

The Philosophical
Society of Texas

PROCEEDINGS

1938

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

of

The Philosophical Society of Texas

held in

DALLAS

on

December 5, 1938

DALLAS

PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY

BY THE REGIONAL PRESS, INC.

1939

The Philosophical Society of Texas

The Annual Meeting and Banquet of the Philosophical Society of Texas was held on December 5, 1938, in the Banquet Room Number One of the Baker Hotel in Dallas.

The original Society, dedicated to the collection and diffusion of knowledge, was founded on December 5, 1837, "by a number of gentlemen from different parts of the Republic (of Texas)." To perpetuate the memory and spirit of the founders, to encourage literary, scientific, and philosophical research, and to foster the preservation of documents and materials of historical value, the organization was revived late in the year 1935 and chartered on the eighteenth of January, 1936. According to the by-laws of the Society, there may be elected not more than one hundred Active Members of the Society, fifty Associate Members, and twenty-five Foreign Members. Active and Associate Members must have been born within, or must have resided within, the boundaries of the late Republic of Texas.

Members present at the banquet on December 5, 1938, were Miss Hockaday, and Messrs. Black, Briggs, G. B. Dealey, DeGolyer, Gambrell, Geiser, R. T. Hill, Kemp, Lomax, Lovett, McGregor, McReynolds, Molyneaux, O'Donohoe, Owens, Rhea, Smith, Stephens, Watkin, and Wrather. Guests included Mrs. J. H. Black, Mrs. George Waverley Briggs, Mrs. H. B. Decherd, Mrs. E. DeGolyer, Mrs. S. W. Geiser, Mr. and Mrs. Will C. Grant, Mrs. Rice R. Jackson, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene P. Locke, Mrs. John A. Lomax, Mrs. Stuart McGregor, Mrs. W. L. Maillot, Miss

M. M. M. Morgan, Mrs. C. S. Potts, Mrs. I. K. Stephens,
Miss Sarah B. Trent, Mr. W. E. Woodward, and Mrs. W.
E. Wrather.

Dr. Edgar Odell Lovett, president of the Society, pre-
sided.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

*Members of The Philosophical Society of Texas, Ladies
and Gentlemen:*

Under the caption, "This Week's Birthday," *Punch* has lately been reproducing certain drawings that originally appeared in its pages some fifty years ago. In the issue of October 26, 1938, is one of George DuMaurier's from the number for October 31, 1885. Its label is "Experientia Docet?"

A wife of two years' standing is calling on a widow. Caller and hostess, uncommonly good-looking, in crinolines and coiffures of the period, are seated facing each other before an open grate, the mantelpiece bearing a single receptacle of flowers or fruit, and, above, the inevitable portrait, presumably of the deceased, apparently in the prime of life, of mien—according to angle or point of view—anywhere from high-brow to middle-brow, low-brow, near-brow, or no-brow-at-all. The widow, perfectly calm and composed, the wife less so, lifting a kerchief half way to what might be a tearful eye.

Says the wife: "Oh Yes! I'm sure he's not so fond of me at first. He's away so much, neglects me dreadfully, and he's so cross when he comes home. What *shall* I do?"

The widow: "Feed the Brute!"

We have just dined well. The phrase is a favorite one of my wife's. Thanks to the consummate skill of Mr. and Mrs. George Waverley Briggs, and fine co-operation on

the part of their aides within and without this public inn, we have all dined very well, alike with respect to company and to comestibles. For from my personal observation of the proceedings, I should conclude that the present occasion has successfully dissolved an age-old injunction of Epicurus, "Consider rather whom ye shall eat with than what ye shall eat." In a word, I doubt if we shall ever dine better or in happier circumstances.

But far and away the best of the evening is still to come. It is the spiritual flight you are eagerly awaiting. I perhaps may lead you to it by way of an old, but true, story of a euphuistic sheriff of the sixteenth century. When the plague was raging at Oxford in 1563 and there was a great shortage of divines, Richard Taverner, the high sheriff, mounted the pulpit of St. Mary's and preached a sermon opening with the following words:

"Arriving at the Mount of St. Mary's in the stony stage where I now stand, I have brought you some fyne bisketts baked in the oven of charitie, carefully conserved for the chickens of the Church, the sparrows of the spirit, and the sweet swallowes of salvation."

I have ventured to congratulate the members of the local committee on the feast, and in due time I shall be in position to congratulate them, all the more, on the flight. "Whither Texas?" is his subject, and the speaker of the evening is ready with Homer's wingéd words to carry us on a great adventure. It were impertinence to presume to introduce him. By voice and pen he is known all over Texas, throughout the country from coast to coast, and beyond the seas. Still in the full vigor of his ascending years, he is by vocation a journalist, by avocation a historian, or, with equal felicity it might be put just the other way

around, by vocation a historian, by avocation a journalist. In each capacity, the press is his platform and the platform his press. In the one he catches and crystallizes public opinion in the making, in the other he feels his way into the past, while in both his objective is to find our way into the future.

Ladies and Gentlemen, our friend and colleague of the Philosophical Society of Texas, the Honorable Peter Molyneux, orator of the 1938 Anniversary Meeting:

WHITHER TEXAS?

PETER MOLYNEAUX

Recently I read a little book which impressed me more, and left me more thoughtful, than anything else I have read in more than a year. It is a narrative poem, written by Josephine Young Case, who, incidentally, is Owen D. Young's daughter, and it is called, "At Midnight on the 31st of March." In a sense it is a modern version of the Bible story of the Deluge, when Noah and his family were all who were left of mankind to "replenish the earth." But it is much more than that. It has something about it also of "Robinson Crusoe," and "The Swiss Family Robinson," and then much else besides.

What happens "at midnight on the 31st of March" is that all of mankind, and all the vast material civilization man has created, are suddenly wiped out, as by magic, except the village of Saugersville, a typical American community of about two hundred persons.

There is no cataclysm. Whatever happened, happened quietly. Nobody noticed it at the time. In fact, only one man in Saugersville was awake, and all he noticed was that the electric bulb by which he was reading faded gradually and finally went out, and that a fresh bulb gave no light. But he concluded only that the power was off, and "he cursed the company and went to bed." But early the next morning, George, the driver of the milk truck to Centerfield, thirteen miles away, returned "an hour before his time" and

told the bewildered villagers that "the road ain't there no more." Then searching parties discovered in due course that there were no roads in any direction, that "there *was* no Centerfield," in fact

"No State, no city, no America,
But only Saugersville in all the world."

Well, that's the situation this little book presents. What would the two hundred or so ordinary people of an average American village of this kind do in such a situation? There are hundreds of such villages in Texas, thousands like it in the United States. Suppose the people of such a village should wake up some morning to find themselves alone on the earth, with not a vestige left of the world outside their one little town, nor even any sign that men had ever lived anywhere else. What would they do?

