

The Philosophical Society of Texas

PROCEEDINGS

1968



The Philosophical Society of Texas

records its enduring gratitude to

Herbert Pickens Gambrell

who revived the Society in 1935 and who, with charm of humor
and graciousness of spirit, has invested it with meaning
and purpose for a third of a century.

December 7, 1968

The Philosophical Society of Texas

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE ANNUAL MEETING
AT SAN ANTONIO
DECEMBER 6, 7, 1968

XXXII

DALLAS
THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS
1 9 6 9

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.

and edited, short chronicles of the lives and careers of those members of the Society who have died in this period, and

WHEREAS, Herbert Pickens Gambrell has endeared himself personally to the membership by his indestructible good humor, his innumerable courtesies and kindnesses and by the skill and charm by which he has invested the reborn Philosophical Society of Texas with intellectual significance free of stuffiness and excessive weight, now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the membership of the Society in this Annual Meeting of December 7, 1968, that we hereby tender our enduring appreciation and thanks to Herbert Pickens Gambrell for his devoted and unparalleled service to our common interest and assure him of our lasting esteem and regard throughout all the recorded days of our Society, and that a copy of this Resolution be spread upon the official Minutes of the Society.

The Resolution was adopted by a rising vote, followed by applause.

President Fleming next summoned bearers to bring to the head table a large, ornately wrapped package and without warning he instructed the retiring Secretary to unwrap the huge carton, which he awkwardly did, helped by volunteer amateur assistants. Extracted from the container was a magnificent antique silver buffet service of matching covered dishes and accessories with an inscription on its broad front. This heavy silver piece was hoisted to the podium and Mr. Gambrell gave a stumbling and unrehearsed reading of the inscription.

Dr. Randall then read the report of the committee on officers for 1969, which was numerous seconded and adopted. Mr. Gambrell's simple response to his election to the presidency was: "For years I have been critical of the seniority rules of the Congress, but tonight, as the senior survivor of the ten incorporators, I feel that there is something to be said for it. And I also recall that years ago the teenagers in the senior class of a small Texas high school printed a sweetly solemn thought on its commencement program: 'This is not Evening. It is dawn.' You are most kind."

Death during the year of two valued members was recorded with sorrow: W. Browne Baker and Lewis Winslow MacNaughton.

The names of ten new members were read:

Evelyn M. Carrington of Dallas
 Fagan Dickson of Austin
 Mrs. Ray L. Dudley of Houston
 Walter Gardner Hall of Dickinson
 Mavis Parrott Kelsey of Houston

William Jackson Kilgore of Waco
Charles A. LeMaistre of Austin
Merton Melrose Minter of San Antonio
W. Dewey Presley of Dallas
Samuel Doak Young of El Paso

The address was by Dillon Anderson, after which the Society adjourned, to reconvene December 5 and 6, 1969, at Stagecoach Inn, Salado.

Attendance at 1968 Annual Meeting

Members attending included: Misses Allen, Friend; Mesdames Dudley, Gambrell, Lee, Northen, and Tobin; Messrs. Hogan, Hart, Wood, Anderson, Flawn, Wardlaw, Gresham, Tsanoff, Butler, Randall, Bryan, Parks Johnson, Kelsey, Kilgore, Doty, Frank Smith, O'Quinn, Mallon, Kirkland, Sherar, Ettlinger, Tips, George Hill, Hershey, Carrington, Long, Harbach, Fleming, Winn, Storey, Minter, Ragan, Pool, Clark, Banks, Mann, Blocker, Hardie, LeMaistre, Bobbitt, Cottam, Dickson, Shuffler, Harrington, Yelvington, Gambrell.

Guests were: Mrs. William R. Hogan, Mr. and Mrs. S. T. Carpenter, Jon Ogg, Mrs. James P. Hart, Mrs. J. Ralph Wood, Mrs. Dillon Anderson, Mrs. Peter T. Fawn, John A. Rose, Mrs. Newton Gresham, Mrs. R. A. Tsanoff, Mrs. George Butler, Mrs. Walter Prescott Webb, Mrs. Edward Randall, Mrs. Parks Johnson, Mrs. Mavis P. Kelsey, Mrs. W. J. Kilgore, Mrs. E. W. Doty, Mrs. Frank C. Smith, Mrs. Trueman O'Quinn, Mrs. H. N. Mallon, Mrs. W. A. Kirkland, Mrs. Stuart Sherar, Mrs. C. R. Tips, Mrs. George A. Hill, Mrs. J. W. Hershey, Mrs. Paul Carrington, Mrs. Harris L. Kempner, Truman R. Lewis, Mrs. J. Buck Winn, Jr., Mrs. Robert G. Storey, Mrs. Cooper K. Ragan, Mrs. Fred Pool, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Stanuch, Mr. and Mrs. C. Hartley Grattan, Mrs. C. Stanley Banks, Mrs. Charles Gilford McCormick, Mrs. Gerald C. Mann, Mrs. T. G. Blocker, Jr., Mrs. Thornton Hardie, James A. Tinsley, Mrs. Fagan Dickson, Mrs. M. T. Harrington, Mrs. Ramsey Yelvington, Mrs. Richardson Hamilton, Mrs. Florence Rosengren, Dr. and Mrs. Herbert Puryear, The Rev. William de Wolf, Mrs. Fred Rohde, Mrs. Gibbs Macdaniel.

TWENTY QUESTIONS: MINERAL, VEGETABLE, ANIMAL OR MAN?

AMY FREEMAN LEE

BY PROFESSION AND MINISTRY, I AM A PAINTER, but I have never been interested in art as an isolated activity but rather as a contributor to the greatest art of all—the art of living.

Tonight, I could have talked on many aspects of my own discipline, but because of the very special nature of my audience, I chose to discuss instead something that is at the very core of myself. When I refer to the special nature of my audience, I am speaking specifically of the fact that his audience is comprised primarily of members of The Texas Philosophical Society. Since the stated purpose of this organization is, "To encourage research into literary, scientific and philosophical studies in Texas and elsewhere", I think this Society provides a proper platform for serious concerns of the mind, heart and spirit.

My primary concern has to do with the fact that cruelty, brutality and violence constitute major motivations in our society and that in my adult lifetime these motivations have gained devotees, and, consequently, momentum and strength. I call this discussion, "Twenty Questions: Mineral, Vegetable, Animal or Man?", because this children's game of identification should remain a symbolic one throughout our life! At the moment, it is imperative for each individual to play this game, because I think it is past time for us to recognize the obvious connection between innumerable forms of brutality in many phases of our daily lives and the violence that climaxes in such acts as the assassination of our late President, John F. Kennedy, and our late religious leader, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. We cannot accept the pat and simplistic answer that such horrendous crimes were committed by one mentally ill person, but rather we must examine objectively the factors in our society that produce such an individual.

Lately, I have been encouraged by the fact that the existence and operation of our innate violence are being considered by our mass media. For example, in the April 19, 1968, issue of *Time* magazine, the "Time Essay" was devoted to this subject in a penetrating editorial entitled, "Violence and History". Just to give the flavor of this article, let me quote a few key excerpts:

"And yet foreigners can and should expect the United States to rise far above its present status as the world's most violent advanced country . . .

"Houston is the U.S. murder capital: 244 last year, more than in England, which has 45 million more people . . .

"Even grimmer is the psychological impact of the King assassination: his killer, however twisted his mind, clearly felt that he had a mandate for murder. The appalling result suggests that all too many unstable Americans unconsciously identify with a kind of avenging western hero, and believe that one man with one bullet can and should change history . . ."

"The U.S. must utterly reject this grammar of violence just as it must urgently enact effective laws against the dangerous, absurdly outdated sale of firearms to all comers . . .

"Today every parent who cares about peace ought to be guiding his children to militant enthusiasm for some humane cause, the most beneficent outlet for aggressions."

While time will not permit us to examine all of the manifestations of brutality and violence that actually exist in almost every aspect of our environment, at least let us look at a few examples from two areas of our activity, commerce and entertainment:

The world of business and its constant companion, advertising, are fraught with symbols of violence. Right now I have a "Tiger in my tank", a "Mustang" in my garage and a "Barracuda" in my carport! For every "Dove" on the market, we have a hundred "Jaguars"! Two recent newspaper articles provide a succinct insight into our psychology of using brutality for commercial appeal:

In the March 14, 1966 issue of the *San Antonio Light*, the approach to car styling is accurately described:

"The tiger in the tank is climbing out and taking over the entire car . . . the feline look of the softer contours and the appearance of the big cat about to spring will dominate car styling."

The *San Antonio Evening News* on May 9, 1967 reported that the noted psychiatrist, Dr. Jeffrey O'Connell of the University of Illinois, had peppered an address by quoting some automobile ads:

"For stab and steer men there is a new three-speed automatic you can lock in any gear. Make small noises in your throat. Attaboy tiger. This model is just a friendly little saber-toothed pussycat. One of these at fast idle sounds like feeding time at the zoo . . . Drive it like you hate it, it's cheaper than psychiatry!"

