

The Simon Review

**The Man and the Land
The Politics of Paul Simon and Southern Illinois, 1950-1973**

By Eugene P. Trani
1975
Paper #21
July 2010

A Publication of the Paul Simon Public Policy Institute
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The Paul Simon Public Policy Institute is very pleased to present this paper by Dr. Eugene P. Trani, President Emeritus and University Distinguished Professor at Virginia Commonwealth University. Dr. Trani taught in the History Department at Southern Illinois University Carbondale during Paul Simon's first race for the U.S. Congress in 1973-74. He and other scholars at SIUC had planned to write a book based on that campaign and this paper preserves the original edition as it was written in 1975 with only minor editorial changes. We are pleased to preserve and publish this historically important document.

John S. Jackson
Series Editor

INTRODUCTION

In 1972, when I was teaching in the history department of Southern Illinois University Carbondale, the late Senator Paul Simon, then Lieutenant Governor, lost in the Democratic primary for Governor of Illinois. I was sad and said to myself that if he ever ran again, I would help in his campaign. Soon, he announced for Congress from the district that SIU was in. Some faculty from SIU, myself included, helped in 1974 in the campaign, as noted later in Paul Simon's book, "P.S.: The Autobiography of Paul Simon" (Chicago, Illinois: Bonus Books, Inc., 1999), p. 128. We also agreed to write a book after his election to the U.S. House of Representatives. The book, for a variety of reasons, never materialized. But my chapter, which was completed in 1975, did, and is hereby attached without revision. Later, I did review one of Paul Simon's books, "Paul Simon, Midwestern Progressive: A Review Essay of Paul Simon's Winners and Losers: The 1988 Race for the Presidency – One Candidate's Perspective," Wisconsin Magazine of History, 73 (1989-1990), 134-141, co-authored with Jerrold C. Rodesch.

Paul Simon was a first class public servant, and during his years in the House of Representatives (1975-1985) and in the Senate (1985-1997), he made remarkable contributions to better the people of Illinois and our country. His 1974 campaign was my last involvement in politics as I became a university administrator, and served at the University of Nebraska (1975-1980), the University of Missouri-Kansas City (1980-1986), the University of Wisconsin System (1986-1990), and then Virginia Commonwealth University (1990-2009). I am proud to have been involved in his "political comeback" and treasure his memory. Since Senator Simon's daughter, Sheila Simon, is the 2010 Democratic candidate for his old office, Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, there might be current interest in this account.

Eugene P. Trani
President Emeritus and University Distinguished Professor
Virginia Commonwealth University
May 24, 2010



The above statement by Dr. Trani was taken from his website on June 4, 2010
<http://www.eugenetrani.vcu.edu/news/desk.html>



On November 14, 1973, the 49th birthday of United States Representative Kenneth J. Gray, Paul Simon announced his intention to be a candidate to succeed Gray as congressman from the 24th District in Illinois, the 22 counties of southern Illinois. This announcement, triggered by Gray's decision not to seek re-election in 1974, brought Simon, Gray and southern

Illinois all together. It is necessary, as a prelude to studying Paul Simon's election victory in 1974, to trace the political development of the three from 1950 to that November day.

Paul Simon's public career began in Illinois in the late 1940s, a long way from where he had been born, Eugene, Oregon, on November 29, 1928, the son of missionaries who had served in China in the 1920s. Simon spent his boyhood in Oregon, where his father, a Lutheran minister, displayed a family trait – political independence. His father aided American citizens of Japanese ancestry whom the United States government removed from the west coast, placing them in internment camps hundreds of miles away. Simon's youth showed an interest in religion, serving as statewide president of a Lutheran youth organization, political reform and newspaper work. From his father, Simon and his younger brother, Arthur, now a minister in New York City, "learned of Roosevelt, LaFollette, and other progressive heroes of the time. He decided upon a hero of his own – Abraham Lincoln."¹

A high school graduate at the age of 16, Simon entered the University of Oregon to study journalism and wrote for the sports department of the Eugene Register-Guard. After one year at Oregon he transferred to Dana College in Nebraska, a small Lutheran school, where he was soon elected student body president. After his junior year at Dana, Simon borrowed \$3,600 and

purchased a defunct weekly newspaper in Troy, Illinois, near where his father had moved, and at the age of 19 he became the youngest editor and publisher in the nation.

His youth had displayed four characteristics that would mark his whole life: a deep belief in religion, with a resulting sense of moralism, that makes him “a remarkably self-possessed individual, if often sanctimoniously so”²; an extraordinarily inquisitive mind, that made reading a major staple of his life; an intense interest in newspaper work, eventually to lead to his becoming the publisher of a chain of 14 newspapers in downstate Illinois; and the beginnings of a political career. Each of these characteristics became even more important as the years went by.

It was the Troy Tribune that brought Paul Simon to the attention of the citizens of Madison County, his new home, as well as the rest of Illinois in the late 1940s. As Simon began his career as a news publisher, he found much that distressed him. He later recalled about the Tribune: “The dust in the shop seemed an inch thick. The equipment – some of it went back to the 1870’s – was ready to fall apart, and it did!” Soon the newspaper had a growing list of subscribers but Simon saw much else that alarmed him. Madison County, across the Mississippi River from St. Louis, seemed dominated by organized crime, with payoffs to government officials, gambling casinos and houses of prostitution the order of the day. Simon exposed these activities in his paper, “embellished with as much detail as he ever lavished on a local nuptial,” and his work came to the attention of Illinois’ new governor, Adlai E. Stevenson. Stevenson talked with Simon and then ordered raids to help clear up the crime. But Simon was not done. He called for the indictment of a recently-retired sheriff and the censuring of the Madison County State’s Attorney. Simon did not enjoy exposing political corruption but noted in a letter to U.S. Congressman Melvin Price that, “I feel strongly that in the long run anything that can be

done to eliminate corruption and devices which lead to it, will be the healthy thing.” The St.

Louis Post-Dispatch editorialized about his efforts:

Paul Simon, editor of the weekly Tribune at Troy, Ill., is only 22 years-old. But he is far more courageous than many citizens of Madison County who are much older, much better established and much better equipped in resources to stand out for law and order.

Simon’s efforts also brought him national attention, and on February 24, 1951, he appeared on television as a witness before Senator Estes Kefauver’s Senate Crime Investigation Committee, then holding sessions in St. Louis. He told the Committee about the extent of organized crime in Madison County and of the need of governmental action to control it.

Newsweek magazine called Simon a “star witness.”³

It was natural that Simon would move on to politics, but the Korean War forced a two-year delay and assignment for Simon as a member of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the U.S. Army along the Iron Curtain in Europe. He returned to Troy in 1953 and soon announced that he would run as a Democrat for the Illinois House of Representatives in the April 1954 primary. The odds seemed great, as the powerful party machine looked with little favor on a reformer, stirring up trouble by insisting on honest government. Even his friends told him that he did not have a chance, that nobody beat the organization in Madison County. With little money, but a campaign style that led Paul Douglas to proclaim Simon “the most effective campaigner I have ever seen,” Simon and his voluntary supporters went out to meet the people. Knocking on doors, meeting people in the streets, in laundromats, at bowling alleys (a favorite Simon campaign stop), in barber shops, and at factory exits, Simon made the rounds in the district, calling for political reform. He later estimated that he had shaken the hands of 30,000 people in the primary campaign. On primary day, he showed his political skill by leading the field in a three-man race,

beating his nearest rival, an incumbent, by more than 9,000 votes. The Alton Telegraph termed it a “sensational upset,” and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat called his nomination a stunner.⁴ Election to the State House was a formality in November 1954, since the district was heavily Democratic.

In 1955, Paul Simon became the state’s youngest lawmaker. This was the beginning of a fourteen-year career in the state Legislature that saw Simon serve eight years in the State House and six years in the State Senate. Simon’s career in state government quickly displayed his honesty, hard work and imagination, and a host of laws saw the Simon name as sponsor or co-sponsor.

Pushed by a sensitive social conscience and a deep belief in the need for honest government, Simon pioneered income disclosure in Illinois, a practice he maintained throughout his political career, even requiring it of his staff. He worked hard to aid the forgotten citizens of his district and the state – children, especially in the field of education, the aged, the poor and the handicapped. He opposed a state sales tax as unfair to low and moderate income families, saying “the sales tax is unique in that the lower the income, the higher the percent of your incomes goes for taxation. The higher your income, the less you spend on items covered by the sales tax.”⁵ He also pushed for fiscal accountability at all levels of government and was one of only two members of the Illinois House who in 1955 voted against State Auditor Orville Hodge’s requests for emergency appropriations prior to Hodge’s arrest for embezzlement of funds. He sponsored legislation which required that meetings of government bodies be open to the public, telling the President of the University of Illinois, who opposed the legislation, that “It is easy to forget that basic to our whole theory of government is that we inform the electorate, not only what decisions are reached but how they are reached.”⁶ Simon kept the citizens of Illinois informed of

governmental activities by writing a weekly news column, "Sidelights from Springfield" which he began in 1957. Provided at no cost to over 300 newspapers in the state, this column won Simon an American Political Science Association award for "distinguished reporting of state and local government." In each of Simon's four terms in the House, he was given an Independent Voters of Illinois "Best Legislator" Award. In the meantime, he married a fellow member of the Illinois House in 1960, Jeanne Hurley of Wilmette, making them for the remainder of her term, the first husband-wife legislative team in state history.

In 1962, he ran successfully for the state Senate, in spite of a new attempt by the Madison County political organization to defeat him. He continued his remarkable legislative career and maintained his position as an independent Democrat. In each of his three terms in the Senate he won IVI "Best Legislator" awards. His terms in the Senate saw more legislation and also the emergence of Simon as an environmental activist, calling for water pollution enforcement to save Lake Michigan through collaboration between Illinois and its neighbors.

In 14 years in the Illinois House and Senate he produced much legislation. During his eight years in the House he sponsored or co-sponsored 493 bills, which covered about 70 different categories, ranging alphabetically from absentee ballots to unclaimed property. Fifty-one of the bills involved schools, 44 state government, 42 appropriations and 37 employment issues, clearly reflecting Simon's concerns. Many involved making state government more responsive to the citizens of Illinois, with 17 bills calling for revisions of the criminal code, 18 being concerned with electoral reforms, 10 involving medicine and surgery, 19 concerning motor vehicles and 15 covering parks. A large number called for revision in the state taxation system. Of the 52 bills, of which Simon was chief sponsor during his House years, 22 became law. He was even more active during his six years in the state Senate, sponsoring or co-sponsoring 509

bills. Again, the main categories displayed his interests: 71 involved appropriation matters, 51 state government, 39 housing and redevelopment, 28 schools, 22 cities and villages, 21 charities and public welfare, 19 medicine and surgery, 18 employment and 16 criminal code. During those six years, he was the chief sponsor of 155 bills, of which 89 became law, a much higher percentage than during his service in the House.⁷

Out of his 14 years in the state Legislature, and the more than 200 bills of which he was the chief sponsor, came much heralded legislation. Among the more important were laws providing for the “Right to Know,” requiring open meetings of public bodies; setting up guidance for released prisoners; bringing revision of state adoption laws; closing tax loopholes; requiring the fencing of automobile junkyards; prohibiting discrimination in the employment of teachers; creating the Illinois Arts Council, the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, a State Science Advisory Council, the Illinois Recreation Council; establishing a high school equivalency test throughout the state; permitting the pre-filing of bills, so that work could begin before the legislative session started; calling for a two-year study commission on the problems of Illinois’ Spanish-speaking people; and requiring internal auditing procedures for each department of state government.⁸ His legislative record showed him to be a fiscal conservative, an environmentalist, and a supporter of the belief that government should serve the people.

Simon obviously stayed busy during his years in the Illinois House and Senate, and yet he found time to do a good deal of serious writing. Among the best works he has ever done is his book, Lincoln’s Preparation for Greatness: The Illinois Legislative Years, initially published by the University of Oklahoma Press in 1965 and re-issued in a paperback edition by the University of Illinois Press in 1971. The result of ten years of work, Simon first decided to do the book in

1955, upon beginning service in the Illinois House. As he noted: “I went to the state library and asked for a book on Lincoln’s four terms in the same Illinois House. They told me none existed. ‘Incredible,’ I thought. More than five thousand books about Lincoln, and none written in depth about this important phase.” That was enough for Simon who produced a well-written, soundly researched volume on Lincoln’s service in the Illinois House from 1834 to 1842, the formative political years for Lincoln. As a member of the Sangamon County delegation, Lincoln was one of the guiding forces that got the state capital moved from Vandalia to Springfield, and in the process came close to scandal, being accused of engaging in logrolling. Simon disputed the logrolling thesis, concluding that “there is no evidence that Lincoln supported any measure with which he was in basic disagreement in order to secure votes for Springfield.”⁹ Simon’s book gained much attention both in the scholarly community and in Illinois at large.

Another work dealing with political corruption proved to be the most controversial writing Simon did during the legislative years. The September 1964 issue of Harper’s Magazine contained an article entitled, “The Illinois Legislature: A Study in Corruption,” by State Senator Paul Simon, as told to Alfred Balk.¹⁰ In this article, Simon contended that the Illinois Legislature was “polluted almost beyond belief,” with fully one-third of the 177 members of the House having accepted payoffs, whether direct or “recorded as legal fees, public-relations services, or ‘campaign contributions.’” He stated that “a few legislators go so far as to introduce some bills that are deliberately designed to shake down groups which oppose them and which will pay to have them withdrawn.” Simon pinpointed racetrack interests as perhaps the most blatant abuse of power in Springfield, charging that Illinois racetracks enjoyed one of the lowest tax rates in the nation because some “influential legislators, or members of their families, are stockholders in racetracks,” with the stock purchase at ridiculously low prices. Simon’s charges

on the racetracks were, of course, prophetic. He also discussed the influence that the Chicago Crime Syndicate had in Springfield, pointing out that almost every major anti-crime measure proposed in the Legislature was blocked from enactment. He criticized the Illinois patronage system, the protection of special interests, the state budget-making which was “handled by a self-perpetuating clique behind closed doors,” the cursory handling the Legislature gave the scandal that involved State Auditor Hodge, and the lack of public scrutiny the activities of the Legislature received. This article was very controversial. His characterization of the Illinois Legislature as “something of a moral dung heap crawling with corrupt politicians and lobbyists,” was disputed by some of his colleagues, but the article, and the Chicago American’s printing of what it reported was a tape-recording of a conversation of lobbyists discussing the \$30,000 spent to kill a particular bill, spurred the reform movement in Illinois. The article also pushed Simon forward as a reform leader, helping him gain his reputation as the “the most widely respected political personage in Illinois,”¹¹ but such activities hardly endeared him to political regulars.

Paul Simon did not want to run for Lt. Governor in 1968. Rather, he hoped to be the Democratic candidate to oppose Republican United States Senator Everett M. Dirksen, who was running for re-election. This was not Simon’s first hope to run against Dirksen. He had lobbied for the 1962 Democratic Senate nomination and received a good deal of support that year, including that from Jack Mabley of the Chicago Daily News who wrote: “I’d like to see the Democrats pick Paul Simon to go after Dirksen.” But the 1962 slatemakers chose Congressman Sidney Yates instead and Simon ran for the Illinois State Senate. Simon based his hope for the 1968 nomination on his legislative record and his belief that only a downstate Democrat could unseat Dirksen. He also saw “Dirksen as particularly vulnerable for lack of leadership in getting at the causes of our urban crisis and in a basically neo-isolationist stance in world affairs,” and

felt that congressional ethics and the one-man-one-vote ruling would be “key issues in a Simon-Dirksen contest.”¹²

Paul Simon put much work in his bid for the 1968 senatorial nomination. He traveled throughout Illinois in 1967 and 1968, addressing all sorts of gatherings. There were, of course, many political speeches, but one of his most interesting talks was a historical one – speaking on “Lincoln, The Postmaster,”¹³ in early February, 1968, at the First Day of Issue Ceremonies for the Illinois Sesquicentennial Commemorative Postage Stamp at Shawneetown. Whatever the topic, Simon gained much exposure in Illinois circles, but not only by traveling over the state, but by sending news releases describing his activities to papers, large and small, in all sections of Illinois.

Simon did more than speak in Illinois. Believing that a first-hand knowledge of international relations was necessary for any senatorial candidate, Simon toured Europe and the Middle East and then went to Vietnam, both trips taking place in 1967. These, of course, were not Simon’s first trips abroad. Spurred by his military service in Europe, Simon remained interested in world affairs during his years in the Illinois Legislature. He made extensive trips abroad, and met with the leaders of more than 80 different countries, including Nehru of India, Ben-Gurion of Israel, Pope Pius XII and Hussein of Jordan. India especially interested Simon and as early as January 6, 1951, he wrote Congressman Price: “the more I study the situation the more overwhelmed and disappointed I am that we have failed to push any kind of positive program for Asia generally and now India in particular.”¹⁴ And so he went abroad again in 1967. He prepared reports for Illinois newspapers on his 1967 European venture, with interesting columns on “Berlin: The Wall Gets Thicker”; “Journalist’s Questions Get No Response from North Vietnam”; “Greece’s Dictators: How Temporary Are They?”; “Visiting

Italy – Always a Thrill”; and “Unnoticed Major Event: Poland Becomes Industrialized Nation.”¹⁵ The most important of these columns described Simon’s efforts to question North Vietnamese officials at their embassy in Warsaw. Asking questions about the possibility of peace negotiations between the North Vietnamese and the Americans, either through the United Nations, neutral countries, or by direct talks, Simon described the North Vietnamese as “very unresponsive.”

