

4-1-1950

The public campaign of the 1949 Virginia Democratic gubernatorial primary

William O. Hester

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/masters-theses>

Recommended Citation

Hester, William O., "The public campaign of the 1949 Virginia Democratic gubernatorial primary" (1950). *Master's Theses*. Paper 58.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

THE PUBLIC CAMPAIGN OF THE 1949 VIRGINIA
DEMOCRATIC GUBERNATORIAL PRIMARY

BY

WILLIAM O. HESTER, JR.

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

JUNE, 1950

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
VIRGINIA

INDEX

Introduction		1
Chapter I	The Opening of the Campaign	5
Chapter II	The Campaign Organizations	12
Chapter III	The Miller Arguments	19
Chapter IV	The Battle Arguments	25
Chapter V	The Edwards, Arnold and Prillaman Arguments	28
Chapter VI	The Candidates in Action	33
Chapter VII	The Outcome	39
Bibliography		61
Supplement I	Battle Campaign Materials	43 Items
Supplement II	Miller Campaign Materials	28 Items
Supplement III	Edwards Campaign Materials	26 Items
Supplement IV	Arnold Campaign Materials	14 Items.

INTRODUCTION

That the South possesses a one-party system of choosing its state and national representatives is an axiom of American politics. On only three occasions since 1880 have Southern presidential electors cast their votes for any nominee other than that of the Democratic Party.¹ On only four occasions in this period has a Governor of a Southern State been elected on any but a Democratic ticket.² This record is convincing testimony that in the States of the late Confederacy the nominees of the Democratic Party are in reality the only candidates having any probability of election.

It would therefore behoove the serious student to delve into the process by which the Democratic Party chooses its nominees, e.g. the Democratic primary. As might be expected,

1. In 1920, Tennessee was caught in the Harding landslide. In 1928, Texas, Florida, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Virginia cast their electoral vote for Hoover in preference to wet, Catholic Al Smith. In 1948 Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina defied the national party to cast their vote for the States' Rights candidate, Thurmond, whom they believed to be a better Democrat than the nominee of the national party.

2. Republican governors were elected in North Carolina in 1897 and in Tennessee in 1881, 1911, and 1921.

in no two states has exactly the same pattern of behavior evolved. In some, like Florida, a splinter-like Factionalism has developed which seldom survives more than one election. In some other states-Tennessee is a notable example- a permanent two faction rivalry exists, not unlike the two party rivalry in all the other parts of the Anglo-Saxon world. Between the Florida and Tennessee extremes, there exist many variations³ of the two basic patterns.

Virginia might be said to possess one of these variations. Belonging to that group of states in which a two faction rivalry exists, the Old Dominion differs from the basic pattern in that one of the two permanent factions of the party is so tightly organized and so completely in control of the political life of the state that a one-faction (or one party) system exists. Thus the one-party system which is universally attributed to the South in reality exists only in Virginia. The examination of a few percentages from recent Virginia state-wide Democratic primaries shows this to be true. In each case the candidate of the dominant faction, or the so-called Byrd Organization, piled up a convincing lead.

3. For statistical analyses of factionalism in the Democratic Parties of the Southern States, see Part 1 of Southern Politics in State and Nation by V. O. Key, Jr. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.

In 1941, where the factional lines were most clearly drawn in the race for Lieutenant-Governor, the Organization candidate corralled 81.3 per cent of the votes. In 1945 the Organization choice for Governor led with 69.9 per cent of the vote. In 1946 the Organization candidate for the National Senate ran up a total of 63.5 per cent of the total vote and in the 1948 race for that same office, the Organization man led with 70.3 per cent of the total. However in the 1949 gubernatorial primary the Organization sponsored candidate received an all-time low of 42.8 per cent of the total vote cast.

The facts attending this most recent race makes it the most extraordinary and interesting political spectacle Virginia has seen in many a decade. The traditional pattern of a two man, Organization vs. Anti-organization, race gave way to a four way free-for-all, much like those common in Florida or Mississippi, but totally foreign to the Virginia political scene. The only past Virginia primary having even the remotest resemblance to the 1949 contest was that of 1917 in which two Organization regulars, former Attorney-General John Garland Pollard and the then Lieutenant-Governor J. Taylor Ellyson, split the Organization vote so badly that the race was thrown to the independent candidate, Westmoreland Davis. However,

the 1917 race was complicated by the "wet" versus "dry" issue as well as the usual Organization versus Anti-organization issue. In addition the total vote then was under 90,000 while that of 1949 was in excess of 316,000.

Thus it could be said that in 1949, for the first time in many years, Virginians themselves could make their choice from a wide field of candidates and platforms rather than having that choice seriously limited by the leaders of the factions as has been the case in past years.

CHAPTER I.

THE OPENING OF THE CAMPAIGN

The campaign of the 1949 Virginia Democratic Gubernatorial primary formally opened on June 10, 1948, the announcement of the first candidate in the field being made almost fourteen months prior to the election date. Before this time however, the usual rumors concerning prospective aspirants were in evidence. Among those mentioned who might carry the Organization banner were State Highway Commissioner James A. Anderson, State Senator Charles R. Fenwick of Arlington and Representative Thomas B. Stanley of Stanleytown.⁴ Foremost among these however was State Senator John S. Battle of Charlottesville who had been⁵ rumored a prospective candidate for more than a year.

In the Anti-organization ranks the two names most often mentioned to carry the fight to "the machine" in the oncoming primary were those of Delegate Robert Whitehead of Nelson⁶ and Francis P. Miller, former Delegate from Fairfax.

-
4. The Richmond News Leader, June 3, 1948.
 5. Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 11, 1948.
 6. The Richmond News Leader, June 3, 1948.

Aside from the candidacies proposed within the majority and minority factions of the party was that of Mayor Horace H. Edwards of Richmond. It was Mr. Edwards, who, having told friends as far back as the summer of 1947 that he positively would run, had behaved the most like an already announced candidate. His many public appearances and speeches were testimony to this.⁷

However Mr. Edwards from the very beginning was at a peculiar disadvantage in regard to when he might publicly announce his candidacy. As State Democratic chairman he could not announce for Governor and his resignation from the former post could not be effected until the July 2, 1948 State Convention. Thus prior to July 2, Candidate Edwards was left in a state of suspended animation.

So it came about that Senator Battle was the first candidate to formally announce his intentions to run. On June 10, 1948 in Richmond, Senator Battle announced his candidacy to the press in a short, terse statement.

Two days later, as if in reply, Mr. Edwards released the following public statement:

7. The Richmond News Leader, June 12, 1948.

" I would prefer to make a formal statement of my intentions today, but unfortunately, my obligations as State Chairman of our party make it important that I complete necessary arrangements for the coming [State Democratic] convention. When this has been done, I shall ask the convention to relieve me of my duties as chairman.

Then immediately I shall make a public announcement of my plans which have been altered in no way." 8

It would appear that Senator Battle's announcement was deliberately timed to anticipate the Edwards announcement which had been expected on July 2. Thus Candidate Battle won the first round of maneuvering even before there was a second candidate formally in the field.

On July 2, as expected, Mr. Edwards released to the press an announcement of his "irrevocable" candidacy. Its release was timed so as to reach the public simultaneously with his speech to the State Convention on the national political scene. The announcement, long expected, was almost completely dwarfed by events at the State Convention concerning the explosive presidential issue.

Meanwhile on June 13, only three days after Senator Battle's announcement, Representative Thomas B. Stanley of the Fifth Virginia District, an Organization regular, announced his "probable" candidacy. Mr. Stanley had been passed over in 1941

8. The Richmond News Leader, June 12, 1948.

9. The Richmond News Leader, June 4, 1948.

as the Organization's choice for Governor and in 1945 he was practically forced to withdraw. His disappointment at the turn of events in 1945 was an "open secret". It appeared that in 1949 his intention was to run, with or without the Organization's blessing.

Upon public announcement of this development, Martin A. Hutchingson, leader of the minority faction of the Virginia Democratic party, announced that he believed it to be "a splendid thing for Virginia to have so many candidates in the field next year."¹⁰ What he undoubtedly meant was that he was pleased that apparently the Organization vote would be split so many ways that his faction's candidate, as yet unannounced, might squeak into office by a small plurality vote. However, Representative Stanley's withdrawal in early 1949 spelt an end to this threat, at least from this quarter.

It was not until July 27 that the candidate of the minority faction formally announced. On that date in Richmond Colonel Francis P. Miller announced his candidacy in a statement highly critical of the Organization. There was no doubt that it was he who would carry the Anti-organization banner. The very next day, Colonel Miller's candidacy was endorsed by Mr. Hutchinson.¹¹

-
10. Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 13, 1948.
 11. Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 28, 1948.