In summary, it is perfectly obvious that brutality and violence in any form, potential, titular, implied or actual have strong appeal

to the U. S. consumer. Evidently, if you wish to make the really successful pitch to the mass of the buying public, one effective way is to give your commodity a name that implies brutality or violence.

The world of U. S. "entertainment" offers an even richer source of examples of cruelty, brutality and violence in the life of western man in the twentieth century. As a prefatory comment, I want to state unequivocally that I am not a "little old lady in tennis shoes" bent on sentimentality. However, while we are on the subject of women, let me say that, in my opinion, to point the finger exclusively at the male of the species as the brute is not only unfair but also inaccurate! Many women in our society have not only abandoned their role as the guardians, teachers and practitioners of tenderness, refinement and cultivation but also sponsor forms of brutality and engage in them. One of the most striking examples of this female retreat from the human level of existence occurs annually during the hunting season when they go forth along with their children to kill for fun. Seasonally, the society and sports sections of the newspapers are filled with photographs, often in full color, of mothers and their children proudly holding the bleeding animals they have shot and killed. No doubt, an appropriate slogan would be: "The family that shoots together may well live to slaughter together!" Even in some superficial aspects of her life, the female leads the brutal way, as for example her desire to wrap herself in the skin and fur of animals to keep warm and to keep up with the Joneses! Nor does her desire to adorn herself and insure her status lessen even when she knows the animal whose fur she demands is becoming extinct! In some cases, the motivation on her part is not brutality but ignorance and/or thoughtlessness. Perhaps if she were made to witness the slaying of the animal, parts of which she wears, her attitude would be different. How many women, or men for that matter, would enjoy watching hunters club baby seals and skin them alive as they do in the Pribilof Islands? The fact remains, however, that women *per se* and as wives and mothers leave a lot to be desired when it comes to having a commitment to a humane approach to life or to making a witness of this commitment.

I not only promise to be objective and realistic but also not to burden you with any examples of "entertainment" that I have not witnessed firsthand. When you examine our *status quo* through our modes of entertainment, you will find that our "civilization" can be described as having an arena ambiance, a coliseum culture and a safari society!

Have you ever observed a popular form of entertainment called demolition derby in which the purpose is to wreck automobiles for

fees and fun while at the same time risking human lives? The following is from an ad in a Kennebunk, Maine newspaper in the summer of 1965, although it might have been from almost any newspaper in any state in the union since this neurosis is national in scope:

“Wanted”

“Young Men Not Afraid To Die! (I thought this must be a military recruiting poster.) If you think you have plenty of guts, lots of nerve and can stand the pressure both mental and physical of Crashing and Wrecking automobiles, deliberately, then you are the man we want. The requirements are simple: You must have a valid driver’s license and supply a junker car that will be demolished—with you in it. (Imagine drivers with this “talent” possessing a valid driver’s license and occupying the highways!) We have 23 entries now, leaving 27 openings left. You must be prepared to take extraordinary risks as you will be a part of a 50-car DEMOLITION DERBY at the Arundel Speedway near Kennebunk Sunday, July 4th—8:30 p.m. (What a great way to celebrate our Day of Independence!) The DEMOLITION DERBY will be split up in 2 or 4 events of 25 cars each. The winners of each event, and the driver who puts on the best show in the DEMOLITION EVENTS will be supplied with a fresh car—no holds barred. (How lucky can you get!) The last man running will receive \$300.00 cash—the others in the finals \$25.00 each. (Even chemically, your body is worth about as much, and if you have a few metal plates and wires in you to boot, as I do, you are worth even more!) Admission \$2.00—kids 50¢” (I’d like to have our ranch foreman ship two hundred baby goats to me and then dressed in western garb with my herd behind me, I’d like to go to the box office at the Speedway and ask for one adult ticket and two hundred admissions for “kids”!)

Of course everything is comparative. At least in the Demolition Derby we have reason to think that the participants are all volunteers. Unfortunately, this is not true in many forms of “entertainment” including the so-called bloodless bullfights. Recently, Texas “distinguished” itself again in one of its inimitable ways by legalizing bloodless bullfights, and in so doing, took another giant step toward primitivism and sadism. There is plenty of evidence to substantiate the fact that this journey may be shorter than we think! All of the rationalizations about bullfighting as a necessary test of man’s bravery and virility as well as a means of providing harmless outlets for his so-called innate aggressions or as a form of pageantry,

¹I have placed my comments in parenthesis.

art or religion, constitute intellectual dishonesty in its most blatant form, for the real name of the game is sadism made manifest through the terrorizing and torturing of the bulls. It is hideous enough that such "human" activity exists even in countries where it has been a custom for centuries, but to have it promulgated at the Astrodome in Houston, Texas and other places in the United States is a national disgrace! If the Vatican can take an official stand against bullfighting *per se* regardless of ethnic and/or cultural patterns, then certainly the U. S. which claims to base its moral structure on the Judeo-Christian ethic has the obligation at least to do as much in an ambience where bullfighting has never been a part of the cultural activity.²

If I had to name one major source of the problem in this area of life relating to our general lack of humaneness I would say that, ironically, it stems from a religious source and that, specifically, it has to do with our misinterpretation of the Judeo-Christian ethic. Through centuries, many people have operated on the principle that God created the earth for man to subdue and to use as he sees fit. If you really follow the Judeo-Christian approach to life consistently, you will realize that you never receive anything for nothing and that there is always a price to be paid in relationship to your potential and the quality of the gift. Since man has been endowed by the Creative Spirit with the richest potential, he owes the greatest debt of responsibility. When in the role of *Homo sapiens* he inherits the privilege of existing on the earth, he has the responsibility to cherish the earth, and if he realizes himself on the genuinely human level, he is concerned not with subduing his environment for his selfish interest but rather with subduing his own lesser self in the process of spiritual refinement in the temporal order!

Even if the Astrodome bullfights were bloodless, and they are not, as has been proved by official observers of the Humane Society of the United States, they are a national disgrace if for no other reason than the influence they bring to bear especially on children in the audience, who comprise what the professional promoters hope will prove the lucrative audience of the future. If you think I exaggerate this influence let me remind you of the Associated Press report of a U. S. marine who said he shot a Vietnamese civilian and then cut off his ear because he thought "it was a common thing to do after a kill". How quickly the tactics of the bullring invade every-

²March 10, 1966, "L'Osservatore", Vatican City: "Along with live pigeon shooting all sports based on useless cruelty toward animals ought to be prohibited. One classic example is that of the bullfight, where there is a crescendo of cruelty to the bull with the banderillas, which tears its flesh, the pikes which prick it to bleed, spurring into the highest degree of furor and danger."

day life! And how strange that the so-called deranged individual who commits a brutal act keeps popping up in our society! Certainly a human being should wake up every morning knowing that he is smarter than a bull or any other animal if for no other reason than by virtue of the fact that since he has been created a *Homo sapiens*, he automatically has been endowed with greater potentials. To have a desire to torture an animal, even by just frightening, much less stabbing it, is a result of a deathly sick soul!

Of course, we do not have to move outside our own indigenous "cultural" pattern in order to discover one of the most widely accepted and yet one of the crudest forms of cruelty extant—the rodeo! As a native Texan, I am particularly familiar with this type of Big Business masquerading as a sport! In this man versus animal game, thousands of animals are tortured, but since the net profits to participants amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars and to sponsors, millions, most of us who do not participate even as spectators choose to remain silent, and so the brutality and violence continue unabated. The California Branch of the Humane Society of the United States summarizes the *status quo* accurately in a pamphlet entitled, "Rodeo, Commercialized Cruelty":

"Each year thousands of animals are maimed, crippled and killed in rodeo arenas.

"Animals are whipped, clubbed, kicked, goaded by electric prods, cut by lariats, and slammed to the ground; flesh is torn, bones are broken, animals are killed.

"Most spectators think that the 'wild bucking broncs' and 'vicious bulls' are acting up because they are naturally ornery. This is far from the truth.

"It is the calculated infliction of pain and terror moments before the shoot gate opens that triggers the crowd-pleasing exhibition of bucking—an exhibition actually of pain and panic.

"Few spectators are familiar with the cruel instruments responsible for the animal's behavior. The bucking strap is suddenly cinched tightly on a sensitive area to make him buck.³ Spurs must be raked over the mount's shoulders if a cowboy is to win, and miscellaneous clubs and prods are used brutally.⁴

"An individual mistreating an animal for his own amusement would be censored as cruel, but if he does the same thing for a crowd's amusement, and to enrich rodeo promoters, there is hardly a protest.

³Genital organs

⁴Electric prods

“Rodeo is a multi-million dollar business. In its present form it requires an annual sacrifice of thousands of dead and crippled animals on the altar of the almighty dollar.”

Personally, all I ask is that you read the rules and regulations set forth by the Rodeo Cowboys' Association establishing requirements for each event in order to qualify and win, and then tell me how it is possible to comply with these rules without being cruel. If that big, brave rodeo cowboy would relinquish his bucking strap, electric prod and spurs, he would not only be out of business, but we would have a chance to see him for what he really is—someone who needs prolonged psychiatric treatment! Again, it is bad enough that adults permit this horrendous activity to continue, but it is a genuine abandonment of life on the human level to encourage children and youth to engage in this barbarism! Rodeos constitute one of the greatest disgraces in this country!

