

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION
NUMBER
527

Interview with
LOUISE RAGGIO
October 31, 1980

d. 1.23.2011

Place of Interview: Dallas, Texas

Interviewer: Gerald Saxon

Terms of Use: Open

Approved: *Louise B. Raggio*
(Signature)

Date: 4/10/81

COPYRIGHT © 1981 THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF NORTH TEXAS STATE
UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF DENTON

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Coordinator of the Oral History Collection or the University Archivist, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203

Oral History Collection

Mrs. Louise Raggio

Interviewer: Gerald Saxon

Place of Interview: Dallas, Texas

Date: October 31, 1980

Mr. Saxon: This is Gerald Saxon interviewing Mrs. Louise Raggio for the Dallas Public Library and the North Texas State University Oral History Collections. The interview is taking place on October 31, 1980, in Mrs. Raggio's office at the United Fidelity Life Building in downtown Dallas. I'm interviewing Mrs. Raggio in order to obtain her recollections concerning her life and the passage of the Texas Family Code.

Good morning, Mrs. Raggio, I'm happy to be here this morning. I would like to start with first perhaps something about your background. When were you born and where?

Mrs. Raggio: I was born on June 15, 1919, actually at my grandmother's home in Austin, Texas, although my parents lived in . . . we still have the farm. They'd bought a farm before I was born between Manor and Elgin, in the Kimbro School District and near the little, tiny hamlet of Littig, Texas, Travis County.

Mr. Saxon: Travis County. You mentioned your parents. What were

your parents' names, and where were they from?

Raggio: My dad's name was Louis Ballerstedt; my mother's maiden name was Hilma Lindgren. All four of my grandparents were immigrants. Two were born in Germany; two were born in Sweden. Both of my parents were born near Manor, and both were born in 1885.

Saxon: What was their occupation?

Raggio: Farmers.

Saxon: What kind of farm did they have?

Raggio: Cotton, maize, (with) dairy cattle when I was small . . . (also) chickens.

Saxon: What kind of responsibilities did you have on the farm while growing up?

Raggio: Well, we learned to do everything. Being the children of immigrants, I suppose we grew up being very self-sufficient. I can remember wallpapering, sewing, driving a tractor. I can remember driving a vehicle when I was too small to reach the pedals--an old T-model Ford truck--when the men were loading hay, like, if a storm was coming up and the hay was in the fields, and I would be just guiding the truck and going very, very slowly while it went by the hay bales. We learned to do everything, and that was just a part of the culture. I'm amazed at the things that I know how to do that other people don't know how to do because I was brought up that way.

Saxon: Were you an only child?

Raggio: Yes. But it was a very extended family. My daddy's family--my German grandparents--had sixteen children, and my Swedish grandparents had ten children. They were all concentrated in that area. So each Sunday the families would get together, and we would see each other during the week. So I had a very extended family of cousins, aunts, and uncles.

Saxon: What were your parents' attitudes about your education and your eventual career? Did they prompt you?

Raggio: Yes, my parents wanted me very much, for instance, to graduate from high school, and this was in the depths of the Depression. My dad got a job working on the county road so that we could move to Austin. You see, there were no hard-surface roads, and when it rained one had to stay at home until the roads dried up. I grew up without electricity, without gas, without hard-surface roads.

When I got into high school, especially my mother wanted me to have a better chance of an education, and, plus, we needed the money. I think that Dad made about eighty dollars a month on the county road. But we needed that during the Depression, and so we would move in during the winter with an aunt and uncle in Austin. The two families moved together, and I went to Austin High School. I graduated there at Austin High School.

- Saxon: And when was that?
- Raggio: I graduated in January, 1936.
- Saxon: If I can backtrack just for a second, you mentioned you went to Austin High School. What about public schools before that?
- Raggio: I started out at Kimbro School, which was a two-teacher school for eight grades. Each teacher had four grades. I went there until the seventh grade and then transferred to Manor and went to Manor for two years.
- Saxon: Do you remember what your favorite subjects were in school, at least in high school?
- Raggio: Well, in high school I liked journalism very much at Austin High School, and, of course, I always liked history. I think so much in high school depends on the caliber of your teacher. I enjoyed chemistry, and I was especially good in mathematics. I was valedictorian of my high school class.
- Saxon: Valedictorian of your high school.
- Raggio: At Austin High School.
- Saxon: When you were growing up, did you want to pursue a journalism career?
- Raggio: Well, women at that time, of course, had very, very restricted expectations. About all at that time a woman could aspire to, other than marriage and children, was to be either a teacher or a nurse, a secretary, or a clerical worker. I

fell into the teacher category and planned to be a teacher, not because I was especially interested in being a teacher but because that was something where there were jobs. That's what I did at the University of Texas; I got a permanent teacher's certificate.

Saxon: You entered the University of Texas in 1936?

Raggio: Yes.

Saxon: And what was your major at that particular time?

Raggio: I majored in political science and minored in history and had twenty-six hours of education, which gave me a permanent teacher's certificate. But if I had done what I was really interested in, I would've gone into journalism, which I enjoyed very much. But there was simply no jobs for women journalists. Another subject that was absolutely fascinating to me in college was geology, but there were no places for women geologists. So I think my life has been just a history of "taking-what-you-have-and-doing-what-you-can-with-it."

Saxon: Yes.

Raggio: Sort of making do.

Saxon: Who made you aware that there were no jobs?

Raggio: It is just like the air you breathe. I just knew that I was inferior to males, and males had opportunities that females didn't, and that was just simply the way it was. I can't remember being too angry about it because it was just the way it was. And even in the religion we had women

were supposed to sit in the back of the church with their bonnets on and mouths shut. That was what we were brought up with the cultural mores, and I just took what I had and was trying to make the best of what that was.

Saxon: Your girlfriends when you were in college, did they more or less pursue the same types of careers that you just mentioned for women?

Raggio: Yes. You see, my family was quite poor, and I knew that I would have to work. So many of the girls at that time went to school, it seemed to me, simply to get a husband. They were more interested in pursuing the males than in getting an education and were taking the courses that sort of were easy. But I knew that I was going to be employed, and so I wanted the ability to bring in a paycheck.

Saxon: You mentioned that your family was quite poor. What kind of jobs did you have when you were going through college?

Raggio: My first job in college was working in the dining room as a waitress in Littlefield Dormitory, for which I got half of my board or something like that. Then I would work in the different departments doing clerical work, and I eventually got to be--what was called--a student assistant. I remember in my senior year I was holding down three jobs and saved what was then an astounding amount of money, in addition to paying my own expenses my senior year. I also coached mathematics, for which I made the "great"

sum of fifty cents an hour, which was top salary. And I coached "trig" and college algebra all through college.

Saxon: Was that unusual for a woman to be a student assistant and for a woman to be a tutor or a coach?

Raggio: No, there were many women who worked. It was more a matter of economics. The persons who worked were the persons who needed to work, and that was the way the poorer students could stay in college.

Saxon: Did you experience any types of discrimination while you were at UT? Did the professors tend to patronize women?

Raggio: No, I wasn't in the kind of courses that would have been patronized. For instance, I did not go to law school and, of course, took only freshman geology. Probably, if I would have gotten into advanced geology or engineering, there would have been a lot of discrimination, but I was in the teacher-liberal arts category, which was okay for women to be in.

Saxon: You graduated from UT in 1939, is that correct?

Raggio: Yes.

Saxon: And what did you do after that?

Raggio: Well, I made Phi Beta Kappa at Texas, and I think I graduated number two in my class.

Saxon: That's outstanding.

Raggio: I had made an application for a Rockefeller grant at the National Institute of Public Affairs and was accepted as

one of the--what was called--interns for a year in Washington, DC. The Rockefeller Foundation's idea was to bring in about thirty to forty young college graduates from all over the country and give them a year in Washington, where they experienced being a part of the government at a very top level, with the hopes that the young people would stay in government service.

I had a really fascinating year in Washington and took courses in public administration at American University. I believe I finished fifteen hours in public administration at American University. I would have needed thirty hours for my master's, but I left Washington in June, 1940, and I never did complete my master's in public administration.

Saxon: You mentioned that there were forty people chosen as interns per year. How many of those were women?

Raggio: Ten.

Saxon: Ten were women. What were your duties? What did they consist of?

Raggio: For the first month we were given an overall view of Washington, with meetings and seminars in the various departments on Capitol Hill and in the Executive Department. Then we were given opportunities to be placed in the departments, according to our interests and according to which departments wanted us, with the idea that we would actually learn by doing.

We would go to work each day, according to the schedule set by the department or the legislator. But then in the evenings and the weekends, we would have these seminars, and we were allowed to attend many foreign diplomatic meetings and conferences. Cordell Hull was Secretary of State, and I can remember being at a number of meetings where he was meeting with the diplomats from all over the world. We went to a lot of congressional hearings and met with a lot of the congressional leaders. Mrs. (Eleanor) Roosevelt had the group over for supper at the White House, and we were given tickets to embassy parties--really, the social life of Washington. It was quite an exciting year for a young person.

Saxon: I can imagine.

Raggio: I imagine it's sort of like the White House Fellows now, except the White House Fellows are in the White House. But this was a very unusual group of young people. For instance, Alex Heard is now Chancellor of Vanderbilt; Harlan Cleveland has been in NATO; and a number of the men are presidents of universities or have had significant appointments. Sherman Maisel was one of the members of the Federal Reserve Board. It was a very unusual group of young people that have done very well.

Saxon: You mentioned you had supper with Eleanor Roosevelt. Did you have supper several times with her?

