

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

PROCEEDINGS

1965

---

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE ANNUAL MEETING  
AT SALADO

DECEMBER 10, 11, 1965

XXIX

---

DALLAS  
THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS  
1966

---

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS FOR THE COLLECTION AND DIFFUSION OF KNOWLEDGE *was founded December 5, 1837, in the Capitol of the Republic of Texas at Houston, by* MIRABEAU B. LAMAR, ASHBEL SMITH, THOMAS J. RUSK, WILLIAM H. WHARTON, JOSEPH ROWE, ANGUS McNEILL, AUGUSTUS C. ALLEN, GEORGE W. BONNELL, JOSEPH BAKER, PATRICK C. JACK, W. FAIRFAX GRAY, JOHN A. WHARTON, DAVID S. KAUFMAN, JAMES COLLINSWORTH, ANSON JONES, LITTLETON FOWLER, A. C. HORTON, I. W. BURTON, EDWARD T. BRANCH, HENRY SMITH, HUGH McLEOD, THOMAS JEFFERSON CHAMBERS, SAM HOUSTON, R. A. IRION, DAVID G. BURNET, *and* JOHN BIRDSALL.

*The Society was reconstituted on December 5, 1936. Membership is by invitation. Active and Associate Members must have been born within, or must have resided within, the boundaries of the late Republic of Texas.*

*Offices and Library of the Society are in the Hall of State, Dallas 26, Texas.*

---

# *The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

STAGECOACH INN at Salado was the meeting place of the Society on December 10 and 11, 1965. The management was host at cocktails before the Friday dinner, at which Rabbi Olan spoke on "The University in the Modern World."

Speakers at the Saturday morning symposium were President Randall, Chauncey D. Leake, and Frank E. Vandiver. Vice President Wozencraft presided. Vice President Kirkland was in the chair during the afternoon session, which was devoted to informal recollections and evaluations of four great Texans, long associated with the Society. Frank Wardlaw spoke on J. Frank Dobie; John A. Lomax, Jr., talked of his father and his work on Folk Songs and sang several of his father's favorites. Lon Tinkle spoke movingly on Walter Prescott Webb and Roy Bedichek, demonstrating that while both wrote only in prose, each man observed and recorded life with the feeling of a poet.

President and Mrs. Randall were hosts at cocktails Saturday evening and Chancellor Croneis delivered the concluding address.

Members present were: Miss Allen, Miss Friend, Mrs. Gambrell, Mrs. Northen, Mrs. Tobin, Messrs. Baker, Banks, Bates, Bellows, Bennett, Bruce, Bryan, Carrington, Croneis, Darden, Fleming, Frances, Gambrell, Garwood, Hart, Hershey, George A. Hill, Hogan, Johnson, Kempner, Kirkland, Leake, Long MacNaughton, Murray, Olan, Pitzer, Pool, Prothro, Ragan, Randall, Redditt, Richardson, Sadler, Sharp, Shuffler, Storey, Sutherland, Symonds, Tinkle, Tips, Tsanoff, Tucker, Vandiver, Wardlaw, Wiggins, Winn, Woodson, Woolrich.

Also attending were Mrs. C. Stanley Banks, Mrs. W. B. Bates, Mrs. W. S. Bellows, Mrs. A. D. Bruce, Mrs. Paul Carrington, Mrs. Carey Croneis, Mrs. William E. Darden, Mrs. J. Frank Dobie, Mrs. St. John Garwood, Mrs. James P. Hart, Mrs. J. W. Hershey, Mrs. J. E. Hickman, Mrs. George A. Hill, Elise Hopkins, Mrs. Parks Johnson, Mrs. Harris L. Kempner, Mr. Harris Kempner, Jr., Mrs. William A. Kirkland, Mr. and Mrs. William Lewis, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Lomax, Jr., Mrs. Lewis W. MacNaughton, Mrs. C. T. McCormick, Mrs. W. O. Murray, Mrs. Levi A. Olan, Mrs. Kenneth S. Pitzer, Mrs. Charles N. Prothro, Mrs. Cooper K. Ragan, Mrs. Edward Randall, Jr., Mr. and



Mrs. Edward Randall, III, Mrs. John S. Redditt, Mr. John A. Rose, Jr., Dr. and Mrs. H. D. Schweppe, Jr., Mrs. Dudley C. Sharp, Mrs. Robert G. Storey, Mrs. Gardner Symonds, Mrs. Lon Tinkle, Mrs. Charles R. Tips, Mrs. Radaslav A. Tsanoff, Mrs. Edward B. Tucker, Mrs. Frank Vandiver, Mrs. Frank H. Wardlaw, Mrs. D. M. Wiggins, Mr. and Mrs. Boyd R. Willett, Mrs. Buck Winn, Jr., Mrs. Cornette Woodness, Mrs. B. N. Woodson.

At the business session, the Secretary announced the election to active membership of these ten Texans:

Thomas A. Armstrong of Armstrong  
 Jacob W. Hershey of Houston  
 William P. Hobby, Jr., of Houston  
 William R. Horgan of New Orleans  
 Paul Horgan of Roswell, New Mexico<sup>o</sup>  
 Peter Hurd of San Patricio, New Mexico<sup>o</sup>  
 Lewis W. MacNaughton of Dallas  
 Stanley W. Olson of Houston  
 Frank E. Vandiver of Houston  
 Frank H. Wardlaw of Austin

The names of three valued members lost by death were read: Mrs. George A. Hill, Jr., immediate past president; Pat Ireland Nixon, president in 1947; and Mrs. Walter B. Sharp, a member since 1946.

Stanley Banks presented the nominations of the committee on officers, which were adopted.

After it was agreed to return to Stagecoach Inn for the Annual Meeting on December 9 and 10, 1966, the Secretary announced the non-constitutional appointment of an additional officer. Our genial host, Dion Van Bibber, was declared honorary Sutler to the Society after it was explained that in the Texas revolutionary army, the sutler was not part of the military force but travelled along with it, ministering to the liquid and other needs of the inner man. Mr. Van Bibber accepted in a gracious note.

<sup>o</sup>"Born in, or at some time resided in, the geographical boundaries of the late Republic of Texas." *By-Laws*, Article I.

## *The University in the Modern World*

LEVI A. OLAN

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY TODAY is irrelevant to human experience. The university can teach us to make a missile if we want missiles, or to build a cathedral if that is what we want. It can, through medical education, teach us health if that is what we want; or how to overcome mental sickness if that is what we want. What it does not do is answer the primary question: Why should we want any of these things?

The idea of going to college in order to examine values, ideas, human experience, is characteristic of very few, if any, young people. Faculty members themselves have lost the ability to understand one another. We have known for some time that a scientist and a poet today generally have little basis for common intellectual discourse.

The extensive splintering of knowledge is revealed by these startling figures: In the year 1900, a small midwestern college offered 67 courses; in 1930, these had grown to 296. In larger schools during the same period, the growth was from 960 to 1,897. The unity of liberal education has been atomized by specialization. "Colleges have become little more than vocational schools," said the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, "in which the aim of teaching is almost exclusively preparation for advanced study in one or another specialty." One is attracted to Sir Richard Livingstone's wry comment that the sign of a good university is the number of subjects that it declines to investigate.

No university today is respectable if it is not primarily an institution of research. A half-century ago a university was a liberal arts college with professional schools attached. Today, good teaching is sacrificed to the glory of research. Even the arts have taken over the methodological apparatus from the sciences and are engaged in investigating subjects quantitatively and by measurement.

The liberal arts college is in practice a diverse collection of departments prepared primarily to train specialists for graduate and professional studies. It is difficult to discover in its program a place for the broad intellectual competence which is truly its major concern.

The increasing number of professional schools play a role almost as important as graduate research in the modern university. The relationship of a school of medicine, of law, of engineering, of education, indeed of any program which prepares a person for a job, needs

clarification. And this brings us to the heart of the whole matter: What is a University? When it issues a diploma and awards a degree, what does it declare? That a man is a qualified doctor, lawyer, engineer, teacher, mortician, plumber?

Unfortunately, this is most often the case. What is totally lost sight of is that *this is not the function of a university*. The professions can be adequately, and perhaps better, trained in specific subjects by separate schools dedicated to the particular job. A university, however, is dedicated to *the development of an intelligent man* who then may become either a lawyer, a clergyman, or a bricklayer. The question of what courses a university should offer is answered very simply — only those of *intellectual content*. If a subject does not have intellectual content in its own right, it has no place in a university. If it does, but not in its own right, it should be taught under the auspices of those departments where intellectual content is basic.

In the hungry search for money, universities tend to set aside the basic purpose of education. What is lost in the confusion is the essential value of intellectual content to a profession. The doctor, lawyer, clergyman, architect, is concerned with man as a whole and the conditions of human life as a whole. To prepare a man for any of these professions without relating his life's work to the total field of knowledge is to confine his usefulness and to limit his potential. The university should instil a lifelong commitment to the intellectual investigation of any topic and a search for the unity of knowledge. The deficiencies in professional techniques which a man has when he receives his degree can be eliminated with practice. The basic deficiencies in scholarly pursuits can never be retrieved.

The necessary integration of basic and professional education is not only an ideal. It is crucial to the very nature of professional practice itself. A professional degree is obsolescent at the time it is conferred by the ongoing evolution of learning and scholarship in the field. Unless a man can "learn, unlearn, and relearn" he will be useless very soon in his own chosen domain.

There are historic and practical reasons why a university should include professional schools whose content is essentially intellectual. What is distressing is the growing tendency to assign a vocational role to the professional school and to the prerequisite requirements for it. In the preprofessional stage a student spends 50 per cent of his time or more on a major which is specifically a preparation for his trade, and the remainder in courses which usually are specialties for others. "He, therefore, leaves college," says the President's Report, "unacquainted with some of the fundamental areas of human knowledge and without an integrated view of human experience that

is essential both for personal balance and for social wisdom." Every genuine profession requires the nourishment of creative thought. When this is abandoned, the profession degenerates into a trade.

The fact that democratization has brought to our colleges young people with a large variety of motives ought not to disturb us. If they come because they know that without a college degree one cannot get a decent job or because a degree gives social status, they are not far removed from the children of aristocrats of former years who attended universities. Indeed, the reason for this matriculation is not incompatible with the genuine purposes of education. In fact it can be exploited so that a young person will devote himself energetically to the intellectual life.

The academic community cannot escape the responsibility for the decline in the nature and quality of our universities as educational institutions. No matter what the pressures are from the business community or from the state, the basic purpose of intellectual confrontation, of an intelligent search for understanding and meaning, cannot and dare not be compromised. A student can graduate from our universities today without ever having to challenge his own assumptions and without catching a glimpse of a world view. He usually emerges without any sign of possessing a critical mind, or the capacity for independent thought. His system of values and his moral commitments show little or no evidence of having received intelligent examination. That trustees and regents, who must provide the money for universities, have given way to the market place standards of our age can be understood if not approved. But that the academic community should meekly acquiesce and even cooperate with this process is almost beyond belief. It is to be pitied that men exchange the role of teachers of wisdom for that of instructors of trades. The house of intellect has become a trade school.

It required the sensitivity of an uncomplicated poet to reduce the tension between the arts and the sciences which plagues almost all makers of college curricula. "When you say the humanities," wrote Robert Frost, "you mustn't forget that they include the sciences, even if the scientists sometimes try to forget." He could have included artists who also sometimes try to forget. The common element in the sciences and humanities, considered as intellectual discipline, is of greater significance than the differences. The unity between them is basic. The wall of separation which has been erected between them on the university campus has introduced a bifurcation whose consequences can be catastrophic. The isolation of man from nature introduces the elements of conflict and of fear, and the intensification of man's sense of alienation.

A major cause for this misunderstanding derives from the popular failure to distinguish between technology, the practical expression of science, and theory, which is the intellectual formulation of man's understanding of his experience with nature and human nature. The almost unforgivable sin of the modern university is that it will graduate young people who have never been confronted by the organic unity of all of life.

That there is a very heavy concentration on the sciences on the campus today is revealed to anyone who studies the budgets of universities. Congress readily votes money to a National Science Foundation but has only now begun belatedly to support the humanities. There is an inherent danger in the imbalance which, again, a poet has perceived. Archibald MacLeish protests against the heavy emphasis upon the sciences in education because they deal too little with facts and concentrate on abstractions. The consequences of this sort of thing are ominous. "Abstractions," he writes, "have a limiting, a dehumanizing, a dehydrating effect on the relations of things to man who must live with them. The result is that we are more and more left in our scientific society without the knowledge of ourselves as we truly are, or our experience as it actually is." Science gives us only abstractions of the world; we do not learn from it what the world really is. The mind which perceives the truth of a mathematical equation but is totally incapable of recognizing the meaning of a Beethoven symphony has not only excluded from experience a whole realm of truth, but has accepted abstraction as reality.

For a university to place its seal of approval upon the diploma of a man who will go through life incapable of communicating with great minds and souls of yesterday and today, never to experience the color, form, and sound with which artists have recorded thought and feeling, is both grave intellectual heresy and shameful dishonesty. On the other hand, to award a degree to a man who is wholly unaware of the scientific interpretation of nature and human nature, and who will remain unaware of the scientific spirit which stresses intellectual curiosity, openness of mind, passion for truth wherever it may lead, respect for evidence, and the free communication of discoveries, is equally a forfeiture of the basic purpose of a university. The primary purpose of a university is to pull together the several parts into some significant "whole," something inherent in its very name, *universitas*.

It is at this point that the condition of modern man and the university confront each other. The sickness which man suffers from most is atomization, the tearing asunder of the world without and within. If he is to find himself as a whole person he must be led to the whole experience of life and not to a part of it. The crucial issue of



our age lies in the answer to the question: What will science do to man? Elevate the human spirit and enrich his experience? Or, lead to degradation of the human spirit and the destruction of life itself? The answer must be given by men, if they are wise men, not just scientists, just poets, just philosophers, but men whose wisdom arises from the total experience of man with nature. The aim of the university, first and foremost, is to educate men to wisdom.

The appeal for unity is often transformed into a program of uniformity. This is demonstrated by what Hutchins calls a "core of unity in the essential diversity of higher education." There probably are some basic values or truths upon which free minds will agree. The danger, however, lies in the credalizing of them, in endowing them with the authority of absolutes. This was the chief characteristic of the Middle Ages, a time when the "core" of truth was defined by church and state. This assigned to education a chartered course, a specially defined goal. It conceived of education as a useful instrument of attaining other ends. In our own day the President's Report profiles the goals of higher education and includes values with which it is easy to agree. "To attain a satisfactory emotional and social adjustment . . . to understand and enjoy literature, art, music as expressions of personal and social experience . . . socially useful and personally satisfying vocations. . . ." These are attainments whose praise is almost universal. The built-in threat here is that these eliminate the possibility of critically challenging the very aims themselves.

A university degree should certify that a man can think and reason, that he engage in the practice of inquiry and discovery, that he is capable of analyzing and evaluating the evidence. It does not proclaim that the student has absorbed all the information about any subject that he will need and use in later years. *The Report of the Faculty Planning Committee of Southern Methodist University* has used simple and noble words to say this:

A university is a community of scholars, mature and fledgling, dedicated to the life of inquiry and the communication of knowledge. . . . its common goal is the educated person whose interests open upon a wide range of human problems and values, whose tastes and habits and conscience are informed, critical, articulate, responsible.

The point here is that uniformity in outlook as to ultimate values is canceled out by the simple fact that man's condition is much too complex and mysterious to find a resolution in an absolute answer. It is true that the Puritan background of our society tends to lure us with clear-cut alternatives, good against evil, right against wrong, absolute against relative. If freedom is a good, then authority is evil.

Man's major problems are human ones which are less susceptible to the clear-cut dichotomies of absolutes. Wisdom is revealed most often in a spirit of moderation, a sympathetic understanding of the other side, which is feelingly aware of man's common weaknesses and strengths. The supreme goal of a university is to send out a person with a feeling of humility before a vast mystery, knowing most how little he really knows, that he is going to be ignorant as is everyone else. If he can only be sure that his ignorance is not complete, that he has some knowledge, little as it may be, he may count himself an educated man. Socrates once said that there was one theme upon which he was ready to fight in word and deed to the utmost of his power, that "we shall be better and braver and less helpless if we think that we ought to inquire than we should have been if we indulged in the idle fancy that there was no knowing and no use in seeking to know what we do not know. . . ."

The first charge upon a university is that it shall consider the student an adult, not a child — an adult who is ready to face the fact that the unexamined life is useless. In too many instances higher education is a form of adolescent baby-sitting. The student is protected against the old draughts of critical examination and radical doubt. The fundamental issues are ignored and what really matters is supplanted by a program of textbook, lecture, quiz, and grade. Rarely is the subject one which asks: How shall men live? And what shall they do to be free and creative? There is no other place where ideas can be subjected to critical evaluation and where men may move forward toward "lands unknown." In a university academic freedom is the very breath of life because the university's chief business is to think, to think independently and daringly, to think all thoughts whether socially approved or rejected. It gains its lifeblood from intellectual controversy. Jaspers speaks of the basic idea of a university when he says: "It would be contrary to the idea of a university to deny admission to a man of intellectual rank who shows proof of intellectual achievement and works in a scholarly way — even if his scholarship ultimately serves an alien interest."

The search for truth is a lonely affair and can take place only in a condition of freedom. If we are to expand our knowledge of the universe and of human experience it is important to respect the privacy of a man's mind as well as we do that of his house. In a university the subject matter must be controversial, for what really matters in life is perplexing and uncertain, and with Socrates both teachers and learners need to be wholly free to see things as they are and "to follow the argument wherever it leads."

There is much in the structure of a modern university which impedes the fulfillment of its primary purpose. The control of a school is generally in the hands of laymen who are endowed not only with the privilege of providing the money but with the responsibility of determining the nature of the curriculum and the complexion of the faculty and student body. The task is almost superhuman and the means adopted to achieve it often verge on the ridiculous. The academic standards belong to the academicians, just as those for medicine are in the hands of doctors. There is something frustrating about laymen, with or without the best of intentions, selecting specialists in a field in which they are alien. In these times no one can make light of the burden of providing sufficient money to meet the needs of higher education. In order to obtain enough money, universities appear to be soliciting for it morning, noon, and night. The job now has become so vast that even the smallest school has a public relations department whose mission is to sell the university to those who can best support it. In too many instances the school cuts the cloth to fit the customer. If the modern university appears to be more of a super-market than a community of scholars, much of the responsibility lies in the fact that the money was available for programs which have no more business there than in a hospital or church.

