increase of income by 32 percent over other white Americans. There was also a huge disparity between whites and blacks in Houston. Whites earned 71 percent more than blacks. However, blacks in Houston earned 29 percent more than their fellow African Americans across the United States. Other minority groups in Houston also fared better than their national counterparts in this economic growth. Despite the inequality of the distribution of wealth, Houston’s overall economic wealth was quite obvious. A significant number of Houstonians, 32 percent, were employed in manufacturing. This would begin to change in the late 1940s and early 1950s as there began a “Yankee influx.” This population shift, which would not be complete until the end of the 1960s, brought more white-collar jobs to the area.25

Houston’s local government had been consistently dominated by an economic, pro-business elite. This group had rarely been challenged, and its members have been consistently aggressive in pursuing their economic goals, with social services ranking a distant second in priorities. This focus resulted in a strong economic base that attracted an ever-growing population. However, the lack of planning resulted in a sprawling city that lacked adequate social services. As part of the city’s power grab, Houston was very

---

24 Ibid, 22-23.
25 Ibid, 72-75.
aggressive in annexing suburbs in order to maintain continuous growth. This prevented the city from being boxed in and allowed the Houston City Council to set economic policy for the county as a whole. This policy, however, only exacerbated the problems of growth and development.  

In a work that was originally his dissertation, Ricky Floyd Dobbs examined Governor Allan Shivers’s political career and the rise of the Republican party in Texas in *Yellow Dogs and Republicans*. His thesis is that changes in laws adopted in the overwhelmingly Democratic Texas legislature in 1951 were an early indication of support for Eisenhower among conservative Democrats in the state. Furthermore, these changes threatened the dominance of the Texas Republican party leadership, who were known as the “Old Guard” and who were opposed to majority rule. He identified Governor Allan Shivers as a “transitional” figure in the state that laid the groundwork for the creation of a competitive two-party state. He also argued that Governor Shivers’s definition of a “true Democratic party” died in 1936 and strongly suggested that he really never had any intention of supporting the national nominee in 1952.

Allan Shivers became the governor of Texas following the death of Governor Beauford Jester in 1949. Shivers made a strong push for control of the Democratic party machinery, believing that this was the key to his first election. Once he achieved this, he became, in Dobbs’s opinion, the strongest governor in Texas history. Although he had first been elected to the Texas Senate from a strong labor district, Dobbs maintains that Shivers was always a strong conservative. After being elected governor

---

26 Ibid, 142-176
in his own right in 1950, one of the bills that Shivers sought was an overhaul of the
election code.²⁸

Dobbs maintains that the Texas Republican party had always been weak in
Texas due in large part to its own informal structure and the fact that it was run by an
elite group who valued patronage over competitiveness. One of the essential
ingredients for change in the Texas Republican party was getting a formal nomination
structure and popular control of the party. To this end, the Texas legislature passed
several laws as part of an overhaul of the election code in 1951. The first change that
they passed was House Bill 43, which standardized precinct, county, and state
conventions for parties that had between 10,000 to 200,000 members. This specific
number assured that the bill only applied to Republicans. This required that these
meetings be formal proceedings, advertised at least a week in advance, and the results
reported to the Texas secretary of state. The location also had to be declared and any
change of location had to be done at least ten days in advance.²⁹

Another drastic change that was adopted by the Texas legislature was something
that became known as cross-filing. This allowed a candidate to be on the ballot in two
different places, provided that two different parties had nominated him. It was also
necessary that the candidate accept both nominations. The cross-filing law created a lot
of controversy among state Democrats. Many liberal Democrats accused Shivers of
destroying the Democratic party and blurring the line between the two parties with the
new cross-filing law. After it was passed, many Democrats believed that Shivers was

²⁸ Ibid
²⁹ Ibid
prepared to bolt the national party. It was a law that had a very short life and was repealed after the 1952 election.30

Shivers claimed to support Eisenhower due to the issue of the Texas Tidelands. The Tidelands had supposedly been promised to Texas in the annexation treaty of 1836. The federal government sought to establish the right of federal ownership in the 1940s, and President Harry Truman had vetoed several bills from Congress that recognized Texas’ claim. Eisenhower stated that he supported Texas, while Stevenson did not. Dobbs argues that the Tidelands issue was really a sidebar that Shivers used to break with the national party. Shivers and conservative Democrats had become disillusioned by the “liberal” direction of Truman’s administration and the party in general.31

The 1952 election, in which Eisenhower carried Texas and Shivers won re-election by an extraordinary margin, was the peak of Shivers’s career. He would endure several financial scandals in his next term as governor and had a brutal re-election campaign for an unprecedented third term that brought out the worst of his personality. In Lyndon B. Johnson’s words, “He (Shivers) had everything almost. He had the head and he had the heels, and he knew how to use them, but he didn’t have a heart.” However, the changes in the electoral laws forced the Republican party to hold a primary in the next election and that helped to give rise to a two-party state.32

These studies provide an in-depth look at Houston and southern politics. They also provide some reasons for the economic and demographic changes that were

30 Ibid, 75-81.
31 Ibid, 82-96.
32 Ibid, 145.
occurring in Harris County. From these studies it can be gleaned that while Harris
County and Texas had the framework for the development of a two-party system, that
change had not yet begun to occur.
CHAPTER 2
VOTER PARTICIPATION IN HARRIS COUNTY

This chapter examines voter participation throughout Harris County and some specific precincts. The thesis of this chapter is that voter participation, during the 1950s, increased throughout Harris County. This led the Republican party, while still in the minority, to have a stable base of electoral support and increased the competitiveness of elections. Furthermore, this development was due in large part to the changing economics and demographics of these individual precincts.

V. O. Key, in his study, *Southern Politics in State and Nation* gave a detailed study and estimate of voter participation in the South. He found that participation was much lower in the South than in northern states-- including northern states that were dominated by one party. This was true even in states such as Texas, where the disenfranchisement of African Americans was not a large factor, due to the fact that they made up a relatively small percentage of the population. He further asserts that while suffrage qualifications such as the poll tax and the white primary undoubtedly affected voter participation and interest, there were other important differences as well.¹

He claimed that voter apathy could be attributed to a number of reasons: First, all southern states were “isolated” from national politics due to the fact that the presidential race was not contested in these states. In Key’s opinion, “A genuine competition for power is not likely to be maintained for state purposes unless the state

is also a battleground between national parties in the presidential campaign.” In non-
southern states, presidential interest drives up the turnout for local and state races.
Second, there was no national support for a minority group to form in these states.
Third, there were no issues of great importance to bring voters out. Finally, with such a
large section of the population being nonvoters, there was not enough dissent to create
a strong faction within the Democratic party, or create a viable Republican party.²

In a later study Key assessed the impact of increased voter turnout on the
political parties. In Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups, he argued that there was a
direct correlation between the two. He stated: “An unusually rapid growth in the total
number of voters from one election to the next is accompanied by an exceptionally high
rate of increase in the number of supporters of one of the parties, but not the other.” In
his view this trend, where all new voters flocked to one party, but not the other, would
continue.³

This chapter studies the impact of increases in voter participation that started to
occur in Harris County with the 1952 presidential election and what effect this had on
the growth of the Republican party. The largest areas of Republican support are then
examined on a precinct level to determine the economic and social trends of these
voters based on the United States census tracts. Finally, a detailed study of voters’
attitudes in Houston is examined.

In 1902, an election law was passed by the Texas Legislature that required the
payment of a poll tax to vote in elections. By 1964, payment of the tax was no longer

² Ibid, quotation on pg. 507, chapters 23 and 24.
required for federal elections, although it still existed for state and local elections. By 1950, the tax was $1.50 and payment was required every January in order to vote the following November. There were two main exemptions to the poll tax: those voters who were turning 21 that year and voters over the age of 60. On several occasions, voters rejected an amendment that would have abolished the poll tax.  

As Texas politics became more competitive, with the growth of the Republican party during the 1950s, victory in the Democratic primary did not guarantee a victory in the general election as it had in previous years. In 1952, Dwight D. Eisenhower was able to carry Texas on his way to winning the presidency. While he was greatly aided by some state Democrats, notably Democratic governor Allan Shivers, it was only the second time a Republican candidate for president had carried the state since Reconstruction. This helped lead to increased voter interest and turnout in the general election, as Table 1.1 shows.  

Table 1.1 Harris County Voter Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Election Year</th>
<th>Qualified Voters</th>
<th>Actual Turnout</th>
<th>Turnout %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>646,869</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>947,500</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>362,495</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,430,394</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>342,331</td>
<td>328,359</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,999,316</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>477,375</td>
<td>382,220</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: “Certified election returns” Boxes 2-12/820 and 2-12/824, State of Texas Election Returns (county-by-county), Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, TX; Boxes 1989/064-9, -12, -13, -14, -15, Election Materials, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, Texas.  


5 “Certified election returns” Boxes 2-12/820 and 2-12/824, State of Texas Election Returns (county-by-county), Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, TX; Boxes 1989/064-9, -12, -13, -14, -15, Election Materials, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, Texas.
Harris County started experiencing tremendous population growth in the post-World War II years, and, over the next several decades, population growth remained steady. Houston’s growth was due in part to the general urbanization trend in the state. In 1950, 55.5 percent of the state's population lived in metropolitan areas. This figure grew to 63.4 percent in 1960 and by 1970 reached 70.3 percent. Migration into the state was also a large factor in this tremendous population growth. In 1960, 22 percent of Texans had been born in another state. In the five years prior to 1960, more than 800,000 people had moved into Texas.  

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress created a national survey of voter potential, based on estimates of the population and actual voter turnout. In 1948, it showed Texas had a potential group of voters numbering 4.3 million, yet there was only a 27 percent (1.15 million) turnout. In comparison, there was a 52 percent turnout nationwide. The turnout for Texas was even worse in 1950, an off-year congressional election. The group of potential voters increased to 4.7 million, however only 360,000 (or just 8 percent) voted statewide. On the other hand, the nationwide turnout was 42 percent.

According to Table 1.1 Houston had a population of 947,500 according to the 1950 Census. This represented a significant jump from the 1940 census. Despite this

---

6 Report by the Texas Research League, on the “Effect of Changes in the Texas Population on State and Local Government.”, August 21st, 1961, Box 4zd322, Jack Cox Papers, CAH.
7 “Certified election returns” Boxes 2-12/820 and 2-12/824, State of Texas Election Returns (county-by-county), Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, TX; Boxes 1989/064-9, -12, -13, -14, -15, Election Materials, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, Texas.
growth in population, only 127,000 voters participated in the 1948 presidential election. Texas, as a whole, gave Harry Truman a larger margin of victory than any other state.\(^8\)

The first year that Texas, specifically Harris County, experienced tremendous growth in voter participation and turnout was in 1952. As mentioned earlier, Dwight D. Eisenhower was able to carry Texas. He won Harris County by an overwhelming margin. He was backed by Democratic governor Allan Shivers and appeared as both the Republican and Democratic nominee on the ballot. The Republican Party was not required to hold a primary in 1952. This changed in subsequent years due to the fact that Shivers was also the Republican nominee for governor. He received more than the 200,000 vote threshold that forced the Republican party to hold a primary in future elections. However, it would be 1960 before the Republican party offered a full slate of candidates on the ballot.\(^9\)

In 1951, approximately 325,000 people either paid their poll tax or were exempt in Harris County. Of these potential voters, 255,000 voted in the 1952 presidential election. This far exceeded the most optimistic projections of 200,000 voters. Due to the fact that voter participation had always been low, there were very large voting precincts. This caused Harris County to have many large blocs of voters because there were only 196 precincts in 1952. By 1962, Harris County had expanded to 290 precincts. Eisenhower was able to carry Harris County with a margin of 146,665 to Adlai Stevenson’s 107,604. Governor Shivers received 61,000 votes in Harris County on the ballot.