This contact with the North Vietnamese whetted his appetite to study the most pressing issue of the day. In late 1967, Simon visited South Vietnam on a fact-finding trip with press credentials from the Chicago Sun Times.¹⁶ Reporting his observations, upon return, to the City Club of Chicago on November 20, 1967, he began by noting that he favored the re-election of President Lyndon B. Johnson and stated that he believed “that the basic limits which President Johnson has placed on the war in Vietnam are sound. He has said that complete withdrawal is unthinkable without certain assurances, and he has said that unlimited war would be catastrophic.”

But Simon called for some major alterations of America’s Vietnamese policy. He recommended a “gradual reduction of American manpower” in Vietnam; a “review of our firepower activities,” which sometimes made more enemies than they destroyed; an “alteration of our present bombing of North Vietnam,” which might help bring peace negotiations.

Simon doubted the effectiveness of the bombing campaign, recalling that Hitler’s bombing of London only strengthened British resolve; a change in American aid to the South Vietnamese from military supplies to other materials. He also call for “an informal, private, unpublicized trip to Hanoi” by two or three men “in whom the President has confidence”; and closer relations with the United Nations and neutral countries trying to arrange for peace

negotiations. Simon offered these suggestions as “constructive criticism” because of the need to “make clear to all nations our willingness and eagerness to have peace with justice,” and because “there is never too much reasoned dialogue on an issue which involves life and death, hope and hopelessness for so many people.” As the February 27, 1968 slatemaking meeting approached, Simon addressed this issue again, endorsing “the broad outlines” of American policy but calling for changes that would bring negotiations and an end to the war.”¹⁷

Simon’s public criticisms of America’s Vietnam policy certainly did not help his candidacy for the Senate nomination before the slatemakers. Still he kept his interest and ambition alive, saying in mid-February that the Senate nomination “remains my first choice,” and noting that he would appear in Springfield “as a candidate for the Senate nomination.”¹⁸ But the slatemakers decided to back Illinois Attorney General William Clark for the Senate nomination, passing over Simon and State Treasurer Adlai Stevenson III, who, like Simon, was a critic of Johnson’s Vietnamese policy.

Simon was nonetheless chosen as the party’s nominee for lieutenant governor, to run on a ticket with Governor Sam Shapiro. So Paul Simon was off and running for lieutenant governor. It was a typical Simon election effort, with an emphasis on issues and hard work on the part of the candidate. Simon’s campaign strategy was to run as much as possible by himself, on his own record, stressing his experience for the job. His campaign literature noted that “there is no time for on-the-job training,” and promised “leadership for tomorrow.” His campaign put out a 32-page brochure entitled, “The Paul Simon Story,” describing his experience, and the candidate went throughout the state expressing his ideas on the office he sought. The major Simon proposal was a promise to serve, if elected, as a state ombudsman, “a lobbyist for the people.” His campaign treasury was aided by a visit in July to Belleville by Maryland’s Senator Joseph

Tydings, who praised Simon as “a man to watch in American politics.” Throughout the campaign, Simon’s press operation was as always “flawless.” Michael Kilian later wrote that “no newspaper was too small, nor any reporter too insignificant, to merit a direct telephone call from Simon himself in response to any inquiry.”¹⁹

Simon’s opponent was Robert Dwyer, an insurance executive from Winnetka. Dwyer had long been active in Republican Party circles but was himself a candidate for the first time. Dwyer stressed his Republicanism, noting that a Republican lieutenant governor should be elected with Richard Ogilvie’s expected victory in the November gubernatorial race. Dwyer also proposed that the lieutenant governor be charged to “create a program whereby we would interest top flight people from business, the professions and academia to serve in an advisory capacity in helping us solve the problems facing the state.” And he criticized Simon for casting “the cruelest vote of the last session of the General Assembly,” by voting against a measure to provide “in-patient care for mentally retarded and emotionally handicapped children,” a charge quickly refuted by Simon, who contended that Dwyer was misrepresenting his vote on a very complex bill. Skillfully Simon pointed out that Dwyer, he was sure, had not made his charge “out of malice, but because he has no background in state government,” and simply did not understand the issue.²⁰

Basically the election campaign was a quiet one, gentlemanly on both sides, as Illinois voters concentrated on the Nixon-Humphrey and Ogilvie-Shapiro races, as well as spirited congressional elections. Simon, throughout the campaign, stressed the Democrats’ approach to state problems and Dwyer the Republicans’. Both agreed that the state constitution should be changed so that the governor and lieutenant governor would be elected as a team. Each received newspaper endorsements, though Simon got many more. The Decatur Herald-Review said:

“there probably is no brighter star for the future in the Democratic party than Sen. Simon” and the paper said it expected Simon to do an excellent job as lieutenant governor. The Illinois State Register noted that a vote for Simon would “be a vote for good government and clean politics in Illinois.” The Auburn Citizen editorialized that 1968 was a Republican year, but “we should make one exception and elect Paul Simon.”²¹

Illinoisans followed the advice of the Citizen on November 5, 1968 and elected Simon by almost 100,000 votes (2,222,331 to 2,125,910), while Nixon carried Illinois by 134,000 votes, Dirksen by 285,000 votes, and Ogilvie by 127,000 votes. For the first time in the history of Illinois, voters had elected a governor from one party and a lieutenant governor from another. While Dwyer contended that his defeat resulted from a lack of name recognition and the “money to overcome it,” for Simon it was a personal victory. Spending \$108,000, a modest sum for a statewide campaign, his victory, the Alton Telegraph stated, was obviously the result of a combination of factors, “including his surprising personal following statewide and his propensity for campaigning harder than seems possible.” While Democrats Paul Powell and Michael Howlett also won statewide races, they were incumbents. Simon’s election was a surprise. The Bloomington Pantagraph declared Simon’s “the most impressive victory in Illinois” in 1968. He had won and yet maintained his independence from the Chicago Democratic organization, though he quickly expressed “a real debt” for the job Mayor Richard J. Daley did for him.²²

The question then became, “What will Ogilvie do with Simon?” How would the mixed Republican-Democratic state executive team get along? This mixed team brought much public comment, with the Illinois State Register pointing out that it was the fifth such arrangement, though the first chosen by the voters, the others coming by deaths or resignations. Both men publicly stated that they could overcome their partisan differences. Simon pledged to work with

Olgivie for efficient state government, not allowing political differences to interfere with the business of the state. Simon also promised to act cautiously during the times he was acting governor. Simon noted: “When he’s out of the state, I’m not going to do anything like fire his entire cabinet.” But Simon did affirm his intention to serve as a state ombudsman, “a person who would investigate complaints filed against state officials by the public.” While Olgivie was not enthusiastic about Simon’s intention concerning the ombudsmanship, he stated that he could work with Simon. And the public seemed satisfied that they could work together. The Chicago Heights Star noted that Simon was “a superior public servant” and expressed confidence that “he and Governor-elect Olgivie will be able to work harmoniously.” At the same time, the Star pointed out its agreement with Simon’s proposal that the constitution be revised to elect the governor and lieutenant governor as a team, a proposal eventually enacted at the Illinois Constitutional Convention in 1971.²³

In January 1969, Paul Simon began his duties as the 32nd Lieutenant Governor of Illinois. Most previous lieutenant governors presided over the state Senate, the only official function of the office other than serving as acting governor whenever the governor left the state, and did little else. But from the beginning, it was clear that Simon, the activist, would do much more.

While Simon had a very busy four-year term as lieutenant governor, his activities in three areas stand out. The first and most important was his service as unofficial “ombudsman” for the state, the role he promised in the campaign.²⁴ The term ombudsman, a Swedish term, means a complaint officer who assists people in dealing with governmental agencies. And that is how Simon saw his office. He hoped “to facilitate and effectuate legitimate governmental and/or private services to people who need them.” Since government already tended to respond to the

pressure “of the mighty rather than the needs of the lowly,” Simon hoped the ombudsman concept would help balance the situation. Working with his small staff, on a “time-available” basis, his office handled more than 100 letters and telephone calls a day – more than 22,000 requests in his first 17 months in office. The sorts of problems varied greatly. Many were from citizens who felt they were getting the “run-around” from state agencies. Simon quickly came to believe that “government, because of its complexity and bigness, too often is slow to respond to people’s problems.” Others came from citizens who felt they had been wronged by private businesses. Others were of a long-range character, such as tax structures, which could be solved by legislative remedies. The complaint went, as Simon noted, “from pollution to pornography, from fire problems to flood problems.” The only concerns that Simon excluded from his office’s jurisdiction were matters pending before the courts. Flood relief, drivers licenses, the rights of Spanish-speaking residents of Chicago in public education, difficulties between law enforcement agencies and citizens, tax relief, strip mining reform, veterans benefits, collaboration between local communities and junior colleges, benefits for the elderly, road repairs, and mental health reform were all problems Simon and his staff dealt with. Simon made frequent trips “to gather information first hand in areas with special problems.” In the course of his four-year term as lieutenant governor, Simon’s office dealt with more than 50,000 complaints and he called for the creation of an ombudsman on a permanent basis. He also saw his activities result in a good deal of legislation, even though he was not empowered to introduce it.

Out of Simon’s activities as ombudsman came his participation as a peacemaker in Cairo, a racially tense town in southern Illinois. Invited by a Cairo newspaper editor who felt inadequate attention was being given to an explosive situation by state and federal agencies, Simon went to Cairo, where he walked the streets and talked to representatives of all groups. In

late April, 1969 he made a comprehensive set of recommendations that proved unpopular to almost every segment of Cairo's population.²⁵ He noted the history of Cairo, pointing out that "the racial attitudes of the Old South have also been part of the Cairo tradition," and that "today Cairo is a community deeply divided, with tensions high," with unfulfilled potential. To reduce tensions, Simon recommended that the police force be greatly overhauled, with a new chief appointed and several Negro patrolmen hired; that the sheriff's office employ at least one Negro deputy; that the local national guard be integrated; that the "White Hats," a source of fear for the Black community, be immediately disbanded; that the City Council be integrated; that the town's clergy meet together regularly; that a Negro newspaper reporter be hired; that the Black economic boycott of the town's merchants be reconsidered; and finally that a "Rumor Center" be established. These were only some of the recommendations that Simon made to overcome decades of "state indifference." The state had to "quit treating the deep, southern part of the state as a step-child." But most of all it was up to the citizens of Cairo. Simon concluded that Cairo's could be a success story "if the difficult problems are faced. If time, which can be either an ally or an enemy, is seized and used: to learn, to heal wounds, to show concern for all people, and to build, build, build."

Progress in Cairo was very slow, with Simon criticized for meddling in the situation. The Illinois State Journal editorialized: "Simon Muddying Waters Cairo Situation." Simon frequently received letters questioning his involvement and answered by saying that "it would be wiser politically for me to ignore the problems of Cairo" but that would mean ignoring "one of the most serious situations in Illinois." He only hoped that his efforts contributed to an eventual peace. By 1971, trouble still existed in Cairo and Simon admitted that the situation was "very discouraging" but he was still hopeful.²⁶ Eventually some of his suggestions were adopted and

the tensions lessened, though not completely, and Simon remained respected in all segments of the Cairo community. Simon's activities in Cairo represent the courageous response of a dedicated public servant who believed he could help.

Simon's other major area of interest concerned investigating the causes of the student unrest on the college campuses in 1970. During the period of maximum campus tension, in the spring of 1970 at the time of the invasion of Cambodia, Simon met with student leaders from 13 Illinois colleges and universities, and in collaboration with them made recommendations for reforms on Illinois campuses. When the Carbondale campus of Southern Illinois University erupted in violence and was forced to suspend classes in May, 1970, Simon, at the request of local officials, formed a task force to examine the situation. Composed of faculty, administrators, students, law enforcement officials, and civic leaders, the task force's report recommended a whole series of reforms for Southern Illinois University. Some of the most important called for the creation of "effective communication, formal and informal, throughout the university community;" greater student-instructor contact; the institution of "an all-university system of teacher evaluation;" a redefinition of the role of the university; more "coordination in the operation of the Carbondale Police Department and the Southern Illinois University Security Police;" cooperation between the City of Carbondale and the university "to insure the adequacy of student housing;" the institution of regular town meetings; and that "guidelines for police action and crowd control be developed and adequately communicated to all law enforcement officers, members of the university community and local citizens."²⁷ This report was a solid contribution, one of the most comprehensive examinations of an Illinois university, and its recommendations have been followed not only at SIU but at other Illinois colleges and universities.

Simon, of course, did many other things during his service as lieutenant governor. When the 1970 general election left the Illinois State Senate evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, Simon gained the tie-breaking vote. He acted, as *Chicago Today* noted, with “tact, diplomacy and fairness from the podium of an evenly divided chamber.”²⁸ He also served, during the first two and one-half years he was in office, as acting governor for 161 days, since he assumed that duty under the old state constitution. He worked closely with Governor Ogilvie, though he criticized the Republican program whenever he felt it necessary.

The office of lieutenant governor gave Simon a highly visible political forum and he used it effectively. He spoke at Democratic gatherings from one end of the state to the other, worked very hard to help the statewide Democratic ticket of Stevenson, Alan Dixon, and Michael Bakalis win the offices of U.S. Senator, State Treasurer and State Superintendent of Public Instruction in the 1970 election, and endorsed Mayor Richard Daley’s re-election bid in Chicago in 1971.²⁹

Paul Simon had been pointing to the 1972 gubernatorial race since his election as lieutenant governor four years earlier. He was a natural candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor in 1972, but not the only one. Simon found his road to the Democratic nomination blocked, temporarily so he thought, by Daniel Walker, a political novice who had won fame as the principal author of the Walker Report (the controversial study of the difficulties between the Chicago police and the street demonstrators at the 1968 Democratic National Convention, which used the term “police riot,” to describe the police behavior).

Nonetheless, Simon was the clear favorite and had many high cards in his hands. He was clearly the strongest candidate and both private and public polls showed him as leading Governor Ogilvie. Next, Simon had the solid organized labor backing that any Illinois Democrat needs to

carry a statewide election. Indeed, the State AFL-CIO endorsed his candidacy before the primary, “an unprecedented happening which nevertheless was a legitimate testament to the unions’ high regard for him.” And third, he had been for many years the champion of Illinois’ liberal Democrats, who make it their most important pastime to battle Mayor Daley of Chicago for control of the state Democratic party, almost always unsuccessfully. While Simon described himself as being “liberal about people, but conservative about money,” liberals looked at his 18-year public career and his support for minorities and work against established interests as proof that Simon was one of their standardbearers. Simon had a reputation “for personal integrity and political courage which other reform politicians could only envy.” He was, in short, “the hero of labor, the friend of the farmer, and the darling, as they like to say, of Chicago’s liberals, who regularly voted him their ‘best legislator of the year’ awards.”³⁰

With these high cards in hand, Simon took on the Democratic organization and demanded to be slated as the organization’s candidate, telling them that he would run in the primary whether they slated him or not. Appearing before the slatemakers in early December, 1971, Simon won endorsement, but not without gaining some political scars. There was discussion of Simon’s Harper’s article, “The Illinois Legislature: A Study of Corruption,” and a good deal of confusion as to what Simon and the slatemakers said about it. Michael Kilian, in a long article about Simon in January, 1972 wrote of the discussion: “‘What about it?’, asked one of the slatemakers. ‘I was misquoted,’ said Simon.” This became a controversial issue. The most important, though Simon contends inaccurate, account of the meeting appeared in a column entitled, “Simon Passes a Boss’s Test,” by Mike Royko in the Chicago Daily News. Royko stated that Simon wanted the nomination so badly that he sold out repudiating his past criticisms of political corruption in Illinois.³¹

In any case, Simon was now the slated candidate and was off and running for his party's nomination. In some ways it was a typical Simon campaign, in other ways it bore little resemblance to his normal style. The Simon campaign strategy was clear and never really changed. At the center of the strategy was a decision to run at Olgivie rather than Walker. There was to be as little mention of Walker as possible, and much criticism of the Republican incumbent, developing the themes for the general election. Such a strategy resulted in a refusal to debate Walker, and was clearly the strategy of a frontrunner, a position Simon was unaccustomed to.