This little book purports to tell, in blank verse, what the people of the village of Saugersville did, and how they managed to survive, during the first twelve months following that fateful "midnight on the 31st of March." I shall not attempt tonight to recount the record of that year. I want to say only that reading this little book left me with an overwhelming sense of our immense riches today, riches which embody an incalculable debt to the past. Contemplating how much had gone out of the world, how much had been lost, as the result of whatever it was that happened on the 31st of March, left me with a sense of heritage and trusteeship, a feeling that life in America and in Texas, right now, on the night of December 5th, 1938, is something which has been derived from the past, and something for which we are responsible to the future. For it made me realize that all this might be lost, not by

a miraculous catastrophe in a single night, but lost nevertheless, by a betrayal of this trusteeship by a single unfaithful generation of men.

I say I shall not attempt to recount the record of the first year of that surviving remnant of the human race. But I want to give you a single quotation. It is a few words spoken by one of the leaders of Saugersville near the close of that year. Looking back over the events of those first twelve months of this new beginning for mankind, he says:

“We have done well so far. That’ll give us strength
To keep on doing well. I hope we can,
But there’s more work here than we half conceive,
And every year will be a fight to live,
Just to survive. That’s why it will be hard
To keep and to pass on the best we have,
Those things of our old world which should go on,”

When I set about preparing to speak to you tonight on the subject “Whither Texas?”, I thought immediately of Saugersville, of the people of that little village, and of their novel situation. For there is a sense in which Texas is like Saugersville, and the people of Texas are like the people of that little village.

As a matter of fact, there is a sense in which the present generation of all mankind is like the people of Saugersville. H. G. Wells once pointed out that man’s situation on the earth is like that of Robinson Crusoe on his island, that there is no commerce between this planet and the rest of the universe, no imports from other worlds, and that man has to make the best he can of what there is on the earth. Man has had to discover how to survive on the earth and how to

get as good a living out of it as possible. And, as Thomas Carlyle says, he had to begin without even a hammer. Each generation on the earth has had to face the same situation, with such equipment as it inherited from previous generations, to be sure, but with the necessity of acquiring anew all the knowledge and skill which previous generations had acquired in their turn, with the necessity of disciplining itself in the successful administration of its heritage, with the duty of teaching and training the generation to come after.

Somebody, probably Emerson, has said that every day is Doomsday. Whoever said it, it is true. And it is true in Texas and in America, as in Saugersville, that the fundamental task is

“To keep and to pass on the best we have,
Those things of our old world which should go on.”

This, I say, is the fundamental task. The heritage from the past must be handed on to the future unimpaired. There must be at least this much. If there is to be progress, there must be more than this, as, thanks to men of previous generations, there has been much more than this in the past. We have had no miraculous catastrophe, wiping out civilization in a night, but we face that situation quite as truly as did the people of the village of Saugersville.

It seems to me that this thought is the proper keynote for a consideration of the topic “Whither Texas?”, especially on such an occasion as this. For let me say that I have a high conception of the character and function of The Philosophical Society of Texas and of its Annual Dinner. To be sure, we are not a “philosophical” society in any formal or technical sense. We are not concerned with the dis-

cussion of ultimates or of the persistent problems of philosophy. Our objects have nothing to do with dialectics or theories of knowledge, with questions of eschatology, or with refinements of epistemology or of philosophic method. I am sure that the founding fathers, who originally organized the Society in the days of the Republic of Texas, whatever else they may have had in mind when they named it, were not thinking of anything of this kind. Nevertheless, I am equally certain that they aspired to set up an organization of Texans which would be something more than a glorified prototype of our modern luncheon clubs. And in reviving the Society, after a dormancy of nearly a century, I feel that our ambitions with respect to it should at least match theirs and in some sense and measure warrant its name. I think of this Society as a fellowship of some of the most enlightened men and women of Texas. I conceive its function to be that of applying competent, well-informed, and honest thought to Texas and to genuinely important questions related to Texas. And this Annual Dinner, it seems to me, should be an occasion fully in keeping with this conception.

Let me say, sincerely and unaffectedly, that I was somewhat aghast when I was chosen by the board to deliver the Address this year. I felt this way chiefly because of the limitations of my journalistic occupation, among which are a habit of hasty expression and a chronic lack of time. I think our Annual Dinner should be the product of greater deliberation and of more leisure than usually accompany the expression of journalists. You may wonder then why I am here. Well, the Board was insistent and I am immodestly susceptible to such flattery. But the circumstance that I am your speaker on this occasion does not affect my

conception of what the Annual Address before our Society should be, and what, I trust, in due course of time it will come to be. However, we must have beginnings, and for our occasion this year such observations as I may be able to offer must serve. I can at least assure you that, leaving aside all question of competence and of fullness of tested information, what I shall say will be an expression of honest thought.

We are living in a time when questions like the one we are considering tonight are highly pertinent and when serious and honest thought with respect to them is imperative. It is a time of confusion and bewilderment, when century-old trends of progress seem destined to complete reversal and when revolutionary change in the world is the commonplace subject of daily newspaper headlines. Indeed, it is a time, in our own country and elsewhere, when the ignorant cocksureness of shoddy messiahs wins converts by multitudes so easily that thoughtful persons are tempted to wonder whether the modicum of wisdom to which man has attained may not yet be forced to find monastic sanctuary during another dark age, or else perish from the earth. In such a time the question, "Whither Texas?" must inevitably be part and parcel of the larger question "Whither America?" and of the still more comprehensive question "Whither Mankind?" I am keenly aware of this inescapable circumstance, but tonight I cannot do more than to indicate this awareness at the outset and then to give it only such passing expression as an honest consideration of our theme may require.

Obviously, an honest consideration of the question, "Whither Texas?" must be chiefly an appraisal of the present situation of Texas. And this in turn must involve

consideration of how Texas arrived at its present situation. I have no idea of attempting anything like prophecy of the future of Texas. The most I may hope to do is to indicate the possible paths into the future from the situation in which we find ourselves today. And in order to discern the direction of those possible paths in any degree, it will be necessary to glance backward along the paths we have come. It cannot be more than a glance in an address like this, so I shall try to indicate only the principal sign-posts along the main highways.

For considerably more than a century Texas has had a reputation as a "wonder" region. This is strikingly illustrated by Thomas Jefferson's frequently quoted statement that "Texas will be the richest State in our Union, without any exception." Jefferson used this phrase in a letter to President Monroe on May 14th, 1820, at a time when Monroe was doing all in his power to make sure that Texas would never be a part of the United States. As you know, the Missouri Compromise line had just been created, and Monroe was determined that the vast region south of that line known as Texas should remain on the Spanish side of the border and not become a new source of violent political controversy in the United States, endangering the existence of the Union. But Jefferson's opinion of the future wealth of Texas, I say, is a striking illustration of the reputation it had even then as a "wonder" region. For Jefferson expressed a view that was widely accepted in the United States at that time.