Perhaps the most popular form of subhuman activity in the United States is hunting. Some twenty million of our two hundred million citizens hunt, and, no doubt, others would if it were possible financially and otherwise. I have spent a lifetime collecting the hunters' stock answers and questions:

First, they are apt to say they love to hunt not because they care if they kill anything, but because they love nature and like to get out in the country. If this is true, why don't they go forth and take walks or camp and not carry a gun at all?

Second, they often pose as true conservationists and if pressed on the point will reply that if they did not kill the animals, the beasts would starve anyway. How many hunters are actually engaged in any pressing conservation problems from air and water pollution to soil erosion? How many hunters know or care anything about ecology? When carried to its fullest enactment, the principle of killing the starving animal could, with a little more brutality mixed with a little more rationalization, be applied to people!

Third, some hunters justify their pleasure in killing by saying that since man is by nature an aggressive animal, he works off his natural hostilities in a harmless way by hunting. Such an eminent social anthropologist as Ashley Montagu has challenged the theory of man-as-aggressive-animal. Recently, when Dr. Montagu addressed one thousand physicians at a Los Angeles symposium entitled, “Twentieth Century Violence and the Physician”, he said,

“Aggression is simply love frustrated. The human being who is aggressive is saying in another way, ‘I want to be loved’. It has nothing to do with instinct, everything to do with environment.”

Fourth, once in a great while, when a hunter's guard is down, he will confess, usually with great hesitancy and embarrassment, that the male of the species finds satisfaction in proving his virility through the hunting act. How can one possibly respond to this pitifully epehebic statement except to say that it is past time for this individual to be briefed about "birds and bees".

Fifth, it would not be fair to fail to mention one of the favorite rationalizations of hunters, namely, that he never kills anything that he does not eat. Since man's survival in our present society scarcely depends on his ability to track down, kill and bring home his supply of meat, would it not be far better if the time, money and energy spent in hunting were spent instead on securing humane slaughter legislation, because in our country, as in most countries of the world, many of our commercial enterprises devoted to the slaughter of animals do not practice humane methods?

When the tables are turned, and the hunters in self-defense respond with questions rather than with answers, they generally suffer under the delusion that they have trapped their humane opponents with the following two questions: "Since you are so opposed to hunting, are you a vegetarian?" Obviously, they fail to see the difference between killing for fun (whether for food or not) and the consumption of meat for nutritional purposes. Their second line of defensive interrogation rests in the question: "Since according to your way of thinking, all entities have life, where do you draw the line; will you also refuse to eat vegetables?" True, one has to draw the line somewhere, so, personally, I draw the eating line after mineral and vegetables; in other words, I am willing to eat minerals and vegetables but not animals.

If you think my comments are harsh, you should read what a young, dynamic naturalist like Bil Gilbert has to say in an article entitled, "Hunting Is A Dirty Business", in the October 21st, 1967 issue of the "Saturday Evening Post"! One of the great mysteries of the world to me is why so very many parents have the time, money and energy to teach children how to kill but not how to care for animals. I find this particularly puzzling when you consider how much a child can learn about responsibility *per se* from the care and feeding of animals. As an artist, I have been a "hunter" all of my life—a hunter of the minds, hearts and souls of other human beings. This is a pursuit in which all participate voluntarily, in which no one is harmed and in which everyone gains!

In the area of contemporary "entertainment", what about body-contact sports such as boxing, wrestling and football in which we risk severe injury and even death needlessly in the name of sports-

manship and fair play? While I do not condone these activities, at least we can assume that all of the participants are acting voluntarily, which certainly is not the case with the animals we capture, terrorize and kill. Lately, however, we seemed to have moved to the opposite end of the field from the old line which held that winning is secondary to the way you play the game. Now we have taken up a stand at the new, hard, fast line that demands that you must win in any way you can, but win you must! Some mass media have devoted lengthy coverage to individual athletes who specialize in brutality. Recently, when I addressed a regional conference for athletic directors in San Antonio, Texas, some of the deans among the football coaches shared their concern with me about the obvious philosophy of win at any cost among trainers and participants as well as the sock-it-to-them activities of disgruntled audiences. If the trend continues, maybe we will return to the form of body-contact sport known in the Roman trade as throwing Christians to the lions. We may well be closer to this revival than you think, for not only do we have the arena syndrome, but the ancient, brutal appetite for playing for keeps and for enjoying the observation of the suffering as-they-play!

In all fairness to the contemporary scene, I do not want to leave out my own field, the arts. While there are innumerable examples of enormous brutality in every area of the arts from that of the mass media of television to that of the more esoteric media of painting, let us take our specific example from the art form of the cinema. In July, 1967, the distinguished New York Times critic, Mr. Bosley Crowthers, summarized the *status quo* succinctly in two incisive articles entitled, "Movies to Kill By" and "Another Smash At Violence" from which I have taken the following quotes:

"Movie makers and movie goers are agreeing that killing is fun. This is killing of a gross and bloody nature, often massive and excessive, done by characters whose murderous motivations are morbid, degenerate and cold . . . They can lead the halfway preconditioned general public to condone preposterous values and cruel deceptions. By habituating the public to violence and brutality these films of excessive violence only deaden people's sensitivities and make slaughter seem like a meaningless cliché . . . I dread how widely such deliberate exploitation of the public's susceptibilities is poisoning and deadening our fiber and strength."

Lately, even the arts, which should be man's expression of significant statements through disciplined form, have been devoted primarily to meaninglessness and to declarations of violence. Even when

it is necessary for art to depict brutality and despair, for the sake of intellectual honesty, art should do so in a manner bespeaking its disapproval and suggesting, by implication, a creative alternative. In its true sense, art, on the highest level, should manifest man's supreme refinement of mind, heart and spirit rather than his utter defeat caused not only by bowing to the demands of man as animal but also by participating in acts of self-imposed degradation!

If we do not care about the so-called lower animals, and we should, certainly out of enlightened self-interest, we should care about each other, for people who engage in brutal activities, ironically brutalize themselves! A brutal society is a degenerate one which is rotting from the inside out and which will perish! This inevitable result of brutalization is the prime lesson of history!

In almost every aspect of life that we have mentioned in which brutality is practiced, what masks as one activity is, in reality, another. So-called sports, for example, are actually forms of commerce in the sense of big business. Specifically, we are speaking of money, whether it is a demolition derby, rodeo, football game or movie. One of the most crass examples of this materialistic philosophy in practice is the National Rifle Association's passionate protection of its own vested interests in maintaining the right to bear arms. (Actually, the right to bear arms refers not to individual citizens but to the state militia. The only arms we have a right to bear are the two connected to our shoulders!) Just think of the financial loss to the manufacturers of firearms should proper long-past-due legislation to control the possession and purchase of guns be enacted for the general welfare. I know exactly what it means in essence to combat brutality—specifically, it means to have the courage to challenge and to cope with individuals and organizations representing hundreds of millions of dollars.

Fortunately, throughout a part of man's recorded history, there have been a few, wise, concerned, courageous human beings who had the guts to advocate humaneness against all odds. Because of the extant prejudice against women as hopeless sentimentalists, I have purposefully chosen my examples from the ranks of distinguished humane men. One of the individuals who comes to mind first in this noble assembly is the late genius, Dr. Albert Schweitzer, whose humane philosophy and conduct gave rise to an entire school of thought known as "reverence for life". In an essay devoted to "The Sacredness of All That Lives", he wrote:

"It is the fate of every truth to be an object of ridicule when it is first acclaimed. Today it is considered an exaggeration to proclaim constant respect for every form of life as being the

serious demand of a rational ethic. But the time is coming when people will be amazed that the human race was so long before it recognized that thoughtless injury to life is incompatible with real ethics. Ethics is in its unqualified form, extended responsibility with regard to everything that has life.

"There slowly grew up in me an unshakable conviction that we have no right to inflict suffering and death on another living creature unless there is some unavoidable necessity for it, and that we ought all of us to feel what a horrible thing it is to cause suffering and death out of mere thoughtlessness . . . I have grown more and more certain that at the bottom of our heart we all think this, and that we fail to acknowledge it and to carry our belief into practice chiefly because we are afraid of being laughed at by other people as sentimentalists, though partly also because we allow our best feelings to get blunted.

". . . the universal ethic of reverence for life shows the sympathy with animals, which is so often represented as sentimentality, to be a duty which no thinking man can escape."

The eminent sociologist, Lewis Mumford, has defined western man in the twentieth century aptly and succinctly as a "connoisseur of violence", while the renowned psychiatrist, Dr. Eric Fromm, has categorized modern man as either lovers of death known as necrophiles (human beings who are devoted to cruelty, brutality and violence) or lovers of life called biophiles (human beings motivated by creative, constructive, unselfish, loving activities).