There is, it seems, one basic principle for the administration of a university, and it is the reverse of what is now the general practice. It really makes no difference whether the money comes from the state or from wealthy donors, from the alumni or the community. The first need is to define a university in authentic terms and then ask for money to support it. The educational policy must precede the financing. The state is no more of a threat than the millionaire so long as the integrity of the basic purpose of a university is never compromised.

The cultural climate of American life is not very sympathetic to the advancement of an institution whose only purpose is to enhance the capacities of men to inquire freely and to examine critically the essence of human existence. The public is persuaded more readily by programs which will prove utilitarian and profitable. One cannot be too sure even how much it will spend for survival when in one year the cost of higher education was the same as that for television sets. We usually buy what we want, and we seem to want gadgets more than education.

It is distressing to watch universities, the only guardians of man's true freedom, succumbing to the lure of the market place. A large school recently dropped "big time" football from its program, not

because it was engaged in big business and recruited cleverly despite the "law," not because it has nothing to do with either education or learning; it was dropped because it did not pay! If the university is ever to return to its central reason for existence, the art of thinking about what really matters, it will just have to declare its independence from dominating controls whether by private laymen or public officials.

Paul Goodman has proposed an experiment for the achievement of an ideal university where the intellectual process can operate unburdened and in freedom. Twenty-five faculty men and two hundred and fifty students go off somewhere and live as a community of teachers and learners. The tuition is to go direct to the faculty, the complex administrative machinery is eliminated, and all minds are engaged in the exciting experience of thinking. A university thus becomes a place, not a course of studies.

Members of the faculty of a university today find themselves separated from each other, living in the town and coming to the campus only to put in the necessary hours of teaching and conferences. Each one is engaged in a specialized field so that there is no common base of interest between them, except tennis, bridge, or golf.

A university is at its best when its students are withdrawn from the world, show preference for disinterested thought, and find perspective and wisdom in peace. The days on campus are for seeing visions, seeking truths, and wrestling with one's soul. A university today cannot be integrated into society since by its nature it is and must be different. Its purview includes all nations, all time, past, present, and future. It is regulated by rules of evidence for truth which cannot be bent to meet the convenience of the town. Scholarship is international and it ceases to exist when it is forced to meet local customs and prejudices.

Indeed, universities must by their very nature live in conflict with society because they are bound to place every institution, moral code, philosophy of life, political system, and popular value under the severe test of critical examination. Contrary to the noble idealism of some students, participating in protest movements for good causes is not part of the educational process, since the very causes themselves need to be thrown into the intellectual forum of teachers and students. Too often, we have uncritical enthusiasm without intelligent comprehension. A university is at its best as an intellectual ivory tower where all are free to analyze, criticize, evaluate, and search vigorously the world and themselves.

It ought to be assumed that a student comes with a desire to enter the life of the intellect and the teacher is there to guide and encourage

him. Perhaps the time has come to rethink all of the "educational pillows," the machinery of assignments, grades, credits, courses, counseling, extracurricular activities. It may be that the university should be only for those who are interested in the search for truth and meaning, for enriching the mind and the spirit. Those who want to learn to be doctors or plumbers, lawyers or bricklayers, can go to trade schools. These are not the functions of the university unless they are studied in the frame of the basic intellectual discipline of which they are a part. The student as an adult and eager about thought must be given freedom, yes, "free to go to the dogs," as Jaspers says.

It will take more than tinkering with the curriculum and classroom techniques to recapture the spirit of learning. Most self-studies by universities end in a rearrangement of courses and the addition of administrative personnel. What is missing is the heart of the matter, the creation of imagination in the classroom, the arousing of intellectual curiosity about life and its destiny, nature and its meaning.

Education begins with significant questions which are forced upon us through the pressure of experience. An enterprise worthy in itself must ultimately relate itself to the problem of human existence. Its aim is to guide men intelligently as they ask questions which matter most: How should we live? How act? How look upon the community? To what shall we aspire? What shall be our vocation? Modern man, whose existence is threatened by total annihilation from without, and a sickening anxiety and fear from within, finds little or no help in the precincts of higher learning. The values of the market place — success, applause, and acclaim — which are so dominant in his mood of despair are ensconced on the campus with all the trappings of a medieval monastery. The anti-intellectualism which pervades the town is characteristic of the university whose inhabitants are there to learn a trade or for social adjustment. It is almost an academic heresy to insist that the only business of a university is the life of the mind. Woodrow Wilson said that an educated man is discovered by "his point of view, by the temper of his mind, by his attitude toward life and his fair way of thinking. He can see, he can discriminate, he can combine ideas and perceive whither they tend; he has insight and comprehension." By these standards a graduate from a modern university is abysmally uneducated. What is even more distressing, the academic establishment confesses its essential failure in private but conforms to the popular image in public.

The deepest concerns of men must go elsewhere when universities cease to be a meeting place of minds, and disintegrate into a number of advanced vocational schools.



## PROLOGUE

EDWARD RANDALL, JR.

“DID I TELL YOU about my grand children?”, I asked a certain friend. “No,” he said, “You did not and I certainly appreciate it. Thank you very much.”

But I am going to tell you about Greece where my wife Katherine and I were a few months ago, a story that is a preface to the discovery of America.

We must always remember that the word “Greece” means much more than Athens and the so-called Mainland. It takes into consideration all the Greek Islands, Asia Minor, North Africa, Sicily and Spain. Here the Greek culture owes a big debt to Crete and King Minos 2,500 years before Christ, and to Asia Minor. Indeed, few of the great Greek personages came from the mainland itself, and the culture of the Near East played a very large part in this history.

On the other hand, Rome was purely military in its glory — “Panem et circenses,” food and entertainment, for a population that was fifty percent unemployed and largely slave. Their culture was stolen from Greece. Their architecture and sculpture were Greek. Indeed, their education was largely Athenian, for after the conquest of Greece their youth was still sent to Athens for its culture. That’s why Julius Caesar quit being just a home-town boy and Marc Anthony met his downfall with Cleopatra; that may be a better way of meeting it than by yourself.

Constantine recognized this and tried to unite Roman militarism with Greek and Oriental culture when he established Constantinople as the Roman capitol in 340 A.D. The attempt was to unite Roman Christianity with Asiatic, but this failed. But directly came the barbarian hordes to a defenseless Rome and swept away the thin veneer of Roman culture and broke the powerful web of trade, law and government that had bound together the Mediterranean world in unity. Civilization in Europe was at its lowest ebb and Rome persisted barely in name. But Eastern civilization persisted. Dramatic samples were the Arabs seen in the Crusades and particularly Marco Polo’s experiences much further East and the culture of North Africa and Spain. But what we value most was the preservation of the Bible and the Greek classics. In this darkest period, there was a force at work however — trade. This drew Moslem, Jew and Gentile together. Starting in the 13th century was an extraordinary period in Italy,

made possible by the remarkable coincidence of genius and circumstance. By 1400 the basis of the Italian Renaissance had been laid, and for financial support there was burgeoning trade and industry and growing cities. The Renaissance in Europe is deeply indebted to the commerce of Naples, of Pisa, and particularly of Venice, because a Renaissance is not possible without money. Ask the dates of the building of St. Peters, St. Marks, Florence, Michael Angelo, Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci — they are all the same and are dependent directly or otherwise on Oriental contacts.

These contacts depended on passage of ships through the Dardanelles or across the strait that separates Europe and Asia, and this was under European control. It was this passage, barely two miles wide, where Leander would swim to meet his sweetheart, Hero. Lord Byron did not believe this story and tried it; it took him over two hours.

Across this, Darius built a bridge of boats to go down to Marathon to his defeat. It was here that the Greeks called on Pan for help. When the Persians were completely routed, the word "Panic" came into being.

This spot was indispensable to South European commerce and culture. But Mohammed the Second, inspired partly by religious faith and partly by patriotism, captured Constantinople in 1453. A disaster faced a culture because all trade and culture was paralyzed.

At this moment Ferdinand and Isabella had pretty well united Spain and were in an expansive mood. Christopher Columbus persuaded them to finance an expedition across the Atlantic to the Indies. He set sail with the Niña, the Pinta and the 'Mario Lanza,' as a small boy once told me. It was the belief of Columbus and his contemporaries that he had reached the islands described by Marco Polo, forming the southern extremity of the continent of Asia. Hence he spoke of "the Indies" and the Kingdom of "Los Indios" continued to be the official name given their American possessions by the Spaniards for many years.

But this feat produced a diplomatic controversy with Portugal. In 1454, Pope Nicholas V had given the Portugese exclusive right to explorations and conquest of the road to India. But this contemplated the use of the route by the coast of Africa south and east. By 1458 the Portugese, Bartholomew Díaz, had rounded the Cape of Good Hope in line with this understanding. Columbus returned and his supposed demonstration that the Indies could be reached by sailing west precipitated a dispute as to spheres of influence. The Catholic sovereigns appealed to the Pope and a boundary line was finally established starting with the mouth of the River Amazon. The Span-

iards demanded that all other people be excluded beyond this line.

When Columbus discovered America, it was with the understanding with Spain of the firm union of Church and State. Hence, wherever a military expedition went the Church was in the front rank, and the basis of Spanish settlements was the Mission.

This curious society of native peasant, priest and warrior, was held together by the Church and feudal law, and the Church was used as an instrument of government.

The first aim of the Spaniards was trade with the Indies, but later their main objective was gold, and the gold of this world was to dominate the western world for more than a century. As the surface gold was exhausted the Spaniards were driven farther afield. Among the first on this field was Cortés in 1519. Striking shortly thereafter was Pizarro in Peru southwestward. What the Spanish had then overrun, from Mexico to Chile, is still called Spanish America. In fact, a certain part is called "Argentine" because that was the assembling point for the silver for the prize cargoes.

Meanwhile, Portugese settlement was established in Brazil, much more colonial than the Spanish. The claim of the Peninsular Powers to divide America based on an award given in entire ignorance of the facts, would in no case be respected. As England was in general alliance with Spain during the early part of the 16th Century, England turned its attention to the discovery of a route around northern Asia. But France, encouraged by the voyages of Jacques Cartier in 1534 and 1542, laid claim to the northern half of North America. After the accession of Queen Elizabeth I there came the Sea Rovers, the great English privateers, but it was not until late in the 16th Century that a permanent settlement was attempted, first under Walter Raleigh, and then under the Mayflower Pilgrims in 1620.

So, Spain, Portugal, France and England came to be great powers as a result of their respective ambitions in America. France was gradually eliminated as a major factor in the Western World, but English endeavor largely shaped the destinies of North America, although Spanish influence pervaded Mexico, Central America and much of North America. It was in Texas that the Spanish and English cultures came together in the 19th Century, and it is here now in the 20th Century that we are finally forging a lasting amalgam.

## *Latin-American Science and Its Influence on the United States of America and Texas*

CHAUNCEY D. LEAKE

PRESIDENT EDWARD RANDALL has clearly and succinctly given the broad historical background to the early common, and later divergent, cultures of English and Spanish peoples. These cultures finally met, clashed, and consolidated in Texas. The process of amalgamation is quietly proceeding, but almost without conscious realization. Broad social processes move slowly, as judged by individual time scales, but they move inexorably. Texas is the natural theater, with New Mexico, Arizona, and California, for the drama of amalgam.

It is now more than a century since the active contact began. From our distance, we can afford to admit that it was largely our aggressive arrogance which led to the first unfortunate clash. It was our lack of understanding that led, under Woodrow Wilson who had little sense of humor, to a second clash. Even now, there are many among us who do not realize that the Mexican Revolution is still in full swing. It is basically an effort by the people of Mexico to get rid of the humiliating reminders of subjugation to European domination. At least we never deliberately tried to force our culture upon Latin-America.

### *The Opening of Latin-America*

With the closing of the trade routes to the east during Medieval Europe, and with the expansion of Muslim influence, every effort was made by the vigorous Europeans to get contact again with the east. As President Randall indicated, this was a determining factor in the 15th century voyages of discovery. After the discovery of the "Indies," all Europe rejoiced at the prospect of getting drugs and spices from the newly-found areas. Indeed, one of the most popular early 16th century books was the *Dos Libros* of Nicolas Monardes (1493-1588), which was promptly translated into English under the title of "Joyful News from the New-Found World." The joyful news was largely information on the rich findings of drugs and spices from the New World which could be used with such advantage in Europe.

Unfortunately, the joyful news quickly went sour. Spain pulled down an "iron curtain." It was a serious blow, and it could be justified only on the usual arguments for national isolation. To some extent, the Portuguese attempted to do likewise.

This abrupt closing of access to the New World by the Spanish authorities led to efforts to break through. This was the reason for the free-booting expedition of Francis Drake (1540-1596). He attacked Spanish ports around Latin-America, and captured tremendous booty. Indeed, it was Francis Drake who first laid claim to any portion of the New World for England, when he put up a plate of brass at Drake's Bay near San Francisco, in June 1579, proclaiming the land as *Nova Albion*, in the name of Queen Elizabeth. The verity of Drake's account is attested by the brass plate itself, which has been found, authenticated, and is now on display in the Bancroft Library of the University of California in Berkeley.

Walter Raleigh also attempted to penetrate the isolation of the New World. He explored portions of the mouth of the Orinoco River in South America, and described many of the amazing plants which he found there. Raleigh (1552-1618) brought tobacco to Europe.

Monardes had given a considerable account of some of the extraordinary new drugs to be found in the New World. These included curare, an arrow poison which, however, could be eaten with impunity. The digestive juices would destroy the poison, but if the poison were injected directly into the body, it would paralyze the muscles. He also described ipecac, which was reputed to relieve dysentery. Again he described guaicum, and that famous trio, sassafrass, sarsaparilla, and smilax, which is still available in our drug stores, as S. S. S., "Nature's Own Remedy."

These interesting plant remedies had been introduced into Europe for the treatment of syphilis. This extraordinary disease, newly recognized around 1493 in Italy, was thought to have been brought by the sailors of Columbus. It was recognized as venereal, and it also was characterized by large pox. On the theory that wherever there is a new disease, there will be the natural remedies for it, various plants from the New World were tried against syphilis, and S. S. S. was the most favored, probably because it certainly did no harm.

Syphilis is largely a self-limiting disease and probably had originated in the old world centuries before, and had gradually lost virulence. Certainly it is significant that Rhazes (850-923), the famed Muslim physician, had already differentiated the "Small Pox" from the "Large Pox." Furthermore, the Muslim physicians shortly afterwards had developed mercurial ointment, which still remains a highly effective agent against syphilis.

We now recognize that syphilis is caused by a spiral-like micro-organism, which is related to that causing a West Indian disease, yaws. It may well have been that the sailors of Columbus brought yaws to Europe, and that this helped to increase the virulence of the ancient spirochete. The name of the disease was taken from the



hero of that extraordinary poem, *Syphilis Sive Morbus Gallicus*, which was published in Verona in 1153 by the distinguished physician and pioneer epidemiologist, Girolamo Fracastoro (1478-1553).

Among other remarkable remedies described by Monardes from the New World was Peruvian, or Jesuit's Bark. This was quickly found to be amazingly useful in treating fevers. Indeed, its successful use had much to do with the overthrow of ancient medical dogma.

Another important description of the natural history of the New World was given by Fernandez de Oviedo y Valdés (1478-1557). His book which was published in Toledo in 1525 was the first to describe those annoying little insect pests, chiggers, which infest Latin-America, and are still annoying in Texas. This book also gave a great deal of information about medicinal plants in the New World.

Actually, the opening of Latin-America did not occur until the mid-18th century. At that time, there was considerable debate about the implication of Newtonian ideas that the earth is flattened at the poles. Some French scientists denied this. The French Academy determined to settle the matter, and sent an expedition under Maupertius to Lapland, to measure an arc of the meridian as close to the poles as possible. It then became necessary to send another expedition to measure an arc of the meridian as close to the equator as possible.

There was no way to get into savage Africa or the Far East, so France approached Spain on the proposition of a scientific expedition to Quito, which was known to be on the equator. Spain debated the matter but could see no harm in admitting a bunch of scientists, who probably had no sense of trade or of economic values. Accordingly, permission was given.

The expedition was led by Charles-Marie La Condamine (1701-1774). It came through Panama, and set up its work in Quito. The small stone pyramids which were used for triangulation can still be seen. They were depicted on early Equadorian postage-stamps. When the work of the expedition was completed, most of the members returned via Panama. La Condamine and the mathematician of the group, who had married a Quito lady, determined to go over the mountains and come down the Amazon. This was a tough and dangerous journey.

The reports of La Condamine stimulated much interest in Latin-America, and many other attempts were made to investigate the area. None were successful, until Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859) made the venture. He had ample funds, and was a brilliant scientist and humanist. He explored the mouths of the Orinoco and Amazon, and further showed that tributaries of the two waters (almost) came together in the highlands of northeastern

South America. He went to Quito, climbing the great volcano, Chimbarazo, and made significant observations on the relation of altitude to barometric pressure. He also described the Peruvian current and its influence on the extensive marine life along the coast of Peru. He also recognized the rich guano deposits and their possible use as fertilizer.

One of the most important effects of von Humboldt's explorations was probably his discussions with Thomas Jefferson when he came through the eastern United States. He spent many days with Jefferson and strongly impressed on Jefferson the importance of the independence movement in Latin-America developing under Simón Bolívar (1783-1830) and his amazing and marvelous mistress, Manuela. Von Humboldt stimulated Jefferson to understand the growing significance of Latin-America, and apparently won the sympathy of the United States for the revolutionary efforts of Bolívar.