The date of that letter of Jefferson's, May 14th, 1820, is an admirable one from which to begin a survey of the course along which Texas has come to the present day. For at that time Texas was almost completely a wilderness. Its

population of persons of European blood was less than three thousand, practically all of which were huddled together, so to speak, in the remote settlement of San Antonio. It was a full month's journey on horseback from the American border to San Antonio, and the nearest settlements in Mexico, south of San Antonio, were not much closer. I say the people of San Antonio were of European blood, but it should be noted that they were not Europeans. They were Texans by birth, and it is not too much to say that the only reason they remained in Texas was that it was their home, that, though they were very poor, everything they possessed was in Texas, and that they could not very easily leave. As a matter of fact, practically everybody who could conveniently leave had already done so by 1820. The settlement at San Antonio, completely surrounded by a wilderness, and constantly harassed by hostile savages, was dying. The mission buildings there were quite as truly abandoned "ruins" in 1820 as they are today. Indeed, they are in a much better condition of repair today than they were then.

It was to this poverty-stricken and declining settlement that Moses Austin came on December 23rd, 1820, less than eight months after the date of Jefferson's letter to Monroe, and from that point forward the tradition of progress in Texas is unbroken. Moses Austin told the authorities at San Antonio that "he came to the province for the purpose of applying to the Government for authorization to settle himself in it with his family" and that it was "his intention to provide for his subsistence by raising sugar and cotton." However, as you know, three days later, after conferring with his old acquaintance, the Baron de Bastrop,

he filed an application to settle three hundred families in Texas.

It was at that point that the development of Texas began. And let me call your attention to the fact that it began with a deliberate project of development, a project of individual initiative and enterprise, and that with it there was born in Texas the tradition of progress which has been a characteristic of the people of Texas ever since. On January 26th, 1821, a little more than ten months after the date of that Jefferson letter, Moses Austin wrote to the Baron de Bastrop as follows:

“If you can obtain a permit for me to land with my property at the place I have requested, say the mouth of the Colorado, and permission is given to establish a town and settle 300 families, one year will make a change in the state and condition of San Antonio beyond anything you can believe. I have full confidence that a town at the mouth of the Colorado in three years would become of the utmost consequence.”

Moses Austin, as you know, did not live to carry out the great plans he had for developing Texas, but his son, Stephen F. Austin, took over his project and became the founder of modern Texas. This is a familiar story to all of you, but I want to stress here the spirit which animated Stephen Austin. It was the spirit of the deliberate and conscious builder and developer, a spirit which has remained the soul of the tradition of progress in Texas.

Almost from the outset, Stephen Austin came to regard Texas as one of the richest undeveloped regions on earth, and he resolved to devote his life to its development. Over and over again he expressed this resolution in writ-

ing. Let me read you a characteristic expression of this kind. Here it is:

“Its fertility and resources, so far exceeding anything I had imagined, determined me to devote my life to the great object of redeeming it from the wilderness. It was a heavy undertaking for a young, inexperienced, and very poor man. . . . These observations convinced me that the only means of redeeming this country from the wilderness was by peaceful, silent, noiseless perseverance and industry, and that the axe, the plough, and the hoe would do more than the rifle and the sword. Under these impressions I began and have pursued the main object with a degree of patience and perseverance which nothing but its vast importance to the civilized world could ever have given me fortitude to continue through many years of hardships and amidst so many discouraging obstacles.”

To illustrate how this spirit continued to animate the tradition of progress in Texas, let me read you one more quotation of a much later date, though still relatively far in our past. It is from a speech delivered at a reunion of the veterans of Texas wars, held in the city of Houston in 1873, or sixty-five years ago. And the speaker was Guy M. Bryan, Stephen Austin's nephew. Here is the quotation:

“Old Texans, veterans of the Republic of Texas, rejoice, be proud, for you can well indulge a manly, patriotic pride in the thought that, in looking around, all about you are results of what you were a part. Look on these moving throngs of people; this prosperous, solid city; these telegraph wires, railroads, steamboats, warehouses, manufactories; and down yonder a little way on the Gulf, that beautiful pearl of the sea, the growing metropolis of

your State. [Galveston was then Texas's largest city.] Turn your eyes East, West, North—on and on, over what once was the range of the wild mustang and the wilder Indian, and number there the ten hundred thousand of your countrymen, of whom you were the advance. This is your monument—the monument of your co-laborers and compatriots—grander and more lasting than pyramids of granite, marble, or brass. . . .

“Where is the State that ultimately can compete with Texas! How vast will be her resources! . . . Our seaboard will have its coronet clustering around a queen of pearls. Our interior will have her Lowells, and Manchesters, and Pittsburghs; our railroads . . . will bind our extended parts together in social and mercantile intercourse, preserving confidence, community of interest, and patriotic affection. Our institutions of learning, benevolence, and religion will rise higher and tower loftier, because of the ample resources and great name of our mighty State. Nothing little will live here—ideas, thoughts, feelings, all will be great, because of the association of greatness.”

These quotations, all of them the utterances of members of a single family, will serve to give an idea of what I mean by the “tradition of progress” which has been a living thing in Texas for more than a century. And it is against the background of this tradition that we must see the process operating which has brought us thus far forth along the road of economic development.

It is a striking fact that Moses Austin told the Spanish authorities at San Antonio that he proposed to provide for his subsistence by raising cotton. The very heart of the economic story of Texas down to the beginning of the 20th century is the expansion of the production of cotton. Cot-

ton was the chief commercial product of Texas from the very first. This was true during the colonial period, it was true during the days of the Republic, and it was true after Statehood, both before and after the Civil War. The first cotton gin was built by Jared Groce on the banks of the Brazos in 1825, the same year the colonization law of the State of Coahuila-Texas was enacted, and from that point forward the progress of Texas and its growth in population was accompanied by an expansion of cotton production.

In 1850, when the first census after annexation was taken, Texas stood twenty-fifth in population among the thirty-six States then constituting the Union. By 1860 it had passed Vermont and Connecticut and had taken twenty-third place. Between 1860 and 1870 it moved up to nineteenth, passing Louisiana, Maine, South Carolina, and Maryland. During the next ten years it passed Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, Mississippi, Tennessee, Virginia, New Jersey, and Wisconsin, and took eleventh place in 1880. By 1890 it has passed Iowa, Michigan, Kentucky, and Indiana, and had taken seventh place, between 1890 and 1900 it passed Massachusetts, and finally, after passing Missouri, it assumed its present position of fifth place in 1910.

During all of this period the chief population-building and population-supporting activity in Texas was the production of cotton. In 1849 Texas produced 58,000 bales of cotton. Ten years later it was producing more than seven times that amount, the crop being 431,465 bales in 1859. This was equivalent to more than 12 per cent of the American crop, which was regarded as an extraordinary circumstance at the time. The Civil War then intervened, but in 1878 Texas produced its first million-bale crop, the total being 1,105,133 bales. This was more than 34 per cent of

the American crop of that year. When the population of Texas reached three million in 1900, the Texas cotton crop was only slightly short of three and a half million bales.