Raggio: The group had just one supper with her.. Of course, we saw her any number of times, but we were formally invited to the White House only one time.

Saxon: What was your impression of Mrs. Roosevelt?

Raggio: I thought she was one of the greatest human beings I have ever known. Her warmth and her concern for human beings . . . I can remember one of our young men was so, I suppose, excited that the napkins--the linen napkins--were on the plate, and he didn't notice that, and he put the food on his napkin. Eleanor Roosevelt saw it and made him feel perfectly at ease and got him another plate--instead of him being embarrassed. But she had the ability to have the very human touch. Of course, I saw her a number of times later on until close to her death. She was here a number of times after President Roosevelt died.

Saxon: You also mentioned Cordell Hull. Did you meet any others, or did you come in contact with, any other policymakers?

Raggio: Yes. I would say that we met, at one time or another, every Cabinet member that was there in 1939. We had the entree to just about any place we wanted to go, through this National Institute of Public Affairs. That was the reason the Rockefeller Foundation was spending money, was to give the young people an entree into the government. Then, of course, World War II came along, and a number of our people were killed. Another one of our members was

James MacGregor Burns, who was the biographer of the president--The Lion and the Fox. It was a group of people of that caliber.

Saxon: What area of government that you worked in did you enjoy the most?

Raggio: Well, I went into the National Youth Administration. I was interested in what government was trying to do with the disadvantaged youth.

Saxon: Let's talk about the National Youth Administration. After you left Washington--the year must have been 1940--did you move back to . . .

Raggio: I came back to Austin. I had a job in the state office of the National Youth Administration and then was put in what was called an area office as an area counselor. During the year and three months that I worked there, I was at various times in sixteen central Texas counties.

The idea was to recruit young people. Now these were people who were fifteen, sixteen years of age. The National Youth Administration at that time had training schools--sort of camps--where the young people were taught a trade, such as carpentry or sheet metal work or painting. The world was a lot different in 1940 than it is now. We were just coming out of the Depression, and there were many, many, many youths who did not have any trades whatsoever, and the youths would be sent to these training schools--sort

of training camps--and the youth would learn a trade. The youth, I believe, were paid fifteen dollars a month and given room and board and supplies. Surprisingly, much of that fifteen dollars would go back to the family because that made the difference in family survival in a lot of things. Now the girls were put in homemaking camps or houses and taught to sew and cook and were not taught to handle sheet metal or taught any trades.

Saxon: Did you experience any problems being a counselor, since you were on your own, obviously, driving through sixteen Texas counties?

Raggio: Well, I suppose I should have, but I have a very good sense of direction, and I can remember getting to places like Flatonia or Dime Box or Lampasas and someone saying that there were some children out in the hills over "that-a-way," and I would find the place and talk to the people. Remember, we didn't have as much communication then. This was before electricity had gone through that area. People didn't have even radios and, of course, didn't have money to subscribe to newspapers, so people could live five miles away and yet really not know of the opportunities available for young people.

Saxon: Were the parents generally receptive to what you were doing?

Raggio: Yes, I didn't have any bad experiences, and I felt what I was doing was important for the young people.

Saxon: What would you say would have been the most important effect of the NYA in your area of Texas?

Raggio: Well, of course, the important thing was that a number of these young people would have skills, and when the war industries started up, of course, those persons were able to go into very good jobs. And I wonder how many of those young people later went on the GI Bill and are now significant producers in our country. But it was a matter of unused talents of people and getting the people to be able to have some marketable skill. Now, of course, NYA had college programs where children going to school could work in the school system, but I was not in that part. I was in the sort of industrial part.

Saxon: And how did you get that job? Directly from your internship experience?

Raggio: Yes, I was recommended to that. My parents wanted me to come back to Texas, but I really wanted to stay in Washington.

Saxon: You did?

Raggio: Oh, yes. I wanted to stay in Washington, but being an only child . . . and my parents had agreed that I could go there for one year. Remember, Washington was a long way away; it was several days and several nights on a train. Airplanes were not available, even if you had the money. I think my train ticket to Washington cost some twenty-eight dollars, but I didn't have the money to come

home for Christmas, so I left in September and did not come back until June. I had made that agreement with my parents, and so I came on back, although I really would have liked to stay in Washington. I was fascinated by it.

Saxon: And you never got back there to work, did you?

Raggio: No, I never have been back. The only time I've been back is on visits, and, of course, it's changed so much. We had an apartment three blocks from the White House, on the fourth floor of what had been the French Embassy at the time Washington was burned in 1812, and it was right in the center of the excitement of Washington. Of course, it's sad to go back. The first time I went back looking for my place--I'd had so many fine memories--it was a parking lot. It had been torn down; it was a parking lot. Things change.

Saxon: How long did you work for the NYA?

Raggio: I worked from June, 1940, until October, 1941.

Saxon: And what did you do after that?

Raggio: Well, I had married in April, 1941, and my husband, Grier, was one of the early draftees in the lottery of 1941. He had gone in the service two weeks before we married. Then he was twenty-eight, and in the fall, 1941, the foreign situation looked so much brighter that these older men were released. And Grier was released from the service, and so I quit my job so that I could be with him. He had

a federal job and was a federal investigator, and I was traveling around with him.

Saxon: How did the war affect your life together?

Raggio: Well (chuckle), of course, we had decided, since the situation looked so much better, it would be a fine time to have a child. And I had found out on December 5, 1941, that we were expecting a child, and December 7th was Pearl Harbor Day. Then he got a deferment to stay out until the child was born and went back into the service in September, I believe, 1942. Then I stayed at home with my parents on the farm until he came back from the service. So the war took three years out of our lives.

Saxon: While you were at home, what kind of activities, particularly community and political activities, did you participate in?

Raggio: Remember, we were in this place without hard surface roads, so there was no thought of my being able to go to school or even work. I did some substitute teaching, but I would have had to have moved away from the farm in order to have had a job. And Grier did not want me to leave the child, so I became active in the League of Women Voters and was president of the League of Women Voters in Austin in 1945.

The older women were very active in war work. That was a fascinating time in many ways because I had the opportunity of meeting some of the old suffragettes: Jane Y. McCallum, Minnie Fisher Cunningham, Mrs. (Mary Heard)

Ellis--the women who had crusaded and had been able to get Texas to ratify the amendment allowing women to vote. I can remember being fascinated by their stories of the real persecution that they had (experienced) because they were espousing the fact that a women should be able to vote--the prejudice, some of the funny stories that were funny then but certainly weren't funny when they were happening.

Saxon: You mentioned stories that the old suffragettes said, and I think you were going to recount one by Mrs. McCallum.

Raggio: Jane Y. McCallum had been secretary of state. She was a woman who had had five children, was married, and her husband was the superintendent of schools in Austin. She was a leader in the efforts for women to obtain the vote back before 1920. And for one of the key votes of the Legislature, the women had heard that the legislators were going to leave town rather than vote on this key issue because they had promised the women that they would vote for allowing women to have the ballot, but they really were not for it. So there was just one way to get out of town at that time, and that was by train because that was before very many automobiles, and certainly there weren't fast roads, and no airplanes. So there was one train that the legislators would have to take. The women went down to the train station, and, as I understand from what they were saying, they got those legislators off the train and walked

back up Congress Avenue with the legislators and then got the vote.

And Jane Y. McCallum would tell of the insults she received, like, "Why aren't you at home taking care of your children?" And her answer was, "Well, my husband's mother lives with us, and she takes care of the children." The first they'd say was, "Well, why don't you get married?" And Mrs. McCallum would say, "I am married." And they'd say, "Well, why don't you have some children?" And she'd say, "Well, I have five children." "Well, why don't you take care of your children?" (laughter) But those were some very fine women, and I suppose I've used them as sort of role models. Role models are extremely important for any human being on which to sort of pattern a life.

Saxon: What impressed you most about the three women or the suffragettes you've talked about?

Raggio: Well, it was their strength, their dedication, and that they were not doing things for selfish reasons. They were doing things because they felt strongly that this was right and something that was needed.

Saxon: What were their--you might not know--but what were their attitudes at that particular time about the woman's situation in Texas, say, in World War II?

Raggio: Well, of course, we were working for secret ballots. Then there was no problem on employment for women, and all of a

sudden it suddenly became okay for women to work in the shipyards, to work in the industrial plants--"Rosie the Riveter"--and the gentle, dainty, incompetent female that wasn't supposed to do anything but be a clerical worker all of a sudden was competent to handle the industrial jobs. And then, of course, after World War II, women were supposed to give up all their jobs and go home and bake bread and have many children. Women have certainly been the "throwaways" of the work force.

Saxon: Speaking of after World War II, what did you and your husband do after World War II?

Raggio: Well, he had his job, of course. He had the right to the same job that he had when he went into the service, and that was in Dallas. We had a terrible time finding any place to live in Dallas, especially with a child. Our child was three years old. We finally got one of these temporary wartime housing projects in what was called Mustang Village. It had been built for war workers and was then used for veterans with children who were returning from service.

Saxon: Do you remember the rent you paid at that particular time?

Raggio: We first moved into a one-bedroom place, and I think it was around thirty-five dollars a month, including utilities. Then we had a second child in September, 1946, so then we were eligible for a larger apartment, a two-bedroom. There

simply was not a two-bedroom, and I can remember going up to see the manager every day before the baby was born. Finally, there was a three-bedroom available, and so we got a three-bedroom, and that was, I believe, forty dollars a month. We got on a list, and several years later we got a refrigerator--an electric refrigerator--and then our rent was raised to forty-one dollars a month. Now the whole apartment wasn't too much bigger than this office. It had three little bedrooms. It was sort of paper walls. Well, it was very temporary housing..

