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Everett McKinley Dirksen’s name appeared on the ballot in 26 elections beginning with his election to Pekin’s City Council in 1926. There followed nine primary and eight general elections to the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as four primary and four general elections to the U.S. Senate.

The purpose of Everett M. Dirksen as Candidate is to present an overview of his electoral record, something historians have neglected.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Primary Elections (13)

Dirksen lost only one primary election—his first, the 1930 Republican primary election for the U.S. House of Representatives. He ran unopposed in seven of 13 primary elections. In his five contested primaries, his margin of victory ranged from 5 percent in 1932 (his first successful primary) to 84 percent in 1968 (his last primary).

General Elections (12)

General election vote totals were substantially higher in presidential years. In Dirksen’s eight House races, the average total vote cast in the four non-presidential years was 90,396; in his eight House races, the average total vote case in the four presidential years was 124,700. In his four Senate races, the average total vote cast in the two non-presidential years equaled 3,659,410; in his four Senate races, the average total vote cast in the two presidential years was 4,344,712.

U.S. House elections. In terms of raw vote, Dirksen’s closest election occurred in 1936 when he won by 8,405 votes out of 129,523 cast (6.5 percent). In terms of raw vote, his largest margin of victory occurred in 1946 (his last for the U.S. House) when he won by 33,443 out of 95,625 votes cast (35 percent). In terms of raw vote, Dirksen’s average margin of victory was 24,050 votes out of an average total vote cast of 107,548 (22.4 percent).

U.S. Senate elections. In terms of raw vote, Dirksen’s closest election occurred in 1962 when he won by 213,195 votes out of 3,709,209 cast (5.7 percent). In terms of raw vote, Dirksen’s largest margin of victory occurred in 1956 when he won by 357,469 out of 4,257,235 cast (8.4 percent). In terms of raw vote, Dirksen’s average margin of victory equaled 287,681 votes out of an average total vote cast of 4,002,061 (7.2 percent).
Dirksen’s Record in Pekin

Popular wisdom in his hometown is that Dirksen failed to carry Pekin’s 21 precincts in his general election victories. What does the record indicate? It is mixed. Dirksen carried Pekin’s precincts in every election to the U.S. House of Representatives, but he lost Pekin in three out of his four elections to the U.S. Senate.

His percentage margin of victory in Pekin in eight general elections for the House ranged from 3 percent (1940) to 45 percent (1934). His average percentage margin of victory in Pekin in his eight general elections for the House was 22 percent. Dirksen’s margin of victory in presidential election years averaged 12.6 percent; his margin of victory in nonpresidential years averaged 30 percent.

Dirksen’s percentage margin of loss in Pekin in his three general elections for the Senate ranged from 2.2 percent to 9.5 percent. His average margin of loss in Pekin in his three general elections for the Senate equaled 5.0 percent.

Appendix A lists Dirksen’s opponents, primary vote totals by candidate, general election vote total by candidate, the two-party general election vote, and the Pekin vote totals for Dirksen and his opponents.
1926 CITY OF PEKIN ELECTION: THE FIRST CAMPAIGN

As Dirksen later recalled in his memoir, *The Education of a Senator*, his interest in politics was first sparked by a conversation with Leon Kinsey, a partner in Dirksen’s dredge boat business. During a trip down the Illinois River, Kinsey mentioned that he was entertaining the idea of becoming a candidate for mayor of Pekin, their hometown, in 1926. Dirksen liked the idea and offered to run for one of the places on the city commission.

Pekin operated under the commission form of government in the 1920s. Anyone could become a candidate by filing a petition signed by a specified number of registered voters. When the filing date closed for the nonpartisan election, there were 44 candidates for the city commission and five for mayor. A primary whittled the number of commission candidates to eight, four of whom would win election. Dirksen was one of the eight, leading the field; his friend Kinsey was one of the two mayoral primary survivors.

Dirksen ran his campaign out of a clothing store on Pekin’s main street. Known as Goldsmith’s Haberdashery, the store’s chief clerk, Henry Gebhardt, was very prominent in sports and community activities. Candidate Dirksen depended on, in his words, “the loyalty and vitality of a great group of friends who were mainly on the younger side and who were willing to get into the campaign and really pitch.”

Hard work paid off as the thirty-year-old Dirksen garnered more votes than any other candidate—2,715 votes, better than 200 more than second place-finisher, Oscar J. Hill. Dirksen also out-polled Kinser who won the mayor’s post. As the leading vote-getter, Dirksen was named Commissioner of Finance at a salary of $75 per month. He and his fellow commissioners had big plans for Pekin. “We set out to run that town,” he said years later. “We were an aggressive council.”

Regrettably, the Dirksen Collection does not contain historical materials related to the 1926 election.
1930 Republican Primary. Dirksen vs. William E. Hull

Dirksen’s record in his party’s primaries included a single blemish—the 1930 Republican primary election to the U.S. House of Representatives when William E. Hull of Peoria defeated him with 27,767 votes to Dirksen’s 26,612.

As the incumbent, Hull campaigned on his eight-year record of service to the 16th congressional district. His campaign brochure listed what he called his “Open Book of Achievement” consisting of accomplishments in veterans’ affairs, agriculture, postal service, and Illinois River and inland waterway development. In the words of his brochure, “He has become known as the ‘Man Who Works.’” A transcription follows the image:

Congressman William E. Hull of Peoria
“The Man Who Works”

William E. Hull—His Record is an Open Book of Achievement

Congressman Hull is now serving his fourth term as a Representative in Congress from the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois. His record has been marked by energetic and courageous statesmanship. He has become known as the “Man Who Works.”
In the following there is a brief statement of some of the outstanding features of his record as a Representative in Congress:

**Congressman Hull** has always been loyal to the ex-service men of this country, including those who served in the Civil War, in the War with Spain, and in the World War. His father was a Civil War soldier and consequently he has had a special feeling for the veterans of that war and their dependents. He has shared a feeling that the veterans of the war with Spain have not received the recognition they were entitled to and is at present supporting a bill to put them on an equal footing with the veterans of other wars. He has shown the same personal consideration for the veterans of the World War by voting for every measure introduced for their relief and recently, in a speech printed in the Congressional Record, advocated the allowance of compensation to the veterans of the World War who were crippled or sick, regardless of whether their disabilities were of service origin or not. In addition to this, he has handled over a thousand special pension and compensation claims for individual ex-service men.

**Congressman Hull**, having been raised on a farm, has been naturally active in support of legislation for farm relief. All of his speeches and activities in this direction have been of a practical nature. He was instrumental in securing a tariff on Butyl Acetate, which was being imported from Germany in competition with corn used in the manufacture of Butyl Alcohol. One of his most spectacular efforts was his fight to secure an eight cent duty on blackstrap molasses imported from Cuba for the manufacture of industrial alcohol. This would create an additional cash market for forty million bushels of corn and four million bushels of barley. Any one conversant with the corn market can readily understand what a boon this would be to the corn farmers of Illinois. Congressman Hull has voted for every measure offered for the relief of the farmer and is still active in trying to write into the Tariff Bill measures for his benefit.

**Congressman Hull**, having been Postmaster in Peoria and one of the organizers of the National Postmasters’ Association, has had an ambition to make the Post Office service in the Sixteenth District of Illinois the best in the United States. He has been untiring in his efforts to improve and extend the service of the rural route and this effort has had the cooperation of the Postmasters and Rural Carriers throughout the District. He has advocated before the Committees in Congress better conditions for all employees in the postal service.

**Congressman Hull’s** outstanding achievement has been the promotion and development of the Lakes-to-Gulf Waterway through the Illinois River. This project has been advocated for over one hundred years and many members in recent years have taken some interest in its development, but no substantial progress was made until Mr. Hull adopted it as his major undertaking as a Member of Congress. No one can realize the tremendous amount of energy he has put into this undertaking, meeting with opposition on every hand, especially from the commercial and power
interests in the East and in Canada. In spite of this opposition he has finally secured an appropriation which insures a nine-foot channel through the Illinois River.

He is now leading the fight for Government aid for the completion of the Illinois Waterway, begun by the State of Illinois nearly twenty years ago. Congressman Hull has the cooperation of President Hoover and the Secretary of War in this important effort to complete the Lakes-to-Gulf Waterway and hopes for success in the near future.

He has also introduced a Bill for the improvement of the Hennepin Canal so it can be utilized in the commerce between the Upper Mississippi, Peoria, Chicago, and Great Lakes points.

Congressman Hull has become the recognized leader for the development of the entire inland waterway system of the nation.

Congressman Hull has, by his industry and fair dealing, won the confidence of the Members of the House of Representatives and has reached a place where his seniority rights command for him a position as one of the leaders of that body.

Congressman Hull is a candidate for renomination on the Republican Ticket at the Primary on April 8 and his constituents will make sure that he is renominated by a substantial majority.

Congressman Hull introduced himself to potential voters with this letter:
For his part, Dirksen offered himself as the candidate of the common man. “There is a tradition in American politics that a citizen should not aspire to high office unless he is
There is a tradition in American politics that a citizen should not aspire to high office unless he is equipped with money and newspaper support. If that tradition is upheld, I cannot qualify. A transcript follows the image:

There is a tradition in American politics that a citizen should not aspire to high office unless he is equipped with money and newspaper support. If that tradition is upheld, I cannot qualify.
Friends well intentioned have spoken to me from time to time about the
foolhardiness of running for Congress because my campaign chest is a meagre one
and because my newspaper [sic] support is of little consequence. I have been told that
Mr. Hull has a million dollars and will control every newspaper in the district.
Perhaps so. Perhaps not. I do not know.

I do know however that it is the right of every citizen over 25 yrs of age to be
a candidate for Congress. The Constitution says nothing about the size of a man’s
fortune as a qualification; the Constitution says nothing about the number of
newspapers a man must control; the constitution says nothing about the need of a
political machine.

My faith in the whole structure of politic[s] in America and my faith in the
intelligence of the American people would tonight die and be a lifeless thing from this
day henceforth if I thought for a moment that these things were essential
qualifications [sic] of the right to run for office.

There is also much hokum in politics. As a rule a candidate supposedly is
pushed into the race by the overwhelming demand of a legion of friends. They
usually insist that he run.

Again I violate tradition. I have not been pushed into this race. I have not been
urged and importuned by countless friends and well wishes [sic] to agree to have my
name placed on the ballot [sic].

I don’t believe in lying to the public. I don’t believe in handing the voters of
the 16th District a lot of hokum. I don’t believe in camouflage. I don’t believe in bunk.

My name will be on the ballot [sic] because I want it to be there. It will be on
the ballot and I shall enter the lists for the Republican nomination because I want to.
There are no strings tied to ambition. It is a Constitutional right to run and too I have
two things in common with the great Abraham Lincoln—neither of us have much
money and neither of us are able to buy the support of so-called powerful
newspapers. Moreover like Lincoln, I have no extensive holdings of stocks and
bonds. I own no vast realty holdings and in consequence I can get the viewpoint of
the average citizen and if there is anything this nation needs today, it is a little more
respect for the views and rights of the citizen who spends his days at the forge of the
drill press of the desk blissfully hopeful that the man whose name he marked on the
ballot [sic] will dutifully represent him.

I believe that it is the proper job of a candidate to let people know who he is
and what he stands for. This sounds like good old fashioned policy and if we had
more of it in the country, we probably would never have had to face many of the evils
that exist within.
No newspaper shall refer to me as the distinguished attorney from Pekin, candidate for Congress because I am not an attorney altho I was partially trained for the law at the University of Minnesota. I shall not be referred to as the well known capitalist because a capitalist must have money and lots of it. I shall not be referred to [as] a national authority on engineering altho my daily contact for years with engineers and engineering has given me a broad knowledge of engineering as it applies to municipalities, to drainage and to River problems.

They will refer to me as a baker. I shall be proud of the title. There is as much distinction in being a successful baker and the owner and manager of a successful wholesale bakery as there is in being a successful lawyer [,] broker, capitalist or business man. I know bakers who list themselves in directories as merchants. I never do. Why should I. If it is worthy to hold up to children for emulation that fact that Lincoln was a railsplitter, Al Smith a newsaboy [sic], after they became celebrated, I believe it is even as worthy before such fame arrives to dignifies [sic] one’s calling by calling it by its right name.
Dirksen’s brochure took dead aim at Hull by offering a series of contrasts between the two. A transcript follows the image.
DIRKSEN FOR CONGRESS

Dirksen vs. Hull for the Republican Nomination for Congress.

DO YOU WANT

Dirksen who has a record for courage or Hull who voted for the Jones Bill “against his better judgment” and even called it a “bad bill”?

Dirksen who stands for cleaning up the Illinois River and the restoration of fishing and hunting to the people or Hull who has been the spokesman of the Chicago Sanitary District and quiescently permitted the pollution of the river with Chicago sewage?

Dirksen who believes in direct relief for the farmers or Hull who prates about farm relief while wheat goes down to $1.02 per bushel?

Dirksen who knows more people intimately throughout the 16th District than any other man or Hull who knows very few and depends on hired publicity

Dirksen who is concerned about immediate relief of the unemployment situation or Hull whose only platform in eight years has been a waterway which is scarcely nearer completion now than it was then?

Dirksen who served 22 months during the World War or Hull who parades the fact that he is “the son of a Veteran of ’61 to ’65”?