You will understand, of course, that there was other development during this period. Notably there were the cattle industry and the lumber industry. But cotton overshadowed all other products combined, and it was the chief source of income of the rapidly expanding population of Texas. In 1900, when the total population reached the three-million mark for the first time, there were only 521,000 persons living in urban communities in Texas, communities of 2,500 or more, and there was only one city of 50,000 population, San Antonio. This means that the bulk of the population of Texas was supported either directly or indirectly by agriculture, and cotton was the pre-eminent agricultural product.

This was the situation until the very dawn of the 20th century. But before the new century was two weeks old something happened which has since modified this situation materially. On the morning of January 10th, 1901, an oil well being drilled by Capt. Anthony F. Lucas on a mound about four miles south of the town of Beaumont "blew in" with such terrific force as to shatter the derrick and sent a stream of petroleum gushing two hundred feet in the air. It was the discovery of Spindle Top and the opening of a new era in Texas.

Petroleum was being produced in Texas in commercial quantities for more than ten years when this happened, and for five years there had been relatively large production around Corsicana. But production had never reached as much as a million barrels in any years prior to Spindle

Top. The story since Spindle Top is one of the most spectacular in economic history. I shall not attempt to recount it here. It need only be said that by 1930 Texas was producing 290,000,000 barrels of petroleum a year, and that today, under strictly controlled and prorated production, its annual output is considerably in excess of 400,000,000 barrels.

This extraordinary development, together with its accompanying development in the production of natural gas on a record-breaking scale, has had a striking effect upon the population of Texas. Between 1900 and 1930 the total population of the State increased from 3,048,710 to 5,824,715, an addition in thirty years of 2,776,000. But of this latter figure only 907,416 persons were added to the rural population, while the urban population was increased by 1,868,589. In other words, whereas the rural population was increased by less than 36 per cent between 1900 and 1930, the urban population of Texas in 1930 was considerably more than four times as much as the urban population of 1900. There can be no doubt whatever that the chief cause of this striking change was the immense development of petroleum and natural gas, for most of the rapidly increasing urban population during those thirty years found employment in commercial and service occupations. I do not think it is too much to say that the population of Texas today would be at least one million less than it is if we had not had the enormous oil development since 1900.

It is not my intention to attempt even to outline the economic history of Texas tonight, and you will realize that many things which have contributed toward the development of the State cannot even be mentioned. But I must

take note of what is usually called "industrial" development, so far as we have had such development in Texas. An idea of the extent of such development may be had from the circumstance that in the peak year of employment in manufacturing industries in Texas, 1929, the number of wage earners employed in such industries was equivalent to only six per cent of the total number of persons gainfully occupied in the State that year. More than one-third of such wage earners were in three industries—petroleum refining, lumber, and railroad repair shops—and included in the remainder were every bakery, ice plant, print shop, and the like producing as much as \$5,000 worth of goods a year. The number of manufacturing wage earners in Texas in 1929 was 134,498, which means that only one person in every 43 of the total population was so employed. In the United States as a whole, including Texas, one person in every 14 of the population was a manufacturing wage earner. We have not regained the 1929 level of employment in manufacturing in Texas since then, in spite of the fact that there has been an increase in employment in petroleum refining in the meantime.

From this sketchy survey it will be apparent to you that economic development in Texas to date has been conditioned by the region's most obvious natural resources, and that it has moved along the line of least resistance, so to speak. The State's immense acreage of fertile soil and its rich deposits of oil and natural gas have been the chief resources developed, and cotton and petroleum have been dominant. By far the largest unit of the total population is still employed in agriculture, and even now cotton, among the single commodities, is the largest employer of labor in the State.

Let me say, incidentally, that the development of petroleum after 1900 did not check the expansion of cotton acreage or of the production of cotton in the State. There was a steady increase of both acreage and production between 1900 and the outbreak of the World War in 1914. Reduced consumption during the World War and then the scourge of the boll weevil in the years immediately after the war did check both, but after 1923 and continuing until the collapse of the market for cotton in the year 1929-30, there was a continued expansion of both acreage and production. Between 1924 and 1929 the average acreage was in excess of 17,000,000 acres, whereas the peak acreage prior to 1914, that of 1913, was 12,500,000 acres.

I need not tell you that cotton has been in extreme difficulties since 1929 and that its situation today is as discouraging as at any time since then. The average acreage since 1933 has been below the peak acreage prior to the World War and about the same as the average annual acreage during the five years preceding the outbreak of the war. This means that there has been a considerable reduction of employment in the production and handling of cotton in Texas. Fortunately, the full effect of this has been offset to some extent by the immense development of petroleum in Texas during the past five or six years. This development saved Texas from absolute prostration during this period, and an idea of what it has meant may be had from the fact that in 1936, for example, 12,527 oil wells were drilled in Texas at a cost of \$313,175,000. This amount is considerably greater than the total value of the Texas cotton crop that year, including the value of the cottonseed and the total of Government "benefits" paid to farmers.

The drilling of wells on this scale has been going on steadily during this period. It is said that a new oil well is completed in Texas every forty minutes during twenty-four hours every day. The amount of money distributed in the State in this way annually has been between three and four times the amount expended for drilling annually twelve or fifteen years ago. This development, however, has about reached its peak, and we may expect it to decline in the future. In any event, it seems certain that the influence of petroleum on employment cannot be any greater in the future than it has been during the past five years, with the probability that it will be much less. I do not mean that the annual production will necessarily decline very soon, but that the drilling of new wells will slow up.

We find ourselves today, therefore, with reduced employment in practically all lines. And in most instances, particularly in the case of cotton, there is no hope of immediate improvement. I think that we are faced with the necessity of developing entirely new opportunities for employment in Texas, unless we are to witness a decline in population and in wealth. But before going into that, I should like to give at least passing consideration to the matter of just where we stood at the peak of our prosperity and where we stand today and also to discuss briefly the causes of the decline and of the checking of our progress.

Of course you know that Texas has not yet fulfilled Jefferson's prophecy. It is far from being "the richest State in our Union, without any exception." On the contrary, it is among the poorer one-third of the States, judged on the basis of per capita wealth or of per capita income. The last official estimate of national wealth made by the Federal

Government was that of 1922, and in that year the per capita wealth of Texas was equivalent to less than 69 per cent of the per capita wealth of the United States as a whole. In the previous estimate, that of 1912, the Texas per capita was equivalent to 80 per cent of the national per capita. An estimate made by the National Industrial Conference Board for 1930 showed the per capita wealth of Texas as equivalent to less than 64 per cent of the per capita wealth of the United States as a whole. It should be noted, in this connection, that the largest item in all these estimates is that of real estate, and that values fluctuate violently.

The National Industrial Conference Board, however, makes an annual estimate of accountable income, and in 1929 its figures showed the per capita income of Texas equivalent to 69 per cent of the per capita income in the United States as a whole. In 1935 the Board placed the per capita income in Texas at the equivalent of more than 73 per cent of the per capita income in the country as a whole. The influence of oil is apparent here, for in many States the decline in per capita income was greater than in Texas. But it should be pointed out that several States have a per capita income equivalent to nearly twice that of Texas, and that only thirteen or fourteen States usually have a smaller per capita income than Texas, most of them being cotton or tobacco States.