The next decision, natural to Simon, was to take stands on the issues. His campaign literature and advertising stressed Simon's experience in dealing with the problems of the state and pointed out his views on many of them. "It's one thing to want change, it's another thing to cause change," noted one Simon pamphlet, pointing to some of the reforms Simon had helped introduce. Fighting for clean air and water, exposing corruption in government, and serving as an ombudsman for the citizens of Illinois, these were the activities of Paul Simon. The main piece of Simon literature was a 24-page booklet entitled, "Paul Simon for Governor: If You're Serious about Change."³² It was the story of Simon, with much biographical material. Most of all it stressed Paul Simon as an issued-oriented politician who had pioneered income disclosure, supported the people's "right to know," taken on the role of environmental activist, and authored much legislation during his service in the Illinois Legislature. With many favorable newspaper quotes from across the state, the brochure presented Simon the reformer to the people. One indication of the confidence, indeed overconfidence, of the Simon campaign was the fact that nowhere on the booklet was the primary even mentioned and many of the booklets were held for distribution during the general election.

A whole series of issue papers and policy stands came from candidate Simon. He called for cleaner politics; rational limits to the state's indebtedness; reform in education, saying, "generally speaking the poorest people in our society get the poorest education"; a revamping of the Illinois prison system; and formation of a consumer protection council that would "initiate legislation, recommend changes in regulations, and help these agencies come out from behind their paperwork to become more sensitive to public need." He also called for regional development in downstate Illinois. He told a gathering in Edwardsville that no town could be prosperous "unless this region is a healthy economic entity." Edwardsville and all other towns in southwestern Illinois had to work to help solve the problems that plagued East St. Louis. Wherever Simon went he had the facts and figures about the region and used them to make his points. This technique proved particularly effective in southern Illinois, where he told audiences about population declines, unemployment increases, doctor shortages, and under-financed schools.³³

Simon took his most controversial stand on February 14, 1972 a little more than a month before the primary election, when he issued a wide-ranging statement, part of which called for tax reform. Billed as a "formal response to the governor's State of the State message," Simon stated his views on transportation, crime, environment and conservation, public aid, health care, and consumer protection in a position paper entitled, "The Real State of the State: Assurances, Realities, Goals."³⁴ Most important of all, he assailed the growing state indebtedness and called for a complete revamping of the Illinois tax system "to distribute the burdens more justly." Specifically, he called for the elimination of the sales tax on food and the personal property tax on "non-income producing property and for farmers." He noted that, "Real estate should no longer bear the heavy burden it does, discouraging property upkeep and taxing farmers, senior

citizens, the ill, the unemployed, and many others unfairly.” He called for a “greater reliance on the income tax, both to guarantee quality educational opportunities for all Illinois children, and to have a fairer tax structure.” Admitting that his proposal meant an increase in the state income tax, he contended that that was the most equitable solution to the financial problems of Illinois. He also promised that under a Simon administration Illinois would pay its own way.

This proposal aroused immediate controversy. He was attacked by both Governor Ogilvie and his primary opponent Dan Walker. Ogilvie said he was “flatly opposed” to Simon’s proposal, noting that the Democrats seemed determined to raise the state income tax. And many thought that Ogilvie had come off better in the “tax battle,” with Simon’s proposal lessening the voters’ memories of Ogilvie’s introduction of the state income tax.³⁵

Dan Walker was even more critical of the proposal. He commented: “Incredibly we are saddled with a governor, Ogilvie, who is overloading us with a colossal deficit budget, and slyly says there will be no tax increase and Lt. Governor Paul Simon, who says besides all our other burdens, we should pay higher income taxes.” Walker seized on this issue in his appearances in late February and early March, forcing Simon to answer his charges. At a Belleville appearance Simon said, “As governor, I would veto any income tax increase that was not accompanied by reductions in other taxes.” When Walker claimed that Simon’s proposal would triple the state’s income tax, the Simon response was that Walker’s remarks were “political hogwash.” Gene Callahan, Simon’s press secretary, said that Simon was not talking “about a bigger tax bite. We’re talking about an overhauling of the archaic tax structure in Illinois.”³⁶

Whatever the response, the Simon proposal caused him difficulties. Why did he feel the need to take the stand? Charles Nicodemus, writing in the Chicago Daily News, wondered, “Is Simon honest to a fault?” Simon himself said, “It was the only honest thing to do.” He noted

that only half of his proposal, the increase in the income tax, received publicity, while the elimination of the sales tax on food and much of the property tax received little or no attention. He told the voters that “through the years, I have tried to speak frankly on issues, telling people unpopular truths, along with the popular.” Still, many politicians asked, as Nicodemus did, “Does Paul Simon still have all his marbles?”³⁷

While Simon was talking around the state issues, almost never mentioning his opponent’s name, Daniel Walker was mentioning Simon at every opportunity. Walker was for all practical purposes a political novice.³⁸ A graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and Northwestern Law School, he served as an administrative aide to Governor Adlai Stevenson and then practiced law in Chicago. In the mid-1960s he became vice president, general counsel and director of Montgomery Ward, and by 1970 was making in excess of \$100,000 annually. In the 1960s he had kept his hand in public affairs, serving on the Chicago Crime Commission and the Illinois Public Aid Commission, but received his greatest public exposure for the Walker Report. Walker began his campaign with a political gimmick. He announced his intention to be a candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor in November 1970, two full years before the general election, and resigned his position at Montgomery Ward. After some preliminary organizational work, he decided to follow the example of Lawton Chiles, who walked his way into a Florida Senate seat in 1970. Walker started a more than 1,000 mile trek throughout Illinois on July 9, 1971 in Brookport in Massac County in southern Illinois, dressed “in what later became his trademark outfit: tan slacks, blue work shirt, red bandana, Dunbar Italian boots.” If plagued by a great name recognition problem that resulted in one voter responding to the question if she had heard of Dan Walker: “Yeah,” she answered, “It’s a Scotch,” his four-month walk was to prove to be very important for Walker. He said: “I didn’t walk to prove I’m

the most physically-fit candidate – although I think I am. I did it to learn the state and talk to the people.”³⁹ The walk was especially important in indicating Walker’s interest in downstate Illinois, which proved essential for his election hopes.

While the walk got Walker statewide attention, it was the campaign themes that won him the election. From the beginning, Walker pictured himself as the people’s candidate and constantly attacked the Chicago machine. Once Simon became the slated candidate, Simon became, in Walker’s words, the machine’s tool. Walker criticized Simon for appearing before the slatemakers, which Walker called “a demeaning experience.” The slatemakers were only interested, Walker contended, in oaths of loyalty and how many patronage jobs a candidate would deliver. Walker refused to appear before the slatemaking committee, saying that he would be a governor “who looks over his shoulder at no one else but the public.” Walker charged that Simon “has tailored his views to those of the Daley machine.” As the campaign reached its final days, Walker emphasized this theme by releasing a letter Simon had written in 1960 blasting the slatemaking tactics “of the Chicago machine.” Simon, in the letter that appeared in the Edwardsville Intelligencer, protested “the method by which my party allows one man to pick the candidates.” Walker wondered if Paul Simon had not changed a good deal since 1960. Walker’s supporters picked this theme up quickly. In the Collinsville Herald, one Walker supporter accused Simon of making a deal with Daley and quoted a North Side Chicago committeeman saying, “Simon gave us assurances he would play ball if elected.” The writer called for Walker’s election as the way to end political corruption in Illinois. Three Democrats, who had supported Simon in his early political career, toured the state in behalf of Walker, saying: “Our message now is that Paul Simon is pretending to be something that he is not, an independent political reformer. There are many people working for him for that reason, but they have been misled.

Gradually over the years, Paul has sold out his principles to satisfy his political ambitions. I guess this does show that some of us were fooled by Paul years ago, but we are showing through our present effort that we have caught up with Paul.”⁴⁰

While Simon vigorously contended that these charges were untrue and that he was his own man, this became a very effective issue for Walker. Many Illinois liberals began to question Simon’s independence. The Independent Voters of Illinois came out for Walker, pointing to Simon’s endorsement of Daley in 1971, his support for a lakefront sports stadium in Chicago, and his refusal to completely condemn President Johnson’s Vietnam policy in 1968. As Michael Kilian wrote in the Chicago Tribune Sunday Magazine, “Politically, liberals tend to be like religious zealots, and it is their nature to deal first with the heretic before turning to the infidel.” Whatever the case, this was Walker’s most effective campaign issue and many articles appeared throughout the state like the one in the Peoria Journal Star that wondered “Has Paul Simon Changed This Much?” Many voters in the state came to believe the blast of Dick Mudge, one of the three ex-Simon supporters who toured Illinois for Walker, “that the Paul Simon running for governor today bears no resemblance to the Paul Simon who ran for the state legislature years ago.”⁴¹

The other attention getter for Walker concerned Simon’s refusal to debate him in the primary campaign. Walker, hoping to gain exposure, had challenged Simon to a series of debates across the state and Simon had accepted but details could not be worked out. Walker’s campaign staff contended that “all along Paul Simon had doubts about the wisdom of debating, that he finally decided to debate and then something happened to convince him he shouldn’t.” Walker himself said that Simon refused “because Mayor Daley does not want him to debate me.” Walker turned to another gimmick and in Rockford on February 2, 1972 Walker debated

Simon's tape-recorded voice. Asking questions of Simon, the moderator played Simon's recorded response, and then asked: "And now, Dan, would you care to respond to that?" Walker proceeded to rip into Simon for "making his peace with the machine"; "reneging on his promises to work for tax reform, not tax increases"; and for refusing to attack Paul Powell. Tom Fitzpatrick, writing in the Chicago Sun Times, thought that the cards were, of course, stacked in the debate but that it was "an effective technique," for Walker. "It's understandable," he continued, "that Paul Simon doesn't want to give Walker a platform on which to propel himself before the public. But he'd better realize how effective this new Walker ploy could become."⁴² While the "debates" never brought out large crowds as Walker conducted them around the state, they did get much publicity for Walker, as they were frequently attended by newspaper reporters, columnists, photographers, television cameramen, broadcasters, and recording people from radio stations, and convinced some Illinoisans that Simon was hiding from Walker.

As the election came near, it appeared that Simon's tactic of not running with Walker was working. While some newspapers were disappointed with both candidates, Simon was endorsed by every major newspaper that made a choice. The Chicago Daily News, Chicago Tribune, and Chicago Sun Times all endorsed Simon, as did the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, with the latter paper calling Simon an "exponent of sane reform." The Southern Illinoisan endorsed Simon because of his "experience and generally exceptional independent thinking," and the Collinsville Herald said: "We are for Simon: Dan Walker is an attractive newcomer, but Simon has earned the nomination; he's on the record, and the record is good."⁴³

The commentators seemed divided about the outcome. Ken Watson of the Copley News Service thought that the voters were apathetic and wrote, "Simon expected to double rival." He

predicted that Simon would get about 650,000 out of the million expected votes. But Taylor Pensoneau, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, thought the race much closer, noting “Simon a Step Ahead in Breakaway Race.”⁴⁴ Would the soft-sell, confident campaign of Simon or the hard-sell, vigorous campaign of Walker, with effective media advertising, win the race?

The voters of Illinois went to the polls on Tuesday, March 21 and made their decision. By Tuesday evening it was clear that an upset was possible. The turnout was much higher than expected and Walker had done much better than expected. By midnight, Walker had squeaked ahead and both camps waited for the final results.

A long wait throughout the night did not change the result. Paul Simon had lost. Simon made his concession speech the day after the election, on Wednesday, March 22. He began by expressing his gratitude to the many who had worked for his candidacy, among them Mayor Daley, “who never asked for any commitments and acted like a gentleman and leader throughout despite the abuse heaped upon him.” He congratulated Walker, pledging his support for the November election. Simon noted, to his supporters, that it was easy in defeat to blame others, but such was rarely accurate. He concluded his concession speech by saying:

I regret the inadequacies of my campaign, inadequacies which others may see more clearly than I do. But I do not regret telling people the truth. I hope I never become so eager for any prize that I corrupt the truth, as vile a corruption as any other.

To those who feel that all is lost, let me remind these good friends that what you supported was not only a man, but a cause. The cause of decency in government, of dignity for all men, needs your continued support, as it will have mine.⁴⁵

What had gone wrong? The final official vote was to show Walker with 735,193 and Simon 694,900, a difference of 40,293. Simon had carried Cook County, but only by about

20,000 votes – 456,441 to 435,484, and had surprisingly lost his homeground, downstate, to Walker, 299,709 to 239,459. All the other slated candidates had won.

The post-mortems began immediately. The Metro-East Journal thought that Walker's campaign strategy was important, especially "his much-publicized walk across the state and the 'debates' with tape recordings of the Simon voice." Other factors, the paper mentioned, were the race in Cook County involving controversial State's Attorney Edward B. Hanrahan, the lack of exciting Republican primaries, the new 18 to 20-year old voters, and the anti-establishment feeling in the state. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch pointed to the fact that "Mr. Walker spent more than a million dollars on his effort, which started out as a people's walk but became a slick, electronic-oriented campaign." And the Collinsville Herald editorialized that the real winner was the Daley machine in Chicago: "For years, the machine had been trying – with no success – to get rid of Paul Simon." Finally, that happened. The Herald questioned the "support" Daley had given Simon.⁴⁶

News reporters had their say too. Jack Flach, writing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, blamed "overconfidence, the lack of an aggressive campaign, a not-too-attractive tv appearance, and a misunderstood tax reform program" for Simon's defeat. Ken Watson of the Copley News Service thought that "the quickest and simplest explanation is the income tax," which he said destroyed Simon. Had Simon not raised that issue, "he probably would still be walking confidently toward the governor's office." But Watson pointed out other factors: the "pent-up voter disgust" with Illinois politicians; the Daley issue; the 18 to 20-year old voters; and the Hanrahan race in Chicago. Taylor Pensoneau, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, concentrated on Simon's poor showing downstate and the "extensive crossover by Republicans to the Democratic side of the primary, many of them to vote for Walker."⁴⁷

In April, the post-mortem continued. In an article in the Arlington Heights Daily Herald, Bob Lahey put forward a number of reasons: Simon's tax proposal; Republican crossovers; and the fact that Simon directed most of his campaign effort against Governor Ogilvie instead of Walker. He further noted that "in the course of a year and a half, Walker established a formidable statewide organization of doorbell ringers and envelope stuffers," and that Walker "apparently succeeded in convincing large numbers of voters, both Republican and Democrat, that Simon was indeed a protégé of Chicago's Mayor Daley." Of all the reasons he cited, Lahey considered the last the most significant. For many Illinoisans, Lahey concluded, the election was an "opportunity to cast a ballot against Daley." The Quincy Herald-Whig thought the tax issue significant, believing Simon had stated the problem "most honestly (however dishonestly his successful opponent, Dan Walker, described it)." The Bensenville Register believed Republican crossovers defeated Simon, at least in DuPage County. Noting that some Republicans crossed over to vote against Daley, while others "voted for Walker because they thought he would be easier to defeat than Simon," the paper asked, "will the real Dan Walker supporters please stand up?" Congressman Roman Pucinski, winner of the Democratic senatorial nomination, believed that one of the reasons Walker won "was that the Simon people underestimated Walker's campaign. And Walker peaked precisely on Election Day." A letter to the Chicago Tribune stated another possible reason. Claiming membership in Americans United for Separation of Church and State, the writer noted that Simon had supported parochial legislation, "giving public tax money to religious operated private schools," while Walker had come out against such aid and supported "the Constitution of the United States on the issue." The writer promised that Americans United for Separation of Church and State would vote against Ogilvie in November, as they had against Simon, because of the Governor's support of such assistance.⁴⁸

Simon's supporters had their say. Mainly they criticized Walker and his campaign methods. In a letter to the Evanston Review, one Simon supporter wrote that "Mr. Walker of course knew that his charges against Paul Simon had no basis in fact. Mr. Walker knew that Paul Simon was not and is not a lackey of the so-called Daley machine...Mr. Walker knew that he was misinterpreting Paul Simon's sound and equitable position on taxation. And yet Mr. Walker persisted throughout the campaign, by innuendo if not by direct statement, in falsifying and distorting Paul Simon's record and position. It is dismaying that the voters did not investigate the facts." Another Simon supporter bemoaned the voters' belief in the "so-called 'sellout' to the Daley organization." And another questioned the support that Illinois liberals gave to Walker. Calling Walker a "Johnny-come-lately to liberal political activism," he noted that it was "unfortunate that Illinois liberals were not able to recognize their true friend. Now their friend is on the sideline and their verbal supporter is in the race."⁴⁹

What did Simon think went wrong? He commented both publicly and privately and his analysis showed a great deal of understanding, albeit too late. In a letter published in many Illinois newspapers, Simon noted the unhappiness that comes from losing: "When you read things about you which are not true, but which many people must have believed, obviously it hurts some." In an interview that appeared in the Springfield Sunday Journal-Register, he stressed the crossovers and the anti-Daley votes: "In Cook County they were crossing over to vote for anti-Daley and anti-organization. One way of doing that was to vote against Paul Simon." Without the crossovers, Simon continued, he would have won, but he admitted that his tax stand (even though it was "completely distorted") hurt him. He discounted the belief that Daley did not work hard enough for him. Simon said he thought Daley did "all that he could for me," though "I think he didn't sense – nor did anyone else and nor did I – what was taking place,

at least to the extent that it was taking place.” In another interview, Simon mentioned Walker’s media campaign: “It’s tough to win when your opponent can outspend you 2-1.”⁵⁰

Perhaps the most perceptive analysis of the election was made by Simon himself, in a letter to his “fellow lieutenant governors.”⁵¹ Simon offered those who were prospective gubernatorial candidates “a few words of wisdom – abusing that word slightly – from a loser.” Simon made four points. First “don’t take any opponent for granted if he is well-financed.” Simon pointed out that while he has been endorsed by all 102 Democratic county chairmen, the AFL-CIO, and a host of others, his “opponent was saturating television with ads which dealt so lightly with the truth that we made the mistake of believing that no one would be deceived by them.” Second, Simon warned the lieutenant governors to “watch out for a candidate who promises more services and lower taxes.” This, Simon pointed out, was an old trick but many people, at least in Illinois, believed it. He recommended that “the candidate who promises what he cannot deliver should be dealt with vigorously.” Simon’s third point was to “make yourself the underdog.” He noted that the constant repetition by the newspapers that Walker had no chance at all “created sympathy for his position.” He also admitted that “if we had taken the candidacy more seriously, we could have done it [become the underdog] by pointing out what he was spending compared to our meager budget.” Finally, Simon warned the lieutenant governors to “recognize that there is an anti-establishment mood, and capitalize on it somehow.” Above all, candidates had to do everything they could to avoid looking “too much like part of the establishment!”