The latter part of July also brought to the public attention the activities of a fifth would-be candidate. Reports were current at this time that the Petersburg offices of manufacturer Rennie L. Arnold had been emitting a steady stream of letters to all parts of the state requesting of various influential persons opinions concerning the possibility of an Arnold candidacy. When questioned about these letters, Mr. Arnold replied that he was considering making the race at the instance of some of his friends and a quiet campaign in his behalf had in fact been waged for the past year. He indicated, however, that a final decision would be postponed until after the November presidential election.¹²

However by September Mr. Arnold had secured a "publicity director" and an enlarged staff to handle his increased correspondence. Of the 3,000 original queries, 1,276 replies were received,¹³ 720 of them agreeable to an Arnold candidacy. An Arnold spokesman described his candidate as being "all but in" the race.¹⁴

During this early stage the campaigns of the three announced candidates consisted of as many appearances at informal gatherings as could be arranged. An occasional formal meeting elicited few specific but many general statements.

-
12. The Progress-Index (Petersburg), July 26, 1948.
 13. The Progress-Index (Petersburg), September 11, 1948.
 14. The Richmond News Leader, September 11, 1948.

In regard to the oncoming presidential election, the words and actions of each candidate were but a reflection of the political philosophy of each. Mr. Miller spoke strongly for the Truman-Barkley ticket.¹⁵ He joined a group of other Anti-organization leaders and formed the Truman-Barkley Straight Democratic Ticket Committee which campaigned effectively for that ticket in the absence of any action in that direction by the Organization dominated State Central Democratic Committee.

Mr. Edwards also spoke up for the national ticket reiterating his stand at the July 2 convention: he urged all Virginia Democrats to support the national party's choice.

Mr. Battle, who of the three announced candidates was the least enthusiastic over the national party's actions, simply endorsed that ticket as the best choice under the circumstances.¹⁶

Upon announcement of the unexpected Truman triumph, each of the three candidates expressed the greatest pleasure.¹⁷

Having been spared the embarrassment of choosing the winning team in that chaotic election, Mr. Arnold formally announced his own candidacy on November 21.¹⁸

-
15. For text of October 28 Miller speech in behalf of national Democratic candidates, see Supplement 2, Item 21.
 16. The Daily Progress (Charlottesville), October 27, 1948.
 17. The Richmond News Leader, November 3, 1948.
 18. The Progress-Index (Petersburg), November 21, 1948.

Thus by the end of November 1948 four candidates were in the field working on the beginnings of a political campaign which was to prove to be unprecedented in Virginia's political history. In addition a fifth candidate had indicated the possibility of his running also. The three men who had announced prior to the 1948 presidential election each had played a role in that contest in Virginia. With that contest now decided, all political eyes were directed to the strenuous campaign to be waged from December to August.

CHAPTER II THE CAMPAIGN ORGANIZATIONS

There are many ways of winning votes. However, each depends on one of two processes; namely, the personal appearances and contacts of the candidate himself and the hard work of his campaign organization. With the settlement of the issues of the presidential campaign, each gubernatorial aspirant settled down to develop these two processes in connection with his own campaign.

It was Candidate Battle who first began work on perfecting his campaign organization. On December 31 the Senator confirmed widespread reports that Sidney S. Kellam would head his state campaign organization. Mr. Kellam, Democratic Chairman of the Second Congressional District and Treasurer of Princess Anne County, was selected at the urging of Second District Democratic¹⁹ leaders who were able to point to the fact that in the recent November general election, every political subdivision of the Second District had been carried by U. S. Senator A. Willis Robertson and Representative Porter Hardy, the Democratic

19. The Richmond News Leader, December 31, 1948.

nominees. Mr. Kellam's appointment as chairman of the Battle forces in the State followed a series of conferences of Organization stalwarts in Richmond during the Christmas holidays. ²⁰

Shortly after the beginning of the New Year, Messrs. Battle and Kellam selected Suite 370-2 of the Hotel Richmond in Richmond to serve as state campaign headquarters. This choice was an optimistic one, for the location overlooked the Capitol and Governor's mansion. It was also a historic one, for in 1948 the Democratic State Central Committee had occupied the very same rooms.

With the appointment of a state director and the opening of a state headquarters, local Battle organizations began springing up all over the state. On January 16, a six man steering committee for the city of Norfolk was named. ²¹ By election day Battle had working for him in Norfolk " a superb campaign organization of the regular organization forces, keyed up to deliver a maximum organization vote." ²²

On January 18 State Senator Lloyd C. Bird of Chesterfield County was appointed chairman of the Third District Battle ²³ forces. Five days later Giles C. Robertson, a Richmond insurance

-
20. The Richmond News Leader, December 24, 1948.
 21. Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, January 16, 1949.
 22. Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 17, 1949.
 23. Richmond Times-Dispatch, January 18, 1949.

executive, was named campaign director for the city of Richmond.²⁴
 Within three weeks eight vice-chairmen were assisting him and a
 city headquarters had been established.²⁵ In April two out-
 standing Richmond women were brought into the Third District
 set-up.²⁶

Charlottesville had seen a Battle headquarters established
 as far back as June 1948 when the Senator first announced his
 candidacy.²⁷ In January, 1949, the first Battle-for-Governor
 Club in the state was founded in Charlottesville. Its activities
 were to consist of door to door campaigning, the distribution
 of a series of pamphlets, the holding of public meetings and
 the assisting in the formation of similar clubs throughout
 the State.²⁸

By July 1949, Battle-for-Governor clubs, committees, and
 chairmen were functioning in practically all the political sub-
 divisions of the State. Their establishment had been effected
 earlier in the campaign than those of the other candidates
 and consequently the Senator's campaign was more advanced in
 most localities than the campaigns of the other candidates. The
 notable exception to this rule was the city of Roanoke, where

-
24. Richmond Times-Dispatch, January 23, 1949.
 25. The Richmond News Leader, February 9, 1949.
 26. Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 9, 1949.
 27. The Daily Progress, (Charlottesville), June 22, 1948.
 28. The Daily Progress, (Charlottesville), January 19, 1949.

Miller and Edwards Organizations were established earlier than that of Battle's and consequently grew to be somewhat stronger.

Colonel Miller's campaign organization in most parts of the State was rather late in being established, at least in comparison with that of his chief opponent. Louis Spilman, editor and publisher of the Waynesboro News Virginian, was not named state director until May 8. ²⁹ Appointments to the local Miller campaign units were being made as late as July 29, only four days before the election. ³⁰ Miller was the last of the four candidates to open a Lynchburg headquarters. ³¹

However there were many exceptions to this rule. In 1948 Beecher E. Stallard was named chairman of Third District Miller forces and Minetree Folkes chairman of the Richmond organization. By the middle of January Clarence Magee was chosen campaign director for Portsmouth and Norfolk County. ³² In early April a group of forty outstanding Virginia women, under the leadership of Dr. Meta Glass, President emeritus of Sweet Briar College and sister of the late Carter Glass, endorsed the Miller candidacy. Six weeks later the formation of a "Women for Miller and Virginia" committee under Dr. Glass' leadership was announced. ³³

-
29. The Daily Progress (Charlottesville), May 8, 1949.
 30. Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 29, 1949.
 31. The News (Lynchburg), June 26, 1949.
 32. The Portsmouth Star, January 20, 1949.
 33. Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 15, 1949.

The Edwards state organization was launched in mid-February with the opening of state headquarters at the Hotel Richmond (one floor below Senator Battle's headquarters) and the appointment of Ed P. Phillips as state campaign director.³⁴ In May a women's committee headed by Mrs. Odessa P. Bailey, former juvenile court judge of Roanoke, was attached to the state organization.³⁵ The local Edwards groups were a little slower in being organized. March 27 saw a Lynchburg committee established, April 18 a Bristol chairman selected, and not until June 27 a campaign committee under L. E. Marlowe set up for Richmond.³⁶ By election day however, a fairly thorough Edwards organization was functioning throughout the state.

As might be expected the Arnold campaign organization in no way matched those of the other three candidates. In January a Petersburg Arnold Club was organized.³⁷ This was the only appearance of any Arnold organizational activity until the appointment of Robert M. Hazlewood of Toano as State Chairman and the opening of state headquarters at the Hotel John Marshall in Richmond in March.³⁸ In May Mrs. Sudie Wood Mann of Richmond

-
34. The Richmond News Leader, February 15, 1949.
 35. The Richmond News Leader, May 20, 1949.
 36. Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 27, 1949.
 37. The Progress-Index(Petersburg), January 11, 1949.
 38. Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 6, 1949.

39

Was named state chairman for women. As late as July 23 Arnold was appointing local chairmen throughout the state.

In summary, it should be noted that the Battle campaign organization, in itself probably superior to its competitors, had behind it and intertwined with it the concentrated effort of the State Organization, state employees, and most local officials and employees. There were, of course, exceptions to this generalization.

On the other hand Mr. Miller's candidacy had behind it the organized effort of all those who had been fighting the "Byrd Machine" in past elections- the professional liberals, those who would have liked to see the Virginia Democratic party in closer harmony with the national party, and organized labor and negro groups.