In a lyrical book titled *THE IMMENSE JOURNEY*, the brilliant naturalist, Loren Eiseley, summarized contemporary man's challenge in a brief, penetrating way when he wrote:

"The need is not really for more brains, the need is now for a gentler, a more tolerant people than those who won for us against the ice, the tiger, and the bear. The hand that hefted the ax, out of some old blind allegiance to the past fondles the machine gun as lovingly. It is a habit that man will have to break to survive, but the roots go very deep."

Perhaps no one in our time who has written about the desperate need for humane motivation in our society has surpassed the clear, persuasive statement made by Norman Cousins in a "Saturday Review" editorial titled, "Our Casual Approach To Violence":

"We have not developed any substantial confidence in moral force or in the vitality of great ideas . . . our conditioning has made violence a seemingly normal part of our lives and we have a casual approach to it . . . The casualness with which violence is treated and accepted may make it difficult for us to think today in totally different terms, even though our lives may depend on our ability to do so . . ."

The British author, H. G. Wells, once wrote that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe". By their very nature, human beings have a position of authority which always carries an inexorable challenge of responsibility. To be a responsible human being, means first of all to be humane. Wherever I go, I say—Run, man—run in such a way that if you are asked who you are, you can answer with objectivity and intellectual honesty:

I am not a mineral!
I am not a vegetable!
I am not an animal!
I am, dear God, a man!



PROPOSED REVISED TEXAS CONSTITUTION

ROBERT G. STOREY, *Chairman*
Constitutional Revision Commission

NINETY-THREE YEARS AGO a group of loyal pioneer Texans, a few of whom had experienced Mexican tyranny, and all weary of Civil War, distrustful of officials because of their experience with carpet-baggers and the oppressive administration of Governor Davis, determined that those experiences should never occur again. They set about to write a new Constitution.

Texas has lived under six flags and eight Constitutions. The first document was the 1824 Mexican federal constitution. Next was the Coahuila-Texas Constitution of 1827. These Constitutions provided for many of our cherished freedoms and liberties, but the printed words were not fulfilled. Their non-observance led to protests, a declaration of independence, and a war with Mexico, which resulted in victory at San Jacinto and the Constitution of the Republic of Texas in 1836. Our first State Constitution came into effect after Texas was annexed to the United States in 1845. The next was under the Confederacy in 1861. Another was written in 1866 but never became fully operative because of martial law following the Civil War. A Constitutional Convention convened in 1868 and remained in session until 1869 but it adjourned without completing its task. A new Constitution was finished and adopted in 1869 by radical and carpetbag elements. It was finally ratified by those permitted

to vote on November 30, 1869. Thousands were disenfranchised to insure its adoption by the favored group. Governor E. J. Davis served under this Constitution until his term ended in near warfare at Austin, after Governor Richard Coke was elected in 1873. Our present Constitution was written in 1875 and adopted in 1876.

A Constitution generally reflects the philosophy of the people at the time when it was written. The real value of a Constitution lies in its embodiment of fundamental principles accumulated from past experience as a guide for present and future action. Such principles naturally are applied to the conditions of the period in which they find expression in constitutional terms. The application of such principles may be broad enough—as in the Federal Constitution and earlier State Constitutions—to permit departures in an expanding and changing future, or it may be so directed to particular situations of the period as to be highly restrictive as conditions change. The first concept results in more conciseness, with more emphasis upon fundamentals; hence is conducive to popular understanding and acceptance of a type of political life, so that the Constitution gains strength and greater respect. The second theory produces a lengthy, detailed, and wordy document, confusing basic principles with peculiar conditions to which they are applied from time to time, and stated in such detail as to discourage people from even reading the document. However, veneration of the Constitution is so imbedded in our political life that we often look upon it as sacred, simply because it is our Constitution. Therefore, the Constitution resists change through inertia, and an attempt to revise it to meet present conditions is regarded with suspicion.

Let us briefly review conditions in Texas in 1875 and 1876 when our present Constitution was written and adopted. Only 150 Counties held elections on the adoption. Approximately one-half of what is now known as West Texas was still unorganized territory and not represented in the convention. At that time Texas had a little over 800,000 people—now, over eleven million. In 1875, no town had as many as 15,000 people. A former esteemed citizen of Dallas, Mr. Tom Finty, Jr., observed long ago:

Our State Constitution is worse than antiquated; it bristles with limitations which hog-tie the cities of today. At the time this Constitution was written, 1875, Galveston, with less than 15,000 inhabitants, was the largest city in the state; San Antonio was smaller, and Houston still smaller; while Dallas was not large enough to be separately enumerated by the United States Census Bureau. Plainly the limitations written in 1875 do not fit the cities of today.

Collin, Dallas, McLennan, and Travis Counties were referred to as West Texas in 1875, and the State still owned 88 million acres of public lands. We had the Old Chisholm Trail and a few other trails but not a single mile of miles of hard-surfaced road. There were 711 miles of railway instead of the present 17,000 miles. Texas produced only a half million bales of cotton that year. The oil business was of no importance until more than a quarter of a century after the adoption of our present Constitution. Now Texas accounts for 30 percent of the world's oil supply and more than one-half the United States production.

One Governor paid tribute to the marvelous achievement of art and science and the advancements in all lines of knowledge; but deplored the fact that in fifty years Texas people had made no progress in the science of government. Perhaps he might have added that the delegates in 1875 never anticipated cold wars, black markets, traffic jams, television, housing shortages, double features, baby-sitters, withholding taxes, jitterbug dancing, newspaper columnists, political polls, college bowl games, or outer space exploration.

Does age alone condemn a Constitution? Certainly not. Witness the Magna Charta and the Constitution of the United States, which seem to improve with age. What is the difference between the Federal and our State Constitution? The Federal is short, concise, and contains general principles, while our Texas Constitution is full of details, highly restrictive, containing statutory provisions and a multiplicity of amendments.

Need for Revision

Those who object to constitutional revision generally argue that our Constitution, regardless of its age, has served us effectively and needs no revision. But the truth is we have been revising the Texas Constitution almost every two years by amendments. More than two thousand have been submitted to the Legislature since 1876, and some two hundred have been adopted. Our Constitution is very long—some 65,000 words compared with 6,500 in the Federal Constitution. However, mere length and numerous amendments does not condemn a constitution, but it does necessitate continuous revision because of restrictions upon the Legislature.

House Resolution 429, adopted by the House of Representatives on May 27, 1967, created a Commission composed of twenty-five members, ten to be appointed by the Governor, five by the Speaker of the House, five by the Lieutenant Governor, and five by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The Commission first met, called by

the Governor as provided in the Resolution, on September 18, 1967.

Eight Research Study Committees were organized, and all members of the Commission were assigned to one or more of them. Our able research director, Robert J. Derby of San Antonio, conducted studies and did research under the direction of the committees.

It was not the purpose of the Commission to discard all provisions of our present Constitution, including amendments, but to preserve the good and tested portions including the Bill of Rights and such sacred rights of Texans as the Homestead Laws. But, there are numerous obsolete, unnecessary, and deadwood provisions in our present Constitution.

Our Commission was dedicated to a thorough study of our own and other state constitutions, both old and new. It appears that early state constitutions were brief and more nearly reflect fundamental principles. Connecticut's first constitution contained only 1,500 words, New York's, 3,000. However, we realize that problems at time of writing those constitutions were relatively simple compared with present conditions. As one writer has observed, "the constitutions of our early history provided helpful models for consideration today." Significantly, our briefest and in many respects our best state constitutions tend to be either the oldest or the latest — for examples those of Connecticut, New Jersey, Hawaii, and Alaska.

It is apparent that our Constitution of 1876 was a protest against the Davis Administration and as an aftermath of the Texas Revolution and Civil War. Texans were seeking protection against irresponsible government by incorporating into our Constitution numerous statutory provisions and prohibitions against the government rather than granting to the executive and legislative departments proper latitude for appropriate legislative and executive responsibility.

Methods of Revision

The early constitutions were generally drafted by the conventions when the population was small. After the adoption of the 1875 Constitution, the method of revision has been through amendment. The present plan of revision through a Commission with adequate study and research is an excellent procedure. All Commission recommendations for a new Constitution must be submitted to the Legislature, and both Houses will have ample opportunity for discussion, debate, hearings, alternatives, modifications, deletions, or rewording, all of which must be approved by a two-thirds majority of both Houses. If, as, and when the final draft is approved by the Legislature, it must be submitted to a vote of the people as a whole or

article by articles, as the Legislature may provide. (Under the terms of the present legislation, there will be ample time for debate by the people before it is voted on.)

House Resolution No. 429 provides that the Commission "shall draft and recommend to the 61st Legislature in writing and deliver to the elected members of the 61st Legislature a new or revised State Constitution at least 30 days prior to the date of the convening of the 61st Legislature," in December 1968.

It is further provided that if the new or revised Constitution of Texas is approved by the 61st Legislature, "it shall be submitted for approval by the voters of the State of Texas on the ballot at the next general election"—in November 1969.

Highlights of Commission Recommendations

Our report to the Legislature, to be transmitted on or before December 14, will contain changes we recommend, as well as deletion of obsolete, unnecessary, and deadwood provisions.