Paul Simon had lost his first election and early 1973 would mean the temporary end to his public career. There was, of course, much immediate speculation about Simon’s future. “Will Paul Simon Return?” the Vandalia Leader wondered. The Leader hoped so, noting that the

“Walker votes were not anti-Simon votes but votes against Chicago Mayor Richard Daley and a protest against taxes, a slap at the so-called establishment, and an expression of general discontent with things as they are.” The Leader felt that Simon would return as a candidate for “governor, U.S. Senator or possibly Congressman.” Ken Watson agreed that Simon would be back.⁵²

What about the 1972 election? Would Simon sit it out? Many of his supporters were furious with Walker for the kind of campaign he ran and there was speculation that his supporters would never work for Walker. Simon himself said he supported Walker and all Democrats, including Cook County State’s Attorney Hanrahan. While Simon felt that Walker had attacked his tax proposal unfairly (“Walker spent eight to 10 times as much as I did on TV ads which said, ‘Don’t let Paul Simon raise your taxes.’”), he said that Walker shared his basic philosophy of government and would “make a good governor.”⁵³

Meanwhile, Simon stayed politically active. He worked to overcome a \$117,000 deficit in his campaign, which had cost a total of \$517,000, compared to Walker’s expenditures of about a million. Fund-raising gatherings were held in May and June to reduce the deficit. Simon was also elected an alternate delegate to the Democratic National Convention, held in the summer of 1972 in Miami Beach, but he did not attend the convention. Simon headed George McGovern’s campaign in Illinois in the 1972 presidential election. A thankless job, Simon again proved his party loyalty and was generally credited with doing as good a job as possible in a losing endeavor. He worked especially hard at overcoming the differences between the party regulars and the McGovern volunteers. After the election, which saw Walker upset Ogilvie in the gubernatorial race, there was even some mention of Simon being named Democratic National Chairman, but Simon indicated that he was not really interested in the post.⁵⁴

He did continue to speak out on politics throughout 1972, making sort of summary observation on his experience in state government in a long article that was entitled, "18 Years of Changing Assembly," and appeared in the Chicago Sun Times, in June, 1972.⁵⁵ "On balance," Simon stated, "there has been an appreciable improvement in the Assembly since the day I entered as a freshman legislator in 1955. There has been a gradual lifting of the caliber of legislator elected, better legislative procedures and improvement in the ethical tone. But there remains substantial room for progress." Simon credited the improvement of the caliber of legislators to the court-mandated reapportionments that began in the mid-1950s. The better legislative procedures came with an improvement of the legislative staff structure. The higher ethical tone resulted as much from fear as from reform. Some politicians had contributed positively to better ethical standards by demanding reform as he had in his 1964 Harper's article. "But credit for improvement also must go to Orville Hodge, Paul Powell and some others, who, through the years, have made unpleasant headlines that have shocked the public and forced some reform." Simon then recommended a number of further reforms, including a reduction of the number of state representatives, which at 177 seemed to him unmanageable; a lessening of the political partisanship that seemed to dominate the state Senate; an upgrading of committee work in the legislative process, which was too often ignored; an elimination of frivolous and duplicate legislation; the requirement that elected legislators be full-time representatives of the people, not holding other jobs; detailed public disclosure of income; a reform of the method of financing campaigns; and more effective control of lobbyists. Most of all, the public had to become alert, sophisticated, and interested, for that "is ultimately the only assurance that the Assembly will concern itself with the public well-being." Finally, good leadership was essential: "That was

true in 1954, when I first entered the political arena. It is true in 1972, when I exit as a public official.”

Early 1973 meant unemployment for Simon but he was not unemployable. He decided not to return to newspaper work, even though he had at one time built up a chain of newspapers in downstate Illinois, and he refused many offers from business. He instead accepted a teaching position in public affairs at Sangamon State University in Springfield. Simon, the author or co-author of six books, was not uncomfortable in academic life and in addition to his duties at Sangamon State, he lectured for a semester at the Kennedy School’s Institute of Politics at Harvard University. The quiet of the classroom allowed Simon to finish, in collaboration with his brother Arthur, his latest book, The Politics of World Hunger, published in 1973. In some ways, it is his most interesting book. The culmination of an interest in the problem of hunger that had previously produced a study entitled, “Too Much Food in a Starving World?” in 1961 and a book, A Hungry World, in 1966; Simon in this book develops the problem of hunger and the widening gap between the rich and poor nations, talks about the models of development for the poor nations, recommends an alternate to current American policy to the hungry nations, and then proposes global development to settle this problem. Noting that many had deplored America’s role in Vietnam, Simon asks: “Can we now, by some contorted logic, believe that it is wrong to pour bombs on innocent people, but permissible to let a thousand times as many go hungry and die through neglect? If so, history will certainly judge the latter to have been a far greater violence against humanity.”⁵⁶ His proposal for the determination of what nations America should aid and how much aid the United States should render is based on a formula: 30 percent need; 20 percent capacity for growth; 20 percent equalization measures; 10 percent respect for civil liberties; 10 percent restraint in military spending; 10 percent population control.

Whatever the formula, Simon argues that the United States must do more to help solve this problem.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS IN THE U.S. HOUSE

While Simon enjoyed teaching, politics remained his first love and when Ken Gray announced that he would not seek re-election in 1974, Paul Simon decided to become a candidate for Congress from the 24th District in Illinois and thus made his announcement of November 14, 1973.

Southern Illinois politics during that same period (1950-1973) was dominated by Gray, and to understand why that domination was possible one must understand the area. The 24th Congressional District of Illinois today is made up of 22 counties. The counties, and their major cities and towns, are: Alexander (Cairo); Bond (Greenville); Clinton (Breese and Carlyle); Franklin (Benton, Christopher and West Frankfort); Gallatin (Shawneetown); Hamilton (McLeansboro); Hardin (Elizabethtown and Rosiclare); Jackson (Carbondale and Murphysboro); Jefferson (Mt. Vernon); Johnson (Vienna); Marion (Centralia and Salem); Massac (Metropolis); Monroe (Columbia and Waterloo); Perry (DuQuoin and Pinckneyville); Pope (Golconda); Pulaski (Mound City and Mounds); Randolph (Chester and Sparta); Saline (Eldorado and Harrisburg); Union (Anna and Jonesboro); Washington (Nashville); White (Carmi); and Williamson (Carterville, Herrin, Johnston City and Marion). The district has changed some of its boundaries in recent years. The Illinois Apportionment Act of 1961 added three counties -- Jefferson, Hamilton, and White, to the district; the 1965 Court Apportionment Plan added four more -- Edwards, Wabash, Washington and Wayne; and the 1971 Apportionment Act replaced Edwards, Wabash and Wayne with Bond, Clinton and Marion Counties. The composition and

tone of what makes up the 24th District today has not altered much in recent years and is dominated by the 15 counties that constituted the 25th Congressional District of Illinois according to the Apportionment Act of 1951. They range from Monroe and Randolph in the northwest, across to Saline and Gallatin in the northeast and down to Alexander, Pulaski, and Massac in the south, where the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers come together, and include in addition Perry, Franklin, Jackson, Williamson, Union, Johnson, Pope and Hardin counties.



These 22 counties cover most of that portion of southern Illinois known as Egypt. The name Egypt, according to a well-known historian of southern Illinois, probably comes from “the winter of the deep snow,” 1830-1831. That severe winter, with late spring frosts, damaged the grain crops, causing a food shortage in the areas north of Franklin County. “Like the sons of Jacob going down to Egypt for corn,” people flocked to the

southern counties of Illinois for foodstuffs, especially grain, thus inspiring the name Egypt.⁵⁷ It is an area of great natural beauty, with the Shawnee National Forest a renowned tourist attraction and the tip of the district, at the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, the nation’s two largest rivers, only one of the many spots of beauty and wonderment. It is also an area that is rich in history, much of it tragic. Cairo served as the spot from which General Ulysses S. Grant launched his invasion of the South during the Civil War. Franklin and Marion Counties have seen some of the nation’s worst coal mining disasters, with one in 1914 killing 52 miners in Franklin County and another in 1947 killing 111 miners near Centralia in Marion County.

Shawneetown, founded in 1797, served as the gateway to the settlement of the Illinois territory, and Kaskaskia, in Randolph County, as the first capital of Illinois. From Cave-In-Rock, located in Hardin County, pirates preyed upon 19th century boat travelers from a hideout in a cave overlooking the Ohio River. From Fort Massac, on the Ohio River in Massac County, George Rogers Clark marched across Illinois to capture the British at Kaskaskia in 1778. The DuQuoin State Fair annually stages the Hambletonian trotting classic, very near where the Perry County strip mines are worked day and night by some of the largest mechanized shovels in the world. Near Prairie Du Rocher, in Randolph County, is Fort Chartres State Park, on the site of the strongest French military post in the Midwest, first built in 1720. Jonesboro saw one of the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates in 1858 and Herrin became known as the center of “Bloody Williamson,” because of the Herrin Massacre, June 22, 1922, when violence between striking miners and strike-breakers resulted in more than 20 deaths.

The 22 counties make up one of the most interesting and certainly one of the largest, in terms of size, congressional districts in the nation. The district covers about one-sixth of the state of Illinois and is larger than the states of Connecticut, Rhode Island and Delaware combined. The drive from Salem in the north of the district to Cairo in the south is nearly 150 miles and from Shawneetown in the east to Chester in the west is almost 100 miles.

Much about the district is indicated by the fact that it contained 9 counties in 1947, 15 in 1951, 18 in 1961, and 22 after 1965. In contrast to other areas of the state, which have shown remarkable population growths, these counties, with few exceptions, have either had small gains in populations or decreases. The population of the 22 counties grew by 2.4 percent, up to 465,107, between 1960 and 1970, compared to a 10.2 growth for the state.⁵⁸ Indeed, twelve of the counties – Alexander, Bond, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Johnson, Perry, Pope, Pulaski,

Union, Washington, and White – had fewer residents in 1970 than they had in 1900.⁵⁹ The largest town in the district is Carbondale, with a population of little more than 25,000, a goodly number of whom are students at Southern Illinois University. More than 55 percent of the people live in small towns and rural areas, compared to only 17 percent for the state. The population density of the district is 51.3 people per square mile, while Illinois averages 199.4.

There are other general population statistics that say much about the area. Almost 15 percent of the people are 65 or older, against the statewide average of less than 10 percent, with approximately 70,000 residents 65 or older in southern Illinois. In five counties, Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Saline and Pope, there are more than 18 percent of the people who are 65 or older. The non-white population is less than 4 percent, while the state non-white population is 12.8 percent. The district generally is made up of an aging white population, largely descendents from settlers who came across the Ohio River from Kentucky and Tennessee. Egypt has historically had a more homogenous population than any other section of the state. In 1860, for example, while the foreign-born population constituted 19 percent of the total of the state, the then 9th Congressional District, representing much of the current 24th, had only 4.9 percent foreign-born. Of the 9,342 persons living in Johnson County in 1860, more than resided there in 1970, only 44 had been born outside of the United States.⁶⁰ Because of the sorts of people who settled in the region, Egypt, much of which lies farther south than Richmond, Virginia, has historically had a southern flavor. There were many Copperheads in the area during the Civil War, and “Dixie is manifested here in the people’s accents, in the cotton fields in the Little Egypt area, and in the virtual state of war between blacks and whites in Cairo.”⁶¹ In sum, the region is southern in origin, Protestant in religion, and conservative in politics.

The district is also among the poorest in the country, with the lowest mean family income (\$7,501) in Illinois, and twice the statewide average of families with income below the poverty level, 15.4 percent to the state's average of 7.7 percent. Such a district has, as a result, many problems. High unemployment, with 17 of the 22 counties having 6 percent or more unemployment in 1970; poor housing, with more overcrowding, more plumbing deficiencies, and fewer conveniences (telephones, televisions, home freezers, and pipe-running water) than statewide averages; bad medical facilities, with an average of 1,435 people per doctor, compared to the state's average of 725, and some counties with no hospitals and only one doctor.

Also large numbers of people on public aid, with 15 of the 20 counties in the state that had more than 7 percent of their citizens on public aid in 1971 in the district; a median average of school-years completed that is two full years below the state average, 10.1 to 12.1, with only 40 percent of the people completing high school, compared to the state's average of 53 percent; and an outmigration of young people to the rest of the state and nation, with more than 100,000 people leaving the district between 1940 and 1970.

That led Professor Ray Wakeley of Southern Illinois University to write that "outmigration has been an outstanding characteristic of population change in southern Illinois since 1940," –these are the characteristics of southern Illinois.⁶² Some individual counties are statistical disaster areas, with Alexander County having 25 percent fewer people in 1970 than it had in 1960 and currently having 27.3 percent of its citizens on public aid; with more than 20 percent of the residents of Hamilton County being 65 or older; with Hardin and Pope Counties each having only one doctor; and with Pulaski County having an assessed evaluation per pupil, for primary and secondary education, of \$6,220, compared with the statewide average of \$31,417, and having 35.7 percent of its people living below the poverty level.

Part of the reason for all of the problems is that the majority of economic activity in the 22 counties is still of, what the economists call, a primary nature, that is the extraction of raw materials, particularly agricultural goods and minerals, where coal leads the way. Much less of the economic life of the area has moved on to the manufacturing stage, and even less to the most advanced, or service-oriented, stage. Less than 20 percent of the working people of southern Illinois are involved in manufacturing, compared to more than 30 percent for the state, and the district has a much higher percentage than the state of people involved in agriculture and mining. Historically, the district has always lagged behind the state and nation economically. The pattern was set in the 19th century, when agriculture dominated the region's economy. In 1860, the then 9th Congressional District had 8.8 percent of the state's people, but produced only 6.3 percent of Illinois' manufactured products and possessed only 5.2 percent of the state's real and personal estate. One historian has pointed out that "in 1860 there were 1,182 farms in Illinois larger than 500 hundred acres; only twenty of these were in the Ninth."⁶³ The statewide average for farm acreage considered unimproved was 37.4 percent in 1860, but 66 percent in southern Illinois, and the area contained only 5.5 percent of the cash value of farms in Illinois. As a result, back well into the 19th century the area was one of subsistence living. Poverty was a well-known resident of Egypt.

Politically, the district had remained remarkably stable, given all of its problems. It (again referring to the main body of the district) was represented in Congress in Washington by only three men from 1931 to 1975. Kent Keller, a Democrat from Ava, served from 1931 to 1941, when he was succeeded by Cecil W. "Runt" Bishop, a Republican from Carterville, who held office from 1941 to 1955, when he was followed by Gray, the West Frankfort Democrat,

who stayed in Congress for the next 20 years. It is interesting to note that Bishop knocked Keller out of office in the election of 1940 and, in turn, was defeated himself in 1954 by Gray.

The economy of the district had much influence over the politics in the area. Never a prosperous area, it was in the 1920s that the economy and politics of southern Illinois came together for good. The successive shocks of declining coal production and the Great Depression profoundly affected life in Egypt, introducing a sort of depression of psychology that judged politicians on the amount of local, state and federal assistance they were able to generate.