Saxon: Now that would be about 20' x 20'?

Raggio: Well, it was a little bit larger than that. The bedrooms were just big enough for a double bed and a chest of drawers and one chair. The kitchen was all tiny and compact, but when you don't have any housing, that looks very adequate.

Saxon: How did you go from Louise Raggio, the mother and domesticated wife, to Louise Raggio, the lawyer?

Raggio: We were in Dallas. We had one car that had 125,000 miles on it. I did not know people here. We did not have a phone; there were no phones available. I, of course, was not a member of any organizations, except the League of Women Voters. After the second child was born, I can remember it was a year where it rained all the time. We had no washing machine, and I had to wash the diapers by hand and dry them in the house. I suppose if there was

any--what they call--after-birth depression or blues, I had every reason to have it. I couldn't even make a telephone call during the day because the nearest phone was about three blocks away--a pay phone--and there might be a whole line waiting for it. So I was extremely isolated.

And Grier had had a very rough time in the service. He had been in all that Pacific fighting and ended up in Iwo Jima, so he had many, many, many scars--emotional scars--from the war. So he didn't have the energy or the old bounciness that he had before he went in the service, and it was Grier's idea that I start law school, when the baby was five months old, as a way of getting out of the house. Southern Methodist Universtiy had the night school, and so I enrolled in the night school about in March, 1947. It was a technique to get out of the house. Plus, I didn't know if a lot of the veterans were, of course, having a lot of problems, and if I had to go back to work, I knew that I would have to teach, and probably if I had some law courses, I could be qualified to teach business law in high school. I was qualified to teach in junior high, and I did not enjoy junior high teaching at all.

Saxon: So your first goal was not necessarily to get a law degree.

Raggio: No, no, it was to get out of the house.

Saxon: To get out of the house (chuckle)?

Raggio: To stay sane.

Saxon: That's a rough way to get out of the house, though.

Raggio: But it was a structured thing where I felt I would go, and it was very inexpensive. I think it was eight dollars a semester hour for law school. After all, federal employees were making practically nothing at that time. I don't think my husband was making \$400 a month, so there was just no money. We never had money for babysitters or things that young people take for granted now. So I started law school, and I just plugged along until I finally got my degree.

Saxon: And you got your degree in what year?

Raggio: In 1952. I took a year out when the third child was born.

Saxon: What was it like for a woman in a professional school?

Raggio: Oh, I can't say that I was very welcome by the then dean, a very nice old gentleman by the name of Dean (Charles S.) Potts, who really did not think that women belonged in law school. And then, of course, I got pregnant and that was not acceptable in SMU at that time. And a number of the professors, I felt, did not think that women had a place in law.

Saxon: Did they discriminate against you in any way?

Raggio: I just felt it from their attitudes and feelings. But remember, I was an older person at that time, so I did not have as rough a time as I'm sure a woman much younger

would have had. And I had children, and I've always been able to get along with people.

Saxon: What kind of obstacles did you have to overcome to get a law degree?

Raggio: Well, it was a time, remember, when I didn't have maids. I didn't have any family here to help me, and I had all of the problems of bringing up three children and going to night school and simply not having any money. But you take what you have and go with it.

Then when we got down to the last year, I was so close and that, I suppose, was the roughest year of all. I had gone to night school and basically had taken what was available certain nights, and I had just a hodge-podge of courses. Well, at that time, certain requirements were . . . you had no choice. You had to have certain requirements to get the LLB. So the last year I went to both night school and day school and took a full course and had the three kids. And then I had to take the Bar examination after I finished law school. I suppose if there was ever an exhausted person, I was it after taking that Bar examination.

Saxon: Was the future bright for an inexperienced woman lawyer?

Raggio: There was no future. After getting the law degree, I wanted to start around looking for a job, and the employment service told me that there were no places they could

send me for interviews. They could send me for interviews, but it would be unkind to send me to places because there were no firms that would hire a woman lawyer. So I had my law degree and no job availability.

Saxon: What did you do after graduation then?

Raggio: Well, Grier was a lawyer, and we had sort of a little office. You see, Grier really hated his federal job; he had a terrible job in the Veterans Administration. Our goal was that I could become employed so that he could quit his job, because we lived from paycheck-to-paycheck.

I know we bought an old wreck-of-a-house in 1949, out on Amherst Street, and we had to rent rooms in order to eat. Our budget was so tight that every cent that he made was used for payments on the house, and we had borrowed everywhere we could to get enough down payment for the house. We had to rent two rooms, and we got seventy dollars a month, and that was our total grocery, emergency--everything--budget, and if those rooms weren't rented, we didn't eat. But we had a little desk and a typewriter, and Grier would do wills and pick up a few dollars for legal work, although it was frowned on by the federal government for an employee to do any legal work.

So then I sort of became the lawyer in this little law office. I had gotten some cases, and I did wills and I

made some money. Of course, Grier would work with me, but he officially could not. The person who went to court, the person who filed . . . I can remember I've always loved Judge (William) "Mac" Taylor. Early in my career I somehow got a damage suit. Now you can imagine how much I knew about a damage suit, but I filed a personal injury suit for a client, and Judge Taylor, I think, offered me, oh, \$5,400 total. I had that on a one-third contingency, and I was talking to . . . of course, I called him "Mac" then, and I said, "'Mac,' this thing is worth more than \$5,400 even at my experience." I felt it was worth more than that. And I remember "Mac" Taylor looked straight at me, and he said, "Louise, you ought to take this; you ought to take this amount." And that's all he said. But from the way he looked at me, I felt that I should. I took the amount. We got the check; it cleared; My client got two-thirds of it, and I got, I remember, the amazing amount of \$1,700. And six weeks later, the insurance company went bankrupt. So if I had not taken that, I would've gotten nothing and been out my court costs and everything like that. And so, as I say, I've always been grateful to "Mac" Taylor because that \$1,700 is like \$170,000 now. It really made a difference, plus, it made a lot of difference to my client. But that was at the time when the insurance companies were going

bankrupt, and there was so much confusion in the insurance industry. But I was out in private practice.

Saxon: Well, how were you treated in the courts at that particular time--a woman lawyer?

Raggio: Oh, well, I was not enthusiastically received. But, you see, Dallas had had Sarah Hughes, and it had Edith DeBusk and some very fine women lawyers ahead of me. I think Dallas has been unusual in Texas in having the caliber of women lawyers that it has, and that continues to this day. So it was easier for me in Dallas than it would've been had if I been somewhere else.

Saxon: Were there any restrictions of the Dallas Bar Association, for instance? Was that more or less a "clubby" atmosphere for all the men?

Raggio: No, women were allowed to join, and I joined soon after I became a lawyer. I got into the Junior Bar, and I was elected vice-president of the Junior Bar. I would have run for president, but age got me. And I can remember at that time, although I don't think it would've been brought up that I was too old to be president, I felt that it would be a bad precedent for me to take advantage of the fact that I was a woman and to run for president after I was thirty-six. And so I didn't run, but I was vice-president. I was secretary-treasurer and then vice-president of the Junior Bar.

Saxon: You practiced with Grier shortly after graduation?

Raggio: Well, he was not allowed to practice. I did the practicing.

Saxon: You did the practicing. And I believe you got a job with the district attorney's office in 1954?

Raggio: Well, there was another reason, too. Kenneth, the baby, was two years old when I graduated, and, not having family here, I would have had to have put Kenneth in a nursery. And at that time there weren't as many nurseries, and child care wasn't available. Plus, I was really exhausted by the time I finished law school and the Bar, and so I stayed at home until March, 1954, when I got a job with Henry Wade. I was the first woman ever hired as a lawyer by Henry Wade.

Saxon: What were your duties for Mr. Wade?

Raggio: I had the duties that no man wanted--no man lawyer wanted--and that was the Wife and Child Division. The Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act had been enacted in Texas about in, well, the early 1950's, because the parent could go across the state line, and there was no way of getting support for a family if the parent went across the state line. So this law was enacted very quickly in all forty-eight states at that time.

And when I got to Wade's office, so help me, there were stacks of files on the floor two and three feet high--stacked-up cases--because, well, nobody really wanted to do that kind of work. There were no forms; there was no organization.

One of the first things I did was to get a bunch of mimeographed forms, with all of my inexperience of not knowing how to draw up a form in that particular kind of law. And those forms, I think, were used for about ten years because nobody had time enough to revise them.

But I got a bunch of mimeographed forms, and then, of course, I suppose I have used the fact that I'm a woman as sort of a weapon. I individually went around to the district judges because we had no judge that was assigned to help us. At that time there were no family courts, no domestic relations judges, and the regular district judges simply did not like family law; it's a very emotional, draining, bothersome kind of law. But we had to have judges to hear all of these cases. I would go around to the judges and say, "Judge, if I have these people," and it was practically (all) women, women all the time, "if I have these women here about fifteen minutes to two on Thursday, would you hear these cases?" And what I did, I'm sure, was very unconstitutional because I would have the group testify as a group (chuckle) and have the forms there, and in about fifteen minutes, I would run fifteen, sixteen, eighteen cases through--just sort of mass-produced. But we would get the forms out because these were the people in Texas who were not receiving support, and the man would be in Idaho or Minnesota. I never had time to

tabulate what all I did, but I sent thousands of those things out, and by the time I left two years later, we didn't have a backlog.