There is no doubt that the chief cause of the relatively low per capita income in Texas lies in the fact that such a large percentage of its people produce export commodities, particularly cotton. The commercial policy which the United States has followed during most of its history has been such as to place producers of export commodities

at a decided disadvantage and to render regions depending on such production economically inferior to other sections of the country. Cotton has always been produced principally for export in the United States, more than 80 per cent of the cotton produced in this country prior to the Civil War being sold abroad, and more than half of it being exported in the period prior to 1929. Consequently the price level of cotton has always been adjusted to the general world price level. This is true, of course, of any export commodity. The policy of the Federal Government of the United States, however, has always been that of maintaining a domestic price level, which usually has been considerably higher in terms of gold than the general world price level. This has been accomplished, as you know, by means of the so-called "protective" tariff. It has always had the effect of creating a disparity between the market value of export commodities and that of commodities produced principally for the domestic market. The circumstance goes a long way toward explaining the economically inferior position of Texas, as of the South generally, in relation to the rest of the country.

It is a striking fact that this was recognized in Texas from the very first. Even in the days of the State of Coahuila-Texas it was recognized. The Texans were compelled to send their cotton to New Orleans to market, which placed it within the American tariff wall, and it had to be sold abroad over this wall. Stephen Austin repeatedly urged the Mexican Government to do something about this, and suggested the establishment of an export cotton market at Vera Cruz and of coastwise shipping between Texas and that port. The Mexican officials always agreed with him that this should be done, but nothing more ever came of

it. When the Republic was established, a beginning was made toward shipping cotton directly to England, and there was prospect that this would have increased steadily if Texas had remained independent. In this connection, it is interesting to note that when William H. Wharton was on his way to Washington in the fall of 1836, to urge recognition of Texas independence and annexation, he wrote to Stephen F. Austin that many of the friends of Texas in the United States thought annexation was not advisable from the standpoint of Texas's interest. He said they contended that Texas would be oppressed by "high tariffs and other Northern measures."

Texas, however, was annexed to the United States in due course, and thus relinquished control of its foreign trade and of its currency, and so it came about that Texas cotton, like the rest of American cotton, could be purchased only with American exchange obtained by foreign customers from behind the American tariff wall. It came about also that the price level at which domestic goods sold in Texas was adjusted to that of the United States as a whole, and that this level has usually been much higher than that at which cotton was sold on the world market. This circumstance, I say, goes a long way toward explaining the inferior economic position in relation to the rest of the country which Texas has occupied during most of its history.

It was this situation which finally brought about the sharp impairment of the export market for American cotton after 1929. American exchange was readily available for the purchase of American cotton so long as the United States was a debtor country, paying large sums on debts abroad every year. But when it became the world's leading creditor country, and after the practice of exporting more than a

billion dollars of capital a year in the form of investment in foreign securities was discontinued in 1929, it became increasingly difficult for foreign spinners to pay for American cotton. The United States continued to maintain the commercial policy of a debtor country after becoming a creditor country. It failed to adjust its policies to its new creditor status, and this placed a premium on every pound of cotton in the world that could be paid for in currencies other than American dollars. It was this situation that stimulated the production of cotton everywhere outside of the United States and which progressively reduced foreign consumption of American cotton throughout the world at a time when the consumption of cotton abroad was increasing to record-breaking levels.

Since 1933, instead of doing anything to change this situation, the American Government has been following policies which have served only to aggravate and intensify it. It has sought to adjust production to the declining foreign market for American cotton and attempted to fix prices by means of Government loans, and both of these measures have served to reduce foreign consumption of American cotton and to stimulate production of foreign cotton still further .

I would be lacking in honesty if I did not say here that, aside from the interests of cotton and of Texas, unless the United States accepts its position as the leading capitalist of the world and adjusts its commercial policies accordingly, we are going to see much sharper domestic adjustment than has yet taken place, and the tendency toward regimentation and Federal Government coercion in relation to the economic activities of the American people will continue, regardless of who is in power at Washington, until we shall

find ourselves in the grip of a dictatorial system of collectivism of one sort or another.

I have said that in such a time as this the question of "Whither Texas?" must inevitably be part and parcel of the larger question "Whither America?" and of the still more comprehensive question "Whither Mankind?" Certainly this is true with respect to the question of the future of cotton in Texas and of the future of the nearly one-third of our population living on cotton farms. A recent survey, made by competent investigators, the report of which has been published by the University of Pennsylvania Press, expresses the deliberate opinion that if the foreign market for American cotton is not restored it is going to be necessary for from six to seven million people to move out of the cotton-producing States in quest of employment. And I know of no valid reason to dispute this.

But obviously, Texas alone can do nothing to change the situation which is progressively destroying the foreign market for its cotton. It is helpless. It has no choice but to accept the regimentation which the Federal Government has ordained to deal with the consequences of this situation. I believe, of course, that Texas representatives at Washington should seek to have this situation changed. But meantime I see no immediate hope that it will be changed.

However, this is not the only respect in which this general situation affects our question "Whither Texas?" The necessity of finding new employment for our people has stimulated interest in industrial development in Texas. But under the present situation we are not going to be permitted to do what we may think practicable and suitable in this connection. Recent policies of the Federal Government are calculated not only to discourage the investment of capital

in new enterprises anywhere, but also to place restrictions on industry, which in due course will make the establishment of new industry in Texas extremely difficult. I have sought this evening to give you some idea of the economic history of Texas and of existing economic conditions in the State. I have tried to present it objectively and dispassionately. And I think that the picture is such that it must have impressed you with the fact that, whatever else may be true of the outlook in Texas, it cannot be improved by attempting to limit working hours to forty hours a week and to fix minimum wages at an amount that a large percentage of our unemployed people, displaced from the farm and elsewhere, cannot possibly earn in industrial production under existing conditions.

So I say, in this respect too, the question of "Whither Texas?" is tied in closely with the question "Whither America?". But the fact remains that we are faced with the necessity of providing new opportunities for employment in Texas, unless we are to witness a decline in population and in wealth. And from a long-run standpoint I think this necessity can be met only by developing an entirely new pattern of industry in the State, based on our peculiar resource pattern. This means that the immediate need in this connection is a comprehensive and persistently prosecuted program of research with the object of working out an industrial set-up based on our resource pattern. Texas is still one of the richest undeveloped regions in the world. It is now the leading fuel-producing State in the Union, with an abundant supply of the most economical kind of fuel right along a seaboard that gives access to the markets of the world, including the vast domestic market along the North Atlantic Seaboard. A program of development certainly

can be worked out, provided adequate research develops the facts upon which to base it. Regardless of the answer to the question "Whither America?", regardless of the course of events in the United States as a whole and in the world, this is something which will have much to do with the answer to the question "Whither Texas?". If Texas would begin the efficient expenditure of, say, one million dollars a year in research of this kind, I am sure that it would pay dividends equivalent to such an investment multiplied by thousands. Surely the "tradition of progress" in Texas, which has been a living thing among us for more than a century, should impel us to undertake such a program.

