

Source 7: "Turnout is Heavy" by Tom Wicker, 1964 (Transcript)

Wicker, Tom. "TURNOUT IS HEAVY." *The New York Times*, November 4, 1964.
<https://www.nytimes.com/1964/11/04/turnout-is-heavy.html>.



Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas compiled one of the greatest landslide victories in American history yesterday to win a four-year term of his own as the 36th President of the United States.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, Mr. Johnson's running mate on the Democratic ticket, was carried into office as Vice President.

Mr. Johnson's triumph, giving him the "loud and clear" national mandate he had said he wanted, brought 44 states and the district of Columbia, with 486 electoral votes, into the Democratic column.

Senator Barry Goldwater, the Republican candidate, who sought to offer the people "a choice, not an echo" with a strongly conservative campaign, won only five states in the Deep South and gained a narrow victory in his home state of Arizona. Carrying it gave him a total of 52 electoral votes.

Senator Plans Statement

A heavy voter turnout favored the more numerous Democrats.

In Austin, Tex., Mr. Johnson appeared in the Municipal Auditorium to say that his victory was "a tribute to men and women of all parties." "It is a mandate for unity, for a Government that serves no special interest," he said.

The election meant, he said, that "our nation should forget our petty differences and stand united before all the world."

Mr. Goldwater did not concede. A spokesman announced that the Senator would make no statement until 10 AM. today in Phoenix.

Johnson Carries Texas

But the totals were not the only marks of the massive Democratic victory. Traditionally Republican states were bowled over like tenpins—Vermont, Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, among others.

In New York, both houses of the Legislature were headed for Democratic control for the first time in years. Heralded Republicans like Charles H. Percy, the gubernatorial candidate in Illinois, went down to defeat.

Former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, riding Mr. Johnson's long coattails, overwhelmed Senator Kenneth B. Keating in New York.

But ticket splitting was wide-spread. And in the South, Georgia went Republican; never [missing text.]

But Mr. Johnson carried the rest of the South, including Virginia, Tennessee, and Florida—states that went Republican in 1960. He carried his home state of Texas by a large margin and won a majority of the popular vote in the Old Confederacy.

Nationwide, the President's popular vote margin apparently would reach 60 per cent or more. His popular vote plurality had risen early this morning to more than 13 million.

The President was clearly carrying into office with him a heavily Democratic Congress, with a substantially bigger majority in the House.

The vote poured in, through the high-speed counting system of the Network Election Service, at such a rate that the leading television broadcasters were calling it a Johnson victory about 9 P.M.

But the only time the Republican candidate ever was in front was early yesterday morning when Dixville Notch, N. H., traditionally the earliest-reporting precinct in the nation, gave him eight votes to none for Mr. Johnson.

After that, in the President's own slogan, it was "L.B.J. all the way."

Election analysts thought that would be the case when the first significant returns came in from rural Kansas, where partial counts of incomplete boxes are allowed. They showed Mr. Johnson running strongly in this traditionally Republican territory.

Their early judgments were strengthened when the President swept early-reporting Kentucky, an important border state that had not gone Democratic in a Presidential election since 1948, and rolled to victory in Indiana, a Republican strong-hold since 1936.

Ohio, a state counted upon as a vital part of the Goldwater victory strategy, fell to the President next, with Mr. Johnson compiling a massive lead in populous Cuyahoga County (Cleveland). One Negro precinct there went for the President by 99.9 per cent of its vote.

In sharp contrast, Mr. Johnson at one point in the evening was carrying only 8.9 per cent of the vote in Jackson, Miss., where his civil rights stand was unpopular. Mr. Goldwater compiled an overwhelming victory in that state, winning more than 80 per cent of its vote.

But as victory after victory rolled in for the President—all New England, the big Middle Atlantic states of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, Southern states like Texas, Tennessee, and North Carolina, the Western states of Oklahoma, Colorado and Kansas—Mr. Johnson's mounting total became a triumphant march across the nation.

There was nothing spotty or regional about it and long before midnight it was apparent that the President would have the "loud and clear" national mandate.

It was one of the most significant victories in Presidential history. The Goldwater campaign had posed a sharp challenge to almost the entire trend of national policy, domestic and foreign, since the Great Depression and World War II.