The coal industry dominated the economy of the area in the first quarter of the twentieth century. With large coal deposits in Franklin, Williamson, Perry, Saline, Randolph and Jackson Counties, southern Illinois moved to a coal economy by about the year 1900. Employment in the mines of southern Illinois increased from about 2,000 in 1908 to about 30,000 during the peak years of production in the mid-1920s. Coal mining so dominated the economy that nearly one out of every four citizens was a coal miner in Franklin and Williamson Counties, two of the district's most populace counties. The miners, highly organized by unions, earned a minimum of \$7 a day in the first half of the 1920s, a good wage for that period.⁶⁴

But by the 1920s, when the southern Illinois mines reached their peak production, the coal markets began to decline. Natural gas and petroleum became serious competitors for both domestic and industrial markets, and the railroads, the greatest single user of the bituminous coal mined in the area, made such great technological advances that they improved "the efficiency of their coal burning by one-fourth." Coal companies decided to close some mines and mechanized others in order to cut costs. "The net effect was widespread layoffs of miners and growing economic distress."⁶⁵ By 1927, a depression had come to the coal mining industry in southern Illinois, with nearly five thousand miners out of work in Franklin, Williamson and Saline

Counties alone. The miners reacted with the anger that had surfaced earlier in the 1920s in the famous Herrin Massacre, and southern Illinois saw the rise of lawlessness, corruption, large scale gangsterism and vigilante groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan, so much a part of history of the area in the 1920s.⁶⁶

To be sure this economic decline was just part of a statewide trend that saw the number of coal miners in Illinois decrease from 103,566 in 1923 to 48,464 in 1933, and even further to 32,852 in 1943 and 18,945 by 1953, but its effects in Egypt were staggering. The 1930 Census, taken before the full effects of the national depression set in, showed Franklin County with the “highest unemployment rate of any county in the United States.” And that county along with Williamson and Saline Counties all having four times the national average of unemployment.⁶⁷

On top of the coal decline, came the stock market crash of 1929 and the Great Depression itself, which affected other sectors of the economy of Egypt. Agriculture, following national trends, was exceptionally hard hit. “Production fluctuated, but prices declined drastically. Tenancy and farm debt grew rapidly while the size of the average farm decreased and the number of people on the land increased.” Many farmers in Egypt, in 1932 and 1933, found that the price “they could obtain for their crops was less than the cost of harvesting. The result was that they let the crops rot in the fields and had almost no income those years.”⁶⁸

Other indicators show how southern Illinois “was crippled by the Depression—worse than nearly any other part of the country.” Fewer than half of its 144 banks in 1929 survived the Depression, statistics among the worst in the nation, where the average was only 31 percent failure. Some communities simply had no banking service, with Marion, a town of about 10,000 having no bank between 1930 and 1937. Indeed, for a period of time all of Williamson County was without a bank. The real estate market in southern Illinois collapsed as people were unable

to continue paying on their houses and the number of foreclosures increased dramatically. Tax delinquency and heavy municipal debts were other problems, with resulting cuts in municipal services, such as the closing of schools in some towns in the district. In 1931, in Marion “four prisoners escaped from the jail because the city could not pay a jailer to guard them.”⁶⁹

Mining communities, such as Benton, West Frankfort, and Marion, “were the hardest hit of all southern Illinois towns.” But all areas of the district suffered. In Anna, with both farming, especially fruit orchards, and a state mental institution, there was much distress. Unemployment, bank failures, tax defaulting, all of the signs of the Depression appeared, though not as severely as in the coal areas. Carbondale, with both a main terminal of the Illinois Central Railroad and Southern Illinois Normal University, had less difficulty than many areas in the district, but even there were hundreds of families without support and children “in the public schools, especially the segregated black schools, were without adequate clothing and shoes.” Cairo, at the southernmost tip of the district, saw its diversified economy crumble and had hunger bad enough to drive “many people into the alleys to search through garbage for food.”⁷⁰ Whatever small recovery Cairo had made by 1937 was wiped out by a devastating flood that year.

In short, “an area which was already poor suffered terribly during the Great Depression,” and residents of Egypt still talk of what life was like in the late 1920s and 1930s.⁷¹ In fact, in many respects the area has never really recovered from the twin shocks of the declining coal production and the nationwide Depression and as a result the depression psychology lives on.

Given all these economic problems, it was not surprising that a Republican area – one that voted Republican in its congressional elections every year from 1902 to 1928, except for 1912, the year of the split in the Republican Party – would initially blame the Republicans. In 1930, Republican Congressman Edward E. Denison, a native of Williamson County, who had

served in the House of Representatives since 1915, campaigned for re-election by telling the hungry, unemployed people of Egypt that the Republican administration in Washington was handling the crisis well and that southern Illinoisans needed patience.

Denison was opposed by Kent Keller, the Democrat from Ava in Jackson County, a graduate of Southern Illinois Normal University, who had taught school, practiced law and served a term in the State Senate (1913-1917). Keller had many liabilities. He was 63-years old, had supported Herbert Hoover in the 1928 election, and had little backing from local politicians, who unsuccessfully opposed him in the primary. But he did call for action. He campaigned on a pledge to work for large-scale public works and relief programs, which alone, he believed, could cope with the massive unemployment and suffering in the district. In a speech entitled, "Unemployment, Its Cause and Cure," delivered in Marion, January 29, 1930, Keller insisted that when industry failed to provide employment the federal government had to create jobs, through programs of public improvement "that would not only provide countless jobs for the unemployed, but would also provide new canals, harbor improvements, public highways and buildings and river improvements." He criticized the Hoover administration and Denison for failing to enact such a program. Keller ran on a slogan of "A Million Jobs For a Million Men," and the people of southern Illinois reacted like much of the rest of the country, by deciding to send a Democrat, Keller, off to Washington to help clear up the mess.⁷²

Keller served 10 years in the Congress, being re-elected in 1932, 1934, 1936 and 1938, before being defeated in 1940. He became part of a coalition in the House known as the "liberal block," and his voting record was much more liberal than the sentiments of the residents of southern Illinois. He supported legislation that raised income, estate and gift taxes; voted for increased benefits for veterans, labor, the unemployed, and the elderly; helped bring the creation

of the various New Deal relief agencies, such as the Public Works Administration and authored the Railroad Retirement Pension Act of 1934, which the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional in 1934. He also fought for the Social Security Act; defended academic freedom for teachers; cheered President Franklin Roosevelt's Supreme Court "Packing Plan"; attacked the Dies Committee, the House Un-American Activities Committee, for launching what he termed a witch hunt on organized labor; and even championed civil rights legislation for Negro Americans. Many of these views were opposed by his constituents but they kept him in office because he was working for the district. As Keller wrote in 1935, he was "struggling to get money...to put men to work in my district" and found himself "chasing from one department to another, persuading, pleading...for my beloved Egypt."⁷³

Keller was credited for the help that the New Deal relief agencies gave to the area. But Keller saw that this was only a temporary solution to Egypt's problems. He believed that prosperity would come to southern Illinois only if the coal mining industry was reinvigorated and that could only be done "by reducing the cost of transporting the coal or by securing manufacturing plants that would use the coal near the mines." His plan for Egypt's future "proceeded along two lines, both requiring public works projects."⁷⁴ The first called for the substitution of rail with water transportation and thus Keller wanted the canalization of the Big Muddy River. Unable to convince the Army Corps of Engineers of the feasibility of this project, he called for the building of dams in the Crab Orchard Creek region, producing a "little T.V.A.," that would produce cheap electric power and attract industry to southern Illinois. He argued that the Crab Orchard projects would produce jobs, create a wildlife refuge, build a recreation site, and construct the beginnings of an industrial base. It was not until 1936 that he got administrative approval for any work in the area, and construction of a dam on Crab Orchard

Creek did not begin until October, 1937. Progress was slow, especially as the Crab Orchard project was shifted from the Resettlement Administration to the Farm Security Administration then to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and finally to the Soil Conservation Service. This bureaucratic tangle, plus local farmer opposition, delayed the completion of the dam that created Crab Orchard Lake until December, 1939. Meanwhile, Keller worked for more dams to create Little Grassy and Devil's Kitchen Lakes, with funds not being released for construction of these projects until October, 1940.

But by 1940 Keller was in political trouble. Progress on his projects had been so slow that many southern Illinoisans came to wonder if they were not just giant boondoggles. The Carterville Herald referred to the projects as "Keller's Folly." Further, Keller's activities in Washington, especially his attack on the Dies Committee, caused alarm in the district. Then, too, President Roosevelt had lost much of his popularity in the district, especially after the fight over the Supreme Court. Finally, in 1940, the Republicans chose an effective opponent, Cecil W. (Runt) Bishop.⁷⁵

Bishop, a native of Johnson County and a tailor by trade, was city clerk of Carterville from 1915 to 1918 and then postmaster there from 1923 to 1933. He began his campaign for Congress early in 1940, using the many contacts he had built up since 1933 as a Special Representative of the Lions International in the Middle West. Bishop criticized Keller for attacking the Dies Committee, stressed the fact that Keller was over seventy-years of age, while he was only fifty, labeled Keller a "perfect rubber stamp for the New Deal," and pointed out that while the New Deal had brought some relief, unemployment had tripled during the decade in Egypt. He also blasted Keller for the removal of farmers caused by the Crab Orchard Lake construction. Bishop promised "to stand up at all times for America first and fight all

Communistic and fifth column activity.” He also pledged to protect homes and jobs in southern Illinois, to see that there was less politics in the relief agencies, and to display “an encouraging attitude towards business and industry to enable them to employ more men.” Armed with the support of the region’s American Legion, which objected to Keller’s fight with the Dies Committee, and many endorsements from area papers, such as the Carterville Herald, Bishop beat Keller, but only by a little more than a thousand votes in the 1940 election, as the district returned to its Republican tradition.⁷⁶

Bishop served seven terms in Congress, from 1941 to 1955, but the economic troubles in the area remained. Unemployment continued to be high, as machines replaced men in the coal mines and on the farms, with agricultural employment, as an example, decreasing by more than 13,000 between 1940 and 1960. There had been over 100,000 coal miners in Illinois in 1923 but by 1953 that number was down to only 18,000 in the whole state, with a little more than half of them in southern Illinois. By 1950 there were about 30,000 people in the district who were unemployed, almost 10 percent of the entire population.

Bishop, off in Washington, seemed of little help. A Republican Congressman during a Democratic era could point to little in the way of assistance he gave the district. His committee assignments were puzzling, for he jumped from one committee to another, as a result never building up the seniority that would have helped the district. He served on Committees for Census, Public Buildings and Grounds, Mines and Mining, Library, Armed Services, House Administration, but the longest he served on any of them was four terms (House Administration), and he seemed unable to utilize his assignment in a way to gain votes back home. While Bishop won re-election in 1942, 1944, 1946, 1948 and 1950, running against Keller every time but 1946, his margin of victory slipped in each election, going from 9,557 in 1942 to 2,548 in 1950. The

expansion of the district from 9 to 15 counties, absorbing counties in the eastern portion of southern Illinois, and the Eisenhower landslide, upped his margin to 19,565 in 1952, but it was clear that the voters were beginning to feel that Bishop's aid to the area – to bring a final solution to the problems resulting from the coal decline and the Depression – was slight.



It was into this situation that Kenneth J. Gray walked, or more properly ran, in 1954, though not yet 30-years old. Gray, born November 14, 1924 in West Frankfort, was educated in West Frankfort and Pope County elementary schools and then graduated from West Frankfort Community High School. He was in the armed services during World War II, from January 1943 until December 1945, and saw action as a crew chief with the Twelfth Air Force in North Africa and southern France and with the combat engineers of the Fifth Army in Italy, sustaining wounds in combat in Corsica. After the war he returned to West Frankfort, where he entered the automobile business with his father, who owned Gray Motors, a Chrysler-Plymouth agency there. He also operated an air service in Benton from 1948 to 1952, using his experience as a pilot, and made a local reputation as a licensed auctioneer. Gray was active in community service, as a vice-president of the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce and as a member of the American Legion Veterans of Foreign Affairs, Kiwanis Club and Fraternal Order of the Eagles.⁷⁷

He became interested in politics at an early age and in 1946 helped Clyde Choate win his first term in the Illinois House of Representatives by serving as Chairman of a “Veterans for Choate” group. In 1950, he sought the Democratic nomination to run again Republican Congressman Bishop. Backed by the American Legion, he ran a close race, losing to ex-Congressman Keller by just over 1000 votes. This was a remarkable showing for a 25-year old

unknown, and proved to party leaders that he could win votes. He sat out the 1952 election, sensing the Republican landslide, but in 1954 was a candidate again.

And 1954 proved to be different. Gray was unopposed in the primary and southern Illinois geared up for a Gray-Bishop race in the fall of 1954. Beginning in the summer of 1954, Gray displayed for the first time the campaign style that was to dominate southern Illinois for the next twenty years. He took every opportunity to gain the attention of the voters. He used his talents as an auctioneer, volunteering for fund-raising drives for the Red Cross, the March of Dimes and other charitable organizations. He began in July to make personal appearances in all the counties of the district, accompanied by the popular gospel singers, the Prophets' Quartette. He brought some distinguished non-southern Illinoisans into the area to endorse his candidacy and criticized the incumbent Congressman. Both Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana and Governor Frank Clement of Tennessee, the latter who gained fame as the keynote speaker at the 1952 Democratic national convention, came to southern Illinois, with Governor Clement telling Franklin County voters about Bishop: "I don't know a Congressional district in the United States where a congressman has the reputation of doing less for his people."⁷⁸ Gray also used television and newspaper advertising to get his message across to the people, staging several 30-minute television programs in the last month before the election and using half-page newspaper ads to announce his personal appearances and television programs, and to blast away at Congressman Bishop, a man who was more than twice Gray's age.

Gray's message was that Bishop was a "do-nothing" Congressman, whose fourteen years in Washington had resulted in no benefits for southern Illinois. Things would be different should the voters elect Gray. He went on the offensive against Bishop in the beginning of the campaign and stayed there. Stressing Bishop's inactivity, and the area's continued economic problems, he

hammered away at Bishop day after day. He stated that if he got “one new job for southern Illinois it will be one more than Bishop has gotten,” and added that it “has cost the taxpayers 14 million dollars to keep Bishop in Congress. Have you gotten your money’s worth?” He noted that even the Republicans were embarrassed about Bishop’s record. It was time, Gray concluded, that the voters “realize he is no longer good for the district.” He combined his attacks on Bishop with promises, should he be elected. He pledged “to fight for securing of jobs for the district’s 30,000 idle workers, work for the completion of Devil’s Kitchen dam and the building of Rend Lake; fight to raise the income tax exemptions from \$600 to \$800; give the farmers a square deal; support REA, Rural Telephone and related programs 100 percent; and support the expansion of Marion Veterans Hospital by at least fifty beds.” His message was that southern Illinois could break from its cycle of poverty only by getting more federal support for the district and he promised to “knock on every door in Washington until something is done about it.”⁷⁹

Curiously Bishop did not run a vigorous campaign. He chose not to respond to Gray’s charges. Perhaps confident with his 19,000 plurality in 1952, Bishop spoke of his seniority and ran general ads noting his service to all groups. He also stressed his ability to work with Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

All of these factors relating to Bishop’s campaign strategy influenced the election. But the most decisive factor was Gray’s strategy, which appealed to the citizens in a district where unemployment continue to rise – going up 50 percent between 1953 and 1954 in 6 counties. The voters of southern Illinois, long used to poverty, had waited for relief from the harshness of the Depression and looked at the economic recovery that the New Deal, World War II, and the Korean War brought to other sections of the state and the nation. They wondered why so little recovery had come to southern Illinois. The Southern Illinoisan, in its endorsement of Gray on

November 1, 1954, spoke for many citizens of the district.⁸⁰ The Southern Illinoisan noted that “Cong. C. W. (Runt) Bishop hasn’t missed a vote during the 14 years he has been in Congress. During that time he has authorized one bill that became law.” The Southern Illinoisan thought that was “not a very good record.” The paper criticized Bishop for opposing increased personal income tax deductions; for supporting the granting of atomic energy monopolies to a few corporations; for opposing public housing construction bills; and for voting against increased unemployment compensation. It also condemned his record concerning local service, saying that “there is no industry in the district that we know of which can be credited to our Congressman.” The Southern Illinoisan concluded: “we need jobs in southern Illinois and we need a representative in Congress who will work at getting new industry to provide jobs. He needs to do more than just appear at every roll call. Southern Illinois cannot afford another two years of ‘do-nothing’ representation in Congress. It is time to change to Kenneth Gray.” On Election Day, 1954, the voters showed their agreement with the views of the Southern Illinoisan by voting 69,562 to 62,659 to send Kenneth J. Gray to Washington.