Dirksen an independent thinker, who prepares his own speeches or Hull whose thinking is done by others and whose speeches have often been prepared by others. (The first Hull Waterway Bill was prepared by an attorney in the employ of the Chicago Sanitary District)

Dirksen who is young and energetic and would give this District real representation or Hull who has given the district no representation at all and through paid publicity has told what a tireless worker he is?

Dirksen who as a successful business man, President of the Pekin unit of the Illinois Hunters and Fishers Association and as a Director of a Three Million Dollar Building and Loan association knows the
immediate needs of the people and is capable of advocating their cause or
Hull of whom a nearby Congressman said “we enjoy his swell parties and then poke fun at him”?

Dirksen who is a student of public affairs, a University man, utterly democratic in bearing and manner, for three years Commissioner of Finance for the City of Pekin, or
Hull whose principal qualification for office has been his fortune?

Dirksen who firmly believes that it is the Constitutional duty of a representative to represent the majority sentiment in his district no matter what that sentiment may be or
Hull who according to an investigation made by Time Magazine and published May 19\textsuperscript{th}, 1929, is a “Wet who can still drink his own pre-Volstead stock, Hull votes for all Prohibition enforcement legislation.”

AFTER 8 YEARS OF HULL
Is it not [sic] time for a change.

VOTE FOR DIRKSEN FOR THE REPUBLICAN NOMINATION FOR CONGRESS
This first congressional campaign took place over six counties stretching over an area 120 miles long. Dirksen called those four months “a nerve-racking ordeal.” He lost 30 pounds for his effort.

When Dirksen retired in the early morning following primary election night, April 8, he held a 4,400-vote lead. But he could not hold it. Later, he discovered that someone had distributed handbills in the Catholic portion of Bureau County on election day with this message in large letters: “Dirksen is a member of the Ku Klux Klan.” It did not require more than that false innuendo to give the primary election to Hull.

But the 16th district had just witnessed the future. As the Peoria Star editorialized on April 9:

Hull was opposed by a remarkable young man. The district has never experienced anything just like him. Without newspaper support, with the business interests arrayed against him, he waged one of the most astonishing campaigns this district has ever witnessed. That he came so close to victory is a tribute to his ABILITY as an orator, this GOOD NATURE and his UNBOUNDED ENERGY. He has arrived.

At the moment, however, the losing candidate was not so sure:

Frankly, the defeat by so narrow a margin was disappointing, and I found it difficult to conceal that disappointment. Things had gone so well toward the latter part of the campaign and there was so much encouragement from so many sources that my confidence in a victory had been built up to the point where I fully expected to win. I had not been in this particular field of activity long enough to develop that kind of tough skin that must come to all politicians, because of the uncertainty of political life. The defeat did not improve my morale.

Dirksen began his campaign to unseat Hull in 1932 the very next day.
1932 Republican Primary. Dirksen vs. William E. Hull (Again)

Dirksen adopted a different strategy for his rematch with Hull. Instead of casting himself as the populist outsider, he labelled himself “A Young Business Man and Student of Affairs.”

As his brochure proclaimed:

A young business man, born in Pekin, who earned his way through the University of Minnesota, studied law, served his country overseas for seventeen months, returned to engage in business and has served his city as a Commissioner and this entire community thru his activity in the American Legion, the Hunters & Fishers, the Isaac Walton League, Service Clubs, Fraternal Orders, and civic organizations. Dirksen neglected to mention that he did not receive a degree from the University of Minnesota or pass the bar examination to qualify for practice or that two of his business ventures had failed.
Nonetheless, Dirksen won 27,085 votes to Hull’s 24,515. He had lost to Hull in 1930 by 1,555 votes; he won in 1932 by 2,570. No one opposed Dirksen in the Republican primary in 1934, 1936, or 1938.
Republican candidate Dirksen faced an immediate dilemma in the general election—how to run as a Republican without associating himself with the failed leadership of President Herbert Hoover, or as Dirksen put it:

Yet with unemployment increasing, with banks popping throughout the country and with business stagnant, what could one say in behalf of Herbert Hoover and against Franklin D. Roosevelt that would have any appreciable political effect? How could one successfully apologize for Republican leadership when the nation was bleeding from the wounds of the depression?

The times called for citizenship in place of partisanship, he believed. “I had no stomach for hurling real or fancied charges against the Democrats nor could I convince myself,” he later wrote, “that they were so bad and incompetent as to require a thorough disinfecting before they were prepared to sit in the seats of authority.”

Little survives in the way of information about Dirksen’s challenger, one Edwin S. Carr. The 1930 census listed Carr as born in 1861 in Illinois, making him at 71 almost twice Dirksen’s age. Carr owned a modest bungalow valued at $6,000 in the heart of Peoria—at 711 Lavelle Street. A widower, the Democratic candidate listed his occupation as real estate agent. Newspapers undoubtedly covered the election fully, but nothing remains in the Dirksen collection about the race.
Dirksen won 60 percent of the vote: 67,948 votes to Carr’s 44,902.
1934 General Election. Dirksen vs. Rayburn L. Russell

Only a single document remains in the Dirksen Papers related to his first reelection campaign, a newspaper campaign advertisement touting the candidate’s record on agriculture. Among his accomplishments, this curiosity: “He has been waging a vigorous fight to have a duty placed on tapioca starch which is imported from the far east and displaces millions of bushels of Illinois corn annually.” Who knew?

His opponent, Rayburn L. Russell, graduated from Pekin High School in 1909, spent six years at the University of Michigan where he earned a Bachelor of Laws in 1915, and entered law practice in Pekin in October of that year. Like Dirksen, he served in World War I, although never overseas. According to a brief entry in the History of the Illinois River...
Valley, Russell was “a democrat in his political views and has been active in party affairs, having served for several years as secretary of the county central committee.”

Dirksen won 65 percent of the vote in the general election—58,716 for Dirksen, 31,044 for Russell.
Although unopposed in the Republican primary, Dirksen’s closest race came in the 1936 general election. He bested Charles Dickman by only 8,405 votes out of 129,523 cast. Dirksen’s total of 68,964 represented 53 percent of the total.

A former teacher, Dickman began to practice law in Peoria in 1919. He served as United States commissioner from 1922 until 1926, and in 1931 became corporation counsel of Peoria. In 1933, he was appointed by the governor as a member of the State Board of Pardons and Paroles. He served as county chairman of the Democratic Party in Peoria County for six years.
The Dirksen Papers do not document the 1936 campaign in any detail. Dirksen’s ad included this sentence: “The best evidence of his [i.e., Dirksen’s] service is that he has been endorsed and recommended for re-election by labor, farm and business organizations.”
1938 General Election. Dirksen vs. James C. Dillon

Unopposed for the third primary election cycle in a row, Everett Dirksen faced Democrat James C. Dillion in the November 8, 1938, general election.

A well-respected businessman, Dillon owned one of Peoria’s most prosperous plumbing businesses (which survives to this day). The son of James E. and Ida Oswold Dillon, James was born in Peoria on February 14, 1893, the fifth child in his family. He attended public schools in Peoria, Spalding Institute, and graduated in 1912 from Manual Training High School. He learned the plumbing trade from J. Botorf, T.F. Flanigan, and spent two years with Dooley & Bruniga. He formed his own plumbing business on February 23, 1921. According to census records, he owed $6,000 on a home at 525 Starr in Peoria and supported his family on an income of $3,500 in 1940.

Dirksen’s billed himself as “A Diligent and Capable Public Servant.”

“A Diligent and Capable Public Servant”
WHO
1. Has the training and capacity for public service.
2. Has applied himself and given all of his time to the office.
3. Can and does rise above party and personal selfishness.
4. By his conduct has brought credit to himself and his district.
5. Now rates high seniority in Congress, is a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee and has grown in the esteem of and in influence with his colleagues.

Dirksen for Congress

His campaign records include the following typescript:
Congressman Everett M. Dirksen of Pekin, Illinois has represented this (16th) District in the House of Representatives of the United States since 1935.

In all matters of legislation of interest to the District he has been most attentive, and has a consistent and progressive record. Due to his own diligence and capacity for work and study he has become one of the best informed members of the House. When he began his second term in the House he was given a place on the Banking and Currency Committee in addition to other Committees and he was one of the leaders in formulating the present Housing legislation and in this Committee and also in forming the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation that insures bank deposits and gives all the depositors assurance that they will not suffer loss if the bank should fail.

He has been one of the most active members of the House when Agricultural legislation has been under way and on his record in this direction has been endorsed for re-election by the several Agricultural Organizations.

Congressman Dirksen is now a member of the Committee on Appropriations and has been most active in seeing that adequate money has been available for the administration of the Farm Acts and the payment of Farm benefits, and it was largely through his efforts that during the last session money has been made available and the Department of Agriculture is now establishing four laboratories throughout the United States to carry on experiments to establish new uses and improve old uses of Farm crops to increase markets for the Farmers.

Congressman Dirksen has taken an active interest and part in formulating labor legislation and on his record has been recommended by National and State Legislative Committees of the several Labor Organizations for re-election.

On his record he is entitled to the support of this constituency.
For the first time, the 1938 election files in Dirksen’s papers contain a half-dozen scripts for 100-word radio ads and related contracts to purchase air time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertiser</th>
<th>WMBD Alliance Life Bldg.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Pekin, Illinois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONGRESS</td>
<td>“From the Heart of Illinois”</td>
<td>Radio Broadcasting Company</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Peoria</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>waterside, it was on the 1938 Election File in Dirksen’s papers.</td>
<td>September 30, 1938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACT FOR**

**Radio Broadcast Advertising**

- **Invoices:**
  - One invoice due on September 30, 1938
  - One invoice due on October 30, 1938

**Terms of Payment:**

- One invoice due on November 1, 1938
- One invoice due on November 30, 1938

**Total Contract:**

- $500.00

**Signatures:**

- Everett M. Dirksen
- W. V. Noble, President of the Peoria Broadcasting Company

**Accepted by:**

- [Signature]
- [Signature]
Here are examples of Dirksen’s radio plugs:

Falling corn prices, huge surpluses, and general farm dissatisfaction indicate that the next Congress will give increased attention to the prospect of finding new uses for farm products. The 16th Congressional district is fortunate in having a young, energetic Congressman who is a pioneer in this field and who as early as 1933, enlisted the interest of Secretary Wallace in the proposal to use surplus corn by using it in the production of alcohol motor fuel. Since then, Congressman Dirksen has secured appropriations totaling $30,000 for continued study of this proposal. He should be kept in Washington to pursue this work. Vote for Everett M. Dirksen for Congress.

When the President of the American Federation of Labor sends a personal endorsement of a Congressman for re-election, you know that such a Member of Congress must rate high with labor. Such an endorsement was sent to labor leaders in Peoria and Pekin and was read to the delegates at the annual convention of the Illinois Federation of Labor in Peoria in September. Labor will and should support Congressman Dirksen for re-election because he has been truly fair, sympathetic and liberal in his consideration of all matters affecting the welfare of labor.

The recent war crisis in Europe indicates that in the next Congress, matters pertaining to neutrality, peace, national defense, and foreign policy will receive much attention. On such important proposals, the interests of this district could be in no better hands than those of Congressman Everett M. Dirksen, who is a world war veteran, a father, a firm believer in preparedness, and devoted to the maintenance of peace. Similar legislation was considered in previous Congresses in which Congressman Dirksen served. He therefore has an excellent background in further consideration of these measures. Vote to re-elect Congressman Everett M. Dirksen.

Convinced that the ultimate solution of our unemployment problem lay in absorbing the jobless in private industry, Congressman Dirksen suggested to Congress in November of 1937, the necessity for creating an incentive for industry to expand and provide jobs. As an incentive, he suggested a tax credit for employers who enlarged their operations and created jobs. Now comes word from Washington that this idea of making inducements in the form of reduced taxes to employers who create jobs is receiving serious consideration by government officials. Here we have the best evidence of the studious devotion of Congressman Dirksen to national problems and of the need for re-electing him on November 8th.
When Congressman Everett M. Dirksen was first elected to Congress from this district, he was but 36 years of age. With his characteristic vigor, he has applied himself to the job, early and late, in season and out and is now a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, one of the most powerful of all the Committees. He has grown in influence in Washington and is now in the very prime of life. The 16th district therefore has an investment in him which will grow as the years go by. The district should protect that investment in a young, energetic, studious and diligent public servant and re-elect him by an overwhelming majority.

On February 12th, 1938, Bruce Barton, noted advertising man and Member of Congress, while addressing a meeting at the Hotel Plaza in New York said that the Republican Party had at least four young Abraham Lincoln's growing up in the Middle West and among them named our Congressman Everett M. Dirksen. Mr. Barton said: "These men are all under 40; they are about the same age as Lincoln when he served in Congress, they are better educated, they have had more experience in government and they have had their souls tempered and hardened on the anvil of the World War. They are material for leadership." In view of such praise from a man like Bruce Barton, it is clear that this district should continue Everett Dirksen in public life and re-elect him to Congress.

Summary of endorsement.

Everett Dirksen won the 1938 election, outpolling James Dillon 61,012 votes to 35,081. The winner captured 63.5 percent on the total vote.
1940 PRIMARY ELECTION. DIRKSEN VS. WILLIAM A. BONE

No Republican had run against Dirksen in a primary since William Hull’s failed effort in 1932. But 1940 produced a challenger in another William—William A. Bone. As is the case too often, little about the primary race exists in Dirksen’s papers. Census records show Bone as 70 years old in 1940, married to Florence, residing in Peoria’s second ward in a rental home at 325 Indiana Avenue, with no income as “currently unemployed and seeking work.” He listed his occupation as “Lecturer. Private Business.”