In summary, the following are general statements of major changes recommended:

Executive:

- (1) A four-year continuous term for Governor.
- (2) The Governor also has the power to remove his own appointive officers of the Executive Department with provisions for succession in case of disability.
- (3) The terms of the Secretary of State, Comptroller, Treasurer, Commissioner of the General Land Office, and Attorney General are extended to four years.
- (4) The Executive Officers would be elected in a non-presidential year.

Legislative:

- (1) The Legislature is authorized to fix its salaries and allowances.
- (2) A new provision on Legislative Districts to replace present provisions which violate the United States Constitution under the "one man—one vote" rule.
- (3) Deletion of requirements for the "emergency clause" in bills.

Judicial:

- (1) Merit selection of Justices of the Supreme Court and Judges of the Court of Criminal Appeals through a five-man lawyer-layman commission who must be approved by the Senate. The Legislature

may extend such method of selection to the Judges of all courts.

(2) Permitting the Legislature to authorize more than one Judge for the same District Court without having to create a new Judicial District when more District Judges are necessary.

(3) The Legislature may increase the jurisdictional amount presently specified for the Justice Courts.

(4) Deletion of the present mandatory requirement of two Justices of the Peace in any precinct in which there may be a city of 8,000 or more inhabitants.

Local Government:

(1) The Legislature is authorized, subject to electoral approval, to change and alter boundaries of counties.

(2) Only one justice precinct is required in each county instead of the present four.

(3) The present governmental organization and powers of counties are retained but the Legislature is authorized, subject to electoral approval, to provide for optional plans of county government or home rule charters.

(4) The Legislature is authorized, subject to electoral approval, to provide for the consolidation of counties and political subdivisions and functions in a county.

General Provisions:

A maximum homestead exemption of \$25,000 for a rural or urban homestead with a saving clause to protect rights of owners under the old provision.

Amendment or Revision of the Constitution:

(1) To authorize the submission by the Legislature of a complete or substantial revision of the Constitution in addition to the present "separate amendment" submission.

(2) To provide that such proposals may be made at any session of the Legislature.

(3) To provide that publication may be in a "daily" as well as in a "weekly" newspaper.

Conclusion

Thirty-two proposals to amend the Constitution were introduced during the 59th Legislature in 1965, twenty-seven of which were passed. At that time the Constitution had been amended 163 times. Eleven of the twenty-seven were submitted to the people at two special elections in 1965, and five were adopted. The remaining six-

teen were submitted at the general election in November 1966, with fifteen adopted by the voters. In 1967, an additional six amendments were adopted by the electorate. In November 1968, fourteen amendments were submitted, and seven approved by the voters, making a total of 196 amendments to our Constitution.

The fact that so many amendments have been adopted and continue to be submitted by the Legislature is persuasive proof that the Constitution needed to be restudied, revised, and rewritten with broad principles and adequate responsibility delegated to the three branches of our State government.

It is obvious that our 1875 Constitution—and those of several other states—was adopted by people who sought protection against irresponsible government, by denying to key officials the power to govern. In fact, many of our present state Constitutions, including our own, were framed and approved in an atmosphere which actually retarded the normal functioning of government.

One writer expressed it in this way:

It is better to give power to the organs of government and then to seek means to keep public officials honest and responsible than to deny them power. The constitution is a poor place to seek complete insurance against irresponsible government.

It is common knowledge that Texas is not only increasing its population very rapidly but is fast becoming an industrial state. Moreover, Texas now has twenty-three urban centers which create problems of government never contemplated by the predominantly rural population of 1875. The demands for new school districts, industries, colleges, airports, irrigation water supply, and other special political subdivisions have prompted numerous amendments.

Texas has a dynamic, progressive, and intelligent citizenship. Her future is bright, and her continued progress should not be curtailed by the cumbersome procedure of more amendments each year to our lengthy Constitution.

TEXAS CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION COMMISSION

Robert G. Storey, *Chairman*, President, The Southwestern Legal Foundation, Dallas

Walter W. McAllister, *Vice Chairman*, Mayor of San Antonio

Senator A. M. Aikin, Paris

Representative W. R. Archer, Houston

Representative William O. Braecklein, Dallas

H. S. Brown, President, Texas AFL-CIO, Austin

Ira Butler, Attorney-at-Law, Fort Worth, Texas

Judge Carlos C. Cadena, Court of Civil Appeals, San Antonio
 Judge T. C. Chadick, Court of Civil Appeals, Texarkana
 Representative R. H. Cory, Victoria
 Chancellor Carey Croneis, Rice University, Houston
 Senator Henry C. Grover, Houston
 James P. Hart, Attorney-at-Law, Austin
 Senator Grady Hazlewood, Canyon
 Representative Alonzo W. Jamison, Jr., Denton
 Senator Don Kennard, Fort Worth
 Dr. Janice May, Instructor in Government, The University of
 Texas, Austin
 Felix R. McKnight, Editor and Co-publisher, The Dallas Times
 Herald, Dallas
 Francis A. Miskell, Consumer Credit Commissioner, Austin
 Peter O'Donnell, Dallas
 Representative R. G. Pendleton, Andrews
 Dean Kenneth S. Tollett, Texas Southern University Law School,
 Houston
 George A. Wilson, President and Chairman of the Board, Lone
 Star Steel Company, Dallas
 Senator J. P. Word, Meridian
 Steele Wright, President, Texas Farm Products Company,
 Nacogdoches

Robert J. Derby
Research Director



A HISTORY OF SPORTS IN TEXAS WITH A UNIQUE PHILOSOPHY

HAROLD V. RATLIFF

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SPORTS is that you can't win them all but that
 in trying to do so you build a spirit of competitiveness that gives
 forth a fierce desire to excel. This is carried into later life where
 you have the courage and determination to tackle anything. Since
 effort is the most important ingredient of success, you thus will
 win more than you lose.

Red Sanders, a football coach whose accomplishments were great in his profession, philosophied that "Winning isn't everything; it is the *only* thing." Which may sound a little drastic but that's what competitiveness teaches.

It was from our career as a competitor in sports and the reporting thereof that we gained the courage to address a venerable body such as the Philosophical Society of Texas, and to use vernacular such as "the hot corner," "post pattern," "left-right combination," "the anchor lap," and "tall can of corn," which are best known to the somewhat hysterical people who crowd the stadia to taunt the umpire, cheer the touchdown dash and marvel at the crunching tackles of the linebackers.

This also prompted us to write a book along historical lines, tracing the birth and progress of major sports in Texas.

This state has a colorful and productive sports history. No other area ever brought forth so many great champions of national and international prominence. Boxers, runners, throwers, jumpers, swimmers, divers, riders, racing drivers, golfers, football players, baseball players—they have been winners on the athletic fields of the world.

The first great athlete from Texas was a dock-working Negro named Jack Johnson, who went from Galveston to international fame in boxing after the turn of the century. Johnson was a man of controversy, perhaps of low morals, but he was a great champion and probably sounded the first high note in favor of equality of the races. During his era there was a shameful search for "a white hope." The white folks just couldn't stomach a somewhat arrogant Negro looking down on them from the pedestal of heavyweight boxing champion of the world.

Johnson was the champion when boxing was illegal in Texas, which brings forth another story dealing with the history of sport. A governor prevented Texas from holding a big prize fight and even the famed Judge Roy Bean couldn't bring one off—he put it on by building a pontoon bridge so the fans could cross the Rio Grande to a sandbar on the Mexican side, thus escaping the wrath of Texas officials that would have descended upon him had he tried to buck the law.

Johnson had to win the championship in Australia, where he beat Tommy Burns for the title in 1908.

Springboard for a proposed world's heavyweight championship fight between James J. Corbett and Bob Fitzsimmons was the planned erection of a gigantic stadium a mile from the present Cotton Bowl. But a state law against pugilism was brought to mind, with a state-wide sentiment against such a thing as a brutal prize fight. A test

case came in the courts and the law was ruled invalid, but Governor Charles A. Culberson stepped in. He called a special session of the Legislature and an air-tight anti-prize fight law was enacted. So plans for the amphitheater were scrapped.

Judge Bean ran into the law in 1896—a year after the fiasco at Dallas—when he attempted to stage a Fitzsimmons-Peter Maher fight at Langtry, on the Mexican border. So, the judge built a bridge so the fans could cross the river to the sand bar where Fitzsimmons knocked out Maher. Thoughtfully, Judge Bean had two carloads of beer shipped in and the sale brought the “law west of the Pecos” a neat profit.

The first organization of a sports endeavor that would survive the long years was the Texas League. It came about in 1888 and was organized by John J. McCloskey, who had come to the state with an independent baseball team on a barnstorming tour a year previously. The league missed only five years until World War II, when it took out for three more seasons. It had one of the longest histories in minor league baseball and produced some of the greatest players in the game. Its most fabled character was Jake Atz, who managed Fort Worth to six straight pennants in the twenties—the greatest winning streak in minor league history. Atz said his real name was Zimmerman but that he changed it when the club he was playing with paid off alphabetically and was out of money by the time it reached Z.