---


\(^9\) Memo from atty. General Price Daniel, opinion V-1533, Box 1989/064-13, Election Materials, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, Texas.
Republican ticket as did several other Democrats. Turnout in traditionally Democratic areas was low, while in conservative areas, such as River Oaks, it was exceptionally high. The Harris County Democratic party chairman stated that in a “normal” election 110,000 votes would have been enough to win.10

Voter participation stayed at the same level in 1956, with the next significant jump coming in the 1960 presidential election. The estimated voting strength in Texas was 5.3 million with the actual voter turnout at 2.3 million or 43 percent. Approximately 325,000 people voted in Harris County. Richard Nixon carried the county by 20,000 votes over John F. Kennedy. Democratic leaders in the county considered this showing to be a “virtual victory” as they predicted Kennedy to lose by at least 30,000 votes. Kennedy did end up carrying the state by a narrow margin.11

In the 1962 election, over 1.3 million Texans voted in the hotly contested governor’s race between Republican Jack Cox and John Connally. This beat the previous off-year election record set in 1958 by more than 500,000 votes. Cox had stated that he needed to carry Harris County by at least 15,000 votes to win statewide. He carried Harris County, but by less than 2,000 votes. Nearly 220,000 people voted in Harris County alone.12

The governor’s race also greatly increased voters’ interest in the Republican party primary. Harris County had a total of 22,000 votes in the Republican primary in 1962. This represented a drastic increase over the previous high of 2,000 in 1960.

---

10 “Final Count in Harris Puts Vote at 254, 597” Houston Post November 9, 1952; Ben Kaplan, “Harris County LOVES Ike!” Houston Press November 5th, 1952.
12 Bo Byers, “Cox Loses by 110,000 votes” Houston Chronicle, November 7, 1962.
There were sixty-one precincts that did not hold a Republican primary due to lack of personnel or a lack of funds. There was a primary in every precinct in 1964. The Republican party, however, was still light-years behind the Democrats who had a total of over 150,000 votes split between six candidates.\textsuperscript{13}

Throughout this period in Harris County, there were 30 precincts that were considered to be dominated by African Americans, according to the Harris County Democratic Party Records. In 1950, blacks made up 21 percent of the population in Houston. By 1960, they made up 23 percent of the population. Normally, these precincts strongly supported the Democratic party candidates, with the exception of the 1956 presidential election, when Eisenhower received nearly one-third of their vote.\textsuperscript{14}

Turnout of qualified voters in the 1960 presidential election was 77 percent for African Americans, lower than the 84 percent figure for the county. While this was a healthy turnout, it still lagged behind the overall average for the county, particularly the really conservative areas where turnout reached the 90 percent range. In 1952, qualified voters in these precincts totaled 33,000 or 10 percent of the eligible vote in Houston. This number jumped to 40,000 or 12 percent of the eligible vote in 1956. In the off-year election of 1962, this number stayed constant at 40,000 but an additional 12,000 votes in other precincts brought the overall percentage to 15 percent. Still, the African American turnout rate was only 54 percent, compared to the overall 62 percent

\textsuperscript{13} “Republican Precincts not holding primaries due to lack of personnel” May 5, 1962, 1962 Election Analysis, Box 4c510, HCDPR, CAH; Republican Party file, Box 4zd346, Jack Cox Papers, CAH; Saul Friedman, “Harris G. O. P. Gives Cox Nod for Governor,” \textit{Houston Chronicle}, May 4, 1962.

\textsuperscript{14} Chandler Davidson, \textit{Biracial Politics: Conflict and Coalition in the Metropolitan South}. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972), 18; “Vote in ‘colored’ Boxes, ’56-’58” Folder, Box 4c505, HCDPR, CAH.
turnout of the county for this election.\textsuperscript{15}

While the number of black qualified voters lagged behind their percentage of the population, the lower rates of turnout further dropped their percentage of voter participation, which made the disparity even greater. Even though the white primary had been abolished, African Americans made up only 9 percent of the vote in the 1958 Democratic primary, however this number jumped to 17 percent in 1960. Turnout rates in almost all of the elections lagged 10 to 15 percentage points behind the average for Harris County as a whole, and well behind the “white” precincts.\textsuperscript{16}

Robert D. Thomas and Richard W. Murray provide an overview of the social and economic changes occurring in Houston during this time period, in their work, \textit{Progrowth Politics: Change and Governance in Houston}. One of the important changes that they note is in population growth. Previous to the 1950s, migration into Houston consisted almost solely of southern whites, with only 15 percent coming from outside the South. Over the next decade, this number rose to 30 percent. This also had an economic impact on the city, as many of these people were attracted by the expansion of more scientific, managerial, and technical jobs that helped to diversify the local economy.\textsuperscript{17}

Furthermore, the economy of Houston boomed during the 1960s and 1970s. The median family income doubled from roughly $10,000 to $23,000. Throughout this time

\textsuperscript{15} Vernon Fewell, “County to G. O. P. as Records Fall,” \textit{Houston Chronicle}, November 9, 1960; “Governor’s Race Analysis in Harris County,” \textit{Houston Post}, November 7, 1962, page 10, sec. 1; “List of ‘colored’ precincts” “Vote in ‘colored’ Boxes, ’56-’58” Folder, Box 4c505, HCDPR, CAH.
\textsuperscript{16} “Vote in ‘colored’ precincts” Statistics-,1956 and 1958 Vote Records, Harris County Folder, Box 4c508, HCDPR, CAH.
\textsuperscript{17} Robert D. Thomas and Richard W. Murray, \textit{Progrowth Politics: Change and Governance in Houston} (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1991), 70
period (1940-1970) African Americans made up a steady 20 percent of the population. Population increases appeared to have been driven by Houston’s thriving economy, as this increase declined during any economic recessions. This economic and population growth could in part explain increases in voter participation along with the changing political climate in the city and in the state.  

For a clearer picture of voter participation, a breakdown of each precinct in Harris County is required. Three elections were analyzed for this comparison: the 1960 presidential election between Nixon and Kennedy, 1960 Senate race between Lyndon B. Johnson and John Tower, and the 1962 race for governor between John Connally and Jack Cox. The last two races were decided by less than 1 percent of the vote, the first going to the Democrat and the following race, to the Republican. These three elections were chosen in part due to their proximity in years, as precinct boundaries can change over time, and partly because it represented three different races. The 1961 Senate race that Tower won is not included because of low turnout due to it being a special election in May. There were a total of 281 precincts studied; nine additional precincts were added in 1962, but they were not included.  

These precincts were sorted first by party affiliation. If the same party carried a precinct in all three elections, it was considered to be strongly for that party. If the party carried that precinct twice, it was put in the leaning column. The Republican party had 115 of the 281 precincts that were solidly Republican, with an additional twelve precincts leaning Republican. Furthermore, these precincts were mostly grouped into

---

18 Ibid, 70-80.  
distinct areas of strength. The Harris County Democratic party divided the county into
twelve areas: A-L. The Republicans dominated areas A, B, C, and F. They also split Area
K evenly with the Democrats. The size and number of precincts in each area varied
from three to forty-three. Precincts are normally grouped together with the exception of
Area G, which included most of the black precincts. Area A, totaling forty-three
precincts, was the largest area and most thorough area of Republican support. Area B
was slightly smaller with twenty-eight precincts, but was also dominated by the
Republicans. For this reason, a detailed study of Area A and Area B was undertaken.
This area ranged from Highway 290 through Rice University into southwest Houston.20

Area A consisted of thirty-seven strongly Republican precincts, one that leaned
Republican, and one precinct that went strongly for the Democrats. There were a total
of 55,000 votes cast in the 1960 races, representing 17 percent of the county’s total
vote. In 1962, 40,000 votes were cast, representing 18 percent of the citywide vote
total. The Republican percentage of the vote stayed steady in all three elections at
around 70 percent. According to the census tracts for this area, there were 54,000 men
and 62,000 women over the age of twenty-one. This represented roughly 116,000
people who should have been eligible to vote. This would have been about a 47 percent
vote turnout in the 1960 presidential election.21

A precinct map of Harris County was compared to the census tracts for Harris

---

20 “Estimate of Voters”, 1956, Box 4c505, HCDPR, CAH; “Vote: General Election 1960” Box
4c508, HCDPR, CAH; “Analysis 1962: Harris County” Box 4c510, HCDPR, CAH; Lance Tarrance, Jr. Texas
21 “Estimate of Voters”, 1956, Box 4c505, HCDPR, CAH; “Vote: General Election 1960” Box 4c508,
HCDPR, CAH; “Analysis 1962: Harris County” Box 4c510, HCDPR, CAH; Lance Tarrance, Jr. Texas Precinct
Votes ’66: Precinct Analysis and Maps (Politics Inc: Austin, TX, 1967), 94-96; U.S. Censuses of Population
County for 1960. While these census tracts are difficult to compare to individual precincts, it was possible to divide the map into “areas” due in part to natural boundaries. These areas were the same as those defined by the Harris County Democratic party. Thus the forty-three precincts in area A produce twenty-five census tracts. These census tracts include a variety of information, including race, residency, and income. Twenty-two of these census tracts were predominantly white. Although none of the forty-three precincts are considered to be part of the thirty “black” precincts, African Americans made up the majority in the other three census tracts. The complete list of these census tracts is in Appendix A. The breakdown is as follows:\(^{22}\)

**Table 1.2 Demographics for Area “A”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Residence in 1955</th>
<th>median income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 &quot;White&quot;</td>
<td>159,891</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot;Black&quot;</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>20,143</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>993,685</td>
<td>246,351</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The most dramatic difference between the census tracts is the economic disparity. There is a tremendous difference between the black and white census tracts. These black census tracts show half of the median income of the average for the city, while there were many more families in the lower economic groups as well (See Appendix A). On the other hand, the white census tracts show almost three times

\(^{22}\) Ibid.
greater economic advantage over the minority tracts and a significant increase over the citywide average in nearly every census tract.\textsuperscript{23}

This area also shows a high level of segregation. This is especially true in the twenty-two “white” precincts, where African Americans made up only 1 percent of the population in these areas. The three minority precincts, while dominated by blacks, were not quite as segregated.\textsuperscript{24}

Furthermore, for the twenty-two census tracts, a little over 27 percent of the population had moved to Houston within the last five years. While not an overwhelmingly high figure, it still represents a jump over the citywide and state average. On the other hand, in the other three tracts, this number was only 11 percent. Even though it is a relatively small sample size, the contrasts between the two are stark.\textsuperscript{25}

Area B, totaling 28 voting precincts, had 24 matching census tracts. There were a total of 28 Republican precincts, all of which favored the Republican party in each election. In the 1960 election, 35,000 people voted, with Nixon getting 77 percent of the vote and Tower receiving 73 percent of the vote. In 1962, 30,000 people voted and Cox carried 75 percent of the vote. These census tracts had 33,000 men and 37,000


women over the age of twenty-one. This represented a total of 70,000 and roughly a 50 percent turnout rate for the 1960 Presidential election. This also represents a slight increase in voter turnout from Area A.²⁶

