

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

PROCEEDINGS

1967

---

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE ANNUAL MEETING  
AT ARLINGTON  
DECEMBER 8, 9, 1967

XXXI

---

DALLAS  
THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS  
1 9 6 8

---

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, Texas 75226.*

---

# *The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

THE INN OF THE SIX FLAGS at Arlington was the site of the 1967 annual meeting December 8 and 9. President and Mrs. Kirkland were hosts at cocktails before the Friday dinner and the directors entertained Saturday afternoon.

President Kirkland presided at the Friday evening dinner and introduced Leon Jaworski of Houston, longtime member of the Society, whose address derived from his current membership in the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice as well as his accumulated observations over many years.

Saturday morning's symposium was concerned with "Thoughts about Cities." Principal discussants were Franklin I. Harbach, who spoke of his long experience in Neighborhood Centers work and his observations as a director of the National Federation of Settlements; and Gail Whitcomb, who spoke as a lawyer and a banker and a concerned citizen. Although Mr. Harbach was considered by some a liberal and Mr. Whitcomb a conservative, their presentations and answers to questions indicated that their viewpoints were not far apart. After a coffee break, President Kirkland, who was presiding, called on Hyman Joseph Ettlinger to introduce Horace R. Byers of Texas A & M University at College Station, who discussed authoritatively and delightfully "A New Look at the Earth, Its Seas, Its Atmosphere and Surrounding Space." Questions from members and guests made it clear that Dean Byers had cleared up many of the mysteries non-scientists had wondered about.

During the afternoon symposium, Vice-President Whyburn presided. Joe B. Frantz of the University of Texas (at Austin) discussed "Kennedy and Johnson: Areas of Agreement." To the surprise of some he demonstrated from the record that the late President and his successor in office were in greater agreement on major problems than many had supposed. Edward Harte of Corpus Christi gave a thoughtful and thought-provoking discussion of Conservation and its vital importance for now and for the future.

No one offered to argue the matter but several wondered how best the citizenry generally could be made aware of the significance of the problem. One suggestion was that Mr. Harte should offer his thoughtful and fact-filled essay for widespread newspaper publication.

The dinner session Saturday evening once again returned to Look at the Cities. Erik Jonsson spoke extemporaneously of what he had learned during his tenure as Mayor of Dallas and more particularly of the Goals for Dallas program which he conceived and is leading toward completion. The text of his address is substantially what he said at Six Flags, later amplified before the Corporate Urban Affairs Conference of the National Industrial Board, which graciously permitted publication here.

Members attending were: Misses Allen, Friend, Hargrave; Mesdames Gambrell, Lee, Northen; Messrs. Sutherland, Anderson, Kirkland, Gambrell, Shuffler, Vandiver, Kempner, Randall, Blocker, Browne Baker, Boner, Ragan, Pool, Edward Harte, Harbach, Fleming, Corneis, Jaworski, Tsanoff, Law, Gresham, Winn, Hoffman, MacNaughton, Tips, Whyburn, Ettlinger, Garwood, Frantz, Wardlaw, Storey, Mallon, Leake, Moudy, Robertson, Whitcomb, Richardson, Garrett, Parks Johnson, Elliott, Wood, Bates, Tate, White.

Guests included: Mr. and Mrs. Joe Belden, Mrs. Dillon Anderson, Mrs. William A. Kirkland, Mrs. Henderson Shuffler, Mrs. Frank Vandiver, Andrew Forest Muir, Mrs. Harris Kempner, Mrs. Edward Randall, Mrs. Carey Croneis, Mrs. Leon Jaworski, Mrs. R. A. Tsanoff, Mrs. Thomas H. Law, Mrs. Walter Prescott Webb, Mrs. Browne Baker, Mrs. C. P. Boner, Mrs. Cooper Ragan, Mrs. Fred Pool, Dr. and Mrs. Whitney Halladay, Dr. and Mrs. Edward Blaustein, Mrs. Newton Gresham, Mrs. Richardson Hamilton, Mrs. P. G. Hoffman, Mrs. Lewis W. MacNaughton, Mrs. C. R. Tips, Dr. Evelyn Carrington, Mrs. St. John Garwood, Mrs. Joe B. Frantz, Mrs. Robert G. Storey, Mrs. H. N. Mallon, Mr. and Mrs. Saul Baker, Arthur Blanchard, Mrs. Chauncey Leake, Mrs. James M. Moudy, Mrs. French M. Robertson, John A. Rose, Mrs. Gail Whitcomb, Mrs. Percy Jones, Mr. and Mrs. William Lewis, Mrs. Jenkins Garrett, Mrs. Parks Johnson, Mrs. James Ralph Wood, Horace R. Byers, Mrs. Don C. Travis, Mrs. W. B. Bates, Mrs. Willis M. Tate, General and Mrs. Paul Harkins.

During the business session, the loss by death during 1967 of Warren Sylvanus Bellows\* of Houston and Dudley Kezer Woodward, Jr. of Dallas, former President of the Society, and both longtime members, was recorded.

The Secretaries announced the election of ten distinguished Texans to membership:

Truman G. Blocker, Jr., of Galveston  
 George A. Butler, of Houston  
 Clarence Cottam, of Sinton  
 Joe B. Frantz, of Austin

\*Necrology notice of Mr. Bellows, *Proceedings*, XXX, 26-28.

H. Bentley Glass, of Stoney Brook, L. I.  
 Franklin I. Harbach, of Houston  
 Helen Hargrave, of Austin  
 Amy Freeman Lee, of San Antonio  
 Stuart Sherar, of Houston  
 Henry B. Zachry, of San Antonio.

Report of the committee on officers (Messrs. Ragan, Parks Johnson and Wardlaw) was presented, moved, seconded, and approved.

President Kirkland express his gratitude to all who had planned and participated in the program, then presented President-elect Fleming with a symbolic gavel. Mr. Fleming spoke briefly and graciously, inviting suggestions for the Society's 1968 program.

The Annual Meeting was then declared adjourned, to reassemble on December 6 and 7, 1968.

---

### *Attendance at 1966 Annual Meeting*

Members present were: Miss Allen, Miss Friend, Mrs. Gambrell, Mrs. Knepper, Mrs. Northen, Messrs. Acheson, Bates, Bellows, Bennett, Bruce, Collie, Croneis, Ettlenger, Evans, Flawn, Fleming, Gambrell, Garrett, Garwood, Gresham, Hardie, Hershey, George Hill III, Hobby, Hogan, Jaworski, Parks Johnson, Marvin Jones, Kempner, Kirkland, Law, Long, Lovett, MacNaughton, Mallon, Moudy, Olson, Pool, Ragan, Randall, Redditt, Richardson, Sharp, Shuffler, Frank C. Smith, Spies, Steakley, Storey, Sutherland, Symonds, Tate, Tips, Tsanoff, Vandiver, Wardlaw, Wiggins, Winn, Whitcomb, White, Woodson, Woolrich, Wortham, Yarborough, Yelvington.

Also attending were Mrs. W. B. Bates, Mrs. Warren S. Bellows, Mrs. J. M. Bennett, Jr., Vandiver Brown, Mrs. A. D. Bruce, Mrs. Marvin K. Collie, Mrs. Carey Croneis, Mrs. Sterling C. Evans, Mrs. Peter Flawn, Mr. and Mrs. Jerome Frautschald, Mrs. Jenkins Garrett, Mrs. W. St. John Garwood, Mrs. Jessie Geis, Lawrence Goodwyn, Mrs. Newton Gresham, Mrs. Harold Guies, Mrs. Thornton Hardie, Mrs. J. W. Hershey, Mrs. George Hill, III, Mrs. W. P. Hobby, Jr., Mrs. William R. Hogan, Frank C. Hughes, Mrs. Leon Jaworski, Mrs. Parks Johnson, Mrs. Perry Jones, Mrs. Harris L. Kempner, Mr. and Mrs. Harris L. Kempner, Jr., Mrs. William A. Kirkland, Mrs. Thomas H. Law, Mr. and Mrs. William Lewis, Mrs. H. Malcolm Lovett, Mrs. Lewis MacNaughton, Mrs. H. N. Mallon, Mrs. Fred Pool, Mrs. Cooper K. Ragan, Mrs. Edward Randall, Mrs. John S. Redditt, John A. Rose, Mrs. Frank C. Smith, Mrs. Zollie Steakley, Mrs. Robert G. Storey, Mrs. Gardiner Symonds, Mrs. Willis M. Tate, Mrs. C. R. Tips, Miss Ann Toomey, Mr. and Mrs. Don C. Travis, Jr., Mrs. Radslov Tsanoff, Mrs. Frank Vandiver, Richard C. VonEnde, Ed Vordenbaumer, Mrs. Frank Wardlaw, Mrs. Walter Prescott Webb, Mrs. D. M. Wiggins, Mrs. Buck Winn, Mrs. Gail Whitcomb, Mrs. Benjamin Woodson, Mrs. Gus Wortham, Mrs. Ralph Yarborough, Mrs. Ramsey Yelvington.

## RENAISSANCE OR REGRESSION?

LEON JAWORSKI

WHAT I WANT TO TALK ABOUT is crime and violence, disrespect for law, disobedience and all of the other concomitants that make for conditions that bring about a disorderly society.

The conditions that exist today are not traceable, in my judgment, solely to sources such as poverty, racial discrimination, broken homes and similar social ills—although these appear to be contributing factors. True, this nation has been guilty of failures of one kind and another from which we should expect to reap some disorder. But the main cause, in my opinion, is to be found in our attitude as a nation—an attitude that no longer embraces the virtue of a high regard for law.

Harken to the admonition of an illustrious Texan, Gov. James Stephen Hogg, who in 1890, after a distinguished record as attorney general and in seeking the nomination for governor, said: “. . . I take this occasion to express my fealty to the law. Neither sentiment, personal taste nor political principles control my convictions in this respect. When laws are passed they should be enforced, for they are but the commands of the people to their officers. Idle and obnoxious ones should be repealed, but none of them can be disregarded except at the expense of official integrity. A people who would encourage and not condemn the crime of official delinquency have but to wait to glean oppression’s harvest. A government that permits a law disobeyed, commits itself to a precedent that in time will be pleaded in justification of anarchy.”

How prophetic are these words of caution. Have not some leaders of government in our nation been guilty of disregarding laws? Have not some of them been guilty of official delinquency in permitting—yes, even encouraging—laws to be disobeyed?

One of the most appalling and frightening of the trends in recent years is the self-serving practice of choosing which laws or court orders to obey and which to defy. The preachments that generate this attitude are cancerously dangerous to our system of government under law. To rest upon or hide behind the claim that, if one’s conscience speaks to the contrary, justification exists for ignoring laws or decrees is but to say that the rule of law is not to be the governing yardstick of our society’s conduct.

If this philosophy is to be adopted, where are we? If the civil-rights leader in good conscience disobeys a law or court decree because it offends his moral belief of what is right, then why should not his antagonist also be free to exercise this prerogative? And if both integrationists and segregationists, as these designations are commonly used, are to be exempt from obedience of laws on conscientious grounds why should not the exemption extend to the Texas bookie who in his heart can see no moral wrong in the placing of bets on horse racing or to the tavern operator in our state whose conscientious beliefs lead him to no moral differentiation between the sale of whisky by the drink and the sale of a fifth by the liquor store.

The conscientious objector to the income tax may find this philosophy quite appealing. This line of reasoning can be extended ad infinitum and to major crimes as well. It is not difficult to foresee that, under a system where one's beliefs are to be the test, killings now considered murder would be viewed as justifiable homicide.

The inevitable result, whether this attitude be confined to violations of injunctions, to misdemeanors or felonies now on our statute books, is to weaken the foundation on which our system of law and order rests. It goes beyond such weakening, in fact, for it tends to destroy our moral concern for what we now consider wrong and evil.

I am not unmindful of the need that exists to correct conditions that may be the roots of crime. But the streets and the highways and the campuses and the beaches are not the places for recourse. Under our constitutional form of government, recourse must be sought in the legislative halls and by due process of law.

The doctrine of civil disobedience as generally practiced today is nothing but a trend toward organized lawlessness and rebellion.