The most famous game of the Texas League was in 1902 when Corsicana beat Texarkana 51-3 to set the all-time scoring record in baseball. A man named Nig Clarke hit eight home runs in eight times at bat that day. This is remembered probably more than the one-sided game in which the Texarkana pitcher, a brawny lad named Charlie DeWitt, was allowed to go the full nine innings. The Texarkana manager, Cy Mulkey, was peeved at DeWitt because he showed up on the day of the game and said “Papa said for me to pitch this game.” Papa was the club owner.

Ad Toepperwein, the world’s greatest marksman, and Max Hirsch, who was the most famous trainer of race horses, came along after the turn of the century. Toepperwein’s greatest feat was hitting all except nine blocks of 72,500 fired at over a 10-day period. Hirsch had three Kentucky Derby winners, one to win the Preakness and five to take the Belmont. Those are the greatest races in the game.

The Second Texas, which some of you gentlemen of my age bracket will remember, was the most fabulous football team in history. It was a National Guard unit sent to the Mexican border in 1916 ostensibly to counter the raids of Pancho Villa but actually to

be trained quickly and cheaply for the First World War. There were football players from Texas colleges in the group and they organized a team that won all its games, scored 432 points to 6 for the opposition and still is considered by many at this late date as the greatest gridiron unit ever to crack a rib or break a leg in the heat of battle.

Tris Speaker was Texas' first, possibly its greatest, athlete of the teens. Speaker became the greatest centerfielder in baseball annals. So proud of his accomplishments was he that he stressed only one fact while dying from a heart attack on a fishing trip. "I am Tris Speaker," he murmured.

The Golden Twenties of sport also had its Texans—Rogers Hornsby, greatest righthand hitter in baseball; Tex Rickard, the most revered boxing promoter; Cecil Grigg, considered by many as the greatest football player Texas ever produced—he was better than Jim Thorpe when they played together on the old Canton Bulldogs -- and Art Shires, who gained fame mostly because of his color and aggressiveness, probably the only man in history to punch his big league manager on the nose. Shires never was a baseball great but he is remembered more than those who gained the greatest fame in the roaring twenties, when color and dash counted for more than .400 averages and 90-yard touchdown dashes.

As the turn into the twenties was made, the University Interscholastic League saw the light of day. It became the world's largest football organization; it grew to more than 1,000 teams and produced the great players who made the Southwest Conference supreme. High school football saw its start in Texas in 1900 and the first team, according to Roy Bedichek, author of *Educational Competition*, was at Dallas High School (today Crozier Tech). But schoolboy football never prospered until Bedichek and Roy Henderson started the University Interscholastic League football plan in 1920.

The League also was instrumental in the longest winning streak in baseball being established. Waxahachie, a member of the League, set the record in 1924-25-26 when it won 65 games in a row. Such players as Paul Richards, Belve Bean, Gene Moore and Art Shires came from this great team. Richards became one of the outstanding managers of baseball clubs.

The thirties found Texas becoming established as the golf leader of the world. It produced Ben Hogan, Byron Nelson, Jimmy Demaret, Lloyd Mangrum and Ralph Guldahl. They won a combined 200 tournaments on the PGA tour and among those triumphs were eight National Open, four PGA and eight Masters championships. This

fivesome ranged from 1936 to the early fifties and there never has—nor probably ever will be—anything to compare with it.

Also the thirties produced Cecil Smith, who was a ten-goal polo player for 26 years—the longest any man ever reigned in this sport of savage rideoffs and great marksmanship with a little ball propelled by a mallet.

In the thirties Texas became a national football power and had its first All-America player. He was Botchey Koch, Baylor guard who was a defensive terror. In a period of five years, three Texas teams won national championships—Southern Methodist in 1935, Texas Christian in 1938 and Texas A&M in 1939. It was a quarter of a century later before Texas scored again. This time the University of Texas was national king.

The football game with the most importance attached to it was played in 1935 when Southern Methodist met Texas Christian at Fort Worth for the national championship, the Southwest Conference championship and a spot in the Rose Bowl. Southern Methodist won it 20-14 and got enough out of the bowl game—which it lost 7-0 to Stanford—to pay off the mortgage on the stadium. This amounted to \$75,000.

Another great athletic star of the thirties was Wilmer Allison, the national tennis champion who played on nine Davis Cup teams. And in the early thirties there came Mildred Babe Didriksen to become the world's greatest woman athlete. She won two gold medals in the Olympic Games and most everything else that she tried in sports. She was a great golfer too, when she turned to the pro ranks.

A gripping story of the late thirties was Monty Stratton, the Greenville farmer who lost a leg in a hunting accident while at his height as a big league pitcher. He got himself an artificial leg and returned to winning baseball.

In 1933 what was to become the world's largest coaching school was started. It reached an enrollment of over 5,000 in 1968. Its annual all-star football game draws as high as 39,000 spectators. It was this big clinic that developed coaching in Texas to the point that the state has the best in the land. The intersectional results of schoolboy football bear this out.

The wondrous thirties of sport also produced the greatest passer and kicker in football history — Sammy Baugh — who tickled the nation with his laconic reply to the question: "Can you hit a gnat in the eye at 30 paces?" Baugh answered: "Which eye?" Sammy went to Texas Christian University on a baseball scholarship but never got to play it much when they saw how he could throw a football.

John Kimbrough of Texas A&M was regarded as the finest full-back collegiate football ever saw in the late thirties and then there was W. J. Wisdom, whose basketball team at John Tarleton College set an all-time winning record of 86 straight.

In the forties there came Doak Walker and Bobby Layne to etch their names in the football hall of fame. Walker averaged eight points per game in 102 games of big time football — four years at Southern Methodist, six with Detroit of professional football. Layne was considered probably the greatest quarterback the pro game ever had.

Also in the forties, Texas had its first world's boxing champion since Johnson. He was Lew Jenkins, known as the sweet swatter from Sweetwater. He was lightweight champion of the world for a year.

In the fifties there came Willie Shoemaker, who was to become the greatest winner in horse racing — he averaged 287 winners a year over a 20-year stretch and earned \$4 million.

And then there was Bobby Morrow, who was the world's fastest human and won three gold medals in the 1956 Olympic Games. Previously, Walter Davis, who was Olympic champion in 1952, had become the first high jumper in history to hit seven feet. Also in 1952 Skippy Browning was the finest diver in Olympics history.

The Flying Queens of Wayland College set the all-time record for victories in women's basketball — 131 straight. Slater Martin became Texas' greatest basketball player. He was known as the mighty mite of the National Basketball Association. He was so little George Mikan thought he was a ball boy for three days. Slater finally got tired of retrieving the ball and introduced himself to the great Mikan with a request that he get to shoot some.

The sixties produced such Texas greats of sport as A. J. Foyt, auto racing's biggest winner; Curtis Cokes, world's welterweight champion who saved up \$300,000 from his fights in two years; Fred Hansen, one of the first pole vaulters to soar over 17 feet and winner of the 1964 Olympics championship, and Randy Matson, whose feat of throwing the 16-pound shot 71 feet 5½ inches was considered the greatest record in track history.

Foyt won the glamorous but dangerous Indianapolis 500 three times. He also won the 24-hour Le Mans race in France in the same year that he had come through at Indianapolis — a feat no one else had accomplished.

The greatest single concrete accomplishment of the sixties was erection of the Astrodome at Houston. It was called the eighth wonder of the world and the people believed the advertising as

shown by the millions who passed through its gates. It revolutionized stadium thinking — but thus far no one has attempted to duplicate it, just thought about it and talked about plans for the future. It is a tremendous undertaking, both in money and effort.

The Astrodome, which also revolutionized boxing by staging the largest attended indoor show in history, costs \$2.7 million annually just to operate it and “you can smoke a cigar, have a hamburger with onions and belch a few times and the odor won’t offend anybody. There are three types of filters to take it out.” This refers to the air conditioning, which costs \$350,000 a year to operate.

Plenty of sports, although without national impact, flourished in Texas before and after it became a republic. Horse racing was widespread but there also were rail-splitting, clopping frolics (whatever that meant), quilting bees and log-rolling, according to William R. Hogan’s *Texas Republic*. There also were fishing and hunting, which, from the beginning, have dominated sports. Co-operative bear and buffalo hunts and wolf chases kept a part of the population busy finding recreation, sport and meat for the table.

Horse racing was the common amusement. There was a racing meet at Velasco, on the Gulf coast, in 1838 under auspices of the Jockey Club in Texas. There are accounts of an “Olympic Circus” in 1843 when there were demonstrations of horsemanship and a variety of gymnastics and “Olympic games.” The *Houston Morning Star* said they were held in Galveston, Houston and San Augustine and that there also were other equestrian organizations at Galveston in 1844 and Houston in 1846.

Gambling was a great sport and billiards became widely played, while there was wagering on cockfights and even a few bowling alleys “which had brief existences.” Anti-gambling laws of 1837 and 1840 did little to discourage the practice of chancing one’s money.