What He Proposed

He had proposed a sharp curtailment of Federal Government activities, particularly in the welfare field and in matters affecting the economy. He had called for a foreign policy of "brinkmanship," in which the nation's military might would be used as a threat against the Communist-bloc nations.

And he had raised doubts whether he would continue to lend Federal influence and authority to the drive for Negro equality in the United States.

Mr. Johnson, in head-on conflict with Mr. Goldwater on almost every campaign issue, thus received decisive endorsement from the nation for the general line of policy pursued by the nation for more than a quarter-century, through Administrations of both parties.

For himself, he won the distinction of being the first candidate from a Southern state to be elected to the White House in more than a hundred years.

And he won a massive vote of approval for the manner in which he had conducted its business since taking over the Presidency when John F. Kennedy was assassinated last Nov. 22.

Rapid Moves Likely

On the impetus of his imposing victory, Mr. Johnson can be expected to move rapidly on a broad front in domestic policy, and to grapple with several serious foreign problems.

He has said that a program of medical care for the aged through the Social Security system will be his first priority in legislative matters. He has also pledged to seek a major education program and to extend his "war on poverty."

In international matters, Mr. Johnson must soon seek positive answers to the problems of establishing some form of international nuclear force that would include West Germany, of reorganizing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its forces, and of prosecuting the anti-Communist guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson voted this morning in Johnson City, Tex., the hill country town where he was born on Aug. 27, 1908, and near which is located his LBJ Ranch. He and Mrs. Johnson voted, like most of the rest of the nation, for Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson's remarkable [missing text]

In Rhode Island, for instance, Mr. Johnson won a massive victory, taking almost 80 per cent of the vote. In the same state, voters re-elected Republican Gov. John Chafee, who had fought Mr. Goldwater's nomination, by about 59 per cent of the vote.

In Vermont, Senator Winston Prouty, a moderate Republican, survived the Johnson tide. But the President's sweeping victory in Ohio endangered the senatorial candidacy of Robert Taft Jr., a pre-election favorite, who was running neck and neck with Stephen M. Young, the Democratic incumbent.

Mr. Johnson's coattails were long for some underdog Democrats, notably Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois, who was re-elected over Mr. Percy, a Republican newcomer who had looked to many in his party like future Presidential timber.

Mr. Johnson's great victory in New York also was a prime factor in the apparent victory of Mr. Kennedy over Senator Keating.

In Iowa, however, one Democrat outran Mr. Johnson—a rare event in yesterday's election. He was Gov. Harold E. Hughes, who took about 63 per cent of the vote to about 60 per cent for the President.

Mr. Johnson's victory was solidly based in the votes of almost all religious and ethnic groups, all income classes, and in every section of the nation. Nor did the so-called "white backlash" against the Civil Rights Act of 1964 materialize to any serious extent.

The backlash was apparent among Polish steelworkers in Baltimore, but Mr. Johnson piled up a heavy vote else-where in Maryland to add that state to his total.

In the District of Columbia, with its big Negro population, the President won by about five to one in the first Presidential election ever held in the Federal city.

Paradoxes Noted

In Kentucky, where anti-Catholic voting contributed to John Kennedy's defeat there in 1960, Mr. Johnson ran in some areas as much as 15 per cent ahead of Mr. Kennedy's totals among white Protestant voters.

In New York, he was about five percentage points ahead of Mr. Kennedy's pace among Roman Catholic voters.

New York provided another paradox. Although there was evidence of a slump in Polish-American voting for Mr. Johnson in Maryland, Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois, that ethnic group gave both the President and Robert Kennedy a heavy pro-portion of its vote in New York.

Even more remarkable was the situation in the South. There, Mr. Johnson carried two states, Virginia and Tennessee, that had gone Republican 1960 and was leading narrowly in another, Florida.

Mr. Goldwater carried South Carolina which went Democratic in 1960, and was threatening in Georgia. [Missing Text]

But it was an election dotted with such paradoxes. In normally Republican Nebraska, for instance. Mr. Johnson and Democratic Gov. Frank Morrison were elected—but so was Republican Senator Roman Hruska. All three carried the population center of Lincoln by a wide margin.

The explanation for such unusual voter behavior lay in the nature of the Presidential contest.