What needs to be done? I have no panacea—but this much I think we can agree upon: Resorting to legislating alone, pontificating, “cursing the darkness” and similar acts do not give us the answer. Rather, it will take a dedicated and determined lawful uprising against crime—with the good citizens of our country setting the example in total support of law and order. It will require a militancy that begins at home, permeates the educational institutions, challenges civic organizations and religious institutions into action and continues in revolt until the ugly face of crime has been changed.

A few years ago, the country of Brazil was on the brink of communism. One government decree after another robbed the



people of Brazil of their freedoms and their possessions. Sensing the danger, hundreds of housewives rushed to their telephones to begin organizing a demonstration. Six days later, on March 19, the wide thoroughfares of downtown Sao Paulo were jammed with what the women called the "March of the Family With God Toward Freedom." Clutching prayer books and rosaries, a vast army more than 600,000 strong marched in solemn rhythm under anticommunist banners. And as they marched, newshawks on the sidelines sold newspapers containing a 1,300-word proclamation the women had prepared. It read in part:

"This nation which God has given us, immense and marvelous as it is, is in extreme danger. We have allowed men of limitless ambition, without Christian faith or scruples, to bring our people misery, destroying our economy, disturbing our social peace, to create hate and despair. They have infiltrated our nation, our government administration, our armed forces and even our churches with servants of totalitarianism, foreign to us and all-consuming. . . . Mother of God, preserve us from the fate and suffering of the martyred women of Cuba, Poland, Hungary and other enslaved nations!"

One bystander called the Sao Paulo women's march "the most moving demonstration in Brazilian history." Days later, similar marches were scheduled for several of that nation's major cities.

This action on the part of the women of Brazil, more than anything else, saved that nation from falling into the hands of the Communists. It is a stirring illustration of what a determined people can do.

Will there be a militant citizens' movement to bring about a new and different attitude toward crime or will we let matters retrograde to an even worse state than exists today? You and I, and other citizens across the land, have a part in writing the answer—and history will record it.

## THOUGHTS ON CITIES

### I

FRANKLIN I. HARBACH

IT IS NOT A CLASSIFIED SECRET that we are living in a changing and restless world. This is especially true in our larger cities. In this area of concern, we find many people in all sections of the city who are frightfully scared; some are looking for simple answers and some wish only to apply force to protect the status quo. In the better areas of town we have, in addition, those who keep moving to avoid responsibility and those who have a tremendous guilt complex which helps to muddy the waters.

I realize that this subject has been adequately covered in periodicals ranging from the "New Republic" to the "Wall Street Journal." Very little new information on the subject can be added, but I would like to point up some of the major differences of life in the poorer sections of our city during the workers' unrest of the I.W.W. era before the First World War, the marches of the unemployed during the Depression which, by chance, preceded the Second World War, and life in these areas today. I would like to cover the period in which some of us who played a role in developing our cities lived. The material I present today is based on firsthand knowledge gained while living and working in the poorer parts of cities in the East and Southwest. During these periods I have been working with organizations formed (1) to help people help themselves; (2) to find, by experimentation, better methods for doing this; and (3) to build bridges among the different cultures and economic groups in the city.

One of the forces which has changed our way of life in Houston during the past years is the difference in kinds of people, family life, and institutions in our neighborhoods today compared to the past. In the past our neighborhood people were poor, but a high percentage of them had an experience of community life in a small town. Our neighbors transferred, in many cases, a built-in organization from their small East Texas or European town. At one time it was almost impossible for anyone to be elected to office in our city who did not come from East Texas, and it was very common for the rabbi or priest to come from the same town as the people around him. Today most of our neighbors are people from

poor rural areas also, but our new residents bring few needed skills and no urban experience.

Then, too, in the past most of our families included a father who played a dominant role in family life; there were few widows. Although the father might not have been perfect, he did bring a certain male discipline to the family structure. Today many of our families do not have both parents living in their home.

To add to this, we find a large group of people who for a long time have been deprived of many of their rights because of their color; they are, therefore, most impatient with our lack of progress.

The second great force which has changed our life in Houston in the past years is the overall growth of city population. In most sections of our city, the rapid growth in population is considered a blessing. It has raised land value, brought in new wealth and industry, increased the number of skilled jobs, and, to a lesser extent, added work for the unskilled and increased the salaries of the more gifted. It also increased costs across the board—which people of the poorer districts found more and more difficult to absorb on their limited resources.

The enlargement of poorer districts because of added poor families caused greater isolation from the rest of the city. Unfortunately, this also formed large islands of skilled labor in some more affluent sections, such as Pasadena. It formed large areas of clerical and lower managerial families in separate areas, as around our airport, and large separate islands in the southwest of our city which were inhabited by wealthier people. As these islands become larger and larger, it is more difficult to build bridges of understanding and concern among the various segments of our society.

In the rapid expansion of the city, our section has been especially hurt by the movement of industry to the fringes of the broader community. This has forced many to buy transportation they cannot afford. On weekends employees of these industries spend most of their time repairing their old cars. A poor man must be a mechanic in order to exist. Compulsory liability insurance—which is fine for property protection—is financially out of reach of many of our people. After the first accident, they lose their driver's license. Here, then, they make a decision. There are two choices, both anti-social: Either they must give up their jobs or become illegal drivers. What chance do they have to avoid police records under these conditions?

The great growth of our city has, also, forced our police to use

patrol cars and, therefore, our law enforcement is impersonal compared to this service in our districts in the past.

In our schools, because of the influx of people, classes are always large. Our children suffer, too, in our large urban schools because all the students they know have the same background. Motivation is very difficult in this kind of setting.

Other great pressures on our people exist. We are recruiting and training a small percentage of the under-employed and unemployed to prepare them to compete as workers in the private sector. For most of our neighbors, however, we will need to create useful jobs, probably in the public service field. We are experimenting with these people as assistants to workers in services to their people in the community. Some help teachers in routine work. Others help in contacting and encouraging their neighbors to become more involved in the programs which will benefit them. To the neighborhood worker, this work is important and rewarding—at the same time, the neighborhood people are better serviced and community life should be improved. We believe that we can demonstrate that, by this process, future generations of the community will have the skills and education to participate in the private sector.

Mass communication is another great force altering life in the poorer districts. In recent years it has improved tremendously—and affected thinking extensively. People in our areas were not actually aware of the great differences between the “haves” and the “have nots” until they were exposed to them by television twelve hours a day in their homes. All over the world, visual communication has been much more forceful than oral communication. I found this to be true not only in the East End of Houston, but also in South America and Italy. In fact, in many towns in Italy where there was only one television set, the mayor controlled it if the town were communist; the priest, if the town were conservative.

In our country, television has increased the desire and demand for many items, since things that we all want are always being offered for sale. Poor people are given easy credit at high interest rates because it is anticipated that they will not be able to meet payments and that the goods will need to be returned. Because of this easy credit, they often overbuy. There is a great deal of friction at the point where their purchases are taken back, and I believe this is one of the many reasons for breaking windows, burning stores, and looting.

These are just a few of the extra pressures put on our neighbors today in our modern city. Different kinds of pressure, nearly all just as destructive from human standpoint, are placed on all segments of our urban society.

In the past indolence was blamed for poverty. In a rich country, we liked to think, anyone willing to work could support a family. But in our time, as the cities grew, we realized that not everyone had this opportunity. During this growing period we stressed opportunity for everyone for better education, better jobs, and better living conditions. Now we realize that opportunities alone are not enough; for not everyone can take advantage of them, or is motivated to do so. We are, therefore, forced to come to grips with what we call "hard-core poverty"—the poverty of disability and despair. No longer can poverty be dismissed as merely a moral or economic problem. Now it also is a social problem.

In predicting the future in which cities increase in size at a faster rate, life in our urban communities will become more and more barbarian. This situation can be avoided only if people who are in leadership positions make adequate plans and make their implementation possible. Just as in industry—these plans for the future must be based on a scientific premise, and all the different disciplines must be brought together to evolve programs and methods of work. We must consider this problem important enough to require that we become more involved than we have been to date so that we will be able to make sound decisions, some of which might be against institutions or programs which have outlived their purpose. It will mean that once the direction is agreed upon, lay and professional people must bring together their resources in the private and public sectors in order to reach their goal. I believe we have the intelligence necessary for sound planning. We shall need, however, real statesmanship at all levels of society if we are to put our plans in action.

## II

GAIL WHITCOMB

TODAY, NO SUBJECT is more discussed than that of minority groups. It is a difficult subject, and the racial considerations compound the difficulty. I find it difficult to comprehend, to penetrate, even to discuss, because it is filled with bias, hemmed in with tradition, and shackled with prejudice.

The only way the average American citizen is going to listen to the present call or to penetrate this burning subject is to be forced into it. I have associated and visited with the militants, the extremists and the moderates. I have talked to Texas Southern University students, deans and professors. I have talked to members of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee Group, to the Kelton Sams, the Lee Otis Johnsons, the followers of Stokely Carmichael—and, too, I have visited with the quieter, more enlightened and highly determined young actors in this group. From this insight, believe me, it is an understatement when I tell you that I am deeply concerned about the future of American society.

Remember that in the large American cities, the Central City is, for the most part, locked in, and it is here that the minority groups are increasing so rapidly. And here it is that they are taking over political control under the ordinary democratic process of "numbers." And it may well be noted that, historically, American cities—the large cities—control the selection of presidents. Certainly, a trend of this nature is a matter of concern to every American.

From my experiences, these few things I believe I have learned: (1) There are no pat solutions to the problem; (2) *Hate* is big business, with some person or group always ready to generate hate for their own selfish purposes; (3) To work with the subject is not the popular thing to do.

We all know that underlying this entire subject there are certain basic problem areas which must be reached and adjusted before permanent solution can be hoped for. Among the most critical of these areas are education, employment, health, and housing. Any serious student of the subject knows that it will take time—reason—and dedication—to achieve anything which resembles satisfactory results in these four areas.

Perhaps each of us in our own communities must seek to find a solution. Let me break off one little segment of this problem and explain what we have been attempting in Houston. Of course, we have several well organized efforts going forward in the areas of improved education, increased employment opportunities, health improvement, and low cost housing development. As a matter of fact, much is being done, with much good being accomplished, yet one hears nothing whatsoever of these accomplishments. It is discouraging that these affirmatives are not given more acclaim, more presentation by the news media.

A few months ago, shortly after the Texas Southern University

incident in Houston, the Mayor and Chief of Police called in a group of business and professional men to discuss the local situation. Houston is, of course, one of the larger urban areas of America and one in which the population count of the minority groups assumes regal proportions. The citizens of Houston have concern for their city and for each and every segment making up the population of the city. The people do not want chaos, nor riot, nor injustice. At this meeting, reports from other cities were reviewed. The question was what would be the best thing to do at that moment in the City of Houston.

From the reports reviewed, it appears that one of the triggers to violence centers around the activities of the police and boils down into what is generally termed "police brutality." This is an indefinite phrase but, nevertheless, a rallying point among minority groups. It appears that this really boils down to police community relations, or the image of the police in the community and among the minority groups.

In reviewing the situation, a description of the attitudes of the Negroes, the Latins—in fact, of the average citizen—toward the police actually startles one. There is an urgent need for deeper concern, for much better understanding on the part of the public on the subject of crime prevention and police activity in general.

We all know that the effectiveness of a law enforcement agency is in direct proportion to the respect held by the people for the law being enforced and the officers enforcing the law. As our meeting with the Mayor progressed, we came to realize that in our community we needed to build a finer respect for law and for the officers enforcing that law. The question was—could we?

Dr. Melvin Sikes, a practicing psychologist at Veterans' Hospital, a Negro of unusual learning and capacity, suggested a program with a new and practical approach; a program the purpose of which was simply to bring police and community in direct confrontation and with police talking to minority groups and members of the minority groups talking directly to the policeman. The groups were to be thrust together under the guidance of trained leadership and forced into intimate and frank discussions of each other and of the respective problems of each individual and each group.

After discussion, it was determined that such a course of action should be attempted and that a pilot program should be initiated. To do so required funding. A budget was adopted and a tax exempt corporation was created, named "Community Effort, Inc."

We are now completing the second of two 6-week pilot programs. We follow the general plan whereby the director of the project, Dr. Sikes, assembles a faculty of about fifteen members, principally psychologists from the Veterans' Administration, the University of Houston, and Texas Southern University. His assistant is John Murray, Director of the Houston Council on Human Relations.