Dirksen won 34,606 votes in the primary to Bone’s 6,496.
1940 General Election. Dirksen vs. M.R. Clark

Dirksen faced M.R. Clark in the general election—Clark would resurface as Dirksen’s opponent four years later, too. Born in Brimfield, Clark resided in central Illinois his entire life. He boasted of farm, business, and political experience in his 1944 rematch. For further details, see the entries for that campaign.

Incumbent Dirksen relied increasingly on endorsements as he conducted re-election campaigns in the 1940s. In 1940, for example, his campaign materials included a report from Will Kennedy of the *Washington Star* who singled out Dirksen as the Republican member of the House who “has developed most and works hardest for his constituents.”

> "What member of Congress has developed most and works hardest for his constituents?" There's a question for you. Especially when you remember that there are 435 members of Congress from 48 states. Well, Will F. Kennedy, who for thirty years has been a reporter and observer around the nation's capitol for 30 years, asked himself that question in February of this year and then proceeded to find the answer. Watching Congress in action every day as he has, he finally picked two. He picked for Democrat and a Republican. For the Democrat he picked Congressman Woodrum of Virginia. For the Republican he picked Congressman Dirksen. When an experienced observer picks our Congressmen for hard work, legislative ability, earnestness and capacity to lead a fight in Congress, it's our clue to send Everett Dirksen back to Congress on November 5th by a huge vote.
As an aside, Dirksen’s popularity and proven vote-getting led to a “Draft Dirksen for Governor” movement led by E.T. Connor of Peoria. Connor’s case included the following statement appearing in the Atlanta (GA) Journal and reprinted on the broadside above:

ABLEST REPUBLICAN.
[By Ralph Smith in the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal]

I have before me the duplicate of the ballot I cast in the poll of the press galleries, by the illustrated magazine, Life, to catalogue the 10 ablest senators and representatives in the present Congress. The name of Everett Dirksen of Illinois appears in third place, with a rating of 82, based on integrity, intelligence, industry and influence. He was “tops” among the Republican members of the House of Representatives.
And, folks, Dirksen still stands at the top of my list. The more I see and read of this young man—he is just 45—the more certain I am that insofar as he is concerned I have made no mistake.

In only his eighth year of service, he is the minority leader of the House in everything but name. Titular leadership vests in Joe Martin of Massachusetts. Dirksen is his chief lieutenant, his right bower, the man upon whom he relies to take the lead in controversial issues of a partisan nature. Martin is the strategist, I’d say, and Dirksen the field general.

The Illinoisan is one of the best informed men in either party and either branch of Congress concerning the far-flung activities and functions of this government. It is astonishing how much he knows, not alone of the federal organization but of legislative matters on Capitol Hill. His information is dependable and impartial to boot, meaning that he is not the type of politician—and he is a politician—who’ll purposely withhold facts in order to strengthen his position.

Yes, I’d say that Everett Dirksen of Pekin, Ill., knows more about the government of the District of Columbia than either of the civilian commissioners appointed by the President to run the District.

And he knows far more about the local government than most of its taxpayers.

Likewise, Dirksen knows the first and last thing about the Virgin Islands, the Philippines, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and what he knows of these insular possessions is nothing to compare with his familiarity with the federal government as a whole.

Able and personable, Dirksen is due to go a “fur piece” in politics, or I miss my guess, for as the thing looks to me today he is the best bet in the Republican party, and growing.

Dirksen also composed a series of radio plugs as he had in 1938. What follows was entitled “The 1940 Election”: 
When the votes were counted, Dirksen tallied 79,780 (58.1 percent) to Clark’s 57,567 (41.9 percent). The 1940 contest proved to be the second closest of Dirksen’s seven reelection bids.
1942 General Election. Dirksen vs. James D. Carrigan

The 1942 congressional elections took place against the backdrop of World War II—the first election conducted in time of war since 1918.

Democrat James D. Carrigan faced off against the incumbent Dirksen. Carrigan, 37 years old, was born and raised in Peoria, the 10th of 15 children. A graduate of Spalding Institute, he was married and the father of two children. The family lived at 518 Fourth Street in Peoria. An electrician by trade, he also operated a small restaurant. In 1933, he was elected a member of Peoria’s City Council from the 7th ward and served a single term. Governor Henry Horner appointed him as Special Investigator for the Illinois Liquor Control Commission in 1936, a position he held until his election to the Office of County Auditor in November 1936. Carrigan was reelected to that position in 1949.

As his campaign brochure proclaimed, “Mr. Carrigan believes our first job is to win this war—win it as quickly as possible—win it so decisively that dictator nations will never again be recognized as major powers.” The main thrust of his campaign was to question Dirksen’s voting record on war-related issues. “It does NOT,” Carrigan said, “express the sentiment of the people from this district. The people are behind the war effort 100 percent. They have no time for partisan politics when their way of life—the American Way—is threatened.”

This strategy had the advantage of highlighting a series of Dirksen’s votes that reflected isolationist sentiment—votes that took place before Dirksen began to support the Roosevelt administration’s policies even before Pearl Harbor. In 1938, for example, the House struck out a Navy appropriation of $1,000,000 intended for harbor improvements at Guam. In 1939, a similar provision in the amount of $5,000,000 was struck out. Dirksen cast “no” votes—he opposed the improvements. As Carrigan concluded, “Today Guam is in Japanese hands. Proper protection could have prevented this.”

Carrigan’s analysis included votes on increasing the number of planes for the Army, repeal of the arms embargo, neutrality bills, trade pacts, conscription, Lend-Lease, and price controls, among others.
James D. Carrigan was born in the City of Peoria 27 years ago, March 15, 1905, the 16th child of 15 children. He was graduated from grade school and Spalding Institute of Peoria, Illinois. He is married, the father of 2 children, a boy 16 years of age, and a girl of 8. He lives with his wife and family at 418 Fourth Street, Peoria, Illinois, in the home which he is buying at the present time. For the past 17 years he has held an electrician's card with local 34 of I.B.E.W., having worked actively at this trade for many years. During the depression years, he successfully operated a small restaurant in the City of Peoria. In 1933 he was elected a member of the City Council as Alderman from the 7th Ward, and served for one term. Early in 1939 he was appointed, by the late Governor Henry Horner, as Special Investigator for the Illinois Liquor Control Commission, and served in this capacity until elected to the Office of County Auditor in November of the same year. This position he now holds having been re-elected in 1940 by a larger majority than in 1938.

Mr. Carrigan believes our first job is to win this war — win it as quickly as possible — win it so decisively that dictator nations will never again be recognized as major powers. He believes that we must place every one of our vast resources into this fight, place every American dollar to the best advantage, place every hour of labor possible to obtain, into this struggle. He believes it is far better to spend that extra dollar, to work that extra hour of labor, than to sacrifice one more life of an American boy on one of the many fields of battle.

To guard against any possible repetition of the present conflict he pledges himself to work for a just and lasting Peace, so the peoples of the earth may enjoy The Four Freedoms as outlined by the Atlantic Charter.

His training and experience qualify him to serve in the Congress. Send a man to Congress who knows the value of co-operation and teamwork; a man who will spend as much time working for the salvation of the American way of life as our boys spend in the service of their country.

Mr. Carrigan believes in an all-out effort to secure war industries for the towns and cities in the district.

Elect
JAMES D. CARRIGAN
TO CONGRESS

-- Carrigan for Congress Committee

Does Your Present Congressman’s Voting Record Really Represent the 16th District?

Read the record as shown on inside pages. It does NOT express the sentiment of the people from this district. The people are behind the war effort 100%. They have no time for partisan politics when their way of life — the American Way — is threatened.

Vote November 3rd. Send a man to Congress who feels the same way about National Defense as you feel. Show the dictators the people in your district are “All-Out” to win.
LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD -- WHAT THESE VOTES MEANT

GUAM NAVAL BASE
In 1938 the House struck out a Navy appropriation of $1,000,000 intended for harbor improvements at Guam. In 1939, a similar provision in the amount of $5,000,000 was struck out. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST improving Guam Harbor. Today Guam is in Japanese hands. Proper protection could have prevented this.

INCREASE NUMBER OF ARMY PLANES
A NO vote was a vote to REDUCE the number of planes authorized for the army. A NO vote indicates the Congressman voted for the Powers Amendment which proposed to cut the number of planes asked for by the army. This amendment was offered only two months before the fall of Poland.

REPEAL ARMS EMBARGO
In June, 1939, the House had adopted an amendment by Representative Vorys of Ohio imposing a mandatory embargo on export of military supplies to warring nations. The effect of this was to prevent critically needed supplies from reaching Great Britain and France after Germany made its attack. In the fall of 1939 this amendment was repealed over determined opposition. It is this vote which is here recorded. A NO vote was a vote to PREVENT areas from going to Britain — this, more than a year and a half after the war had begun.

RELAX NEUTRALITY ACT
In November, 1939, the House voted to modify the neutrality law sufficiently to give more specific aid to the Allies. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST aid to the Allies.

RENEW TRADE PACTS
Renewal of the Trade Agreements Act for mutual sealing down of tariff walls with foreign nations. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements, through which Secretary Hull has made the Good Neighbor policy a reality.

CONSCRIPTION ACT
In September, 1940, with World War II more than a year old, and the Nazi menace spreading over Europe it was necessary to pass the conscription act. The voluntary enlistment system had failed badly and in order to prepare for defense for our own Nation, this action was vital. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST national defense in the full meaning of the word.

LEND-LEASE
On January 6, President Roosevelt asked authority and funds to manufacture war materials "to be turned over to those nations which are now in actual war with aggressor nations"; in other words, the United States was to become the arsenal of democracy. On February 6th the bill was amended and passed in the House. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST making the United States the "Arsenal of Democracy".

DRAFT EXTENSION
On August 12, 1941, less than 4 months before Pearl Harbor, the House approved extension of Draft Army service for 18 months, BY THE NARROW MARGIN OF ONE VOTE. This, after plea of President Roosevelt and Chief of Staff Marshall, in which they had stated that the country's peril was much greater than at the time the draft act was passed. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST keeping the Army intact.

ARM MERCHANDISE SHIPS
In order to arm merchant vessels it was necessary that Congress repeal Section 6 of the Neutrality Act. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST the arming of merchant ships. A vote against giving our merchant marine the chance to fight to live. (There is no vote recorded for the Congressman from this district on this measure.)

LIFT DOLLARISERENT ZONES
Three weeks before Pearl Harbor the House was asked to approve repeal of some sections of the Neutrality Act so as to permit lend-lease aid to go into so-called "combat zones" to nations already fighting against the dictator nations. A NO vote was a vote AGAINST sending this aid to the nations fighting fascism.

AFTER PEARL HARBOR

UPHOLD PRICE CONTROL
Threatened with the prospect of inflation Congress finally passed a price control bill. It was a necessary part of the domestic war program. It gave Congress an opportunity to prove its willingness to go "all-out" for the war program. A NO vote on this important measure was indication that the game was still to be "polities as usual".

POWER BILL
On March 17, 1942 Congress, killed appropriations for the Table Rock and Bull Shoals developments on the White River in Missouri. This despite the fact that all the war agencies, including the Army and Navy Munitions Board had asked for passage of this measure, and it had been approved by the Senate. The Army and Navy Munitions Board had urged the building of these two dams because this is in an area where much defense work could be performed if power were available. According to Chairman Leland Olds of the Federal Power Commission "War production will soon require annually more than all the electricity sold by central station electrical systems, both public and private, for all purposes in the country in 1940". Shortage of sufficient electric power may mean widespread power rationing will be necessary, or that non-defense factories will be forced to close down because of a power shortage. The power trust in Washington today wields great power over many members of congress, and some even on war issues follow their dictates rather than the requirements of national defense. A NO vote on this measure would seem to indicate a greater fear of increased power capacity, particularly public capacity, than a Hitler victory.
Dirksen announced his candidacy in early January: “I believe I can say with modesty and humility that service in the forces of our nation 25 years ago and service in the Congress in years gone by have developed a background, an experience, and a familiarity with the problems now before our country which would be of genuine value to the people of the district, the state, and the nation.”

The Republican drove home his experience both as a veteran of World War I and as the incumbent in newspaper ads.
Dirksen won 68.8 percent of the vote on November 3 with 55,135 votes to Carrigan’s 24,696. That margin would prove to be the largest, in percentage terms, Dirksen ever received.
1944 General Election. Dirksen vs. M.R. Clark

The 1944 general election—no one challenged Dirksen in the Republican primary—featured a rematch with Democrat M.R. Clark, who had lost to Dirksen in 1940 while winning 41.9 percent of the vote.

Dirksen’s papers contain a six-page draft of the incumbent’s announcement (see Appendix B) both for reelection to the House and as a candidate for the preferential presidential primary in 1944.