The Clarksville newspaper told of horse racing, featuring a duel between Woodpecker and Albert Gallatin over two miles at the village of Boston. The village of Columbia had a track on which match races were run for a purse that reached as high as \$1,000.

Hogan reported that even the invading Mexican army failed to end the sport of racing and most small Texas towns had courses. These included Galveston, Houston, Velasco, Washington, Columbus, Columbia, Richmond, Crockett, Texana, Bastrop, San Augustine, Nacogdoches, Clarksville, Boston, Brazoria, San Antonio and Goliad. “Purses that compared with many clubs in the United States” were offered.

One English lady, whose yacht touched at Galveston, wrote that the national amusement of the frontier republic was “whittling.”

But apparently this never reached sports stature, although some of the fellows might have competed with each other over who could finish his whittle first.

Intercollegiate football, which still creates most of the fuss in sports, saw its start in Texas on an October day in 1894 when the University of Texas met Texas A&M at Austin. "There was a host of ladies in attendance to cheer our boys on to victory," said an account of the historic game, "and the presence of hundreds of their gentleman friends lent noise, if nothing else, to the occasion."

The University of Texas won 38-0 and it was not unlike recent results in this storied gridiron rivalry.



HUMAN TRANSPLANTS — TEXAS CONTRIBUTIONS

CHARLES A. LEMAISTRE

FROM A MEDICAL POINT OF VIEW transplantation is simply treatment by replacement. Transplantation is not a new phenomenon; only the controversy surrounding it is. Successful kidney transplants were performed 15 years ago — over 2,000 have been done — and almost a decade of experience with liver transplantation has aroused little interest.

The real interest arose when medical advances made it possible to transplant the "seat of the soul" or "the symbol of love" — the heart. An ongoing torrent of troublesome questions have burst on the scene seeking absolute answers but finding none.

For instance:

- when is the exact point of death?
- who is competent to make the value judgments as to the donation of a heart?
- who among the dying shall receive new life as a gift?
- is the transplantation procedure totally ethical?
- is it legal?
- should homicide victims ever be used as donors?

Philosophically, *life* and *death* have been expressed as the two enigmas of our existence, the beginning and the end. They cannot be defined, or interpreted, in absolute terms of biology or law.

Yet, for the first time a major concern over the quality and quantity of life has arisen. Even a fraction of life is precious, and one who remains barely clinically alive is still a person to some loved one. This places in sharp focus a potential social crisis involving terminal patients destined to die in a few days or weeks who may become sources for healthy hearts.

Death is no easier to deal with biologically or legally than life. True death can have no quality of its own in the eyes of the physician, for it is nothing but the ultimate cessation of life. Yet biologic death is a process which might extend over as much time as several weeks. Irreversible death may occur while heart, lungs, liver and kidneys remain clinically viable and suitable for transplant. Shall the patient who has suffered massive brain destruction be allowed to die quickly in order to obtain a viable heart for someone who will not live without it?

It is apparent that attempts at absolute definitions of life or death are not practical at the present time. The exact time of cessation of life or the accomplishment of death is imprecise and must inevitably lead to the frustrating problems of today's controversy.

When all is said and done, it seems ironic that the end point of existence — which ought to be clear and sharp — should so defy the power of words to describe it. Absolutism need not stand in the way of progress, however, for the value judgment rendered by the medical experts as to the end of useful life and the beginning of death are based on sound evidence and long experience. I shall at this point resist the temptation to delve into detailed medical evaluation but rather turn to other professional problems created by organ transplantation.

Lawyers have a most reasoned approach to practical considerations. The "consent issue" previously mentioned may become very confusing when the right to grant consent for organ donation by other than the donee is considered. The definition of "consent" is relatively simple and has been expressed as an act of reason accompanied with deliberation. For consent to be valid, the act must be unclouded by fraud, duress or mistake. Any of the following persons who has testamentary capacity could give all, or any part of the decedent's body: the spouse, an adult son or daughter, either parent, an adult brother or sister, or a guardian or any other person authorized to dispose of the body.

As it is for the physician, the determination of the point of legal death is an extremely complex problem for the lawyer. The question of point of death will undoubtedly be raised as a defense for an accused murderer in the event that the heart of the slain person

should be transplanted successfully. The argument that the so-called slain person had not in fact reached the point of death on the basis that his most vital organ continues to live within another is somewhat difficult to refute in absolute terms.

The larger issue of the good of society will also undoubtedly be raised in criminal trials. The argument may be so constructed that the good of society demands punishment of the guilty and should take precedence over the benefit of an individual.

The theologian is not spared concern in this dilemma — take for instance the concept of resurrection. Theologians differ widely on the requirements of a body element necessary to allow for resurrection. The description of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, in fact, implied unit of a body and soul. The image of the intact body in the life hereafter may be indispensable to many. It seems likely, however, that theological consensus will result in approval of organ transplantation so long as removal of the organ does not suppress a vital function of the donor and hasten the end of useful life.

Among the moral questions confronting the potential recipient of an organ is the decision concerning who will receive the chance for a new life. The supply is very limited and the demand great. What criteria should be used for establishing priorities for one individual over another? Most physicians would select the person most urgently in need of a new heart and whose physical and immunological condition offered the best chance for a successful transplantation. Yet, who is to decide which potential recipient would be most useful to society if his life-span be extended? Whereas the medical evaluation of the chances for successful transplantation is becoming more clearly defined, the usefulness of one individual to society may be difficult to ascertain compared with the potential usefulness of another.

So far, I have attempted to propose provocative issues for your intellectual rumination. Dilemmas exist and value judgments are necessary, but the very fact that the medical advances continue despite these controversies is an encouraging sign of reason in our times. The dream of immortality overrides most other considerations of man and this certainly is not new. Egyptian pharaohs in 4,000 B.C. dreamed the same dream and hoped to achieve it with hieroglyphic appeals to their gods. Carved on the walls of their tombs we find this exhortation from the *Book of the Dead*: "Let Life Rise Out of Death." The wealth of the Pharaohs, however, could not buy the priceless opportunity given many dying men today to extend their years through the gift of a new heart.

We will be remiss in our duty to society if the obstacles facing

today's promising achievements are allowed to dominate and dictate inaction. Society in all its ramifications — moral, legal, philosophical and religious aspects — must keep pace with modern science.

The eminent Chinese philosopher Chuang-Tzu in 400 B.C. aptly summed up the crux of today's promise:

"Life follows death. Death is the beginning of life. Who knows when the end is reached."

Following Vice-Chancellor LeMaistre's paper, President Blocker of the University of Texas Medical Branch spoke extemporaneously and informatively upon other aspects of the transplant problem.



SOME AMBASSADORIAL OBSERVATIONS

EDWARD CLARK

I HAD A WONDERFUL TOUR IN AUSTRALIA. Time and again during the tour, I was forcefully reminded of the way other nations look to the United States for leadership.

They look to us to set an example.

They expect us to do better than anyone else in living up to our responsibilities.

The roots of these responsibilities stretch to the ends of the earth, and embrace political, economic, social and moral considerations of the greatest moment. They involve the capacity of our national conscience to distinguish right from wrong, and to guide our actions accordingly.

The people I met in Australia, like those elsewhere around the globe, know full well what we *say* we stand for as a nation: peace with justice, freedom, equality of opportunity, the dignity and worth of the individual.

But, they ask, how well do we live up to our responsibilities of helping to achieve these goals for our own people and the rest of the free world? This insistent question takes on fresh urgency in a Presidential election year when the vocal conscience of responsible citizens is given an opportunity to manifest itself through our free institutions.

There are many reasons why other nations expect so much of us, but the most important is that we are the richest and most powerful nation on earth. By the simple maxim that responsibility is proportionate to power, the burdens of world leadership are inescapably ours.

American industry delivers nearly twice the volume of goods and services accounted for by the European Common Market countries plus Great Britain. A single state — California — out-produces all of Red China with its 750 million people and an area one-third larger than continental United States. Thanks to motivation, education and high capital expenditures, worker productivity in the United States is 40 per cent above that of Sweden, 60 per cent above West Germany, 70 per cent above France, and 80 per cent above Britain. Some of our largest companies, such as General Motors and American Telephone & Telegraph, have gross annual revenues greater than all but a few member countries of the United Nations.

Other people are, of course, fully aware of the realities of our strength and power, starkly and irrefutably spelled out in the statistics by which nations are rated. Yet foremost in their minds, as I found out as Ambassador, is not the *fact* of our material wealth and accomplishment, but rather the *implication* of this power. They want to know whether our growth as a people can keep pace with our materialistic gains; whether our national character and purpose can transcend mere economic projections; whether, indeed, we are up to the task of handling this great entity we have created — the most powerful state in all history.

Because they are interested in Americans as a people as much as they are concerned with us as a nation, the citizens of other countries are dismayed at the present disorder and violence within our society. They are concerned about our seeming confusion over moral standards, the existence of poverty amid plenty, unemployment amid job vacancies, and the decline in the quality of our living environment.