And now, one final point and I am through. We have another tradition in Texas besides the tradition of progress. It is the tradition of freedom. Concretely it is the tradition of true federalism as distinguished from centralism. The Texas revolution was fought in defense of true federalism and against centralism, and Texas declared its independence and maintained it in order to escape the tyranny of centralism. I hope that tradition is still alive in Texas and that it will never cease to be a vital thing among us. When Texas came into the Union it came in under a federal system, a system of limited and delegated government, clearly defined in a written Constitution, subject to interpretation only by an independent judiciary. It is because the American Government is that kind of a government that it has survived for a century and a half. There has never been a time in our history when this federal form of government, this system of true federalism, was more necessary to our national welfare than today. And there have been few times in our history when it was more menaced by at-

tack from men highly placed in the affairs of our country. As Americans we should be resolved to maintain that form of government against all such attacks. And as true Texans, faithful to our traditions, we cannot escape the duty to defend it in support of our own liberties.

I do not know the answer to the question "Whither America?". But there are those who say that in the future ahead America will be compelled to choose between the two major forms of collectivism, that it will have to become Fascist or Communist. I know that the people of Texas want nothing to do with either of these. I am not so sure about the people of some of the other sections of the United States. It may be that in the years ahead such a choice will be made in the United States. If that time ever comes, it is my prayer that the people of this State, faithful to their traditions of freedom and of progress, will know how to answer the question "Whither Texas?".

President Lovett: If I shrank from approaching this desk in advance of the speaker, what can I possibly say from the heights to which his discourse has transported us? We have sat as one man enthralled. From its initial modest disavowal of the technique of philosophy, and its simple story of what might be the last remnant for which this civilization shall be saved alive, through the hundred years beginning with the pioneering sense and courage of the colonizing Stephen F. Austin and culminating in the prophetic vision and constructive forecasting of the planning Peter Molyneaux, we have sat as one man enthralled. And immediately on recovering command of our faculties we are conscious of growth in stature, and in faith, understanding, and hope.

"We live by admiration, hope, and love," said Wordsworth. He thought the History of Herodotus "the most interesting and instructive book next to the Bible, which had ever been written." Taken by and large, history, like poetry, philosophy, and science even, began with theology. For many it is still involved in theology. In the century under review one statesman after another has seen the hand of God in history. You have only to think of testimony to this effect on the part of Bismarck, Gladstone, and Woodrow Wilson. The World War precipitated the reading and writing of history anew. We have witnessed every one of the historical aspects of history asserting itself anew. In theology, in literature, in propaganda, history has lived again anew, while of late it has been hailed and challenged as science, and characterized as philosophy, politics, ethics, and economics, in turn. The last peak—history as economics—of that mounting range of abstractions, Mr. Molyneaux has scaled tonight; and is it not the height of his argument to have capped that peak with history as business, whether the man of business be in commerce, agriculture, industry or any other of the practical affairs in our distinguished colleague's outlook for the common weal of Texas?

The argument finds support in the remoter sources of philosophy. For example, the forerunner, Thales of Miletus, man of piety, military engineer, astronomer, and man of business, amassed an ample fortune by buying up all the olive presses in Chios and Miletus in anticipation of a bumper olive crop. His date is fixed by his having foretold the eclipse of the sun which put an end to the battle between the Lydians and Medes. Modern astronomical calculations place this eclipse in the year 585 B. C. Four of his successors jump to mind to sustain the present argument:

Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Alexander the Great: three of whom were prosperous men of means and two were college presidents! Socrates was Plato's teacher; Plato was Aristotle's teacher; Aristotle was Alexander's teacher. Plato studied under Socrates ten years, until the latter's death; Aristotle was associated with Plato as student and colleague for twenty years, until the latter's death; Alexander's education was directed by Aristotle for seven years, and for thirteen years longer Aristotle's scientific researches were handsomely subsidized by Alexander, until the latter's death, in Babylon, at sunset, June 13th, 323 B. C.

History affords no example more striking of cumulative teaching. The interval from Socrates the questioner to Alexander the conqueror covers in time two, at most three generations of men, and it ranges in space from the market-place of Athens, a city of a hundred thousand freemen, to the bounds of the Macedonian Empire, the world empire of its own day. Rarely, probably never, have reflection and action met in greater achievement. A far cry perhaps, yet is it not a heartening one at once to those who teach and to those who learn? Socrates, the master of those who teach; Plato, the master of those who think; Aristotle, the master of those who know; Alexander, the master of those who rule; and the master of those who rule was taught by the master of those who know.

From that sequence of master minds evolved the composite legal, evaluating, organizing, ecumenical mind of the West. It remains an unconquerable mind. It has moved Mr. Molyneux in his flight to reason. It has led him on a record run, a record run in narration, statistics, and inspiration. On the scene of our present discontents he has let loose a veritable shower of statistics. The firmament of

our local history he has successfully swept from horizon to zenith for recurring and reassuring signs of progress, and once more discerned in a darkening sky the beckoning star of freedom. On the threshold of our second century he has taken stock of our resources, with insight and understanding. With eloquence and persuasion he has disclosed to us that the Lone Star State is not a single star, nor is it a constellation. It is a double star—this Lone Star of Texas is a double star—and the name of the twin star of Freedom is Progress. They rise together—these twin stars—they rise together, together they set. They cannot be separated. When Freedom rises, Progress is soon to follow; when Freedom goes down, Progress is soon to go down.

I am sure that in trying to make something like adequate acknowledgement of Mr. Molyneaux's moving performance I have already been taxing your patience and his, but pray permit me in conclusion to confirm his conclusion by citing one more familiar parallel between Hellas and Texas.

In the History which Thucydides wrote, we find Pericles saying, "Happiness is freedom and freedom is courage, knowing," he said, "the secret of happiness to be freedom and the secret of freedom to be a brave heart." His principle is still today the fundamental formula of any humane government and the prime condition of all human progress. Like his people, we shall be free because we will to be free; like them, we shall make progress because we will to make progress. Under the inspiration of Mr. Molyneaux's recovery of that principle of Hellas in the traditions of Texas, let us thank God, take heart, and go forward.

* * * *

President Lovett: Since the last Annual Meeting of the Society we have lost by death three distinguished members: Colonel Edward Mandell House, Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, and Frank Clifford Dillard. On motion, duly seconded and carried, I appoint Messrs. Molyneaux, Dealey, and Rhea a Committee on Resolutions respecting deceased members, to bring in a report at the next Annual Meeting, for publication in the *Proceedings* of the Society.