The nation was voting at the end of one of the most unusual Presidential campaigns in its history. Some called it dull, some called it dirty, some called it unenlightening, but no one disputed that there had been few like it.

It was remarkable, first, in that no Vice President had ever succeeded to office so late in the term of his predecessor as Mr. Johnson did when he took over less than a year ago—Nov. 22, 1963. As a result, almost all of his time in office, following a political “moratorium” in memory of John F. Kennedy,

The campaign was unusual, too, in that Mr. Johnson was the first resident of a Southern state to be nominated by a major party for the Presidency since Zachary Taylor of Louisiana ran on the Whig ticket in 1848 and James K. Polk of Tennessee was nominated by the Democrats in 1844.

President Taylor was both the last Southern resident elected President before today and the last successful Whig candidate.

Mr. Goldwater, the President's Republican opponent, was in many ways an even more unusual candidate. As an apostle of a conservatism that was virtually uncompromised throughout his year-long campaign, he was the most ideological and factional candidate of either major party since William Jennings Bryan ran on a free silver platform in 1896.

As the candidate of a faction that had captured the Republican party, rather than the overwhelming choice of that party's consensus, Mr. Goldwater suffered sharp defections that amounted almost to a party split.

Except for a conciliatory speech to a group of Republican leaders at Hershey, Pa., on Aug. 12, Mr. Goldwater made little effort to compromise with the more moderate and liberal sentiment in his party. In Republican National Headquarters and in many of the state parties, a “purge” of non-Goldwater men was carried out soon his nomination in San Francisco on July 15.

Appeals to Republicans

As a result, many Republicans either withheld public support of the Goldwater-Miller ticket, or defected outright to the Mr. Johnson and Humphrey carefully refrained from attacking the Republican party as such, termed Mr. Goldwater no more than its “temporary spokesman” and openly appealed for dissident Republicans to enter the Democratic coalition this year.

Thus, a Southern Democrat once considered too conservative to win the Democratic nomination, and a small-state conservative long believed to be an isolated figure in Republican politics, made the 1964 race—the 45th Presidential campaign in the nation's history.

Although Mr. Goldwater was the challenger, his outspoken conservatism and controversial views set the tone of the campaign and largely shaped the most hotly debated issues. Most analysts and polltakers came to believe that the central question of the campaign was not Mr. Johnson and the record of his Administration but Mr. Goldwater and the radical departures he proposed in both domestic and foreign policy.

There were few substantive exchanges between the candidates until after the nomination of Mr. Johnson and Mr. Humphrey at Atlantic City on Aug. 26. On Aug. 18, the United States Senate, with the acquiescence of the President, killed a bill that would have suspended the equal-time provision of the law governing broadcasting, and that ended all chance of an actual face-to-face debate between Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Johnson.

Nevertheless, as the campaign developed through the fall months, with both men and their running mates crisscrossing the nation and appearing frequently on television, a dialogue did develop between them on several questions, including the following:

CENTRALIZED GOVERNMENT

Mr. Goldwater contended that since 1933, the Federal Government had absorbed more and more power from the states and localities, and that within the Government itself, the executive branch and the Supreme Court had progressively usurped powers that more properly resided in Congress or with the states.

He pledged, however, that he would move slowly in terminating Federal programs and that he would honor both actual and implied commitments between the Government and the people.

Mr. Johnson vigorously defended the Federal Government as the instrument of all the [missing text.]

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. Goldwater argued on several fronts. He said the Administration's reliance on missiles of manned bombers would eventually bring a sharp reduction in deliverable nuclear capacity. He said the Supreme Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces ought to have "more lee-way" in the use of tactical nuclear weapons – weapons he said should be considered "conventional."

Later, he modified this to say that commanders in the field already had delegated authority to use nuclear weapons in certain pre-described emergency situations.

Throughout his campaign, Mr. Goldwater implied that the United States ought to have overwhelming nuclear and conventional strength, and should use it in a policy of "brinkman-ship" to force Communist governments to stop disturbing the world's peace.

Mr. Johnson and other Democratic spokesmen denied that the shift to missiles endangered American security. They insisted that the nation's strength had never been greater, and that it was measurably increased over that provided in the Administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Democrats also insisted that nuclear weapons control should and did remain exclusively in the hands of the President. They termed Mr. Goldwater a "trigger-happy hip-shooter" who could not be relied upon to keep his finger off the "nuclear button."