Dirksen began his announcement with the following three paragraphs:

Republican Opportunity

The Republican party stands on the threshold of a great opportunity, but it must not be opportunist in approaching it. That is the course of weakness and inertia. It needs an acute conscience. It must seek power to accomplish a purpose. If its purposes and spirit are good, it deserves to succeed; if not, it does not deserve to succeed. It needs humility and the common touch. In this new epoch, no other quality will do. It must and can become the vehicle for giving our nation the leadership in world affairs. We dare not let this disordered world drift. It needs firm direction from the one nation which has the power, the capacity, the will and the sympathy to do so. It is not enough that we preserve both the form and substance of a great nation of great prosperity where that prosperity is unequally apportioned.

Hat in the Ring

On whom shall the cloak of leadership be laid? There is no great enthusiasm for old names. Perhaps it is neither immodest or vain-glorious for one who has been identified with the Federal Government for more than ten years to humbly submit his own name for the consideration of his party.

Thirteen years ago, when first I invited the confidence of the people of the 16th Congressional district in the hope that I might represent them in Congress, they first demurred and then bestowed that confidence. I could reward them only with diligence and unremitting labor. I shall ask their suffrage again for a seat in the Congress and at the same time, submit my name for the preferential Presidential primary in 1944. If they see fit to decree otherwise, I shall be neither hurt nor chagrined. These are days for good soldiers whether on the battle front or the home front.

Although this election feature deals only with Dirksen’s campaigns for the House and Senate, his formal announcement of candidacy for the Republican nomination for president came on December 2, 1943.
The surviving records do not indicate if Dirksen’s opponent, M.R. Clark, tried to persuade voters that Dirksen had bigger ambitions than returning to the House. But Clark’s single campaign brochure carried this headline, “DIRKSEN HAS FAILED YOU!,” before listing eight of Dirksen’s votes proving, in Clark’s words, that Dirksen “has carefully served special interests only, and failed to serve everyday citizens—small businessmen, farmers, workers.”

Clark, born in Brimfield, boasted of farm, business, and political experience. He served two terms as Brimfield village clerk and four terms as supervisor of Brimfield.
Township. He had chaired the Board of Review and Board of Supervisors of Peoria County. “M.R. Clark stands for speedy and total victory in the war, and permanent, democratic peace thereafter. He stands obligated to serve ALL the people, and to deny any special services to special interests.”
When the votes were tallied, Dirksen prevailed 70,301 (59 percent) to 48,779 (41 percent)—virtually the same percentages as in Clark’s unsuccessful bid in 1940.

Republican Dirksen failed to win his party’s nomination for president or vice president in 1944. Franklin Roosevelt won his fourth term handily.
1946 General Election. Dirksen vs. Hans A. Spading

The 1946 general election pitted Democrat Hans A. Spading against Dirksen—no one challenged Dirksen in the Republican primary. As fortune would have it, this was Dirksen’s last campaign for a seat in House; he was forced to retire because of an eye ailment and did not seek reelection in 1948.

For any experienced observer, the outcome was easy to predict. Dirksen prevailed with 64,534 votes to the challenger’s 31,091. The Republican’s winning margin of 67.5 percent fell short only of his record margin in 1942 of 68.8 percent.

Born and raised on a farm in Phelps County, Missouri, Spading was 49 years old when he began his campaign. A veteran of World War I, he was married to Mabel and together they had three children. One son, Gilbert, was killed in World War II. The Spading family had moved to Peoria County in 1929. In addition to farming, Spading was employed as a machinist at Caterpillar Tractor Company.

As his brochure described, the Democratic candidate singled out “seven BIG jobs: required of government:

The 1st job is TO PREVENT INFLATION.
The 2nd big job is to PREVENT ANOTHER WAR.
The 3rd big job is to keep MONOPOLY from controlling the country.
The 4th big job is to HELP OUR VETERANS.
The 5th big job is UNITY OF THE COMMON PEOPLE.
The 6th big job is HOUSING.
The 7th big job is JOBS.

“I am not running for Congress for any personal reasons,” he said. “I am a candidate because I believe that the farmers, workers, small businessmen and professional men have not been properly represented in Congress.”
The Democrat went on the offensive in his advertising and letter-writing campaigns.
One such letter from the Spading for Congress Committee, enclosed a statement that characterized Dirksen in the following terms:

Dirksen enthusiastically follows “take-it-easy-with-the-Nazis” Robert Taft.
Dirksen joins with Rankin, Bilbo and other Ku Klux Klan men from the South to prevent progressive legislation.
Dirksen’s breast swelled when he was “decorated” by bloody-handed King George of Greece—Hitler’s ardent friend and ally throughout the war.
Dirksen has accepted the wholehearted endorsement of Gerald L.K. Smith—who openly defends Fascism and sneers at Democracy.
As Election Day neared, Spading urged Democratic committeemen to help him distribute 50,000 leaflets throughout the district.

Dirksen’s simple campaign brochure highlighted five words: veteran, experienced, diligent, courteous, and able.
He also touted the endorsements of several national publications. For example, Mark Sullivan writing in the *Washington Post*, said “Dirksen would stand high on any list of Congressmen best equipped with understanding of the nation’s business.” *Time Magazine* called him “Among the best Republican brains in the House.” But the most meaningful endorsement came from the district’s major newspaper, the *Peoria Star*:
Representative Everett M. Dirksen will be returned to Congress by a big majority of the voters of the Sixteenth district. Thus the people will express their approval and appreciation of his distinguished service and assure themselves of another two years of the kind of representation which Mr. Dirksen is singularly qualified to give.

The Republican candidate for re-election has been alert to the interests of this district and energetic in the pursuit of them. He has been particularly conscientious in keeping constituents informed on events in Washington and his participation in them.

Mr. Dirksen was first elected to Congress in 1932 when Democratic landslides were sweeping the country. He has been with the minority party ever since, but nevertheless has won an enviable reputation among his colleagues of both parties as an able, hard-working and exceptionally well-informed member of the House. In a recent national magazine poll of both Republican and Democratic representatives, he was rated No. 2 man in the House, the most effective speaker of that body, and one of the five members considered to have the best grasp of domestic affairs.

In the 1944 Presidential campaign, he was called upon by the National Republican committee for numerous radio network addresses and personal appearances throughout the nation. At the same time, forty members of Congress proposed him as an available candidate for Republican nominee for Vice President.

An adequate summary of Representative Dirksen’s activities and achievements in Congress is not possible here, but we may note some highlights. He is a member of the House Appropriations committee. He served on the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress (six senators and six representatives) which reorganized and streamlined Congressional procedures, including provision for a legislative budget which, for the first time in 18 years[,] gives real hope and promise for a balanced budget.

While a member of the Air Safety committee, Mr. Dirksen covered the United States and South America in an inspection tour of flying facilities and reported numerous recommendations for improving the safety of air travel. As a one-man committee of the Appropriation[s] committee, he covered 32,000 miles in a world tour of 21 nations, acquiring a familiarity with world conditions equaled by few members of Congress. His account of the tour was one of the outstanding reports of the year in Congress.

Mr. Dirksen was born and raised in Pekin. After graduating from Pekin high school he entered the law school of the University of Minnesota, working his way. When World War I broke out, he enlisted in the Army and served 22 months, 17 of them overseas. He was commissioned overseas as a second lieutenant of artillery. He
was in [the] balloon service on the western front and in [the] intelligence service with the Army of Occupation in German.

Returning to civilian life, he was engaged in manufacturing, as a dredging contractor on the Illinois river, and in the wholesale bakery business in Pekin, and finished his law studies. He served as Commissioner of the City of Pekin from 1927 to 1931.

Recently Representative Dirksen has won nationwide recognition for the book, “Communism in Action,” a documented study of Communism prepared by the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress under Mr. Dirksen’s direction.

Mr. Dirksen’s advancement in Congress has been rapid. It may be considered the preface to a more brilliant career when the Republican party regains control of Congress. The Star is happy to add its voice to those of his many friends who wish him continued success.
EVERTT M. DlRlKSEl FOR CONGRESS
Representative Everett M. Dirksen will be returned to
Congress by a big majority of the voters of the SIXTH
district. Thus the people will express their approval
and appreciation of his distinguished service and assure
themselves another two years of the kind of representation
which Mr. Dirksen is singularly qualified to give.

The Republican candidate for re-election has been alert
to the interests of this district and energetic in the pursuit
of them. He has been particularly conscientious in keeping
constituents informed on events in Washington and his par-
ticipation in them.

Mr. Dirksen was first elected to Congress in 1932 when
Democratic landslides were sweeping the country. He has
been with the minority party ever since, but nevertheless has
won an enviable reputation among his colleagues of both
parties as an able, hard-working and exceptionally well-in-
formed member of the House. In a recent national magazine
poll of both Republican and Democratic representatives, he
was ranked No. 2 man in the House, the most effective speaker
of that body, and one of the five members considered to
have the best grasp of domestic affairs.

In the 1944 Presidential campaign, he was called upon
by the National Republican committee for numerous radio
network addresses and personal appearances throughout the
nation. At the same time, forty members of Congress pro-
posed him as an available candidate for Republican nominee
for Vice President.

An adequate summary of Representative Dirksen's activ-
ities and achievements in Congress is not possible here, but
we may note some of the highlights. He is a member of the
House Appropriations committee. He served on the Joint
Committee on Reorganization of Congress (six senators and
six representatives) which reorganized and streamlined Congres-
sional procedure, including provisions for a legislative
budget which, for the first time in 18 years gives real hope
and promise for a balanced budget.

While a member of the Air Safety committee, Mr. Dirksen
covered the United States and South America in an
inspection tour of flying facilities and reported numerous
recommendations for improving the safety of air travel. As
a one-man committee of the Appropriation committee, he
covered 12,000 miles in a world tour of 21 nations, acquiring
a familiarity with world conditions equalled by few members
of Congress. His account of the tour was one of the out-
standing reports of the year in Congress.

Mr. Dirksen was born and reared in Pekin. After gradu-
ation from Pekin high school he entered the law school
of the University of Minnesota, working his way. When World
War I broke out, he enlisted in the Army and served 22
months, 17 of them overseas. He was commissioned overseas
as second lieutenant of artillery. He was in balloon service
on the western front and in intelligence service with the
Army of Occupation in Germany.

Returning to civilian life, he was engaged in manu-
facturing, as a dredging contractor on the Illinois river, and
in the wholesale bakery business in Pekin, and finished his
law studies. He served as Commissioner of the City of Pekin
from 1927 to 1931.

Recently Representative Dirksen has won nationwide
recognition for the book, “Communism In Action,” a docu-
mented study of Communism prepared by the legislative
reference service of the Library of Congress under Mr.
Dirksen's direction.

Mr. Dirksen's advancement in Congress has been rapid.
It may be considered the preface to a more brilliant career
when the Republican party regains control of Congress.
The Star is happy to add its voice to those of his many friends
who wish him continued success.
EVERT M. DIRKSEN

BORN AND REARED IN PEKIN, ILLINOIS. ATTENDED PEKIN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, WORKED WAY THROUGH LAW SCHOOL.

PUBLIC SERVICE: COMMISSIONER OF THE CITY OF PEKIN, FROM 1927 TO 1931.

RATED BY BOTH PARTIES AS MOST EFFECTIVE HOUSE SPEAKER; AMONG TOP FIVE ON DOMESTIC AFFAIRS.

HAS COVERED SOUTH AMERICA AND 21 NATIONS OF OTHER HEMISPHERE BY PLANE IN FACT-FINDING TOURS FOR CONGRESS.

HAS SERVED IN CONGRESS SINCE 1933.

BUSINESS: MANUFACTURING, DREDGING CONTRACTOR ON ILLINOIS RIVER, WHOLESALE BAKERY, LAW.
1950 PRIMARY ELECTION. DIRKSEN VS. WILLIAM J. BAKER AND LAR “AMERICA FIRST” DALY

The 1950 Republican primary for the U.S. Senate attracted three candidates: William J. Baker, Lar “America First” Daly, and Everett Dirksen.

Baker was making his fifth bid for one of Illinois’s seats in the U.S. Senate. A former bookkeeper, plumber, and mail clerk, Baker had moved into a real estate career by 1950. Fifty-six and single, he lived in Chicago and, in the words of the Chicago Daily News, “shows no capacity for the office.”

Daly, 38, filed for senator on both the Democratic and Republican tickets but was thrown out of the Democratic race. He owned the American Stool & Chair Company and had run unsuccessfully for several offices. He promised, if elected, to introduce “every day” a resolution to declare war on Russia. The Daily News declared him “unfit for the office.”

The state-wide press barely covered what the Chicago Tribune called Dirksen’s “farcical opposition.” “The primary election campaign was of no immediate concern,” Dirksen recalled in his memoir, “mainly because there would be candidates who were more or less perennial and who made no real effort to obtain the party nomination.”

In the end, Baker garnered 149,286 votes; Daly, 47,668 votes; and Dirksen, 545,028 votes.
1950 GENERAL ELECTION. DIRKSEN VS. SCOTT W. LUCAS

The Dirksen Congressional Center has published “Of Fakers, Flip-Flopers, Bunglers, and Cowards: Everett Dirksen’s Campaign for the U.S. Senate, 1950” (December 2011), a full account of Dirksen’s first campaign for the Senate. Copies are available for purchase from The Center.

Dirksen Restarts His Political Career

Although Everett Dirksen had retired from politics in 1948 to deal with an eye ailment, his health improved so that by mid-1949 he was laying the groundwork for a new campaign—this time for the U.S. Senate, the seat then held by Senate Majority Leader Scott W. Lucas, a Democrat from nearby Havana, Illinois.