Then in addition to this uniform support, I handled the wife and child desertion; I handled the juvenile docket, I tried juvenile cases where juveniles were accused of murder, rape, arson, whatever it was. Then Wade, after a year, told me that I could work in the regular criminal courts if I wanted to, and so I would sit second chair on other cases. And then he assigned me to Judge Brown's county criminal court. Joe Brown was the one that tried the (Jack) Ruby case, and I remember, when I was assigned there, Wade's and Judge Brown's and my picture appeared on the front page of the Times-Herald because it was so unprecedented that a woman would be a prosecutor in a criminal court.

Saxon: I think you were the first woman prosecutor in a Dallas criminal court,

Raggio: Well, yes, but, I mean, here I was, prosecuting drunk driving and aggravated assault. But the Times-Herald had our pictures on the front page; "Wade Assigns Woman as a Criminal Prosecutor," That was in 1955, I guess,

Saxon: Did you have a good record at that particular time?

Raggio: Oh, yes, I had a very good record. I remember women were finally allowed to serve on juries about in 1955, and I

was in Joe Brown's court. So the first day that women were allowed to serve on juries . . . I don't know how this happened, but I was trying a case, and here comes twelve jurors. Ten of them were women, and two of them were men, and I was trying the case. So you know, I struck the two men (laughter). And we had an all-woman jury, and, of course, that was reported all over the state. I don't know how fair it was. I think those women, if they couldn't have convicted the defendant, would've convicted the bailiff.

Saxon: Any man?

Raggio: Any man (laughter). It was, I believe, an aggravated assault case, and I felt the man was guilty, but he really didn't stand much of a chance. They were going to convict somebody.

Saxon: In dealing with the family matters in Mr. Wade's office, did that perhaps provide the impetus for your idea that the Family Code needed to be revised?

Raggio: Yes. Anybody who does family law knows that the family laws needed revision, and when you get into the law revision, what looks like it is so simple simply isn't. And the Corporation Section would have the financial support of corporations; the Insurance Section would have financial support of insurance companies. Oil and gas would have a financial base.

But families do not have any benefactors, so the family law, in my opinion, was about the worst morass of all the laws. We had laws where one would say one thing, and one would say exactly the opposite. For instance, when we started on the revision of the Family Code, we found laws that were on the books that were absolutely valid laws regulating cohabitation of slaves. But we hadn't had slaves for a hundred years. Concerning apprentices, like, when people used to sell their children to work, we had laws regulating things like that. There simply has not been the energy or the money or the time to do a revision. The laws were just accretions of conflicting laws (passed) over a hundred years.

Saxon: Well, how did you become involved in the move by the Texas Bar to revise the Family Code?

Raggio: I left Wade's office in 1956, and when you go in private practice, you take the cases that come to you. Since I had a reputation in family law, I had more family law than anything else and was active in the revision of family law because there were so many things that I felt were inadequate.

The State Bar organized a Family Law Section of the Bar in 1960. Paul Carrington, a very fine Dallas lawyer, was president of the State Bar at that time, and he had known of the work I had done with families in Dallas, and

he appointed me on the council (Family Law Council). Here I was, a member of a body of the State Bar interested in family law, and I became secretary of the council, then vice-chairman. I became chairman in 1965.

You have to go back into the history of Texas at that time because there had been the movement on revision of the laws affecting disabilities of married women, and some of the groups like the (Texas Federation of) Business and Professional Women (B&PW) had gone after this constitutional amendment--the Equal Legal Rights Amendment. And that amendment would be introduced in each session of the Legislature. But I got to be a part of the Bar structure and had access to various legislators. During these years there had been the ferment in women's groups for an Equal Legal Rights Amendment to remove the discriminations against married women. The discriminations against married women were a result of long history in Texas. I've never felt that it was malice on the part of men, but it was simply an amalgamation of the Spanish laws with the English laws and the peculiar needs of Texas.

But Texas had the worst laws in the United States discriminating against married women. Married women were not allowed to sign contracts; if they were going into business, they had to have their disabilities of coverture removed. It was just an unbelievable set of, oh, twenty-five

to thirty disabilities for a married woman, and that a single woman or a widow did not have. And this was very restrictive and very detrimental for business in Texas and a real millstone around the neck of a woman.

Saxon: Now how was it detrimental to business?

Raggio: Well, for instance, I remember one case where I was representing a car dealer in Oak Cliff. The car dealer had sold cars to a woman, say, for ten years. The woman then got married--her second or third marriage--and the car dealer did not have her husband sign the contract. The woman's daughter wrapped the car around a telephone pole, and the woman said, "Come and get your car. I'm not responsible because I'm a married woman, and you didn't have my husband sign the contract." And there was no suit against her. It was one thing right after the other.

And if you go back into the cases, you'll find out all sorts of--what seems to me--real fraud in the oil fields because unless a woman's acknowledgment was properly taken before a notary, and unless her husband was chased out of the room and she was examined privily and apart, you did not have a good deal. It was used to set aside conveyances, and unless you were sure that those things had been done properly, you really were not sure of your title. So it could be used as an instrument of fraud.

Plus, why should a woman have to go to court in order to be able to transact business? I couldn't make a bond, even in a probate case; I'd have to have my husband come and sign it for me. I couldn't have gotten him out of jail. He could get me out of jail. It was just one thing right after the other that was the result of the long history of Texas.

All right, the women's groups in the 1960's were having this Equal Legal Rights Amendment before the Legislature each time. I had said that I was a part of the structure of the Bar and had found out the law was almost going to pass each time, but the legislators had counted their votes and were sure that it wasn't going to pass, so it was never going to get to the voters. The Bar, by a referendum sent out to all the lawyers in about 1964, voted three to one against the constitutional amendment, against Equal Legal Rights. I've been a pragmatist all my life, and I believed that Equal Legal Rights simply was not going to pass. I was put on a committee as a Bar representative to meet with the Business and Professional Women's groups in trying to get a joint bill, and we hammered out a bill--I think it was in the 1965 session--but I knew that it didn't have a chance. It was sort of window dressing.

I was elected chairman of the Family Law Section of the Bar in 1965, and I asked Clint Small, the president

of the Bar, please to assign this--this might just be called marital property at that time because there was no such thing as a Family Code--marital property to my section. I asked Clint at a party where "umpteenth" people were talking to him. I don't know whether he really heard what I said, but he said "yes." And then immediately after I got back to Dallas, I wrote him a letter thanking him for assigning it to us. Then I sent a letter out to my council, saying that the president of the Bar asked us to do this, and if I do not hear from you by a certain date, I shall record your vote as "yes." My council was not for this--the Family Law Council.

Saxon: They were not for . . .

Raggio: For taking on this big job. This was a tremendous job; this was a big job. I didn't get any replies back, so when the time had passed, I wrote to Clint and said, "Our Council approves; we'll take it." Well, Clint, by that time, I think, had reconsidered, and he asked the Probate Section to work with us on this.

The Probate Section at the time was headed by two really great lawyers from Houston, Charles Saunders and Hank Hudspeth, and they are scholars and they understood what these restrictive laws on women were doing to business. It wasn't a matter of being pro-female; it was a matter of simply bringing Texas into the 20th century. The

Probate Section was engaged in a massive revision of the Probate Code, so they said, "Look, Louise, you do this and we will help and we will read, but you have to take the major part of the work," which was fine.

So I am very much like a bumblebee. If you look at the bumblebee from an engineering standpoint, it can't possibly fly because it's not engineered to fly; but the bumblebee doesn't know it, and so the bumblebee flies. Well, I did not know what a gargantuan task this was. I frankly thought that any lawyer that had been involved in family law . . . two or three of them could sit down and in a couple of days get these discriminations out and put the marital property--simply marital property--put it in the 20th century. Ha!

Two years later, after thousands of hours of work, I had learned that legal recodification is not that simple. But I was very fortunate in having some really great scholars who were all so dedicated. Now they weren't blithering idiots, like I was. They probably wouldn't have taken on this because they would've known how much work it was. But in my abysmal ignorance, I didn't. And so I signed up for it and then, of course, had to get it finished. Sometimes "fools rush in."

But I had some really great people that understood this: Professor Joseph McKnight and Professor Gene Smith

from SMU Law School, Dean Angus McSwain from Baylor, William Huie from the University of Texas, and then some practicing lawyers. One of the greatest was Dewey Lawrence, who's long since passed away. He was an elderly lawyer from Tyler--the true Southern gentleman, and he just looked like it--and he represented all the banks in East Texas. He was simply perfect to go to the Legislature and say, "Gentlemen, these laws are just and right, and this is what we need for Texas." But we put together this group of people who were responsible for drafting this, and, remember, this is just on marital property.

We went through seven complete drafts in the two years. We would get a draft and think that all these discriminations were out, and then we would have an all-day meeting or a two-day meeting, and someone would say, "Yes, but this cannot be done this way on account of something that would happen in real estate or probate or insurance or something else." So then you'd start from ground zero again. But this work was very well done and has not been held unconstitutional, except some of the discriminations that we knew were in there. For instance, I can remember Dewey Lawrence when we were saying that a husband has a duty to support a wife. I wanted it, and now the law says a wife has a duty to support the husband period. Dewey said that he simply

could not go along with that, and so the phrase was added, "the woman has a duty to support the husband if he cannot support himself." Well, being a pragmatist, I was certainly not going to lose Dewey, and I agreed to it. And there were some discriminations like that, but this was light years ahead of what we had had in the past.

So we got this package, and then it was . . . of course, we were a Bar committee, a Bar section, but the Bar did not give us even a postage stamp. Basically, we financed this ourselves. Most of the work, early work, was financed by our law office with no contribution whatsoever from the Bar. As we got into it, it became such a gargantuan task that we started looking for foundation money, and eventually, before the Family Code was out, we got, oh, six figures of foundation money. But we started all that by simply financing everything ourselves, everything--the secretarial work, the postage, all that.

