2201 Scenic Drive
Austin 3, Texas
January 29, 1962

Mr. Ed Idar, Jr.
223 South 17th Street
McAllen, Texas

Dear Ed:

I have just had a three-hour session with Don Yarborough here at home. We covered the waterfront, and I am convinced that I understand the man. I know where his financial backing is coming from, and I am thoroughly satisfied about the matter. His social philosophy is very sound, and I am convinced that he is sincere.

He and his wife are out-and-out integrationists (a fact that cannot be revealed publicly) and sincerely concerned over the plight of minority groups.

He agrees that a positive, specific platform is what will gain mexicano support -- and he is prepared to put it on the line for us. He will commit himself to put into operation reform programs along a wide front -- education, health, and the like. He agrees that mexicanos are entitled to their share of political appointments. He is prepared to name an advisory council that will brief him on the needs of the latinos. Etc.

He tells me that LBJ men have let it be known in certain high political circles that the mexicanos are already committed to Connally.

I find that D. Yarborough is not a Dugger type of liberal -- that is, Yarborough is more practical, less academic, and more genuinely identified with social problems that mean something for our people. Also, he doesn't jump to conclusions without careful checking. For instance, Ronnie's "mess of postage" article was inspired by the rumors that the LBJ camp has spread that Pena and others have committed the mexicanos to support Connally. Ronnie should have double-checked on that one. Yarborough did -- that is why he came to me for advice. I told him that I could not answer for anyone but myself on that score and that I am not pro-Connally.

also, I told him that I could vouch for you and Hector -- that if you told him you were uncommitted, you were uncommitted: period. We do not double-deal, nor double-cross our own associates in PASSO.

Yarborough does not want to be identified with his senatorial namesake, nor with the theoretical liberals; though they are his friends and he supports them. He makes a strong case for judging him for what he proposes to perform rather than for his "liberal" label. This I agree with.

I still believe that if our choice is either Wilson or Connally, I'd choose Jack Cox! Since Wilson is a dead duck already, it means that if Yarborough does not get our endorsement we will be making a colossal miskake. What has LBJ done for us in all of these years? He has cut our throats at every turn, and has never lifted a finger to do anything meaningful to the welfare of our people. The Kennedys forced him into federal judgeship appointment of a mexicano, and he went along then only because he expected us to object to Garza and he could then have his Anglo candidate named. Even then, he chose a mexicano that never stood for us. I do not swallow the fiction that Connally is his own man. He is LBJ's man, and nothing but -- and we can expect from him, no matter what he promises, just what we have gotten from LBJ in the past: nothing. Ralph failed us as regards Salinas, something I'll not forget soon, but LBJ was the architect of our defeat. PASSO has a legitimate gripe against Ralph on this score (and on Public law 78), I agree. That being the case, are we going to be mad at a minor demon and hug to our bosom Satan himself? Let us not be silly! It would be laughable if we were suckered into this kind of stupidity! Better that we do not endorse anyone, if we can't endorse Yarborough.

What benefit have we ever received from the LBJ machine? LBJ-Rayburn-Daniel have always treated us like dirt. Are we so naive, so immature politically that we believe that their alter ego, John Connally, is going to turn over a new leaf? It is a laugh!

Suppose we endorse Yarborough, and LBJ gets mad at us. What do we lose? Nothing! Further, this is not the last election that will take place where our votes are crucial ones -- and LBJ, mad or not, is going to have to come back to ask for our votes. And he, then, is going to have to deliver -- for he will know that without performance on his part we will vote the other way! So, we are faced with a situation in which we cannot lose, if only we do not endorse Connally. If PASSO endorses Connally we will lose our strategic bargaining position, and the hopes of the mexicanos for a long time to come.

I will feel, personally, that all the work that we have put into the development of political leadership and political effectiveness has gone for naught.

Now, don't misunderstand -- this is not the conclusion of a "liberal" Democrat. It is the conclusion of one whose sole concern is for that kind of good government that will improve the status of our people, the mexicanos. If a conservative Democrat, or a Republican, gave evidence that he would perform this, I'd be for him. I have voted Republican (in New Mexico) when, for my people, the candidate in that party was best. I'd vote for one here if I thought that, in the long run, that would be best for my people.

Again, this is practical good politics. I recognize that Don Yarborough has some deficiences -- but let us not try to cure a bleeding cut on our nose by putting a tourniquet on our throats!

Now, let us suppose that Don Yarborough is endorsed by us and that he is a disappointment in his first term as Governor. As a "liberal" he cannot win reelection without our continued support. So, all that we would have lost is a couple of years -- though we would have gained in the lesson we would have taught those who constituted his opposition. If we endorse Connally he will win; and, once in office, he would become so entrenched and the LBJ machine would become so all-powerful, that he wouldn't need us any more. So, poof, to hell with the social reforms and the political changes for which we stand! We would be back to Allan Shivers, Price Daniel, and the good old political serfdom which has the lot of the mexicano under them.

Let us not mistake this: LBJ has been making goo-goo eyes at some of us for a purpose -- his purpose, not ours. A mi no me dan atole con el dedo! I am one of those who has felt the wrath of the political gods- that-be (Shivers, LBJ, Daniel) and I am not about to knuckle under at this late date. You know part of the story (when VanCronkite acted as the "finger" and hatchet man) -- there are other parts that you do not know and that I am prepared to tell.

Let us keep the record clear: I have received no favor of any kind from the so-called liberals, including Senator Yarborough. Whatever recognition I may have received from

the Roosevelt-Truman administrations or from the current one I received on my own, without even the knowledge of the "liberals." So I have no debts to pay there ("Velas no tengo en ese entierro."). It is simply that, after almost 40 years of working in behalf of my people (I started in 1923!), it is my seriously considered conclusion that our people will be served best by PASSO's endorsement of Don Yarborough.

Cordially,

George I. Sanchez

vr