Area A and Area B were right next to each other, with Area B extending into west Houston, ending at Highway 290. One census tract was dominated by African Americans, and two additional census tracts that had over 1,000 blacks (see Appendix B for the complete list.) The breakdown is as follows:²⁷

Table 1.3 Demographics for Area “B”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tracks for Area B</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Residence in 1955</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-White</td>
<td>97,882</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Black</td>
<td>13,596</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>993,685</td>
<td>246,351</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The three black census tracts were very similar to the citywide averages in several areas, although the economic median income was still lower, even with a significant white population. Although further economic breakdowns (see Appendix B) suggest that blacks were wealthier in these census tracts than in the city as a whole,
they still lagged behind the white median income.\textsuperscript{28}

For the twenty-one white census tracts, the median income appears quite high at first glance. However, several of these census tracts had a median income of over $20,000, while there were three below the citywide median income. Although all of these census tracts were dominated by whites, there was a large degree of economic disparity.\textsuperscript{29}

Another thing of note, there was only a slight increase of migration into this area in comparison to Area A. This was true of both the white and black census tracts showing only a slight variation from the citywide averages. For such a strong Republican area, there did not seem to be as many “new” voters as one might expect.\textsuperscript{30}

In preparation for his 1972 re-election bid for the United States Senate, John Tower and his campaign paid for a scientific poll to be done of the Harris County voters who were registered or who planned to register. The poll consisted of a total of 300 voters: 150 women and 150 men. Of the respondents, 245 were white, with 39 African Americans and 14 Latinos also taking part in the survey. Nearly two-thirds of the people in this sample poll had an education of high school graduate or below. Nearly half of the respondents listed their income as less than $10,000 annually, with the other half


stating that their income was above this threshold. Nearly 80 percent of those polled had lived in Texas for at least twenty years.\textsuperscript{31}

Voter participation among those polled was relatively high. In the 1968 presidential election, 70 percent voted. In the off-year election in 1970, 58 percent cast a ballot. A little over half, 54 percent, considered themselves to be Democrats. There were a number of independent and swing voters totaling 28 percent. A small number, 17 percent, considered themselves to be Republican in this survey. However, only 42 percent had voted in the previous Democratic primary and George Bush won more votes among this group over Lloyd Benson in his bid for a Senate seat.\textsuperscript{32}

Of those polled, foreign affairs (Vietnam) and the economy (inflation) were listed as the biggest national problems according to a third of the respondents. No other issue got more than 8 percent. Among local problems, race and pollution were the top two answers, with each garnering 15 percent. People who considered themselves Democrats listed race, crime, and pollution as their top concerns. However, a number of people who identified themselves as “swing” voters considered state political corruption to be the biggest problem (12 percent). People who identified themselves as Democrats were also more apt to blame the government for the country’s inflation problem, whereas swing and Republican voters blamed labor as well. Republican and swing voters viewed unemployment as a problem that was equally the responsibility of business, the government, and labor. However, almost two-thirds of Democrats blamed the government for unemployment problems. A supermajority of the respondents did

\textsuperscript{31} Decision making information, “Harris County Poll”, Folders 6 and 7, Box 887, Election Series, John Tower Papers, Southwestern University, Georgetown, TX.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
not believe that the government was responsible for providing healthcare. Nearly 85 percent believed that a strong military for the United States was vital.\textsuperscript{33}

Overall, 51 percent of those polled approved of the job that President Richard Nixon was doing. For Republicans, this figure was 92 percent, while his approval rating was 59 percent among swing voters. Approval for John Tower as Senator was 44 percent overall; among swing voters it was 43 percent, but 39 percent had no opinion. A third of Democrats approved of Tower, but 42 percent had no opinion. He polled better among Republicans with 85 percent approving of the job he was doing. His approval among men was 47 percent, while among women it was 41 percent. There was no consistent pattern of support for Tower based on income, although those with a higher education were more likely to approve of him. Among those polled in a potential John Tower-Ralph Yarborough race, Tower had the advantage 42 to 38 percent, with 10 percent undecided. Among swing voters, 60 percent stated that they would vote for Tower.\textsuperscript{34}

The growth in political participation was sparked, in line with Key’s theory, by a competitive presidential campaign in 1952. Political participation in state races did not really increase until the 1962 race for governor, which ended up being tightly fought and contested. The Republicans appeared to have a solid base for support in various elections. This Republican base overwhelmingly supported the party and turned out in decent numbers. They tended to be wealthier than the citywide trend, but there were exceptions to this characterization. While the population in these areas from other

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
states was higher than the citywide average, it was not overwhelmingly so. Finally, although the majority of voters considered themselves to be Democrats, they held conservative views and would on occasion support the Republican candidate. On the other hand, few in the survey identified themselves as Republican, suggesting that the party still had quite a way to go in terms of party leadership and mass participation in the party.
CHAPTER 3
HARRIS COUNTY LEADERS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

At the end of the 1940s, the state of the Republican party in Harris County resembled the statewide party. It was, for the most part, poorly organized and under funded. While Houston was a conservative city, several of its leaders, such as William and Oveta Culp Hobby and Jesse Jones, supported the Democratic party throughout this period. Even with several prominent Republicans residing in Houston, the party had difficulty attracting people who identified themselves as Republicans and who would actively participate in party affairs. This started to change during the 1950s and 1960s. It is the thesis of this chapter that the Republicans were able to expand their political base in Harris County for a variety of reasons. First, the party was invigorated by new political leaders who changed the party’s direction and organization. Another critical factor was an increase in donors and money that the party started to receive. This chapter will examine some of the challenges that the Republicans faced, such as the political environment and structure of politics in Houston. It will also take a look at some of the Houston civic leaders and their impact on the party. Finally, an analysis of the individuals who donated to the Republican party and who took an active role-- and their backgrounds, occupations, and political views-- will be undertaken.

In their work on Houston Politics, Progrowth Politics: Change and Governance in Houston, Robert D. Thomas and Richard W. Murray offered this assessment of politics in Harris County, “Houston’s political environment does little to encourage citizen interest or involvement. The major political parties largely avoid local issues, and few
other political groups or associations are active.” This pattern was manifested in the reality that political participation in Houston lagged far behind other cities, even those elsewhere in the South.¹

There were several important factors that led to this development in Houston politics. First, an economic elite existed whose power in city affairs went largely unchallenged by others in the community. This economic elite was made up of civic leaders such as Jesse Jones, William and Oveta Culp Hobby, and Roy Cullen. While not all were Republicans, they did hold conservative views. These elites held tremendous influence in local politics and their monopoly on city affairs was rarely challenged. They did not resist change, as long as they were directing it. Some of the issues that they promoted were local growth to help sustain low taxes and the maintenance of Anglo social and political dominance.²

Second, the structure of Houston politics favored the elite. Before 1955, the Houston City Council was composed of three council persons at-large and five from single member districts. Afterwards, this was changed to a complete at-large election system with no single-member districts. This diluted minority strength, and people in the minority party, the Republicans, were unable to win elections. This system also made it difficult to beat the incumbent. The Houston City Council rarely interjected

---

¹ Robert D. Thomas and Richard W. Murray, Pro-growth Politics: Change and Governance in Houston (Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley, 1991), 98
accountability into the city’s executive and bureaucratic processes. In 1966, voters rejected a proposal that would have created a mixed council— one composed of at-large and district seats. In the 1970s as a result of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Department of Justice forced the city to adopt such a plan. The lack of minority representation on the council was exacerbated by Houston’s policy of annexing growing surrounding suburbs. This annexation policy was seen as vital to Houston’s growth for a number of reasons: it prevented suburban encirclement, helped to maintain a low tax spread across a large area, and prevented a large inner-city minority population. This caused the proportionate growth of minorities to be offset by the mostly white suburbs. This prevented citywide minority triumphs that occurred in other southern cities.3

Houston was often viewed as a “swing” city, meaning that in elections it was not strongly Republican or Democratic. Despite this, it was much more important to the Republican party than to the Democrats. For the Democrats, this was partly due to the fact that the city was under-represented in the state legislature. Houston, despite its size, elected few members to represent it in Austin. The Democratic party in Harris County also tended to be more liberal than the rest of the state, and it was not uncommon for the loser in the Democratic primary to have carried Harris County. This occurred several times in the late 1950s for the nomination of governor. This liberal

3 Thomas and Murray, _Progrowth Politics_, 205-209; 212; 217; Chandler Davidson, _Biracial Politics: Conflict and Coalition in the Metropolitan South_ (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Press, 1972), 60,61; Chandler Davidson, ed., _Minority Vote Dilution_ (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1989), 2, 9,68-69. The Supreme Court did not make a ruling on at-large local voting systems until the 1980 case _City of Mobile v. Bolden_ where it ruled that it must be proven, that the system was adopted with the intention of minority discrimination; McComb, _Bayou City_, 199-203.
base consisted of a larger group of minorities and a stronger labor presence than any other populous Texas city. The Democratic electorate in Houston was also divided sharply along economic lines. For the Republicans, however, Harris County represented a fundamental part of the Republican party. Big cities, such as Dallas and Houston, represented half of the Republican primary vote. Dallas and similar Texas cities, however, were staunchly conservative and had a stronger Republican base than did Harris County. The Houston electorate contained a lot of “swing” voters, and even those voters who supported Republican candidates did not consider themselves to be Republican. Despite these factors, it was believed that a statewide Republican candidate had to carry Harris County by at least 50,000 votes in order to win the election.4

Republicans in Harris County had to “divide” the Democratic party between the liberals and conservatives in order to achieve victory in the county. The success of Republican party candidates in Harris County had a direct correlation to the strength of the liberal Democrats. This Democratic coalition, composed of minorities, labor, intellectual liberals, and democratic loyalists could be effective against Republican challenges. When this coalition split, however, it allowed the Republicans to be victorious; an example was the special senate race in 1961 that John Tower won. This uncertainty in the Democratic party caused the Republican vote to fluctuate by as much

---

as 10 percent. Such a coalition did not exist in other cities such as Dallas. This coalition was partially driven by demographics and economics. By 1960, 30 percent of the population in Harris County had been born outside of Texas. Many of these people were attracted to the city for economic reasons, looking for job opportunities. Houston also had a stronger labor presence than most Texas cities. By 1960, minorities made up 25 percent of the population, giving Houston the largest number of minorities of any southern city. These demographic factors gave the liberal Democrats a fairly stable base of support. These developments also aided the Republican party locally. Some of the new residents, who took managerial and professional jobs and who came from different backgrounds, donated and participated in the local party. As a result of Republican party activity Conservative Democrats began to move into the Republican party. 5

Republicans in Houston also had extremist groups that threatened to split the party. Don Carleton studied these groups in Red Scare! Right Wing Hysteria, Fifties Fanaticism, and Their Legacy in Texas. He argued that the Red Scare in Houston was perpetuated by a couple of groups within the city. First was a group of women who called themselves the “Minute Women.” They were typically upper-class Republican women, and they were usually college-educated but with a paranoid view of foreign