So in January, 1955 Gray began what was to turn into a twenty-year congressional career that stressed “bringing home the bacon” to southern Illinois, a message that was particularly effective in an area still suffering from the effects of the Depression and feeling increasingly ignored by an urban-oriented state government. Selected as a member of the House Committee on Public Works in his first term, the committee with jurisdiction over projects relating to harbors and rivers, dams and bridges, navigation and internal waterways, federal buildings, highways, and water pollution, Gray worked hard for southern Illinois and let the people back home know of his activities. In the end, by the time he announced his retirement, he was a political legend who could cite \$4 billion of expenditures, mainly from the federal government,

brought into the area, \$800 million more than the district paid in taxes during those years, prompting the Nader Study of Congress to proclaim Gray the “Pork Barrel Prince.” Many were “physical, easy-to-see, politically beneficial projects; such as, federal office buildings, post offices, a federal prison, water and sewer system improvements, public housing, river basin improvements, major lakes, interstate highways, recreation and tourism developments.”⁸¹ There was \$400 million for highways (Interstate Highways 24, 57 and 64); \$200 million for low income and elderly housing; a \$15 million federal prison, with an annual payroll of \$4 million and 150 new federal buildings, especially new post offices. Also, \$75 million for airport improvements; \$50 million for local water and sewer facility improvements; \$50 million for the construction and improvement of health facilities and increased Social Security and black lung benefits, now totaling \$22 million annually. Also, massive Army Corps of Engineer projects, such as the Kaskaskia water system, including 56 miles of barge canals, which cost \$200 million, and the \$54 million Rend Lake inner-city water system; and the locating of 100 new industries with over 25,000 employees in the district. The list, that Gray and his supporters cite, goes on and on.⁸² Even Gray’s opponents rarely challenged the list but argued “whether or not the federal projects Gray obtains are needed and whether or not they serve the purposes for which they were intended effectively and without incidental damage to the environment,” though some of his opponents contended that Gray claimed credit for more than he deserved. The Nader Study noted in 1972 that “there is no doubt that Gray is a master of the pork barrel and that his constituents, who are dependent on his talents, are pleased with his performance.”⁸³

Such success, however, did not come quickly for Gray and his district. Gray understood that action was necessary and he held, right after the election in 1954, what he called the “sink or swim” meeting in West Frankfort, with city and county officials, businessmen and civic leaders

from all over the district. He wanted to hear their beliefs on what was needed to save southern Illinois. “Over 9,000 people responded to his invitation and attended the meeting and brought with them their problems consisting of streets, housing, job opportunity, education, water and sewer, recreation, and health facilities.”⁸⁴

With these views in mind, Gray sought assignment to the Public Works Committee, because he “thought he could bring benefits in the form of federal subsidies and outlays to his district.”⁸⁵ He believed that federal projects were the only way to combat the unemployment in his district. Eventually, he became the 5th ranking member of the 37-member Public Works Committee, as well as the Chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee and a member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Small Watersheds and Rivers and Harbors. Gray found progress slow in the beginning, especially in his first term. It was almost two months before he participated in a debate in the House, at which time he stated his support for a proposed \$20 per person income tax cut. In the same debate he noted the depressed state of his district and demanded that the Eisenhower Administration “talk about reviewing the human budget instead of the monetary budget.” Two months later, on May 25, 1955, in endorsing the distribution of surplus commodities to the needy, he again talked of Egypt:

I come from southern Illinois where there are 30,000 able-bodied men and women out of work, 25,000 receiving Government surplus food. It pleases me to be able to stand up and speak out at every opportunity I might have, to do something, whether it might be in a small way or large way, to help those suffering people.

I say to you this afternoon very, very sincerely I believe this bill is one that will be good for the people, it is a bill that will help alleviate some of the suffering of the people in my district by giving them bread upon the table.⁸⁶

His district and its problems became the persistent theme of Gray's activities in Congress, one he was to repeat time and time again. The first bill he introduced into Congress, H.R. 2397, 84th Congress, would have helped his district. It was "to amend Title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits may become payable." Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, but never acted on, it was typical of the sort of legislation Gray was interested in. Other bills that he introduced in his first session would have meant much to southern Illinois. One called for amending the Railroad Retirement Act "to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of certain benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act." Another would have granted all honorably discharged veterans of World War I, 60-years or older, a pension of \$100 a month; and a third, H.R. 5374, would have encouraged "the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and Possessions," a bill that would have certainly helped southern Illinois since the majority of the fluorspar in the United States is in Hardin County. None of these bills became law, but Gray was clearly working for his district.⁸⁷

The second session of the 84th Congress went much the same way. On the opening day of that session, Gray introduced a bill, H.R. 7902, to help alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in economically depressed areas. During that session he supported the Import Quota Bill, with its provisions on oil, to preserve the coal industry in southern Illinois, and condemned the Interstate Commerce Commission's plan to raise railroad freight-rates. He also called for the location of a proposed federal prison in southern Illinois, supported the Federal Highway Construction Program, and favored an increase in veteran's benefits, projects that held out potential help for Egypt. Unsuccessful with his own legislation, he sought from the House

floor to add amendments to the 1956 Public Works Appropriations Bill to provide: “\$75,000 for a study of canalization of the Big Muddy River, Ill., \$50,000 for a study of flood control of Cache River, Ill., and \$25,000 for study of flood control in Harrisonville and Ivy Landing District No. 2, Monroe County, Ill.” Narrowly rejected on a House roll call, 120 to 111, Gray then turned to the technique of using the omnibus budget bills to secure federal projects for his district.⁸⁸ Gray was learning how the House of Representatives worked.

By the end of his first term, he issued his report card, saying that it called for his re-election. Through the omnibus budget bills, he contended that he secured \$4,300,000 for the Devil’s Kitchen project and \$3,000,000 for 1956-1957, for flood control in the district; obtained government surplus property for the area; and helped acquire federal funds for hospitals, rural electrification cooperatives, airports, a Federal Court House building in Benton, and the Shawnee National Forest, as well as federal loans for housing at Southern Illinois University. He also noted his support for a law that lowered the Social Security retirement age from 65 to 62, and an anti-pollution law that would bring federal money into the district.⁸⁹ The voters agreed that he had a good report card, re-electing him in 1956.

Always the problems of the district were uppermost in his mind. As he candidly stated many years later to the Nader investigating team: “On a priority basis my district comes first and the national priority comes second.” Gray’s legislative record, in his twenty years in Congress, showed that he sponsored or co-sponsored more than 600 pieces of legislation, not including the federal projects authorized in the omnibus budget bills. The categories displayed his interests: 121 involved public works; 63 were relief bills; 40 concerned education and health; 28 had to do with pension and veterans affairs; 25 dealt solely with southern Illinois; 22 covered coal or other kinds of mining; and 19 pertained to social security. His voting record showed much the same

tendencies, with Gray always supporting legislation that would aid miners, veterans, public aid recipients, farmers, the elderly and school children, with his votes solidifying “the blocs of voters upon whom he could consistently depend for re-election.”⁹⁰

Over the years Gray’s ability to bring home the bacon increased as his seniority grew and his friendships with the Congressional leadership became firmer. One of his major victories for the district in the early portion of his Congressional career occurred in 1960 when the Bureau of Prisons selected a site near Crab Orchard Lake as the first choice for a new federal maximum-security prison. Skillfully Gray amended the 1960 Judiciary Appropriation Bill to provide “for construction of a maximum-security institution on a site to be selected by the Attorney General.” The Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, was later to write Gray, “The construction of the Federal Prison in your district would not have been considered by the House if it had not been for your hard work, influence and popularity.”⁹¹ Another major victory for Gray came in 1961 with the passage of the Area Redevelopment Bill “to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to certain economically depressed areas,” a bill he introduced into the House as H.R. 361. While the Senate version, introduced by Paul Douglas and others, became Public Law 87-27, this was the same bill that Gray had introduced in his first term in Congress and one he had long fought for. The bill permitted the Secretary of Commerce to make public facility loans, of up to 100 percent of a project’s cost, to help establish or expand commercial or industrial facilities. It also provided for Urban Renewal Grants.⁹² This bill eventually provided much help for southern Illinois.

Gray’s increasing influence in Congress in the 1960s was evident from the changing nature of the Army Corps of Engineers expenditures in Illinois, a particularly interesting

development. Using his growing seniority on the Public Works Committee and the argument that his district bounded by the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and containing four river basins, was subjected to intermittent flooding and drought, Gray was able to dramatically increase the Corps' Illinois funds spent in his district. In 1962, Gray's district received only 8 percent of the Corps' Illinois budget, but by 1965 it had risen to 22 percent, by 1968 it was 60 percent, and in 1970, the district received 75 percent of the \$46.5 million Corps appropriation for work in Illinois. In a position, by the late 1960s, to decide the fate of much public construction, Gray was able to get support for his pet projects. As one House member stated: "If a congressman wants a new post office in Arizona, he votes for a reservoir in Southern Illinois." Some criticized a number of these Corps projects as unnecessary, with the proposed \$228 million project calling for 73 reservoirs and 1,000 miles of channel improvement in the Big Muddy Basin being the most controversial. Gray's contention, accepted by many of his constituents, was that such projects brought improvements which resulted in corporations such as General Tire and Kaiser Aluminum settling in southern Illinois. And the Nader report seemed to agree, by noting in 1972 that "if Gray's constituents are at all upset about the effects of water resources projects on their district, they are either extremely reticent, or they believe that the damages are outweighed by the economic benefits."⁹³ In short, the majority of southern Illinoisans saw the Corps projects as just another aspect of Gray's bringing home the bacon, which increased federal spending in his district from about \$17 million in 1955 to \$432 million in 1971 and \$539 million in 1973. Few argued with such success.

The other aspect of service towards the voters of southern Illinois that Gray emphasized over the years was an almost legendary constituent-oriented office. Gray worked hard at being an accessible Congressman, who answered telephone calls and letters promptly. He aided

southern Illinoisans in getting benefits for black lung, social security and veterans, supported civic and local organizations in southern Illinois in any way possible, and cordially hosted thousands of southern Illinoisans who visited Washington. The stories of Gray's friendliness and assistance were frequent and personally meaningful. Irene Hehner of West Frankfort related one that was typical. "My father-in-law had already signed up for black lung benefits and the settlement had been made, however we waited and waited and no checks came." Finally, Mrs. Hehner "contacted Congressman Gray and very soon after that, the checks began coming. There's been no further problems." Other stories covered a whole range of activities: assisting in getting passports, hastening Medicare payments, bringing servicemen home during family emergencies; getting gasoline during the recent shortage for an area trucking company; finding federal jobs for area residents. This list was endless. Richard Darby of Marion noted that "It's almost impossible to talk with someone who has not been aided or his family has not been aided by Gray in some way."⁹⁴ And Gray returned to southern Illinois at every opportunity, making 37 trips one year when government allowances covered only 11. He remained a very visible Congressman. As a result, Gray had a very close personal relationship with the voters of his district.

Because of his success in bringing federal funds into the district and his close personal touch with his constituency, Gray had little political interference in the way he conducted the rest of his activities. Because of his position on the Public Works Committee, as well as his service on the House Administration Committee, Gray was very instrumental in bringing the reinvigoration that has taken place in Washington in the last 15 years. In fact, he was named Washingtonian of the Year in 1973, an annual award given to the person who had done the most to improve the quality of life in the District of Columbia. Whether additional football seats at

Washington's R.F. Kennedy Stadium, the proposed \$65 million Eisenhower Convention Center, the proposed National Visitors Center at Washington's Union Station railroad terminal, the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts or the newly constructed Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden in the Smithsonian Institution, all projects in Washington went through Gray's committee and he became the champion of them all. Southern Illinoisans knew little of this aspect of his career.

His general voting record was also more liberal than the district's sentiments. His cumulative voting record was rated at 67 percent by the Americans for Democratic Action and only 10 percent by the Americans for Constitutional Action, the former a liberal political organization and the latter conservative. Gray voted with the Democratic leadership on most issues, and gave more support than the average Democratic member to the Democratic leadership in each of the last four Congresses he served in. In the field of social issues, for example, his voting pattern was generally liberal. He criticized busing in recent years, but was a supporter of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with its provisions for equal public accommodations, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which prohibited poll taxes, bills probably not supported by a majority of his constituents. He also supported the establishment of child care facilities for the working poor, backed the right of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue cease-and-desist orders against job discrimination, voted for the Equal Rights Amendment, and favored the creation of a Consumer Protection Agency. His voting record was more conservative on matters concerning foreign policy but even there he went along with Democratic efforts in 1971 and 1972 to cut off Indochina funds. The Nader Report commented on Gray's voting record:

If Gray's voting record is somewhat more conservative than that of northern Illinois Democrats, it is worthwhile to note that Gray's over-all record rarely varies more than six percentage points from the Democratic mean. Furthermore, since Gray's district has usually voted Republican in presidential elections there is undoubtedly significant pressure to conform to the Republican President's wishes on non-district affairs.⁹⁵

Gray did little to publicize his voting record, or his activities on behalf of Washington, in Egypt and southern Illinoisans were generally not interested in them.

By stressing his success in gaining federal dollars for southern Illinois and staying on top of his constituent work, Gray became unbeatable at the polls. The Republicans tried but could not unseat him. Their contenders, over the years, came from all over the district: Pope, Williamson, Massac, Jefferson, Washington, Saline and Jackson Counties all contributed candidates. The Republicans, after Gray defeated Bishop in 1954, ran Sam Scott in 1956, Carl Sneed in 1958, Gordon Kerr in 1960, Frank Walker in 1962, Mrs. Stillman J. Stanard in 1964, Bob Beckmeyer in 1966, Val Oshel in 1968 and Fred Evans in 1970. But the only thing that happened was that the Gray victory margin, which was only 11,000 in his first bid for re-election in 1956, had grown to 44,000 in 1970. As a result, no Republican even challenged Gray in 1972, thought to be a Republican year, and he defeated an independent opponent by almost 130,000 votes. The people of the district concluded that Gray, in contrast to Bishop, was working for the folks back home and deserved re-election after re-election. Over the years Gray built up a huge voting coalition of Democrats, Republicans and Independents. Gray was the only Democrat for whom some Republicans ever voted. Kenny Gray became Mr. Southern Illinois.

The most interesting, and among the closest, of the elections involving Gray was the race in 1968 against Oshel, at that time the Mayor of Harrisburg, and of course Paul Simon's

opponent in 1974. The 1968 Gray-Oshel campaign began in a strange manner. On January 31, 1968 Gray announced that “after thoughtful and prayerful consideration, I have reluctantly concluded that after the drain of what will have been 14 years of night and day public service, plus three years in the Air Force, I no longer can be assured, in my own mind, that I could bring to the Office for another two years the strength, enthusiasm, the resilience, and the patience that my conscience would demand and the people would deserve.” Gray felt that he had “truly reached the limits of my physical endurance.” Citing the increased demands of the office, with over “500 letters, calls and personal visits per day,” and the satisfaction of knowing that much progress had been made to bring prosperity to southern Illinois, he felt he could retire. He pointed out that federal money had helped southern Illinois greatly and that this had been his purpose in running for Congress in 1954. “I feel, he said, “this basic mission has been accomplished with the great help of organizations and individuals in Southern Illinois.”⁹⁶

The bombshell of Gray’s retirement announcement, according to one newspaper, “stirred things up” in southern Illinois politics. Republicans, even before Gray’s withdrawal, had thought him vulnerable. Democratic difficulties on the national level, especially the war in Vietnam, plus the possibility of a strong Republican state ticket, had added “more than a little bit to party enthusiasm.” Now they became absolutely confident of their ability to claim the congressional seat, though Joe Hale, the Republican State Central Committeeman, emphasized that Gray’s decision “doesn’t change our plans one bit. Gray would have been a hard man in the campaign, as he has always been, but I feel that the strong GOP candidate we hope to have would win regardless of his opposition.” Still the 22 Republican county chairmen, who would select the Republican candidate, were “taking more than the usual pains in their selection of a candidate who will not be just more grist for the Gray mill.”⁹⁷

There were many Republicans interested in the nomination. The first to declare was Val Oshel. Oshel, the owner of a medical and surgical supply firm, was a native southern Illinoisan, having graduated from Harrisburg High School and attended Southern Illinois University. He was elected Mayor of Harrisburg in 1967 after four year's service as public safety commissioner on the Harrisburg City Council. He actually announced his candidacy the day before Gray's withdrawal, and said that Gray's decision made no difference at all. Oshel noted: "I think it's a Republican year and we're going to have a Republican congressman no matter who the Democrats name. I want the job and I'm going after it as hard and fast as I know how." And Oshel did. He made many speeches and appearances between his late January announcement of candidacy and the early March selection meeting of the Republican county chairmen. He told the Saline County Republicans at a Lincoln Day banquet that the Democrats were in trouble: "the heat's getting to them, and it's up to us to keep the heat on."⁹⁸

While other candidates appeared before the Republican chairmen at their March 3rd meeting – among them John Austin of Nashville, Harry Pearce of Carmi, William Pike of Carbondale, Paul Rehberger of Cypress, Gary Burdick of Cutler, and State Representative James Eatherly of Galatia – Oshel easily won the Republican chairmen's endorsement. Joe Hale said that Oshel was a "completely responsible candidate, clean as a hound's tooth, who's had enough experience to know what it takes to run a campaign." Perry County GOP Chairman Steve Reel agreed, saying that "Oshel is a bright young man and hasn't got any political scars." To Reel it did not "make any difference who the Democrats finally decided upon because Oshel is going to win."⁹⁹ While the official state primary was not to be held until June 11, it was clear that Oshel would be the Republican candidate in the November election.

The Democrats, meanwhile, were in a state of chaos as they looked for their Congressional candidate for November. Gray's withdrawal announcement began a flurry of speculation as to who would be chosen as his successor. The most discussed possible successor was State Representative Choate from Anna, Gray's old friend, and an 11-term legislator in Springfield. But Choate soon announced that he had no interest in the job and the Democratic search went on. The Democratic county chairmen met in Marion on February 25, 1968 and selected Paul Ziegler of Carmi as their candidate. Ziegler, who served for 6 years in the Illinois House of Representatives and then 10 years in the State Senate, was at the time working for Secretary of State Paul Powell, who was from Vienna.¹⁰⁰ So southern Illinoisans seemed headed for a Paul Ziegler-Val Oshel congressional race.