The program was named the Houston Cooperative Crime Prevention Program. It is a cooperative effort among the Houston Police Force, the business community, and the members of the community. Each of the 6-week sessions is organized, generally, in this fashion:

First, the faculty undertakes to school itself in the problem presented and decides on the best manner in which to develop an agenda for, and to keep orderly conduct in, each of the 3-hour sessions to be undertaken. At the beginning of each session, approximately one hundred members of the police force and approximately the same number of community participants, particularly members of minority groups, meet in joint session, and the general purposes of the effort are outlined. It is explained that this is a democratic process and a means of listening to the points of view of the other fellow. An open discussion of the problem follows, with equal talking to equal. It is a study of the image which each has of himself and of the image which each group has of the members of the other group. Then, following the general joint session, the police and the community participants are separated, each group headed by one of the trained members of the faculty. In these separate sessions the police, with a prearranged agenda, discuss how they see themselves. The members of the community discuss how they see themselves. Notes are kept on each session.

At the following week's session, the police discuss how they see the members of the community, and members of the community how they see the police, together with what they see good and bad about the police, with notes of these discussions being kept.

At the third session, confrontations are held between police and members of the community, and the notes of each session are read and discussed. Here discussion is open and it immediately becomes personal and heated.

In the session following, the respective groups discuss among themselves the subjects which have been presented in confrontation.

In the final and crowning session, all participants meet. An



open, frank discussion ensues—an analysis of the many things which have been discussed by all parties.

The reaction to this effort has been amazing. (We have had evaluations by experts). The problem now is what to do with success. It appears that, undoubtedly, there is much to suggest in this form of confrontation in building confidence among members of the community and in giving members of the police an opportunity to better understand the individual members of the community. It is now our hope that we can make these sessions continuous. This would enable us to give every member of the police force an opportunity for confrontation with members of the community and, in the hope of building greater respect for the police and for the laws which they are attempting to enforce, we could have thousands of community members involved.

We are well aware of the many difficulties involved and of the near impossibility of changing the attitudes of many individuals, but we are finding that there are many in the community who are eager to participate and to learn. We are finding, too, that the younger officer is most eager to become better acquainted with the community, its individuals and their problems.

We realize that this is only one phase of the enormous problem, but we believe that this is action replacing indifference; that it is a beginning; that it is an attempt by the members of the community to find their own solutions to the problems of that community.

## A NEW LOOK AT THE EARTH, ITS SEAS, ITS ATMOSPHERE AND SURROUNDING SPACE

HORACE R. BYERS

*Dean, College of Geosciences, Texas A & M University*

PROBABLY EVERY THOUGHTFUL AMERICAN today realizes that the future of his country is intimately related to the progress of science and technology. Historically, our economic health has in no small part been maintained by our vigorous response to the innovations resulting from the industrial revolution. We are now experiencing an explosive growth of science, both in volume and importance of discoveries and in personnel and funds committed to science. It touches our lives in countless ways and affects our national policies.

The most spectacular scientific break-throughs have been in nuclear physics and the space sciences, but highly significant advances have been made in other fields as well. One could read off a list of accomplishments, but it would be about as long as a metropolitan telephone directory, and one would be afraid of leaving out presently obscure discoveries that might later prove to be epoch making. The biological sciences, the engineering sciences, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and the earth sciences have all contributed to the knowledge explosion.

I am going to speak of the earth sciences, or what some of us prefer to call the geosciences, to which I devote my career. The geosciences can be said to be concerned with different *spheres* of the earth: the lithosphere, or solid earth; the hydrosphere, or fluid parts such as the oceans, lakes and rivers; the atmosphere, with its varied weather activity; the magnetosphere, with its radiation belts and reactions with solar plasmas; and finally the spheres of the other planets and our own special star, the sun.

With the development of artificial satellites and space vehicles we have the opportunity of looking at the earth from the outside, whether by automatic picture taking from unmanned satellites or by direct viewing from manned ones. From the outside, the atmosphere and its manifestations are the most conspicuous visible features. A considerable portion of the earth is shrouded in clouds. These are seen most prominently in patterns recognizable as storm systems, but also local thundershowers and related clouds are discernible.

The atmosphere is therefore a good place to start this discussion. It is a far cry from the bumbling weather forecaster of yesterday

to the complicated computer-oriented and automated atmospheric science of today. When you look at the earth from the outside, the atmosphere is a bright blue sphere swept with clouds, here and there looking transparent and uncomplicated. It is hard to realize from the vantage point of a space ship how many political boundaries this atmospheric veil envelopes, how many national meteorological services are involved in describing its day-to-day, hour-by-hour actions. There are about a hundred meteorological services belonging to the World Meteorological Organization, a United Nations agency headquartered in Geneva, which standardizes, coordinates, and transmits simultaneous weather observations all over the world at least twice a day, and in certain areas four to eight times a day.

The late President John F. Kennedy, in an address before the United Nations General Assembly shortly after his inauguration called for a world-wide step up in observations, measurements, and studies of the atmosphere for the benefit of all mankind. The nations of the world and the world scientific community took his words seriously, and the national meteorological services, through their World Meteorological Organization, and the nongovernment meteorologists, through the International Association of Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics, of which I was recently president, have organized the World Weather Watch, an intensification of atmospheric studies along the lines that President Kennedy, with the full support of his successor, President Johnson, wished it.

Augmenting the World Weather Watch, now in operation, is a Global Atmospheric Research Project (GARP) a Tropical Meteorological Experiment (TROMEX), and a Barbados Oceanography and Meteorology Experiment (BOMEX) organized to solve pressing problems of atmospheric behavior. In all of these endeavors, giant balloons, special aircraft, earth-orbiting satellites, special ocean ships, desert and ice islands are used as measuring platforms.

Let us consider what some of the problems are. With the development of the new high-speed electronic computers it should be possible for us to calculate the forecast of major weather patterns weeks in advance. But to solve the equations in this time scale we need to consider the general circulation of the atmosphere as a whole. In the general circulation the warm air rises in the tropics then, under the effects of the rotation of the earth, develops into the great upper westerlies. Finally sinking air at the poles results in an accumulation there, combined with intense cooling, which creates a cold air mass that sporadically bursts out at the surface into middle and low latitudes behind cold fronts. This interplay

of the air currents causes our weather. Areas over the oceans, in the tropics and polar regions where observations are scarce, hold the key to this general circulation. If we can get the data from these inaccessible places to feed into the computer, we can test whether it is possible thus to significantly extend in time the range of our forecasts.

A host of other bits of information are needed in order to piece together the picture of the detailed structure of the atmosphere and how it works. The satellites are being depended upon to fill many of the gaps. Knowledge will be obtained to help usher in the supersonic jet transport age—to know what areas are free of turbulence and safest for flying.

Now we come to the oceans. Oceanography is a collection of sciences. At Texas A&M we divide it into biological, chemical, geological, geophysical, meteorological, and physical, listing them alphabetically. In oceanography, as in meteorology, there has developed recently an intense interest, not only on the part of Government, but in industry as well. When people make—and perhaps correctly—such predictions as that the oil potential under the continental shelf and deeper waters of the Gulf will exceed the amount extracted from the land areas of the Gulf states, the petroleum and other industrial interests sit up and take notice. In last year's session of Congress acts were passed to stimulate the development of marine sciences. One act created the Federal Council on Marine Resources and Development, which operates at the Cabinet level under the chairmanship of Vice-President Humphrey. Reporting to this Council is a 15-man Commission made up of Government, industry, and academic people. Dr. Julius Stratton, President of the Ford Foundation and former president of M.I.T., is chairman of the Commission, and Dr. Richard A. Geyer, head of our Department of Oceanography at Texas A&M, is vice-chairman. Another Texan, your distinguished guest speaker Leon Jaworski of Houston, is a member of the Commission. The task of this group is to study the needs for this country's development of marine science and how they can be met, especially by Government.

There is a great deal of interest in mineral recovery from the sea, aside from petroleum. Some diamonds have been recovered from stream outflow into the sea in South Africa, but one can be sure that such recovery is going to be extremely rare. Nodules of manganese cover the bottom of the ocean assaying in a highly pure state, but no one is now in business dredging up this important metal. Presumably manganese, can be extracted from mining

on land more cheaply, or at least with less risk of capital. Actually there is more to be gained from extracting soluble materials from the sea water, such as the very abundant sodium, potassium, magnesium and, of course, salt. Sea water is today a leading source of bromine.

The production of fish protein concentrate from trash fish such as menhaden and hake is being worked on intensively because this offers a cheap and abundant means of producing much-needed protein for underdeveloped, undernourished populations in many parts of the world. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has recently declared that this type of fish protein is suitable for human consumption. It can be produced as pellets or made into a fish-meal flour.

Another interest on the part of industry is in developing and operating deep submersibles or submarines for undersea research, exploration, construction and related uses. Several companies have invested large sums in developing submersibles of this type, but so far there has been very little demand for them. Perhaps we need to re-think our oceanography to provide for much larger support funds to make it possible to use such underwater vehicles.

Texas A&M operates one of the half dozen or so major oceanographic centers in the nation. The activities center around the 840-ton research vessel, the *Alaminos*, operating out of Galveston. The operating budget, by no means lavish for this type of operation, amounts to about 1½ million dollars a year. Among the various research activities performed, one of them, the marine geophysics project, is of great interest to the petroleum industry. It involves making seismic profiles of the sub-bottom structure in areas beyond the continental shelf that the oil companies haven't worked over. On the continental slope and farther out in the Gulf we have found structures highly suggestive of petroleum interest. To further these developments and to keep abreast of whatever we may discover, several oil companies have supported this work.

The oceans represent the last great frontier on this earth. Their exploration for the sheer delight of discovery is a very enticing venture. The spectacular sea floor with great formations equaling the Grand Canyon; the fantastic fish of the very deep waters; the fascinating food chain and biological productivity of the sea; the phenomenal interactions of the sea and the air to produce hurricanes and typhoons—all of these excite the imagination and spur us on to the discovery of new facts about this largely unexplored environment.

Now, as to the solid earth: In the last 150 years since men systematized their knowledge, geologists have been occupied with describing, classifying, and dating the land forms and rocks. Recently, geologists and geophysicists have been concentrating on the dynamics and kinetics of rock structure and deformation. A new subdiscipline called tectonophysics has developed in which scientists try to duplicate in the laboratory the processes which cause rocks to fracture, bend, fold, and flow. The study of strains and fractures leads to a better understanding of earthquakes, and indeed the great Alaska earthquake of three years ago has stimulated an organized attack on the problem by some of the country's outstanding geologists and geophysicists. Hopefully we shall be able in the future to predict major earthquakes, with great saving of life.

In this great sedimentary area in and surrounding the Gulf it is being realized that sedimentation isn't just the laying down of horizontal beds of sediment. This, too, is being regarded as a dynamic phenomenon. In the many geologic ages rivers built deltas, changed their courses, placed layers in odd overlapping forms and in general produced a pattern of active and changing transport and deposit. At the new U.S. Geological Survey sedimentation laboratory in Corpus Christi, research projects are being directed toward better understanding of these processes. Texas A&M is one of the centers for sedimentation studies working with them.

Knowing our earth is a prerequisite to knowing the space around us. In this field there has certainly been a knowledge explosion. The space between us and the sun is not just a dead vacuum. Clouds of particles are sent off from the sun. Charged or magnetized, these particles interact with the earth's magnetic field, which guides and stratifies them in radiation belts or causes them to flow in the brilliant aurorae. Beyond us, farther away from the sun, in the direction of Mars, Jupiter and the rest, we find the fascination of the unknown or the only partially known. These other planets are vastly different from the planet Earth, and therein lies their tantalizing beckoning to the explorer.

So we find the geosciences encompassing the planetary and space sciences, and dependent on solar physics. In fact it was a geophysicist who discovered radioastronomy.

And so, we at Texas A&M, under the able leadership of Earl Rudder, have built a College of Geosciences, the only such college in the country, to give Texas an important lead in this interesting and developing group of sciences.

## KENNEDY AND JOHNSON: THE SENATORIAL YEARS\*

JOE B. FRANTZ

IT IS ALWAYS OPEN SEASON on politics and folklore. In the past decade politics and folklore have so often intertwined that they are frequently inseparable and inextricable. Therefore today's exercise represents an attempt to disentangle fact from fiction in all that has been written and claimed and charged and refuted by the partisans of the two contending wings of the Democratic Party in the recent past. I am not here as a partisan of either man, though I have my private and public loyalties, but merely to examine—in Western lingo, to assay—to size up.