The report of the nominating committee was then read and adopted:

Your committee on nominations moves the election of the following officers and directors for the term ending December 5, 1939:

For President, GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALEY
For First Vice-President, GEORGE ALFRED HILL, JR.
For Second Vice-President, EUGENE CAMPBELL BARKER
For Third Vice-President, HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON
For Fourth Vice-President, WILLIAM STAMPS FARISH
For Fifth Vice-President, HOWARD MUMFORD JONES
For Recording Secretary, ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST
For Corresponding Secretary, SAMUEL WOOD GEISER
For Treasurer, GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS
For Librarian, WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER
For Directors:

GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALEY	WILLIAM ALEXANDER RHEA
GEORGE ALFRED HILL, JR.	UMPHREY LEE
EDGAR ODELL LOVETT	DAVID LEFKOWITZ
GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS	JOHN ELZY OWENS
CHARLES SHIRLEY POTTS	JOSEPH GRUNDY O'DONOHUE

SAM ACHESON

I. K. STEPHENS

HERBERT P. GAMBRELL, *Chairman*

President Dealey then took the chair as presiding officer, and after informal discussion of Society matters, the meeting was adjourned.

G. B. DEALEY, *President*

SAMUEL WOOD GEISER, *Secretary*

BY-LAWS OF THE SOCIETY

On May 7, 1936, the incorporators adopted the following By-Laws, which reproduce in spirit and effect the By-Laws of the original Society:

Section I. The annual meetings of the Society shall be held in the city of Dallas, Texas, or at such other places in the State of Texas as the Board of Directors may select from time to time. The annual meetings shall be held on the fifth day of December—such date being the day on which the Society was founded in 1937. The Society shall meet in called meetings at such other times and places as the Board of Directors may decide. The Recording Secretary shall notify in writing all members of the Society at least ten days before the time set for such meetings.

Section II. There shall be three classes of memberships in the Society. (1) Active members, the number of which shall not at any time exceed one hundred; (2) Associate members, the number of which shall not at any time exceed fifty; (3) Foreign members, the number of which shall not at any time exceed twenty-five. To be an active or associate member a person must reside in, have been born in, or have at some time resided in, the geographical boundaries of the late Republic of Texas. All other members shall be foreign members. Vacancies in active membership may be filled from the associate memberships only. Neither associate members nor foreign members shall have voting powers.

Section III. Three members in good standing may nominate a person or persons for membership in the Society, such nominations to be made on forms to be supplied for that purpose and filed with the Recording Secretary of the Society, nor later than one month before the annual meetings in any year. From the nominations so made, the Board of Directors shall recommend to the Society the candidates for membership whom they believe to be qualified for membership. Members shall be elected by ballot by the Society from such lists of nominations and recommendations as its annual meeting. A favorable vote of at least three-fourths of the active members present shall be necessary to the election of any member.

Section IV. The membership fee for admission to the Society shall be ten dollars, payable at the time of acceptance of membership in the Society. There shall be no further dues payable by any member of the Society. The Board of Directors may by a majority vote fix an assessment on all members, but it shall never exceed five dollars in any one year.

Section V. The officers of the Society shall be a President, five Vice-Presidents, one Recording Secretary, one Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, a Librarian, and ten Directors, who shall be elected by a majority of the members present at the annual meeting; which officers, at the time of their being balloted for, shall be active members of the Society. They shall hold office for one year or until their successors shall be elected.

Section VI. It shall be the duty of the President to preside at all the meetings of the Society; to see that all its decrees and ordinances are faithfully executed; to lay before the Society all communications that may have

been made to him; and to submit to the Society all communications that may have been made to him; and to submit to the Society such business and matters as he shall deem deserving its attention: In case of a vacancy occurring in any office, he shall fill the same by appointment, till the next annual meeting. He may suspend until the next annual meeting any officer who shall have conducted himself improperly in office.

Section VII. In case of the death, sickness, or inactivity of the President, his duties shall devolve on the Vice-Presidents in the order of their rank.

Section VIII. The Recording Secretary shall keep a book in which he shall record the by-laws of the Society, a list of the members and their addresses, a journal of the proceedings of the Society, and copies of such communications as may be ordered by the Society to be recorded.

Section IX. The Corresponding Secretary shall be charged with all the correspondence of the Society; and he shall keep copies of the same.

Section X. The Treasurer shall have charge of the moneys belonging to the Society, which he shall pay out to the order of the President; or in compliance with an express order only of the Society. His accounts shall be rendered at the annual meeting, and be at all times subject to the inspection of any officer of the Society.

Section XI. The Librarian shall have charge of all books, papers and other personal property acquired by the Society, under such regulations as may be made by the Board of Directors.

Section XII. The officers of the Society shall be *ex-officio* a committee of publication, to act in conformity with such regulations as may hereafter be passed by the Board of Directors.

Section XIII. Members may be expelled for improper conduct by vote of a majority of the members present at an annual meeting.

Section XIV. Ten per cent of the active members of the Society who are in good standing shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Section XV. These by-laws may be amended by a majority of vote of the members at any annual meeting of this Society, or at any meeting called for that purpose.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

for the Year 1939

President

GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALEY

First Vice-President

GEORGE ALFRED HILL, JR.

Second Vice-President

EUGENE CAMPBELL BARKER

- Third Vice-President*
HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON
- Fourth Vice-President*
WILLIAM STAMPS FARISH
- Fifth Vice-President*
HOWARD MUMFORD JONES
- Corresponding Secretary*
SAMUEL WOOD GEISER
- Recording Secretary*
ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST
- Treasurer*
GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS
- Librarian*
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER

DIRECTORS

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| George Bannerman Dealey | John Elzy Owens |
| George Alfred Hill, Jr. | William Alexander Rhea |
| Edgar Odell Lovett | Umphrey Lee |
| George Waverley Briggs | David Lefkowitz |
| Charles Shirley Potts | Joseph Grundy O'Donohoe |

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

- ACHESON, SAMUEL HANNA, editorial writer and historian, *The News* Dallas
- AYNESWORTH, KENNETH HAZEN, former president, Texas Surgical Society; regent, University of Texas 601 Franklin Avenue, Waco
- BAKER, KARLE WILSON (Mrs. Thomas E.), author 1013 North Street, Nacogdoches
- BARKER, EUGENE CAMPBELL, former president, Mississippi Valley Historical Association; professor of American History, University of Texas Austin
- BATTLE, WILLIAM JAMES, former president, Texas Fine Arts Association; professor of Classical Languages, University of Texas Austin
- BIZZELL, WILLIAM BENNETT, president, University of Oklahoma Norman
- BLACK, JAMES HARVEY, former president, American Society of Clinical Microscopists, and of the American Association for the Study of Allergy; professor of clinical medicine, Baylor University Medical School Dallas
- BOLTON, HERBERT EUGENE, former president, American Historical Association; professor of American history, University of California Berkeley
- BRIGGS, GEORGE WAVERLEY, vice-president, First National Bank Dallas