### *Scientific Aspects of Latin-America*

We are well acquainted with the artistic and humanistic influences of Latin-America upon our own culture. In graphic art, the work of the great fresco painter, Diego Rivera (1886-1957), is well respected in the United States, and splendid examples of his work exist in California. His contemporaries, Orozco and Siquiaros, are becoming equally influential in stimulating mural decoration. The graphic artists of Chile and Peru, and of other parts of Latin-America, have been well recognized by the extensive exhibits arranged by the International Business Machines Corporation. In music, Heiter Villalobos (1887-1959), who was Director of Musical Education for Brazil, took part in scientific explorations in the Amazon valley to study folk music as early as 1915, and has composed many works in special Brazilian styles.

We are now learning to appreciate the effectiveness of Latin-American endeavor in ethnology and in archeology. Thanks to Texan Lewis Hanke, much is known of the remarkable work of Bartolomé de las Casas (1474-1566), the famed apostle of the Indians, who had been on the third voyage of Columbus. Our Southwest owes much to Father Kino, and the Jesuits who established such beautiful missions as San Xavier del Bac at Tucson. Similarly, there is much romantic interest in the extensive missionary effort of Father Junipero Serra and his Franciscans in the well designed California missions. In archeology and in the engineering associated with archeology, vast ruins have been excavated under the auspices of Latin-American countries, particularly in Mexico and in Peru.

It is not often recognized that there was much European medical interest in Latin-America. Information on native plants of possible

medical value was early sought. Of particular interest is the Badianus manuscript, now in the Vatican. This was written by a Spaniard in Latin from information supplied by a Mexican native. It is interestingly illustrated and indicates the extensive medicinal lore accumulated by the natives of the Mexican area in regard to local plant products. It is possible that the hallucinating mushrooms were known, as well as the nervous effect of peyote. Yams, which are now so important in the development of steroid drugs, were described, as well as other species of *Dioscorea*.

Although Francisco Pizarro (1478-1541) was a courageous and brilliant fighter, there is ample evidence to indicate that he was cruel, treacherous, and heartless in his conquest of the Incas. On the other hand, Hernando Cortés (1485-1547) was more humane. Although he had conquered Mexico in 1519, by 1523 he was already actively rebuilding.

Among other amazing structures was a huge square building, the Hospital de Jesús, built in 1523, and still functioning as one of the finest hospitals in the world. This building is still supported by an endowment left by Cortés and is maintained by rental from shops around the streets on the first floor. It is one of the major achievements of Mexican medicine to have maintained it so well over so long a time.

The oldest universities in the New World are the Royal University of Mexico and the University of San Marcos de Lima, both established in 1552. These centers of classical learning still emphasize the humanities, but are extensively engaged in developing the sciences as well. The new physical endowment of the University of Mexico is magnificent, with its superb architectural design, its outstanding library, and its excellent laboratories.

During the 17th century, several reports appeared on the natural history of Latin-America. William Dampier (1652-1715), the famed English hydrographer, described his journey around the world, and gave special attention to some of the aspects of Latin-America. He described particularly the extensive marine life in the Pacific area. It was he who rescued Alexander Selkirk off the coast of Latin-America, thus giving rise to the story of Robinson Crusoe.

During the 18th century, Antonio de Ulloa (1716-1795) described the remarkable character of the flora in the area of Cartagena. He also gave a considerable account of the insects and reptiles of the area. It was during the 19th century that Latin-America really excited scientific attention. The natural history of the coast areas of Latin-America and of the Galapagos Islands were exhaustively studied by the great but neurotic naturalist, Charles Robert Darwin (1809-1882). Indeed, it was his investigations in Latin-America and the Galapagos

that gave him such a rich background for his concept of adaptation as a crucial factor in the survival of living material.

It is not as generally recognized that Darwin was a considerable anthropologist, as indicated by his careful studies of the natives of La Tierra del Fuego. Its interesting peoples have more recently been exhaustively studied by Alexander Lipschitz, the distinguished biochemist and pharmacologist of Santiago. Professor Lipschitz is not only an outstanding anthropologist, but has also contributed significantly to our knowledge of sex hormones and of other important types of pharmacological agents.

It is not usually realized that Alfred Russel Wallace (1823-1913), who independently reached the same conclusions as Darwin regarding naturally operative factors of adaptation in survival of living things, had also studied extensively in Latin-America. The two men presented preliminary reports on their conclusions in 1858, and eternally to their credit they cooperated fully in the subsequent presentation of their work before the Linnean Society.

Few of us know that Herman Melville (1819-1891), the great romantic writer, was a considerable naturalist. He traveled extensively and wrote brilliantly, as in *Moby Dick*, as a result of his experiences. Among his writings is *The Enchanted Isles*, in which he describes the remarkable volcanic remnants of the Galapagos and the extraordinary character of the marine life around them, as well as their striking flora and fauna.

It is well to appreciate that the Galapagos are still the objects of intensive study. The California Academy of Sciences has supported many expeditions to the region, and its *Proceedings* are filed with extensive detailed reports on these extraordinary areas.

A great entomologist was Henry Walter Bates (1825-1892), who spent many years studying the natural history of the Amazon. It was he who described so thoroughly the extraordinary social character of ant colonies, including the foraging ants, the leaf-carrying ants, and the way by which they maintain their colonies.

One of the greatest figures in ornithology is Frank Michler Chapman (1864-1945), who so well described the distribution of bird life in Columbia and in Equador. Another famed ornithologist is Charles William Beebe, who again wrote so extensively on the Galapagos as well as explored the depths of the ocean. His books on the jungle are widely known.

Again, one of the most interesting recent ornithologists is Konrad Guenther from Germany, whose writings include much on the bird world, the tropical world, and his explorations in Brazil. Outstanding in his book, *A Naturalist in Brazil*, is his detailed description of bird songs. One of the important members of the new school of naturalists

is Ivan D. Sanderson, who has made such an interesting description of squirrel monkeys and other exotic animals of Latin-America. His books on *Animal Treasure* and *Caribbean Treasure* are amazing for the detail of their accurate observation of animal life.

Much of what I have been describing is beautifully discussed by that great writer, Victor Wolfgang von Hagen, in the selected readings entitled *The Green World of the Naturalists*. This is a fine book, and full of extraordinary information presented in the spirited language of the original authors.

A more recent brilliant description of current naturalistic exploration in Latin America is given by Margaret B. Kreig in her delightful book *Green Medicine: The Search for Plants that Heal*. This well describes the exciting studies currently being made by Richard Schultes and Bruce Halstead. Mrs. Kreig gives a good description of the history of quinine and goes on to discuss in detail the story of curare, which is so important now in helping to carry through successful anesthesia. She describes carefully the keen work of Carl Djerassi from Stanford University, who first recognized that the important chemical compounds, the steroids, could be obtained from wild yams. This has resulted in the extensive development of all types of steroid drugs, such as vitamin D, the sex hormones, the corticosteroids for the relief of arthritis, and the progesterones, which are becoming so significant in the control of fertility. It may well be that some of the chemical knowledge developing from the steroid compounds may be used to solve the most pressing current problem of worldwide significance, which is simply the fact that we have too many people everywhere. The steroids are amazingly significant in connection with many aspects of current drug development.

The extraordinary success of cinchona in relieving fever led to extensive cuttings of the Peruvian forests and thus to their depletion and to the resulting great increase in the price of "The Bark." The active agent in "The Bark" was first described by Bernardino Gomes (1769-1823), who got a white crystalline substance from cinchona bark by using the principles designed by F. W. Sertuerner (1783-1841). Sertuerner had obtained the first pure alkaloid, morphine, from a crude drug source, opium, in 1806. Gomes' study was reported in Lisbon in 1810. It was later confirmed by the famed French chemist, Pierre Pelletier (1788-1842), and the brilliant founder of experimental pharmacology, Francois Magendie (1783-1855).

Pelletier and Magendie also isolated other important alkaloids from Latin-America sources, including emetine from ipecac, still the most successful agent against visceral amebiasis. Further, they isolated strychnine from the beans of *nux vomica* and showed its important effects in stimulating the nervous system.



These chemical developments in the early part of the 19th Century had much to do with the significant advance in modern medicine. Quinine was the most important of these pure chemical compounds from natural sources. The observation that quinine is particularly useful in treating malaria led to its extensive use. Its price increased enormously, and it became necessary to try to find substitutes.

Quinine remains indispensable because it destroys the parasite causing malaria, and thus all the symptoms associated with the disease. Indeed, although many substitutes for quinine have been found, recent events in Vietnam indicate that quinine still remains the most effective drug against some of the resistant forms of malaria. Darwinian principles of adaptation operate even among germs.

As an incident in the search for substitutes for quinine, studies were made on willow bark and leaves and on wintergreen. Both were found to contain salicylic acid, named for *salix*, the Latin name for willow. Salicylic acid is too toxic for ordinary use, but again by acetylation, its toxicity is greatly reduced. The resulting compound, acetylsalicylic acid, or aspirin, is the most widely used drug all over the world, with the exception of alcohol.

The extensive destruction of the cinchona forests of Peru led Sir Clements Markham to try to obtain some of the seeds so that he could set up cinchona plantations under British auspices in India. The British did not support his efforts. Accordingly, he persuaded the Dutch to undertake the effort in Java. It was enormously successful and Java was the main source of supply for quinine until the Japanese seized the plantations during World War II. This caused an intensive search for quinine substitutes and many were obtained. The cinchona trees also are the chief source for quinidine, so important in heart irregularities. Since we can't yet easily synthesize quinine or quinidine, we are at the mercy of the Indonesians, who are jealously guarding their cinchona forests.

Another important drug obtained from Latin-America is cocaine, isolated from cocoa leaves, which had been used by the Incas for centuries to relieve fatigue. It was the first local anesthetic.

Early studies on the alkaloid isolated from cocoa leaves, cocaine, were made by Thomas Moreno y Maiz of Peru, and reported in Paris in 1868. It is important to realize that during the 19th Century, most of the growing scientific activity in the Latin-American countries was based on Paris. The paralyzing effect of curare, which had been used for hunting with poisoned arrows by the Amazonian natives, was exhaustively studied by the famed physiologist, Claude Bernard (1813-1878) in Paris, and it was shown that the drug blocks the neuromuscular junction. This was the first clear explanation of the mechanism of action of any drug.

### *Current Latin-American Scientific Contributions*

One of the most important scientific contributions from Latin-America was the development by Vital Brazil (1865-1950) of antisera against snake bites. This was promoted in Sao Paulo and resulted there in the establishment of the great Instituto Butantan. This was the original institution in the world for the production of antisera against poisonous snake bites. Snake venoms had been studied extensively, but no successful antisera had been developed until the work of Brazil.

Another outstanding Brazilian scientist was Carlos Chagas (1879-1934), who did so much to bring fame to the great Oswaldo Cruz Institute in Rio de Janeiro. It was Chagas who discovered the trypanosome responsible for the American form of sleeping sickness, commonly called "Chagas disease." This is a difficult disease to handle, and is responsible for a great deal of morbidity and mortality in Latin-America. So far, it has not been possible to obtain a satisfactory chemotherapeutic agent to use against it. Extensive studies, chiefly by Ardzoony Packchanan of the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston, have shown that the trypanosome of "Chagas disease" is gradually spreading along with the ticks which carry it and which may serve as a reservoir for the micro-organism. These ticks have been noted to be working northward through Central America, Mexico, and into Texas. Indeed, Dr. Packchanan has evidence of the possibility of human "Chagas disease" in Texas. His studies on its control deserve full support.

Outstanding has been the contribution of Carlos Monge of Lima to our understanding of "mountain sickness" and of the effects of chronic oxygen want. These studies have contributed greatly to our success in high altitude flying.

Particularly significant have been the physiological studies of Bernardo Houssay of Buenos Aires and his associates on sugar metabolism and on the hormones of the anterior pituitary. For this work, Professor Houssay received the Nobel Prize in 1947. Marked has been scientific advance in Mexico City. Interestingly, most of the great Latin-America scientific contributions have been in biology and medicine. The Latin-Americans have not contributed much in the physical sciences. On the other hand, they are outstanding in archeology, ethnology, and anthropology.

In Mexico City is located the remarkable Cardiology Institute, developed under the direction of Professor Chavez. This was the first institution of its kind in the world, and from it have come many important reports on cardiovascular disease and its control. It is with this Institute that Doctor George Herrmann, Professor of Medicine

at the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston, has cooperated so extensively.

Texas is fortunate in having the great Latin-American Institute at the University in Austin. This will be certain to provide background for ever-increasing cooperation between the Americas, not only in humanistic endeavor but in scientific studies as well.

It was in Texas that one of the first real advances was made in the international control of disease. This came from the work of Theobald Smith (1858-1934) in recognizing the importance of animal reservoirs of disease, particularly in connection with his studies on hog cholera in northern Mexico and Texas. The brilliant medical men associated with the School of Aviation Medicine in San Antonio, as well as those in Brooke General Hospital, have shown the importance of many other reservoirs of disease involving insects and birds, as well as animals. These studies are advancing increasingly on an international level.

One of the most beloved of scientists in Texas, associated with colleagues throughout Latin-America, was Charles Pomerat (1905-1964), who developed a world-famed tissue culture laboratory at the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston. Doctor Pomerat had many students from Latin-America, and had frequently visited the Latin-American centers for biomedical study. He was particularly welcomed in Mexico City, where he worked closely with Doctor Isaac Costero at the Cardiology Institute. Charles Pomerat was highly regarded throughout Latin-America for his many cultural interests. One of the world's top cytologists is Wiktor Nowinski, who was brought to Texas by Charles Pomerat from Buenos Aires. Doctor Nowinski's great monograph on *The Cell*, written with Eduardo de Robertis of Montevideo, has gone through several editions and translations. His study of malignant growth is basic in current understanding of cancer. Doctor Nowinski is an admirable example of the transmission of scientific knowledge from Europe to Latin-America and through Texas to the world again.

José de Valle, one of Latin-America's top pharmacologists, completed his training at Galveston. He is widely known for his studies on steroid hormones, and he is planning an international pharmacology congress in Sao Paulo for 1966.

The outstanding intellectual leader in the interpretation of current Latin-American philosophy is Patrick Romannel, formerly of the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, and now at Texas Western University in El Paso. Doctor Romannel has studied directly in Quito, Mexico City, and other Latin-American centers, and is thoroughly familiar with the significant philosophical studies from the whole Latin-American area.

Doctor J. J. Izquierdo, Professor of Physiology at the University of Mexico, is well known as a brilliant classical scholar. He has translated the works of William Harvey and of Claude Bernard into Spanish, and has contributed widely to the interchange of historical material relating to the history of science. Professor Enrique Beltran of Mexico City has been largely responsible for the development of wide interest in Mexico in experimental biology. One of the most important neurophysiologists in the world today is Arturo Rosenblueth, who worked with Professor Walter Cannon at Harvard. He then established his own neurophysiological laboratory in the Cardiology Institute at Mexico City. It was his friendship with Norbert Wiener which enlisted the latter's interest in the extremely complex activity of the mammalian brain, and which led to Wiener's concept of "cybernetics," thus adding so much to the background theory for modern computers.

### *In Prospect*

It is clear that effective intercommunication and cooperation between scientists throughout the Americas can result in great benefit to us all. The scientific contributions from Latin-America have been long and important. The more that they are recognized, the more benefit will come from them, and the greater stimulus there will be to their wide extension. Scientific interchange between the United States and Latin-America is already well channeled through Texas. It will be wise to extend this interchange.

Rapid changes are occurring throughout Latin-America. Populations are increasing enormously. Eager and vigorous young people are coming into the universities, and are insisting on the best kind of technical training. This should not result in any loss of respect for traditional classical values, but should show how wise it will be for us all to keep our sciences in balance with our humanistic endeavors so as to get the lasting satisfactions we all crave from our educational effort. Latin-America science and art can well continue to funnel through Texas for the stimulus and interest of the world.

### R E F E R E N C E S

- M. B. Kreig, *Green Medicine: The Search for Plants That Heal*, Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago, 1964, 462 pp.
- Wolfgang von Hagen, *South American Called Them: Explorations of the Great Naturalists*, A. A. Knopf, New York, 1945, 320 pp.
- Wolfgang von Hagen, *The Green World of the Naturalists: A Treasury of Five Centuries of Natural History in South America*. Greenberg, New York, 1948, 392 pp.

IN PRAISE OF FOLLY:  
*Oxbridge Against the Brainpickers*

FRANK E. VANDIVER

TWENTY-TWO YEARS AGO, on December 4, 1943, Walter Prescott Webb addressed this honorable Society. Fresh from a year in England as the Harmsworth Professor of American History at Queen's College, Oxford University, he titled his talk "The English Universities: Oxford and Cambridge." Aside from the fact that a most notable man made it, there were several notable things about his speech. With his usual clarity and warm wit, Webb undertook the task of describing the essence of Oxford and Cambridge — of Oxbridge, in modern parlance. That he succeeded where virtually everyone else failed is hardly surprising to those of us who knew him. His speech rings freshly today, and from it still comes perhaps the finest insight into an esoteric way of life. The things he perceived around him were much the same when I had the honor to hold the Harmsworth chair two years ago — a mere two decades works little erosion in the placid course of Oxford life. The colleges are still the university, each autonomous, each a little isle of independence carried sometimes to isolation, each a society sufficient to its purpose.

The purpose of Queen's College, of the more than thirty colleges comprising the amorphous University of Oxford, is at the heart of a philosophical question. What kind of thing are they all trying to do? And how are they going about doing whatever it is they are doing? These questions are deceptively easy to ask and absurdly difficult to answer. Webb warned of the difficulty. "English university life, as it exists at Oxford and Cambridge," he said, "is so different from American university life that any attempt at comparison or analogy is almost certain to result in failure." True enough; still, the objectives of all universities surely have some congruence — all of them purvey knowledge. Oxford and Cambridge colleges own to this objective. The way they set about purveying it, though, is not merely a matter of how — it is so central to the entire Oxbridge system that the way becomes a reason as well as a means.

Like most rank outsiders, I thought I grasped the essential qualities of Oxford education shortly after arriving on the scene. With a kind of Texan super-confidence I was instantly ready to assess the merits of the tutorials, the lectures, the closed societies which are the faculties, the whole matter of life in Queen's College. This kind of rushing

American certainty seems to be an annual malady which Oxford has come to tolerate along with rain, fog, tourists, and the Morris Car Works. And, as with most outsiders, my certitude faded with familiarity.