I suppose that I should confess that I am performing this examination for my own benefit, while you, either because of loyalty to the Philosophical Society or because of too much inertia to march into the market madness that is Christmas in Dallas, are my captive audience. This is a sober speech, which may not be fitting for either Arlington or for a congregation of philosophers. But I want to cut through the verbal maze of barbed-wire entanglements; I want, to perpetuate a vintage bromide, to unscrew the inscrutable.

The time to start this analysis is after the election of John F. Kennedy to the Senate in 1952. Lyndon B. Johnson had preceded the late President by four years. In the Senate the two men, sharing membership as members of a minority party, first really came together, or collided, whichever way you choose to interpret their overlapping careers. By this time Senator Johnson had already emerged as the leading legislative light of the Democratic Party in the Senate, ably advised by his politically astute and powerful fellow-Texan, Sam Rayburn. The two made a team that knew how to put over programs.

On the other hand, Kennedy was looked upon as a cross between intriguing and promising. His name had been known since New Deal days because of his father's service and his father's insistence on always taking a whole big brood of Kennedys along with him. Young John had already had a break-in experience as a Congressman from Massachusetts, and in attaining his Senate seat he had defeated another proud and even more historic name, the very

\*A portion of this address was also given at a Western History Association luncheon in San Francisco in October, 1967, and is scheduled for publication by that Association in autumn 1968.

personable and able Henry Cabot Lodge. The Kennedy campaign tea parties and the Kennedy approach to pragmatic wooing of the women's vote had become a topic of some national interest, largely because it brought a fresh quality onto a scene whose politicking is too often repetitious.

But at this juncture, and until January 1961, John F. Kennedy was officially a junior Senator who looked to his more powerful senior, the Senator from Texas, for general guidance and assistance. The fact that Senator Johnson was the youngest Democratic leader of the Senate in history and would shortly become the youngest Senate Majority Leader did not take away from the fact that the Junior Senator from Massachusetts was a youth indeed. The fact, too, that the junior Senator was handsome, unmarried, and much in demand socially did not detract from his interest as good copy for the press and television. It was Senate Majority Leader Johnson who gave the junior Senator's career a major advance by naming him to the valued Foreign Relations Committee.

As far as our trans-Mississippi world is concerned, the two men naturally represented differing attitudes. Senator Johnson was a marginal Westerner, living a little more than an hour's drive west of the Balcones Fault line which geographically, geologically, and culturally divides Texas into the South and the West. Johnson definitely lived in western country, deficient in rainfall, spacious and sparse, good for grazing and deer hunting and not much else. The LBJ Ranch might not be a true ranch in the western concept of size,—unless you're a Californian who calls everything larger than a parking lot a ranch—but it was a true ranch in its approach to agriculture. Except for some peach orchards, no one in his area knew any past nor foresaw any future for ordinary farming. You could raise white-faced Herefords if your land had some springs or streams, or you could raise sheep and goats if your land belonged to the less watered, rocky patches. Beyond that, besides egg-sized peaches suitable chiefly for Fredericksburg brandy, about your only crops would be pecans and prayer.

The fact that Senator Johnson's home district also encompassed land to the east of the Balcones Fault, a region which in reality is a continuation of the broad southern Mississippi Valley, and the fact that Texas itself had once been a member in good standing of the Confederate States of America meant that perforce Johnson must represent some Southern attitudes and that he must also bear the political onus of being tagged as a Southerner.

Senator Kennedy, of course, belonged to an entirely different breed. Although he came from enormous wealth, his family had



risen recently enough to remember the aspirations and frequent inconveniences of being Boston Irish. He represented an area in which ethnic differences were contradictorily sublimated and intensified. He represented an area where people worked for wages, and expected their children to work for wages also. He represented urban America with all its stresses, sophistications, and strengths.

There was just enough gap in the age of the two Senators that the junior Senator had missed the shock of the Great Depression, and had been a presumably happy prep school and college boy when Lyndon Johnson was sticking his neck out for New Deal fervor. JFK's approach to the problems of hard times were arrived at intellectually and rationally rather than emotionally and subjectively.

So far as can be ascertained, as fellow Senators in the same party the two men worked together with reasonable harmony and friendliness. Probably warmth was missing, but this is not too surprising. As the leader of his party in the Senate, Johnson worked long hours and did little else than work. Senator Kennedy fitted work in with other endeavors, including his well publicized romance and marriage to the future First Lady. Each man at times represented his sectional interest, though both obviously were struggling to rise above mere sectional representation.

Examining their records in general, one finds that they tended to vote together on most issues, but varied on specifics. It is a reasonable assumption that Senator Kennedy followed the lead of his party's chief representative in the Senate and pursued a separate path only when party leadership as represented by Senator Johnson did not take a determined party stand. These were, you know, the days of the Eisenhower administration when most of the time Eisenhower's progressive support came from the Democratic leadership in both Houses. The policy of loyal opposition as practiced by Rayburn and Johnson took the form of support where White House suggestions seemed to them in the national interest. They objected only when opposition did not mean purposeful obstructionism.

Two items in this Eisenhower period—one anecdotal and the other political—can be cited for whatever they are worth in asaying the amount of warmth and understanding between the two Senators. On one occasion a Texas professor, not this one, complained to George Reedy that Senator Johnson lacked a sense of humor. In denial Reedy offered this bit of evidence:

As Majority Leader, Senator Johnson naturally insisted that all Democratic proposals pass through his hands. One day, he was

standing at his aisle desk at the front of the Senate chamber when Senator Kennedy, like a respectable junior, came quietly down the aisle to ask permission to introduce a resolution commemorating some anniversary of Arthur Fielder and the Boston Pops orchestra. Johnson pretended not to hear the request. Kennedy repeated the request in a louder tone, and again Johnson, inclining his ear closely toward the junior Senator's head, did not get it quite clear. A third time Kennedy gave his request, this time loud enough that other Senators within the immediate area could hear. Johnson, now with an audience, grinned at his colleague from Massachusetts and with an affectionate slap, said, "Oh come John, this is the United States Senate. We can't take its valuable time for resolutions on every fife and drum corps in the United States!"

(I might add that I have told this story to solid Kennedy adherents who did not find it the least bit humorous or heartwarming.)

The other story, authenticable, is rooted in the exciting contest between Senator Kennedy and Senator Kefauver for the Democratic nomination for Vice President in 1956. As you will recall, the contest very quickly evolved into a two-man fight. The Texas delegation, which had been looking the other way, dramatically switched its allegiance to Senator Kennedy at the personal urging of its principal delegate, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson. At the moment the determination of Johnson to support Kennedy was considered to be a crucial break-through, but other states then began switching one way or the other, with enough of them going for Kefauver to give the Senator from Tennessee the nomination. Most pundits agree that Kennedy was the long-range winner by not running for Vice President in a losing cause.

Before you accuse Senator Johnson of trying to put his junior Senator out of future running for President, you must recall that Senator Johnson's personal hero was Franklin D. Roosevelt, who himself had once been persuaded to accept a Vice Presidential nomination in a losing cause, and yet Roosevelt has come down in history in political circles as *The Champ*. Senator Johnson, like Senator Kennedy, was too historically astute not to realize that a national race, albeit a losing one, in which the contender is not the front runner, can give a man a national name without any of the burden of being tagged a loser.

Johnson, of course, had one advantage over his junior colleague, insofar as Texans are concerned. Johnson discussed western problems with an easy familiarity that made him immediately accept-

able as a fellow-Westerner. He had worked on western road gangs under the broiling sun, he had doctored cattle, and he had alternately raged and prayed as the weeks crawled by with hardly a cloud in the sky, while his land parched and withered away.

When he was in the West, Kennedy countered this lack of western exposure by reiterating in almost every speech the undeniable fact that two of the greatest friends—he always insisted, the two greatest—of the West had been two New Yorkers, both named Roosevelt. The inference was inescapable: If you want a third great friend, go a little farther east to Massachusetts.

Many people might claim that Johnson had one insuperable advantage. As Senate Majority Leader after 1954, he was in a position to grab much more publicity and credit for any development and legislation that might take place. This argument can be disposed of by the fact that he was also much more exposed politically, and that his kind of exposure was the same kind that had ruined Presidential ambitions for such stalwarts as Henry Clay and Robert Taft.

So much for generalities. Let's look at the record, as that earlier Democrat often suggested. First, a hard look at the West. With regard to disposal and management of the public domain, a federal land policy persists which has satisfied neither the proponents of state ownership nor the advocates of federal management or private ownership; neither Easterners nor Westerners; neither cattlemen nor sheep ranches; neither the range livestock industry nor the conservationists; neither Kennedy nor Johnson, as Senators or as Presidents, have concentrated on this problem, which continues almost as it always has. On the other hand, the budgets for such divisions of our public life as the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, National Parks Service, and Forest Service have consistently doubled, trebled, and risen even more spectacularly, invariably with the support of these two men, so that the West can be said to have profited from their presence.

Opposition counter to this claim is that both men are by nature spenders from the public purse, and that they will invariably increase budgets because of their inherent prodigality. And there is the even more conservative charge that both men were dedicated to the extension of federal control at the expense of local and private enterprise. In turn that assention can be refuted by pointing out that, for example, although the Bureau of Land Management has "found it difficult if not impossible to build support for its program which might counterbalance the opposing political power of stockmen," nonetheless the budget of the BLM "roughly

tripled" under the serene and passive administration of President Eisenhower.

One of the issues which can provoke arguments without end is the construction of dams, particularly for production of power. To some people in arid lands federally-constructed dams are sacred cows, no more to be damned in concept than motherhood or Mormons. To others, inundating lands with dammed-up water, especially at federal expense, is so much "big dam foolishness," as the signs along the river Kaw proclaimed a decade ago.

Throughout, one fervent and consistent adherent to the construction of dams at federal expense has been Lyndon Johnson. When in 1958 Senator Johnson published "My Political Philosophy," he wrote the following:

"Our nation, like all nations, is possessed of certain resources—resources of nature, resources of position, and resources of the human mind. Thus whatever we are to be we must build from those things at our disposal, and to content ourselves with less than the ultimate potential is to deny our heritage and our duty.

"Obviously, having come from a land like Texas, I feel this strongly. Of all endeavors on which I have worked in public life, I am proudest of the accomplishments in developing the Lower Colorado River during the 1930's and 1940's. It is not the damming of the stream or the harnessing of the floods in which I take pride, but, rather, in the ending of the waste of the region.

"The region—so unproductive and insignificant in capacity in my youth—is now a vital part of the national economy and potential. More important, the wastage of human resources in the whole region has been reduced. New horizons have been opened for the fulfillment of young minds, if by nothing more than the advent of electricity into rural homes. Men and women have been released from the waste of drudgery and toil against the unyielding rock of the Texas hills. This is fulfillment of the true responsibility of government."

Shortly after Johnson went to Congress as a youth not quite thirty, he wangled an appointment with President Franklin D. Roosevelt to discuss extension of cheap public power to his district through the use of federal funds. The state of Texas had already undertaken a series of dams on its Colorado River for reclamation and flood control, plus a parallel purpose of producing cheap electric power. However, the bureau chiefs felt that Johnson's Hill Country was too sparsely populated to provide with power. It simply was not economic. The freshman Congressman showed Roosevelt pictures and detailed figures, and in a manner which has

become familiar to the nation since, told the President that he wanted a better life for the children of his constituents than he and his father and his grandfather had known.

The result was approval of the necessary federal funds to bring electricity to his district and a farm-by-farm stumping of the district to form co-ops in what he often called the battle of public power against the privately-owned "power trust," which always suggested Wall Street and "the interests" to his constituents. Soon he had the largest co-op in the nation, the Pedernales Electric Co-Operative, with headquarters in Johnson City, with rates 25% cheaper than they had been in neighboring areas. Shortly afterwards, his work culminated with the purchase by the Lower Colorado River Authority of the plants and equipment of a complex of privately-owned electric companies in 16 Texas counties, most of them in Johnson's 10th District. Before his first two years were up, he had obtained more than \$70,000,000 for his Hill Country district in federal loans, grants, and projects, a bit of a record for a freshman in those days. As he observed, in typical Johnson fashion, all he wanted was for the farm women to "lay aside their corrugated washboards and let their red-hot cookstoves cool off while they iron on a hot August afternoon" and to enable the "farmer who has been dragging water out of a well with a bucket all his life" to "get himself an electric pump to do the work" as well as all the "power he can afford to buy to run it."