- BROGAN, ALBERT PERLEY, dean of Graduate School, University of Texas
Austin
- BURGES, RICHARD FENNER, former president of International Irrigation
Congress First National Bank Building, *El Paso*
- BURGES, WILLIAM HENRY, former president, Texas Bar Association .
. First National Bank Building, *El Paso*
- BURLESON, EMMA KYLE, chairman, Texas State Library and Historical
Commission *Austin*
- CASTANEDA, CARLOS EDUARDO, Historiographer, Texas Knights of Colum-
bus Historical Commission, director of Latin-American libraries, Univer-
sity of Texas *Austin*
- CARY, EDWARD HENRY, former president, American Medical Association
Medical Arts Building, *Dallas*
- CHANDLER, ASA CRAWFORD, professor of biology, The Rice Institute .
. *Houston*
- CLAYTON, WILLIAM L., member of Anderson, Clayton & Co., cotton factors
. *Houston*
- COHEN, HENRY, rabbi, Temple Beth-El *Galveston*
- CRANE, MARTIN McNULTY, former attorney-general of Texas
Republic National Bank Building, *Dallas*
- DEALEY, GEORGE BANNERMAN, president, *The Dallas News* . . . *Dallas*
- DEGOLYER, EVERETTE LEE, former president, Geophysical Research
Corporation, former president, American Association of Petroleum Geo-
logists and of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical
Engineers Continental Building, *Dallas*
- DOBIE, J. FRANK, secretary, Texas Folk-Lore Society; professor of English,
University of Texas *Austin*
- FARISH, WILLIAM STAMPS, former president, Humble Oil Company and
the American Petroleum Institute; president, Standard Oil Company of
New Jersey *Houston and New York*
- GAMBRELL, HERBERT PICKENS, associate professor of history, Southern
Methodist University *Dallas*
- GEISER, SAMUEL WOOD, professor of biology, Southern Methodist
University *Dallas*
- HACKETT, CHARLES WILSON, professor of Latin American history Uni-
versity of Texas *Austin*
- HILL, GEORGE ALFRED, JR., president Houston Pipe Line Company, and
Houston Oil Company of Texas *Houston*
- HILL, ROBERT THOMAS, former president, Texas Geographical Society
. Jefferson Hotel, *Dallas*
- HOCKADAY, ELA, president, The Hockaday Junior College . . . *Dallas*
- HOGG, IMA 2940 Lazy Lane, *Houston*
- HOUSTON, ANDREW JACKSON, retired colonel, Texas National Guard .
. *LaPorte*

- HARPER, HENRY WINSTON, dean-emeritus of the Graduate School, University of Texas *Austin*
- HUTCHESON, JOSEPH CHAPPELL, JR., United States circuit judge Federal Building, *Houston*
- IDESON, JULIA BEDFORD, librarian, Houston Public Library . . . *Houston*
- JENNINGS, HERBERT SPENCER, former president, American Society of Zoölogists The Johns Hopkins University, *Baltimore*
- JONES, CLIFFORD BARTLETT, president, Texas Technological College *Lubbock*
- JONES, HOWARD MUMFORD, professor of English, Harvard University *Cambridge*
- KEMP, LOUIS WILTZ, former chairman, Advisory Board of Texas Historians, Texas Centennial Commission . . . 214 Westmoreland Avenue
Houston
- LAMAR, LUCIUS MIRABEAU, lawyer . . . Petroleum Building, *Houston*
- LEE, UMPHREY, president, Southern Methodist University . . . *Dallas*
- LEFKOWITZ, DAVID, former president, Central Conference of American Rabbis Temple Emanu-El, *Dallas*
- LOMAX, JOHN AVERY, honorary curator of folk songs, The Library of Congress *Austin*
- LOVETT, EDGAR ODELL, president, The Rice Institute *Houston*
- MARSH, FRANK BURR, professor of ancient history, University of Texas *Austin*
- MCGREGOR, STUART MALCOLM, editor, *The Texas Almanac*, *The News* *Dallas*
- MCREYNOLDS, JOHN OLIVER, former president, Pan American Medical Association Mercantile Bank Building, *Dallas*
- MOLYNEAUX, PETER, editor, *The Texas Weekly*; trustee, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace *Dallas*
- O'DONOHUE, JOSEPH GRUNDY, secretary, Texas Knights of Columbus Historical Commission *Sherman*
- OWENS, JOHN ELZY, vice-president, Republic National Bank . . . *Dallas*
- PIERCE, GEORGE WASHINGTON, chairman of Division of Physical Sciences, Harvard University *Cambridge*
- POTTS, CHARLES SHIRLEY, dean of the School of Law, Southern Methodist University *Dallas*
- PURYEAR, CHARLES, dean-emeritus of the Graduate School, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas *College Station*
- QUIN, CLINTON SIMON, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Texas . . . *Houston*
- RAMSDALL, CHARLES WILLIAM, former president, Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the Southern Historical Association; professor of American history, University of Texas *Austin*
- RANDALL, EDWARD, president of the Rosenberg Library, and of the Galveston County Medical Society; member of the board of Regents, University of Texas *Galveston*

- RHEA, WILLIAM ALEXANDER, professor of law, Southern Methodist University *Dallas*
- SCHOFFELMAYER, VICTOR HUMBERT, agricultural editor, *The News* *Dallas*
- SEARS, GEORGE DUBOSE, lawyer *Houston*
- SMITH, THOMAS VERNOR, professor of philosophy, The University of Chicago; congressman from Illinois *Chicago and Washington*
- SMITHER, HARRIET WINGFIELD, archivist, Texas State Library . *Austin*
- STEPHENS, IRA KENDRICK, professor of philosophy, Southern Methodist University *Dallas*
- SUMNERS, HATTON WILLIAM, congressman from Texas *Dallas and Washington*
- TRUETT, GEORGE WASHINGTON, president, Baptist World Alliance *First Baptist Church, Dallas*
- WATKIN, WILLIAM WARD, professor of architecture, The Rice Institute *Houston*
- WEBB, WALTER PRESCOTT, professor of history, University of Texas *Austin*
- WEISER, HARRY BOWYER, professor of chemistry, and dean, The Rice Institute *Houston*
- WEST, ELIZABETH HOWARD, librarian, Texas Technological College *Lubbock*
- WIESS, HARRY CAROTHERS, president, Humble Oil and Refining Company *Houston*
- WHARTON, CLARENCE RAY, lawyer, Esperson Building *Houston*
- WRATHER, WILLIAM EMBRY, former president, American Society of Economic Geologists; president, Texas State Historical Association 4300 Overhill Drive, *Dallas*

DECEASED MEMBERS

- BENEDICT, HARRY YANDELL, formerly president, University of Texas (Austin) d. May 10, 1937.
- CULLINAN, JOSEPH STEPHEN, formerly president, The Texas Company (Houston) d. March 11, 1937.
- DEALEY, JAMES QUAYLE, formerly president, The American Sociological Society; formerly editor-in-chief of *The News* (Dallas) d. January 22, 1937.
- DILLARD, FRANK CLIFFORD, formerly lawyer (Sherman) d. September 25, 1938.
- HOUSE, EDWARD MANDELL (Houston and New York) d. March 28, 1938.
- MONTGOMERY, JAMES T., formerly lawyer (Wichita Falls) d. May 19, 1939.
- BENNYBACKER, MRS. PERCY V. (Austin) d. February 4, 1938.
- WHEELER, WILLIAM MORTON, formerly professor, Harvard University (Cambridge) d. April 20, 1937.