Let me say in my own defense that I proceeded with an abundance of interest and a paucity of comparative data. Webb was right: It is not possible to compare the American college system with Oxford and arrive at any rational view. The two are not analogous on any level. American colleges are laboring to provide more and more subjects to more and more people. Oxford and Cambridge strive to enlighten a modest few.

Other pitfalls ensnared me: I arrived in the ancient halls of Queen's convinced that Oxford rested safely at the pinnacle of educational excellence. It was the best there was to be found anywhere. You know what I mean: Americans — perhaps because our country is too young to have real perspective on life — Americans all revere things old, and especially English things old. Oxford has tended its intellectual vineyard for the better part of eight hundred years — on the basis of time alone it commands veneration. But starry-eyed admiration is a kind of myopia; it took some time for me to learn Oxford and feel a bit of it from the inside. When, at last, something like belonging happened, new revelations flooded in to dim some expectations, to chip a few idols, and to provide new and different respect.

One of the first things to change my Brother Jonathan sort of awe was British politics. Not long after we arrived in Oxford my family and I discovered that the Tory party was in deep trouble. Prime Minister MacMillan (also the Chancellor of Oxford University — a purely honorific life position) was in poor health; the party languished with him. A campaign to find a new Tory leader filled hours of "Telly" time. And it became clear in the course of the winter of 1963 that Harold Wilson's Labour Party had a good chance to win the next general election.

This proved most vital to Oxford, for it developed, most surprisingly to me, that the University, despite its ancient rights and privileges, rested squarely in the path of politics — was to be, for that matter, one of the issues of the campaign. This was so because of Oxford's philosophy of education, because of what it tried to do, and most particularly because of how it applied its philosophy. And as the political struggle enmeshed Oxford increasingly in the toils of the present, the problems of higher education in modern society were starkly unmasked.

Time is Oxford's strength; the times are its problem. The whole conception of the place is antique; its buildings, its monuments, its

people all seem ill fitted to modernity. History hovers over the city and its colleges in force – but history has picked up speed and is almost overrunning Oxford. Increasingly nowadays everything that Oxford and Cambridge represent is under attack in England. Certainly this is understandable. Oxford and Cambridge are misfits, admitted, even proud, misfits. They stand unhurried in a world of speed; they are in, but hardly of, an England in the midst of startling shifts and surges.

If things are working out so that England must wrench itself from the 19th century, from the ornate comfortableness of the last Victorians, if the age of automation and nuclear fission presses urgently against the inertia of the past, if all these sad realities must somehow transform England, Oxford and Cambridge surely will not be touched. Wars and outrages and tumults have afflicted Britain often in eight centuries and those bastions of the verities have survived. They are apparently immutable.

Immutability can be an irritation in a time of upheaval. And England is in the throes of such a time. As her world position ebbs with new circumstances, Britain finds her domestic position far from tranquil. Finely drawn class distinctions hallowed by the years are crumbling in a new technological age. Once the Industrial Revolution recast England's social structure; so again it happens. Now, though, the agent is not the spinning jenny but the atomic reactor; not the business entrepreneur but the peripatetic research scientist. These new managers of things have not before come from Oxford and Cambridge. But they come now, even from Oxford – a place without Cambridge's long scientific tradition. These days Oxford sports a strange, mutated appendage out past St. Catherine's College and across from Rhodes House: the laboratory complex. This complex boasts tall, glass encased monoliths, those functional buildings designed for efficiency and dedicated to research. There is a sad foreboding fact about these places, a fact which changes some of the old realities of Oxford: these buildings belong to no college but rather to the University. So the administrative unit "University," so dear to us in this country, seems about to burgeon in an alien atmosphere.

Could it be otherwise? That is the question currently before the convivial groups in the college Common Rooms – those leathered places of elegance where conversation is an art and deliberation a necessity. Is it possible, the question runs, that the system of learning dear to Oxford and Cambridge is no longer acceptable in the era of efficiency?

There is nothing particularly efficient about Oxford and Cam-



bridge. On a cost basis the kind of education they purvey is wasteful beyond imagination. The whole scheme is focused on the individual, on the scholar engaged in the essentially personal business of learning. Such teaching as is done in these two bastions of individualism is done man to man, via the tutorial system. In our present terms, this kind of technique involves a good many "contact hours." And, in fact, the average tutor in an Oxford college expects to be involved in discussions with students at least eighteen hours a week! Still, too few are reached by too many and the end result is waste. Public lectures are given by Readers (roughly comparable to our Associate Professors) and by Professors, but nobody has to attend — believe me, I know! Compulsory spoon-feeding through lectures and relentless testing is unknown. A man who wants to learn will learn. Point him in the right direction, and let him go. Help him hone his writing style, help him master lab techniques, help him formulate the right questions, but put the burden of acquiring data squarely where it belongs — on him.

Now this system works. It works as planned. It produces remarkably able scholars, people steeped in their subject, adept at research, skilled in presenting their findings. And the system has an almost unique record of achievement. Generations of gentlemen have gone forth from Oxford and Cambridge to govern England, to run the businesses of the realm, to teach in the Public Schools, to manage the colonies, to tend the far corners of a globe once largely England's pocket borough.

I used the term "gentlemen" advisedly — and it is not these days an "in" word. Gentlemen are partly what is wrong with England — anyone can see that they are. Those inimitable chaps wearing bowlers and pin stripes, carrying umbrellas and striding purposefully along Whitehall or Threadneedle Street — those folk of the old-school-tie clan comprise the ineffable "establishment." Clothes may not make a man a gentleman, but in England speech pretty nearly does — and the products of the Public School-Oxbridge culture all speak in cultivated modulants. They are different from most modern Englishmen.

That differentness is causing part of the trouble. As class structure erodes, class marks seem more glaring and unacceptable. Democratic urges have altered the Tory party as well as the Labour Party. More people want a part in prosperity and in the things that provide it — such as government. These people, the Great Public, are largely outside the pale of tradition, they are an upstart byproduct of the Scientific Revolution. And they have to be dealt with.

Oxford and Cambridge are not geared to deal with them — there are too many of them. Numbers are anathema to the system of indi-

vidual learning, so the system has customarily ignored numbers. Unfortunately this no longer seems possible. These new numbers are exerting a new force in English education — something of the force so long a part of American mass instruction.

Most of the new rising middle class folk have neither the money for Public School nor the connections for Oxford or Cambridge. So an accommodation has been found for their children. The so-called “Red Brick” or Provincial universities have proliferated. Many cities boast universities which resemble American colleges more than traditional English academies of privilege. Graduates of truly public schools find admission to these places. Red Bricks are a mass answer to a mass problem.

But they are an answer which breeds new problems. All require money, more and more of it each year as enrollments escalate. And hence they are colliding head-on with Oxbridge.

I have often used the coined word “Oxbridge.” It is in current usage in England, and carries a slight condescension. Its existence serves to show how really apart Oxford and Cambridge are from things — they are inextricably linked in alienation. Because they are not modern they are now suspect.

Suspicion breeds its own contempt, of course, and an oddly inverted contempt is levelled at these two defenders of the antediluvian. They are attacked in assorted papers as Tory strongholds, as cultivators of the out-of-date, as inbreeders, as monuments to the status-quo. Still, most people would like to see their children get into one of these decrepitudes!

Sufficient suspicion, though, has been generated to make Oxbridge a good political issue. And during the months preceding the last general election the question of whether England could afford Oxford and Cambridge waxed warmly indeed. Since the West had somehow been committed to an educational race with Russia and the East, more brains must be trained than an individual system could produce. Obviously, the system must change.

Oxbridge had its defenders, and the battle joined almost along Labour-Tory lines. But national education is really beyond parties and politics and with typical British method a Royal Commission was constituted to inquire into the whole problem of university training. Out of this inquiry came the famed “Robbins Report,” named after the chairman of the Commission, Lord Robbins. In many ways a truly shattering document, the Robbins Report accused virtually every Englishman of complicity in a crime of national ignorance. Well over two-thirds of the young people of Britain would never get to college. Not because they were incapable of the work,

but simply because there were not enough colleges to take them. Since this was demonstrably the fact, how could the nation justify Oxbridge and its devotion to scholars rather than students?

This all sounded familiar to me, and I'm sure to all Americans in Britain. It is a reasonably accurate mirror image of an American dilemma. Our problem long has been the ascendancy of academic democracy — the idea that everyone is entitled to an education because he exists. And I suspect we were ushered into this tragedy of numbers because we fashioned a modern technological structure ahead of any other nation. Our kind of society uses builders, makers, tinkerers in far greater numbers than designers, theorizers or philosophers. And a nation's educational system will pretty well resemble its social structure. We get what we deserve. So will England, if she pursues her present course. And who can really deny the virtue of just deserts? It is true that modern technocracy has produced better mousetraps and fatter mice, better dishwashers and finer dishes — so that there is a patina of success over everything. With which, who argues?

Embattled Oxbridge argues, and that is as it should be. Oxbridge is a state of mind, a state of mind more necessary perhaps just now than in several hundred years. It's necessary in the United States and especially here in Texas.

A year ago Professor Radoslav Tsanoff surveyed for you some of the intellectual resources of our state. His remarks were encouraging — but not entirely so. Despite the rich and growing arsenal of thought available in Texas — and in the United States — there are enemies gathering against thought and its results. I am not referring here to the hackneyed threats of such evils as McCarthyism and its ilk; I refer, rather, to the pressing threat of sheer numbers.

The old wheeze about safety in numbers is simply not true any longer — at least not in the realm of public education. Mass, size, bulk, whatever you call it — creates its own terms and values. Not until recent times, though, have we been forced to concern ourselves with the fearsome qualities of size. All through the early history of our nation and our state, educational bulk took care of itself — largely through the selectivity of money. Just so many could afford an education; and of those fortunates, just so many could absorb learning and earn a degree. Population explosions plus economic explosions — the two staggering phenomena of post-World War II America — changed the traditional picture of learning.

With the domestic revolution brought on by World War II, with the newfound concern for social democracy in addition to political democracy, America gradually became aware of educational de-

mocracy. Educational democracy is, of course, a contradiction in terms — education is not, by definition, democratic. But most Americans, dedicated as they rightly are to the proposition that all men are created equal, found no difficulty in erecting the theory that all minds are created equal. If everyone is entitled to a new car each year, entitled to a “chicken in every pot,” or to prosperity — whatever that means — then everyone is also entitled to an education. As this conviction grew into dogma, education entered the lists of status symbols — it became a necessary commodity in the endless pursuit of the Joneses.

Now all brains are simply not created equal. This is a sad truth of biology, but one so ugly as to be unacceptable in a pampered society. Nothing, these days, is impossible, is it? Brains can be developed along with Polaroid color film. Just give everyone a chance and everyone will emerge like L. Frank Baum’s scarecrow — stuffed with brains.

Add to this democratic right the sudden challenge of Sputnik, and you have a demand for mass education difficult to deny. This very challenge has led to the crisis of Oxbridge. It is causing the crisis of Austin — where fellow-member Harry Ransom is presently fighting the battle of exclusion. It is causing the crisis of Berkeley, where great masses of students have become so alienated from the University of California that good order has disappeared in a rather piteous quest for identity.

I hate the word “Identity,” and the whole syndrome it describes. If the popular press is to be believed, countless thousands of freshmen and sophomores strewn across American campuses are all engaged in a vague but tumultuous struggle to find themselves. This has always sounded silly to me. Everyone knows who he is, or is carted off to the nuthouse! Perhaps our universities are minimum security institutions — I’ve often thought so. But over the last few years I’ve come more and more to sympathize with student’s unrest. Their struggle for finding is in microcosm the struggle of us all in the present state of things.

Consider the kinds of things most often said by the long lines of student demonstrators: “Everything is too impersonal.” “Where is the concern for us as people?” “How can we relate to life?” “Where is the mess of the present leading? And why should we go?” These are not irrational, juvenile complaints. They are serious doubts of alienation, queries of a generation raised outside, problems articulated by men caught in the mass.

Us older folk ought to be asking the same questions. The reason

we aren't, I imagine, is that circumstances have slowly, unsuspectingly engulfed us, and we're so caught we cannot see that we are. But the questions are valid for us.

Challenges of mass and Russian scientific achievements have put the normal changes of the 20th century under forced draught — reaction time has shortened and speed is the essence. Speed, like mass, is a factor in the present human equation. We must all do more faster and better.

You know the loud cries raised often against the tinsel civilization we seem to have created — against the chrome-plated, air-conditioned nightmare. Mass is part of this nightmare. Mass, speed, results — these are the key words of our time.

Just as we have a special glossary, so have we now a special set of values to fit us into the present. These values are a kind of perversion of the pragmatic philosophy, but in practice they run like this: Everything that is, is good as long as it works. Things that are helpful in making our society work are energy and money. People generate both; ergo, people make plenty. And it requires no genius to write an important corollary: The more people, the more energy and money, hence the more of everything that works.

Now it is true that as speed has picked up and society — because of speed, energy and money — has grown more complex, one sub-theorem has become important to our times: Uneducated people can't make things work. This fact of life has contributed much to the pressure for mass education. I am not ruling out by any means the age-old American — and Texan — idea that education is the catalyst of democracy — that idea still holds and only adds to the urgency of the problem.

America has reached the present as the most industrialized society in history. Mass production and interchangeability are the great artifacts of our success. They have invaded all facets of our lives — especially education. Minds, like other kinds of parts, are susceptible to mass production methods. Unfortunately there is some truth to this boast — certain mass production techniques have worked in American schools and our country can now claim a phenomenally high literacy rate.

High schools and colleges have picked up the lead and mass educational schemes are rife across the country. We are now treated to depersonalized classes.

What is the result of this horrid picture? American colleges, universities, other centers of alleged culture, are mass producing a denatured product — technical man. These "educated" are of a stripe —

highly competent in the modern sense, machine-adapted, deft at manipulation, and fully devoted to the new deity of our age: The Great God Computer. Values of this new type man are similar — everything depends on consensus. Happiness is teamwork.

Regrettably this belief in teamwork spills over into the usually fusty and aloof realm of research. Research is that branch of human endeavor which has for its aim the broadening of knowledge, the discovery of new ideas, the increase of cultural experience. Once almost entirely the lair of the lonely scholar, the resort of the starving artist, research is now affluent and cooperative. If you want a large government grant, dream up a teamwork project in science, or social science, label it “interdisciplinary,” make portentous statements about programming it modelwise into a prototype — and stand back. The money rolls in! Research is no longer popular in the lonely lab or the remote garret — the new scene is filled with sharp, crafty types sitting around a conference table (replete with pads, pencils, and tape-recorders), engaging in the new nostrum of “picking each other’s brains.”

Admittedly, this Madison Avenue phantasm I’ve described is overdrawn — but not as overdrawn as I would like. The era of the brain-pickers is upon us.

The consensus age is unlikely in Texas and the United States, for consensus is a flat acceptance of mediocrity. Little of daring originality emerges from a committee! Group therapy is substituted for initiative, “think sessions” for thought. This is essentially un-Texan; certainly the founders of this Society would hardly recognize inquiry in the guise of agreement.

Changing times have, however, tended to make Oxbridge appear an anachronism. All the pressures of the present have created a hybrid educational beast — the multiversity. Multiversities abound in America and they have all the earmarks of being adaptations suited to circumstance. Our larger universities today — the University of Texas is a case in point — are compelled by popular demand to do much more than instruct and find new truths. Most of them have been lured into a limbo of government appendage — contract research and experimentation for various governmental agencies provide much of the annual budget. Individual research along lines dictated by individual curiosity is often stifled by urgent government needs. Only the usable things are now worth learning.

For all humanists this whole business is chilling. And it is chilling for us all. What happens to the random thought, to the vagrant beauty, the stray melody — what happens to some grace in the world?

Untrammelled pursuit of technical mediocrity may not foredoom the human race to extinction — but it will foredoom us all to cruel insensitivity. Perhaps extinction is preferable.

Most of Oxbridge's products would think so, would "opt" for annihilation rather than capture by the Philistines. And there is much to commend this view. Oxbridge and all it represents offer an alternative. That alternative is excellence, individual, personal excellence. Personal excellence in all fields of endeavor will preserve the dignity of intellect, the sanctity of self, in the onrush of numbers.

There are those who argue that Oxbridge is elitist, that the doctrine of individual excellence is undemocratic. Oxbridge would confess to certain undemocratic tinges but deny the elitist label. The kind of thing that goes on in Oxford and Cambridge, and in a few American colleges, is cultist perhaps, but only in the sense that preservation of culture is cultist.

Preservation of culture is increasingly vital to us all. We Texans are often accused of lacking culture, of being "super Americans" in the worst, most chrome-plated way. And if our state continues down the road to educating everybody, then we will deserve the epithets. Our Governor urges educational excellence; the chancellor of our state university urges selectivity; our people urge equality of opportunity. Now manifestly we cannot have generalized excellence unless we change our terms. Excellence must become adequacy.

We can cling to traditional excellence and we must if we desire anything like progress as we have known it. Our best chance to retain something of it is to sustain the aims of Oxbridge, to sustain the efforts of those who argue for selectivity in American college admission — those few who are undemocratic enough to admit that education is something only a certain percentage of the populace can use effectively. Reduction of mass will lessen other pressures. Standards of taste will have some small chance of asserting themselves if the crush of insensitivity is lighter. And that in turn will free some individuals from the serfdom of size. Poets, novelists, artists, composers, pure scientists — all with a questing heart — can more easily follow their lonesome paths. In isolation they may find their place in the world.

Lest I am accused of being too hard on higher education, let me hasten to say that I do not believe all universities are willing conspirators against freedom of thought. Far from it. Most of them stridently proclaim loyalty to the faith, urge the virtues of research and unfettered learning. And to the extent that harried administrators are given to see the light they are honest in pursuing it. But univer-



sities grow these days almost exponentially. And in the midst of expansion with all the horrors it brings, administrators may be excused if they misunderstand their situation. Even the most well intentioned college presidents must sometimes yield to expediency – the arguments for it are siren-like and legion.

We cannot put the burden of defense wholly upon our universities. All of us must resist depersonalization of learning. All of us must be especially devoted to defense of one man's right to be wrong, one man's right to doubt, one man's right to discover. To do less defaults an obligation of the past and wastes a privilege of the present.