Saxon: Now when you say "ourselves," you're referring to whom?

Raggio: Well, what I did postage-wise, and professor McKnight donated his time, and Gene Smith donated his time.

Saxon: So the individuals involved . . .

Raggio: The individuals involved. We had some Family Law Section money, but it was just a trickle compared with the needs. But it was people, lawyers, who gave their time and thousands of hours of work that was donated on it.

Saxon: What foundations were cooperative?

Raggio: Eventually, it was Hoblitzelle, Moody, Houston Foundation, but that gets ahead of the story. Remember, in 1967 this was merely the first part of what is now the Family Code--the Marital Property (provisions). But we had to get that by the Bar Legislative Committee, and, remember, this Bar had voted three to one against this concept just three years before. Well, the way that that was handled was to have someone, a persuasive person, contact each member of the Legislative Committee of the Bar (laughter). And this person did, and I can remember the chief counsel of the Bar was shocked and was really furious and came out of the meeting and told me, "Louise, you got it approved! Now you get it passed!" He was just furious. And I said, "I will." And so, basically, we had to do our own lobbying on it.

Saxon: If I may ask, who was this persuasive person that you referred to?

Raggio: Well, it was Robert Hughes, who had been a legislator and a domestic relations judge. Robert Hughes understood what we were doing. Anyone who took the time and had the legal background and was a scholar could see what we were doing was right. But the prejudiced person would say, "Well, we've got to keep women in their place. You're going to turn women loose on business and break up marriages and

families, all of these things." And I suppose if I'm good at anything, it's getting people to work together and putting together a team that did this. So we got it approved by the Bar, and so it went as Bar legislation.

The president of the Bar at this time was also a great man by the name of W. O. Schafer from Odessa. W. O. understood what we were doing. There weren't many airline flights to Austin at that time, but W. O. came in from Odessa for our hearings. Dewey Lawrence came in from Tyler. Dean McSwain got his Baylor boys, the lawyers, organized, and there were a tremendous number of Baylor members of the Legislature. So we had a great deal of help, and, of course, I was spending probably over half of my time--well over half of my time--just working on this and running back and forth to Austin for the legislative hearings.

Then some very fortuitous things happened. There had been this running battle between women's groups and the Legislature on this Equal Legal Rights (Amendment), and some of the women's groups would only talk about equal legal rights and were genuinely hated by the members of the Legislature. At the hearing before the House on this, five members of B&PW came down and testified against this legislation. I was absolutely thunderstruck to have these people testify against it. But it was probably the reason that the legislation was passed, because there was

so much feeling against the women, and here, I suppose, I was the perfect foil against this women's group, and, of course, I've been a member of the B&PW since 1954, and I'm for equal legal rights. But I testified against equal legal rights sort of in a trade-off because I felt there was no chance of it passing and no chance of it getting through in 1967. Ben Barnes was the speaker, and Ben Barnes agreed to push this. I suppose you would call it the trade-off's that you find down there. But we had the support of the powers in the Legislature, and this legislation went through unanimously in the House, and with only two votes against it in the Senate.

Then we were in a pickle because, when legislation is passed with that great majority, it goes into effect immediately. And so then we had to get Governor Connally to put a rider on it so that it didn't go into effect until the first of January because we were changing the laws in ninety days, and, frankly, the lawyers in Texas, although it had been in the Bar journals, simply didn't know what it was. So we had too much success that way (chuckle). We had very good leadership in our legislative sponsors: Gene Fondren, who is now a lobbyist, I think, for the railroads; Dick Cory, who is now a lobbyist for the beer groups and automobiles; and Senator J. P. Word. None of these people are in the Legislature anymore. They were

the power structure with Ben Barnes, and, of course, Connally, I'm sure, didn't know what it was, but Ben Barnes was certainly very supportive of it.

Saxon: Why do you think the women's groups, or the B&PW, opposed? What were their reasons?

Raggio: I think that it was a very wrong decision because they wanted it their way, even if they went down to bitter defeat. Instead of knowing that this work had to be done . . . you see, if the Equal Legal Rights Amendment had been passed first, then these statutes would have had to have been changed to conform. Now when Equal Legal Rights was passed later in the 1970's, there was practically nothing that had to be changed because we had already done the work on Marital Property in 1967. But a constitutional amendment is not self-enacting. You have to have the statutes to build, to conform, and I don't think that we would have had the caliber of laws without the kinds of persons who were dedicated enough to give all their time in 1965, 1967, such as McSwain, McKnight, Smith. This is why it has worked so well in Texas. I think the B&PW was absolutely wrong. And I think that this is one of the weaknesses of some women-- if they don't get it their way, they go against it instead of saying you take half a loaf instead of none.

Saxon: I'm kind of shocked, actually, by both sides--B&PW for not

supporting your revision of the Family Code and for the Bar for not supporting the ELRA. Now what was the Bar's reasoning behind not supporting the Equal Legal Rights Amendment? Just that it wouldn't pass?

Raggio: Well, the Bar had this referendum in 1964 where the lawyers three to one voted against it, so the Bar had no choice. I mean, you're bound by a referendum, and the referendum, loud and clear, was three to one against the Equal Legal Rights Amendment.

Saxon: Well, why do you think most of the Bar members voted against the ELRA?

Raggio: Because they felt--and if you go back into the Bar journal in 1964, you can see the arguments pro and con--that it would disturb our community property system and that it would cause a lot of women to be preyed upon by unscrupulous people who wanted to get the property away from them, and they would sign all sorts of contracts committing the community (property). As I say, I don't think it was malice as much as it was just fear of change. And that's true in so many things. You have fear of change.

Saxon: Didn't the American Bar Association come out in favor of the ERA, or was that after this?

Raggio: No, this was afterward. Remember, we're talking about sixteen years ago, and things have certainly changed. Then when the Federal Government passed the Equal Legal Rights

Amendment, Texas was one of the first states to ratify it. I think I'm wrong on Ben Barnes being speaker in 1967. I think Ben Barnes was speaker later, but he was a factor in all this.

Saxon: In the 1967 session, who helped to spearhead this through the Legislature. You mentioned Ben Barnes, and a few lobbyists. Was there anyone in the Senate who was particularly helpful?

Raggio: Well, of course, Word was quite helpful.

Saxon: Senator Word?

Raggio: And then it was mostly like keeping some of the people that we expected to oppose it to sort of explain to them. I'm sure there were a number of trade-offs . . . I know there were trade-offs: "Look, you support this and I'll support the other." But that's, of course, the legislative process.

Saxon: You also said that, of course, revision is a massive undertaking which takes money, organization, and time. What kind of organization did you create to help get this through the Legislature or to help revise it?

Raggio: Well, what I did was to have this group of people, McSwain and all those, do the scholarly work. Then the sponsors, Gene Fondren, Dick Cory, and Senator Word, felt that a low profile was the way to get it through in 1967--that if there was a lot of publicity about it, it would bring up

a lot of the fears that the legislators had. And so we had a very, very low profile, and then, of course, when B&PW came down and testified against it, the members felt, "Well, this must be anti-ERA."

I think I told you before that I remember going before a Senate committee after the House committee, where the B&PW came down five strong and testified against it. I was petrified in going before this Senate committee because I expected to be just barbecued. I've forgotten who was chairman of that committee, but it was an older, very, very conservative lawyer, and when I came before the committee, the lawyer looked at me--this chairman of the committee--and named some women and said, "Are you with that group?" And I said, "No, I'm representing the State Bar of Texas." And he said, "How does this certain woman stand on this?" And I said, "Well, she testified against it in the House committee." Basically, he said, "That's all I want to hear," and the thing was approved by the Senate committee.

So I think it's only fair to say that the legislators really didn't understand all the ramifications of what we were doing because we were doing by statute what the Equal Legal Rights Amendment was doing by constitutional amendment. But I felt it was what Texas had to have, and I certainly was backed up by the scholars and some of the

greatest practicing lawyers in Texas, like W. O. Schafer and Dewey Lawrence, who really had a great deal of experience and understood what we were doing.

Now after this got started and got rolling, while Clint Small was still president of the Bar, Clint called me up one fine day and said, "Louise, you're making such progress on the Marital Property that I'd like to have this as the first part of a Family Code." All of the Texas law will eventually be put in codes, but it might have been fifteen or twenty years before anybody would have gotten around to doing a Family Code. And so I still hadn't learned my lesson, and I said "sure."

Saxon: Why not.

Raggio: Yes, why not. And that's how the Family Code got started, and that's how it got to the Family Law Section. Normally, there are special committees set up to do this. For instance, when you had a Constitutional Revision Committee, you had a committee not just from one segment, but from all over Texas. But then we got into revising the entire Family Law, and I didn't know how much work that was, either. But by that time, I was totally exhausted and had really put a great financial drain on my law practice and myself, and that's when we started getting foundation money. And the first challenge grant we got was from Hoblitzelle Foundation, and Sarah Hughes put that through.

Oh, there's one funny thing. After this 1967 passage by the Legislature of all of these laws, I called up Sarah Hughes and said, "It's passed!" And she said, "You've got to be mistaken! You couldn't have gotten that thing through! We've been trying for years to do that, and you're just not correct." And she really didn't believe that we had done this until it had already been passed.