It is in this field of reclamation and power that the Johnson-Kennedy Senatorial association is most notable. To such proposals Johnson brought fifteen years of official involvement. Kennedy's interest was more recent, largely because he was younger but also because he represented an area in which capturing water has been less crucial.

Usually the two men voted together on so-called reclamation projects, though not always. For instance, when Senator Wayne Morse, then a recently converted Democrat, proposed an amendment to the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria land reclamation project in the Southern Pacific Basin of California so that no single landowner might receive water for more than 160 acres, or 320 if married, Johnson voted against the amendment. Kennedy was absent, though it was announced that if he had been present he would have voted *for* the amendment.

As regards the bill providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Kennedy voted for the measure while Senator

Johnson voted against it. On Senator Long's amendment to the bill, designed to keep control in Congress of the funds to be spent rather than granting full authority to the company, Johnson voted *for* Congress while Kennedy voted *for* the corporation. This time Kennedy voted with the winners.

On relatively routine measures, such as the 1954 river and harbor bill, JFK and LBJ almost invariably voted *yea* together. A study of their voting and occasional debating records indicates that the similar voting records were more a matter of party accord than of any ideological warmth. The only divergence here appears in the 1957 River and Harbor and Flood Control Act in which LBJ voted with a two-to-one majority, with JFK again being absent but Senator Mansfield announcing that if he had been present he would have voted *nay*. On the 1954 River and Harbor Act, Kennedy offered an amendment which would have required United States Steel to pay half the cost of some dredging in the Delaware River rather than having the federal government pay the entire cost. Johnson and 18 others supported the Kennedy amendment, which was soundly trounced.

Then came Hell's Canyon, along with Dixon-Yates, the biggest public power controversy of the Eisenhower administration. Toward the end of his administration President Harry Truman had approved plans under which the federal government would build a high multi-purpose dam costing \$500 million on the Snake River where it follows the Idaho-Oregon boundary. The Idaho Power Company said such a high dam was unnecessary, and that private companies could do a more efficient and cheaper job with three smaller dams. With President Eisenhower supporting private exploitation, the Federal Power Commission in 1955 granted a license for private production of power in Hell's Canyon. The advocates of public power tried to push legislation in favor of the federally-built-and-operated dam through Congress for three years from 1955 through 1957. They lost every time. Some evidence of local feeling may be gleaned from the fact that Eisenhower's Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, resigned to contest Wayne Morse for his Senate seat. McKay's defeat has been charged to his advocacy of private power.

On the votes both JFK and LBJ invariably voted *yea*. On the 1957 vote, which passed the Senate by 45 to 38, Senator Johnson did not vote because he was paired with the absent Senator William Knowland, but stated "If I were at liberty to vote I would vote '*yea*.'" During the debate on the bill, the Majority Leader spoke in its favor. Senator Kennedy was silent. Kennedy's objec-

tion to Hell's Canyon was one of economy—he thought that here the government could save money. But as he ruefully admitted to Theodore C. Sorenson, “We made a lot of enemies for nothing.”

On one other occasion on the issue of federal dams, the two Senators diverged. In 1955 Senate Bill 500 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a Colorado River Storage Project and participating projects. This project was pushed by many conservatives, including President Eisenhower, because of its interstate quality and the undeniable fact that the lands were being ruined by timber overcutting and overgrazing. In an area without much moisture, any gashes in the forest or any disappearing of grasslands were scars that perhaps would never heal. Was this land to become another vast emptiness like the dust bowl from Kansas through Okie country into the Texas Panhandle? To head off such a result, President Eisenhower signed an appropriation bill of \$760 million for the Upper Colorado River irrigation and reclamation project that would provide reservoirs, dams and power plants, and transmission facilities for the area. Johnson voted for the bill, which passed by better than two-to-one. Once again Kennedy was absent, though Senator Clements announced that if Senator Kennedy had been present, he would have voted *nay*.

The accomplishments of the Upper Colorado River Storage Project are well-known. As of this moment there are at least 28 participating projects designed to benefit a total of nearly 1,500,000 acres. Better than half of this total are already irrigated lands which are short of water. When completed, the hydroelectric power plants should have an installed capacity of about 1,300,000 kilowatts. Already Flaming Gorge dam has been designated a National Recreation Area. The three dams of the Curecanti unit along the Gunnison are probably two-thirds completed. Again Navajo dam, a 402-foot-high earth dam, was dedicated in late summer of 1962, while Glen Canyon dam has backed up Lake Powell for 186 miles to build an incredibly beautiful reticulation of green and blue water, varnished red cliffs, and other-worldly shapes that bids fair to become a major tourist area.

Undoubtedly, if “His Majesty’s opposition” had chosen to be obstructionist in the 1950’s, the West would not have had these booming areas and these enticing prospects as of today. But with Democratic assistance, the projects were authorized under Eisenhower, and have been or are being completed under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Leaving public power, a chronically plaguing question, as urgent in 1957 as it was in 1954 or in the Truman days of 1951 when the pertinent act was passed, has been the importation of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico to assist during the period of maximum agricultural labor need on the North American side of the border. In March 1954 a joint resolution authorized the proper United States agency to recruit Mexican farm labor in the event that the governments of the two countries could not agree on certain points. Probably reflecting distance from the problem, Johnson voted for the resolution while Kennedy supported the losing view. Neither, however, spoke out on the question.

In 1956 a farm bill came up aimed at providing an improved farm program. In its essentials it was non-controversial, passing with only two votes against it. It is worth little to note that both Kennedy and Johnson voted for the bill. But one other point is noteworthy. Eight amendments were offered to the bill. Six passed, but what is more notable is that on the eight amendments, Kennedy and Johnson voted differently five times.

Such a loaded question as ownership of the offshore oil of the Tidelands, which affected Texas, Louisiana, and California, did not get into the legislative chamber when the Democrats held a majority. Although all the non-Tidelands states were arrayed against them—Arkansas, for instance, brought suit to avoid the submerged lands act as an “attempt to abdicate the sovereignty of the United States to a few of the states”—the Supreme Court settled the issue short of legislative action by declaring in principle for the offshore rights of the several states.

I need hardly point out how virulent feeling ran in Texas over the alleged seizure of its tidelands by the federal government. In 1952 Governor Allan Shivers went to Illinois to visit the Democratic nominee for President, Adlai Stevenson, to see where he stood on the tidelands issue. When Stevenson declared for the federal government, Shivers led a successful movement to take Texas out of its traditional Democratic rank in 1952 and again in 1956. But in both contests, Senator Johnson, although regularly accused of being friendly with his state's oil interests, refused to desert his party and campaigned hard for Stevenson. Many Texans and other Westerners thought that Johnson was a traitor, as they would again when he accepted the Vice Presidential nomination under Kennedy.

In the latter days of their Senatorial careers Kennedy and John-



son both voted for admission of Hawaii to statehood. In this vote Johnson left behind such colleagues as Senators Byrd, Russell, Smathers, Sparkman, Talmadge, Thurman, and a man that he was then close to, William J. Fulbright, all of whom turned thumbs down on admitting Hawaii to full participation in the American political system. The two men also agreed on the Wheat Act of 1959, which President Eisenhower vetoed as a "proposed return to the discredited high, rigid price supports (which) would hasten the complete collapse of the entire wheat program."

Later, in one of Kennedy's very first campaign speeches, in Spokane, he stated that "It is time for a fresh and imaginative program to meet the programs of our Nation's wheat farms. It is time for a program which views the farmer as a great national asset—not an unwanted burden on the taxpayer. It is time for a program which views an abundance of wheat as an opportunity to provide hungry people with a decent diet—not as an unwanted stock of useless grain to be stored and forgotten. It is time for a program which sees in America's farms a true source of American strength—not a source of difficulty."

He repeated this statement in such states as Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, and North Dakota, adding at Fargo that from "The way we would handle the problem facing the wheat growers, . . . I think comparable programs could be worked out for other commodities." He reminded his listeners in Billings, Montana, that Theodore Roosevelt had called a historic conference 52 years earlier for the development of the natural resources of the United States, and then once again was heard the off-repeated phrase:

"It is, . . . a source of satisfaction, I think, to all Americans that the two Americans of this century that did more to develop the resources of the United States, to conserve them, and protect them for other generations, both came from New York State, Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt."

The list of endeavors and accomplishments by Majority Leader Johnson and Junior Senator Kennedy during the Eisenhower years is not interminable, but is too long to present in detail here. Together, they supported enlargement of the defense budget when the majority was voting to cut military strength. As late as 1960 they both voted unsuccessfully to override President Eisenhower's veto of the Area Redevelopment Act of that year.

Every politically aware person knows that under Johnson's leadership the Senate passed the first Civil Rights Bill since just after the Civil War. The beginning of the space program, the enlarge-

ment of atomic energy research and application, extension of reciprocal trade agreements, expanded social security, higher minimum wage, the soil bank program, the enactment of the National Defense Education Act, legislation to reduce corruption in labor unions and to protect members' rights in union elections—these are but a handful of the accomplishments of the Eisenhower Administration which observers readily admitted were made possible only by the Democratic leadership in the Senate (where Johnson led and Kennedy followed) and the House. As Senators, both men regularly laid their futures on the line, with legislation, with votes, and with programs and promises for the years ahead.

Later, as Presidents, both men tried to deliver on their promises as well as restrictions on executive action and the compatibility of Congress permitted. The patterns that were established during their Senatorial days definitely have demonstrated continuity right down to the present.

The remarkable fact has been that despite differences in backgrounds and the different focus which each man brought, their programs have been so nearly identical in principle and in degree. This may say more for the party than it does for the individual President, but it also tends to give the lie to those people who have confused styles with attitudes, thinking that because one man's style differs from another, then his heart and his mind and his principle must also differ. Johnson has been astute and active in building on studies and principles enunciated under Kennedy, while simultaneously expanding and accelerating a progressive program of his own.

Certainly for the past decade and a half the nation in general, and the Southwest in particular, have been thrust forward by policies engineered first in the Senate and then from the White House by one or both of these men, working either together or in tandem. For the Southwest, it is hardly necessary to go into what the two men have accomplished in such fields as industrial development, military appropriations in the Southwestern area, and other moves which have primed our regional economic pumps. You have to stop somewhere.

In the next several months you are going to be victimized by an almost intolerable smog of political charges that will have just enough truth to confuse and deliberately mislead. What I have wanted to do here—while still remaining more concise than Castro—is to prepare you for those obfuscating days ahead by an unemotional look at the recent past. While you may not agree that

credit for the spectacular onrush of the nation—with Texas at a rate far in advance of even the national average—is due either to Kennedy or Johnson, I do believe that you will agree from this rapid assay that the domestic policies of the two men harmonized from the beginning and that their areas of agreement have far exceeded their areas of divergence. If in listening to this account of their harmony, you think that one—or both—sang bass—or basely—then you, my friend, are the living refutation that the last of our freedoms was not plowed under, as a long generation ago was charged, by King Franklin the First.

## CONSERVATION

EDWARD H. HARTE

CONSERVATION, IN MY VIEW, is *the* crucial human enterprise, and I am happy to be here today as its spokesman.

Conservation is literally a global topic, as its aim is to preserve the health and productivity of our only home, the planet Earth, of which we, like all living things, are a part.

This idea that we are part of a global ecosystem is a relatively new one, not to this distinguished company, but certainly to the American public at large.

As a society, we Americans have revelled in our power to alter nature. I think Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* was the first challenge to our uninformed optimism that really got through to the people. She made us realize that we are indeed members of an ecosystem, and that it matters to us what other people do to that ecosystem.

Although the problem is global, its solution—if any—will be worked out on a much narrower stage. I propose to discuss the problem from the point of view of what we can do, here in Texas.

Texans, and most Americans, don't really trust conservationists. For instance, when Mr. Kirkland and I first discussed my participation on this program, he inquired very closely into my association with the National Audubon Society. Finally he said, "You're not against hunting, are you?" The implication was clear that if I *were* against hunting, we would just forget the whole business . . . and nothing better illustrates the low estate of the conservationist in Texas.

We are not highly regarded.