Dirksen announced his decision to battle Lucas formally on Sunday, September 18, at a statewide picnic attended by 4,000 at Exposition Gardens in Peoria. The candidate sounded themes he had honed in scores of speeches over the past few months. He said his platform would be “peace, productivity and freedom.” As for peace, Dirksen said, “Without peace there can be no peace of mind, no lasting progress and no full constructive use of taxes we now pay. Thirteen billion for weapons each year does not permanently enrich the nation.”

As for productivity, “Productivity is the only credible way to lick poverty and create buying power. More goods for more people in more places at less cost is the secret weapon of prosperity.” Dirksen assailed “constant and ill-tempered assaults on the whole business structure” and “the stubborn belief that thrift is good for the people but not for the government. The way to develop buying power is not to vote it but to produce it. A taxpayer gets more from his dollar when he spends it himself than he does when it makes a wasteful journey to Washington and back.”

As for freedom, “Freedom is the great spiritual adventure of civilization.”

Democrats had failed on all three counts, Dirksen charged. “Let the events tell the story,” he said. “There is the recent confession the United Nations cannot cope with aggression; the ominous troop movements in Europe; the engulfment of China; the stalemate on the Austrian and German treaties more than four years after VJ Day; the billions for armaments; our virtual eviction from Asia by a former ally; the costly airlift and the mistakes of Yalta. All these proclaim a peace that has failed.”

Dirksen reminded Republicans that you “cannot outspend, outlure, and outpromise a party which places victory before country.” Repeating a line he used often, Dirksen exclaimed, “You cannot stem a Red tide with a chronically red budget.”

“This is no time for a thimbleful of gospel. The issue is not only economic but moral. The Republican party sprang from the moral issue of freedom. It has endured for nearly a
century. In the days of its stewardship this nation made its greatest progress. Its concept was, and is, the greatest good for [the] greatest number within the framework of freedom.”

Decrying wasteful bureaucracy and planned economy, which he termed a “fancy name for economic enslavement,” Dirksen said the great issue before this generation was “freedom for the man in the street.”

Dirksen warned, “what we are dealing with today is a crisis. At the end of the one road lies an epitaph for freedom. At the end of the other is the fulfillment of the American dream.” He proposed to take the voters down “the road marked America.”
TIME TO CHANGE HANDS

YES SIR, I ALWAYS GO FOR A MAN WHO PLOWS A STRAIGHT FURROW!

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, CANDIDATE FOR US SENATE

LUCAS'S RECORD OF WORKING FOR FOREIGN ELEMENTS

DIRKSEN'S RECORD OF WORKING FOR AMERICAN PRINCIPLES WHILE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
The Challenger

Dirksen announced his candidacy on September 18 and campaigned without an official opponent until December 27, 1949, when Senator Scott W. Lucas formally announced his intention to run for reelection. Governor Adlai Stevenson and other party luminaries joined him and 1,500 supporters in Havana’s high school gym.

Lucas spoke for nearly an hour, delivering a 5,500-word speech. “The story of my life is a familiar story here in America,” Lucas began. “It is the story of freedom and opportunity for the poor as well as the rich, the folks on the farms as well as the citizens in the cities. It is the story which rises from the well-springs of liberty.”

Lucas was born February 19, 1892, on a farm in Cass County, the youngest of six children. Dirksen, 54, and Lucas, 58, knew each other well, thought highly of one another, and shared several characteristics. Both grew up in little towns on the Illinois River. Both came from poor backgrounds and worked their way through college. Both had enlisted in World War I as privates. Both came out as lieutenants. Both were attorneys. Both had been active in the American Legion, Lucas having persuaded Dirksen to join. Both lost their first elections to Congress, Lucas losing the Democratic nomination for a Senate seat in 1932 and Dirksen losing in the Republican primary for a House seat in 1930. Both started their careers in the House, Dirksen in 1933 and Lucas in 1935. Each was considered a moderate within their respective parties. Each was regarded as an excellent speaker. Both supported New Deal programs in general; both opposed Franklin Roosevelt’s court-packing scheme in particular. Both rose to prominence in Congress.

They differed, too, of course. In the matter of style, for example, Lucas presented a more polished image. He looked the part of a United States senator. Nearly six feet three inches tall and well built, Lucas wore expensive, carefully tailored business suits. Writers compared his profile to that of the Barrymores, famous stage and screen actors of the day. Capitol Hill secretaries named him the senator they would most like to see in a leopard-skin suit. He could appear “stand-offish,” however, and had the bearing “of a statesman burdened with the cares and responsibilities of great office.” By contrast, Dirksen favored “a rumpled, ‘just folks’” style. In Washington, Dirksen could present himself as professionally as the next guy. In campaigns, however, “he carefully shunned the mannerisms of the statesman and even those lesser stylistic gambits of that other aloof creature, the self-satisfied politician.”

Lucas brought some notable potential advantages to the 1950 campaign: support from the Democratic machine in Chicago, downstate popularity bolstered by his small-town credentials, experience winning statewide campaigns in 1938 and 1944, his influence in Washington, a robust campaign treasury, and the Democratic Party’s determination to hold the seat.
But Lucas faced an obstacle he could not overcome—he was President Harry Truman’s leader in the Senate.

It could not be fairly claimed, as Dirksen would, that Lucas was simply Truman’s stooge. Yet Lucas was closely associated with the most liberal members of the Fair Deal coalition, an association that threatened to undermine him with conservatives in his home state who had supported him. In most respects, and primarily because of his leadership position in the Senate, Lucas came to symbolize the Truman administration. His defeat would not merely be the loss of a seat in the Senate for Democrats. It would embarrass the administration, and Republicans would count a win as a repudiation of the Fair Deal and a bellwether going into the presidential election year of 1952.

This decision by Lucas campaign strategists, in December 1949, to promote Lucas as the Senate leader proved fortuitous for Dirksen. It allowed him the make the contest a referendum on the Truman administration and on Lucas’s membership in the administration’s leadership team. Whether or not Lucas had any alternative is up for debate. But the die was cast by this decision.

The Bloomington Pantagraph captured Lucas’s conundrum well in an editorial:
Sen. Scott W. Lucas, the Democratic candidate seeking re-election, has become a puppet of that administration. Despite an occasional show of independence by voting against the President when his vote will not change the outcome, he is forced by his position as Majority Leader to do the bidding of the party dictators when the chips are down. He no longer represents the people of Illinois. He is a high ranking officer in the most powerful and ruthless administration in modern democratic history.

A vote for Lucas is a vote for Truman, for deficit financing, for coddled labor bosses, for political expediency in foreign affairs, for inflation, for class favoritism. A vote for Lucas is a vote voluntarily to relinquish your cherished right to be represented as a citizen of the United States.

The Pantagraph has come to this conclusion after twice supporting Mr. Lucas for the Senate. We think his last term has been his worst. We believe his position as Majority Leader in the Senate is a detriment to his services to the State.

Of course, Lucas’s partisans were not content simply to tout his leadership or to shrink into a defensive crouch built upon his record. They proposed to go after Dirksen, too. They suggested slogans that would contrast “the steady international position of Lucas against the flip-flops of his opponent.” The slogans were a bit more cumbersome: “Lucas leads the fight against Communism, at home and abroad,” and “Everybody knows where Scott Lucas stands,” and “Scott Lucas sticks to his guns.”

One of the unique features of the Lucas campaign was the decision to produce a four-color, comic book-style campaign brochure—a marvelous example of candidate promotion.
SON OF A TENANT FARMER, SCOTT W. LUCAS ROSE FROM THE CLAY SOIL
OF THE LINCOLN COUNTRY IN ILLINOIS TO BECOME THE YOUNGEST MAJOR-
ITY LEADER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE IN 20th CENTURY HISTORY.
FARM BOY, SOLDIER, LAWYER, and STATESMAN, HE HAS MOUNTED TO THE
HONORED POSITION OF SPOKESMAN FOR THE PEOPLE OF ILLINOIS AND
ALL THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA. HERE IS THE STORY OF HIS LIFE – A
STORY OF AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY AND IDEALS...
The Result
Dirksen defeated the Democratic incumbent handily, outpolling Lucas 1,951,984 (54.1 percent) to 1,657,630 (45.9 percent). As the press reported at the time,

Dirksen became the symbol of new leadership for all who were haggard with worry over the dismal diplomatic record which preceded the war in Korea, all who were tired of paying subsidies, farmers who were tired of trading liberty for handouts, housewives who wondered how they could makes ends meet under inflationary pressures, wage earners who could see nothing but heavier and heavier taxes in a Democratic future, and all who feared the sickening drift of power to the federal bureaucracy in Washington.
1956 General Election. Dirksen vs. Richard Stengel

Unopposed in the Republican primary, Everett Dirksen faced Democratic Illinois state representative Richard Stengel in Dirksen’s first U.S. Senate reelection bid. This race also coincided with the 1956 presidential campaign pitting President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who sought a second term, against Democrat Adlai Stevenson.

The Challenger: Richard Stengel

The 42-year-old Stengel hailed from Rock Island, where his law firm, Coyle, Stengel & Gilman, was located. He had served eight years in the Illinois General Assembly and in each session of that period newspaper reporters covering the legislature named him as one of the five best legislators. A Navy veteran and one-time Assistant U.S. District Attorney, Stengel’s campaign materials featured laudatory comments from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Chicago Daily News, the Chicago Tribune, and the Illinois State Register. One of his brochures paired the candidate’s qualities with the letters in this name:
RICHARD STENGEI

RICHARD STENGEI is an experienced lawyer. He has served eight years in the Illinois legislature. In each session of that period the newspaper correspondents covering the General Assembly picked him as one of the five best legislators; in 1953 they named him the best.

He is 42 years old. His home is in Rock Island, where his law firm is Coyles, Stengel & Gilman. At one time he was Assistant United States District Attorney there.

After graduation from high school in 1932, he then went to Chicago to earn his way through school. He got a night job as attendant in the Chicago State Hospital for mental patients. He attended DePaul University, then transferred to the University of South Dakota, where he graduated in law, ranking third highest in the class. During the war Stengel enlisted in the Navy and served on anti-submarine duty.

No lawmaker in the General Assembly has received a larger share of citations of approval than Richard Stengel. His record was sound and progressive. He was a leader in fights for sound tax measures, civil rights, freedom in education, industrial development in Southern Illinois, better mental health programs, and other such measures.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has said of Stengel: "One of the ablest as well as best-liked members of the legislature."

Chicago Daily News: "Voters...should be alert to recognize intelligent and faithful public service...We refer to Richard Stengel of Rock Island..."

The Chicago Tribune: "...In four sessions of the legislature he has built up a record of a man to be listened to when he talks."

The Illinois State Register: "He is a great booster for new business and industry in the Prairie State."

In 1943, Stengel married Miss Lois Howell, whom he met at the University. They have three children: Kathryn, 10; William, 8; and Charles (Casey) 2. The Stengel family are members of the Broadway Presbyterian Church of Rock Island.
As a state representative, Stengel had pledged to support a nine-point program:

- Supporting a nine-point program.
- Members of your profession have shown increasing interest in recent years in the election to public office of men of high quality and integrity. Along with other conscientious citizens, they know that a functioning democracy requires men of high caliber to legislate in the public interest.

We feel that in Richard Stengel, the Democratic Candidate for the United States Senate, we have a candidate who justifies the confidence of people like you.

The problems of adequate housing and building expansion are of special concern to Richard Stengel, who is a forward-looking young man. He is supporting a program of 135,000 units per year in public housing without any self-defeating restrictions. He is concerned with adequate private housing for middle income and the aging groups, and in urban renewal and development. He is particularly interested in increased buildings for schools and mental institutions.

A brief biography is attached. Will you please read it and give him your support?

We hope that you will join this committee and assist in this campaign with a contribution plus your moral support. Time is short and the need is urgent.

Please make out your check now, payable to the Stengel for Senator Committee, and mail it in the enclosed return envelope.

We thank you for whatever you can do to help us make Dick Stengel better known in the Chicago area.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Arnold Maramont
Finance Committee
• Raise unemployment compensation benefits to at least 66-2/3 percent of take home pay.
• Improve the present workmen’s compensation laws to provide for increased benefits and more adequate coverage due to injury or occupational diseases.
• Institute proper factory safety inspection laws and give factory inspectors authority to stop any unsafe operations.
• Provide decent pensions for the aged and disabled.
• Enact a $1.25 minimum wage law in the State of Illinois.
• Provide legislation that will give equal employment opportunities to all, regardless of age, sex, race, nationality or religion.
• Provide an adequate free highway system from state and federal funds. No toll roads.
• Extension of the Agricultural Assistance program to all farmers.
• Support legislation to protect the small family type family farmer.

Very little related to Stengel’s challenge survives in Dirksen’s papers.

**Everett Dirksen**

Dirksen formally announced his candidacy for reelection on October 7, 1955 (See Appendix C). He touted his record of service to the Republican Party and what he described as the qualities that prepared him to render public service: diligence and devotion to the work of the office, impartiality, dignity, unbiased judgement based upon conviction, informing and advising the people, willingness to confess error and mistaken judgment, and adaptability to grow and change, devotion to freedom, and moderation.

He then listed “the goals of human living which I seek to keep in mind”:

• Peace is the eternal quest of mankind.
• Freedom is our greatest gift.
• National security is an assurance of our survival.
• Sound fiscal policy is a guarantee of stability and prosperity.
• Expanding the enjoyment of living for our people is a legitimate function of government.