But on March 2, 1968 Gray made another announcement. He stated that he would, after all, seek re-election. Gray cited 15,000 letters and telephone calls from constituents, as well as the urging of the White House and his colleagues in the House, and announced that 1968 was not the year to step down. He said that he had been sincere in his earlier announcement, but "certain recent events make it imperative that I change my mind," a reference no doubt, to the naming of Ziegler as his possible successor about which Gray was known to be unhappy. The Southern Illinoisan speculated that Powell had forced Ziegler's selection, and that there was "an agreement between Powell and district Republicans under which Powell would support a weak congressional candidate in exchange for GOP support for Powell."¹⁰¹ Whatever the reason, Gray was back in the field.

The public reaction to Gray's announcement was enthusiastic, at least among Democrats. The Democratic county chairmen were very happy and many indicated they planned to ask Ziegler to step aside. Jackson County Democratic Chairman Ray Chancey exclaimed:

“Wonderful,” and Perry County Chairman Sidney Keene said, “I was hoping he would run again.” Williamson County Chairman Omer Sanders said it all when he noted: “I’m going to be for Kenny Gray, and I think the rest (of the chairmen) are going to be.” Only Paul Ziegler, among the Democrats, seemed unhappy. He noted, “As far as I know, I’m still the party’s choice.” And he predicted, “We’re just going to have a primary that’s all.”¹⁰² Eventually Ziegler was forced to accept Gray’s decision and went along with the county chairmen in their support of Gray.

Another person unhappy with Gray’s return was Val Oshel, although Oshel said: “I thought I would be facing him when I announced. I thought I could defeat him then, and I see no reason to think any differently today.”¹⁰³ In fact, the whole Republican party in southern Illinois seemed less than pleased with the Congressman’s announcement that he would seek re-election. Nonetheless, a Gray-Oshel race was assured as southern Illinoisans approached the June 11th primary.

The mid-June primary made it official and Gray and Oshel began their campaigns in earnest. Oshel went on the offensive against Gray even before the primary. In mid-April he had delivered a spirited indictment of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society, “citing his concern over inflation, useless wars and inefficient government as some of the principal reasons for entering the Congressional race.” He criticized Gray and the Democrats for having “offered us aspirin to calm our aches and pains without doing anything to cure the ills.” Oshel contended that “it will take responsible Republican leadership to get the job done, with a Republican Congress to back these leaders. I intend to be on that team, with your help.”¹⁰⁴ This April speech laid out much of Oshel’s campaign strategy and he continued to stress many of these points during the rest of the campaign.

Oshel began his formal campaign against Gray at a June 14th fund-raising banquet held in his honor at the Student Center at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. Another aspect of Oshel's campaign strategy was set in motion with the appearance of Senator Everett M. Dirksen. Oshel was to bring many distinguished Republicans, both state and national leaders, into the district to speak in his behalf. Dirksen was just the first. Dirksen delivered a 45-minute appeal for Oshel and outlined what was to be another of Oshel's major campaign themes. Oshel's election would be "in the best interest not only of this district, but of Illinois and the nation as well," especially if the candidacy of Alabama Governor George Wallace threw the Nixon-Humphrey presidential race into the House of Representatives. The Illinois Congressional delegation had 12 Republicans and 12 Democrats and "our state would lose its vote for President if all Congressmen voted party lines, and this would be a tragic day for Illinois." Oshel agreed with Dirksen's remarks and in a brief address attacked "inflation, unemployment, school prayer bans, the Poor People's Resurrection City in Washington, government spending, the War on Poverty and disregard for law." He also impressed and delighted the Republican gathering by singing a campaign song in a "rich, melodic voice." The next night the Oshel-Dirksen road show went to the Saline County fairgrounds for another fund-raiser for candidate Oshel, where Dirksen again cited the need "to send Val Oshel to Washington." Oshel kept up the attack, making the rounds during June, July and August, and in mid-August went to Springfield for a conference with Republican presidential nominee Richard M. Nixon. Oshel indicated that Nixon had much "personal interest in his effort to unseat incumbent Congressman Kenneth Gray," and that the Republican party had designated the 21st District a "target district," a designation that would mean the appearance of national personalities and much financial assistance.¹⁰⁵

While Oshel continued to attempt to tie Gray to the national Democratic party and to the problems of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, such as inflation, the war, high crime rates, and the riots in the cities, by late August and early September Oshel also began to personally attack Gray. He stated that Gray had been unsuccessful in attracting private industry to southern Illinois and contended that the government projects Gray claimed credit for did “not bring permanent jobs to a community,” and “did not even pay taxes to our state, counties and cities.” He also charged that Gray’s claims were exaggerated and that many of the projects would have come to southern Illinois anyway. Oshel pointed out that the “people of the 21st district pay \$16.63 in taxes for every single dollar that comes back here in federal programs.” While federal programs were necessary, Oshel called for a greater effort to secure private industry for southern Illinois. In these areas, Oshel said, Gray was a failure.¹⁰⁶

On September 7th, Oshel opened his headquarters in Harrisburg with a visit by more political visitors, Republican gubernatorial candidate Richard Ogilvie and Congressman Donald Rumsfeld of Winnetka.¹⁰⁷ Ogilvie stated that the “opening of Val Oshel’s headquarters in Harrisburg marks the beginning of a crusade for southern Illinois,” and called Oshel “one of the brightest and most articulate Republicans in Illinois.” Ogilvie also noted that “the election of Val Oshel would assure the Illinois vote for Dick Nixon,” if the election went to the House of Representatives. At this headquarters opening, Oshel attacked Gray for the planned route of Interstate Highway 24 through Franklin and Williamson Counties, and proposed a “master highway plan,” which called for a more easterly route for I-24, a curious suggestion since Franklin and Williamson counties were two of the most populous in the district.

Gray’s initial response to these Oshel attacks was just a promise to “go the length and breadth of the district to tell the people” what he had done for them in 14 years in Congress. He

asked the people to consider performance, not promises, and lashed out at Oshel for criticizing federal support in southern Illinois. He claimed to have brought more than \$2 billion in federal spending to the district, with more to come. He also stated that he was “depending on no one other than the good folks of southern Illinois” in his campaign and would not bring “every Tom, Dick and Harry” from outside the district to aid in his campaign.¹⁰⁸

By mid-September, the campaign became more personal. Oshel began to attack some of Gray’s votes in Congress and wrote Gray a public letter asking the Congressman:

How can you explain, for example, your vote on April 26, 1966 on the Agriculture Appropriations Bill when you were one of only 98 Congressmen that voted against prohibiting surplus food sales to Communist nations? How can you explain your vote on May 25, 1965 on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 when you voted against prohibiting Communist dominated Latin American Labor Unions from receiving our tax dollars? How can you explain your vote in September, 1967 against prohibiting surplus food sales to Communist nations? The list is long, Ken, and just as I intend to tell the people about it, surely you would not be unwilling to let the people know the way in which you have been representing the district, the people and their interests.

He linked these votes by Gray to the war in Vietnam, where “we must either win or get out.” Votes like the ones he cited, Oshel contended, helped “our enemies.” In short, Oshel said, Gray “represents an administration that tells him what to do on every occasion.”¹⁰⁹

These personal attacks, especially the ones in Oshel’s open letter, stung Gray deeply. The Congressman charged that the Oshel contention that Gray was “soft on Communism” was “an incredibly crude deception,” which misrepresented Gray’s voting record. Gray demanded that Oshel stop distributing campaign literature, which attacked Gray’s votes and stated that “no vote of his [Oshel] will ever be in favor of supplying Communist nations or non-Communist nations who supply North Vietnam as long as American servicemen are sacrificing their lives in

South Vietnam.” Gray also responded with a five-page letter from the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dr. Thomas Morgan, justifying Gray’s voting record and attacking “the unfair and unfounded criticism made against you by your opponent.” Gray served notice that he did “not intent to tolerate the false and incredible distortions of facts concerning my voting record.”¹¹⁰ But Oshel would not back off and replied that Gray had “failed to establish the record of firm opposition to trade with Communist nations and his record is clear proof of this fact.” Oshel stated it was a waste of time to debate this issue “while our boys are fighting and dying in the rice paddies of South Vietnam when a halt to the flow of supplies to North Vietnam would save so many American lives.” He also stated to the voters of southern Illinois: “I for one do not like the idea that my son, or some member of your family, runs the risk of being killed by a bullet made with American money.”¹¹¹

Oshel stayed on the offensive in September and October, jumping from issue to issue, but always lambasting his opponent for his record in Congress. Seizing on public discontent with college radicals, Oshel promised to sponsor legislation that would deny federal scholarship funds to disruptive students. He also attacked Gray for exaggerating his influence in bringing federal funds to the district; called the War on Poverty, which he claimed Gray supported, “the most flagrant abuse and misuse of the tax dollar in our history” and referred to the voters of the district as the “forgotten people of southern Illinois,” represented by a man who had lost touch with Egypt. He declared that “Nixon is going to be elected. How much influence do you think a southern Illinois Democrat is going to have in the new administration?” Oshel also began to attack Gray more and more as “one of the biggest spenders of the Great Society in the U.S. Congress,” and laid major responsibility for the inflation in the United States at Gray’s doorstep.¹¹²

Gray began fulltime campaigning on October 12, 1968, and quickly found himself in the position of having to answer the many charges Oshel made. He hit Oshel's attack of Gray being a big spender by pointing out that Oshel, as Mayor of Harrisburg, had sought Gray's assistance for federal funds for a Harrisburg industrial part. And, he pointed out how federal funds had acted as seed money in attracting industry to the district. He attacked Oshel's proposal for I-24 as misconceived; noted the importance of his seniority for the people of southern Illinois; called Oshel's fact sheets "pure political bunk"; and defended his record in Congress, saying how far southern Illinois had come since 1954.¹¹³

The last three weeks of the campaign saw frenzied activity on both sides. Oshel traveled to Paducah, Kentucky to visit with Tricia and Julie Nixon; and received the endorsement of Richard Nixon's brothers, Donald and Edgar, in Marion. He also kept up his personal attack on Gray, saying on October 21 that Gray was guilty of "aiding and abetting dope pushers" by refusing "to support strengthening of the law against narcotic sellers" in a vote before Congress on June 1, 1966. Oshel contended that "Ken Gray's vote against strengthening the penalties for selling narcotics is one which every voter should remember on election day. It is a vote which has benefited the illegitimate side of society – the crime syndicate, etc. – and hurt society's legitimate side— the law abiding citizens of our communities."¹¹⁴ Oshel promised better representation on such issues should he be elected.

The big events of the Oshel campaign came in the last week of the election fight and involved the visit to southern Illinois of prominent Republicans. Oshel joined the Republican Victory Train that visited the district on Tuesday, October 29. Aboard the train were Olgivie, Senator Charles Percy and Julie Nixon and David Eisenhower, and some reports indicated that Oshel stole the show with his rousing speeches. The very next day, Richard Nixon came to

southern Illinois, for an airport rally at Marion to boost Oshel's chances for election. Addressing a crowd of approximately 15,000, Nixon called Oshel a "bright new star on the political scene," and called for Oshel's election. Nixon told the crowd that "unless you get the senators and congressmen to back your president, you're not going to get the kind of leadership I've been talking about." He needed Oshel and looked forward to having him come to Washington.¹¹⁵

The Oshel camp hoped the Nixon visit would give Oshel the spark he needed to beat Gray. But Oshel and his supporters did much more than just prepare for Nixon's visit during the last months of the campaign. Throughout the campaign "billboards, bumper stickers, brochures, television, radio and newspaper advertisements" were used by Oshel "in a high-powered, coordinated, well-financed campaign to convince voters Gray is too cozy with the Democratic Party line and too distant from home in his votes." As the campaign came to an end, Oshel hit hard with ads that personally attacked Gray. One exclaimed:

Quit playing games... with your son's life! LBJ and his hand-picked boy, Ken Gray, have made a mess in South Vietnam where 28,000 Americans already have sacrificed their lives!

The ad also mentioned Gray's votes on foreign trade cited earlier by Oshel. Another ad had pictures of Gray and Johnson and then Nixon and Oshel, with the captions: "This is Your Incumbent Congressman and His Boss: This is Val Oshel and the Next President: What You've Had...or a Good Congressman for a Change? It's Your Choice! Send Val Oshel to Congress!" And another questioned whether Gray really supported the Wabash Valley Waterway. These ads, appearing in newspapers all over the district, displayed the large financial backing Oshel had during the 1968 campaign, which Gray has estimated at about \$450,000.¹¹⁶

Gray was not inactive as Oshel slashed at him, brought Nixon and other Republicans to southern Illinois, and launched his advertising blitz. Gray campaigned hard in disputing Oshel's proposal for I-24, eventually forcing Oshel to back off from his plan. Gray also attacked Oshel for charging that Gray had aided drug pushers, saying Oshel was guilty of "smear campaigning." Displaying a letter he received from Mrs. Shirley Oshel thanking Gray for helping a project she was interested in and saying to Gray that "the door of our home is always open to you," Gray wondered: "Can you imagine anyone inviting a Communist and dope pusher into their home?" Most of all, he emphasized the economic progress made by southern Illinois during his years in Congress and the specific aid he had been able to deliver through government grants. He constantly cited \$2 billion of federal funds that had come to the district since 1955, while the taxpayers had only sent \$1.3 billion to Washington during the same time. Throughout the district he displayed an electrical map that he called a "Christmas Tree of Progress," with lights noting the federal projects he had brought to the district. He also attacked Oshel's chief guest, Richard Nixon, saying there was "no such thing as a new Mr. Nixon," rather he was just "a warmed over candidate" beaten by Kennedy in 1960. These themes, especially the "I'm bringing back what I've been asked to bring back," dominated Gray's advertising. One particularly effective ad pointed out that "Congressman Ken Gray Has Helped Everybody—including His Opponent and The Powerful Speaker of the House of Representatives." The ad had letters of thanks from John McCormick and both Shirley and Val Oshel, for help Gray had rendered.¹¹⁷

Finally Gray reacted very strongly to the Oshel advertising campaign. He sent a public telegram to Oshel on November 1, demanding that Oshel stop using the "completely false and libelous ads you are running in the news media." He threatened that "if these false ads are not withdrawn, I intent to seek recourse in the courts." Stung by Oshel's ad on Vietnam, which

implied that Gray had voted “for foreign aid funds that are killing our boys in Vietnam,” Gray enclosed a telegram from the Department of State explaining Gray’s votes on the measures Oshel cited. Oshel’s response was that Gray was desperate and that he would not be intimidated. Oshel said he would “continue the fight on his voting record.”¹¹⁸

With this, the fight was over. The race was generally considered to be a toss-up. The Republican party clearly counted on Oshel’s aggressive campaign, plus the large expected victories of Nixon, Dirksen and Ogilvie, to defeat Gray. How would the people react? An indication of their reaction came in advance in the form of newspaper editorials, which favored Gray. The Cairo Evening Citizen called for Gray’s re-election, saying that “if Oshel wants to tag Ken Gray as a big spender, the tag should be complimentary instead of derogatory. If any area in the United States ever needed federal help when Gray took office 14 years ago, it was the 21st district. We’re still not out of the woods and for some time yet will need representation such as provided by Kenneth J. Gray.” The Benton Evening News said the election of Oshel would be “a poor trade” and urged Franklin County voters to support Gray. And the Southern Illinoisan agreed, calling the Oshel campaign “essentially negative and occasionally contradictory.” The paper noted that Gray’s approach was to support “his national party on most – although not all – issues the party feels are crucial. In turn, he gains the party’s support for projects in his district.” As a result, Gray should not be criticized for national issues but praised for “accomplishing what voters in this district have asked him to do – get help in the massive quantities previously unattainable. He should be given the opportunity to continue.”¹¹⁹

On Tuesday, November 5, 1968 the people of southern Illinois voted 111,425 to 94,363 to keep Gray in office. Oshel did well in traditional Republican areas, carrying Edwards, Johnson, Massac, Pope, Wabach, Wayne, and Washington Counties, as well as Monroe and

White Counties, but lost in the more populous areas of the district. The people, at least the majority, had resisted Oshel's aggressive, well-financed campaign and voted to send Gray back to Washington for another term. The Depression psychology had worked again, as it had in all those other elections.

By late 1973, Gray announced his retirement. It was not the Republican party but poor health that made Gray decide not to stand for re-election in 1974. There had been some columns by Jack Anderson in 1972 and 1973 that had been critical of Gray, accusing him of possible misuse of campaign contributions, but they had little impact on Gray's prestige in southern Illinois. Rather it was a 1973 heart attack that made him retire.

And so, November 14, 1973, the day of Simon's announcement, saw the convergence of Paul Simon, southern Illinois and Kenneth J. Gray as Simon began his campaign to succeed Gray in Washington.