Our preference for watching instead of killing is tiresome, if not abnormal. Our passion for keeping at least small patches of this earth in a natural state threatens progress. And some of the things we have said about cleaning up after ourselves are dangerous and—quite literally—un-American.

Now, I admit that conservationists have been long on indignation and frequently short on facts. But somebody had to say that:

our air and water pollution are an insult to our humanity;  
our cities are ugly and getting uglier;  
we cannot pave the entire country and retain our sanity;

man hasn't the right—that it is immoral for him—to force any species of life into extinction;

we are building in this country an urban environment in which the animal *homo sapiens* is an alien, and that when enough members of any animal society are alienated, the rejected ones will destroy that which they cannot participate in.

But things are looking up for conservationists.

Science is beginning to document some of the truths known intuitively by conservationists at least since the time of Thoreau—that life worth living depends on an environment worth living in,—that there is, as Stewart Udall has said over and over again, “a connection between the health of the environment and the health of the society that lives in it.”

Experiments have shown that animals, adequately fed, but systematically deprived of adequate space and subjected to stress, will develop many of the social and physical ills that afflict mankind in an urban environment.

I am one of those who believe that an environmental crisis is building up in our state, imperceptibly still to most of us, and—in that regard—I would like to suggest to you three problem areas in Texas which deserve the attention of citizens of the calibre of this audience.

They include the General Land Office, our submerged lands legislation, and the need for the preservation of natural areas.

There has never been in Austin any agency of government which was primarily oriented toward ecology, and it is unlikely that there ever shall be. Some states have Departments of Natural Resources, with broad powers over state lands, forests, minerals, and fisheries.

We Texans have relegated these to a variety of jurisdictions—minerals to the Railroad Commission; lands and forests and marshes to the General Land Office; and fisheries to both Parks & Wildlife and the Land Office.

By now the bureaucracies are so large, and the interests they regulate so important, that it makes more sense, in my opinion, to re-orient existing agencies than to set up a new department as watchdog over the total environment. Along the line of re-orienting existing agencies, I would like to suggest that the General Land Office deserves serious study.

### *General Land Office*

Under its present administration, the General Land Office is oriented almost exclusively towards money. The policy is to *Maximize* present income for the school children of Texas, without regard for the future needs of those same school children—and their children—for open space, solitude, recreational areas, wild-life habitat, marine spawning grounds, or any other non-monetary value.

A more intelligent policy, a more modern policy, would be to *Optimize* all the various values which the school children of Texas can realize from their legacy of state lands.

I have seen in Corpus Christi two instances of what I regard as the Land Office's short-sighted policy of insisting on maximum monetary return to the exclusion of all other returns.

One instance was the Padre Island National Seashore. When this was an issue, first in Washington and later in Austin, the Land Commissioner, Jerry Sadler, led the fight against establishment of a National Seashore on Padre Island. Those of you who have been opposed by Commissioner Sadler know what a resourceful antagonist he can be. He attacked on many fronts.

Because of this experience, I was not surprised last year when the commissioner ignored a plea from the city of Corpus Christi for relief in an environmental problem in Corpus Christi Bay.

The problem came up in this way. The city annexed Corpus Christi Bay, in order to control the operation of shrimpers. Soon thereafter, certain restrictions on drilling in the Bay were lifted by the Navy, and a prolific gas field was discovered. Applications poured into city hall for drilling permits, pipelines and production platforms, and the public—which regards the Bay as the most important esthetic element in our Corpus Christi environment—demanded regulation to minimize the unfavorable aspects of a gas field at the city's front door. The mayor and council in Corpus Christi petitioned the School Land Board to call a moratorium on further oil and gas leases in the Bay until an ordinance controlling drilling could be drawn up, but the request was not honored.

I am convinced that no matter who is Land Commissioner, the story at the General Land Office will be more or less the same, because I believe it is the clear intent of our constitution and laws that the Land Office is to get the maximum buck off state lands, regardless of any other conflicting values.

But maybe we can re-orient the legal framework in which the General Land Office operates.

I submit that the broad and complicated question of how Texas administers its public lands is an important factor in the response this state makes to its environmental crisis, which I believe is building up. The laws governing this agency should be revised to balance *all* the different values—some of them non-monetary—which should be realized from the state-owned lands.

### *Natural Areas*

Another matter of urgent importance is the acquisition of natural areas throughout the state.

This is more important and more urgent than many informed persons might at first think, unless they are made aware of the speed with which land in its undisturbed state is disappearing. By land in its undisturbed state, I mean land which has not been plowed, treated with herbicides and pesticides, fungicides or fertilizers, and which has not been so overgrazed as to eradicate important native plants.

Ecology is a new science which includes vast areas of other sciences and extends literally over the entire surface of the earth. Obviously, I am not an ecologist, or an oceanographer, or biologist, or chemist, or geologist, or any other sort of scientist. In these areas I shall have to plagiarize, an activity for which my profession of journalism makes me adept. In the interest of saving you time, I will not stop to say when I am plagiarizing, or whom—I think you'll know I'm quoting.

Here and there in every state, one can still find an occasional tract of land occupied by most or all of the plants and animals that lived on it when the first white settler arrived. The members of such wild communities, having lived together for thousands of years, have achieved a stable relationship with each other, and all have been adapted by evolutionary development to the local climate and soil and to each other's presence.

Living organisms exist in nature as members of one or more of these complex communities, and the role the organism plays in the community is what gives meaning to its physical form, its habits, and its attributes. *Only within the frame of reference provided by the biotic community of which it is a functional unit can it be fully understood.*

It was not long ago that natural scientists thought they could study animals in a zoo. They now know that it is not the zoo, but

undisturbed natural areas that are the real laboratories of the biological sciences. It is here that we will train the thousands of ecologists we need to keep us from making more environmental blunders and to help us correct those we have already made.

Every year sees precious last remnants of once extensive plant-animal communities vanish. In my part of the state, where prairie chickens were once abundant, only a few hundred acres of habitat remain. In the Rio Grande Valley, hundreds of thousands of acres of brush have disappeared, and today there are only about 3,000 acres of original, productive brush for white wing dove nesting.

Natural areas should be preserved not only for study by future generations of scholars, but also for their stock of different species, races, and strains of living organisms. In other words, they are needed as a reservoir of genes, which we may very likely need tomorrow, if we do not destroy them today. This is a new concept, only recently beginning to be understood by those outside the academic community.

In this regard, a famous geneticist has said that an acre of the biological community of which the wild ancestor of corn was a part would easily be worth a billion dollars today because of the genes it would provide.

One of America's top wildlife conservationists recently pointed out that we have reached the point where little further benefit can be expected from the type of wildlife protection laws that proved so beneficial in the past.

The current decline in many species is due almost wholly to an accelerated shrinkage in suitable habitat. This is especially true of waterfowl.

The time during which natural areas can still be acquired is rapidly running out. Those of you who think something ought to be done about it should encourage government leaders, both at home and in Austin, to become active in this area. But inevitably, if really significant tracts of natural areas are to be saved in Texas, it will have to be through the efforts and generosity of individual Texans—and is the case in World Wildlife's efforts now to secure prairie chicken and whitewing habitat in Texas.

One of the most promising projects along this line in Texas right now is the proposed Texas System of Natural Centers, recently established by a consortium of Texas colleges and universities. The first of the natural centers is to be in Travis County, for which the group is attempting to raise \$1,125,000.

Other centers, each of several thousand acres, are planned for the high plains, the Trans-Pecos, East Texas Piney woods, coastal



marshlands, and the South Texas brush country. I would like to suggest that this idea of preserving natural areas is one of which you will hear more in the future, and I think it is something that merits the attention of Texans of a philosophical turn of mind.

### *Submerged Lands*

My third and final recommendation concerns submerged lands, as they are called in Texas law. A more descriptive name might be shallow water bays, because the expression "shallow water" tells the story. They are enormously productive areas precisely because they are shallow enough to allow sunlight to penetrate to the bottom and nurture a rich variety of plant life, which in turn feeds all sort of other life.

The state owns all these submerged lands, and they are administered by the Land Commissioner and the other members of the School Land Board.

Our present act gives only the most cursory nod to the conservation interest — and gives the School Land Board authority to lease land in those bays to private developers for periods up to 50 years. We recently had a case in Nueces County where the board in Austin actually set a fixed lease which will be applicable until 2017!

One cannot help wondering how smart this is going to look to the school children of 2017. Certainly any fixed rental that might have been acceptable to developers 50 years ago, in 1917, would be ludicrous today—and I dare say today's rentals are going to look pretty silly 50 years from now.

But the most serious weakness of our present law has nothing to do with money. It is once again a question of orientation. Although the law doesn't explicitly state it, the philosophy of our present act is that shallow water bays are "worthless marshes" and that what the school children of Texas need is industrial and commercial development in all those bays.

Nothing is set aside for other uses—for nurseries for our important fishing industry, for recreation for the millions who are on the way, or for water-fowl habitat, or any other non-industrial use.

We need, very seriously, to re-orient our submerged land legislation to an ecological point of view. In order to do this we are going to have to know a lot more than we presently do about our bays and estuaries. Specifically, we need a survey of the resources, along the Texas coast, and then, on the basis of the facts produced

by the survey, we need to identify the areas to be protected for marine life, wildlife, recreation and so forth.

A proper survey would probably cost up to a million dollars, and require several years—although the possibility of working with data already developed by NASA's orbiting infra-red cameras could cut both cost and time appreciably.

In order to get such a survey, legislators from all over the state are going to have to think like the lawmakers of a maritime province, which is exactly what their constituents do not do. The Texas coast is unquestionably the least appreciated of this state's natural resources.

There is a movement now to revise the basic legislation to strengthen the conservation interest, and we expect to go to the Legislature at our first opportunity with a plan for surveying the entire coast. Once again, I dare to suggest that this effort merits your support, regardless of where you live in Texas.

### *Conclusion*

In closing I should like to remind you that the face of Texas is being transformed at a very rapid rate due to man's power and man's ignorance. By power I refer to nothing more esoteric than brush shredders, land chisels, root plows, and power saws. These new tools enable us quite literally to destroy the environment.

That we are ignorant ecologically doesn't need documentation. But if you don't believe it, consider this ironic situation. In the Torrey Canyon crisis the British fought the oil scum with detergents, and finally licked most of it after a valiant fight. It was only later that they discovered that the detergents were more harmful than the oil. Oil killed 30% of the plankton in the area—but the detergents killed more than 90%. Another example concerns the Super Sonic Transport, whose impact on the environment was once thought to be limited to noise of the booms. The Department of the Interior is now studying the possibility, which Secretary Udall considers very high, that the supersonic booms will crack all the birds' eggs within its path. Even Ducks Unlimited may get excited about this threat to the environment.

There is in our state a strong ecological conscience. We are near enough to the soil to know that unspoiled nature and the out of doors are as important to us as our new, artificial world of booming cities and clogged freeways. But at our state capital, the ecological conscience of Texas has been mute. We can, and should, make it speak.

## BEYOND THE CROSSROADS

ERIK JONSSON

HAVING FOR FOUR YEARS, since becoming Mayor, spent essentially all my waking hours, and a number of sleepless nights, in study and thought of American cities in general and my own city in particular, I have reached some conclusions which I feel privileged to discuss. One of my strongest convictions is that while there is very much we can and must do through our vast technological resources and sheer dollar power to get at obdurate urban ills, we cannot and will not begin to correct these in any significant, effective degree unless and until we go "back to the people," back to where they really live; not in Washington, not in their State capitols, but in their home towns. We Americans need very badly to talk with one another, eyeball to eyeball, to find out what really is in our hearts and minds. That is what I mean by "back to the people." Let me embroider on the thought and begin with a series of questions which give some perspective to our cities and their crises. What is a city? What is it for? Why is it the way it is?

In Aristotle's view, a city existed "to provide a better place for people to live." Today, each of us and a very considerable number of our fellows from the President to the man on the street is fully alerted to the fact that our nation's cities do not well meet Aristotle's *raison d'etre*. We are equally alerted to exponentially increasing new multitudes and magnitudes of problems and complexities of metropolises and megalopolises. These seem guaranteed by an inevitable continuum of the population and knowledge explosions and by the equally real "revolution of rising expectations" born at the very founding of this nation and nurtured by communications and mobility so swift as to be unbelievable to one who lived only three or four decades ago.