Then here's another funny thing now, although it sure wasn't funny at the time. But here we had this massive change. We had made this decision that we would write the laws the way we felt they should be because we thought the Legislature would carve out maybe 80 percent of it, and we would have 20 percent. But here we had the entire package, practically verbatim. And then here the laws were changing. The lawyers, even though it had been in the Bar journal, didn't know about it. So we had to put on institutes in sixteen different cities. And so beginning in September, 1967, until December or January, I went to Odessa in a sleet storm, I went to Lubbock in a dust storm, and so forth. We went all over the state with these one-day institutes of the Bar to tell the lawyers what the changes were. The lawyers were really not happy with us. Here we were, messing up the property law that they had learned from time immemorial. But that took a

great deal of time. Here we had all this revision time and the legislative time, and then we were running around all over Texas.

Now I did get one of the highest honors of the State Bar in 1967. I got the Citation of Merit for doing this, after it was passed, which is one of the nice honors you get--recognition from your own profession.

But in the meantime we had started this entire revision of the Family Code. We had divided--that was while I was still chairman--the section into sort of task groups and had projected that every two years we would present to the Legislature another segment of the Family Code. In 1969 Marriage and Divorce was presented, where we added the ground of unsupportability to the Family Code. That's when we started getting foundation money. We set up a Family Code Project at SMU with Professor McKnight and Gene Smith basically in charge of it. Then the secretarial work and the files went from this office out there.

Saxon: Were you chairman of the section at that particular time?

Raggio: No, Angus McSwain became chairman in 1967. I was past chairman and stayed very active in it. But then the way it went through . . . Gene Smith became . . . after you're past chairman, you're off the council, and when I had been chairman, I had the by-laws completely revised

so you didn't have people staying on the council automatically. I think that it is very important to keep a new group of people coming on anything like the Family Law Council rather than having the same people elected over and over because you do need a lot of different currents, lifeblood. On our Family Code project--and, of course, the chairman can sort of influence the nominating committee-- I insisted that we have lawyers from small towns, big towns, from all sections of the state; and I had affirmatively looked for minorities, for persons of different religions, different ways of looking at things, because this is a family project and should represent the different interests and different mores in Texas. Also, when people did not attend meetings, we had it put in there that if you didn't attend so many meetings, you were off the council, and I enforced that.

And really, by the time I was out, we had put in practically a new, hard-working council. Persons were told before they were nominated that they were expected to spend complete weekends, many times a year, working on this and that if they didn't have the time we didn't want to put them on the council, no matter how important they were. That was one of the great things, was the lawyers who took time, top lawyers--and we did look for top lawyers--and they would take their time, and we would

start on Friday evening and work through Sunday afternoon, weekend after weekend. And then the task forces would meet separately, and then we would get back in a council meeting and put our things together and criticize. I laughed and said I was glad that nobody got murdered in this time because if any of our council members would have been murdered, probably everybody else would have been a suspect, the way we would pound on the table and yell at each other and say, "That's not right!" Yet, that is, in my opinion, the only way to write a code, is to have all of this conflict during the writing instead of just having one person's ideas because this really was an amalgamation of many people's ideas.

Then we also had some group meetings with psychiatrists, social workers, probation officers, and church groups to get input from many, many, different groups. I know we couldn't have put through a lot of this without the support of a various number of church groups and their lobby machinery down in Austin. We put through a very unusual coalition, and that's why we had the legislative success.

Saxon: In 1969, you mentioned you revised the statutes on marriages, divorce, and annulment. What, in your opinion, was the most important thing to come out of the 1969 session?

Raggio: Well, we added the insupportability ground and . . .

Saxon: Could you define that?

Raggio: Well, that's where you don't have to have fault. That's no fault . . .

Saxon: No fault divorce?

Raggio: Some states simply have no fault as the only ground. We just added it, and that was, oh, for a number of reasons. But one of the things is that you live in the real world, and you try to figure out what you can get passed. No matter how good laws are, if you don't get them passed, you end up with "zilch," and that's the difference. For instance, Pennsylvania during this time had been paying professors money to revise the Pennsylvania Family Code. Well, this didn't get passed because, in the first place, it didn't have all of the conflict and the crosscurrents in it, and it didn't have the support of various groups. Now it might have been an improvement on the old laws, but you need the dedication. And this Family Code--that little book that you've seen--represents tens of millions of dollars of volunteer time. Now even after we got the foundation money, that was used for secretarial, for postage, for travel expenses. Then we got our travel expenses paid after we got foundation money, but you simply could not pay for the volunteer time we had from very top lawyers. That makes you feel good about our entire country, when you had people who are willing to

dedicate themselves. And this was not a fun meeting at all.

Saxon: It was work.

Raggio: It was work. I think the people felt they had a mission, and the mission was to revise the laws for the families in Texas.

Saxon: Legislatively, in 1969 were there any snags in the Legislature, or was it as smooth-sailing as it was in 1967?

Raggio: It was fairly smooth-sailing in 1969. Angus McSwain was chairman of the section, and, of course, Angus is not only a great scholar but Angus is a great politician (chuckle). And Angus had his Baylor boys in the Legislature, so there was no particular problem in 1969.

Saxon: That was unlike the session in 1971, where you did experience some problems.

Raggio: We had a fine lawyer from El Paso--a fine lawyer--but he did not understand the legislative process. This lawyer from El Paso simply believed that things were going along well, and, of course, I just rode herd the entire time during the 1967 Legislature and was down there, and that was parent-child relationship. And this lawyer was absolutely crushed to find out that people had been telling him things were fine when they weren't; and the bill died. Now you have to understand the legislative process. You have to be so far along by a certain time, and you

don't wait until the last minute, and you really have to keep nagging the entire time to get it through the morass down there in the Legislature.

Saxon: Who was the lawyer from El Paso?

Raggio: A very fine person named Orba Lee Malone, and a very fine lawyer. He's a very good church . . . he's a leader in the Baptist church, and I think Orba didn't realize that people lied. And that's what people were doing to him, was lying to him down there.

Saxon: Do you believe that the Sharpstown scandals and all that had anything to do with it not being passed?

Raggio: Oh, it surely could have. And it's easier to say things are going along all right and maybe they will, but it just didn't work out that way.

Saxon: What were some of the provisions?

Raggio: Well, that is what is now Parent and Child.

Saxon: Right. Now what are some of the most important provisions that were revised.

Raggio: Well, of course, we were defining the rights of the parent that has the children, defining the rights of the visiting parent, setting standards for termination, for adoption.. It's a big package. Probably the laws are better because then we had two more years to revise it.

Now Gene Smith became chairman in 1971, and one of Gene's conditions was that I would go back on the council.

I had been off and was eligible to go back on and do the lobbying again. Then the time was spent to completely rework the Parent-Child (statutes) again. And then that went through in 1973. Then in 1975, the Paternity (Section was introduced). Remember, we were still being quite political, and we weren't touching some of the things that we felt would jeopardize the entire package.

Saxon: Such as?

Raggio: Paternity! Texas and Idaho were the only two states in the Western world where a male had no liability for support of his child born out of wedlock. But that was a very touchy subject and would have jeopardized the entire package. Well, pragmatically, I feel that if you can get 90 percent of a good package passed, you go for the 90 percent, even though the other 10 percent is just and right and you should have it.. Sometimes it's worth laying down your life for a principle, but in this there were so many things that were important that I always felt that we should not do the things that would defeat the main purpose.

Saxon: And Paternity was passed in 1975?

Raggio: Yes, but that wasn't passed until we had the United States Supreme Court saying that if you didn't have support for illegitimate children, you weren't going to have support for legitimate children. So Texas was in the position of

having to pass it.

Saxon: Why do you think that Texas was in the forefront of family code revision?

Raggio: Simply because we got this thing started. It was just these fortuitous circumstances--of me really not knowing what I was getting into. It was sort of being in the right place at the right time. You know, tides move and you sort of moved with the tide. I got in this because I was very interested in trying to have more equitable laws for married women, and that was my interest in 1965. Again, like when I started law school, it wasn't that I was intending to be a well-known lawyer; I was just taking one day at a time. I certainly wasn't thinking about a Family Code when we did this Marital Property. That would have scared me silly.

Saxon: Well, you were very successful in all of those things. Were there any unusual snags that you encountered in the Legislature in 1967, 1969, 1971, 1973, 1975?

Raggio: All kinds of snags. You have to understand the legislative process. It's so easy to keep a bill from being passed. I remember one time that we felt that a certain unnamed legislator--and I'll be very vague on this--was very much against the bill, and we felt that this person had possession of the bill but said that he did not. And somehow one of the persons working on it got access to this legislator's desk

and found the bill in the desk and removed it from the desk because we had to have that particular piece of paper to move it along.

Saxon: Just happened to procure it. (chuckle).

Raggio: Just happened to procure it. And then, as I say, there were trade-offs by people who would vote for this, if somebody else would vote for the other.

Saxon: I think in our pre-interview conference--and I don't want to put you on the spot--you mentioned shenanigans. I assume that was the type of thing you were talking about.

Raggio: Those were some of the shenanigans that were done. And then, I suppose, one of the effective things that was done in getting the juvenile law passed was that a number of groups, especially women's groups, had really made dedicated studies of the Family Code. Now this was in the 1970's, you see, after it had gone along and had been partially passed. And I can remember a Jewish women's group that had made a study of over a year of this--very intelligent women--and when this thing got stuck in the Legislature, those women, at their own expense, from various parts of the state, went down to the Legislature and just lobbied. And there's, in my opinion, nothing more effective than a Jewish mother who knows her subject. (chuckle). They were very effective. That was sort of a shenanigan because I had told the powers that we were going to have

groups like that daily down there if we didn't get this thing on the road. I think that that moved it along.

Saxon: I've asked you this question for 1967, but for the other legislative sessions who were your most important supporters in the Legislature and your most bitter opponents?