5Soukup, Party and Factional Division, 96-105; Davidson, Biracial Politics, 187; Robert D. Bullard, Invisible Houston: The Black Experience in Boom and Bust (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1987), 15-26; Keller, Make Haste Slowly, 9-11, 18-20; Leon, Ethnicity in the Sunbelt, 98-101; Guadalupe San Miguel Jr., Brown, Not White: School Integration and the Chicano Movement in Houston (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001), 15-18; Levengood, “The Duration”, 160-163; Raymond Moley, Editorial, Houston Chronicle, June 3, 1960; Both Key and Soukup define liberals and conservatives based on their economic views and support of the New deal. Soukup takes this further and finds a correlation between support for the New Deal and Party loyalty. In the 1950s, the issue of Truman’s civil rights agenda and school desegregation became a factor as well between liberal and conservative support as well.
affairs. Most of their work was done in education, where they wanted books censored and education programs ended that they viewed as favorable to the United Nations. They also achieved their goal of having the deputy superintendent of the Houston Independent School District, George Ebey, fired. The National Education Administration estimated that 60 percent of Houston school teachers had been under pressure from the Minute Women.6

The other group consisted of conservative elites in the city. Carleton views their involvement as one of “opportunity” rather than as “true believers.” While at times they were concerned with how radical the movement had become, they also saw it as a way to maintain power within the city. He also faults the two newspapers, the Houston Chronicle and the Houston Post, for giving sensational journalism to the “Red Baiters” and he notes that these two newspapers were owned by conservative elites: Jesse Jones and William and Oveta Culp Hobby. The author argued that one of the reasons for the success of the movement was that there had been a strong liberal presence in the city during the late 1940s. This included a small Communist party and a growing labor movement in the area. He pointed out that this presence had disappeared by the time of the actual Red Scare in the 1950s.7

The most well-known figure in Houston in the early-mid twentieth century, was Jesse Jones. Jones, who was often referred to as “Mr. Houston,” was a lifelong Democrat. His first business was the lumber industry, and he benefited from the expansion of the ship channel in the 1920s. He created a financial empire based on real

7 Ibid, 6-15.
estate, banking and insurance, and investing companies. He also owned the *Houston Chronicle* and helped William P. and Oveta Culp Hobby buy the *Houston Post*. He served in President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s administration for thirteen years, first as the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Committee (RFC) and then as the secretary of commerce. From this position, he furthered Houston’s economic goals and provided tremendous federal economic aid to the city during World War II.\(^8\)

Jones was known for having little political ideology and having a significant ego and enormous pride. In 1945, Roosevelt asked Jones to resign to allow his former vice-president Henry Wallace to take the job. He was humiliated to be dismissed in such a manner. He was further angered that as one of the leading conservatives in the Roosevelt administration, he was to be replaced by a liberal such as Wallace. He returned to Houston a bitter man who still held enormous influence. He told close associates that the Democrats had been in power, “entirely too long...maybe its time we buried the Democratic party.” In 1948, Jones resumed control as the chief editor of the *Chronicle* and his newspaper endorsed the Republican ticket in 1948. He stated that it was “time for change in philosophy in government.” He told fellow Democrats that “patriotism should tell us to forget party labels this year...this will not be a case of leaving our party, rather our party has left us.” Although he despised the Truman administration, he wanted to maintain influence in conservative Democratic circles in Texas. For this reason, in the 1952 election he claimed to be neutral and sent a $2,500

donation to the national Democratic party. Privately, however, he worked for the election of Dwight Eisenhower. He stated privately that he favored an Eisenhower presidency, “very much... but of course I cannot show an active interest.” Despite this disclaimer, his newspaper editorialized support for the Eisenhower campaign and attacked Truman’s presidency, especially over foreign policy and Communism.⁹

William and Oveta Culp Hobby were also considered part of this powerful group of Houstonians. William Hobby had served as Texas governor and was still referred to as “governor” by many of his friends. In 1939, after fifteen years of managing the Houston Post, the Hobby’s bought it. Oveta Culp Hobby was national chairman of the National Democrats for Dwight Eisenhower organization. She stated the organization goal, ‘We will be working with Democrats of honor and integrity who are displaced, disillusioned, and disheartened by the chaos and corruption in the Truman administration...Stevenson cannot, as he promised earlier in the campaign, clean up ‘the mess.’” She was later appointed to the head of the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration. Although neither were involved in local Republican party affairs, they maintained quite an influence through their newspaper.¹⁰

Hugh Roy Cullen was another well-known Houstonian. Unlike many other prominent conservatives in Houston, he always had close ties to the Republican party, although he never held any position in it. This acknowledgment was important for the

---

⁹ Carleton, Red Scare, 77-84; Editorial, Houston Chronicle, September 17, 1948.
party, as many people did not like to label themselves as “Republicans.” He also contributed significantly to the party and provided the funds for conservative radio programs. Cullen was born in Denton County and moved to Houston in 1911. He briefly sought to raise cotton and cattle before turning to oil, where he amassed a fortune by developing deep drilling. He strongly believed in the self-made man and that with great wealth came great social responsibility. Over time he donated $11 million each to the University of Houston and to Houston hospitals. It is estimated that over his lifetime he donated $175 million to various causes, which was approximately 93 percent of his wealth. Unlike some of the other leaders of the party, Cullen never ran for office nor did he own a newspaper. His opinion, however, was valued in Houston, primarily because his generosity gave him a forum to express his political views. He was also very outspoken about his conservative views compared to some of the other civic leaders in Houston.11

Cullen was a strong supporter of states’ rights and he bitterly opposed the New Deal. He was a strong isolationist who believed that alliances were “un-American.” While primarily a Republican, he did aid the Dixiecrats in 1948, “loaning” the Texas party $60,000. He took an active role in the Dwight D. Eisenhower campaign in 1952. He supported Eisenhower, mainly due to the belief that he represented the best chance for Republican victory throughout the nation and specifically the South. While Cullen respected Robert Taft, he thought, “it would be dangerous to nominate him for the Republican candidate for we might lose.” In correspondence with Eisenhower, he was

critical of several members of Eisenhower’s campaign staff as being too liberal and not being very bright politicians. He believed that they were too left of center, they believed in a strong-centralized government, and at times they tried to outdo the New Deal. He was bitterly opposed to the 1954 Supreme Court ruling against racial segregation, stating that the decision had “done more to destroy individual freedom than any government action since the founding of the nation.”

Another leader for the Republican party during this time period and one of the leading women in the party was Marjorie M. Arsht. She was born in 1914 and grew up in a Jewish family in Yoakum, Texas, a few miles outside of Houston. She attended Rice University before spending a couple of years in France. Upon returning to the United States, she earned her Master's degree at Columbia University in New York. After graduation she returned to Houston and became a teacher at Hogg Junior High School.

Despite Arsht’s Jewish background, she and her father had been Republicans since the Roosevelt administration. In 1960, two political candidates were invited to speak before a Jewish “sisterhood” to which Arsht belonged. The Republican candidate was Bob Overstreet, and he was opposed by Democrat Wally Miller. She was impressed by the Republican candidate and made a campaign contribution of $5. Whereas her political views had always been known, with this donation she started appearing on Republican “lists” and being recruited to become an active member of the Republican

---

12 H. R. Cullen to Dwight D. Eisenhower, November 29, 1951, H. R. Cullen file, DDEL; H. R. Cullen to Dwight D. Eisenhower, January 10, 1952, H. R. Cullen File, DDEL; Carleton, Red Scare, 89-92
party. She stated that Texans were resistant to the idea of a two-party state due to their contention that “Texas actually had two parties, one conservative and one liberal, all within the Democratic party.” She also pointed out that victory in the Democratic primary nearly guaranteed victory, as Republicans rarely opposed Democrats in the November election. Arsht worked to reverse this trend.14

Arsht became a member of the Tower campaign after she wrote an editorial for the Houston Press about the creation of the John Birch Society, a violent anti-communist organization. In the editorial, she argued that people needed to re-evaluate the catalyst for such groups. She pointed out that many of Republican Robert Taft’s supporters, whom Eisenhower had defeated for the presidency, believed that Eisenhower was a liberal. They argued that this became evident when he appointed Earl Warren to the Supreme Court. She stated, “extremism breeds extremism...We should address ourselves to reclaiming balance in our institutions and public policies in order to negate the impetus for creating groups such as the Birch Society.”15

After John Tower’s successful election in 1961, the Harris County Republican party asked Arsht to run for the state legislature in the 1962 election on the Republican ticket. She accepted the offer and was unchallenged in the Republican primary. After announcing her intentions, she received a phone call from Wallace Sterling, chairman of the Democratic party in Texas. He told her, “Marjorie, we didn’t know you wanted to be

---

14 Arsht, All the Way, 133-136; James A. Berton to Harris County Executive Committee, January 31, 1961, Folder 5, Box 438, John Tower Papers, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas; Arsht’s family came from a wealthy background as her father’s brothers the Meyer family ran Foley’s department store in Houston, although her father was rather estranged from his brothers, her mother’s side of the family including Henri Bendel was quite wealthy as well.
15 Arsht, All the Way, 133-136.
in the legislature. Just say the word and you’re in.” She replied, “But, Walter I don’t want to be a Democrat!” Her campaign suffered the same financial problems as other Republican candidates. A successful fundraising event yielded just $25. She did receive a few large donations and was able to raise $8,000 altogether. She was also able to gain the endorsement of all three Houston newspapers. The seat was still at large for the county instead of single-member districts. She also lacked support in the Jewish community and was attacked as being sympathetic to communism and to the Birch society. Despite these factors, Arsht was able to run a strong campaign. She lost but won 48.9 percent of the vote county wide. She believed that if she had been able to run in a single-member district, she would have won the election. Later in the 1960s, conservative Democrats sought out Arsht to oppose a liberal Democrat in the state legislature. If she accepted, they offered to finance her entire campaign. She declined and never sought public office again, instead devoting herself to the reorganization of the Harris County Republican party.16

Her most important contribution to the Harris County Republican party was her efforts at reorganizing the party at the precinct level and achieving greater participation in party meetings and conventions. After her defeat, Arsht sought to improve the Republican election strategy. She believed that the Democrats were smarter campaigners than the Republicans because of what she termed the “bell cow system.” This theory was that the Democrats found a popular winner in a specific area and used that person to promote their party within that area. Meanwhile, the Republicans

16 Arsht, All the Way, 136-138, 142-155; The three newspapers were: The Houston Post, the Houston Press, and the Houston Chronicle.
promoted the leader of the national party, such as Barry Goldwater, without regard to his local popularity. She sought to increase involvement in the precinct conventions and executive committee meetings. She created a program that became known as the neighbor-to-neighbor fund drive. This was an effort to get Republicans to ask their neighbors for contributions and maximize the financial structure of the party. The Republican party in Harris County was divided at that time by what she termed as “us versus them syndrome.” The local Republican party was mostly founded by a few upper-class Republicans and very much had a top-down political operation and environment. Furthermore, there were two groups of people in the Republican party: “old” Republicans and converted Democrats who were “too conservative for the conservative wing of the Democratic party and therefore had no real concept of Republican principles.” Arsht served for a time as a precinct chairman and later served on the state Republican executive committee and continued to seek ways to increase participation at the local level. Due in large part to Arsht’s efforts, participation in Republican primaries and other party functions continued to grow. 17

There were several prominent Republicans who joined the Eisenhower campaign in 1952. The first, of course, was Jack Porter who used Eisenhower’s candidacy to catapult himself to leadership not only in Harris County but also in the state. He had opposed Lyndon B. Johnson in the senate race in 1948, receiving 400,000 votes, the most in the state for a Republican to that point. Porter advised Eisenhower to push for

---

17 Arsht, All the Way, 155-161; 168-173; Saul Fiedman, “Harris G.O.P. Gives Cox Nod for Governor,” Houston Chronicle, no date, Republican party clippings, Houston Metropolitan Research Center, Houston, Texas; “Harris County Republican party: List of Chairmen”, Folder 9, Box 715, John Tower Papers, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas.
a strong states’ rights platform at the Republican convention and to avoid civil rights issues. He worried that since much of Eisenhower’s campaign organization came from the North and the East, there would be an appeal to the northern black vote, which would cause a backlash in the South. Porter did not believe that Eisenhower would receive much support from labor leaders. Porter was also opposed to the repeal of labor laws that had “reduced the power of some arrogant labor leaders.” He warned that federal spending needed to be cut and that the executive branch had become too powerful at the expense of the legislative branch. He served on the committee to select the vice-president at the 1952 Republican convention, and he served as national committeeman until 1960. Once he gained control of the party machinery, he worked to make the Republican party in Texas competitive in elections. He accomplished this goal by achieving two things. Previously in most elections, Democrats were not even opposed by a Republican candidate. Although there were not many electoral victories under Porter, there were numerous close races that required the Democrats to run a hard-fought campaign. Secondly, the Republicans’ finances continued to grow throughout his leadership. Although Porter was from Houston, he tended to stay out of local politics. After spending ten years as the leader of the state party, he retired to his oil business, where he was the president of an independent oil association.  