Our cities, begun as clearings, forts, or farms a hundred or more years ago, are today flooded by a tidal wave of people. Judging especially by their public, but often by their private protestations as well, we find in the people great confusion and unrest—greater dissension and anger—than ever before. The hostile environment our forebears tamed when they settled here has grown hostile once more. It happened, I think, because a city is but a system for doing things for people, and in coping with the surge of exponential growth we forgot or failed to keep the system in the "human scale."

A city, after all, is to serve people as they apply their efforts, divide their work and use their talents and skills so as to maximize their value and to secure themselves and their families against the hazards of nature and those created by man.

A city is not simply for people. It is people—those who inhabit it. Their variety is as great as the kinds of buildings they erect for their use and the vehicles they choose to convey themselves about between work, shop and home. It is the contrasting and widely divergent variety of creatures—the tall ones, the short ones, the sweet ones, the sour ones—who lend the spice and interest to living which makes it fun and who impose on a city the demands with which it must deal.

Cities really are only tools, part of the kit, through which men accomplish their goals and plans. Unlike most tools in which each component is assembled for its contribution to achievement of the overall design objective, our cities are collages of units created to serve individual purposes with little coherence or regard for the overall ends of the society served. I am encouraged that we are beginning to recognize the need to improve them by first looking at them in total.

“The new wisdom about cities,” *Fortune's* January editorial observed, “begins with an awareness that race and housing and jobs and education and welfare all interact.” Put another way, what cares a man, long unable to find work or a job that pays well enough for him to have what he sees others enjoy, for the city? All he knows of the free enterprise system is that for him it hasn't worked well or perhaps at all. He listens to a different drummer.

A proper house doesn't make a good man or a good family, but it helps. Conversely, for people ill-housed, love and affection which reinforces the family—the most successful mode by which men and women have learned to live together—gives way to indifference, even hostility and hate, and another unit of our national life, a family, is shattered.

Or, education. What is slower and harder to come by? Few who lack it have the ability and perception to evaluate the necessary steps to secure it, even to the degree which might permit a small step upward. The energy of many, therefore, is channeled into learning how to stay alive in other ways—by the welfare roll, by stealing, by a hundred other means that combine to form the spiraling crime rate of this land we call America.

I was cast in the role of “public servant” only four short years ago as Mayor of one of the fastest-growing cities—now eighth

largest—in the nation. It is not surprising, having been for three-quarters of my life “in business” where survival depends on continuous critical self-examination and reasonably prompt action on problems, that I have neither adjusted to, nor am I satisfied with, the cities’ approach to problem solving. In comparison with my industrial experience, at best these can be described as late, slow, ill-proportioned to the magnitude of the problems.

High among the dangers of our approaches, I would count these:

1. For whatever reasons—the ability to understand or the ability to finance our cities—will continue their headlong rush to solve today’s and tomorrow’s problems with yesterday’s technologies.

2. Seeing the prospect for overall and long-term solutions, we shall not provide the immediate kinds of relief to people who have emergency kinds of needs even though we know the principle of deferred gratification has no legitimacy and less acceptance in the ghetto.

3. We may persist in a “let George do it” attitude. As *Fortune* magazine researchers and writers observed in a recent issue: “All U.S. institutions from street gangs to churches must be involved in the effort.”

This was recognized as intrinsic to a program in my city we call Goals for Dallas. It was instituted in the belief that to realize a worthwhile destiny, Dallas as a city stood a better chance to succeed, as did the business with which I was so long associated, if it had clearly established and *well understood* goals and plans in which *the people* were involved. Lacking these, vital decisions were at best expedient, injudicious, fragmented, and above all, made without the citizens really involved and therefore without any real relevance to what it was they wanted their city to be and to do. Except for the involvement of a true diversity of citizens in it, the values of our Goals program would have been nil. As it is, out of the program have come new levels of concern, commitment, and cooperation.

A group of Dallas citizens accepted my proposal that the citizens undertake to define our city’s goal, and shortly after 12 local writers were selected to undertake, with the help of Dallas citizens and authorities of national prominence, comprehensive examinations of current conditions in the city in all areas of mutual concern: government of the city, design of the city; health; welfare, transportation and communications; public safety; elementary, secondary, higher and continuing education; cultural activities, recreation and entertainment; and finally the economy of Dallas. There-

after, men and women (87 in all) of diverse backgrounds, creeds, races, viewpoints, interests, cultures, and occupations representative of the diversity of Dallas citizens were chosen to draft the goals—some general, some specific, in the same 12 vital areas. The goals pertain not to just any city, but to ours.

In the drafting conference, for which they had been asked to do substantial homework and in which they spent many hours of intensive but patient and understanding deliberations, these 87 citizens sublimated their personal interests and showed the highest order of unity in their effort to search our Goals for Dallas. Together with the essays, these were first published (and twice reprinted) in what we refer to as Volume I of Goals for Dallas. The books were studied in scores of discussion meetings attended by several thousand citizens prior to neighborhood meetings which churches, clubs, chambers of commerce, PTA's and other groups helped to organize. Thereafter neighborhood meetings were held throughout the city and in nearby communities. In each one, discussion groups were organized and then brought together in general session to report their conclusions. Votes were taken and recorded on changes or additions recommended in the Goals. With modifications ranging from minor editorial changes to complete rewording, over 60% of the general and specific goals were changed; twelve new ones were added. Ultimately 114 Goals were decided upon and published in Volume II. Some of the goals are long term; some short. For a few the cost will be great. Many can be achieved at moderate expense; some without spending a dime!

In many cases the Goals were so right and so clearly and straight-forwardly expressed that the beginning endeavors leading to their accomplishment could be and were immediately begun. Without doubt the Goals program stimulated the almost three-to-one approval Dallas voters gave to the fourteen items comprising the largest city bond program ever presented in the State of Texas. The approval was impressive in its scope; in the fact it was given in August, dogdays of a Texas summer that might discourage a trip to the polls. It was given at a time when bond issues were being roundly defeated elsewhere, and it was given in spite of the fact that twelve of the fourteen items required a tax increase rather unpopular at the time. (Ten days before our election, the President announced he would bid for a national income tax increase.)

Stage One of Goals for Dallas, in which 10,000 citizens ultimately participated, is complete. Stage Two is underway and

participation of even greater numbers of citizens is sought. With task forces of citizens for which, incidentally, there were 1,400 nominations to fill 240 Task Force jobs, we are now embarked on a course to cost the goals, establish priorities for their attainment and to identify the organizations best able or essential to achieve them. Both stages required thorough, careful preparation—time to communicate—to understand. The time scale *cannot be telescoped*.

There were those in the beginning who doubted both the motives and the meaningfulness of our Goals program. Some, I guess, still do; but not many. The need to achieve; the reach to understanding; the need to communicate remain.

Past approaches to city problem-solving have been as random as the patterns of growth which produced towns and metropolises. It is time we took a systems approach to begin with goal settings.

City or other governments alone cannot provide the answers to the cities' crises; neither can business and industry. Problems of the cities can only find final solutions in total frontal attack by governments, business, industry, institutions, public and private, and, finally and most important, concerned citizens. We unite or our society falls. Goal setting, *democratically* accomplished, gives clear signals to political and other concerned bodies as to what people need, want and expect. When they set goals for a city, political support for projects required to solve problems is built-in.

Even the most self-seeking political hack can apply the goals program for that reason, and the community can afford to support him because it gets things done that are otherwise politically difficult or impossible.

Washington has long tried to solve the cities' problems by fragmented approaches on the grand scale. But, individual citizens and their families are not *in* Washington, where the "mass approaches" are designed, and they are not "on the grand scale" or *in* "masses". This is in no way to deprecate Washington's efforts. We should be glad that ideas are being produced there and efforts made to solve our problems. The point is instead to remember people as they are—the little folks living in a world that has forgotten the human scale of things. They are dwarfed by the skyscraper, outsped by the car and plane, left behind in the race to keep informed during the knowledge explosion. They turn away from government proffered assistance, welfare workers, and do-gooders who do not seem to understand them. Lest too many listen too long to the demagogue who promises what he can't deliver and counsels

a return to the law of the jungle instead of the rule of law, we desperately need effective two-way communications and mutual understanding between government and the people.

After listening carefully to what the people say, it is equally important to inform them about what's going on that bears on their condition. Where an eyeball-to-eyeball kind of dialogue exists in an effort to achieve understanding of what the problems are, what has been done to date, and what might be brought about next, there follows a new relationship between representatives of government and citizens.

There is one other thing we must not forget about our countrymen. When frank exposition of facts as they exist is made to people and they understand the difficulties to be faced, they will accept some pretty bitter medicine. What they must believe is that the approaches are real; the problem-solvers down to earth; that the integrity of those with whom they speak is beyond question. When you go "back to the people" and ask them to speak out, you may not be served up what you'd like to hear. If you're the least bit phoney and don't really care when you ask, you'd better not even ask. But, if you truly want to know and understand, rapport is not hard to establish and they will lay it on the line to you. Then the amazing thing happens. Black and white, Christian and Jew, left-leaners and right-wingers, rich and poor, suddenly find themselves saying things so much in agreement that they look at each other almost in shock and surprise. There is common ground after all. That was the magic of the town meeting in our early history.

That is the magic of the Goals program as well: People talking to people, finding out their opposites aren't so bad after all; coming to conclusions through reasonable consensus, common understanding, mutual trust. We can have that in America again. The price is for all of us to begin, now, today, the dialogue that can bring us together again. We have been talking to ourselves, in little isolated clusters of folks with identical ideas and beliefs, forgetting that America was built on diversity; that we should be having our discussions with the sprinkled and sparkling variety of citizens that has made us what we are.

It is time in America to say aloud—and again and again—not, what's wrong with it, but what's right with it. And, I submit there is still much that is right—much that is good. Let's start getting together to do what we are smart enough to know to do. We have enough muscle, money, and time to do that instead of arguing about the unimportant.



Too simple the solution, too easy, too cheap? No. The disciplines involved here are complex, difficult, expensive. But what isn't that's worth doing? Too great the challenge, too dear the price, too late the hour?

No—This is America. It is all we have, and we are all it has.

As John Gardner wrote in his book, *Excellence*:

The fact that millions of men and women have died violent deaths defending the ideal of individual freedom does not insure the survival of that ideal if we cease paying our tithes of devotion. Unlike the great pyramids, the monuments of the spirit will not stand untended. They must be nourished in each generation by the allegiance of believing men and women. Every free man, in his work and in his family life, in his public behavior and in the secret places of his heart, should see himself as a builder and maintainer of the values of his society. Individual Americans—bus drivers and editors, grocers and senators, beauty operators and ballpayers—can contribute to the greatness and strength of a free society, or they can help it to die.

Ours must be a great effort; the times demand it. Each of us must pay our tithes of devotion.

## N E C R O L O G Y

## DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD JR.

1881-1967

Lawyer; b. Uvalde Coutny, Tex., July 19, 1881; s. Dudley Kezar and Anna (Russell) W.; A. B., U. of Texas, 1901; J. D. cum laude, U. of Chicago, 1907; m. Mary Lee Thomson, Jan. 4, 1911; children—Elizabeth (Mrs. Robert H. Jones), Mary Virginia (Mrs. Thomas R. Houghton). Began in civil engring work, railroad location and construction, southwestern U. S., 1902-04; admitted to bar, 1907, and practiced Austin, Tex., 1907-32; special legal and administrative work, Dallas, Tex., since 1932. Chmn., bd. of regents, U. of Texas. Mem. Tex. and Dallas county bar assns. Sigma Alpha Epsilon, Phi Delta Phi, Mason (33).

THAT IS THE DECEPTIVELY BRIEF DETAIL of a career that has left a lasting impress on his native state, as recorded in *Who's Who in America*. It is accurate, but it gives no hint of the quality of the man or of the multitudinous, gratuitous services he performed as a matter of course throughout a long and busy life.

At two crises in the history of the University of Texas he willingly abandoned his own work to help save his alma mater. First was during the now only hazily remembered war between Governor James E. Ferguson and the institution, in 1916-17. The Governor demanded the dismissal of the president and certain members of the faculty, threatening to veto the biennial appropriation if the regents refused. The regents stood firm and the appropriation was vetoed. Will C. Hogg, son of the famous Governor James Stephen Hogg and oldest brother of Miss Ima Hogg, moved from his Houston office to an Austin hotel and enlisted Mr. Woodward's full-time help. The fight was bitter but the Hogg-Woodward strategy brought about the impeachment of the Governor and a fortunate ruling of the Attorney General held that the Governor, in his anger, had vetoed the detailed allocations of the voluminous budget but left the total appropriation intact. Mr. Woodward later served, gratis, as guardian for a young grandson of his most vitriolic opponent in this once famous fight.