Raggio: I'd have to go back. Off-hand, it was far more general at that time. I'd have to go back and check notes because I don't want to just guess at it. I know Lieutenant Governor Hobby was in there--very supportive. We had the support of the powers. We arranged that sort of at the beginning to get good sponsors, and, oh, I can remember Lynn Nabers was very helpful, but I would be reluctant to give particular names. Gene Fondren and Dick Cory and Word stand out because that was the first group that would take this on when it was first sort of a hazardous assignment.

Saxon: I can imagine that it was a hazardous assignment. In 1975, once the whole package had been produced, I assume you started spending more time in the office. Did life return to normal, and when was that?

Raggio: Well, not really, because I had become a member of the council of the American Bar Association in 1968, and by 1975 I was chairman of the Family Law Section of the American Bar. So I just sort of shifted gears and had all fifty states to worry about with family law and the big problems that you have that are sort of interstate.

Saxon: What were your goals as head of the American Bar Association's Family Law Section?

Raggio: Well, one of the things is education in family law. The Texas Bar probably has the best continuing legal education program in the entire country. The Texas Bar consistently gets the awards as being the best bar in the United States. You have some states that not only do not have family law sections, but they don't even have family law committees. There's no continuing legal education, and so through the American Bar, you try to have institutes, and you try to have publications. We put out a number of excellent publications.

Plus, there's these interstate problems that have to be dealt with from a national level rather than just a state level, for instance, the child snatching and running across the state line, the non-support, the uniform child custody laws. In other words, it used to be just a dandy summer exercise for the non-custodial parent to get the child and get to another state, and then the custodial parent would have to go to the other state and sue for custody. This translates into money and time, and most people simply don't have the money or time to do that.

Plus, you get into the international child custody questions. It's very easy to get a passport for your

child, even if you don't have custody. And I've had this happen in my own practice with a father, I remember, from Panama. I got the divorce, the mother got custody, and everything was just great. The father had worked here but had gone back to Panama. And so he came to visit and was going to take the children to Six Flags and said he'd have them back before six o'clock. Well, before six o'clock he called from Panama and said, "I have the children in Panama, and what are you going to do about it?" And the answer was nothing legally because you didn't have the international machinery to deal with it. With jet planes making it easier to get around the world than it used to be to get to the county courthouse when you had to go by buggy and it would take you two days to get to the county courthouse, now you can be at the farthest point of the globe in that same time. So laws have changed.

Saxon: In 1971, the ELRA did pass the Texas Legislature and was ratified in 1972, I believe, by the people. What were your feelings on that?

Raggio: Very happy. Very, very, happy and supportive of it because I worked for it.

Saxon: And the Bar? It didn't actively lobby against it at that time, did it?

Raggio: No, it didn't. But we still had that referendum, and that

had not been changed. And that's the vote. No matter how the president would feel, until there was another referendum, that's the policy of the Bar.

Saxon: Did it create confusion in the court systems and did it wreck havoc on the community property statutes?

Raggio: No, because the basic work had been done in 1967.

Saxon: So the community property statutes had been changed by 1967?

Raggio: Yes. There were some other things that had to be brought into compliance, but that certainly wasn't the massive work that would've been required under the marital property.

Saxon: In your opinion, where do you think women are headed in the 1980's in Texas?

Raggio: Well, of course, women are headed more in the work force, and I think that women getting equal pay for equal work is going to continue to take time, but we certainly are a lot better off than we were twenty years ago. There's newspaper articles about where a woman receives only 60 percent of a man doing the same job. That is going to take time, and I think that we just have to continue to understand and to work together. Women will have to know that women will have to do a superior job when they get into the executive-managerial capacities to which they had not been allowed in the past.

Saxon: And lastly, what are your future goals?

Raggio: Well, I've sort of just bumbled along. My goal is to be less active. Of course, that's what I've said so many times. I'm very proud that my sons are competent lawyers, that I don't have to be as concerned about economics as I did in the past. But sort of things just happen because I certainly never made a big blueprint of saying this is where I'm going in my life. People say you have to sort of plan and then work toward that plan, but that just hasn't been the way it's worked for me. Whenever something's come by that I felt I could exert a significant influence, I've done it. And I don't know what the next thing would be.

I know I'm enjoying it tremendously, and I've enjoyed all of the things. I haven't enjoyed them when they were happening. Remember, this has been a tremendous amount of tension and uncertainty and blood, sweat, and tears. But when you feel that your mission has sort of been accomplished, it's a very fulfilling feeling.

But I don't really have any plans. I've threatened to take it easy for some time, and, after all, I'm sixty-one now, but I feel good and have a lot of energy. I never had political ambitions for myself. I've never wanted to be a judge because I've wanted the freedom to fit into the things that I've been able to fit into, but I have no more idea of what I'm going to be doing than

I did in 1970 after the Family Code was sort of completed. Yet, after the federal laws were passed, I did a number of things: discrimination suits pro bono, to get those ideas started--equal pay for equal work for women--and I suppose I'll keep on seeing what's needed, and where I can fit in, I'll continue to do it.

Saxon: Is there anything you'd like to add to the record that I haven't covered?

Raggio: Well, I don't think I've brought in that I've been married thirty-nine years, and my husband has certainly been supportive of the things I've done. My children have been supportive. I have been one of the first women in law, that I know of, that has had a family, children, home, career, and done it without a lot of family support. because I haven't had family around here or have I had a lot of hired help. I have been active in civic groups, but certainly a woman can do that. I think if you know our boys--our sons--who are now in their thirties, you would find they haven't had any maternal deprivation because of my activity in civic work, and, after all, I've been quite involved in civic work, having gotten the Zonta Award, the Extra Mile Award, and been on everything from Who's Who in America to local groups. I've made probably a thousand--when I got the Zonta Award we figured I had made probably a thousand--talks

in Dallas for which I don't charge. I feel that that's a civic responsibility, because I talk on law. Now I am the first woman that's ever been a director--elected as director--of the State Bar of Texas, and I'm enjoying being one of the directors--some thirty to forty persons that run the State Bar--and that's logical, having been active in the Bar for twenty years.

I've been president of Town North B&PW; I was president of the Quota Club. I've been a member of the board of directors of the Women's Council . . . oh, many, many, civic groups. I've worked in fundraising, been active in the women's movement here in Dallas.

In my opinion, a person has to have priorities, and there were very few persons--females--that have had the opportunity for leadership in the Bar, and so I have concentrated my energy in the Bar work because, when I started out, very few women had the opportunity. Now there are more women in the Bar, although I'm still the only woman elected. Now the governor appointed a non-lawyer woman, Dr. Janice May, as a member of the board of directors because we do have five non-lawyers as members. But, otherwise, there was no woman elected a director this past year, and I don't know if there will be. I have another year-and-a-half to serve as a member of the State Bar board of director, but I spend at least

two weekends a month traveling for the State Bar and work just about every day as a state board director, so that does take much time.

Now after that's over, I don't know. I'm going to Chicago next Friday. I'm a governor of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers, which is the lawyers who do a lot of family law all over the United States. I've been a governor for some time, and I may have more time, after this State Bar work is over, to be active in that group. I was on Shepard's editorial board--that's a law book company--and I served on that board as an advisor, and I've had a number of very nice appointments on the decision-making level, which is very nice, instead of the stamp-licking level. After working all these years, it's very nice to be a decision-maker or policy-maker. And I think that I have to use my time in things like that.

I also like to do a lot of other things. I love to garden; we entertain at home; we have four grandchildren that I thoroughly enjoy. I took the two older ones to the American Bar meeting with me in Hawaii last summer. The girls were then twelve and nine. Then, like this Saturday night, my four-year-old grandson's parents are having some guests for dinner, and he's bored because he had to go to his room, so he'll be spending the night with us. So we have two grandchildren here in Dallas, and the two

older ones live in New York City.

Saxon: Speaking of grandchildren, if I may backtrack just for the record, would you give me the names of your sons and when they were born?

Raggio: Grier Raggio, Jr., was born on August 6, 1942. He's married, has a practice in New York City, has a marvelous wife, has two children: Julie, who's almost thirteen, and Bridget, who is ten. Tom was born on September 11, 1946. He's married to a super gal named Janice, has two children: Stephen, who is four-and-a-half, and Kristin, a little girl, who is a year-and-a-half. Kenneth was born on October 11, 1949. He married for the first time last June to another great gal named Patty, and they obviously have no children . . . or maybe in this day and time that's not obvious, but they have none. But I have just wonderful daughters-in-law, and the nicest thing is that the daughters-in-law are each others best friends. The sons and the daughters-in-law enjoy vacationing together and being together. And the grandchildren are just marvelous little human beings.

Saxon: It sounds like a very nice family situation.

Raggio: Yes, we have a warm, very closely-knit family--very closely-knit.

Saxon: How did you balance family with career all this time?

Raggio: Well, you read all the stresses and strains of being a

"supermom," and back when I started to work for Henry Wade, the magazine articles were all forecasting that if a woman didn't spend full time in the home looking at the kids, the kids were all going to end up in the penitentiary. So I've had all the stresses and strains of being a "supermom," and I'm very pleased that women do not feel that necessity as much now. But I baked the cookies for the Boy Scouts--two of my boys were Eagle Scouts--and I went to all of the Scout meetings. I was room mother. I worked in the cafeteria. The kids all went to the Highland Park school system, and the mommas ran the cafeteria. I did all of the things that any mother who was not employed did, plus running the home.

All of my civic work was not just altruistic. When you do not have family or connections, the only way you can work up your law practice is to be known, and that was one of the ways I could become known, is in being active in groups.