“The material and human resources which we possess as a nation inspire the hope and the conviction that we can achieve living levels undreamed of in other days,” his announcement read. “Fair and prudent management of our national affairs, coupled with faith and optimism, can carry us steadily forward to this goal, and to its consummation I shall always do my very best.”

**The Campaign**

Dirksen decided to tie his electoral fortunes to President Dwight Eisenhower, who also sought reelection in 1956. One of Dirksen’s campaign ads read, “Ike Needs Him—You Need Him; Keep Everett M. Dirksen in Washington.” In his speeches, Dirksen stressed how Eisenhower, with his support, had led the nation to an era of “peace and prosperity.”
IKE rewarded Everett Dirksen’s loyalty in the Senate. In September 1955, he wrote a testimonial letter to be delivered at a dinner honoring the senator from Illinois. “He is indeed an outstanding American, widely versed in governmental affairs, independent in thought and action, and effective in advancing needed projects through the legislative processes,” the president wrote the chairman of the testimonial event. “I hope that my personal appreciation of his accomplishments … can be made evident during the course of your dinner.”

On August 9 the next year, Dirksen received a more formal endorsement from President Eisenhower. In it Eisenhower praised Dirksen for his “effective help” in passing administration legislation “for the public good.” “In your case,” Eisenhower wrote, “I have been especially pleased by the way you have responded when I personally called on you for help in important legislation.” He concluded, “I hope that the people of your State will give you the opportunity to continue your service in the United States Senate.”
Dirksen recognized, of course, the power of the president’s support and had the letter, on White House stationery, reproduced exactingly in his campaign pamphlet for the voters of Illinois.

In a limited campaign for his own reelection, Eisenhower chose to make one of his few appearances in Illinois. Speaking at Bradley University in Peoria, a few miles from Dirksen’s hometown of Pekin, the president embraced Dirksen:

I am glad to see here one who has become during these past four years my very good friend—Senator Everett Dirksen. He’s a tough and good fighter—and I ought to know. These last years I have often asked his help and always he has given it wholeheartedly. Our program in Congress is the better for it. Our country needs Everett Dirksen back in the United State Senate.
Incumbent Dirksen’s strategy to “nationalize” his reelection made sense in the context of Illinois politics, too. An investigative reporter for a Chicago newspaper discovered that state auditor Orville Hodge, a Republican who had won renomination, had been involved in embezzlement, forgery, and a confidence game, scamming the state for more than $1.5 million. By associating his campaign so strongly with IKE’s, Dirksen distanced himself from the scandal roiling the state’s Republican ticket.

There follows a reproduction of Dirksen’s campaign summary typed by the candidate himself:

---

Incumbent Dirksen’s strategy to “nationalize” his reelection made sense in the context of Illinois politics, too. An investigative reporter for a Chicago newspaper discovered that state auditor Orville Hodge, a Republican who had won renomination, had been involved in embezzlement, forgery, and a confidence game, scamming the state for more than $1.5 million. By associating his campaign so strongly with IKE’s, Dirksen distanced himself from the scandal roiling the state’s Republican ticket.

There follows a reproduction of Dirksen’s campaign summary typed by the candidate himself:
CAMPAIGN SUMMARY.

1. General Goals.

To appraise the work and render judgment on the achievements of this administration, it is necessary to go back from time to time an examining the basic goals and purposes. These furnish the reasons for the course which is followed and the policies which are pursued. These are essentially moral in character. These purposes might be stated as follows: To serve the whole good through fair, prudent and impartial direction of the nation's affairs both at home and abroad; a steadfast devotion to national freedom and security; without these, our way will wither and decline; to take the long view; knowing there will be change and to meet the challenge of change as it comes; to conserve our wealth and the power of making economic decisions in the hands of individuals with a minimum of government intrusion as the best known way to supply the needs and wants of the people; to also manage our financial affairs as to maintain stability of values, encourage growth, inspire confidence in the present and the future, induce new ventures and developments to meet the needs of the future, and conserve the value of the people's money; a nation free from reckless demagogues; to do the prudent and necessary thing without measuring it by the ballot box; to recognize that there are certain human hazards and costs in the operation of a free system in a complex industrial age and that these costs must be offset by sound social programs in such a way as to assure the continuation of that free system. These are the basic purposes which determined the course and explain the actions taken by this administration in serving the people.

The quest for peace and security is an administration's first duty. In just two generations, 600,000 young Americans lost their lives, one million and one half million or more were wounded, the money cost exceeded $500 billion, and the agony, dislocation and drain could not be measured. The duty of finding and preserving peace needs no other argument. This goal has been steadfastly pursued. When the Eisenhower administration took over in January of 1953, there was a stalemate war in Korea, shattered morale in Formosa, a hopeless conflict in Indochina, a frustrated divided Germany, an unliberated Austria, a powder keg in Iran and Trieste, and growing uncertainties elsewhere. In the face of all this, the prior administration was pursuing an indecisive, short-range, day by day, dust settling policy which could only delay the reassuring situation. The Eisenhower administration addressed itself firmly with an all-inclusive policy. Out of those efforts came an armistice in Korea, clear notice to the Communists that aggression would be vigorously opposed, a peace treaty with Austria and Germany, assistance in ending the inflammatory disputes over Trieste and in Iran, withdrawal of the fleet from Formosa and assurances of aid to the Republic of China, successful negotiations for bases in Spain, a proposal to the world for the peaceful use of the atom, the proposal for open skies and the exchange of military blueprints and aerial inspection, and a firm and constant pressure against Red aggression. The course has been marked by patience and firmness. The larks of peace can be heard again.

For three years, no young American had had his dream of life cut short by enemy gunfire on some far off battlefield. Peace is more than a word. The peace policy of this administration has paid in human dividends in the form of peace of mind for our people, hope for the world, and an assurance to our youth that the challenges of today can be met without shedding young blood.
Stengel adopted three strategies for his campaign. First, he attempted to link Dirksen to the corrupt Hodge. Democrats sought to focus the adverse publicity on Republicans by arranging for Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, to
hold hearings in Chicago ostensibly to see if new federal legislation was needed to prevent the recurrence of Hodge-type scandals. Dirksen tried to blunt the repercussions of the scandal by telling voters “not to vote in a fit of anger.”

Second, Stengel painted the sixty-year-old Dirksen as out of touch, a “reactionary mossback” as one biographer put it. The challenger also tried to drive a wedge between Dirksen and Eisenhower by portraying the senator as loyal to the discredited senator from Wisconsin, Joe McCarthy, and, therefore, an anti-Eisenhower Republican. But the gambit failed when the president endorsed Dirksen.

Dirksen took nothing for granted, however, traveling 200 miles per day for the last ten weeks before Election Day, November 6. His campaign press releases during that period highlighted the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration and refuted charges brought by the Adlai Stevenson-Estes Kefauver ticket. They also announced endorsements from such organizations as AMVETS, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the American Ukrainian Republican Association, and the John Ericsson League. These campaign files contain no mention of Richard Stengel.

The Result
Dirksen had won his first campaign for the U.S. Senate in 1950 with 54.1 percent of the vote. He improved that margin, barely, winning 54.2 percent of the vote in 1956. He outpolled Stengel with 2,307,352 votes to the challenger’s 1,949,883. Dirksen’s winning percentage in 1956 was the largest of his four campaigns for the Senate seat.

“It was a rugged campaign for everyone,” Dirksen wrote after the election. “But it proves all over again that victory is the end result of constant and sustained work at every level and with every weapon which a campaign requires—doorbell ringing, precinct work, good direction, financial support, speakers, organizational effort, and the unending job of converting voters to our cause.”
The 1956 campaign was notable for another reason—it produced Louella Dirksen’s favorite bumper sticker. Printed in red, white, and blue, the sticker read D I R K S E N, with I K E emphasized in the name.
1962 PRIMARY ELECTION. DIRKSEN VS. HARLEY D. JONES

Perhaps it is a sign of how little Dirksen thought of his 1962 Republican primary opponent that there is not a single file about Harley D. Jones in either Dirksen’s political papers or those of his campaign manager, Harold Rainville. A Google search reveals Jones to have been a 69-year-old Chicago attorney with offices at 11 S. LaSalle. He was an unsuccessful candidate for judge of the Superior Court in 1929 and for judge of the Municipal Court in 1930.

Not surprisingly, Dirksen won the primary with 742,973 votes (the highest number of votes Dirksen ever received in a primary) to Jones’s 109,574.
1962 GENERAL ELECTION. DIRKSEN VS. SIDNEY YATES

Historians have not written sufficiently about the 1962 race, the closest of Dirksen’s four Senate races and the first he faced as Minority Leader of the U.S Senate. Several factors deserve more attention: the role John Kennedy’s administration played in backing the campaign of the opposition leader in the Senate; the failed efforts of a liberal Democrat to convince a popular president of his own party to campaign for him; the impact of an international incident (the Cuban missile crisis) on domestic politics; and the impact of press coverage on campaigns.

This feature cannot address all these topics. Instead, its purpose is to convey the flavor of the 1962 Senate campaign in Illinois.

Dirksen Announces

Dirksen announced his intention to run for a third Senate term on September 22, 1961, at a testimonial dinner in his hometown of Pekin. “All the major decisions in my life have been made here,” he said, before recounting a series of life-making choices. “It is time for another decision. Shall I again ask the people of Illinois for their suffrage that I might continue the work I have pursued in the United States Senate?” He answered, of course, in the affirmative.
"After long absences from home enforced by the duties of office in Washington, there always comes back to me some lines from that poem which I learned long ago, 'Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, this is my own, my native land,' This is my own, my native land, my native city, where the family tap-root went deep many generations ago, and it will ever be so, no matter what tasks life may assign to me.

"All the major decisions in my life have been made here. The determination to go to college even though I had no funds when high school days were over; the decision to marry, if she would have me, the girl who has been my constant inspiration; my first venture into the field of public service when I became a candidate for the City Council; the decision to run for Congress and find public service at the national level; the decision to run again for Congress despite lack of success in 1930 resolved every doubt as to what course I wanted to pursue in life; the recurring decisions made every two years when I became a candidate for re-election to the Congress; the agonizing decision to retire after an eye malady threatened my vision; the decision to seek a seat in the Senate despite the fact that those who counselled this course stated at one and the same time that it would be impossible to win; the decision to seek a second term in the Senate -- these, all these decisions were made here in my home town."
The inspiration which I received here from a saintly mother, a devoted family, steadfast friends, the constant faith of teachers who taught me, the inspiration I found here in church, and the atmosphere of a quiet and well ordered community were the forces which helped to fashion those decisions, and for these I shall be always and eternally grateful.

"It is time for another decision. Shall I again ask the people of Illinois for their suffrage that I might continue the work I have pursued in the United States Senate? Without egotism and without any self-serving spirit I believe one can honestly catechize himself publicly for answers to some questions which are at once simple but important.

"Have I been diligent in the pursuit of the people's business? Have I been moved by conviction in meeting the domestic and world challenges of our time? Have I been willing to freely confess my mistakes and get back to the path of truth? Have I placed the well-being of the country above all else in seeking answers to the problems and proposals with which we dealt year after year?

"In good conscience and after carefully considering the matter I believe I can give an affirmative answer to all of these questions and that I can well and truly and honorably continue that service and fully requite the trust which you committed to me long ago. I shall, therefore, ask the people of this great state to permit me to continue in their service in the United States Senate when they make their judgment in 1962."
Sen. Dirksen’s sense of public duty is simple, understandable, unselfish. To him, public office is literally what it should be—a public trust. He believes in taking counsel with the people he represents, in giving heed to their views, in securing all of the facts, and then in making a judgment which best serves all of the people. His fidelity to freedom is an open book. His determination to preserve our Federal-State system of constitutional government runs like a rod of steel through his record. He has consistently and vigorously opposed government control whether in Federal aid to education, farm programs, compulsory medical care under the Social Security system, or in any other field as a threat to freedom.
The Republican incumbent faced the voters for the first time as Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate, a position that had given him power and visibility unmatched by any other Republican senator of that era. *Time Magazine* chose Dirksen to feature on its cover six weeks before the election.
The Challenger

Born in Chicago in 1909, and the youngest of six children of Lithuanian immigrants, Sydney R. Yates graduated from Lake View High School in Chicago in 1928. He graduated from the University of Chicago with a degree in philosophy in 1931 and earned a law degree there in 1933. In the mid-1930s, he played semi-professional basketball and practiced law. He also worked for Illinois state agencies overseeing railroads and commerce.

After serving in the Navy in World War II, Yates returned to his law practice. In 1948, he was elected to Congress, upsetting incumbent Republican Robert Twyman. A die-hard liberal, Yates narrowly won reelection to his next two terms and thereafter easily beat all opponents—he won a total of 24 terms to the House.

The Campaign

In 1962, Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daly persuaded Yates to give up his safe House seat to run against Dirksen. After campaigning in 35 counties, the candidate provided an upbeat report to his fellow Democrats. “The reception and the enthusiasm were excellent everywhere,” he wrote. “In almost every county the party is at the peak of its strength.” Yates campaigned by comparing his record in Congress with that of Dirksen’s. He reminded his audiences that Dirksen had voted against increasing the minimum wage, medical care for the aged under Social Security, the area redevelopment bill, the housing bill, the manpower retraining bill, improving unemployment compensation, and the feed grains farm bill. “I expect to continue this hot and heavy campaigning right up to election day …. There will be no let-up.”
Fellow Democrats Working for Victory!