Again, after the regents had discharged President Homer P. Rainey, which infuriated faculty, students and alumni, and eventuated in the resignation of two successive chairmen of the board, Governor Coke Stevenson, a long time friend, phoned to ask Mr.

Woodward to accept appointment. He smiled and, after telling the Governor that he must have called lots of men to get down to the W's, accepted. The situation was full of dynamite. Tremendous pressure from all sides was brought to induce the regents to reinstate the president. Mr. Woodward took the position that the board had acted and the issue was closed, and the regents backed him. With firmness but with tact and courtesy he rode out the storm which was slow in subsiding. After going on the board, he accepted no new clients and handed his old clients over to his partner in his Austin law office. When he felt that his duty to the University and the State had been fully discharged, he declined reappointment.

He never resumed the active practice of law, but went daily to his downtown office where his friends visited him and he conducted a voluminous correspondence. During this period, when the affairs of the Dallas Public Library demanded a steady hand, he gladly accepted the presidency of the Library Association. That chore attended to, he became president of the Dallas Historical Society at a time when the twenty-year lease on the Hall of State required an act of the Legislature for its extension. This he managed single-handedly and without fanfare.

He was a member of this Society during twenty-two years and served as its president in 1953. At this Annual Meeting and at his request, Robert Gerald Storey delivered his well-remembered address on "Freedom Under Law."

He was a lawyer of distinction, a clear-headed man of business, a dutiful and zealous public servant; but he was infinitely more. He was a man of sterling integrity, courtly manner, and unflinching courtesy. One who knew him many years recalls that he never heard Mr. Woodward speak an unjust word or evince anger at any person—not that he liked everyone he dealt with, but that he distinguished between personalities and principles. He could disapprove of a man's principles or his causes at the same time he found things in the person to admire. Members of the Critic Club, which he attended regularly each month for more than two decades, recall his papers, particularly the ones dealing with his alma mater. He wrote not as a partisan but as a judge, stating fairly the issues on both sides of controversies and minimizing his personal role.

He died at his home in Dallas and was buried in Hillcrest Cemetery. Mrs. Woodward, his two daughters, and their grandchildren survived him.

## OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

*For the Year 1968*

*President*

RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING

*First Vice-President*

WILLIAM MARVIN WHYBURN

*Second Vice-President*

ROBERT LEE BOBBITT

*Third Vice-President*

DILLON ANDERSON

*Fourth Vice-President*

JOHN MIRZA BENNETT, JR.

*Fifth Vice-President*

HARRIS LEON KEMPNER

*Corresponding Secretary*

HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL

*Recording Secretary*

SAM HANNA ACHESON

*Treasurer*

BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN

*Librarian*

SAMUEL WOOD GEISER

*Directors*

WILLIAM ALEXANDER KIRKLAND

EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY

HARRY HUNTT RANSOM

WILMER ST. JOHN GARWOOD

GEORGE CREWS MCGHEE

RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING

EDWARD RANDALL, JR.

ROBERT GERALD STOREY

JAMES PINCKNEY HART

RUPERT NORVAL RICHARDSON

## 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
° McGruder Ellis Sadler . . . . .	1966
William Alexander Kirkland . . . . .	1967

°Deceased

## MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

- ACHESON, SAM HANNA, editorial writer emeritus, *The News* . . . Dallas
- ALLEN, HERBERT, general manager, Cameron Iron Works; life trustee, member board of governors, Rice University; regent, Texas Technological College; director Southwest Research Institute; fellow American Society of Mechanical Engineers . . . Houston
- 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
- BENNETT, JOHN MIRZA, JR., chairman, National Bank of Commerce and City Public Service Board; director, Texas and Southwestern Cattlemen's Association; Major General, USAFR . . . San Antonio
- BINKLEY, WILLIAM CAMPBELL, visiting professor of history, University of Houston; past president, Mississippi Valley Historical Association and Southern Historical Association; former managing editor, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* . . . Houston
- BLOCKER, TRUMAN G. JR., surgeon; president, Medical Branch University of Texas; consultant to the Surgeon General . . . Galveston
- 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
- BUTLER, GEORGE A., lawyer; board chairman, Bank of Texas; trustee, George Washington University, Grand Central Art Galleries, Washington-on-the-Brazos Association . . . Houston
- CABELL, CHARLES PEARRE, General, United States Air Force; former Deputy Director of Central Intelligence . . . Dallas and Washington
- CARMACK, GEORGE, former editor *Houston Press*; editor *The Albuquerque Tribune* . . . Albuquerque

\*Life Member

- CARRINGTON, PAUL, lawyer; past president, Texas Association of Commerce; past president, State Bar of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- CLARK, EDWARD, lawyer; former Secretary of State of Texas; former United States Ambassador to Australia . . . . . *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., retired Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States . . . . . *Dallas 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*
- COTTAM, CLARENCE, director Welder Wildlife Foundation; former research chief, Department of the Interior, and dean, Brigham Young University; past president, National Parks Association . . . . . *Sinton*
- 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*
- EVANS, STERLING C., president, Bank of the Cooperatives and Federal Land Bank; chairman of the board, Texas A & M University System; president, Wortham Foundation . . . . . *Houston*
- 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*
- FAWN, PETER T., director, bureau of economic geology, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- 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, founder, volunteer collector and curator, Richard T. Fleming Library of The University of Texas Writers; 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*
- FRANTZ, JOE B., professor of history, The University of Texas; director, Texas State Historical Association; editor, *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*; president, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Austin*
- 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; past president, Texas Institute of Letters; member, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . . . . . Dallas
- GAMBRELL, VIRGINIA LEDDY (Mrs. Herbert), director of the museum, Dallas Historical Society; vice president, American Association for State and Local History . . . . . Dallas
- GARRETT, JENKINS, lawyer; member Governor's Committee on Education Beyond High School; newspaper publisher . . . . . Fort Worth
- GARWOOD, WILMER ST. JOHN, professor of law, University of Texas; former Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas; president, Texas Civil Judicial Council . . . . . Austin
- \*GEISER, SAMUEL WOOD, professor emeritus of biology, Southern Methodist University . . . . . Dallas
- GERMANY, EUGENE BENJAMIN, geologist; 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
- GLASS, H. BENTLEY, president, Stoney Brook Center, State University of New York; president, United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa; former professor of biology, Goucher College and Johns Hopkins University . . . . . Stoney Brook, L. I., N. Y.
- 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
- HARBACH, FRANKLIN ISRAEL, director, Neighborhood Centers Association; past director, National Federation of Settlements . . . . . Houston
- HARDIE, THORNTON, lawyer; former chairman of the regents, University of Texas . . . . . El Paso
- HARGRAVE, HELEN, retired professor of law and law librarian, The University of Texas; member State Bar of Texas . . . . . Austin
- 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, EDWARD MOLMEAD, publisher Corpus Christi *Caller*; vice president, Texas Daily Newspaper Association; director, Texas Research League; member, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . . . . . Corpus Christi
- 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, book designer and publisher, The University of Texas at El Paso . . . . . El Paso
- HILL, GEORGE ALFRED, III, lawyer; president, San Jacinto Museum of History Association . . . . . Houston

## \*Life Member



- 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*
- 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 professor, University of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- JAWORSKI, LEON, lawyer; trustee, M. D. Anderson Foundation; past president, Texas Civil Judicial Council; past 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 president, 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, former chairman of the board, First City National Bank; trustee emeritus, Rice and Princeton Universities; regent, University of the South . . . . . *Houston*

\**Life Member*

- 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, retired 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 directors, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- LAW, THOMAS HART, lawyer; general attorney, Fort Worth and Denver Railway; past president, Texas Junior Bar Association . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- 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*
- LEE, AMY FREEMAN, member advisory council, College of Fine Arts, The University of Texas, and HemisFair; artist, critic and lecturer . . . . . *San Antonio*
- LEMMON, MARK, architect . . . . . *Dallas*
- LONG, WALTER EWING, supervisor, Texas Legislative Service; member, Texas Library and Historical Commission; chairman, Texas Civil War Centennial Commission . . . . . *Austin*
- 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, retired partner DeGolyer and MacNaughton; trustee, Graduate Research Center . . . . . *Dallas*
- MALLON, H. NEIL, former president, board chairman Dresser Industries; past president, Dallas Council on World Affairs; trustee, Southwest Research Institute and Southwestern Legal Foundation . . . . . *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, University of Texas; member board of governors, University of Houston . . . . . *Houston*
- MOORE, MAURICE THOMPSON, lawyer . . . . . *New York, New York*
- MOSELEY, JOHN DEAN, president, Austin College; former Director, Texas Legislative Council . . . . . *Sherman*
- MOUDY, JAMES MATTOX, chancellor, Texas Christian University . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- MURRAY, WILLIAM OWEN, Chief Justice, Court of Civil Appeals . . . . . *San Antonio*

- NELSON, FRED MERRIAM, chairman of the board, Texas Gulf Sulphur Company  
Houston
- NORTHEN, MRS. MARY MOODY, president National Hotel Company, Moody  
National Bank; trustee, Moody Foundation, Medical Research Foundation;  
member, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . . . . . 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, Justice, Court of Civil Appeals . . . . . 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; vice president, Texas State Historical Association  
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
- REDDITT, JOHN S., lawyer; former state senator; former chairman, Texas High-  
way Commission . . . . . Lufkin
- RICHARDSON, RUPERT NORVAL, professor of history, Hardin-Simmons Univer-  
sity; 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 pres-  
ident, 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, Of-  
fice of Civil and Defense Mobilization . . . . . Abilene
- RUDDER, JAMES EARL, president, Texas A & M University System; Major Gen-  
eral commanding 90th Infantry Division; former Commissioner, General  
Land Office of Texas; member, Reserve Forces Policy Board, Department  
of Defense . . . . . College Station
- SANDLIN, MARLIN ELIJAH, lawyer; chairman of board, Great Northern Oil Com-  
pany and Pan American Sulphur Company . . . . . Houston
- SCHWETZ, 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, past president, Texas State Historical Survey Committee,  
former Attorney General of Texas . . . . . Odessa
- SHERAR, STUART, organizer and president, Trinity Petroleum and Paddock Ranch  
Company; formerly with Humble and George Carter Oil Companies  
Houston
- SHIVERS, ALLAN, former Governor of Texas; chairman, Western Pipe Line;  
president, United States Chamber of Commerce . . . . . 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, retired, 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 Hainsworth 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*
- WHITCOMB, GAIL, lawyer; board chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank; past president, American Brahman Breeders Association and Houston Chamber of Commerce . . . . . *Houston*
- WHYBURN, WILLIAM MARVIN, former president, Texas Technological College; Kenan professor of mathematics, University of North Carolina; and Frenselley Professor of Mathematics, Southern Methodist University . . . . . *Dallas*
- 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*
- 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*
- YARBOROUGH, RALPH WEBSTER, United States Senator . . . . . *Austin and Washington*
- YELVINGTON, RAMSEY, playwright . . . . . *Wimberley*
- ZACHRY, HENRY B., president, H. B. Zachry Company since 1924; past president, Association of General Contractors of America; director, Texas Research League, Federal Reserve Bank, Southwestern Research Institute; former board chairman, Texas A&M University System . . . . . *San Antonio*

---

# IN MEMORIAM

---

NATHAN ADAMS  
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  
WARREN SYLVANUS BELLOWS  
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 BURGESS  
WILLIAM HENRY BURGESS  
EMMA KYLE BURLESON  
JOHN HILL BURLESON  
H. BAILEY CARROLL  
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 GALLAGHER  
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  
HERMAN GERLACH JAMES  
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

---

## IN MEMORIAM

---

JEWEL PRESTON LIGHTFOOT  
EUGENE PERRY LOCKE  
JOHN AVERY LOMAX  
JOHN TIPTON LONSDALE  
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  
DAN MOODY  
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  
MC GRUDER ELLIS SADLER  
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  
DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD JR.  
FRANK WILSON WOZENCRAFT  
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER  
HUGH HAMPTON YOUNG

---