I've been in seminars before, but now I get into some very neat seminars.. I get invited by the American Academy of Pediatrics, and I went to one seminar at Wingspread in Wisconsin several years ago when they discussed the legal aspects of child care. I'm going to one in March--the American Academy of Pediatrics--where there will be some thirty persons of different professions--

probably two or three lawyers--and there'll be top people, and we're going to discuss the problems of confidentiality between doctors and children. For instance, the child has V.D. and does not want the parents to know, goes to a doctor. What's the law? What's the doctor's responsibility? I get invited to be on television and quoted in magazines, I enjoy those things. But before I go to this seminar in March, I'm going to have to spend many, many hours doing background research.

I remember one of them when I said "yes" when I should have said "no." One was a seminar at the medical school in San Antonio, where I think I spent about fifty or sixty hours on background material to make my talk because I did not want to get up before a group of doctors from all over the United States and not know what I was saying. I was talking about the legal aspects of child abuse.

But I don't write nearly so much as I should. Some day I should take time and write down all of these things. Now, like, I get invited to go down and talk to women lawyers in Austin, I'll take a weekend to do that. I suppose I need to discipline myself to get some of this written, and actually I'm grateful to you that you're taking it down on tape because I will take several hours to talk. I have so many things that I feel I need to do

that I don't sit down and write it all up.

Saxon: What is a typical day in the life of Louise Raggio like, if there is such a thing?

Raggio: There is no typical day. I'm an early riser, and I go to bed early. But I'm down in the office six o'clock in the morning, usually six or six-thirty, and then it just depends on whether it's court or working at the desk.

I have some very strong feelings about family law. I feel that the most significant lawyer in family law is the one that keeps the family conflicts to a minimum. And the great criminal lawyer, or the one that just wants to have a great conflagration, is doing a real disservice to families because the persons will be going to the same graduations, the same funerals, the same weddings, and when you have a bloodletting in court, it causes irreparable damage. I do not like contested cases because of what it does to the persons involved. And I try very hard, and usually fairly successfully, to keep the animosity at a minimum, and most of the cases I settle. I go to court if I have to; obviously, you never settle a case if the other side feels you can't try it.

But I have been in trials, and I have seen the results of what's happened to children, twenty-five years ago, twenty-years ago, when the parents were at each other's throats, when you could not keep down the bitterness between

them, and invariably you have some very damaged children. And, of course, children are so important, and they're so helpless. I've been a part of the significant swing from the child being a property of the parents to the child having rights. For instance, we went out, oh, making these significant changes, putting affirmatively in the Family Code that both parents had equal rights to custody, because when I started practicing, I can remember the judges would not give custody to a man for any reason. I can remember one old judge practically putting me in jail because I was trying to take custody away from a mother, and the judge leaned over the bench at me and said, "Mrs. Raggio, I've never taken custody away from a woman, and I don't intend to start now!" And, of course, I've seen women kill children when I was in the DA's office. I was in some . . . well, you can't have worse abuse than killing, killing a child. You never get over that; you never get over having a child killed by a parent.

And so I suppose all of those experiences I've had have made me have maybe a different point of view. Family law should be practiced for the benefit of the families. To me a family lawyer is as important, or more important, than a minister or psychologist or psychiatrist because a family lawyer can really direct the tempo of the case. I try to keep things on low key when there's children

involved. Now people who don't have any children, if they want to fight and get their "jollies" out of that, that's their business. But when children are involved, that's irreparable.

Saxon: So you feel you add a separate dimension to family law by trying to minimize the tension.

Raggio: Plus, you find that when a person comes in--in family law--that person's whole life has been shattered because you hit at some of the basic emotions. And both men and women come in here and are really basket cases. Their ego is gone; their whole life is shattered. Well, I feel you have to have an extra dimension to help that person put their life back together and help that person to stand on that person's own feet. That doesn't help if the person keeps leaning on the lawyer or leaning on the psychiatrist or leaning on the minister or leaning. But your goal has to be for that person--to be able to have that person stand on his own feet and to feel that the best part of life is yet to come. And one of the great things that you see is particularly the older woman who comes in here and is absolutely devastated. She's been programmed that she's to be a wife and a mommy and nothing else. And all of a sudden, her marriage is gone--her husband has gone off with a younger woman--and here she is, at fifty or sixty and depressed, feeling life

has no future. And you work with that person, and a year or so later you see her as a happy, productive member of society. So I feel that that takes an extra dimension that doesn't have anything to do with the kind of pleadings that are filed.

Saxon: So as a lawyer, particularly a family lawyer, you have to act not only as lawyer but as perhaps confidant/psychologist?

Raggio: Well, you don't give psychological advice. I give mostly "nuts and bolts" advice. But the goal is always to have that person able to take care of that person's own problems, stand on that person's own feet, instead of leaning on somebody else. And, like, Jonathan Livingston Seagull, it's fun to fly. If you can give that person a concept that it's fun to fly on your own power, I think you've done the job that a family lawyer should do.

Saxon: You mentioned you come in the morning at six o'clock or six-thirty, and then you either work at your desk or have cases or things like that. What time do you make it home?

Raggio: Well, a lot of times it's six o'clock before I make it home. But, remember, I spend a lot of time out of the office--for State Bar or for drafting. I'm gone a lot of the times. I attend seminars and conferences for the American Bar Association, and I use that sort of as

vacation time, fun time, for all the things I do.

Saxon: I assume your practice is a successful one, judging by the trappings of the office and all the awards you've received.

Raggio: Yes, I've been . . . I don't know whether you call it lucky or diligent or persevering.

Saxon: Does the office have a particular specialty--Raggio and Raggio?

Raggio: Well, we do a lot of family law.

Saxon: Not just you?

Raggio: The boys do a lot of family law, and the non-family members--we have two lawyers who are not Raggio's--do a lot of family law. My husband does a lot of business law, real estate law. But, remember, I've tried criminal cases. I've done a variety of law.

Saxon: Well, I think you mentioned in our pre-interview conference that you specialize in whatever comes through the door at the time.

Raggio: When you first start out, yes. Now people call and want all kind of different law, and then I'll send them on to somebody else that is more competent in that field. But when you start out, you do collections, you do traffic tickets, you do anything that comes in the door, because it's not subsidized. You don't have Medicare or medical insurance like the doctors do, and so you really have to

make it on your own. And that is scary when you have three children and no resources and you start hanging out your shingle to make a living.

Saxon: What do you feel is the caliber of the new lawyers coming in to the profession today?

Raggio: Well, most of them are quite bright. I think we've had too many new law schools, and I think we're turning out too many lawyers. Not that you want to be a dog in a manger, but I think when you get too many, then you have people that will maybe, because the lawyer may need the business, may want to litigate when it would be better not to litigate. And I'm quite active--have been for many years--on such things as legal services or lawyer referral, and I know I'm a board advisor to the lawyer referral committee of the State Bar.

One of the problems we have in the Bar, of course, is delivering very good legal services to the middle income people. You see, we don't have legal insurance, and you have the problem of the person that needs very sophisticated legal services and yet does not have the money to pay and yet is not qualified for legal aid. For instance, I've seen in the paper this morning the legal services in that McKinney trial were \$60,000. Now that doesn't mean it all went to the lawyer, but whenever you have psychiatrists, accountants, appraisers, evaluators,

you can run up a bill of many, many thousands of dollars if the case is going to be prepared adequately. And how is that paid for? So that's one of the things I'm glad to work with with the State Bar. Of course, the State Bar is very concerned about how the legal services can still be individualized and not sort of a mass-produced patent medicine where you just pour out a tablespoon for everybody, and, yet, have it where persons can afford it.

Saxon: Well, is there anything else you'd like to add?

Raggio: Yes, I want to say that, first, I applaud Dallas Library and North Texas State University for taking the time to put things on tape for future generations. And one of the things that I think is tremendously important in this democracy of ours is the listening to various people, like me, for whatever it's worth, because if I could say anything significant, it's being the importance of trying to stand on that person's own feet and not be looking for somebody else to do things for you. Our democracy was built on the idea that all of us have certain talents, and if we're going to survive as a nation, if we're going to survive as a profession, it's going to be each of us doing the things that we can do best and doing for ourselves.

And I feel that I have a duty to pay back the great blessings and opportunities that I've been given. In other words, my pro bono work, it's really not because I'm just

altruistic. I also think that this is part of what makes this nation operate. We have to feel that we work for things other than money, and, strangely enough, it seems to me that when you get that attitude, that you're working for the improvement of the whole community, the money sort of takes care of itself. But we have to understand that we are in a particular place in the history of this planet where we have this country, based on a unique idea with unique situations, having the distance that we've had back two hundred years ago. This opportunity may not come again in centuries. We're getting all the complications of the great inventions that we have had, and, yet, in my opinion, our nation isn't going to function unless each of us takes the responsibility of doing our share and being willing to contribute our time and talents for the benefit of society, instead of just saying the world owes me a living and I'm going to take mine, and the rest of the people can worry about their own problems.

I suppose I get this because my grandparents didn't leave Europe because they were wealthy and influential and important. They left because they were peasants; they left because they were persecuted. My grandfather came out in a sack of potatoes when he was sixteen years old. He was a stowaway, a refugee. He knew what he had over here in this country. He was never rich, but he understood that it

was his duty to vote, to know what was going on, to be a part of the community. And, somehow, I think that's one of the things that we need to get over to our people, that this country still needs this great dedication of each of the persons and a gratitude for the government, even with it's imperfections, and the opportunities that we have in this great land.

Saxon: I thank you for your candor and openness.