Mr. Edwards was forced to draw his support from those who owed their allegiance to neither group- those independents who would follow what he termed a "middle-of-the-road" policy. Mr. Arnold would presumably appeal to those businessmen who, like himself, would like to see a more business-like operation of the State government.

39. Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 12, 1949.

However, as in most elections, it was the large group of independent voters to whom each candidate had to make an effective appeal before he could hope to win.

CHAPTER III

THE MILLER ARGUMENTS

In addition to the possession of an effective campaign organization, any candidate who hopes to win a substantial number of votes must make as many personal contacts and appearances among the voting public as is possible. Colonel Miller led off in this field, for it was he who made the first formal campaign speech. On December 2 over a Richmond radio station, the Anti-organization candidate delivered what was nominally an appeal to the un-registered Democratic voters of Virginia to qualify to vote in the oncoming primary. Actually it was a down-the-line indictment of the Organization but especially in regard to Virginians' indifference to exercising their privilege to vote.⁴⁰ The language used was reminiscent of the Miller pro-Truman speech of October 28 when it was admitted that "we are in a political mess in Virginia" the responsibility lying squarely upon "certain members of the clique which for some years has controlled the Democratic Organization in this Common-

40. For text of speech, see Supplement 2, Item 22.

41
wealth". These two bits of early campaign oratory proved to be the forerunners of the entire Miller argument; namely that many things in Virginia are not as they should be and the dominant Organization is primarily responsible.

On February 10 this argument was crystallized into the final form to be used throughout the duration of the campaign. Over a five station radio hookup, Mr. Miller blasted the activities of one who for "all intents and purposes has continued to govern the State nineteen years after ceasing to occupy the Governor's chair". U. S. Senator Harry Byrd "has run the State through his overseers as if he were an absentee landlord. The chief overseer of this absentee landlord has been Mr. E. R. Combs, Chairman of the Compensation Board- for years the operating boss of the Byrd Machine."

These two men working with a clique "composed of backward looking men who have little imagination" have denied Virginia a "free society", the result being that the state is "eighteen years behind in meeting the needs of the present generation of school children" in regard to school buildings; health education in many parts of the state "constitutes one of the greatest

41. For text of speech, see Supplement 2, Item 21.

hindrances to the conservation of human resources in the Commonwealth"; "our economically vital seafood industry faces virtual extinction"; "game is vanishing in spite of increased license fees for hunting"; in some parts of the state "rural telephone service is worse than it was thirty years ago"; and our "streams and rivers have been turned into open sewers".

Therefore "the issue of this campaign is a free society". Mr. Miller promised that his "administration would be dedicated to establishing in Virginia political conditions which would make it possible for a free society to develop and flourish".⁴²

However not once did Miller attack the Organization because it was a political organization. On the contrary, he admitted "political organization is a necessary device for making the peoples' will effective in public policy".⁴³

This reasoning was in line with that of Dr. Douglas S. Freeman who, after pointing to the fact that "there always has been a 'machine' in Virginia, first an organization of men and then of party, to direct legislation and sometimes defeat the will of the people", declared that the real question of the campaign was "not in the existence or non-existence of a machine but in (1) the intelligence of the

42. For text of speech, see Supplement 2, Item 23.

43. Ibid.

direction, (2) the spirit with which it combats opposition,⁴⁴ and (3) the standard of public service it supplies".

Colonel Miller's campaign was largely a criticism of the Organization's performance in regard to these three operations. Therefore it was an almost entirely negative campaign, and in this respect reminiscent of the 1944 Dewey presidential campaign. The voter became well acquainted with what Mr. Miller was against but what he was for remained somewhat hazy in the public mind as it was so seldom enunciated.

The question of improvement of the state's public school system, considered by the other three candidates as being the foremost question of the campaign, was not stressed by Mr. Miller. He did have a formula however, as did the other three, for solving this perplexing problem. The state should assume all instructional costs, guaranteeing a \$2,000 minimum yearly salary for all teachers possessing a collegiate professional teachers' certificate. This state action would thus free some twelve to fifteen million dollars of local funds⁴⁵ which might be used for school construction purposes. As the campaign progressed, this stand proved vulnerable as Mr. Miller never defined what authority the state should possess as it assumed the responsibility of paying teachers' salaries.

44. Editorial in the Richmond News Leader, July 27, 1948.

45. Richmond Times-Dispatch, February 15, 1949.

In regard to the sales tax, Mr. Miller joined Battle and Arnold in roundly denouncing the proposal. Mr. Miller's objections were that the tax would "do irreparable damage by destroying the local roots of our public school system"⁴⁶ and in addition, would mean "a cut in the family budget, a reduction in retail sales, and a market with less money to buy the produce of our farmers".⁴⁷

In regard to labor legislation, Mr. Miller declared his belief that all such legislation should recognize "the equal rights of both management and labor, subject to the superior right of all the people."⁴⁸ Most labor unions actively supported Miller evidently believing that he would interpret this principle as being favorable to them.

In regard to agriculture, the Anti-organization candidate, pledged himself, if elected, to fire the Commissioner of Agriculture and construct more farm to market roads; in regard to poll tax repeal, he pledged himself in favor of the principle but against the Campbell amendments.

Regarding each of his specific proposals, Mr. Miller made it clear that its accomplishment could be achieved only

-
46. Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 31, 1949.
 47. Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 21, 1949.
 48. Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 11, 1949.

by the overthrow of "the machine". Thus Mr. Miller felt justified in concentrating his fire throughout the campaign on that one objective.

CHAPTER IV THE BATTLE ARGUMENTS

Mr. Battle's campaign of oratory opened somewhat later than did his campaign of organization. On February 15 from his home in Charlottesville, the Senator denounced the "vicious attack upon the government of Virginia as administered under Governors Pollard, Peery, Price, Darden, and Tuck"⁴⁹ which had been made by Mr. Miller only five days earlier.

As the campaign developed, Mr. Battle spoke only occasionally of the "machine" issue, undoubtedly realizing that it is more spectacular to attack than to defend. However he could not and did not avoid the issue. "This so-called iniquitous machine is nothing more or less than a very loosely knit group of Virginians- no membership, no roll- but simply the people in Virginia who usually think alike, who are interested in the welfare of Virginia, who are supremely interested in giving Virginia good government and good public servants, and they usually act together."⁵⁰

The Senator's chief concern was with improvement of the

49. For text of speech, see Supplement 1, Item 12.

50. Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 26, 1949.

Virginia public school system, which he believed could be achieved within the framework of the pay-as-you-go system and without the imposition of a sales tax or additional taxes of any other sort. A four point program to achieve this end was released by the Senator in April which included (1) release of 57 million dollars of State surplus money to the localities for school construction purposes under conditions to be prescribed by the General Assembly; (2) fifteen million dollars per year to be made available by the State until the condition is relieved; (3) adoption by the State of a reasonable minimum salary scale for teachers with State and locality participating in its payment; and (4) re-examination of the teacher retirement system and revision to provide higher retirement benefits for retired teachers.
51

If he could not stress the defense of the "machine", Mr. Battle could and did hit the labor issue hard. He alone of all the candidates unreservedly endorsed the three state labor laws which organized labor in Virginia had always and were even now opposing: the open shop law, the Virginia Public Utility Relations Act, and the law prohibiting mass picketing, force and violence on the picket lines. His forthrightness in this respect was in sharp contrast to the vagueness of Messrs.

51. Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 10, 1949.
For details of this plan, see Supplement 1, Item 6.

Miller and Edwards who, in vying for labor support, attempted to straddle the fence. This lack of frankness on the labor subject by these two candidates was a natural target for Battle attacks in the latter stages of the campaign.

The Battle campaign was in competition with that of Edwards in regard to the farmer. The Senator before a number of farm audiences stressed the importance of agriculture for the Virginia economy and pledged his efforts towards securing an increased farm income.⁵²

One noteworthy feature of the Battle campaign was the stressing of the need for the provision of added means to attract more tourists into the State. An expansion of the advertising program by which the State aids private business in the promotion of tourism was advocated as the means to this end.⁵³

Just as Mr. Miller often condemned some of the actions of past administrations as short comings, Mr. Battle praised the same as worthwhile deeds. There was no doubt in this contest who was "pro" and who was "anti", as far as these two candidates were concerned. Concerning the other contestants, however, there was some speculation.

52. Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 27, 1949.

See Supplement 1, Item 7.

53. The Richmond News Leader, May 16, 1949.

See Supplement 1, Item 8.