## Administration in a "Modern" University

CAREY CRONEIS

MY TOPIC IS "Administration in a 'Modern' University." I said "in," not "of" a university. In short, I wish merely to describe — not to prescribe. I realize that there are at least 20 persons in this audience who know — or think they know — more about the subject than I do. They are probably right. But I have one great advantage — I have the floor. While I have it, my plan is to outline — possibly with some bias, but with what one may hope is the reasonable objectivity of one who has always enjoyed college and university problems — the generally unrealized complexities of educational administration.

Now it is a fact that the college administrator has never had a very high standing — at least on his own campus. For years, his image has been a tarnished one. Eric Ashby, the Master of Clair College, Cambridge, commented on this point a little over a year ago, saying, "When I left scientific work to become a university president after having been a professor for thirteen years, someone gave me this advice. 'Remember,' he said, 'that in the eyes of professors, all administrators are an evil. Say to yourself every morning, I am an evil. Am I a necessary one?'"

Nevertheless the candidates eagerly standing in line for vacated presidential positions are more numerous than ever. They may include a brash freshman, a distinguished professor, a disgruntled parent, the alumnus who contributes \$5 a year or less, the uninitiated Trustee who doesn't yet really know the score, and the deeply committed and highly involved Regent who does. At least all of these classes of individuals, and many more, have been heard to observe that they know how to do the president's job better than he does. But only those hard-bitten individuals who have served as the chief administrative officer of an educational institution are really aware of the fantastic ramifications and the perils of such a position. Of this particular fraternity it may be said — as it has been remarked of the boy who twisted the mule's tail — they are not as pretty as they once were, but they know much more.

To bring matters somewhat into focus, let us consider the perils of the president as they existed a quarter of a century ago. Then as now, the chief administrator had unlimited responsibility, quite limited authority, and relatively little pay. It was not possible then, nor is it now, to hire a man to run a business organization as large,

as complex, or with as many personnel and budgetary problems as the average university without paying him at least four times as much as the normal stipend of the administrative officer of an educational institution. Moreover the business executive still does command considerable administrative power. Again, owing to the extraordinary peculiarities of the institution which he manages, the university president cannot, like the average business executive, effectively delegate authority, or even hire and fire — however intelligently — with impunity.

Twenty-five years ago, the college or university president dealt with a decalogue of interrelated problems — that is, the secondary schools, the college curriculum, the composition of the student body, student activities, the faculty, the staff, the alumni, the Board of Trustees, finances, and the public. In general, the public schools gave inadequate preparation for college. Therefore, the curricula of “higher education” had to be watered down so that the average college student could be taught what he should have learned in the high school. The student body, except in the most prestigious schools, was accepted as it came. Few with warm bodies and adequate finances were turned away. Student activities were complex and, if the general deportment left something to be desired, flagrant flaunting of the rules brought only expected dismissal. The academic pace was relatively leisurely, and social activities flourished and were even administratively encouraged.

In 1940, a reasonably competent faculty could be assembled even by a jerk-water college, and, in fact, except in certain fields where demand was just beginning to be felt, the average college administrator could take his pick. The salaries were meager — distressingly so — and faculty members, young or old, tended to their knitting. The finances were difficult, commonly fantastically so. A modest gift was cause for a celebration, and a modest donor got not the brush-off but an illuminated scroll. The Ford Foundation, of course, had not been heard of.

The operating staff was small, dedicated, and poorly paid. It was not unionized. The alumni, and that particular and peculiar segment of the public known as the parents were, according to their several temperaments, arrogantly critical, or understandingly helpful; but, for the most part, confidence in their own academic expertise was then at an engagingly low level. The Board of Trustees, then as now, ran the gamut from individuals characterized by completely selfless dedication to the cause, to those who accept appointment to a board largely for prestige purposes. Governing boards, however, were somewhat more social and fraternizing in those days, and the aver-

age administrator was more likely to be a friend and confidant of the Board rather than its agent and servant. The public, in 1940, reluctantly accepted the university in its midst and supported it much in the manner of porcupines making love – cautiously. But support the institution the public did, particularly if its athletic teams were successfully dedicated to the winning of games rather than to the building of character.

The situation in those days was surely complex enough for any one man to handle. The plain fact is that, even then, few college or university administrators were able to go through the academic wars without grievous dents in their moral, intellectual and spiritual armament. But now, all of the administrative problems of the past have been compounded. The complications began to be notable after the enactment of the G.I. Bill at the time of World War II, and they have constantly grown in both numbers and kinds so that the curve of their increase has become almost vertical since the advent of Sputnik in 1957.

Merely for example, many of the secondary schools, after constant prodding by the universities, now prepare their students so well, at least in certain subjects, that the curricula of the colleges have to be beefed up in order to cope with the advanced standing of the students entering the institutions of so-called higher education. As a consequence, the curricula of the latter are being made and remade as never before. (Curriculum-tinkering has always been a favorite indoor sport of faculty members. Sometimes it seems that this pastime is an especial avocation of those not particularly competent in their own field.) At any rate, the administrator must now cope with committees on the curriculum for each of the divisions of the university. As if this were not enough, he now finds that the student body also has an active – and commonly an aggressive, if not arrogant – curriculum committee, and the alumni and the Board of Trustees may also get into this act. Complicating the issue still further, entire new subjects are being, and indeed must be, introduced into the curriculum as one result of the modern surge of science and technology. And national committees of the various disciplines get their oar into the local curricular waters. Nor are administrative problems made simpler in this and related areas by the existence of accrediting agencies.

The student body is no longer selected casually. Even institutions of so-so standing have entrance requirements which have become rather frighteningly high. The competition for the better students, particularly those who win National Merit Scholarships, is so great that most of the major institutions, including many state universities,

proselyte for them with the avidness that the football coach usually exhibits when he spots a high school halfback who is both speedy and rugged. In fact, one university sends out to all National Merit Scholarship Semifinalists a brochure stating "— — — State has merit, too." Thus, it is obvious that a large admissions staff must be maintained, even by those institutions which are deluged by applicants.

Now for the administrator, this entire situation poses many serious problems. A minor one, which causes more administrative trouble than the uninitiated would suppose, stems from the perverse fact that apparently the children of alumni are quite generally not as intelligent as their parents. Even more remarkable, evidently there is some wry, Parkinsonian law in effect which states that some children of trustees and major donors to an institution will seek admission to its ivied halls with a vigor directly proportional to the modesty of their intellectual attainments.

Student activities are now complex, or, better stated, "activistic." Students are inclined to demonstrate — for any good cause, or for any unworthy one, or, more tantalizing still to the administrator, for one so amorphous and ill-defined as to be completely unintelligible to the average adult mind.

The effectiveness of student demonstrations has been well shown through the so-called Berkeley riots. University of California political science faculty members, Sheldon Wolin and John Schaar, have stated, "It isn't often that a great university goes smash, yet that's just what happened to the Berkeley campus during the first week of last December. Campus authority vanished, academic routines were reduced to shambles, and the prophecy of Mario Savio was fulfilled — that is, 'the machine came to a grinding halt.'" Mario Savio himself was free to speak on the campus and expressed his views in newspapers, on TV, and in national as well as international magazines. I saw pictures of him and descriptions of his exploits in the newspapers of Singapore and Djakarta in December, 1964. According to Mario, however, "students are permitted to talk all they want so long as their speech has no consequence." But consequences there certainly were, and if for no one else, at least for the administration, because, as Wolin and Schaar point out, the university officials responded to the crisis in a fashion which "wavered between treating the student movement as a children's crusade, a Communist conspiracy, and a Civil Rights panty raid." Professors Wolin and Schaar also commented, "If not free speech, what then is the issue? In fact, preposterous as this may seem, the real issue is the seizure of power." I have witnessed this seizure of power in the Japanese universities by the so-called Zengakuren students, and at a number

or other institutions, including the University of Rangoon. In 1960, the militant Rangoon student groups made ten demands of the government authorities which, surprisingly, were granted. One was the "right" to hire and fire the deans — naturally from the student viewpoint a valid and even entrancing idea — and the "right" of students to receive all passing grades in their senior year regardless of how dismal their course performances may have been. Not surprisingly the University of Rangoon, for all practical higher educational purposes, has closed its doors.

One is reminded of the story — possibly, but not probably, apocryphal — of Henry Luce's conversation with noted labor organizer George Meany. "Mr. Meany," said Mr. Luce, "are there any limits to the demands of 'Labor'?" "None whatever, Mr. Luce," was the frank reply.

Martin Lipset and Paul Seabury have pointed out that "Universities are probably more vulnerable to civil disobedience tactics than any other institution in the country precisely because those in authority, whether administration or faculty, are 'liberal.'" This comment is probably, in general, a correct one, but "liberal" administrators get precious little credit for their liberality. In fact, their liberal actions, decrees, and pronouncements often come back to haunt them. Students are likely to squat, with very little dignity but with a great deal of impunity, in such an administrator's office.

The editor of the college paper — who is, one way or another, a likely partisan in any student demonstration — by history and tradition is a dedicated public and private enemy of the "administration," which, in general, must suffer the indignities the editor heaps upon it, without rebuttal or effective recourse. In fact, although the college paper obviously could not exist without the university — which, incidentally, gives it both space and financial support — the editor very commonly mirrors his own views, or those of a militant minority in the student body — certainly rarely those of the administration! The situation simply cannot be explained logically to the average trustee or to the business man whose support the administrator seeks to enlist. Secretly, even the most "liberal" administrator can't quite understand it either.

The college editor is also free to print — and he commonly does give space to — the diatribes of anti-administration provocateurs, such as Paul Goodman. Goodman maintains that although students are the natural leaders of protests, faculty backing for their efforts is imperative. He urges such backing because, he says, "The students are transient. They do not definitely know what they want. They do not know the score behind the scenes and thus they can be

abashed by administrative double-talk." Goodman states further that the source of many of our present educational difficulties lies in administrative irresponsibility. Perhaps so — yes, quite possibly so. Strangely enough, however, student and faculty irresponsibility have a much higher tolerance level. Goodman goes on to say, "When administration becomes the dominant force in the community, however, it is a sign that extramural powers are in control — state, church, or economy — and the administration is their agent. Notoriously, image-burnishing and fund-raising disregard or even prevent teaching and learning."

I suppose that, philosophically speaking, one can torture a modicum of truth out of any statement, however absurd or overdrawn. But *administration* the dominant force? Indeed! Volumes could be written on the rapidly increasing erosion of the powers of the educational administrator. Now at this point I would normally conclude my remarks. But last night we were shown — by rabbinical revelation and example — that an after dinner speech which is effective should last 56 minutes. Besides, I have something more to say.

If I seem to dwell overly long on student activities or student unrest, it is only because the student activist movements of today take up a disproportionately large amount of the time of the average administrator. As a case in point, a great many male and female students now appear to be on an emotional binge with reference to so-called restrictions on their "freedom" with regard to dormitory conduct and hours. Stated in the simplest terms, which I assure you are not exaggerated, what the young men and women would really like to have from the authorities is — to put it politely in their terms, "Open house," that is, permission to visit back and forth in their rooms — on campus as well as off — at any hour of the day or night, without restraint or supervision. This particular national trend has received some little notice in the press; it receives a great deal of attention from every administration. In speaking to a group of young men and women — how young, how serious, how delightfully engaging, how dedicated to their petition for at least more open Open House — I once asked, "If these requests *are* granted, will there be further demands?" Somewhat taken aback, but with the praiseworthy candor of youth, the answer came, "Well, yes, of course." Shades of the Luce-Meany colloquium!

I cannot conclude this section of my remarks without relating a true story concerning the kind of student activity which is beyond anticipation, but whose consequences may cause very serious administrative problems. The event in question transpired sufficiently long ago to permit the telling tonight. A university Architectural



Society for many years had put on a rather elaborate annual Ball. This particular year the theme was "Evil." To make a long story short, the costume prize went to a couple dressed in religious garb. The young man obviously simulated a priest, the young woman a nun, but a nun who was aggressively pregnant. Admittedly, the *theme* of the Ball was carried out in these costumes, but mostly poor taste was in evidence. The matter might not have reached the public eye had it not been for another unforeseen circumstance. The committee of judges — including the wife of a faculty member and an Episcopalian priest — awarded first prize to the errantly sacrilegious pair. Understandably, the Catholic hierarchy, including a local Bishop, took umbrage not only with the University but with the Episcopalian judge whose attachment to the University was tenuous, but sufficient to involve its administration — and a faculty wife is an involving party, too, isn't she? The administration was thus caught in a cross-fire of a particularly harassing type. There seemed to be no way to make the punishment fit the crime, but the "Ball" was banned for one year. But wait. The function normally raised a large sum of money so that a traveling fellowship could be awarded to an outstanding young architect. Needless to say, the architects of the community set great store by this award, and the administration was, in the end, forced to dig up other funds so that the next year's fellowship award winner could secure the financial wherewith to make his European pilgrimage.

If the students cause an increasing amount of trouble for the administration, so does the faculty. Unlike a quarter-century ago, faculty members do not now stand in line for a job. On the contrary — like our football friends, Messrs. Anderson and Nobis — they have visions of signing for a bonus. It is the administrator who now stands in line beseeching each candidate to smile on him, knowing full well that the candidate has a dozen "offers." During the last quarter-century salaries of many faculty members have not merely doubled but increased five-fold. If this did not pose enough administrative difficulty, the better faculty member in an advantageous, competitive discipline is practically able to dictate the terms of his employment.

The faculty member is today more than ever dedicated to his particular discipline and — although there are still many splendid exceptions — he is commonly a mercenary at the university rather than a dedicated part of the institutional organization. To make matters even more complicated, the American Association of University Professors has become a more militant and, indeed, a more effective organization year after year. That the A.A.U.P. has done great good

certainly cannot be denied, but the more its tenure and appointment regulations have become the national norm, the less administrative authority the average administrator actually possesses. Moreover, the faculty has attempted successfully to seize power from the administration. That the faculty *is* the University has been long and cogently argued. In the "modern" University professors have *proved* their point. In most institutions faculty committees are all-powerful. They really hire, promote, withhold promotions, and fire; and, with impunity, they can, and with increasing frequency do, nullify many a good — or at least reasonably good — administrative directive.

A further complication in dealing with the faculty results from increasing government support, not merely to universities, generally, but to specific researchers who can and do build feudal kingdoms virtually impregnable to administrative assault. And if the feudal knight *is* effectively challenged administratively, he merely picks up his marbles — lucrative research contract, that is — and moves, say, from Texas to California. As has been observed, "The drain in brains flies mainly West in planes." The fact is, the natural conflict, between the administration and the students on the one hand and the faculty on the other, is something like a modern war or an argument with a woman — it can't be won — and it can't be ended.

The simple, non-faculty staff of the 1940's is now a complex organization which may number greatly in excess of the faculty itself. Highly paid technicians, directors of institutes, a wide range of non-faculty appointments including members of a Development Office, who may be counted in the scores, and a complex operational staff which is involved in all sorts of activities from athletics to the animal colonies in zoology, make not only for additional expenses of a ballooning type but for many a campus jealousy and conflict. The Business Officer progressively enlarges his feudal domain simply because he must, and government contracts grow not merely from year to year but almost from day to day. Thus, a special campus officer in charge of extramural or governmental activities has become a prominent and deservedly important figure on the university scene. Somehow he never seems an altogether charming person to the faculty member with contract problems — problems with which the President's Office inevitably becomes involved.

At many colleges the parents are now organized, and happily they contribute rather heavily to the financing of the institution. But these quasi-postgraduate Parent-Teacher Associations, valuable though they may be, provide just one more legitimate set of visitors to the President's already overcrowded office.

The university Alumni Association is something of a paradox for

it understandably insists on a high degree of independence, even though its budget is likely to be partially or wholly underwritten by the university itself. All manner of partially, or completely, unauthorized alumni programs have institutional sponsorship, and yet few important steps may be taken by the university administration without first consulting the alumni and obtaining the Association's general approval. Such approval can by no means be assumed, for the average alumnus wishes his alma mater to retain the pristine perfection it necessarily possessed when it was able to spawn him.

The alumni are naturally interested in the external as well as the internal affairs of the university. For the most part, they wish it to be conservative in a day of liberalism. Moreover, they would dearly love to have alma mater's athletic endeavors crowned with success. In this one particular, the modern alumnus is not very much different from his counterpart of a quarter of a century ago. Fortunately, he is much more likely to contribute to the institution of his choice than was his predecessor of 1940. Indeed, many a university has waxed strong largely through the efforts of its alumni body. Therefore, even though the Alumni Magazine may have an editorial policy as anti-administration — if more slyly so — than the college newspaper, the average college administrator makes a good face over such editorial effrontery, and devotes a disproportionately large amount of his time to the cultivation of good alumni relations.

In general, Boards of Trustees have not changed a great deal in the last quarter of a century. For the most part, they remain somewhat more conservative than their constituencies — that is to say, they are perhaps a bit more conservative than the alumni, and considerably more conservative than the student body or the faculty; and they commonly regard the chief administrative officer as being at least a little too far left of center in his attitudes. Never in history, however, have they had to devote so much time to the institution they serve, and never have they been as dedicated to the cause of education as they are at present. In short, Boards of Governors, Regents, or Trustees, are gradually becoming at home in the educational maze. It is a hopeful sign. But the education of the Boards is by no means complete, and every college administrator has to spend a great deal of his time explaining, even to his most sympathetic Board members, the seamy facts of academic life, which, to the successful business man, almost always appear to be not only unreasonable but also un-American, anarchistic, atheistic, and amoral.

The financing of a "modern" university is a Herculean project. In the last quarter-century many a university has grown from what was once a small, comfortable, country-club-like organization to a

vast business enterprise. Even at a small school such as Rice University, the expenses of the institution have increased about twenty-fold during the past 25 years. Not only are faculty salaries up in a spectacular fashion, but, in general, students – particularly graduate students – must now be paid to go to school. In fact, the stipend of an advanced graduate student is now about equal to the salary paid to the average full professor prior to World War II. The research and peripheral expenses have increased even more spectacularly. For example, an electron microscope which may cost say \$50,000 is the research tool used today by a scientist whose counterpart in 1940 was more than content to use a polarizing microscope which cost approximately \$1,000. In many another sector of scientific activity, the costs have increased from twenty- to fifty-fold. It is therefore necessary for the college or university administrator to see to it that the alumni drive is constantly going forward on well-oiled wheels, that the state legislature is “safe” for the next budget period, that the Washington funding agencies are alerted to his needs, and that a capital fund campaign is either in the making or is being actively pursued.