And they argued that a policy of brinkmanship was not only too risky in the nuclear era but also that the idea of forcing Communist nations to back down from their line of policy was unrealistic and oversimplified.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Goldwater, who voted in the Senate against the Civil Rights Act of 1964, on the ground that its public accommodations and equal employment sections were unconstitutional, insisted that such legislation infringed the rights of people.

He said the solution to the problems of Negro rights could be found only "in the hearts of the people," not in legislation, and he urged that the enforcement of these rights be left to the states.

Mr. Goldwater was believed by many observers to be seeking the so-called "white back-lash" vote from white persons alarmed at the pace of the Negro rights drive. His strategists conceded that they hoped to "sweep" the once solidly Democratic Southern states, and both Mr. Goldwater and Mr. Miller campaigned heavily in that region.

Mr. Johnson gave total support to the civil rights bill enacted last summer. He and his supporters derided the idea of leaving civil rights enforcement to the states.

The President campaigned extensively in the South, however, urging Southerners not to let their concern with the race problem bar them from full participation in the economic and social advance of the nation. There also was more than a hint in some Democratic campaign speeches that Southern states that remained adamantly opposed to equality for Negroes might begin to lose lucrative Federal defense contracts and other forms of subsidy.

MORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Goldwater charged that there was "moral decay" in the nation and lawlessness in the streets; whether his reference was to hoodlums and juvenile delinquency or to Negro demonstrations was never made clear. He frequently pointed to the Robert G. Baker and Billie Sol Estes cases as examples of lax morality in the Johnson Administration.

When Mr. Johnson's top as [missing text.]

Mr. Goldwater's thesis was that "moral decay" in the Johnson Administration "trickled down" to the people and was affecting the fiber of the nation itself. Mr. Johnson seldom replied to these charges although he did defend Mr. Jenkins as an able public servant whose personal misconduct had not endangered the national security.

These were the main themes of the campaign—but there were others. Mr. Johnson spoke frequently of his "Great Society" concept, a plan that envisioned massive new Federal programs in education, medical care, conservation of natural resources and urban renewal in the cities.

Mr. Goldwater criticized the Democratic tax cut of 1964 as politically inspired "gimmickry" and offered his own five-year program of tax reduction. He also called Mr. Johnson's "war on poverty" a "cruel hoax" designed only to win the votes of the less fortunate.

Mr. Johnson, however, attributed the nation's rising prosperity to the 1964 tax cut and promised even greater efforts to eliminate poverty, illiteracy and discrimination.

Most Democratic strategists believe, however, that the most telling argument on their side was the widespread belief that Mr. Goldwater would be careless in the use of nuclear weapons, belligerent in his foreign policy, and thus would endanger the peace. This accounted, they believe, for the high percentage of women in both parties who indicated to polltakers that they feared to back Mr. Goldwater.

The two Presidential candidates campaigned in strikingly different manners, although each roamed widely in the nation by jet aircraft and made frequent speeches.

Contrasts Noted

Mr. Johnson was folksy and mingled freely with the crowds; he often climbed on top of his limousine to speak to street-corner throngs through a bull horn. Mr. Goldwater almost never made sidewalk tours, handshaking expeditions and rarely came close to the sizable crowds that turned out to see him. In motorcades, he rode in a closed car, paying little attention to the increasingly sparse turnouts for these events.

On the platform, despite his hard-hitting charges, Mr. Goldwater was deceptively mild, often colloquial, and rarely made any effort to rouse his listeners to excitement. Mr. Johnson, on the other hand, sometimes roared at the top of his voice through an hour or more of almost extemporaneous speaking.

As the campaign advanced, Mr. Johnson's lead seemed at first to widen, then to shrink somewhat, then to return to approximately the level at which polltakers had first estimated it. In the final days of the campaign, for instance, Dr. George Gallup predicted that he would win 61 per cent of the vote, just about the pre-campaign prediction of most polltakers.

Mr. Goldwater insisted to the last, however, that his campaign had started "moving up" before Oct. 15 and was coming to a peak that would bring him victory on Election Day. Neither he nor any of his supporters, however, ever predicted that he could win by more than a few electoral votes.