Eugene P. Trani
1975

Notes

Paul Simon's personal papers, hereafter Simon MSS, are deposited in the Illinois State Historical Society Library in Springfield. This collection, made up of 99 boxes of materials, covers Simon's official life from 1953 until 1973. It is currently closed to researchers and will remain closed for the foreseeable future. Because of the special nature of this book, Mr. Simon allowed the author of this chapter permission to do research in the collection, where the author concentrated on public materials such as speeches, press releases and publications, which are generally available elsewhere. With few exceptions, the author's citations to the Simon MSS are to public materials, though several private letters by Mr. Simon are cited. Mr. Simon placed no restrictions on the material the author could examine in the Simon MSS and the decision to concentrate on public materials was the author's. In addition, Mr. Simon supplied the author with extensive clippings from his statewide races in 1968 and 1972. These clippings are currently in the possession of his mother, Mrs. Martin Simon, who resides in Collinsville.

1. Michael Kilian, "What Makes Simon Run?" Chicago Tribune Sunday Magazine, January 16, 1972. p. 21. This article, hereafter cited as Kilian, Tribune Sunday Magazine, was very helpful for background information on Simon. Also helpful were "A Background Paper on State Senator Paul Simon," Folder 30, Box 22, Simon MSS; and "The Paul Simon Story," pamphlet prepared for 1968 campaign and "Paul Simon for Governor," pamphlet prepared for 1972 campaign, copies of both of which are in the Simon MSS.
2. Kilian, Tribune Sunday Magazine, p. 21.
3. "The Paul Simon Story," Simon MSS, pp. 3-4; Simon to Melvin Price, February 3, 1951, Folder 9, Box 14, Simon MSS; "The Paul Simon Story," Simon MSS, p. 6; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 23, 1951; and Newsweek, February 12, 1951.
4. "A Background Paper on State Senator Paul Simon," Simon MSS, p. 4; "The Paul Simon Story," Simon MSS, p. 9; and St. Louis Globe Democrat, April 14, 1954.
5. "The Paul Simon Story," Simon MSS, p. 11.
6. Ibid., p. 13.
7. These figures are the result of research done by Linda MacLachlan, a student in the Law School at Southern Illinois University, who examined the Illinois Legislative Synopsis and Digest for the bills that Simon sponsored or co-sponsored during his 14 years in the Legislature.

8. "The Paul Simon Story," pp. 20-21, and "Paul Simon for Governor," pp. 14-15, both in the Simon MSS.
9. Paul Simon, Lincoln's Preparation for Greatness: The Illinois Legislative Years (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), pp. vii, and 104.
10. Paul Simon, as told to Alfred Balk, "The Illinois Legislature: A Study in Corruption," Harper's, September, 1964, pp. 74-78.
11. Kilian, Tribune Sunday Magazine, p. 22; "The Paul Simon Story," Simon MSS, p. 19; and Benton Evening News, cited in "Paul Simon for Congress." Pamphlet prepared for 1974 election, copy in author's possession.
12. "A Background Paper on State Senator Paul Simon," Simon MSS. This seven-page paper was prepared as part of Simon's campaign for the 1968 senatorial nomination.
13. Paul Simon, "Lincoln, The Postmaster," text of speech in 1968 clippings in possession of Mrs. Martin Simon.
14. Simon to Melvin Price, January 6, 1951, Folder 19, Box 14, Simon MSS.
15. Paul Simon to Newspaper Editors, no date, with copies of the columns, in 1968 clippings in possession of Mrs. Martin Simon.
16. Text of speech on Vietnam to City Club of Chicago, November 20, 1967, Folder 11, Box 62, Simon MSS.
17. Champaign-Urbana Courier, February 3, 1968.
18. Metro-East Journal, East St. Louis, February 19, 1968.
19. "The Paul Simon Story," Simon MSS; Belleville News-Democrat, July 15, and October 18, 1968; and Kilian, Tribune Sunday Magazine, p. 22.
20. Skokie News, September 12, 1968; LaGrange Park Suburban Life, September 26, 1968; Dwyer Press Release, October 3, 1968, copy in 1968 clippings in possession of Mrs. Martin Simon; and Paul Simon's Editor, Lacon Home Journal, October 17, 1968.
21. Illinois State Register, Springfield, October 24, 1968; Decatur Herald-Review, October 24, 1968; Illinois State Register, October 14, 1968; and Auburn Citizen, #21, September, 1968.

22. Chicago Sun Times, November 11, 1968; Alton Telegraph, November 7, 1968; Bloomington Daily Pantagraph, November 7, 1968; and Chicago Sun Times, November 22, 1968.
23. Illinois State Register, November 12, 1968; Alton Telegraph, November 12, 1968; Metro-East Journal, November 10, 1968; and Chicago Heights Star, November 10, 1968.
24. The two best sources on Simon as ombudsman, upon which the following is based, are Paul Simon, "The Ombudsman in Illinois: An Adventure in Government," University of Illinois Assembly on the Ombudsman, University of Illinois Bulletin, Volume 66, June 25, 1969, pp. 27-34; and Paul Simon, "The Ombudsman in Illinois: An Experiment in Government," Summer, 1970, Folder 23, Box 39, Simon MSS.
25. Paul Simon, "Recommendations Regarding Cairo, Illinois," April 22, 1969, Folder 28, Box 23, Simon MSS.
26. Illinois State Journal, Springfield, August 15, 1969; and Simon to Nellie Jane Sullivan, Cairo, April 4, 1970, and Simon to Russ Shaver, Madison, August 2, 1971, both in Folder 28, Box 23, Simon MSS.
27. Report by the Lieutenant Governor's Committee on Southern Illinois University, "A Practical Study of Campus Problems," September 20, 1970, Folder 15, Box 24, Simon MSS.
28. Cited in "Paul Simon for Governor," Simon MSS, p. 18.
29. Simon's reasons for endorsing Daley are explained in Simon to Paul Lufkin, March 28, 1971, Folder 16, Box 81, Simon MSS, a letter Simon made public.
30. Kilian, Tribune Sunday Magazine, p. 22.
31. Ibid., p. 26; and Mike Royko, Chicago Daily News, December 7, 1971.
32. "Paul Simon for Governor," Simon MSS.
33. Addison Register, January 26, 1972; Wheaton Journal, January 28, 1972; Collinsville Herald, February 28, 1972; Edwardsville Intelligencer, January 27, 1972; Ridgway News, February 17, 1972; and Okawville Times, January 20, 1972.
34. Illinois State Register, February 14, 1972; and Collinsville Herald, February 24, 1972.

35. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 16, 1972; and Ken Watson, Copley News Service, Kankakee Journal, March 8, 1972.
36. Ken Watson, Copely News Service, Kankakee Journal, March 8, 1972; Metro-East Journal, March 15, 1972; and Streator Daily Times Journal, March 4, 1972.
37. Charles Nicodemus, Chicago Daily News, February 21, 1972; and Paul Simon, "From the Statehouse," Calhoun Herald, Hardin, March 9, 1972.
38. A good source for information on Walker is Clifford Terry, "Dan Walker: his long road to Springfield," St. Louis Globe Democrat, March 11-12, 1972.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.; Chicago Daily News, February 2, 1972; Chicago Sun Times, March 9, 1972; Collinsville Herald, January 27, 1972; and St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 5, 1972.
41. Kilian, Tribune Sunday Magazine, p. 26; Bill O'Connell, "Has Paul Simon Changed This Much?" Peoria Journal Star, March 3, 1972; and St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 5, 1972.
42. Wheaton Journal, January 24, 1972; Chicago Daily News, February 2 and 3, 1972; and Tom Fitzpatrick, Chicago Sun Times, February 3, 1972.
43. Ken Watson, Copley News Service, Aurora Beacon-News, January 27, 1972; Metro-East Journal, March 10, 1972; St. Louis Globe Democrat, March 15, 1972; Carbondale Southern Illinoisan, March 12, 1972; and Collinsville Herald, February 28, 1972.
44. Ken Watson, Copely News Service, Collinsville Herald, March 21, 1972; and Taylor Pensoneau, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 19, 1972.
45. "Paul Simon's Concession Speech," copy in 1972 clippings in possession of Mrs. Martin Simon.
46. Metro-East Journal, March 23, 1972; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 23, 1972; and Collinsville Herald, March 27, 1972.
47. Jack Flach, St. Louis Globe Democrat, March 23, 1972; Ken Watson, Copley News Service, Collinsville Herald, March 30, 1972; and Taylor Pensoneau, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 26, 1972.
48. Bob Lahey, Arlington Heights Herald, April 17, 1972; Quincy Herald-Whig, no date, copy in 1972 clippings in possession of Mrs. Martin Simon; Bensenville

- Register, April 5, 1972; Northwest Times, Chicago, April 12, 1972; and letter to Chicago Tribune, April 18, 1972.
49. Letter to Evanston Review, April 6, 1972; letter to Glenview Life, April 13, 1972; and letter to Chicago Tribune, May 5, 1972.
 50. Paul Simon to Editor, Calhoun Herald, May 4, 1972; Sunday Journal-Register, Springfield, April 9, 1972; and St. Louis Globe Democrat, March 23, 1972.
 51. Paul Simon to Fellow Lieutenant Governors, May 23, 1972, Folder 5, Box 39, Simon MSS.
 52. Vandalia Leader, June 1, 1972; and Ken Watson, Copley News Service, Collinsville Herald, June 1, 1972.
 53. Ken Watson, Copley News Service, Moline Dispatch, April 7, 1972; and Rockford Register-Republicans, April 6, 1972.
 54. Metro-East Journal, June 4, 1972; Southern Illinoisan, June 1, 1972; Collinsville Herald, September 14, 1972; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, November 29, 1972; and Metro-East Journal, November 30, 1972.
 55. Paul Simon, "18 Years of a Changing Assembly," Chicago Sun Times, June 25, 1972.
 56. Paul and Arthur Simon, The Politics of World Hunger (New York: Harper's Magazine Press, 1973), p. 18. See also Paul Simon, "Too Much Food in a Starving World?" This Day, 1961; and Paul Simon, A Hungry World (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966).
 57. John W. Allen, Legends and Lore of Southern Illinois (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1963), pp. 41-42. See also Alan Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray: Democratic Representative from Illinois," Ralph Nader Congress Project: Citizens Look at Congress (Washington: Grossman Publishers, 1972), pp. 1-2, hereafter cited as Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray."
 58. The figures cited in this portion of the chapter, unless otherwise noted, come from the factbook on the district that Simon had prepared as part of his campaign for Congress
 59. Roy E. Wakeley, "The People in Southern Illinois: A Most Valuable Resource," Community Development Service, Southern Illinois University, January 24, 1972, p. 2, hereafter cited as Wakeley, "The People of Southern Illinois."

60. John Y. Simon, "Union County in 1858 and the Lincoln-Douglas Debate," Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, LXII (1969), pp. 271-272.
61. Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," p. 1.
62. Wakeley, "The People of Southern Illinois," p. 8.
63. John Y. Simon, "Union County in 1858 and the Lincoln-Douglas Debate," Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, LXII, p. 272.
64. Very helpful for the part of this chapter dealing with the 1920s and 1930s was David E. Conrad and Glen M. Jones, "Town Life in Southern Illinois during the Great Depression," ICarbs, I (1974), pp. 121-140, hereafter Conrad and Jones, "Town Life in Southern Illinois." See also Charles J. Wilkins, "The Federal Role in the Economic Development of Southern Illinois" (M.A. Thesis, Southern Illinois University, 1965), for an analysis of the economic history of Egypt.
65. Conrad and Jones, "Town Life in Southern Illinois," pp. 121-122.
66. The best study of this period in the history of Southern Illinois is Paul Angle, Bloody Williamson: A Chapter in American Lawlessness (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1974).
67. Conrad and Jones, "Town Life in Southern Illinois," p. 122.
68. Ibid., p. 122.
69. Ibid., p. 126.
70. Ibid., pp. 127-137.
71. Ibid., p. 138.
72. For details of Keller's campaign against Dension, see Robert S. Johnston, "Kent Keller: New Dealer from Little Egypt" (M.A. Thesis, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, 1971), hereafter Johnston, "Kent Keller"; and Stuart Weiss, "Kent Keller, the Liberal Bloc, and the New Deal," Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, forthcoming, hereafter Weiss, "Kent Keller," with page citation to manuscript supplied to author by Professor Weiss. See Johnston, "Kent Keller," pp. 37-38, for Marion speech.
73. Weiss, "Kent Keller," p. 13. Professor Weiss's article is a good summary of Keller's years in Congress.
74. Weiss, "Kent Keller," pp. 13-15.

75. See Weiss, "Kent Keller," pp. 16-17, for an account of Keller's weakened position in the district.
76. Caterville Herald, February 23, August 9 and 16, and November 1, 1940; and Marion Daily Republican, November 4, 1940.
77. The best source on Gray's background and his early career in Congress is George T. Farmer, "An Analysis of the Bases of Congressman Kenneth J. Gray's Political Power" (M.A. Thesis, Southern Illinois University, 1962), hereafter Farmer, "Gray's Political Power." See also Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray"; and Special Kenneth Gray Edition of the West Frankfort Daily American, July 20, 1974.
78. Farmer, "Gray's Political Power," p. 28.
79. Ibid., pp. 28-30.
80. Southern Illinoisan, November 1, 1954.
81. Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," p. 7; and Southern Illinoisan, November 3, 1968.
82. For the Gray list of accomplishments, see West Frankfort Daily American, July 20, 1974; and Evansville Sunday Courier and Press, March 24, 1974.
83. Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," pp. 2, 8.
84. West Frankfort Daily American, July 20, 1974.
85. Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," p. 7.
86. Farmer, "Gray's Political Power," pp. 34-35.
87. Ibid., pp. 35-36. For a complete list of the bills that Gray sponsored or co-sponsored between 1955 and 1973, see American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress to Kenneth J. Gray, February 14, 1974, copy in Author's possession, hereafter Legislative Reference Service's List of Gray's Legislation.
88. Farmer, "Gray's Political Power," pp. 37-40, and Legislative Reference Services List of Gray's Legislation.
89. Farmer, "Gray's Political Power," pp. 40-42.
90. Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," p. 17, Legislative Reference Service's List of Gray's Legislation; and Southern Illinoisan, November 3, 1968.

91. Farmer, "Gray's Political Power," pp. 80, 89.
92. Ibid., pp. 93-94.
93. Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," pp. 8-10.
94. West Frankfort Daily American, July 20, 1974; and Evansville Sunday Courier and Press, March 24, 1974.
95. Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," p. 18. This study has an analysis of Gray's voting record in Congress.
96. Carmi Times, January 31, 1968.
97. Harrisburg Daily Register, February 1, 1968.
98. Southern Illinoisan, January 30, 1968; and Harrisburg Daily Register, February 1 and 20, 1968.
99. Southern Illinoisan, March 3 and 5, 1968.
100. Southern Illinois University Daily Egyptian, February 21, 1968; and Southern Illinoisan, March 3, 1968.
101. Southern Illinoisan, March 3, 1968.
102. Ibid.
103. Golconda Herald Enterprise, March 7, 1968.
104. Harrisburg Daily Register, April 11, 1968.
105. Harrisburg Daily Register June 15 and 17, and August 16, 1968; and Southern Illinoisan, June 16, 1968.
106. Marion Daily Republican, August 28, 1968; and Benton Evening News, September 9, 1968.
107. Harrisburg Daily Register, September 6 and 9, 1968; and West Frankfort Daily American, September 9, 1968.
108. Harrisburg Daily Register, September 7, 1968; and Southern Illinoisan, September 22, 1968.

109. Benton Evening News, September 12, 1968; and McLeansboro Times Leader, September 19, 1968.
 110. West Frankfort Daily American, September 23 and 24, 1968; Benton Evening News, September 23, 1968; and Southern Illinoisan, September 29, 1968.
 111. Southern Illinoisan, September 29, 1968; and Daily Egyptian, October 9, 1968.
 112. Anna Gazette-Democrat, September 26, 1968; Cairo Evening Citizen, September 30, 1968; Southern Illinoisan, October 4, 1968; and West Frankfort Daily American, October 14, 1968.
 113. Southern Illinoisan, October 10, 1968; West Frankfort Daily American, October 11, 1968; and Harrisburg Daily Register, October 12, 1968.
 114. Harrisburg Daily Register, October 17, 1968; Anna Gazette-Democrat, October 17, 1968; Benton Evening News, October 21, 1968; and Marion Daily Republican, October 21, 1968.
 115. Centralia Sentinel, October 30, 1968; Marion Daily Republican, October 30, 1968; Daily Egyptian, October 31, 1968.
 116. Southern Illinoisan, November 1, 1968; Benton Evening News, October 29, 1968; Cairo Evening Citizen, October 31, 1968; Carmi Times, November 1, 1968; and Berlow, "Kenneth J. Gray," p. 5.
 117. Southern Illinoisan, October 22, 1968; Harrisburg Daily Register, October 30, 1968; Red Bud News, October 31, 1968; Southern Illinoisan, November 1, 1968; and Benton Evening News, November 2, 1968.
 118. Benton Evening News, November 1, 1968; and West Frankfort Daily American, November 1, 1968.
 119. Cairo Evening Citizen, October 20, 1968; Benton Evening News, October 30, 1968; and Southern Illinoisan, November 3, 1968.
-