Finally, the general public is involved in higher education as never before. Indeed, the time will soon be with us when all individuals in this country are likely to be offered, more or less for free – and like it or not – the advantages of an education beyond the high school. At long last the American public really does believe in education; in fact, they now probably believe in it *too much*, for as Chancellor James Moudy, of Texas Christian University, observed recently in his inaugural address, the American citizen seems to think there is something *magical* about education. There obviously is not. Surely we cannot get along without increased advanced education, but the educational effort *per se* – however improved, expanded, or accelerated – will not make us a better people. In fact, if one is inclined to be just a little cynical, he comes to the conclusion that the higher the general educational level of a people, the more developed is their genius for evil as well as their capacity for good. This is another fact which worries every educational administrator who is worthy of the name. Moreover, although the administrator now and again does have success with one of the hundreds of projects for which he is responsible, he commonly is dismayed to find that his triumph in that particular venture has likely engendered another problem whether it be of space, of personnel or personalities, or of just plain money. It is true in the educational world – as Dean Inge once pointed out for things in general – that nothing fails like success. In the administrator’s constant attempt to turn failures into

successes, he is rarely understood, seldom pitied, and commonly regarded as something of a prevaricator. And that is why he is addicted to a new drug, which is something like a combination of "No Doz," "Compoz," and "Nembutal." The N.I.H. call it "Damital," and although it won't cure ulcers, it does make frustrations seem quite enjoyable.

It is entirely possible to discuss humor, or a humorous subject, in a serious fashion. I am not so certain that I have been able to follow the chairman's advice and discuss a serious matter in a humorous way. I have, however, attempted to outline, quite incompletely, only a few of the problems the average university administrator must face every day of the year. Perhaps I have exaggerated a little for effect — but overall, I think not. Indeed, in talking to this group I have been carrying coals to Newcastle, especially in asking for understanding and sympathy for the university administrator. Actually, administrative officers are a very hardy lot. They have to be. They are long-suffering, and particularly well-conditioned to wear engaging smiles on many occasions when they would very much prefer to commit mayhem. Thus, when unexpected and outrageous barbs of fortune wound them to the quick, the public is unaware that their armor has been pierced. They all attempt to emulate the *savoir-faire* of A. Lawrence Lowell, as typically displayed through the following true story: Nicholas "Miraculous" Butler, president for so many years of Columbia University, had not been long in office when he was in trouble with his faculty, and so he went up to Boston to seek the advice of President Lowell of Harvard.

Butler opened the conversation by saying, "President Lowell, my faculty is already starting to call me a liar."

President Lowell replied, "Don't be upset, they have long since proved it on me."

Doubtless, after tonight, you will be proving it on me as well.

## N E C R O L O G Y

## WILLIAM LOCKHART CLAYTON

1880 - 1966

DESCENDANT of early English colonists in Virginia whose sons steadily pushed westward with the frontier, born on a Mississippi farm during Reconstruction, his father a good man but beset with failure, a small town boy in Jackson, Tennessee, working from early youth to help his family, even dropping out of school for a job at the Madison County Court House and only with difficulty finding time for night study to finish the seventh grade, William Lockhart Clayton left his home at the age of 15 to take employment in a cotton office in St. Louis. He was tall, straight and lean, bright of eye, keen of mind, already a prodigious worker, and blessed with a will to learn and with a humanity as broad as Lincoln's. The court house exposure at 13 inspired him to spend part of his earnings for lessons in typing and shorthand and within a year he became a public stenographer.

At 19, having worked as a private secretary in the cotton business both in St. Louis and in New York and briefly as a court reporter in Tupelo and as a partner in a typewriter supply agency in Jackson, Will Clayton was persuaded by the same cotton man to return to New York. There he undertook to learn and to progress, mastering the art of cotton classing, in spare time taking lessons in French and also in dancing. He even wrestled with the idea of studying law. The process of his self-education had begun early and it lasted a lifetime. One vital element in his development was supplied by his happy marriage in August, 1902, to Miss Sue Vaughan of Clinton, Kentucky.

It is quite understandable that as Will Clayton rose in the cotton firm in New York from department to department and as a salesman to both domestic and overseas customers, he absorbed the intricacies of foreign trade, foreign exchange, and finance. Nor is it to be wondered that his brother-in-law Frank Anderson recognized his potential and in 1904 invited him to join in the formation of a partnership along with Monroe Anderson, a Jackson banker, to deal in cotton in Oklahoma City. The new firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. including a younger brother, Ben, who joined it in 1905, made steady headway and, due to Will Clayton's international outlook, early set up connections for selling directly to European mills. Its export volume

became so important and the storage of cotton at ship-side so essential that in 1916 Anderson, Clayton & Co., having built its own gins and warehouses at key interior points, moved to Houston where cotton could be concentrated at the docks and where Will Clayton's experience in foreign trade proved an even more valuable asset.

From then on, except for the year 1918 in Government service in Washington, he gave himself unreservedly to the development of his great company and became in time the clear thinking, articulate spokesman for the whole American cotton industry. One great service to stable cotton marketing resulted after exhaustive hearings before a Senate Committee in the establishment of "Southern Delivery" by which cotton sold under future contracts could be tendered in Gulf ports rather than exclusively in New York. The period of his career from 1926-1940 is studded with brilliant speeches and writings in opposition to acreage controls, price fixing and other measures designed to aid agriculture but contrary to basic economics and a free market system. He opposed high tariffs as destructive of international trade and predicted as the inevitable consequence of mandatory acreage reduction the gradual disappearance of American cotton from world markets.

But William L. Clayton, the imaginative and successful cotton man, ever interested in people and in politics, had also a highly developed sense of responsibility as a citizen. Again and again, however reluctantly, he laid aside his personal duties and affairs to answer his country's call in time of critical need. In 1940, twenty-two years after his World War I service under Bernard Baruch as a member of the Committee on Cotton Distribution of the War Industries Board, he went to Washington, first as Deputy to Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and, having returned home hopefully for the cotton season, then was recalled on the urgent request of Jesse H. Jones, backed by the personal intervention of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Here in late October, 1940, began a period of almost seven years residence in Washington as a government official, beginning as Deputy Federal Loan Administrator and Vice-President of the Export-Import Bank, then in February, 1942 as Assistant Secretary of Commerce, in February, 1944 as Surplus War Property Administrator, in December, 1944 as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs and, finally, in August, 1946 as Under-Secretary of State for Economic Affairs from which post he resigned in October, 1947. These years involved the most exacting high-level activity, first in the purchase of critical and strategic materials for defense, then war damage claims, export allocations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, and innumerable



trips abroad as a member or head of U. S. delegations to world conferences on war and peace, finance, trade and employment, food and agriculture, reconstruction and development, and on reparations at the Potsdam Conference under President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes. It was on planes flying between meetings that in the spring of 1947 he wrote the two memoranda which became the basis for Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard University June 5, 1947, followed by the implementation of the Marshall Plan for which Under-Secretary Clayton immediately flew to Europe for negotiations with England, Russia, France and Italy. The *New York Times* of September 21, 1947, spoke of our "Number One Envoy to Europe, W. L. Clayton, counsel to an ailing continent."

Before returning to Houston in November, 1948, Mr. Clayton as unofficial adviser to the Secretary of State headed the U. S. delegation to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment at Havana, out of which grew the International Trade Organization, in which the United States is not a member, but also the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in which it has actively participated. His interest in civic and governmental affairs by no means diminished, as evidenced by trusteeships of Johns Hopkins University, Texas Southern University and the School for Advanced International Studies; by sponsorship of the National Planned Parenthood Campaign of 1949; by appointment by President Truman to the National Security Training Commission in 1951; and by the presidency of the Philosophical Society of Texas in 1950. President Kennedy in 1962 appointed him to the National Export Expansion Council and in 1963 asked him to work for the nuclear test ban treaty.

Mr. Clayton, who never accepted unless he could serve, continued to speak and write and testify in support of international cooperation and world trade and other great causes in which he believed, and in 1964 at the request of President Lyndon B. Johnson he was co-author of the agenda for a meeting of NATO. Finally, as late as January 1966 he flew to Paris on government business, and in Washington for the last week before his death on February 8 at the age of 86 he was busily engaged as co-chairman with Mr. Christian Herter of the U. S. Citizens Committee to NATO, considering economic and non-military matters.

William L. Clayton endowed with equally full measures of realism and of idealism was a business leader, dedicated patriot, world citizen, and with his wife Sue Vaughan Clayton a generous philanthropist, a modest, simple, great hearted humanitarian and a Southern gentleman who never grew old.

## MRS. GEORGE ALFRED HILL, JR.

1894 - 1965

MARY VAN DEN BERGE HILL, the highly esteemed President of The Philosophical Society of Texas, died on July 25, 1965.

A native of Victoria where she was born on July 15, 1894, a daughter of Joseph V. and Frances Wofford Van den Berge, she received her early education in Victoria, partly in a private school organized and taught by her grandmother. For her college work she proceeded to Sophie Newcomb in New Orleans, where she was graduated in 1914. Her education was in the arts, which she taught in the schools of her native town.

On June 24, 1916 she was married to George A. Hill, Jr., and moved to Houston, of which they both became lifelong citizens. Their two sons and one daughter have also made their home in Houston. Mr. Hill served as President of the Society in 1942 and continued to take a leading part in its activities until his death in 1949. The more important details of his distinguished career were recorded in *Proceedings*, XIV, 1949. But we should recall again his outstanding public service to our State in promoting the establishment of the San Jacinto Museum of History Association, to which he contributed very valuable historical and artistic materials of Texas, Mexico, and the entire Southwest.

Mrs. Hill's social and cultural activities manifested her most versatile personality. The list of over twenty organizations of which she was a leading member is a record of her productive energies which can hardly be matched. Without citing them all in detail, we may here only indicate the many lines of her interests. She served as president of the Junior League of Houston and as regional director of the national organization of Junior Leagues. For ten years she was a member of the City of Houston Recreation Council. She led in the organization of the Garden Club of Houston, served as its president, promoted the organization of other local garden clubs and their federation, was active in the regional and national work of garden clubs and was one of those who promoted the first garden pilgrimage in Houston. Her early interest in the arts found expression in her support of the Houston Symphony Society. She was active in the work of the Women's Forum. She served as Houston chairman of the Committee for the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis and was active in the Harris County Polio Association. She supported the Harris County unit of the American Cancer Society. During the

Second World War and for several years after its close she was Houston chairman of volunteers in the Volunteers Community Services. In 1946 she was awarded a citation by the United States Treasury Department in behalf of the War Finance Program. She served many terms as board member of the Houston Community Chest and especially in the later organization of the United Fund of Houston and Harris County. Mrs. Hill was also active in promoting educational work. She endowed a scholarship at the Austin Presbyterian Seminary.

Mrs. Hill shared actively her husband's great interest in the organization of the San Jacinto Museum of History at the battleground. They were both fourth generation Texans, whose forebears had come during or prior to the days of the Republic of Texas. The collection and preservation of Texan and Southwestern historical materials was their lifelong pursuit, and subsequent to the death of her husband Mrs. Hill established a foundation for the endowment of the San Jacinto Museum of History. The Hill family tradition, thus closely identified with the Museum, has been continued by George A. Hill, III, trustee and president of the Museum Association and a member of this Society.

Throughout her life, in the numerous and varied social and cultural organizations in which she was active, Mrs. Hill manifested a spirit of genuine devotion, combining fruitful energy with a truly unselfish and modest disregard for personal fame. During the last few years of her life, despite grave illness, she showed a certain quiet heroism in continuing her active social services. The way in which she pressed her waning energies in preparing the program of the 1964 meeting of our Society, at which she was unable to be present in person, was only the last expression of a truly enlightened and brave and creative spirit that will continue to inspire those who knew her and her work.

— R. A. T

---

## CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ

1885 - 1966

CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ was born in Fredericksburg February 24, 1885. He came of freedom-loving German stock who settled the lovely Hill Country west of Austin in the mid-nineteenth century.

In the summer of 1901 this tall, fair haired, blue eyed young Texan entered Annapolis as a midshipman appointed in our Navy from the Lone Star State.

A light but courageous football player for his four years on the Severn, he was respected and loved by his companions there to a degree unusual in hyper-critical youth. The Academy's year book *Lucky Bag* for 1905 wrote of him with prophetic perception, "He is a man of cheerful yesterdays and confident tomorrows."

A passed Midshipman at sea for two years before becoming an Ensign in 1907, he advanced through the usual duties assigned a successful officer.

He was married to Catherine Vance Freeman in 1913; Mrs. Nimitz and he maintained the best Navy tradition of a happy marriage — blessed with fine and affectionate children — for over half a century.

As his career advanced there accrued to him in subtle but certain manner a continually enhanced reputation for confidence, rock-like moral and physical courage, rare intelligence and perceptiveness, and an understanding heart.

A few high spots — before his ultimate responsibilities — that I know he especially enjoyed and cherished were Executive Officer battleship *South Carolina*, Commanding heavy cruiser *Augusta*, Chief of Staff Submarine Force, Professor of Naval Science and in charge of the Navy's first NROTC unit, University of California, and, as a flag officer (since 1938) — Chief of Naval Personnel.

This last assignment — known in earlier days as Bureau of Navigation — brought into the fullest play, up to that point of Admiral Nimitz's career — his great capacity for leadership, judgment, understanding, and moral courage.

He was serving as the source of decision and integrity in the administration of all the Navy's people, when the blow fell on Pearl Harbor. As we turn toward the life-giving sun, the Navy as one man turned to Admiral Nimitz to restore the Pacific Fleet and lead it to victory.

What he did, how he did it, his rare gifts of modesty, wisdom, firmness, and courage, are now recorded in history. Across the boundless Pacific moved the Fleet, halting the enemy at Coral Sea, at Midway inflicting a defeat so decisive he would never recover, and with our great Marine Corps, conquering Saipan, Tinian, Guam, Iwo Jima, and on to Tokyo Bay, where on fast battleship *Missouri's* quarterdeck he accepted the Japanese surrender for the United States of America whose uniform he had worn for 44 years.

The honors that followed were great but in a way, almost anticlimactic. He was Chief of Naval Operations, became a Fleet Admiral, received the highest decorations at the disposal of the Great Republic and its allies, many honorary academic degrees, a Phi Beta Kappa Key — and his belated high school diploma.

In 1947 he returned to his adopted home in the lovely San Francisco Bay area and continued on active duty, always available to the President and the Secretary for any service or advice asked of him. He was on active duty 61 years.

He died and was buried at his own wish, without the pomp of a State funeral beside the Pacific, like any other sailor home from the sea.

He accepted membership in this Society from his flagship in 1943, and characteristically explained his absence from the next Annual Meeting on the ground that he had some unfinished "pressing business with some little men in the Western Pacific Ocean." He made his first public appearance after the war in Dallas, where a portrait bust of him was dedicated in the Hall of State and he spoke at the Annual Meeting, December 7, 1946. Before his address he facetiously denied a rumor that he had said the Pacific Ocean was larger than Texas; he had only said: "If anything is larger than Texas, it is the Pacific."

He was universally esteemed and respected by his fellows in the services and by plain citizens everywhere; those who knew him personally held him in deep and abiding affection.

— J. L. H., JR.

---

## PAT IRELAND NIXON

1883 - 1965

DR. PAT IRELAND NIXON, known to his many friends and associates as "Dr. Pat," a distinguished member of this Society for many years and a past president, died at his home in San Antonio on November 18, 1965, at the age of 81 years. His father, Robert Thomas Nixon, came to Texas from Randolph County, North Carolina, in 1852, and settled in the eastern part of Guadalupe County, about seven miles South of the present city of Luling. The father was twice married and there were eighteen children, eleven by his marriage to Laura Wood Nixon, and seven by his second wife, Fannie Andrews Nixon. Pat Ireland, fifth child of the second marriage, was born on November 29, 1883.

When he came into the world two important events were taking place in Texas. One was the opening of The University of Texas, from which in 1905 he was to be graduated; the other was the laying

of the corner stone for our present state capitol. In the Governor's office at that time was John Ireland, noted for his honesty and integrity, a country lawyer from Seguin, the county seat of Guadalupe County, in which the Nixons had settled. Robert Thomas Nixon was a friend of Governor Ireland, and named his son Pat Ireland. To-day the Texas descendants of Robert Thomas Nixon number more than five hundred.

Pat Ireland Nixon spent his boyhood on the family plantation; graduated from the Luling high school in 1900; from Bingham School in Asheville, North Carolina, in 1902; and from The University of Texas in 1905. He then entered Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, and received his M.D. degree in 1909.

He began practice in San Antonio on September 27, 1911, and continued for more than fifty years, until a short while before his death. On the occasion of his 75th birthday in November, 1958, four prominent families of San Antonio who had selected him as their family physician a few months after his office was opened, honored him and his wife with a memorable dinner at the San Antonio Country Club, attended by several hundred people — a marvelous demonstration of the love and affection in which they were held. His response on that occasion will long be remembered by those present.

At one time or another he was a president of the Bexar County Medical Society, Texas Surgical Society, San Antonio Historical Association, Texas State Historical Association, and The Philosophical Society of Texas. He served on the board of directors of several of the San Antonio hospitals and was a member of numerous national, state and local professional, cultural and civic groups. He was active in the work of his church.

Long interested in the history of Texas, and particularly its medical history, he authored several historical and medical books. These included *A Century of Medicine in San Antonio* (1936); *The Medical Story of Early Texas* (1946); *A History of the Texas Medical Association* (1953); and *The Early Nixons of Texas*. The book "Early Nixons of Texas," published in 1956, was awarded the Summerfield G. Roberts Award of \$1,000.00, annually given to the best book published during the year depicting the character of early Texans. He also, with C. Stanley Banks, wrote the history of Laurel Heights Methodist Church of San Antonio, of which they were long time members. His last work, a few months before his death, was a volume dedicated to his beloved wife, Olive Read Nixon, who died in 1964, and which contained his eloquent, beautiful and moving tribute to her and the great influence which she had had in his life. They had met at Austin in 1904, when they were both students at The Univer-

sity of Texas, and were married in 1912, the year after he had opened his office in San Antonio. There were four sons of the marriage, two of whom are to-day practicing medicine in San Antonio.