CHAPTER V THE EDWARDS, ARNOLD, AND PRILLAMAN ARGUMENTS

Mr. Edwards made it clear in his opening campaign speech on March 14, that he considered himself a politically free agent who would wage a "middle-of-the-road" campaign. Indeed an argument which developed as a keystone of his campaign was that if either extreme should triumph, internal strife would be rife in Virginia for the next four years. The solution offered, of course, was to elect this moderate contender who was the only one who could bring harmony back into the Democratic Party of Virginia. "I believe that I can point the way neither to the right nor to the left, but straight ahead in that middle-of-the-road course that was chartered for us by our forefathers."⁵⁴

This straight ahead course did not deter Mr. Edwards from taking an occasional swing at that "certain group in Virginia which depends on nods and winks and blessings from powers-that be."⁵⁵ However on but one occasion did Mr. Edwards use language as strong as that of Mr. Miller and this was when he

54. Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 15, 1949.

55. Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 14, 1949.

referred to the State Compensation Board and its chairman, Mr. Combs, "who single-handed has perverted the board from its legitimate uses and made of it a political agency, pure and simple."⁵⁶ The Edwards formula for correcting this condition was to fire Mr. Combs and this he proposed to do if elected.

Mr. Edward's chief concern as witnessed by the campaign, was the issue of improving the Public School System, and in this he was in agreement with Senator Battle. The difference between the two candidates arose over how these improvements were to be financed. Mr. Edwards denied the Senator's contention that State surplusses were available in sufficient amount to do the job. He insisted that the levying of a retail sales tax was the only solution, a two per cent tax imposed for a four year period which would automatically terminate at the end of that period.⁵⁷

Mr. Edwards stressed the sales tax issue to such an extent that it seemed, at times, that he hoped to make the primary a referendum on the subject. Late in the campaign Mr. Edwards spoke out for repeal of the tax on tangible personal property maintaining that it was not and never could be administered

56. Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 14, 1949.

57. Richmond Times-Dispatch, February 15, 1949.

58
 equitably. Thus while advocating the repeal of one tax, this candidate proposed a new one, and all the while a State legislation commission was studying the whole question of State Taxation.

In regard to the State's controversial labor laws, Mr. Edwards called for a committee of equal representation among labor, management, and the public to be appointed to study the problem. However on one occasion, at least, this candidate declared his wholehearted support of the right-to-work law.⁵⁹

Like Candidate Edwards, Candidate Arnold avoided the labor issue, but when pinned down voiced his support of at least one Virginia labor law, the anti-closed shop law.⁶⁰ Mr. Arnold's chief concern, like that of two other of the candidates, was with the improvement of the State's public schools. The method of financing the improvements, as advocated by Mr. Arnold, was a startling surprise to most Virginians; an abandonment of the pay-as-you-go principle and issuance of bonds. "It appears to me that it is unjust economy to cause our present generation to bear the burden of the future while we neglect to give our citizens today some of the services which are so badly needed."⁶¹

-
58. The Richmond News Leader, July 6, 1949.
 59. Daily Press (Newport News), July 27, 1949.
 60. Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 23, 1949.
 61. The Richmond News Leader, February 28, 1949.

Mr. Arnold was even more emphatic in his denunciation of the sales tax, "the worst form of taxation" which in all probability could not be terminated at the end of four years or any other period of time once it was imposed.⁶²

In regard to the "machine" issue, Mr. Arnold only occasionally spoke in reference to it but when he did, the language used was rather strong. While Miller attacked the actions of the machine as such, Arnold attacked them as props of one of his chief opponents. The "Machine's hope of hoodwinking the intelligent voters of Virginia into rallying at all cost against one candidate and abandoning Arnold and the other candidates in an all out effort to save Virginia from some unknown danger that must yet be proved" was Battle's only hope of victory.⁶³

In addition to these four contenders there was a fifth announced candidate for seven weeks of the campaign. On February 24, Mayor Nick Prillaman of Martinsville announced that he too would run for the Governorship. On April 30 he withdrew, announcing his intention of running for the Lieutenant-Governorship instead. On several occasions while

62. Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, April 27, 1949.

63. Halifax Gazette (South Boston), July 27, 1949.

a candidate, Mr. Prillaman had criticized the "status quo" in Virginia, so it came as no surprise when, upon his withdrawal from the race, the Prillaman forces became "aligned with the⁶⁴ Miller program".

Thus as Stanley had threatened to split the Organization vote but had finally backed down, Prillaman had done likewise with the Anti-organization vote.

64. The Richmond News Leader, April 30, 1949.

CHAPTER VI THE CANDIDATES IN ACTION

Even considering the number of candidates in the race, this campaign probably produced more verbal fireworks, ill-tempered exchanges, and just plain mudslinging than any other comparable contest in the State's history.

Noteworthy also was the early date at which this display began. For example, in early February Mr. Kellam accused Colonel Miller of stealing Senator Battle's school platform. After a denial, followed by other sharp exchanges back and forth, the two contestants withdrew to their corners, each satisfied that he had proven the other a "mudslinger".⁶⁵

In April a fight broke out between the Miller and Battle managers in Richmond, the former accusing the latter of attempting to draw votes of both labor and management. In reply, the Battle people attempted to prove that Miller was receiving labor support from outside of the State.⁶⁶

Numerous other exchanges, involving all the candidates and other out-standing citizens of the State as well, were in evidence

65. The Richmond News Leader, February 3-5, 1949.

66. The Richmond News Leader, April 29-May 6, 1949.

throughout the campaign. Several of these are so outstanding as to be remembered for many years to come.

For example Colonel Miller, in attempting to prove that a "free society", did not exist in Virginia, claimed that some in the State who differed with the "Byrd party line" feared to express their opinions in public. "Reprisals for nonconformity take an infinite variety of forms. A lawyer has found that clients cease to come to his office. An insurance man has found that policies are written by a competitor. The owner of a store has found that customers go elsewhere. The head of a family has been made slowly aware that his family is being socially ostracized and that malicious gossip has been circulated about his wife."⁶⁷

These charges naturally did not go unchallenged. State Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., editor of the Winchester Evening Star, challenged Mr. Miller to name those who had been thusly intimidated and by whom.⁶⁸ In his reply Mr. Miller did not name any lawyers, insurance men, store owners, or families who had been punished. Instead he spoke (1) in general terms of "State employees"; (2) "the attack made by Harry Byrd, Sr. upon the appointment of Judge Floyd H. Roberts of Bristol:"

67. The Richmond News Leader, April 20, 1949.

68. Editorial in Winchester Evening Star, May 3, 1949.

(3) the "pressure" applied by Mr. Byrd, Jr., on Senator Hunsdon Cary during a fight "to destroy the late Governor James H. Price"; and (4) the attitude of the Winchester newspaper "toward the late Senator Russell Cather because of Senator Cather's support of the late Governor Price."⁶⁹

Senator Byrd interpreted this rebuttal as a refusal to reply and most of the State's newspapers agreed editorially with him. Typical was the comment of the Lynchburg News:

"Colonel Miller has made charges that he will not substantiate. He has brought accusations that he refuses to back with evidence. He has spoken of men and women who were 'persecuted' but refuses to tell the people of Virginia who they are. That is unworthy. Until and unless Colonel Miller does name names and does offer evidence he ought not to receive the votes of Virginians who do not believe in smear tactics in a political campaign".⁷⁰

Another noteworthy incident of the campaign was the endorsement Senator Battle received from Republican leader Henry A. Wise of Charlottesville who urged Virginia Republicans to vote for Battle in order to meet an "unholy invasion by aliens into our domestic affairs."⁷¹ Warmly received by the Senator, this plea elicited cries of anguish and woe from the Millerites. Miller himself described the move as one of desperation, the "machine's" reliance on its Republican auxiliaries in time of crisis.⁷²

-
69. The Daily Progress(Charlottesville), May 7, 1949.
 70. Editorial in The News (Lynchburg), May 10, 1949.
 71. The Daily Progress(Charlottesville), July 13, 1949.
 72. Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 15, 1949.

Another endorsement made during the campaign was not so well received by the beneficiary as was Mr. Wise's endorsement of Battle. In the closing days of the campaign, Mr. Battle produced a letter from Mr. James C. Petrillo, President of the American Federation of Musicians with offices in New York City, which had been sent to the Virginia members of that union requesting their support of Mr. Miller in the gubernatorial primary.⁷³ The Senator condemned this effort of "outside

labor leaders" to secure Mr. Miller's election.

"After hours of deliberation and a conference with his State campaign manager",⁷⁴ Miller issued a disapproval of the Petrillo endorsement, branding it as unsolicited. As a diversionary move, the Miller headquarters then released two letters sent out by Senator Battle seeking labor support within the State. This was supposed to prove the oft repeated contention that the Battle supporters were seeking the votes of labor and management, a charge which the Senator never once denied.