This is the first of a series of reports I expect to make to you on the progress of our campaign for the U. S. Senate.
I want to keep all of you informed on what we are doing, and I want your suggestions and advice.

Thus far I have campaigned in more than 35 counties. I can tell you, as I have told audiences wherever I have been, that the Democratic Party is on the move. The reception and the enthusiasm were excellent everywhere. In almost every county the party is at the peak of its strength. There is more activity among party workers and in their contacts with the public than at this time in any campaign in previous years. We have a strong state ticket and excellent local candidates. Victory is in the air.

I have been waging a type of campaign which is new to me. The British say they "stand" for election, and we usually say that we "run" for election. I am walking for election. I have walked around the courthouse square in every county I have visited, and also down the main streets, where I have met people, shaken their hands, and talked to them. I also have been meeting with party leaders and their workers. I am doing my best to become better known throughout the state, and I am confident that this person-to-person campaign is paying off. (Note the attached clipping from the Peoria Herald.)

A great deal of the credit for the warm reception I have received is due in great measure to the work and cooperation of the county chairman, county chairwoman, and their workers. They have been doing an excellent job, and I am truly grateful.

I am campaigning on my own record in Congress, and comparing it with that of my opponent. (Did you know he voted against increasing the minimum wage, medical care for the aged under Social Security, the area redevelopment bill, the housing bill, the manpower retraining bill, improving unemployment compensation,
Events laid waste to Yates’s plans, however. Although Yates had vigorously supported President John Kennedy both in his candidacy and presidency, Kennedy did not reciprocate. His administration quickly learned that Dirksen’s support in the Senate was crucial to the new president’s legislative success. As Dirksen biographer Neil MacNeil described it:
This obvious friendliness by the President and his men for Dirksen alarmed Sidney Yates, Dirksen’s Democratic opponent in his race for reelection to the Senate. Yates, a talented liberal Congressman, became so upset that he went to the White House to plead with Kennedy to make firm commitments to come to Illinois and help him with his campaign against Dirksen. Kennedy made those commitments, but even so there was gossip all over Washington that Kennedy did not want Dirksen defeated. There were good reasons for the gossip, for it was no secret that inside the Democratic hierarchy the defeat of Dirksen, if it happened, would be regarded as a political catastrophe for the Kennedy administration. Robert (“Bobby”) Baker, Secretary of the Senate Democrats and a long-time intimate of the Senate’s inmost operations, believed Dirksen was the ablest leader the Senate Republicans had had in at least two decades. “He’s been a fantastic help to the Kennedy administration,” Baker said, “and Kennedy knows it. … I like Sid Yates, but my party would be in a hell of a mess—Kennedy would be in a hell of a mess—if Dirksen gets defeated.”

On Friday, October 19, Kennedy met his commitment to Yates. He joined the Congressman in Illinois to campaign against Dirksen in both Springfield and Chicago. The next day Kennedy abruptly canceled any further campaigning, pleading he had a head cold, and he flew back to Washington. In reality, an international crisis was at hand; American reconnaissance planes had photographic proof that the Russians were mounting nuclear missiles in Cuba, threatening the nation’s safety as never before. On Monday, October 22, Kennedy had resolved to act, and he summoned the leaders of Congress to appear “forthwith” at the White House for an urgent meeting with the President. Dirksen, like the other leaders, instantly returned to Washington, abandoning his political campaign. Dirksen came because he had no choice on such a summons, but he knew as well as any the enormous benefit such a call for him from the President had to have on his reelection campaign. …

A few days later, after a second meeting at the White House, Dirksen suggested to President Kennedy that if the crisis had calmed enough, as it appeared to have, he permit the Congressional leaders to leave Washington. Dirksen said a number of the leaders, including himself, were running for reelection, and they wanted to get back to their campaigning. Amused, Kennedy teased Dirksen about his doubts at winning reelection.

“What are you talking about?” Kennedy joked, as Dirksen remembered. “You’re not having any trouble. You’re just as good as in.”

“You and I are not novices in this,” Dirksen replied. “We don’t take anything for granted. There’s work to be done.”

Back in Illinois to resume his campaign, Dirksen casually mentioned these words of the President to him in the hearing of a reporter. The results were immediate news broadcasts and newspaper headlines all over Illinois to the effect that President
Kennedy himself had written off any chance that Congressman Yates might defeat Dirksen.

The Result

After the votes were cast on November 6, Yates came up short with 1,748,007 (47.1 percent) votes to Dirksen’s 1,961,202 (52.9 percent). The Democrat conceded to Dirksen in a telegram the next day: “I congratulate you upon your election and wish you well in the difficult days ahead.” If Dirksen replied, there is no evidence in his files.
1968 PRIMARY ELECTION. DIRKSEN VS. ROY C. JOHNSON

Dirksen faced only token opposition in the June 1968 primary. Roy Johnson, a truck driver who lived in Calumet Park, was a newcomer to politics, although he had been active in local civic affairs and American Legion activities. In addition to serving as a volunteer firefighter, Johnson was national chairman of the Pardon Jimmy Hoffa Committee that attempted to persuade President Lyndon Johnson to pardon the former Teamsters’ Union boss from a federal prison sentence. Roy Johnson’s platform included destruction “now” of Red China, Cuba, and France’s atomic arms plants.

Dirksen defeated his Republican challenger with 622,710 votes to Johnson’s 53,069.
William G. Clark

William Clark’s roots ran deep in Democratic Party politics. His grandfather, John S. Clark, was a state representative in Illinois, and his father, John S. Clark II, was a Chicago alderman. William grew up on Chicago’s West Side. He graduated from a Jesuit high school in Wisconsin and attended Loyola University, Michigan State University, and the University of Michigan before receiving his law degree from DePaul University.

After five years of practicing law, he was appointed by Governor Adlai Stevenson in 1952 to the post of attorney for the Cook County administrator. He was elected to the state House two years later, and after a term in the state Senate, he returned to the House and was elected Democratic leader. As Democratic majority leader of the Illinois House of Representatives in 1959 and 1960, he was known as a consensus-builder between the party’s machine and liberal voting blocs. Clark was first elected Illinois attorney general in 1960 and reelected in 1964—he held the office during the 1968 campaign. Married to Rosalie Locatis Clark, the couple lived in Chicago with their five children.

No surprise, then, that Clark’s listed his priority as “Peace in Viet Nam” with these bullet points:
• First, we have to stop the bombing of North Viet Nam, but we must guarantee the safety of American troops in South Viet Nam by whatever means are necessary.

• If South Viet Nam is ever to have a stable government, there must be free elections representing all political viewpoints of the South Vietnamese people.

• We must initiate land reforms to give the landless Vietnamese people a personal stake in the future.

• Finally, a neutral, international peacekeeping apparatus must be established.

Clark also put forth a “Bill of Rights for The Poor,” which included rights to a meaningful job, to a livable income, to good health, to a complete education, and to a decent home. In view of the rioting that took place in 1968, Attorney General Clark announced, “There is no place for lawlessness in our society.” He cautioned, however, that “we must not sacrifice justice in order to achieve stability. Poverty may be no excuse for crime, but certainly crime is no excuse for us to overlook poverty.”

Everett M. Dirksen

Everett Dirksen formally announced for what would be his fourth, and last, candidacy for the Senate on February 17, 1968:

Both the world and our country are confronted with a crisis. It is deeper and more serious than we think. I have been serving with men and women in all branches of government who deal with it. I do not propose to forsake them. I shall be a candidate for re-election to the United States Senate on the Republican ticket.

The easy course would be to walk away and let the fire burn. But to retreat from an unfinished war or from the unsolved challenges and baffling problems would be alien to every conviction which I cherish. Long ago, Illinois voters reposed a trust in me. I would like to continue to fulfill it.

This is not quite the time for a statement on the issues. There is sound reason for that. In early 1965, I was instrumental in setting up the Republican National Coordinating Committee. Its purpose is to coordinate Republican policy. It meets four times each year. It consists of the Republican leadership of the House and Senate, former presidential and vice-presidential nominees, seven governors, and seven members of the Republican National Committee.

The Committee has managed to secure a substantial number of the greatest brains in the nation to serve on task forces to research the whole field of government policy, both foreign and domestic, and present their conclusions to the Committee. Much of this will doubtless find its way into the Republican national platform for 1968.

The talent, the range of views, and the prestige of these task force members assures [sic] the development of principles and policies with which we can go to the people in
November with high confidence in what we say as to what must be done and how to do it.

In such a time, nothing matters save that the body be the ready servant of one’s will, that the will be strong and intact, and that the spirit knows compassion born from the experience of both peace and war. Long ago, I was in uniform on the Western Front in France and saw my share of death and destruction. A son-in-law served in a PT squadron in the Pacific in World War II and a grandson will be eligible for a draft card four years hence, to which I trust he will courageously respond, if and when, God forbid such a day must come. This I offer to the people of my native state in the year which marks the 150th anniversary of the admission of our state to the Union.

Not unexpectedly, the Senate Minority Leader ran on his record. His campaign published a series of brochures each emphasizing his accomplishments or endorsements targeted to a particular audience.

“Everett McKinley Dirksen: As the Press Sees Him,” for example, carried laudatory comments from reporters David Broder, William Eaton, William S. White, Doris Fleeson, and Willard Edwards, among others. Writing in the Washington Post, White called Dirksen’s reelection “vital”:

Dirksen is not only Republican leader of the Senate but is also a man all but irreplaceable there both to his party and to the country itself. In point of fact, he is by any fair measure the least expendable senator in either party. … For this man … is in
simple truth the balance wheel of the Senate itself and by far the greatest force there for an enlightened, and even a statesmanlike, approach to the truly vital affairs of the nation. He has, simply and unarguable [sic], earned the gratitude of responsible people not only of Illinois but of all the United States.
The Campaign

For the second time in his Senate career, Dirksen’s reelection campaign coincided with a presidential race. In 1968, Republican Richard Nixon faced Democrat Hubert Humphrey. On the campaign trail, Dirksen did not mention himself, or ask for votes for himself. He asked for votes for the Republican ticket. He told his audiences that an entire change was needed from the White House to the coroner’s office. One of Dirksen’s favorite lines: “Move over Hubert” referring to the Democrat presidential nominee. The senator appeared to campaign more vigorously for the Richard Nixon-Spiro Agnew ticket than for himself. In a typical speech, Dirksen would say the Democrats should get out because in eight years they had lowered farm parity, failed to resolve the conflict in Vietnam, put crucial financial strains on the country, and failed to solve the growing crime problem or deal with civil unrest.

Bill Clark spent most of his time attacking Dirksen. “I’m running against his record as much as on my own record,” he said. He told audiences that Dirksen had never done anything for them and charged him with various affronts from abusing his free mail privilege to voting on measures in which Dirksen had a conflict of interest. There was the matter of Dirksen’s age, too, which the Democratic challenger invariably called attention to. Senator Dirksen would turn 73 before the new Congress began and would reach 79 before the end of his fourth term.
The Outcome

On November 5, Illinois voters broke a tradition that had held throughout the state’s 150 years of statehood. No senator—Republican or Democrat—had ever been elected to a fourth term until 1968. Dirksen was that senator winning 2,358,947 (53.2 percent) of the vote to Clark’s 2,073,242 (46.8 percent). Although his percentage was down from the 54.1 percent in 1950 and 54.2 percent in 1956, he improved from the 52.9 percent he received in 1962.

---

**STATEMENT**

I, Everett McKinley Dirksen, do swear that I am a citizen of the United States and the State of Illinois, that I am not affiliated directly or indirectly with any communist organization or any communist front organization, or any foreign political agency, party, organization or government which advocates the overthrow of constitutional government by force or other means not permitted under the Constitution of the United States or the constitution of this State; that I do not directly or indirectly teach or advocate the overthrow of the government of the United States or of this State or any unlawful change in the form of the governments thereof by force or any unlawful means.

Subscribed and sworn to by me this 1st day of March, 1968.