He was outstanding for his day-to-day systematic work and effort. Always busy as a successful and highly regarded general practitioner, at the end of a busy day he would spend the evening, until a very late hour, in research and writing. He was a genius in his ability to express himself. As the result of his efforts, there were produced the books mentioned above, to say nothing of many letters, brochures, and pamphlets. He was widely read in the classics and literature in general, and his writings abound with quotations of prose and verse therefrom. Trinity University conferred on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Letters.

The outstanding collection of rare medical books at the Bexar County Medical Library in San Antonio was the result of his leadership and efforts. Several months before his death, his large and valuable library of Texana, built up through many years of careful selection, was presented by him to Trinity University of San Antonio, where to-day it is housed in the University library, with unusual and special recognition and designation.

He was a remarkable man in his accomplishments; he was truly a gentleman and a scholar; he lived a full life, one of service to his fellow man, devotion to his family and to his profession, and the Christian way of life.

— C. S. B.

---

## MRS. WALTER BENONA SHARP

1873 - 1965

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS lost a valuable long-time member in the death of Estelle Boughton Sharp, on August 30, 1965.

Estelle Boughton was born on June 19, 1873, in Vassar, Michigan, a daughter of George A. Boughton and Delia A. Boughton. After her school days she studied at the Oberlin Conservatory of Music. She married Walter Benona Sharp on January 28, 1897, and thereafter made her home in Dallas and later in Houston. Mr. Sharp was one of the well-known pioneers in the Texas oil industry and was connected with the early development of the Texas Company. For fifteen years prior to her husband's death in 1912 Mrs. Sharp shared



her active participation in petroleum discovery and production with steadily developing interest in various phases of social reform.

In those early days of organized social welfare work in Texas, Mrs. Sharp became a devoted leader in arousing the social conscience of Houstonians and Texans to a higher sense of public responsibility. Realizing the great need of trained social workers in the welfare field, she established and supported for several years the School for Civics and Philanthropy in Houston and later a lectureship in that field at the Rice Institute. For long years she served with great distinction on the board and on committees of the Community Council of Social Agencies in Houston, and was elected a life member of the board.

Mrs. Sharp was a woman of moral courage, untiring and intelligent devotion, and clear vision. She pursued her work in social welfare through public institutions and private agencies, in large ways and small. Men and women and children in need were to her always human beings, and her attitude was deeply humane and personal. Her interest was not in mere routine charities but in agencies which developed people's capacities to improve their own condition, through better education and more intelligent and productive co-operation. For almost sixty years she was actively interested in neighborhood philanthropic work. She was a member of the first board of directors of the Houston Settlement Association, in 1908, and in 1962 she established the Estelle Sharp Neighborhood Center of the Neighborhood Centers Association of Houston and Harris County. The lives of thousands which have been made more significant through her benefactions will be an enduring and glowing tribute to her memory. For Mrs. Sharp wealth signified opportunity to help others. It gave her the means to provide and sustain needed social services.

While Mrs. Sharp's generous social-mindedness thus contributed to various fields of philanthropic work, she was also active in many lines of artistic and cultural activity. For years her home was a hospitable meeting-place for fortnightly discussion groups. One of her deep interests was the promotion of peace. She took an active part in the work of the American Association for the United Nations and in other plans and agencies for the cessation of war and international conflicts. She had a genuine spirit of kindness and friendship which expressed itself in all her personal relations. She literally radiated active goodwill. She inspired and supported the organization of several Conferences for Citizenship in a Democracy, or COCIAD as they have been called, to provide active discussion of public affairs and stimulate a more responsible and more intelligent

public spirit and cooperation in our society. Her active mind was alert and tireless despite advancing years, and until her death at the age of ninety-two conversation with her was a stimulating and cherished experience for all who were privileged to be her friends.

The influence of Estelle Sharp on the humanitarian and cultural life and on the broad public enlightenment in Houston and Texas was and will continue to be far-reaching. Her life through the years was a vital expression of enlightened social conscience resolutely translating high ideals into living realities.

— R. A. T.

## PAST PRESIDENTS

° Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar . . . . .	1837-59
° Ira Kendrick Stephens . . . . .	1936
° Charles Shirley Potts . . . . .	1937
° Edgar Odell Lovett . . . . .	1938
° George Bannerman Dealey . . . . .	1939
° George Waverley Briggs . . . . .	1940
° William James Battle . . . . .	1941
° George Alfred Hill Jr. . . . .	1942
° Edward Henry Cary . . . . .	1943
° Edward Randall . . . . .	1944
° Umphrey Lee . . . . .	1944
° Eugene Perry Locke . . . . .	1945
Louis Herman Hubbard . . . . .	1946
° Pat Ireland Nixon . . . . .	1947
Ima Hogg . . . . .	1948
Albert Perley Brogan . . . . .	1949
° William Lockhart Clayton . . . . .	1950
° A. Frank Smith . . . . .	1951
° Ernest Lynn Kurth . . . . .	1952
Dudley Kezer Woodward Jr. . . . .	1953
° Burke Baker . . . . .	1954
° Jesse Andrews . . . . .	1955
James Pinckney Hart . . . . .	1956
Robert Gerald Storey . . . . .	1957
° Lewis Randolph Bryan Jr. . . . .	1958
W. St. John Garwood . . . . .	1959
George Crews McGhee . . . . .	1960
Harry Hunt Ransom . . . . .	1961
Eugene Benjamin Germany . . . . .	1962
Rupert Norval Richardson . . . . .	1963
° Mrs. George Alfred Hill, Jr. . . . .	1964
Edward Randall, Jr. . . . .	1965

°Deceased

## OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

*For the Year 1966*

*President*

MCGRUDER ELLIS SADLER

*First Vice-President*

WILLIAM ALEXANDER KIRKLAND

*Second Vice-President*

ROBERT LEE BOBBITT

*Third Vice-President*

WILLIAM MARVIN WHYBURN

*Fourth Vice-President*

DILLON ANDERSON

*Fifth Vice-President*

FRANK WILSON WOZENCRAFT

*Corresponding Secretary*

HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL

*Recording Secretary*

SAM HANNA ACHESON

*Treasurer*

BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN

*Librarian*

SAMUEL WOOD GEISER

*Directors*

MCGRUDER ELLIS SADLER

EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY

HARRY HUNTT RANSOM

WILMER ST. JOHN GARWOOD

GEORGE CREWS MCGHEE

EDWARD RANDALL, JR.

ROBERT GERALD STOREY

JAMES PINCKNEY HART

DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD, JR.

RUPERT NORVAL RICHARDSON

## MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

- ACHESON, SAM HANNA, editorial writer, *The News* . . . . . Dallas
- ADAMS, NATHAN, honorary chairman of the board, First National Bank of Dallas; past president, Texas Bankers Association . . . . . Dallas
- ALLEN, WINNIE, retired archivist, University of Texas Library . . . . . Austin
- ANDERSON, DILLON, lawyer; former Special Assistant to the President of the United States for National Security Affairs . . . . . Houston and Washington
- ANDERSON, ROBERT BERNARD, partner, Carl M. Loeb Rhoades and Company; former Secretary of the Treasury; former Tax Commissioner, Texas . . . . . New York
- ANDREWS, MARK EDWIN, president, Ancon Oil and Gas Company; former Assistant Secretary of the Navy . . . . . Houston
- ARMSTRONG, THOMAS REEVES, Armstrong Ranch; former president, Santa Gertrudis Breeders Association . . . . . Armstrong
- BAKER, HINES HOLT, former president, Humble Oil and Refining Company . . . . . Houston
- BAKER, WALTER BROWNE, banking and real estate consultant . . . . . Houston
- BANKS, STANLEY, lawyer; chairman, Texas Library and Historical Commission . . . . . San Antonio
- BATES, WILLIAM BARTHOLOMEW, lawyer; chairman of the board, Bank of the Southwest and of the University of Houston; trustee, M. D. Anderson Foundation and Texas Medical Center . . . . . Houston
- BELLOWS, WARREN S., chairman of the board, W. S. Bellows Construction Corporation; past president, Associated General Contractors of America . . . . . Houston
- BENNETT, JOHN MIRZA, JR., chairman, National Bank of Commerce and City Public Service Board; director, Texas and Southwestern Cattleman's Association; Major General, USAFR . . . . . San Antonio
- BINKLEY, WILLIAM CAMPBELL, past president, Mississippi Valley Historical Association and Southern Historical Association; former managing editor, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* . . . . . Austin
- BOBBITT, ROBERT LEE, former Attorney General of Texas, and Associate Justice, Fourth Court of Civil Appeals . . . . . San Antonio
- BONER, CHARLES PAUL, director of research and professor of physics, University of Texas . . . . . Austin
- BREWSTER, LEO, United States District Judge, Northern District of Texas . . . . . Fort Worth
- \*BROGAN, ALBERT PERLEY, professor emeritus of philosophy, University of Texas; past president, western division, American Philosophical Association . . . . . Austin
- BROWN, GEORGE RUFUS, vice president, Brown and Root; chairman of the trustees, The Rice University . . . . . Houston
- BRUCE, ANDREW DAVIS, Lieutenant General, retired, United States Army; chancellor emeritus, University of Houston . . . . . Temple
- BRYAN, JAMES PERRY, lawyer; regent, University of Texas . . . . . Lake Jackson
- CABELL, CHARLES PEARRE, General, United States Air Force; former Deputy Director of Central Intelligence . . . . . Dallas and Washington
- CARMACK, GEORGE, former editor, *The Houston Press* . . . . . Washington
- CARRINGTON, PAUL, lawyer; past president, Texas Association of Commerce; past president, State Bar of Texas . . . . . Dallas

\*Life Member

- CARROLL, HORACE BAILEY, director, Texas State Historical Association; professor of history, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- CLARK, EDWARD, lawyer; former Secretary of State of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- CLARK, JOSEPH LYNN, professor emeritus of history, Sam Houston State College; past president, Texas Commission on Inter-racial Co-operation . *Huntsville*
- CLARK, RANDOLPH LEE JR., director and surgeon-in-chief University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute; professor of surgery, University of Texas Postgraduate School of Medicine . . . . . *Houston*
- CLARK, TOM C., Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States  
*Dallas and Washington*
- †CLAYTON, WILLIAM LOCKHART, former Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs . . . . . *Houston and Washington*
- COLLIE, MARVIN KEY, lawyer; former president, National Bank of Commerce; trustee Methodist Hospital, University of Houston . . . . . *Houston*
- CONNALLY, JOHN BOWDEN, Governor of Texas; former Secretary of the Navy  
*Floresville and Austin*
- CRONEIS, CAREY, chancellor, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- DARDEN, WILLIAM E., president, William E. Darden Lumber Company; former regent, University of Texas. . . . . *Waco*
- DAVIS, MORGAN JONES, president, Humble Oil and Refining Co.; past president, American Association of Petroleum Geologists . . . . . *Houston*
- DOTY, EZRA WILLIAM, professor of Music and dean of the College of Fine Arts, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- DOYLE, GERRY, typographer; director of publications, San Jacinto Museum of History . . . . . *Beaumont*
- ELLIOTT, EDWIN ALEXANDER, former Regional Director, National Labor Relations Board; former professor of economics, Texas Christian University  
*Fort Worth*
- ESTES, JOE EWING, United States District Judge, Northern District of Texas  
*Dallas*
- ETTLINGER, HYMAN JOSEPH, professor of mathematics, University of Texas  
*Austin*
- EWING, WILLIAM MAURICE, Wiggins professor of geology and director, Lamont Geological Observatory, Columbia University; past president, Seismological Society of America, and American Geophysical Union  
*Palisades, New York*
- FERGUSON, CHARLES W., senior editor, *Reader's Digest*; former cultural relations officer, American Embassy, London . . . . . *New York, New York*
- FINCH, WILLIAM CARRINGTON, dean, Divinity School, Vanderbilt University; former president, Southwestern University . . . . . *Nashville, Tennessee*
- FLEMING, RICHARD TUDOR, retired vice-president and general counsel, Texas Gulf Sulphur Company . . . . . *Austin*
- FRANCIS, CHARLES INGE, lawyer; former regent, University of Texas and North Texas State College; former Special Assistant to the Attorney General and to the Secretary of War . . . . . *Houston*
- FRIEND, LLERENA BEAUFORT, librarian, Eugene C. Barker Texas History Center, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- \*GAMBRELL, HERBERT PICKENS, professor emeritus, Southern Methodist University; past president, Texas State Historical Association, research director, Dallas Historical Society; president, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Dallas*
- GAMBRELL, VIRGINIA LEDDY (Mrs. Herbert), director of the museum, Dallas Historical Society; vice president, American Association for State and Local History . . . . . *Dallas*
- GARWOOD, WILMER ST. JOHN, professor of law, University of Texas; former Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas; director, national board, English-Speaking Union of the United States . . . . . *Austin*

\*Life Member

†Deceased

- \*GEISER, SAMUEL WOOD, professor emeritus of biology, Southern Methodist University . . . . . Dallas
- GERMANY, EUGENE BENJAMIN, geologist; chairman, Lone Star Steel Company; chairman, Texas Industrial Commission . . . . . Dallas
- GILBERT, ROBERT RANDLE, vice chairman, retired, Republic National Bank; former president, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; executive committee-man, Southwestern Legal Center; Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas Historical Society . . . . . Dallas
- GILCHRIST, GIBB, chancellor emeritus, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College System . . . . . College Station
- GRAVES, IRELAND, lawyer . . . . . Austin
- GREEN, LEON, Distinguished Professor of Law, University of Texas; former dean of the School of Law, Northwestern University . . . . . Austin
- GREENHILL, JOE, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . Austin
- GRESHAM, NEWTON, lawyer; former president, State Bar; chairman regents, State Teachers Colleges; trustee, St. Luke's Hospital . . . . . Houston
- HARDIE, THORNTON, lawyer; former chairman of the regents, University of Texas . . . . . El Paso
- HARRINGTON, MARION THOMAS, chancellor emeritus, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University System . . . . . College Station
- HARRISON, GUY BRYAN JR., professor of history, Baylor University . . . . . Waco
- HART, JAMES PINCKNEY, former chancellor, The University of Texas; former Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . Austin
- HARTE, HOUSTON, publisher, *Standard Times* and other newspapers; vice president, Associated Press . . . . . San Angelo
- HEATH, WILLIAM WOMACK, lawyer; chairman regents, University of Texas; former chairman, Board for Hospitals and Special Schools . . . . . Austin
- HERSHEY, JACOB W., board chairman, American Commercial Lines; chairman advisory committee, Transportation Center, Northwestern University . . . . . Houston
- HERTZOG, CARL, typographer . . . . . El Paso
- HILL, GEORGE ALFRED, III, lawyer; president, San Jacinto Museum of History Association . . . . . Houston
- HILL, GEORGE W., president, Southern Heritage Foundation; former executive director, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . . . . . Austin
- HILL, JOSEPH MACGLASHAN, physician; director, Wadley Research Institute; past president, International Society of Hematology . . . . . Dallas
- HINES, JOHN ELDRIDGE, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church; trustee, Episcopal Seminary of the Southwest; former member State Board of Hospitals and Special Schools . . . . . Houston and New York
- HOBBY, OVETA CULP, president, *The Houston Post*; former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare . . . . . Houston
- HOBBY, WILLIAM PETTUS, JR., executive editor, *Houston Post*; president, Child Guidance Center; chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations . . . . . Houston
- HOFFMAN, PHILIP GUTHRIE, president, University of Houston . . . . . Houston
- HOGAN, WILLIAM RANSOM, professor of history, Tulane University . . . . . New Orleans, Louisiana
- HOGG, IMA . . . . . Houston
- HOLLOWAY, JAMES LEMUEL JR., Admiral (retired), United States Navy, former Superintendent, United States Naval Academy . . . . . Washington
- HORGAN, PAUL, director, Center for Advanced Studies, Wesleyan University; president, American Catholic Historical Association; member, National Institute of Arts and Letters . . . . . Roswell, New Mexico and Middletown, Connecticut