Another attempt by Battle to show his chief opponent's connection with organized labor, this time inside of the State, occurred in late July when the Senator produced an affidavit

73. For text of this letter as circulated by Battle State Headquarters, see Supplement 1, Item 27.

74. The Richmond News Leader, July 19, 1949.

signed by Frank Nesbitt, president of the Front Royal local of the Textile Workers Union of America, swearing that Miller had appeared at a meeting of the Virginia State P.A.C. of the C.I.O. and when receiving its support requested that this support be kept secret.⁷⁵ In reply Miller described the affidavit as "a tissue of lies from beginning to end" and claimed that Battle also had attended the P.A.C. meeting.⁷⁶

The charges that caused the most uproar, however, were those made by Mr. Arnold to a Fredericksburg audience. Two and a half weeks before election day, the Petersburg candidate charged that the Byrd Organization had offered him the Lieutenant-Governorship or the 1952 Senate seat if he would withdraw from the Gubernatorial race. When pressed further by supporters, Mr. Arnold stated that a group of about eight "influential members of the Organization" had approached his state campaign manager, Robert Hazelwood. He named only one of the eight, Jesse W. Dillon, State Treasurer, who immediately denied the charge.⁷⁷ Later Arnold named Governor Tuck as one who had asked him not to run and State Senator Charles R. Fenwick as one who offered to back him for the Lieutenant-Governorship if he should withdraw from the Gubernatorial contest. Both men denied the

-
75. For text of affidavit as circulated by Battle State Headquarters, see Supplement 1, Item 28.
 76. The Daily Press (Newport News), July 30, 1949.
 77. The Evening Star (Washington, D. C.) July 14, 1949.

allegations and no further attempt was made to substantiate them by the Arnold forces.

By August 1, the Arnold campaign was in full swing. Mr. Hazelwood announced that he had been offered a bribe of \$10,000 "to desert Rennie Arnold", the offer having been made by "a man very close to Harry Byrd", a prominent Richmond contractor.⁷⁸ When Senator Byrd demanded the name be disclosed, Hazelwood said he had promised the person to keep his identity a secret. After the primary, when the State Board of Elections met to hear Hazelwood, he did not appear. Richmond's Commonwealth's Attorney T. Gray Haddon announced that Mr. Hazelwood was free to appear before a grand jury, but the accuser chose to ignore this also.

Thus the mudslinging which had been indulged in with such great vehemence, continued for some weeks after the votes were in and counted. For some these results were a surprise. For others they were not. However, for none was a certainty fulfilled.

78. Richmond Times-Dispatch, August 1, 1949.

CHAPTER VII

THE OUTCOME

From the very beginning two main ideas of how the vote would shape up were prevalent among the dopesters. The first of these held that the race was a three way affair- the right, center, and left competing on a fairly equal footing. The Edwards' candidacy, at a disadvantage as it had no permanent political organization to back it up, would make up for this by its middle-of-the-road character, one which would draw votes from the right and the left.

The other idea held by the "experts" was just the opposite; namely, that the Edwards' candidacy would repel votes to the right and left and thus solidify the two extreme positions. The race would therefore be a strictly two way affair between Miller and Battle. And as between these two, it would be a toss up.

In the main it was this second theory which was upheld by the primary returns. However, the two favored candidates did not run neck and neck as predicted. Conservative Battle led Liberal Miller by 23,729 votes.

The official state-wide returns were:

Battle	135,426	or 42.8%
Miller	111,697	or 35.3%
Edwards	47,435	or 15.0%
Arnold	22,054	or 7.0%

Mr. Battle carried six of the State's nine congressional districts; the Fifth and Seventh by a majority vote, the First, Fourth, Sixth, and Eighth by a plurality.

First District:	Battle	13,682	or 40.4%
	Miller	11,619	or 34.3%
	Edwards	6,422	or 19.0%
	Arnold	2,126	or 6.3%
Fourth District:	Battle	11,585	or 39.1%
	Miller	7,276	or 24.5%
	Edwards	5,813	or 19.6%
	Arnold	4,984	or 16.8%
Fifth District:	Battle	15,703	or 51.0%
	Miller	9,518	or 30.9%
	Edwards	4,086	or 13.3%
	Arnold	1,475	or 4.8%
Sixth District:	Battle	16,308	or 44.9%
	Miller	12,788	or 35.2%
	Edwards	4,707	or 13.0%
	Arnold	2,481	or 6.9%
Seventh District:	Battle	15,417	or 57.5%
	Miller	7,219	or 26.9%
	Edwards	3,417	or 12.8%
	Arnold	744	or 2.8%
Eighth District:	Battle	22,127	or 49.2%
	Miller	17,691	or 39.3%
	Edwards	3,598	or 8.0%
	Arnold	1,555	or 3.5%

79. Election returns are taken from Statements of the Vote compiled by the State Board of Elections, which are listed in the bibliography.

The remaining three districts, the Second, Third and Ninth, gave Miller a plurality of their vote.

Second District:	Miller	15,988	or	40.4%
	Battle	14,504	or	36.7%
	Edwards	6,422	or	16.2%
	Arnold	2,126	or	6.6%

Third District:	Miller	18,775	or	39.4%
	Battle	17,367	or	36.4%
	Edwards	5,989	or	12.6%
	Arnold	5,532	or	11.6%

Ninth District:	Miller	10,823	or	39.6%
	Battle	8,733	or	32.3%
	Edwards	6,957	or	25.7%
	Arnold	556	or	2.2%

In regard to the smaller political sub-divisions, of the Commonwealth's one-hundred counties:

Battle carried	44	by a majority,	26	by a plurality
Miller carried	8	by a majority,	9	by a plurality
Edwards carried	1	by a majority,	10	by a plurality
Arnold carried	0	by a majority,	2	by a plurality

Of the twenty-seven independent cities in the State:

Battle carried	5	by a majority,	5	by a plurality
Miller carried	5	by a majority,	9	by a plurality
Edwards carried	0	by a majority,	1	by a plurality
Arnold carried	0	by a majority,	2	by a plurality

The percentage of the total vote polled by any one candidate in a political sub-division varied from the 0.5% polled by Arnold in Scott County to the 82.6% Battle polled in Rappahannock County. The complete returns percentagewise, first by county and then by city follows:

	Battle	Miller	Edwards	Arnold
Accomack	56.5	23.8	10.6	9.2
Albemarle	70.1	22.7	5.2	2.1
Alleghany	30.6	52.8	5.6	10.9
Amelia	23.3	22.1	46.1	7.7
Amherst	40.3	44.8	11.4	3.6
Appomattox	69.2	9.6	19.2	2.0
Arlington	44.1	47.0	4.6	3.1
Augusta	56.0	26.8	14.9	1.8
Bath	52.5	22.3	20.4	4.8
Bedford	49.9	22.3	22.0	5.8
Bland	33.8	29.5	35.2	1.4
Botetourt	44.8	22.0	27.9	7.0
Brunswick	41.5	19.3	30.2	9.0
Buchanan	16.8	60.5	21.5	1.3
Buckingham	47.7	15.1	34.4	2.7
Campbell	47.7	35.7	10.8	5.8
Caroline	53.7	20.8	18.1	7.5
Carroll	31.3	25.0	42.3	1.3
Charles City	22.6	48.5	18.0	10.8
Charlotte	58.8	24.3	14.9	1.9
Chesterfield	32.3	38.6	8.8	20.3
Clarke	60.5	19.8	18.5	1.1
Craig	47.3	22.5	27.9	2.3
Culpeper	53.7	19.6	16.6	4.1
Cumberland	37.3	7.7	47.3	7.7
Dickenson	32.4	55.4	10.5	1.1
Dinwiddie	31.7	23.1	12.7	31.9
Elizabeth City	30.4	48.1	16.4	4.8
Essex	63.0	19.5	12.3	5.2
Fairfax	36.5	52.3	7.9	3.0
Fauquier	56.3	24.9	16.3	2.5
Floyd	35.5	31.5	29.3	3.7
Fluvana	68.4	22.1	5.7	3.8
Franklin	49.6	21.5	20.9	7.9
Frederick	67.7	19.3	9.8	2.9
Giles	51.9	34.1	9.1	4.9
Gloucester	45.7	15.3	36.1	3.3
Goochland	56.7	25.8	12.7	5.0
Grayson	37.3	24.6	38.5	0.7
Greene	80.5	13.5	3.8	2.2
Greensville	41.2	25.1	7.3	26.4
Halifax	58.8	29.7	5.6	5.8
Hanover	42.8	35.9	10.7	10.5