While the party began to grow under Porter’s leadership, it was not until the election of John Tower to the United States Senate, that the party in Harris County rapidly began to change. For his campaign in 1961, only 189 out of 290 precincts had a

---

chairman and Republican organization. For the first time, by 1964, there was a Republican primary in every precinct. In 1963, Bill Elliott was elected to the Houston City Council. He was considered to be the first Republican to serve on the council.19

The Republican State Finance Committee created a confidential file to monitor the financial state of the party. In this file was a list that contained the names of donors that the committee designated as “key Republicans.” This group had either raised or donated $2,000 to the Republican party (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 Harris County Key Republicans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Donation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman, M.S.</td>
<td>VP, Texas</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Thomas D VP, Texas Fund Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsh, Raymond</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett, Arthur E. Driver</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartle, William O President</td>
<td>Drilling/oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen, Harry H.</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Oil/banking</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorn, David H.</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farish, W. S.</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay, Albert B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil/ranching</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haden, Charles</td>
<td>Asst. Lawyer</td>
<td>Fulbright firm</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoard, Mrs. J. O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, John F.</td>
<td>Sr. VP</td>
<td>Gas/oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterson, Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media/oil</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCollum, L. F.</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Oil/medical</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed, L. S.</td>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp, Dudley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Lloyd H.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: “Charter Key Republicans”, March 15, 1964, Box 4zd346, Jack Cox Papers, CAH; 1960 Houston City Directory.

They also usually took an active role in the party throughout the state, whether serving as precinct chairmen or holding fundraisers. There was also a list of contributions by county. Harris County contributed significantly more to the party financially than any

19 “GOPs Sew To Reap In Harris: Districts, Leaders Named For Tightly-Knitted Setup,” Houston Post, May 5, 1953.
other major metropolis. According to this confidential memo, Harris County had contributed 25 percent more than Dallas and 50 percent more than Bexar Counties in 1963. Although it is difficult to discern the role each of these individuals had in the Harris County Republican party, their existence proves that the party was growing in size and financial assets.  

One of the participants in the Republican party was Albert B. Fay. He was born in Louisiana and moved to Texas in 1928. He attended Yale, where he received a B. S. in Geology. He then served in the Navy during World War II. He and his brother Ernest owned a shipbuilding company during World War II. His business interests then turned to oil and ranching, and after he made several unsuccessful bids for public office, he served as an ambassador to a couple of foreign countries. He served as a national committeeman from Texas from 1960 to 1969. He also led Richard Nixon’s campaign efforts in Texas.  

Another oil chairman, L. F. McCollum, was also a prominent member of the Republican party. He was born in Tennessee but was raised in south Texas. After graduating from the University of Texas, he joined Humble Oil. He served on the Conoco board and was a chairman for the Baylor College of Medicine for fourteen years.  

---

20 “Harris County Republican Party: List of Chairmen” Folder 9, Box 715, John Tower Papers; “Charter Key Republicans”, March 15, 1964, Box 4zd346, Jack Cox Papers, Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin, Texas (hereafter cited as CAH); Texas Republican Finance Committee Memo, October 31, 1963, Box 4zd322, Jack Cox Papers, CAH.  
21 Houston Chronicle, August 6, 1979; Johnston, The Un-Known City, 236, 272, 324, 372.  
22 Houston Chronicle, December 1, 1968; Saul Fiedman, “Harris G.O.P. Gives Cox Nod for Governor” Houston Chronicle, no date, Republican party clippings, Houston Metropolitan research Center, Houston, Texas.
Other Republicans included William S. Farish. He was born in Mississippi and after receiving his law degree from the University of Mississippi he moved to Houston. He served for a while as president of the Gulf Coast Oil Producers Association. This association became Humble Oil Company and he served as one of the founders. Another Republican was Thomas D. Anderson. He was the nephew of Monroe (MD) Anderson. He took over the Anderson foundation which helped build the Medical Center.  

While Republicans gained much of their financial support from the oil industry, there were a couple of lawyers who also achieved “key Republican” status. One of them was Charles Haden, a member of the Fulbright and Jarowski firm. Haden was also a county chairman for the Harris County Republican party in 1964. Another was Dudley C. Sharp. However, most of the Houstonians who were considered “key Republicans” were involved with the oil industry.  

The Mastersons were another involved Republican couple. Carroll Masterson was the daughter of the founder of Humble Oil Company and Harris Masterson's father owned the Houston Post in the 1930s. They were considered “key Republicans.” They were also very involved in the arts in Houston and made several notable donations, including plans to leave their house to the city’s art community. There were several other women involved with the Republican party, including Mrs. J. O. Hoard. a “key Republican” and her husband who was president of Exploration Company Oil. Mrs. M  

---

23 Johnston, The Un-Known City, 125, 128, 137.  
24 Ibid; “Campaign Misc.”, Box 4zd346, Jack Cox Papers, CAH.
Ackerman was considered a “key republican”, although it was her husband who served on the executive committee in Harris County for the Republican party.  

Table 2.2 Tower Campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, F. Gene</td>
<td>Band Manager</td>
<td>Tools/supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunigan, F. A.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerdes, Connie</td>
<td>H-Physician</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinn, Fred</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriman, Douglas</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert, Don</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffington, Roy</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isenhart, Frank</td>
<td>Purchase Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapp, Al</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehm, Barbara C.</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, John E.</td>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maher, John</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Drilling/oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosher, Ed</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, Robert C.</td>
<td>Physican</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runnels, Clyde</td>
<td>Longshoreman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starnes, Lawrence D.</td>
<td>Architect Designer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall, John A.</td>
<td>Physican</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walpole, Ben</td>
<td>Physican</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver, Henry O.</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webre, Lloyd P.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York, J. Barry</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Horace O.</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: “List of Names”, Folder 7, Box 715, John Tower Papers, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas; 1960 Houston City Directory.

The second group contributed to the Tower campaign. No information was given on campaign contributions, but the Tower’s campaign staff created a statewide list of people they viewed as important. It is not clear whether all of these people made donations, although some did. The above table 2.2, lists the Houston names. In-depth information on these donors does not exist, although there is basic demographic...

---

25 Ibid; Fiedman, “Harris G.O.P. Gives Cox Nod for Governor.”
information. The occupations listed were those given in the *1960 Houston City Directory*.

One of these donors was Roy Huffington. He was born just outside of Houston and served in the U. S. Navy during World War II. Huffington worked for Humble Oil for ten years before becoming an independent oilman who did the majority of his work in Indonesia and dealt primarily with natural gas.26

Table 2.3 Cox Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Donation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush, George</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain, Dixon</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton, Benjamin</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doherty, Wilfred T.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oil/petro</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Richard W.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost, C. M.</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosline, Jim E.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamman, John III</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrin, R. T.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring, Robert</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Natural gas</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightower, H. Wayne</td>
<td>Staff landman</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, Willard M.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>magnet cove</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, John C.</td>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, Ralph A.</td>
<td>Oil/ranching</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Gaston C.</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, Russell A.</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, John F.</td>
<td>Sr. Vice-P</td>
<td>Gas/oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangum, R. O.</td>
<td>Drilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon, Don E.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Drilling</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohle, Theodore. W.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptune, Millard K.</td>
<td>Sr. Vice-P</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Willard L.</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Weldon H.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Drilling</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutlles, J. E.</td>
<td>Assistant mgr.</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance, Harold</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>Banking/oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, Kenneth</td>
<td>Division mngr.</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddill, A. W.</td>
<td>Vice-president</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortham, John L.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: “Jack Cox Correspondence: Harris County,”. Boxes 4zd288, 4zd338, Jack Cox Papers, CAH; *The 1960 Houston City Directory*.

---

Finally a list of Jack Cox donators is listed. Due to the large nature of his campaign, this list is limited to those who gave at least $100. This list was also generated from the correspondence between Jack Cox and these individual donors. The 1960 Houston City Directory was also used, along with some biographical sketches.

Richard W. French was president of United Carbon Company. Born in Colorado but moved to Houston in 1959, French attended Harvard University and served in the United States Army. He had also worked for Standard Oil Company prior to moving to Houston. Another donor was Robert Herring. His business interests included natural gas, steel, and banking. He was born in Texas and graduated from Texas A&M University. He served as president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce and he worked in the Tower and Nixon campaigns as well. Benjamin Clayton was another Cox donor. He had been a partner in the office of Anderson, Clayton, and Company (ACCO) until 1930. It was a cotton marketing firm, that had been originally based in Oklahoma City. It grew to become one of the largest cotton brokerages firms and had offices throughout the United States and in Europe.27

The Republican party ended this period as a growing and developing party. It was aided by the changes in Houston’s political structure, namely the creation of single-member districts. The party also benefited from new leadership which sought to increase participation at the precinct level. Reorganization efforts were undertaken to improve financing campaigns and achieving solid voter turnout. With new leadership and party organization, participation at the precinct level started to rapidly increase with

---

the campaigns of John Tower and Jack Cox. As the list of donors indicates, the financial state of the party had taken a tremendous step forward as well.
CHAPTER 4

ELECTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN THE REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES

This chapter focuses on the development and growth of the Republican party and the changes and struggles within the Democratic party in Harris County throughout the 1950s and 1960s. The thesis of this chapter is that for the Republican party, this era brought changes in rules and leadership, and the party developed both on an organizational and a financial scale. The Democrats experienced a significant fight between the liberal and conservative wings of its party, which led conservative Democrats to join the Republican party. These two events provided the catalyst that the Republican party needed for growth. This chapter examines the specific details of several important elections: Dwight D. Eisenhower’s success in winning Texas in both of his presidential elections, John Tower’s election as Republican senator, and former Democrat Jack Cox’s unsuccessful bid for the governor’s office. These elections proved to be the decisive factor that allowed the Republican party to become viable in Harris County.