\*Life Member



- HOUSTON, WILLIAM VERMILLION, chancellor emeritus, Rice University  
*Houston*
- HUBBARD, LOUIS HERMAN, president emeritus, Texas State College for Women;  
past president, Association of Texas Colleges . . . . . *Georgetown*
- HURD, PETER, National Academecian . . . . . *San Patricio, New Mexico*
- IRONS, WATROUS HENRY, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; former pro-  
fessor, University of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- JAMES, HERMAN GERLACH, former president, Ohio University; past president,  
Southwestern Political Science Association . . . . . *Chicago, Illinois*
- JAWORSKI, LEON, lawyer; trustee, M. D. Anderson Foundation; past president,  
Texas Civil Judicial Council; president, State Bar of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- JEFFERS, LEROY, lawyer; regent, University of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- JOHNSON, LYNDON BAINES, President of the United States  
. . . . . *Johnson City and Washington*
- JOHNSON, WILLIAM PARKS, radio pioneer . . . . . *Wimberly*
- °JONES, CLIFFORD BARTLETT, president emeritus, Texas Technological College;  
honorary chairman, Lubbock National Bank . . . . . *Lubbock*
- JONES, EVERETT HOLLAND, Bishop of West Texas, Protestant Episcopal Church  
. . . . . *San Antonio*
- JONES, HOWARD MUMFORD, professor of English, Harvard University; past presi-  
dent, American Academy of Arts and Letters . . . . . *Cambridge, Massachusetts*
- JONES, JOHN TILFORD, JR., president, *Houston Chronicle* . . . . . *Houston*
- JONES, MARVIN, retired Chief Judge, United States Court of Claims  
. . . . . *Amarillo and Washington*
- JONSSON, JOHN ERIK, chairman, Texas Instruments; chairman, Graduate  
Research Center of the Southwest; trustee many institutions; Mayor  
of Dallas . . . . . *Dallas*
- KEETON, PAGE, dean of the school of law, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- KEMPNER, HARRIS LEON, trustee, H. Kempner; president, H. Kempner Cotton  
Company; chairman executive committee, Imperial Sugar Company  
. . . . . *Galveston*
- KILMAN, EDWARD, editor emeritus, *The Post* . . . . . *Houston*
- KING, FRANK HAVILAND, formerly general executive for the Southwest,  
Associated Press . . . . . *Dallas*
- KIRKLAND, WILLIAM ALEXANDER, chairman of the board, First City National  
Bank; trustee emeritus, Rice and Princeton Universities; regent, University  
of the South . . . . . *Houston*
- KLEBERG, ROBERT JUSTUS JR., president, King Ranch Inc. . . . . *Kingsville*
- KNEPPER, DOROTHY WARDELL (Mrs. David W.), director, San Jacinto Museum  
of History . . . . . *Houston*
- KREY, LAURA LETTIE SMITH (Mrs. A. C.), novelist and essayist . . . . . *Austin*
- °LAMAR, LUCIUS MIRABEAU, general counsel, The California Oil Company  
. . . . . *New Orleans, Louisiana*
- LAW, FRANCIS MARION, consultation chairman, First City National Bank of  
Houston; past president, American Bankers Association, and of the direc-  
tors, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- LEA, TOM, painter and novelist . . . . . *El Paso*
- LEAKE, CHAUNCEY DEPEW, professor of pharmacology, University of California;  
past president, History of Science Society, American Association for the  
Advancement of Science, American Society for Pharmacology; president,  
American Association for the History of Medicine . . . . . *San Francisco*
- LEMMON, MARK, architect . . . . . *Dallas*
- LONG, WALTER EWING, supervisor, Texas Legislative Service; member, Texas  
Library and Historical Commission; chairman, Texas Civil War Centen-  
nial Commission . . . . . *Austin*

°Life Member

- LOVETT, HENRY MALCOLM, lawyer; member board of governors, Rice University  
Houston
- LUCEY, ROBERT EMMET, Archbishop of San Antonio; past president, California  
Conference on Social Work . . . . . San Antonio
- LYNCH, WILLIAM WRIGHT, president and general manager, Texas Power and  
Light Company . . . . . Dallas
- MACGREGOR, GEORGE LESCHER, president, Texas Utilities Company . . . . . Dallas
- MACNAUGHTON, LEWIS WINSLOW, partner DeGolyer and MacNaughton;  
trustee, Graduate Research Center . . . . . Dallas
- MANN, GERALD C., president, Diversa, Inc.; former Secretary of State and  
Attorney General of Texas . . . . . Dallas
- MARCUS, STANLEY, president, Neiman-Marcus . . . . . Dallas
- MCCALL, ABNER VERNON, president, Baylor University; former Associate  
Justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . Waco
- MCCLENDON, JAMES WOOTEN, Chief Justice (retired), Third Court of Civil  
Appeals . . . . . Austin
- MCCOLLUM, LEONARD FRANKLIN, president, Continental Oil Co. . . . . Houston
- MCDERMOTT, EUGENE, chairman, executive committee, Texas Instruments; past  
president, Society of Exploration Geophysicists . . . . . Dallas
- MCGHEE, GEORGE CREWS, Ambassador to West Germany . . . . . Dallas and Bonn
- MCKILLOP, ALAN DUGALD, professor of English, Rice University . . . . . Houston
- MCNEESE, AYLMEER GREEN JR., president, Bank of the Southwest; regent, Uni-  
versity of Texas; member board of governors, University of Houston  
Houston
- MOODY, DAN, former Governor of Texas . . . . . Austin
- MOORE, MAURICE THOMPSON, lawyer . . . . . New York, New York
- MOSELEY, JOHN DEAN, president, Austin College; former Director, Texas Legis-  
lative Council . . . . . Sherman
- MURRAY, WILLIAM OWEN, Chief Justice, Court of Civil Appeals  
San Antonio
- NELSON, FRED MERRIAM, chairman of the board, Texas Gulf Sulphur Company  
Houston
- †NIMITZ, CHESTER WILLIAM, Fleet Admiral, United States Navy . . . . . Washington
- NORTHEN, MRS. MARY MOODY, president National Hotel Company, Moody  
National Bank; trustee, Moody Foundation, Medical Research Foundation  
Galveston
- NORVELL, JAMES R., Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . Austin
- OLAN, LEVI, rabbi, Temple Emanu-El . . . . . Dallas
- OLSON, STANLEY W., dean, Baylor University College of Medicine; chairman,  
medical board, Jefferson Davis Hospital . . . . . Houston
- O'QUINN, TRUEMAN, lawyer . . . . . Austin
- PARTEN, JUBAL RICHARD, oil and mineral investments; ranching . . . . . Houston
- PITZER, KENNETH SANBORN, president, Rice University; former professor of  
chemistry and dean, University of California . . . . . Houston
- POOL, GEORGE FRED, executive vice-president, East Texas Chamber of Com-  
merce . . . . . Longview
- PROTHRO, CHARLES N., president, Perkins-Prothro Company, trustee, South-  
western University . . . . . Wichita Falls
- RAGAN, COOPER K., lawyer . . . . . Houston
- RANDALL, EDWARD JR., physician; professor of medicine, University of Texas;  
director, Sealy and Smith Foundation . . . . . Galveston
- RANSOM, HARRY HUNTT, chancellor, University of Texas system . . . . . Austin
- RATCHFORD, FANNIE ELIZABETH, retired librarian of rare book collections, Uni-  
versity of Texas . . . . . Austin

†Deceased

- REDDITT, JOHN S., lawyer; former state senator; former chairman, Texas Highway Commission . . . . . *Lufkin*
- RICHARDSON, RUPERT NORVAL, professor of history, Hardin-Simmons University; past president, Southwestern Social Science Association . . . . . *Abilene*
- RIPPY, JAMES FRED, professor emeritus of history, University of Chicago  
*Durham, North Carolina*
- ROBERTS, SUMMERFIELD GRIFFITH, president, Streber Oil Company; vice president, Dallas Historical Society . . . . . *Dallas*
- ROBERTSON, FRENCH MARTEL, lawyer, oil operator; past president, Texas Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association; former chairman, Texas Prison Board; chairman, State Board for Hospitals and Special Schools; consultant, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization . . . . . *Abilene*
- RUDDER, JAMES EARL, president, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas; Major General commanding 90th Infantry Division; former Commissioner, General Land Office of Texas; member, Reserve Forces Policy Board, Department of Defense . . . . . *College Station*
- SADLER, MCGRUDER ELLIS, executive chairman of the trustees, Texas Christian University; past president, Association of American Colleges . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- SANDLIN, MARLIN ELIJAH, lawyer; chairman of board, Great Northern Oil Company and Pan American Sulphur Company . . . . . *Houston*
- SCHIWETZ, EDWARD MUEGGE, artist . . . . . *Houston*
- SEALY, TOM, lawyer, former chairman of regents, University of Texas  
. . . . . *Midland*
- SHARP, DUDLEY CRAWFORD, vice chairman, Mission Manufacturing Company; former Secretary of the Air Force . . . . . *Houston*
- SHEPPERD, JOHN BEN, president, Texas State Historical Survey Committee, former Attorney General of Texas . . . . . *Odessa*
- SHIVERS, ALLAN, former Governor of Texas; chairman, Western Pipe Line  
. . . . . *Austin*
- SHUFFLER, RALPH HENDERSON, director Texana Program, University of Texas  
. . . . . *Austin*
- SIMPSON, JOHN DAVID JR., president, Superior Dairies, Inc. . . . . *Austin*
- SMILEY, JOSEPH ROYALL, president, University of Colorado; former president, University of Texas . . . . . *Boulder*
- SMITH, FRANK CHESLEY, president, Houston Natural Gas Company, former chairman of board, Texas College of Arts and Industries; president, University of Houston Foundation; past president, American Gas Association . . . . . *Houston*
- SMITH, HENRY NASH, professor of English, University of California  
. . . . . *Berkeley, California*
- SPIES, JOHN WILLIAM, former dean of the medical faculty, University of Texas  
. . . . . *Austin*
- STEAKLEY, ZOLLIE COFFER, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas  
. . . . . *Austin*
- STEEN, RALPH WRIGHT, president, Stephen F. Austin State College; past president, Texas State Historical Association . . . . . *Nacogdoches*
- STOREY, ROBERT GERALD, president, Southwestern Legal Foundation; dean emeritus of the law school, Southern Methodist University; past president, American Bar Association . . . . . *Dallas*
- SUTHERLAND, ROBERT LEE, director, The Hogg Foundation and professor of sociology, The University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- SYMONDS, GARDINER, chairman of the board, Tennessee Gas Transmission Company; trustee, Stanford University; director, Texas A & M University System; visiting committee member, department of geological sciences and Graduate School of Business, Harvard . . . . . *Houston*
- TATE, WILLIS McDONALD, president, Southern Methodist University . . . . . *Dallas*

- THOMASON, ROBERT EWING, United States District Judge, Western District of Texas . . . . . *El Paso*
- TIMMONS, BASCOM N., Washington correspondent; past president, National Press Club . . . . . *Washington*
- TINKLE, LON, professor of comparative literature, Southern Methodist University; book critic, *Dallas News*; past president, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Dallas*
- TIPS, CHARLES RUDOLPH, president, Ambassador Hotel; past president, Sons of the Republic of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- TOBIN, MARGARET BATTIS (Mrs. Edgar), former regent, University of Texas . . . . . *San Antonio*
- TSANOFF, RADOSLAV ANDREA, Trustee Distinguished Professor of Humanities, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- TUCKER, EDWARD BLOUNT, president, Nacogdoches County Lumber Company; formerly regent, University of Texas . . . . . *Nacogdoches*
- VANDIVER, FRANK EVERSON, professor of history, Rice University; former Harmsworth professor of American History, Oxford . . . . . *Houston*
- WALKER, AGESILAUS WILSON JR., lawyer . . . . . *Dallas*
- WALKER, RUEL CARLILE, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- WARDLAW, FRANK H., director, University of Texas Press; past president, Texas Institute of Letters and American Association of University Presses . . . . . *Austin*
- WHITE, WILLIAM RICHARDSON, president emeritus, Baylor University; former president, Hardin-Simmons University . . . . . *Waco*
- WHYBURN, WILLIAM MARVIN, former president, Texas Technological College; Kenan professor of mathematics, University of North Carolina . . . . . *Chapel Hill, North Carolina*
- WIGGINS, DOSSIE MARION, president, Citizens National Bank; former president of Texas Technological College and of Texas Western College; trustee, Texas Tech Foundation, Medical Research Foundation of Texas; Hardin-Simmons University . . . . . *Lubbock*
- WILLIAMS, ROGER JOHN, Distinguished Professor of chemistry, The University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- WILSON, LOGAN, former chancellor, The University of Texas; president, American Council on Education . . . . . *Washington*
- WINN, JAMES BUCHANAN, JR., chairman, Archilithic Company; member, Academy of Applied Science; artist; rancher . . . . . *Wimberley*
- WOOD, JAMES RALPH, lawyer; chairman, Southwestern Insurance Company; vice-chairman, Texas Research Foundation; trustee, Southwestern Medical Foundation, Southwestern Legal Foundation; director, State Fair of Texas, Dallas Citizens Council . . . . . *Dallas*
- WOODSON, BENJAMIN N., president, American General Life Insurance Co.; former Special Assistant to the Secretary of War . . . . . *Houston*
- WOODWARD, DUDLEY KEZER, JR., lawyer; past president, Dallas Historical Society; former chairman of the regents, The University of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- WOOLRICH, WILLIS RAYMOND, professor emeritus and dean emeritus, College of Engineering, The University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- WOOTEN, BENJAMIN HARRISON, chairman of the board, Dallas Federal Savings and Loan Association; regent, North Texas State University . . . . . *Dallas*
- WORTHAM, GUS SESSIONS, president, American General Insurance Company; vice-chairman of the trustees, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- WOZENCRAFT, FRANK WILSON, lawyer . . . . . *Washington and Dallas*
- YARBOROUGH, RALPH WEBSTER, United States Senator . . . . . *Austin and Washington*

---

# IN MEMORIAM

---

JAMES PATTERSON ALEXANDER  
JESSE ANDREWS  
WILLIAM HAWLEY ATWELL  
KENNETH HAZEN AYNESWORTH  
BURKE BAKER  
JAMES ADDISON BAKER  
KARLE WILSON BAKER  
EDWARD CHRISTIAN HENRY BANTEL  
EUGENE CAMPBELL BARKER  
MAGGIE WILKINS BARRY  
WILLIAM JAMES BATTLE  
HARRY YANDELL BENEDICT  
JOHN HAMILTON BICKETT JR.  
CHARLES MC TYEIRE BISHOP  
WILLIAM BENNETT BIZZELL  
JAMES HARVEY BLACK  
ROBERT LEE BLAFFER  
MEYER BODANSKY  
HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON  
JOHN GUTZON DE LA MOTHE BORGLUM  
PAUL LEWIS BOYNTON  
GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS  
LEWIS RANDOLPH BRYAN JR.  
RICHARD FENNER BURGES  
WILLIAM HENRY BURGES  
EMMA KYLE BURLESON  
JOHN HILL BURLESON  
EDWARD HENRY CARY  
CARLOS EDUARDO CASTAÑEDA  
ASA CRAWFORD CHANDLER  
WILLIAM LOCKHART CLAYTON  
MARION NELSON CHRESTMAN  
THOMAS STONE CLYCE  
CLAUDE CARR CODY JR.  
HENRY COHEN  
TOM CONNALLY  
MILLARD COPE  
MARTIN MC NULTY CRANE  
JOSEPH STEPHEN CULLINAN  
THOMAS WHITE CURRIE  
GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALEY  
JAMES QUAYLE DEALEY  
EVERETT LEE DE GOYLER  
ADINA DEZAVALA  
CHARLES SANFORD DIEHL

FRANK CLIFFORD DILLARD  
J. FRANK DOBIE  
HENRY PATRICK DROUGHT  
CLYDE EAGLETON  
ALEXANDER CASWELL ELLIS  
WILLIAM STAMPS FARISH  
LAMAR FLEMING, JR.  
FRED FARRELL FLORENCE  
PAUL JOSEPH FOIK  
JESSE NEWMAN CALLAGHER  
MARY EDNA GEARING  
JOHN WILLIAM GORMLEY  
MALCOLM KINTNER GRAHAM  
MARVIN LEE GRAVES  
CHARLES WILSON HACKETT  
HARRY CLAY HANSZEN  
HENRY WINSTON HARPER  
FRANK LEE HAWKINS  
JOHN EDWARD HICKMAN  
GEORGE ALFRED HILL JR.  
MARY VAN DEN BERGE HILL  
ROBERT THOMAS HILL  
WILLIAM PETTUS HOBBY  
ELA HOCKADAY  
THOMAS STEELE HOLDEN  
EUGENE HOLMAN  
EDWARD MANDELL HOUSE  
ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON  
WILLIAM EAGER HOWARD  
JOHN AUGUSTUS HULEN  
FRANK GRANGER HUNTRESS  
JULIA BEDFORD IDESON  
HERBERT SPENCER JENNINGS  
JESSE HOLMAN JONES  
HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR  
ROBERT MARVIN KELLY  
LOUIS WILTZ KEMP  
THOMAS MARTIN KENNERLY  
ERNEST LYNN KURTH  
UMPHREY LEE  
DAVID LEFKOWITZ  
JEWEL PRESTON LIGHTFOOT  
EUGENE PERRY LOCKE  
JOHN AVERY LOMAX  
JOHN TIPTON LONSDALE

---

# IN MEMORIAM

---

EDGAR ODELL LOVETT  
CHARLES TILFORD MC CORMICK  
TOM LEE MC CULLOUGH  
JOHN HATHAWAY MC GINNIS  
BUCKNER ABERNATHY MC KINNEY  
JOHN OLIVER MC REYNOLDS  
FRANK BURR MARSH  
MAURY MAVERICK  
BALLINGER MILLS  
CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ  
JAMES TALIAFERRO MONTGOMERY  
PAT IRELAND NIXON  
CHARLES FRANCIS O'DONNELL  
JOSEPH GRUNDY O'DONOHUE  
JOHN ELZY OWENS  
ANNA J. HARDWICK PENNYBACKER  
HALLY BRYAN PERRY  
NELSON PHILLIPS  
GEORGE WASHINGTON PIERCE  
CHARLES SHIRLEY POTTS  
CHARLES PURYEAR  
CLINTON SIMON QUIN  
CHARLES WILLIAM RAMSDELL  
EDWARD RANDALL  
LAURA BALLINGER RANDALL  
SAM RAYBURN  
LAWRENCE JOSEPH RHEA  
WILLIAM ALEXANDER RHEA  
JOHN ELIJAH ROSSER  
JEFFERSON DAVIS SANDEFER  
VICTOR HUMBERT SCHOFFELMAYER  
ARTHUR CARROLL SCOTT

ELMER SCOTT  
JOHN THADDEUS SCOTT  
GEORGE DUBOSE SEARS  
ESTELLE BOUGHTON SHARP  
JAMES LEFTWICH SHEPHERD, JR.  
MORRIS SHEPPARD  
ALBERT OLIN SINGLETON  
A. FRANK SMITH  
THOMAS VERNON SMITH  
HARRIET WINGFIELD SMITHER  
TOM DOUGLAS SPIES  
ROBERT WELDON STAYTON  
IRA KENDRICK STEPHENS  
HATTON WILLIAM SUMNERS  
HENRY TRANTHAM  
GEORGE WASHINGTON TRUETT  
WILLIAM BOCKHOUT TUTTLE  
THOMAS WAYLAND VAUGHAN  
ROBERT ERNEST VINSON  
LESLIE WAGGENER  
ALONZO WASSON  
WILLIAM WARD WATKIN  
ROYALL RICHARD WATKINS  
WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB  
HARRY BOYER WEISER  
ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST  
CLARENCE RAY WHARTON  
WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER  
HARRY CAROTHERS WIESS  
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER  
HUGH HAMPTON YOUNG