	Battle	Miller	Edwards	Arnold
Henrico	37.6	37.4	10.4	14.4
Henry	36.2	44.0	14.4	4.8
Highland	69.3	9.4	19.6	1.7
Isle of Wight	27.1	10.1	60.8	2.7
James City	34.4	24.1	19.4	22.0
King George	69.4	20.7	6.4	3.5
King & Queen	51.0	26.1	17.8	5.2
King William	35.2	25.6	30.0	9.1
Lancaster	50.9	36.3	9.4	3.0
Lee	12.8	68.7	17.9	1.0
Loudoun	60.4	31.6	6.6	1.3
Louisa	54.1	32.8	8.2	4.8
Lunenburg	49.4	26.6	17.2	6.8
Madison	67.7	20.8	9.6	5.6
Mathews	50.9	37.1	9.7	2.3
Mecklenburg	46.5	28.9	15.1	9.4
Middlesex	50.4	18.1	26.4	5.0
Montgomery	53.1	30.0	14.6	2.3
Nansemond	31.0	22.3	40.3	6.4
Nelson	40.9	52.7	3.4	2.5
New Kent	40.0	33.0	15.6	11.4
Norfolk	26.5	56.9	10.3	6.3
Northampton	60.4	20.5	14.6	4.5
Northumberland	52.5	29.8	14.7	2.9
Nottoway	38.4	24.1	22.3	15.2
Orange	51.6	28.1	15.8	4.6
Page	76.7	18.1	4.3	0.9
Patrick	75.0	17.7	4.2	3.1
Pittsylvania	53.8	37.3	3.6	5.4
Powhatan	30.1	28.1	37.2	4.6
Prince Edward	48.7	19.3	26.9	5.0
Prince George	25.9	34.3	4.5	35.2
Prince William	49.7	23.1	22.2	5.0
Princess Anne	68.0	17.7	8.6	5.6
Pulaski	60.9	21.0	15.2	2.5
Rappahannock	82.6	13.0	3.1	1.2
Richmond	55.6	26.2	10.2	8.0
Roanoke	46.6	30.1	16.9	6.3
Rockbridge	38.7	44.5	14.8	1.9
Rockingham	61.2	8.7	28.4	1.6
Russell	50.2	16.8	31.7	1.3
Scott	26.2	49.4	23.9	0.5

	Battle	Miller	Edwards	Arnold
Shenandoah	74.9	15.0	7.1	2.4
Smyth	29.6	20.4	46.7	3.3
Southampton	41.6	32.2	21.7	4.5
Spotsylvania	48.7	45.0	3.1	3.2
Stafford	52.8	34.3	9.1	3.9
Surry	36.8	19.5	31.3	12.4
Sussex	49.7	13.3	23.7	13.3
Tazewell	38.2	25.9	34.9	1.0
Warren	63.8	30.6	3.9	1.7
Warwick	25.8	32.7	30.0	11.5
Washington	26.7	22.9	48.9	1.4
Westmoreland	58.8	27.4	10.7	3.1
Wise	25.4	53.9	18.6	2.1
Wythe	59.7	11.9	27.3	1.2
York	24.8	39.7	28.5	7.0

Alexandria	34.1	54.3	6.5	5.2
Bristol	30.8	28.1	35.6	5.5
Buena Vista	46.7	46.5	5.7	1.1
Charlottesville	63.7	32.1	2.3	1.9
Clifton Forge	22.2	61.9	3.6	12.2
Colonial Heights	22.0	22.2	16.3	39.4
Danville	44.6	39.7	8.6	7.1
Falls Church	41.0	51.0	5.6	22.0
Fredericksburg	45.0	39.6	6.0	9.5
Hampton	30.9	42.1	22.0	4.9
Harrisonburg	62.3	5.8	28.0	3.9
Hopewell	20.2	52.4	8.3	19.1
Lynchburg	54.9	33.1	5.9	6.2
Martinsville	47.8	42.3	7.2	2.7
Newport News	17.9	41.0	34.5	7.0
Norfolk	39.5	41.2	11.7	7.7
Petersburg	24.5	26.6	6.6	43.2
Portsmouth	26.3	57.5	11.8	4.2
Radford	29.8	48.5	18.7	3.0
Richmond	37.1	40.6	12.7	9.6
Roanoke	44.5	34.9	12.9	7.6
South Norfolk	27.7	49.2	10.2	12.9
Staunton	51.4	25.1	19.2	4.1

	Battle	Miller	Edwards	Arnold
Suffolk	45.3	15.6	28.4	10.7
Waynesboro	37.1	46.9	10.2	5.8
Williamsburg	27.7	48.8	11.6	11.9
Winchester	65.9	22.7	5.9	5.5

In regard to the geographical concentration of each of the candidate's strength, the following map makes clear that Arnold carried only the area immediately adjacent to his home in Prince George County; that Edwards' strength lay in three small separate geographical locations, in the east, center and west of the State; that Miller carried the counties in the far west of the State, the counties that Robert Whitehead swung to him (Nelson, Amherst, Rockbridge), the area adjacent to the District of Columbia, and scattered counties from Richmond to the sea. Battle carried all else, his greatest majorities, however, being in the Shenandoah Valley north of Nelson and Rockbridge Counties and in the Northern Neck.

Key to the following map:

Counties:	dark red-	Battle by a majority
	light red-	Battle by a plurality
	dark blue-	Miller by a majority
	light blue-	Miller by a plurality
	dark yellow-	Edwards by a majority
	light yellow -	Edwards by a plurality
	light green-	Arnold by a plurality
Cities:	red dot-	Battle by majority or plurality
	blue dot-	Miller by majority or plurality
	yellow(gold) dot-	Edwards by majority or plurality
	green dot -	Arnold by majority or plurality

Of almost equal importance with the actual outcome of the primary is the comparison of the performance of the Anti-organization candidate with the past performances of other Anti-organization candidates. The Organization v. Anti-organization lineup has existed only since 1941, since which time there have been only five State-wide elections. The following table shows the comparable figures, the first candidate in each being the Organization candidate:

Year	Office	Contenders	Percentage of vote	Actual vote	Total vote cast
1941	Lt. Gov.	William Tuck Moss Plunkett	81.3 18.7	108,189 24,863	133,052
1945	Governor	William Tuck Moss Plunkett	70.1 29.9	97,304 41,484	138,788
1946	Senate	Harry Byrd Martin Hutchinson	63.5 36.5	141,923 81,605	223,528
1948	Senate	Willis Robertson James Hart	70.3 29.7	80,340 33,928	114,268
1949	Governor	John Battle Francis Miller	42.1 35.3	135,426 111,697	316,612

To break this vote down further, the following table presents the political sub-divisions arranged in order of the greatest percentage of votes received by the Anti-organization candidate in 1949, with the percentage performance of Anti-organization candidates in past primaries. Percentages are in red, actual number of votes received in black.

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
County of Lee	68.7 1698	46.1 241	79.4 1608	27.9 266	2.6 49
City of Clifton Forge	61.9 759	58.3 315	61.7 604	51.3 176	27.3 71
County of Buchanan	60.5 1391	67.1 1133	31.4 368	14.6 94	1.2 23
City of Portsmouth	57.5 3321	52.1 1105	64.3 2897	49.5 722	30.3 951
County of Norfolk	56.9 4580	56.9 986	62.2 3407	30.8 1975	12.5 270
County of Dickenson	55.4 956	55.3 326	66.8 553	25.6 161	5.9 68
City of Alexandria	54.3 3550	51.1 970	52.9 1958	38.5 953	22.0 735
County of Wise	53.9 2351	45.5 747	55.4 1110	6.5 233	2.4 85
County of Alleghany	52.8 1499	64.9 979	56.4 1119	62.4 332	32.6 97
County of Nelson	52.7 840	10.8 79	28.5 226	14.1 99	23.9 309
City of Hopewell	52.4 1167	54.3 257	57.4 851	46.7 1032	24.9 338
County of Fairfax	52.3 3051	33.2 691	42.1 1350	39.2 809	28.0 629
City of Falls Church	51.0 435	Falls Church became an independent city in August 1948. Prior to that date its vote was tallied with that of Fairfax County.			
County of Scott	49.4 1003	37.2 80	75.1 1023	54.2 239	7.8 50

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
City of South Norfolk	49.2 497	53.1 102	67.3 519	32.3 191	11.9 53
City of Williamsburg	48.8 376	28.4 55	38.2 150	40.6 206	25.1 102
County of Charles City	48.5 264	55.3 140	42.6 133	57.1 56	35.2 38
City of Radford	48.5 652	38.8 145	56.0 590	50.9 280	53.1 68
County of Elizabeth City	48.1 2424	55.7 1182	49.0 1260	36.0 482	18.1 131
County of Arlington	47.0 4789	36.0 1644	45.2 2874	21.2 750	17.1 197
City of Waynesboro	46.9 643	12.7	Waynesboro became an independent City in January, 1948. Prior to that date its vote was tallied with that of Augusta County.		
City of Buena Vista	46.5 263	8.8 30	31.6 79	22.4 35	13.4 11
County of Spotsylvania	45.0 817	29.1 67	23.8 147	12.4 73	14.0 113
County of Amherst	44.8 940	22.5 237	38.7 592	28.7 294	18.5 240
County of Rockbridge	44.5 874	10.0 95	19.6 233	32.9 213	24.5 158
County of Henry	44.0 810	22.2 115	32.7 572	15.2 104	14.5 99
City of Martinsville	42.3 808	20.9 43	27.3 306	17.3 66	18.5 53
City of Hampton	42.1 557	47.6 255	40.0 356	24.9 276	19.5 237