The Democrats in Texas during the 1940s became more and more dissatisfied with the national government and the direction in which their party was heading. The first bolt was in 1944 by a group of Democrats who opposed Franklin D. Roosevelt for another term. They became known as the Texas Regulars. Among their complaints was the fact that FDR had switched to Henry Wallace, a man they viewed as extremely liberal, for his vice-presidential pick in 1940. They also opposed the restrictions he had placed on businesses and his pro-labor stance as part of their economic grievances.
These Democrats sent their own delegation to the National Democratic Convention along with a more liberal group of Texas Democrats. The Democratic National party divided the Texas delegation votes and seats at the convention between the two factions: half went to Roosevelt and the other half opposed him. In September, the Texas state Democratic convention booted off the electors who had opposed Roosevelt at the national convention. These Texas Regulars subsequently formed a third party that drew nearly as many votes as the Republicans did in the November 1940 election: about 15 percent of the vote. 28

There was another bolt in 1948 as some members of the state Democratic party joined forces with the States’ Rights Democratic party, nicknamed the Dixiecrats. They were led by Strom Thurmond, who was their presidential candidate, and they were motivated primarily by their infuriation at some of President Harry S. Truman’s stances on civil rights. These included Truman’s efforts to end desegregation in the military, his endorsement of an anti-lynching law, and his support for the Fair Employment Practices Committee. These disgruntled Democrats formed a third party that joined the Dixiecrats’ effort to get on the ballot in Texas. These Democrats never had any party organization, however, and were unable to get Thurmond on the November ballot as a Democrat. In the southern states where Thurmond was on the ballot as a Democrat, he carried those states. In Texas, where he did not appear as a Democrat, he won only about two-thirds of the vote that the “Texas Regulars” had received four years earlier. The Democratic ballot also lost about 75,000 votes, claiming only 65 percent of the

vote, which was their lowest percentage since 1928. It was the Republicans who gained the most in the presidential election, receiving about 25 percent of the vote, a significant number given the state of the Republican party in Texas. Entering the 1950s Texas was a bed of discontent and ready once again to bolt the Democratic party.\textsuperscript{29}

Texans disagreed with the national Democratic party on numerous issues. Many conservative Democrats opposed Truman’s civil rights policy. They had been particularly upset at the 1944 United States Supreme Court decision \textit{Smith v. Allwright} that struck down the all-white Texas primary. This opened the party up to minority participation. Conservative Democrats in Texas wanted the rule restored that required two-thirds of the delegates to approve the presidential nominee at the national convention. This rule, which was changed to a simple majority vote at the 1936 Democratic National Convention, had previously assured that the nominee was acceptable to the South. This was accomplished by the South voting as a bloc and it would prevent the nomination of a candidate they viewed as unfavorable to their interests. Texas Governor Allan Shivers also listed Truman’s “bungling foreign policy” and the “codling of communists in high places of government” among his objections.\textsuperscript{30}

The Democratic party was split into two factions: a conservative wing and a liberal one. Conservative Democrats maintained a strong hold over most state elections, while liberals in the party did have a few notable exceptions, such as Ralph Yarborough’s election to the United States Senate in 1957. Towards the end of the


1950s, this gradually began to change. One telling note was the make-up of the Texas legislature. In 1951, there were 105 conservatives in the House, with only 45 considered liberal or moderate. By 1961, they were even, with 75 conservatives and 75 moderates or liberals. This shift was aided by large defections of conservative Democrats to the Republican party. The largest base for conservative support came from the most populated metropolitan areas composing over fifty percent of the total vote.\(^{31}\)

In Harris County, conservative Democrats held the advantage for most of the 1950s as the county almost always supported the conservative candidate. However, the representatives in the Texas legislature were nearly evenly split in their positions on issues. Big cities in Texas had a much stronger tendency towards conservatism than large cities in the North for a variety of reasons. Texas cities had a strong commercial base rather than a manufacturing base. Furthermore, a large percentage of this group was made up of white-collar, managerial jobs. There was also a weak union presence and a failure to work successfully with minorities.\(^{32}\)

The Republican party started to experience growth in the 1950s due to a variety of factors: new party leadership, changes in election laws, and the 1952 presidential election. At that time R. B. Creager, a member of the Old Guard Republicans, led the Texas Republican party. They were primarily interested in patronage and controlling the party machinery. Creager told a man who wished to join the Republican party to join

---


\(^{32}\) Soukup, *Party and Factional Division in Texas*, 74-86.
the Democratic party instead, “Because what is best for Texas is for every state in the union to have a two-party system and for Texas to be a one-party state. When you have a one-party state, your men stay in office longer and build up seniority.” Creager died in 1950 and was succeeded by Henry Zweifel, another Old Guard Republican. In a letter to the Houston Post, a dissident Republican stated: “Patronage has been the only purpose of the Texas Republican party for the past thirty years...in fact, a healthy growth of the Texas Republican party is the last thing the leaders ever wanted.”

For many years, the Texas Republican party had been exempt from holding primaries by a Texas law that required a party to have received at least 100,000 votes for governor in the last election in order to have to comply with the state primary law. After this number was surpassed, the Old Guard Republicans persuaded the Texas legislature to increase the limit to 200,000. Instead of primaries, they would usually hold informal precinct and county conventions in which the location or time would change without notice. Dissident Republicans claimed that the meetings were hidden so that they could be easily controlled. One story was circulated to get their point across. Allegedly, a Republican federal judge was unable to find his precinct meeting in 1948. It had been in an outhouse near a packing plant. For Republicans who did want change, the “rule or ruin” attitude of the Republican party kept it from being competitive in the state.

One of the essential ingredients for change in the Texas Republican party was

---

getting a formal nomination structure and popular control of the party. To this end, the Texas legislature passed several laws as part of an overhaul of the election code in 1951. The first change they passed was House Bill 43, which standardized precinct, county, and state conventions for parties that had between 10,000 and 200,000 members. This specific number assured that the bill applied only to Republicans. This required that these meetings be formal proceedings, advertised at least a week in advance, and the results reported to the Texas secretary of state. Also, the location had to be declared and any change to location had to be done at least ten days in advance.35

Another drastic change adopted by the Texas legislature was something that became known as cross-filing. This allowed a candidate to be on the ballot in two different places, provided that two different parties had nominated him. It was also necessary that the candidate accept both nominations. The cross-filing law created a lot of controversy among state Democrats. Many liberal Democrats accused Shivers of destroying the Democratic party and blurring the line between the two parties with the new cross-filing law. After it passed, many Democrats believed that Shivers was prepared to bolt the national party. It was a law that had a very short life and was repealed after the 1952 election.36

Meanwhile, some state Republicans sought to make the Republican party in Texas competitive. Jack Porter of Houston, who had been defeated by Lyndon B.

---

Johnson in a race for the U.S. Senate seat, led this group of Republicans who wished to change the status quo. Porter viewed Eisenhower's candidacy for president as having the potential to draw conservative Democrats and non-voters to the Republican party. If he could name the Texas delegation to the national convention for Eisenhower, it would make him national committeeman for Texas and would give him control over the Texas Republican party. With this in mind during 1951, he became Eisenhower's campaign manager for Texas instead of challenging the old guard Republicans for direct control of the Republican party. Zweifel had already come out for Robert Taft, who would oppose Eisenhower for the Republican nomination.37

Porter first met Eisenhower in Texas in 1949 and became a whole-hearted Eisenhower supporter. Over the next couple of years he corresponded with Eisenhower who was in Europe heading NATO. He sent Eisenhower the results of a poll which showed that most Texas newspapers would support Eisenhower if he were the Republican nominee. Porter viewed Shivers’ support for the two bills as an indication of his early support of an Eisenhower candidacy and claimed that Shivers had quietly worked for the bill’s passage. Porter believed that they had passed the cross-filing law for one reason only: “To put General Eisenhower on the Democratic ballot if he was nominated.”38

Porter knew that in order to succeed he would have to attract other voters to

---


participate in the Republican precinct meetings and to support Eisenhower's candidacy. To achieve this, he worked to encourage disgruntled conservative Democrats and “Presidential Republicans” to participate. One of the important steps he initiated was to introduce a rule change over who could participate in Republican precinct meetings. These meetings were vital in making up the delegation to the state convention. The amended rules allowed someone to participate in the convention regardless of his/her past voting behavior. In order to get this approved, Porter agreed to a pledge. People were required to sign a statement that they were a Republican and wished to participate in Republican activities for that year. The rule changes allowed a greater number of people to participate, while the signed statement prevented court challenges to the political nature of the participants. Porter and the Eisenhower backers were quick to point out, however, that the pledge was not binding and people could vote for whomever they chose that November.39

The issue that probably got the most attention was the Texas tidelands oil issue. The tidelands represented a claim that states made to the first three miles of coastland off their state. Texas claimed ten miles, pointing to the annexation treaty when Texas entered the Union as proof that the national government promised Texas their tidelands. This became a vital issue when there was believed to be a significant amount of oil in these tidelands or coastal waters. Before the 1948 election, Truman had stated that Texas’ claim to their tidelands was “different” from other states. A couple of

---

months after the election, Truman announced his intention to reserve the oil for defense and other national issues. His administration sued Texas for control of the tidelands and won their case before the U.S. Supreme Court. Congress then passed a bill recognizing states’ claims to the tidelands. Truman however vetoed this bill in March 1952.40

This issue came to the forefront when Eisenhower made his views public at the end of March. In a March 28, 1952 letter to Jack Porter, who was his campaign manager in Texas, Eisenhower expressed his support for the state’s position. He told Porter that federal ownership was “calculated to bring about steady progress toward centralized ownership and control, a trend which I have bitterly opposed.” He would later say that his interpretation of the annexation treaty with Texas guaranteed them the tidelands. Porter then shared the letter with other Eisenhower leaders, including Oveta Culp Hobby, who was the editor of the Houston Post and leader of Citizens for Eisenhower. She thought that it was an excellent statement and advised Porter to publish the letter in the Dallas Morning News where it would get the most coverage in Texas.41

The Republican effort for Eisenhower in Texas was greatly aided by support from conservative Democrats. This support would be vital to their success as Democrats greatly outnumbered Republicans in the state. This movement was known nationally as


“Democrats for Eisenhower.” It was led by Oveta Culp Hobby and was created to help get disgruntled Democrats across the country organized for Eisenhower. She had backed the “Regulars” during their fight against FDR and was always a supporter of Allan Shivers throughout his career. In Texas, however, Governor Shivers would eventually lead Democrats in supporting Eisenhower in the general election. Almost every state official also supported Eisenhower. This support provided Eisenhower’s campaign with money and organization that the Democratic party would normally have received. Given the fact that the Democrats for Eisenhower had the support of the state Democratic party, there was little need or desire to have the national organization in Texas.42

The National Democrats for Eisenhower organization was advised that there were several legal options for Democrats to vote for Eisenhower in Texas. First, under the cross-filing law, Democrats could nominate and place Eisenhower on the ballot as their presidential candidate instead of Adlai Stevenson, who was the candidate nominated by the Democratic party at the National Convention. The legality of two or dual sets of Democratic nominees for president was disputed and would likely end up in court. The legal opinion of the Texas Attorney General also suggested that the Democrats and Republicans could nominate the same set of electors for the election. This could be done because the state Republicans held their convention after the