[Signature]

Notary Public

*Form 113*

My commission expires: 12-14-69

END END
### Everett M. Dirksen's Campaign and Election Statistics, 1930-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Republican Primary Opponent</th>
<th>Primary Vote for Leading Opponent (R)</th>
<th>Primary Vote for EMD</th>
<th>General Election Opponent Name (Democrat)</th>
<th>Total General Election Vote for Opponent (D) (%)</th>
<th>Total General Election Vote for EMD (%)</th>
<th>Total Two-Party General Election Vote</th>
<th>Pekin Vote for EMD</th>
<th>Pekin Vote for Opponent (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>William E. Hull</td>
<td>27,767</td>
<td>26,612</td>
<td>Not applicable (NA)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>William E. Hull</td>
<td>24,515</td>
<td>27,085</td>
<td>Edwin S. Carr</td>
<td>44,902 (39.8%)</td>
<td>67,948 (60.2%)</td>
<td>112,850</td>
<td>4,978</td>
<td>2,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>32,155</td>
<td>Rayburn L. Russell</td>
<td>31,044 (34.6%)</td>
<td>58,716 (65.4%)</td>
<td>89,760</td>
<td>4,934</td>
<td>1,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35,369</td>
<td>Charles C. Dickman</td>
<td>60,559 (46.8%)</td>
<td>68,964 (53.2%)</td>
<td>129,523</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>4,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30,071</td>
<td>James C. Dillon</td>
<td>35,081 (36.5%)</td>
<td>61,012 (63.5%)</td>
<td>96,093</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Republican Primary Opponent Name</td>
<td>Primary Date</td>
<td>Primary Vote for Leading Opponent (R)</td>
<td>Primary Vote for EMD</td>
<td>General Election Opponent Name (Democrat)</td>
<td>Total General Election Vote for Opponent (D) (%)</td>
<td>Total General Election Vote for EMD (%)</td>
<td>Total Two-Party General Election Vote</td>
<td>Pekin Vote for EMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>William A. Bone</td>
<td>April 9, 1940</td>
<td>6,496</td>
<td>34,606</td>
<td>M.R. Clark</td>
<td>57,567 (41.9%)</td>
<td>79,780 (58.1%)</td>
<td>137,347</td>
<td>5,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 5, 1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>April 14, 1942</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>31,203</td>
<td>James D. Carrigan¹</td>
<td>24,969 (31.2%)</td>
<td>55,135 (68.8%)</td>
<td>80,104</td>
<td>4,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 3, 1942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>April 11, 1944</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25,758</td>
<td>M.R. Clark</td>
<td>48,779 (41%)</td>
<td>70,301 (59%)</td>
<td>119,080</td>
<td>4,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 7, 1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>April 9, 1946</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>32,370</td>
<td>Hans A. Spading</td>
<td>31,091 (32.5%)</td>
<td>64,534 (67.5%)</td>
<td>95,625</td>
<td>4,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 5, 1946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1948 EMD did not seek reelection

1950 | William J. Baker Lar Daly       | April 11, 1950     | Baker 149,286 Daly 47,668              | 545,028             | Scott W. Lucas                            | 1,657,630 (45.9%)                             | 1,951,984 (54.1%)                  | 3,609,614                      | 4,929                      | 5,272                      |

¹ In the Democratic primary, Eugene F. Cavanaugh won unopposed—no mention of a James Carrigan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Republican Primary Opponent</th>
<th>Primary Vote for Leading Opponent (R)</th>
<th>Primary Vote for EMD</th>
<th>General Election Opponent Name (Democrat)</th>
<th>Total General Election Vote for Opponent (D) (%)</th>
<th>Total General Election Vote for EMD (%)</th>
<th>Total Two-Party General Election Vote</th>
<th>Pekin Vote for EMD</th>
<th>Pekin Vote for Opponent (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Unopposed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>686,268</td>
<td>Richard Stengel November 6, 1956</td>
<td>1,949,883 (45.8%)</td>
<td>2,307,352 (54.2%)</td>
<td>4,257,235</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>7,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Harley D. Jones</td>
<td>109,574</td>
<td>742,973</td>
<td>Sidney Yates November 6, 1962</td>
<td>1,748,007 (47.1%)</td>
<td>1,961,202 (52.9%)</td>
<td>3,709,209</td>
<td>5,184</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Roy C. Johnson</td>
<td>53,069</td>
<td>622,710</td>
<td>William G. Clark November 5, 1968</td>
<td>2,073,242 (46.8%)</td>
<td>2,358,947 (53.2%)</td>
<td>4,432,189</td>
<td>7,148</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

2. Vote totals for Pekin’s 20 precincts were more difficult to obtain. Vote abstracts stored by the Tazewell County Clerk provided Pekin vote totals for 1944, 1950, 1956, 1962, and 1968. These “official records,” however, were missing for Dirksen’s other nine elections. The hard copy of the *Pekin Daily Times* provided total for 1942, 1944, and 1946. The microfilm copy of the Times,
which is difficult to read, supplied the Pekin vote totals for 1932, 1934, 1936, and 1940. Two papers were published during the 1930s and 1940s in Peoria, but those papers did not publish precinct totals for Tazewell County with one exception: the *Peoria Journal-Transcript* published the Pekin totals for the 1938 election.

3. Candidates from other political parties not included.
APPENDIX B

EVERTT DIRKSEN'S ANNOUNCEMENT SEEKING REELECTION TO THE HOUSE, 1944

ANNOUNCEMENT.

REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITY.

The Republican party stands on the threshold of a great opportunity, but it must not be opportunist in approaching it. That is the course of weakness and inertia. It needs an acute conscience. It must seek power to accomplish a purpose. If its purposes and spirit are good, it deserves to succeed; it not, it does not deserve to succeed. It needs humility and the common touch. In this new epoch, no other quality will do. It must and can become the vehicle for giving our nation the leadership in world affairs. We dare not let this disordered world drift. It needs firm direction from the one nation which has the power, the capacity, the will and the sympathy to do so. It is not enough that we preserve both the form and substance of a great nation of great prosperity where that prosperity is unequally appportioned. Emotional touch, escape from depression, a tonic for victory, a hat in the ring.

On whom shall the cloak of leadership be laid. There is no great enthusiasm for old names. Perhaps it is neither immodest nor vain-glorious for one who has been identified with the Federal Government for more than ten years to humbly submit his own name for the consideration of his party.

Thirteen years ago, when first I invited the confidence of the people of the 16th Congressional district in Illinois in the hope that I might represent them in Congress, they first demurred and then bestowed that confidence. I could reward them only with diligence and unremitting labor. I shall ask their suffrage again for a seat in the Congress and at the same time, submit my name for the preferential Presidential primary in 1944. If they see fit to decree otherwise,
I shall be neither hurt nor chagrined. These are days for good
soldiers whether on the battle front or the home front. Of 3 1
men in White House, 18 served in one or both
branches of Congress. I served in one.

SPIRITUAL APPROACH.

No man can earnestly contemplate the highest office within the gift
of the people without first examining his own conscience and setting
forth certain matters of the spirit which are an essential part of
him and would have to go with him were he privileged to achieve his
objective. It sounds like a copy-book platitude to dwell on the
qualities of honor and truth. I mean a punctilious regard for truth.
Many of our troubles today spring from deception, delusion and lack of
probity. Compare the administrations platform of 1932 with the proposals
it submitted after reaching office and see how far performance has
departed from promise. Perhaps it's political cleverness. But there is
also an ugly word for it. How much truth gets to our people today con-
cerning the war effort. It is justified on the basis of military
necessity. If that be true, then no report would be better than a
half truth. Censorship has ever been designed to conceal not reveal
truth. How long can we go on with such deception before the confidence
of the people in government is destroyed and the forces of revolutionary
change gather. The account of General Marshall and his staff to a secret
session of Congress in October does not square with the headlines. Too
long have the people been exhorted to support their government. It were
better to invite their tears and sacrifices by disclosing the magnitude
of the problems before us. No other course is worthy of a free people.
THE PRESERVATION OF BALANCED GOVERNMENT.

How strange it sounds to say that the lawmaking powers of the Congress must be restored. They are not there today nor have they been for a decade. Congress became a mere ratification forum. So much of our present trouble springs from friction between the legislative and executive branch. Is it not an impertinent sneer upon Congress for a Chief Executive to reveal important matters to press conferences before the formality of bringing them to the attention of Congress. How intriguing to note that Churchill's first report, is always to Parliament. Does it comport with dignified government to refer to a Senatorial sojourn as a nuisance trip, a decent humility and a proper regard for the lawmaking branch is of the essence of democracy. While Congress is often physically but not always so near, sympathy is as distant as antipathy. Failure in such trouble not surprisingly with sympathy is misunderstanding.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

We must lead the world back to peace, decent living and organized justice. What is peace but the status quo between wars. It is the condition which obtains between conflicts. When it is shattered, it becomes war. Whatever force threaten the status quo is an invitation to war. What are these forces. There are quarrels over boundaries, materials, etc. But there are other forces. The insidious methods of international cartels to throttle competition in nations can be cited. The problem then is to narrow the area of frictions which invite war. The strict isolationist would avoid them. The strict interventionist abets and aids them. The first approach is narrowing the causes of conflict is an instrument to apply the principles of justice to all such disputes. Peaceful means must first be exhausted and thereafter force.
Unity of purpose, sacrifice, teamwork will come when...
Has there been deliberate delusion of the people's of the earth by
tenuous promises which cannot be fulfilled. Consider any representation
to bring the four freedoms to the corners of the earth. How shall it
be done. There's the rub. To promise beyond our capacity is deception,
the bitter fruit of which will be disillusionement, hate, distrust
and disrespect in the years ahead. The blunders of today will become
the tragedies a generation hence.

'A PROGRAM.'

The record of any man in legislative halls becomes an open book where
all may read. There one can read the mistakes also.

THE WAR.
INFLATION.

1. ENLARGING POWER OF CCC IS DESIGNED TO CURB RUNAWAY INFLATION.

Have inflation now.

2. GENERAL OBSERVATION.

Present price-wage pattern different from other wars

Previously, cost of commodities and living outran increases in income

Now—individual income outran prices and cost of living

Result of increased wages plus use of ceilings to keep down price

3. THE PAY OFF

In many fields production is becoming unprofitable,

Making less goods available at lower prices,

Supplying more money to buy such goods

Our economy more unbalanced than ever

Storing up suffering and dislocation for the future.
ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDACY OF
EVERT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN
FOR
REELECTION TO U.S. SENATE

TO MY FELLOW CITIZENS OF ILLINOIS,

I would like to continue to serve you in the United States Senate. This may therefore be considered as a statement of my candidacy.

Whether this service shall continue is for you to decide for this is a government by the people.

I can but hope that your decision will be based upon one broad consideration and that is whether I have been a good public servant.

It would appear somewhat selfish and self-serving for me to say whether I have. Others can say it with better grace.

It does appear appropriate however that I make some statement of the case. To do so and completely avoid the personal pronoun is a bit difficult and I trust you will not deem it unseemly.

Next year, two decisions must be made at the polls.

The first of these is the decision of Republican voters of the State as to who will be their nominee.

To them I believe I can say with candor and modesty that I have sought according to my lights to observe the principles and the covenants of the party.

For many years, I served on the party’s National Congressional Committee. For four years, my Republican colleagues in the Senate honored me with the Chairmanship of the National Senatorial Campaign Committee. These duties I pursued as vigorously as I could in all sections of the nation. I trust therefore that these labors, and my record in both House and Senate, will serve as evidence of my devotion to the party and that this service will find favor in the sight of all who subscribe to these principles.

In November of 1956 comes the larger decision. It will then be for all of the qualified voters of this great state to say who shall serve them in the United States Senate. Here again, I trust that the sole consideration will be the quality of the service rendered.
If one of the marks of good public service is diligence and devotion to the work of the office, I do believe that for myself and a faithful and competent staff, I can say that we have earnestly pursued the people's business.

If impartiality is a mark of good public service, we have sought to serve all of the people of the state and nation without regard to race, creed, color or political opinion.

If dignity is a mark of good public service, we have endeavored at all times by word and deed to maintain the dignity of this high station and keep it above reproach.

If unbiased judgment based upon conviction is a mark of good public service, I have followed this course in the belief that a representative of the people owes to them not only his energies and talents but his best judgment as well. I esteem it a high compliment that in his letter of September 19th, the President should say, "Everett and I have not of course agreed on every public issue, but never have I had occasion to doubt that sincerity and conviction have motivated every vote he has cast."

If informing and advising the people of what transpires at the national level of their government is one of the marks of good public service, we can point to the personal reports made over a long period in all parts of the state and to the radio and television discussions as an evidence of this service.

If willingness at all times to confess error and mistaken judgment and to correct such errors and mistakes is a mark of good public service, I can candidly say that publicly and privately, I have been ever willing to admit any shortcomings of judgment, for only in truth and candor shall we find the proper way. In a free land, not the least of the freedoms is the freedom to err.

If adaptability to growth and change is a mark of good public service, I have sought to interpret history intelligently and to keep in step with the basic truth that change is eternal. Our tradition and progress teaches us that the basic problem of government is to adapt sound principles to changing conditions.
If devotion to freedom is one of the marks of good public service, I have sought in every way and with whatever talent I have to assert the importance of preserving the climate of freedom as indispensable to our survival and continuing progress.

If moderation is a mark of good public service, I have tried to avoid those extreme courses which have sometimes marked our national thinking in recent years and to find a sound middle road in the belief that this course not only assures steady progress but provides the greatest good for the greatest number of our people.

In this spirit I have sought to serve you and if it merits your confidence and esteem, I shall carry on.

Perhaps a few other observations are appropriate to indicate the goals of human living which I seek to keep in mind.

Peace is the eternal quest of mankind. To its achievement I shall do whatever I can in the hope that sword and shell and bomb in the arbitration of mankind's problems may be abolished.

Freedom is our greatest gift and to its preservation I pledge my every effort.

National security is an assurance of our survival in a fitful world and it will not be neglected.

Sound fiscal policy is a guarantee of stability and prosperity and I shall adhere to it even though it may be times appear to be an unpopular course.

Expanding the enjoyment of living for our people is a legitimate function of government to be achieved through sound policies.

The material and human resources which we possess as a nation inspire the hope and the conviction that we can achieve living levels undreamed of in other days. Fair and prudent management of our national affairs, coupled with faith and optimism, can carry us steadily forward to this goal, and to its consummation I shall always do my very best.

With a deep sense of gratitude for the opportunity I have had to be heard on the challenges and problems of our time, I shall cheerfully abide the decision for you are the Sovereign in this great, free land.