County of Prince
George

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
City of Norfolk	41.2 5261	51.3 1775	46.1 5609	45.8 2906	15.6 1306
City of Newport News	41.0 1900	65.5 1127	55.4 1709	42.7 1213	24.1 234
City of Richmond	40.6 13668	31.6 4779	48.3 11644	47.1 7263	23.2 3250
City of Danville	39.7 2475	42.4 554	42.3 1596	26.5 450	15.1 501
County of York	39.7 605	34.4 146	39.2 271	31.0 102	15.5 102
City of Fredericks- burg	39.6 830	27.0 83	32.8 299	32.4 171	21.3 172
County of Chester- field	38.6 1360	26.8 417	52.0 1371	48.0 462	26.3 261
County of Henrico	37.4 1740	30.9 405	51.5 1748	45.7 435	19.0 270
County of Pittsylv- vania	37.3 2032	27.6 425	37.5 1391	17.2 493	12.2 407
County of Mathews	37.1 333	9.8 19	16.4 109	17.5 50	8.1 46
County of Lancaster	36.3 448	18.7 54	23.2 172	18.4 52	13.1 37
County of Hanover	35.9 719	22.0 173	41.0 612	42.7 244	30.0 384
County of Campbell	35.7 880	19.7 278	25.9 489	24.0 235	14.1 92
City of Roanoke	34.9 4370	43.2 2032	46.4 3740	54.4 2808	70.3 4097
County of Prince George	34.3 431	40.9 104	45.3 312	41.4 150	24.4 55

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
County of Stafford	34.3 435	12.1 24	25.4 143	11.8 45	8.3 29
County of Giles	34.1 507	47.6 311	43.7 495	18.0 114	26.5 127
City of Lynchburg	33.1 1908	16.8 670	24.6 1113	22.0 383	18.5 455
County of New Kent	33.0 156	32.5 50	43.8 121	45.6 52	23.8 53
County of Louisa	32.8 499	14.6 75	24.5 301	28.6 334	13.4 89
County of Warwick	32.7 915	49.4 273	47.7 677	45.4 430	16.0 31
County of Southamp- ton	32.2 652	28.4 204	28.7 437	36.4 317	5.0 67
City of Charlottes- ville	32.1 1084	28.6 218	35.9 662	41.0 492	23.4 178
County of Loudoun	31.6 779	18.7 164	13.7 294	10.7 192	13.6 323
County of Floyd	31.5 102	29.6 48	17.9 65	20.0 33	28.8 69
County of Warren	30.6 587	16.7 168	31.0 589	13.4 80	4.9 38
County of Roanoke	30.1 1092	37.0 933	43.8 1524	43.8 709	47.8 572
County of Montgom- ery	33.0 569	13.2 108	23.0 330	34.5 253	16.8 137
County of Northum- berland	29.8 223	24.7 69	31.8 246	33.3 110	15/7 40
County of Halifax	29.7 1241	11.9 159	20.0 618	5.8 172	3.1 80

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
County of Bland	29.5 213	5.5 22	18.7 95	12.8 31	8.2 24
County of Mecklen- burg	28.9 845	19.5 157	28.2 464	33.3 871	15.1 102
City of Bristol	28.1 630	41.5 134	42.3 457	28.6 133	14.0 161
County of Orange	28.1 473	14.0 66	17.8 210	32.2 175	22.4 195
County of Powatan	28.1 178	21.8 31	29.3 101	42.9 76	12.3 23
County of Westmore- land	27.4 269	22.5 57	25.7 210	23.4 102	14.0 54
County of Augusta	26.8 505	7.3 64	16.2 417	27.1 405	27.6 180
County of Lunenburg	26.6 579	33.9 269	30.7 411	19.2 293	15.8 61
City of Petersburg	26.6 1051	45.3 413	38.6 1012	44.1 578	17.9 136
County of Richmond	26.2 220	16.2 30	20.0 88	30.4 54	13.2 23
County of King and Queen	26.1 135	18.7 26	20.6 72	17.4 19	17.0 19
County of Tazewell	25.9 561	18.8 131	35.1 518	22.9 147	10.5 110
County of Goochland	25.8 334	7.7 31	24.5 206	19.5 160	10.5 38
County of King William	25.6 202	17.7 87	31.6 211	22.7 88	16.0 77
City of Staunton	25.1 600	13.0 87	17.1 213	29.1 395	23.2 138

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
County of Greenville	25.1 372	25.1 109	27.9 279	19.9 95	7.0 23
County of Carroll	25.0 260	17.5 64	23.7 209	18.4 90	16.0 77
County of Fauquier	24.9 652	8.5 72	13.6 218	26.1 186	27.6 189
County of Grayson	24.6 475	12.5 118	42.4 752	22.4 252	10.6 77
County of Charlotte	24.3 501	9.1 69	20.6 333	22.2 403	3.8 34
County of James City	24.1 92	23.5 28	37.7 89	52.8 76	22.3 37
County of Nottoway	24.1 487	34.3 246	30.8 466	37.3 416	14.7 58
County of Accomack	23.8 769	8.4 89	12.2 245	18.7 207	3.8 43
County of Dinwiddie	23.1 356	27.8 110	26.3 260	18.9 114	12.7 64
County of Prince William	23.1 357	12.4 81	29.5 317	12.8 75	10.7 43
County of Washington	22.9 415	22.0 128	32.3 521	47.5 315	17.9 157
County of Albermarle	22.7 542	19.1 148	23.2 326	29.4 308	28.6 277
City of Winchester	22.7 391	18.3 94	12.2 201	20.5 167	21.2 91
County of Craig	22.5 79	23.6 33	54.6 197	23.4 34	41.8 66
County of Bath	22.3 120	4.1 9	17.7 71	18.0 22	40.4 67

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
County of Bedford	22.3 616	21.3 301	24.1 626	28.3 297	27.4 334
County of Nansemond	22.3 472	36.5 290	47.6 836	25.1 168	8.7 59
City of Colonial Heights	22.2 198	Colonial Heights became an independent City in March, 1948. Prior to that date its vote was tallied with that of Chesterfield County.			
County of Amelia	22.1 266	20.7 68	20.2 172	16.0 109	14.7 34
County of Fluvanna	22.1 162	11.5 30	16.9 95	25.6 99	24.1 67
County of Botetourt	22.0 262	15.6 90	31.4 325	27.1 217	44.5 261
County of Franklin	21.5 597	16.5 130	23.2 394	11.9 161	20.6 397
County of Pulaski	21.0 399	18.7 103	24.2 394	21.4 154	13.0 129
County of Caroline	20.8 270	11.0 64	18.2 165	26.2 104	14.9 173
County of Madison	20.8 113	0.0 0	10.2 54	22.7 58	22.7 96
County of King George	20.7 71	7.6 9	17.6 54	20.4 21	18.5 35
County of Northamp- ton	20.5 401	21.1 148	12.0 183	15.3 162	3.4 25
County of Smyth	20.4 290	11.4 60	23.1 225	20.8 243	30.2 243
County of Clarke	19.8 175	11.1 32	14.1 144	9.7 31	15.2 61

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
County of Culpeper	19.6 329	7.2 48	13.2 154	22.0 152	16.0 113
County of Essex	19.5 140	22.0 36	24.0 127	39.7 117	7.3 18
County of Surry	19.5 167	28.6 76	20.9 117	23.0 104	15.4 49
County of Brunswick	19.3 376	16.6 101	30.2 283	25.5 130	7.7 78
County of Frederick	19.3 297	16.4 77	18.0 283	11.1 46	4.0 23
County of Prince Edward	19.3 332	19.4 124	17.8 247	20.9 223	10.5 154
County of Middle- sex	18.1 147	23.5 60	20.8 116	29.5 95	15.3 36
County of Page	18.1 296	6.4 50	17.1 239	11.1 78	6.3 50
County of Patrick	17.7 123	5.3 32	3.5 49	3.1 35	4.7 66
County of Princess Anne	17.7 636	17.3 213	25.9 708	16.0 234	8.6 114
County of Russell	16.8 409	5.2 60	17.0 308	3.6 54	1.7 33
City of Suffolk	15.6 402	25.9 168	29.8 471	19.5 340	18.6 227
County of Gloucester	15.3 216	12.9 47	32.4 324	14.3 82	16.9 141
County of Bucking- ham	15.1 218	16.8 85	18.8 195	15.8 98	13.2 48
County of Shenan- doah	15.0 251	7.2 48	12.0 257	9.4 75	6.7 66

	Miller 1949	Hart 1948	Hutchinson 1946	Plunkett 1945	Plunkett 1941
County of Greene	13.5 36	10.2 10	11.7 19	20.9 24	23.5 28
County of Sussex	13.3 191	12.9 67	13.3 149	11.9 83	15.7 70
County of Rappa- hannock	13.0 126	9.7 48	13.1 92	4.7 13	6.4 11
County of Wythe	11.9 196	2.5 19	12.9 169	12.8 60	14.7 56
County of Isle of Wighe	10.1 167	17.6 86	28.1 323	21.9 146	7.1 55
County of Appomat- tox	9.6 189	4.4 51	6.5 127	5.5 89	1.6 15
County of High- land	9.4 43	3.7 11	7.1 33	16.6 24	4.8 8
County of Rocking- ham	8.7 177	5.6 50	7.4 181	10.5 83	7.1 49
County of Cumber- land	7.7 71	15.9 53	12.1 62	6.4 29	9.3 64
City of Harrison- burg	5.8 91	7.8 47	12.5 143	13.8 82	11.7 54

Geographically speaking, the Anti-organization strength in the State seems to have flourished in the same areas in all five of the Organization v. Anti-organization State-wide primaries, as the following series of maps illustrate.