---

42. Porter, interview by Luther, 228, pp. 24; Allan Shivers, interview by John Luther, interview 238, transcript, pp. 13, 14, 40; Press Release from Citizens for Eisenhower announcing creation of National Democrats for Ike, Democrats for Eisenhower file, Box 1, Series 1, Oveta Culp Hobby Papers, DDEL; Dobbs, Yellow Dogs, 30.
Democrats held theirs. This way both sets of electors would be committed to Eisenhower.43

Following the Democrats, the Republicans held their state convention in mid-September. Although some Republicans wanted to see if Eisenhower could help state Republicans win other offices, Porter wanted the Democrats to be cross-filed. The convention by a unanimous vote opted to list all of the Democratic nominees for statewide office, on the Republican ballot. This, of course, was made possible by the new cross-filing law. They had earlier invited Governor Shivers and Attorney General Price Daniels to join them on their own terms. The keynote speaker of the state convention had this to say about the Democrats: “They think as we do, politically we belong together and this year we are together.” This was an effort to get unhappy state Democrats to vote for Eisenhower. Although the Democratic state convention had requested Democrats to work for Eisenhower’s election, many had not personally committed to Eisenhower, including Governor Shivers. All of the state Democrats, with the exception of John C. White, who was the Commissioner of Agriculture, accepted the Republicans’ nomination. Thus, the Republican ballot was the same as the Democrats’ except for the presidency. Eisenhower easily carried the state and won Harris County by a strong majority.44

The next major breakthrough for the Republican party came with the election of

---

43 Memorandum of Texas Election Laws, Box 1, Series 1, Hobby Papers, DDEL. Porter interview by Luther interview #228, DDEL.
John G. Tower to the United States Senate in the special election of 1961. Tower had opposed Lyndon B. Johnson in his re-election bid for his Senate seat in 1960. Although Tower lost the race statewide, he narrowly carried Harris County. According to former Texas Governor Allan Shivers, Tower told him if he ran for the Senate, Tower would not oppose him. However, Tower began to prepare to run for the 1961 election. A staff memo, which consisted of a study of Harris County, stated, “As goes Harris, so goes the state.” Tower himself was of the opinion that his election statewide would hinge on how great a margin he was able to carry in Harris County. Due to these factors Tower based his campaign in Houston and focused heavily on Harris County.45

Both Tower and his opponent, conservative William Blakely, predicted victory in the election. Democratic Governor Price Daniels stated that the campaign was unwilling to publish favorable poll results due to the fear of “overconfidence.” The election produced greater than expected interest from inside and outside of the state. The original estimate for turnout statewide was only 200,000. After absentee and early voting, this estimate was increased to one million.46

Tower was 35 at the time of the election. Prior to running in the 1960 senatorial campaign against Johnson, he taught political science at Midwestern University in Wichita Falls, Texas. Both his father and grandfather had been Methodist ministers, but Tower became interested in politics at an early age. He stated that his views leaned...
toward the Republican party, but “it was Harry Truman, I think, who was most responsible for my becoming a Republican.” After serving in the Navy in World War II, he became an active member of the Republican party in Texas. He was a delegate to the National Conventions in 1952 and 1956 and served as one of Dwight Eisenhower’s campaign managers in Texas in 1956. In 1960, Tower served on the platform committee at the Republican National Convention and also led the Southern Conference, where he worked for a moderate civil rights stand.47

When campaigning, he was careful never to identify himself as a Republican, instead labeling his political views as a “consistent conservative.” He opposed federal aid for education, favored expansion of the activities of the House Un-American Committee, and supported right to work laws. He opposed nearly every John F. Kennedy program. He stated, “The New Frontier is based on the premise that our people are no longer able to think for themselves.” He believed that this would lead to expanded government and would be harmful to free enterprise. He called himself a “moderate” on civil rights issues. He was of the belief that his victory would boost the morale of conservatives all over the United States. 48

Aware that there were not nearly enough Republican voters in the state, Tower sought the support of disgruntled conservative Democrats. He highlighted a group of 150 conservatives in South Texas who switched their allegiance from the Democratic to the Republican party. He told them in a campaign speech, “I think there are going to be

some more like you, when I win there are some important people on the state level that are going to make the switch with me.”

Tower’s campaign also received support from Republicans outside of Texas. Several senators from other states came to Texas to campaign for him. One of these senators, Thurston Morton of Kentucky, claimed that Tower already had more national stature than Blakely and that he would be a strong spokesman for conservatism in the Senate. Blakely attempted to use this support to undermine the Tower campaign and he argued that as the incumbent, he already had good committee assignments and Texas influence would diminish with the election of Tower. The Republican leader in the United States Senate, Everett Dirksen, made a public promise of top committee positions for Tower, instead of adhering to a strict assignment based on seniority that the Republicans normally followed.

One of the campaign steps that Tower’s staff took was a block-by-block effort in Harris County to get out the vote. They used a vote-trend analysis to determine the predominantly Republican precincts and emphasized these areas. With the election occurring in May, turnout would be lower than in a November election. In addition, during the primary, liberal Democrats split the vote between them allowing a conservative Democrat, William Blakely, to win the nomination. The Tower’s campaign also attempted to gain the support of conservative and liberal Democrats who wanted

---

to gain control of the Democratic party. The theory was, if a Republican were elected, more and more conservative Democrats would join the Republican party.51

A long-standing struggle between the liberal and conservative factions had been occurring in state-wide politics and this was true in Houston as well. In a study conducted of the 1959 legislature, there were a total of nine representatives from Houston: two were considered moderates, seven were considered liberals, and there were no conservatives. This was different from a city such as Dallas, where Republicans had already won several seats and conservatives dominated the area’s representation as a whole. There was some expected backlash from African American voters towards Blakely. He opposed the Kennedy nomination of an African American, Robert Weaver, to serve as chief of the United States Housing Program. 52

In the primary for the special election for the open Senate seat more than fifty candidates ran, including several prominent liberals. The liberals split the vote among themselves, which allowed a staunch conservative Democrat, William Blakely, to finish second and oppose Tower in the run-off for the seat. Later on, liberals lamented the fact that they were unable to rally behind one candidate for the Senate. Maury Maverick Jr. was one of the two main liberals along with Henry B. Gonzalez. He stated in an oral history interview that the election had been a “mistake,” and that they had been too “vain and proud to run in the same election.” 53

51 Jerry D. Stephens, Tower Research Staff, “Harris County Precinct Analysis” Box 726, JTP; Houston Post May 1961.
53 Maury Maverick, Jr. interview by Chandler Davidson, Oct. 27, 1975, transcript, pgs. 24-25, Woodson Research Center, Rice University, Houston, Texas.
Tower’s candidacy was somewhat limited by its financial resources. It did not possess the financial resources of other Republican elections such as the bid by Jack Cox for governor, nor was it as well funded as his future campaigns would be. This is evident by some of the more elaborate studies and other campaign efforts that took place in future election years. Despite these shortcomings, Tower was still able to win.54

Some liberal members of the Democratic party even suggested that liberals should not vote in the upcoming election, recommending that they “go fishing” instead. These sentiments were blasted by National Committeeman Bryon Skelton. He stated that it would be a “national shame and disgrace” if Texas elected a Republican senator. He also stated, “If Democrats vote, we will win overwhelmingly.” In an analysis done by the Houston Post liberal democrats and areas of strong Democratic support did not vote in large numbers. In predominantly liberal areas in Houston, voter participation was dramatically down in the run-off compared to the primary. This was true of the African American precincts as well. On the other hand, turnout in conservative areas was up compared to the previous election, and Tower carried these areas more decisively then he had during the primary. This resulted in Tower carrying Harris County by nearly a two-thirds majority. This greatly aided Tower in carrying the state and becoming the first Republican senator from Texas since Reconstruction.55

Another breakthrough for the Republican party came during the 1962 gubernatorial race between former Democrat- turned Republican Jack Cox and

54 “Harris County Survey”, Folders 6 and 7, Box 887, John Tower Papers, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas; Jack Cox Papers, CAH, Austin, Texas.
Democrat John Connally. Although Cox ended up losing the campaign, he was able to carry Harris County and give the Democratic party its biggest challenge for a state office. The election saw a tremendous boost in voter participation as the first competitive state race in the general election.\textsuperscript{56}

Cox had formerly been a conservative Democrat. He had served in the Texas legislature during the 1950s and ran unsuccessfully for the nomination for governor in the Democratic party primary in 1960. In that election he opposed Governor Price Daniel and received 41 percent of the vote. He publicly switched parties in 1961 and easily won the Republican party's nomination for governor with little or no opposition. He also led several "Resignation Rallies" of conservative Democrats switching to the Republican party in the fall of 1961. In ranking his priorities, he stated that he was a conservative before he was a Republican. He benefited greatly from his time as an elected Democrat because of his organizational and financial support. He had strong financial backing from several conservative groups and individuals, including some Democrats. These conservative groups included some small grass-root supporters along with traditional Republicans, such as the oil industry and business groups. \textsuperscript{57}

Cox, who was forty-one at the time of the election, grew up in poverty in Breckenridge, Texas. He joined his father at age ten, as an oil field worker. He attended North Texas State University, where he concentrated on politics and economics. He served for six years in the Texas legislature as a Democrat. He also served six years on

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Houston Post}, November 7, 1962.

\textsuperscript{57} "Resignation Rallies" \textit{Human Events Commentary}, October 6, 1961, Box 4c510, HCDPR, CAH.; Speech (unnamed), Box 4zd346, Jack Cox Papers, CAH; Neil Addington, "Cox Will Keynote State Republican Convention", \textit{Houston Post}, September 16,, 1962, section 1, pg.17;
the Texas Commission for Higher Education. A staunch conservative, he claimed never to have voted for a Democratic nominee for president. He left the Democratic party in 1961 after deciding, “I felt for a long time that I could be instrumental in changing the course of the national Democratic party...I no longer believed this possible. I believed the place for me was in the Republican party.” He opposed increased government spending and wanted fewer federal restrictions, especially on oil.58

Cox and his campaign benefited from a Republican party that had been invigorated by the election of John Tower. The Republican State Convention was, by far, the largest ever held in the state. Observers noted that there was excitement and enthusiasm that had been missing in previous conventions. This was true in Harris County as well. The local party stated that they were sending more delegates to their convention than the Democrats were to theirs. Previous problems with finding enough chairmen and volunteer support for the elections was no longer an issue.59

One theme that the Cox campaign emphasized was the close ties that Connally had to Lyndon B. Johnson. The Cox campaign staff perceived that there was a great deal of discontent among conservative Democrats with Lyndon B. Johnson. The leader of the Republican party in Texas, Tad Smith, stated that the race for governor had “national significance.” He argued that the election of Cox would lead to the defeat of the Kennedy-LBJ ticket in 1964. Cox’s campaign manager stated that his victory would

bring “political emancipation” to the state and restore the United States government to “conservative principles.” Some political observers criticized the Cox campaign for becoming so focused on the Washington angle.60

Cox also sought out voters who desired a two-party state. He declared that the growth of the Republican party was at the “expense of the old one-party machine in Texas politics.” He extolled the virtues of having a two-party state. He also argued that the Democrats were trying to kick conservatives out of their party, while the Republicans were welcoming them. He argued that, “A one-party government encourages wrongdoing and stagnation.” 61

One of the Cox campaigns’ main objectives was to attract conservative Democrats for the 1962 election. The following exchange was reported by the Houston Post at the Harris County Democratic Caucus: “If you are a Democrat, be a Democrat!” followed by “I would rather be an out-and-out Republican than a Connally Democrat!” The conservative faction in Harris County had gained the upper hand, however, and fully endorsed all the candidates including Connally. The delegates to the Democratic State Convention were very conservative and sought a platform similar to their views. There were no liberals among the delegates. One of them stated, “We want as

---

conservative a platform as we can possibly get.” While all of their wishes were not met, they were satisfied with the results of the convention.  