Key to the following maps:

Counties: light blue; 30-40% of vote to Anti-organization candidate

dark blue: 40-50%
 purple : 50-60%
 black : over 60%

Cities: blue dot: 30-50%
 black dot: over 50%

Of the four primaries prior to that of 1949, the one most comparable to that of 1949 is that of 1946. This is true for two reasons. Firstly, of the five primaries a greater number of votes were cast in these two than in the others and secondly, each faction here provided a maximum effort in an attempt to elect its candidate.

Thus a further comparison of the 1949 and 1946 primaries might be helpful in plotting the course of the Anti-organization effort. The following table lists first counties and then the cities alphabetically and tallies Miller's percentage of gain or loss when compared with Hutchinson's vote.

Accomack	/ 11.6	Buckingham	- 3.7
Albemarle	- .5	Campbell	/ 9.8
Alleghany	- 3.6	Caroline	/ 2.6
Amelia	/ 1.9	Carroll	/ 1.3
Amherst	/ 6.1	Charles City	/ 5.9
Appomattox	/ 3.1	Charlotte	/ 3.7
Arlington	/ 1.8	Chesterfield	-13.4
Augusta	/ 10.6	Clarke	/ 5.7
Bath	/ 4.6	Craig	-32.1
Bedford	- 1.8	Culpeper	/ 6.4
Bland	/ 10.8	Cumberland	- 4.4
Botetourt	- 9.4	Dickenson	-11.4
Brunswick	- 10.3	Dinwiddie	- 3.2
Buchanan	/ 29.1	Elizabeth City	- .9

Essex	-	4.5	Prince Edward	/	1.5
Fairfax	/	10.2	Prince George	-	11.0
Fauquier	/	11.3	Prince William	-	6.4
Floyd	/	13.6	Princess Anne	-	8.2
Fluvana	/	5.2	Pulaski	-	3.2
Franklin	-	1.7	Rappahannock	-	.1
Frederick	/	1.3	Richmond	/	6.2
Giles	-	9.6	Roanoke	/	15.7
Gloucester	-	17.1	Rockbridge	/	24.9
Goochland	/	1.3	Rockingham	/	1.3
Grayson	-	17.8	Russell	-	.2
Greene	/	1.8	Scott	-	25.7
Greensville	-	2.8	Shenandoah	/	3.0
Halifax	/	9.7	Smyth	-	2.7
Hanover	-	5.1	Southampton	/	3.5
Henrico	-	14.1	Spotsylvania	/	21.2
Henry	/	11.3	Stafford	/	8.9
Highland	/	2.3	Surry	-	.6
Isle of Wight	-	18.0	Sussex	-	0.0
James City	-	13.6	Tazewell	-	9.2
King George	/	3.1	Warren	-	.4
King & Queen	/	5.5	Warrick	-	15.0
King William	-	6.0	Washington	-	9.4
Lancaster	/	13.1	Westmoreland	/	1.7
Lee	-	10.7	Wise	-	1.5
Loudoun	/	8.3	Wythe	-	1.0
Louisa	/	8.3	York	/	.5
Lunenburg	-	4.1			
Madison	/	10.6	Alexandria	/	1.4
Mathews	/	20.7	Bristol	-	14.2
Mecklenburg	/	.7	Buena Vista	/	14.9
Middlesex	-	2.7	Charlottesville	-	3.8
Montgomery	/	10.0	Clifton Forge	/	.2
Nansemond	-	25.3	Danville	-	2.6
Nelson	/	24.2	Fredericksburg	/	6.8
New Kent	-	10.8	Hampton	/	2.1
Norfolk	-	5.3	Harrisonburg	-	6.7
Northampton	/	8.5	Hopewell	-	5.0
Northumberland	-	2.0	Lynchburg	/	8.5
Nottoway	-	6.7	Martinsville	/	15.0
Orange	/	10.3	Newport News	-	14.4
Page	/	1.0	Norfolk	-	4.9
Patrick	/	14.2	Petersburg	-	12.0
Pittsylvania	-	.2	Portsmouth	-	6.8
Powatan	-	1.2			

Radford	- 7.5	Staunton	/ 8.0
Richmond	- 7.7	Suffolk	- 14.2
Roanoke	- 11.5	Williamsburg	/ 10.6
South Norfolk	- 18.1	Winchester	/ 10.5

Thus Mr. Miller improved over Mr. Hutchinson's vote percentage in 50 of the counties and 10 of the cities. He fell below Mr. Hutchinson's percentage in 49 counties and 17 cities. In comparison, Mr. Battle's percentage was below that of Mr. Byrd's in 98 counties and all 27 cities. He beat the Byrd percentage only in Scott and Craig counties. It should be remembered however, that the Edwards and Arnold candidacies are universally conceded to have cut deeply into the Organization vote.

The following two maps attempt to show the geographical area where Miller outshone Hutchinson (first map) and where he was outshone by Hutchinson (second map).

Key to first map:

Counties:	light blue-	Miller gain 0.1-4.9% over Hutchinson
	dark blue-	Miller gain 5.0-9.9% over Hutchinson
	purple-	Miller gain over 10% over Hutchinson
Cities:	blue dot-	Miller gain 0.1-7.4% over Hutchinson
	black dot-	Miller gain over 7.5% over Hutchinson

Key to second map:

Counties:	light blue-	Miller loss of 0.1%-4.9% compared with (Hutchinson)
	dark blue-	Miller loss of 5.0%-9.9% compared with (Hutchinson)
	purple-	Miller loss of over 10% compared with (Hutchinson)

where the Anti-organization strength until this time has always been its weakest, Miller made some spectacular gains.

This might suggest that in the future, Anti-organization strength will grow in those areas where it has always done poorly and that its strength in its own strongholds has already reached the peak and will there remain static.

If this be the case, Virginia's outlook for a two party (or two faction) system seems bright indeed. It will most certainly not be a Democratic V. Republican system but it will be a conservative V. liberal system and thus in accord with the political systems of the rest of the Anglo-Saxon world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Daily Press (Newport News), July 27, 1949; July 30, 1949.
- The Daily Progress (Charlottesville), June 22, 1948-July 3, 1949.
- The Evening Star (Washington, D. C.), July 14, 1949.
- Halifax Gazette (South Boston), July 27, 1949.
- The News (Lynchburg), May 10, 1949; June 26, 1949.
- Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, January 16, 1949; April 27, 1949.
- The Portsmouth Star, January 20, 1949.
- The Progress-Index (Petersburg), July 26, 1948-January 11, 1949.
- The Richmond News Leader, June 3, 1949- August 18, 1949.
- Richmond Times-Dispatch, June 11, 1948-August 19, 1949.
- Winchester Evening Star, May 3, 1949.
- Statement of the Vote for Governor and Lieutenant Governor: Democratic Primary Election, Tuesday, August 5, 1941. Compiled by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, Richmond: Division of Purchasing and Printing.
- Statement of the Vote for Governor and Lieutenant Governor: Democratic Primary Election Tuesday, August 7, 1945. Compiled by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, Richmond: Division of Purchasing and Printing.
- Statement of the Vote for Members of Congress and United States Senator: Primary Election, Tuesday August 6, 1946. Special and General Election Tuesday, November 5, 1946. Compiled by the State Board of Elections; Richmond: Division of Purchasing and Printing, 1946.

Statement of the Vote for Members of Congress and United States Senator: Primary Election, Tuesday August 3, 1948. Compiled from Official Records by Levin Nock Davis, Secretary of the State Board of Elections. Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Purchasing and Printing, Richmond, 1948.

Statement of the Vote for Governor and Lieutenant Governor and Attorney-General: Democratic Primary Election Tuesday, August 2, 1949. Compiled from Official Records by Levin Nock Davis, Secretary of the State Board of Elections. Commonwealth of Virginia, Division of Purchasing and Printing, Richmond, 1949.