James Caldwell, who was a member of the Democratic finance committee in Harris County, in a letter to other members of the party, described the Republican fundraising efforts in Harris County: “The conclusion is inescapable, that the Democrats have a much harder task ahead of them than first imagined.” This was in response to the block-by-block Republican fundraising effort that was averaging at least $5,000. Some precincts already had totals as high as $8,500. These figures came as a “considerable shock” to this Democrat. This was a significant grass-roots fundraising effort, as each family was asked to give $120. It is also obvious from the correspondence by Cox in his personal papers how much more broad-based financial support he had compared to the Tower campaign. Despite the financial backing that Cox had, it still paled in comparison to the Democrats. John Connally had spent over one million in the Democratic primary alone. The “goal” of the Republican party was to raise $500,000 for the campaign. Although this was money raised by just the Republican party and does not include money that Cox was able to raise on his own, it illustrates some of the differences between the two parties. Smith acknowledged that money was a big problem facing the Republicans and even if they only supported Cox, there was no way to match the money Connally had.

---

63 James Caldwell to F. T. Baldwin, September 1962, state executive committee folder, Box 4c505, HCDPR, CAH; Ellen Middlebrook, “Helping Connally JFK, LBJ Aim, Smith charges”, Houston Post,
Although Cox carried Harris County, he did not win by the margin necessary for it to translate into a statewide victory. Whereas Tower had won nearly two-thirds of the vote in Harris County, Cox won by less than 1 percent. He was seemingly hurt by an enormous turnout, over 250,000 compared to the 100,000 people who had voted in the Tower election a year earlier. This came despite efforts from some notable conservative Democrats, such as former Governor Shivers working on his behalf.\textsuperscript{64}

Despite these breakthroughs for the Republican party in Harris County, obstacles remained for the party in elections. Democrats continued to be victorious in races for the state legislature. Republicans also were unable to make a strong showing in the races for the U. S. House, including in the new 22\textsuperscript{nd} District, which had a large population of people from other parts of the state and country. In this sense, Houston lagged behind other cities, such as Dallas, which had elected several Republicans to the state legislature and its own United States House of Representatives. Despite this, the Republican party had made some impressive strides from an organizational and financial perspective. Meanwhile, the liberal wing of the Democratic party began to control the party structure in Harris County. This occurred as more and more conservative Democrats became Republicans, or at least started voting for Republican candidates, even if they did not consider themselves to be Republicans.

\textsuperscript{64} Houston Post, November 7, 1962; Jack Cox to Allan Shivers, miscellaneous correspondence folder, Box 4zd346, Jack Cox Papers, CAH.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

The rise of the Republican party, and a two-party system in Harris County and Texas was a slow process that began in earnest with the election of Dwight D. Eisenhower as president. There were six significant factors that aided this development: Economic changes came rapidly to Houston during World War II and the post-war years that followed. This economic prosperity and opportunity brought about demographic changes in the county. There was also a developing “political environment” in Houston due to these changes. This process aided the Republican party, especially its political leadership as it became better organized due to changes in party structure from within the party and from forces outside of the party. A two-party system became encouraged due to the fact of deep factionalism within the Democratic party. Finally, the Republicans were able to achieve success through some of the candidates, who already had a strong base of conservative support and favorable conditions in their campaigns. While all the authors cited in this paper made important contributions, Key appears to be the most accurate.

Houston experienced economic growth throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Due largely to the oil industry in the city, Houston did not go through a harsh depression as did much of the country at the end of the 1930s. With the discovery of oil, Houston had become a booming town. The city experienced other economic growth as well. The Houston ship channel and commercial shipping continued to expand and develop. This was especially true during World War II, when Houston received federal grants to
increase the depth and width of the Houston Ship Channel. During this time, Houston also developed a large petrochemical and synthetic rubber industries. Manufacturing accounted for 20 percent of the city’s work force. While this was larger than in most other Texas cities, it still lagged behind some northern cities. Houston also saw its professional businesses grow and begin to attract white-collar workers from other parts of the country.

These economic changes brought about a demographic shift in the population. The first was a dramatic increase in the size of the population. Houston went from being a relatively small city to one of the largest in the nation almost overnight. Don Carleton in *Red Scare!* Argues that this rapid change helped to foster a sense of uneasiness and paranoia about many of the new residents. The economic expansion also attracted people looking for a better financial opportunity. A large group of minorities and rural Texans from all across the state made up the vast majority of this population increase. By 1960, nearly a third of Houston’s population had been born outside of Texas. Some were from other southern states, but many had come from northern and western states as well. Many of these new citizens came from a different political culture than those raised in the South. Houston also had a larger minority population and a stronger labor movement than could be found elsewhere in the state. This was partly why the Harris County Democratic party tended to be more liberal than the statewide party. These factors helped to turn many conservatives in Harris County into “swing” voters or even into the Republican party itself.
For the development of a two-party system to occur there needed to be a change in the “political environment” that existed in Houston during this time period. Harris County had always experienced voter apathy and low voter turnout. This was true throughout the South, but Houston even lagged behind several other southern cities. This began to change for a variety of reasons. First, demographic changes brought people from other states, who were used to a much higher level of voter participation. Second, issues that sparked an emotional and passionate response began to become a part of politics. This included the New Deal and desegregation. The elimination of the white primary in 1944, and the abolishment of the two-thirds rule in the National Democratic party also changed the composition of the party. This led to a backlash in Texas among conservative Democrats. Their discontent with the national party helped the Republicans become better organized and more competitive with the Democrats, and this growth of the Republican party caused elections to become more competitive and actual campaigns to be fought. A renewed interest in politics greatly increased voter participation, as V. O. Key in *Southern Politics* predicted that it would.

Texas Governor Allan Shivers and his conservative supporters in the legislature passed several laws that resulted in better organization for the Republican party. These laws required the holding of primaries to nominate candidates, instead of the informal nomination structure that the Republicans had previously had. Several liberal Democrats warned in 1951 that these changes brought about by the Democratic legislature, constituted a sign that conservative Democrats intended to bolt the party in
1952. Shivers and his allies resented the New Deal and actions taken by the national Democratic party and they opposed the Truman administration.

These changes were also not welcomed by the leaders of the Republican party. Called the “old guard,” this elite group of men had long controlled the party. They were primarily interested in patronage and had done little to help the party grow and develop in the state. The new election laws allowed their power over the party to be challenged. H. J. (Jack) Porter, who had run unsuccessfully for the United States Senate seat against Lyndon B. Johnson in 1948, sought to gain control of the Republican party. He decided that the best chance for success lay with the candidacy of General Dwight D. Eisenhower. Porter became Eisenhower’s campaign manager in Texas and sought to gain control of the party at the state convention. The most pivotal moment would be the 1952 Republican primary. Porter sought conservative Democrats to vote in the Republican primary for Eisenhower. He agreed to a loyalty oath for the participants, believing that such a statement was not legally binding. The “old guard” leaders attempted to have the strong primary vote for Eisenhower tossed out at the state convention based on the fact that some of the voters were Democrats. This became known as the “Texas steal” and helped Eisenhower to secure the nomination at the National Republican convention.

Allan Shivers and the Texas legislature supported Eisenhower’s candidacy instead of the national Democratic nominee for President, Adlai Stevenson. The legislature passed a cross-filing law that allowed Eisenhower to appear as the Democratic nominee on the Texas ballot. Votes for Stevenson had to be written in as he was not the
Democratic nominee and Eisenhower easily carried the state with the aid of the conservative Democrats. It represented a major break for the solidly Democratic state and attracted people to the Republican party. Porter became the national committeeman from Texas and the leader of the Republican party for the next decade. Although the Republican party did not offer a full slate of candidates, this election represented a significant development for the party and the development of a two-party system.

The next significant step occurred with the election of Republican John Tower to the United States Senate in 1961. His election was aided by a number of key factors that allowed his campaign to be waged under favorable circumstances. The election occurred in May in a special Senate race to fill the seat vacated by LBJ. While turnout was higher than expected, it was still less than a November election would have been. Furthermore, the Democratic party’s liberal faction split among several candidates. This allowed a conservative Democrat, William Blakely to oppose Tower in the run-off election. This development led many liberals to stay away from the polls on election day. Liberals either did not vote at all or some supported Tower in the hopes of chasing conservative Democrats into the Republican party. Tower also benefited from strong support from Republicans outside of Texas that aided his campaign. V. O. Key stated that part of the reason for the one-party system in the South in the 1940s was the absence of outside Republican support and organization to aid the weak Republican structure in the South. This was not the case in Tower’s campaign in 1961. Many Republican senators campaigned for Tower, he received financial assistance from the
national party, and he was promised top committee assignments after his election. This greatly aided his campaign, especially from a financial perspective.

Towards the end of 1961, several events occurred to strengthen the Republican party in Texas and in Harris County. Jack Cox, a conservative Democrat, who had served in the Texas Legislature, opted to switch parties. He then announced that he would run as a Republican for the governor’s office in 1962. Although he did not win, his campaign helped to further strengthen the Republican party. He had a much stronger base of financial support than most Republicans enjoyed, due to his tenure in the legislature. He also was a known conservative and was able to gain conservative support from people who did not consider themselves Republicans. This new leadership brought a lot of growth to the party and produced greater participation at the precinct level. Additionally there were more chairmen and a stronger primary organization. Although Texas was not a solid two-party state, the Republican party had made tremendous gains in Harris County and throughout the state.
APPENDIX A

AREA A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tracts for Area A</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Residence in 1955</th>
<th>Income (families)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4,845</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11,219</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5,532</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,776</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47-A</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67-C</td>
<td>6,377</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67-D</td>
<td>7,919</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68-A</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68-B</td>
<td>11,924</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91-H</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91-I</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113-F</td>
<td>9,387</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113-G</td>
<td>12,752</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113-H</td>
<td>5,403</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113-I</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114-A</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114-B</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>9,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6,464</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73-A</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73-B</td>
<td>13,420</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,017</strong></td>
<td><strong>508</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

AREA B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tracts for Area B</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Residence in 1955</th>
<th>Income (families)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,933</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8,257</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-A</td>
<td>8,578</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-B</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-C</td>
<td>8,593</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-A</td>
<td>7,275</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-B</td>
<td>4,649</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-A</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-B</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-C</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-A</td>
<td>13,888</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-B</td>
<td>7,638</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-C</td>
<td>4,088</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-D</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-E</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-F</td>
<td>6,101</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-G</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-E</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-K</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-L</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-J</td>
<td>3,542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 111,478   | 5,656    | 150    | 78,884  | 16,581 | 7,085  | 923   | 2,030   | 3,154   | 11,869  | 12,547  | $9,992 |
| 95%       | 4%       | 1%     | 77%     | 16%    | 7%     |       |         |         |         |         |      |
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