They are shocked and confused by such appalling spectacles as the public flouting of the duties of citizenship; or draft card burnings; of the American flag being torn and spat upon; of high officials of government so heckled and harassed that they cannot move freely among the citizenry; of representatives of law and order at all levels being beaten and shot; of businessmen and military officers recruiting on college campuses being threatened and abused by student mobs; of agitators who are permitted to speak freely, even when they advise people to "start shooting" and urge open rebellion against the Government.

That such things are taking place in a land that offers more legitimate avenues of dissent than any other nation on earth is a paradox that those abroad find difficult to comprehend.

"What's happening to your country?" they ask. "Are you headed toward anarchy?"

It is not surprising that they should question the trends they see and, beyond, these trends, the basic moral tone of our whole society. Not when they see high government officials accused of dishonesty in office. Not when businessmen are convicted of flagrantly misusing stockholder funds. Not when the rackets thrive at our waterfront piers and airports. Not when crime has increased 60 per cent in the past six years, and serious crimes are now occurring at the rate of five every minute.

In view of developments like these, is it any wonder that our democratic premises are questioned abroad and our promises disbelieved? We can hardly expect to talk one way while acting another as a nation — and maintain any sort of world leadership.

As a small-time banker, I was particularly concerned by the fact that there is much uneasiness overseas — and properly so — about the way we have been managing our financial affairs. A very wise financier and a good friend of the United States said to me in Australia: "Your country can't go on much longer the way it has been going."

We have seen in recent devaluation of the British pound what can happen when a country persists in living beyond its means. While our own economy is a great deal stronger than Britain's, it cannot be abused indefinitely. The growing reality of inflation and the worsening of our balance-of-payments position are inevitably eroding confidence in the dollar.

Inflation is an especially serious problem because it is so closely interwoven with every aspect of our economy, and because there is little sign of improvement. Now our recent average of 3 per cent inflation may strike you at first glance as a small figure, but it is not. If this country were to permit prices to rise 3 per cent every year, this would amount to 35 per cent on a compounded basis over the next decade. That's far more than any nation can afford and remain strong economically. With so much of the world trade and prosperity dependent on the dollar, we have additional responsibilities for combating inflation.

The Administration's new program to bring the payments situation under control is aimed almost entirely at the private sector — at the free movement of private capital and tourism. By sharply restraining direct overseas loans and investments by United States

companies, it will unquestionably hurt their ability to compete effectively in foreign markets. Any restriction on the movement of funds impedes our drive for increased world trade.

While all of us recognize the need for drastic action to reduce the payments deficit, I feel it is a mistake to place the whole burden on one sector of our economy. *The Federal Government must exercise restraint in its own spending, and there are many areas where this can be done without harm to domestic or international programs.*

Clearly, we must pay what is necessary for Vietnam. But other industrial nations are well able to shoulder more of the cost of defending their own regions and aiding the world's developing countries. Indeed, a more equitable sharing of these burdens is long overdue.

An appropriate beginning might be made in Southeast Asia through a joint effort of the *United States, Australia and Japan.*

I am persuaded that such coordination is essential for real progress in these developing countries, both as to aid and direct investment. Some of these nations are not in a position to judge the merits of various investments or the feasibility of such ventures for their own country.

Over a period of time, they would incur liabilities which would be difficult for them to meet. For the most part, their economies individually will not support the large units needed for economical production. Yet it would be uneconomical to establish smaller high-cost units. Things like assembly plants for automobiles, fertilizer plants, and the like, require enormous capital investment, and will be competitive only if large units are involved. It would be a great drain on the economies of the developing nations if this type of investment were not properly programmed on a regional basis. After all, there is only a limited amount of aid and capital available to do the job properly and an equitable sharing is necessary.

I believe it would be highly advisable for the governments of the *United States, Australia and Japan* — the three major non-Communist forces in the Pacific area — to appoint a committee of businessmen to work out an economic development program in which each country would participate on a relatively equal basis. In this way, self-defeating uneconomic ventures would be avoided and greater good would redound to the group as a whole.

Beyond such regional arrangements, I think it would be desirable for a multinational body such as the World Bank or its affiliates — or perhaps even a new World Aid Organization — to oversee the planning and administration of economic assistance contributed by all the industrial nations.

Such an organization could draw upon the best talent available anywhere in the free world. It would be relatively immune to political pressures. It could foster sound economic development because it would not have the compulsion to produce quick results and would be relatively impervious to nationalistic whims. Having no political or commercial interests of its own, it would be able to concentrate on obtaining the greatest possible return in economic and social developments for each dollar spent. It could limit its assistance to projects that were soundly conceived and executed, and tie the financing of such projects to appropriate economic performance.

Realistically, the United States cannot be the sole contributor to the world's economic welfare and military security. And those people overseas that I spoke with understand this. Furthermore, they don't expect the United States to play such a role. What they do expect from us, though, is the kind of personal involvement that confirms that we as individuals recognize our responsibilities: first, as American citizens; and second, as world citizens. I mean the kind of involvement that comes about when you or I say, "Look, this issue or that one is important to me and I'm going to do something about it." I mean the kind of involvement we have when citizens from all walks of life, regardless of personal pressures, find the time to lend a hand in the day-to-day process of governing. Doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, business — particularly businessmen. I think businessmen have protested too much against the caliber of government people, but have done too little about it.

Over the years, federal, state and local government units have approached the business community repeatedly for top-flight men and women willing to serve in particular executive jobs. More often than not, they have come away empty handed.

Summing up the results, business by and large believes it has a responsibility to further the aims of good government at the national, state and local levels; but so far, with a few notable exceptions, it has been reluctant to take specific steps to carry out this responsibility. If the business community is serious about providing leadership in this area, what it needs most of all are some new attitudes. There are two steps that would have a profoundly constructive impact in getting more good men into government service.

First, corporations should have a firm policy of encouraging executives to serve a stint in government, and they should make this policy known. At present, the initiative usually comes from the executive himself. I'd like to see more companies take the initiative in urging their people to serve, because I'm convinced

that over the long run, both company and the government would benefit.

Second, corporations should give executives, who are considering government service, some assurance that if they return, their position in the company would be enhanced, not lessened, by their service. I realize how difficult it is to spell this out in detail, but it would be desirable to talk to the executive in concrete terms about the importance of experience in government.

Such actions would, in my view, go a long way toward overcoming some of the more formidable obstacles to government service by the business executive. We cannot be mere bystanders in the serious business of self-rule. We must get "where the action is" and play a decisive part in determining the direction and purposes of that action.

This sense of individual responsibility is the key to healthy nationhood. Look around the world today. *The nations that are prospering are the ones whose economic systems unleash the full measure of people's energy, ability, character and initiative, and provide them with the freedom they need to make the most of their opportunities.*

Japan is a prime example. Having doubled its real per capita output in just the past seven years, that country expects to double again by 1977. *What's the mysterious ingredient that enables Japan to lead the world in growth rate?* Certainly not the land's natural wealth, for Japan now imports most of its industrial raw materials and nearly three-fourths of its energy resources. *The explanation, I'm convinced, lies in the character of the Japanese people, in their willingness to work and sacrifice and strive for improvement.*

The sooner we, in this country, understand that we are dealing with people and not statistics and begin giving individuals genuine help and encouragement in advancing toward their personal aspirations, the nearer we will be to solving our national problems. *We must see to it that all of our people have access to education, training and opportunity for meaningful work — rather than reducing millions of them to accepting life-long "handouts" from the Federal Government.*

We need to abandon the parasitic philosophy that has choked off our vigor and ambition. We need to dedicate ourselves to human values and human goals and to making a contribution to better living for others.

This, I think, is the crux of our future relationship with the people of other countries. We are proud of our strength and our wealth and of the material benefits that these have brought. Out of our generosity as a people, we willingly share these benefits with others.

Yet, at the same time, we tend to stress too often, the materialistic side of our national wealth.

The impression I received in Australia is that what the people of other lands are looking for is not only additional shiploads of all the wonderful material things we produce. They are also looking for proof, through example, that the true spirit of America continues to exist and thrive . . . that we are people still possessing the virtues that have built this nation: our energy, initiative and character, our love of freedom, our willingness to sacrifice when we have to, our conviction that every man must have his chance, our natural inclination to make the most of our resources, our inherent good sense, our compassion and courage, and our trust in God. These should be our major "exports" to other countries.

What the people abroad are asking, in essence, is: "Will the REAL America please stand up?" It is high time, I think, that we, as individuals, should stand up and show other nations — in word and deed — what we really are. When we do this, we will have taken an important step toward exercising true world leadership.



AUSTRALIA: AN ASSESSMENT

C. HARTLEY GRATTAN

WHEN IN 1783 THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM, of which David Hartley was the negotiating spokesman, finally arrived at an accommodation which allowed the revolted colonies strung along the eastern seaboard of North America their freedom, the British government faced a perplexing variety of domestic and foreign problems. With regard to the governance of the Empire that remained now that the thirteen principal North American colonies were gone, they continued to assert the supremacy of the Parliament in London, a prime cause of the alienation of the North American colonists; they continued to regard the security of the British Isles as the supreme guarantor of Empire security, and they were still convinced that the national strength was augmented by possessions overseas, when governed economically by mercantilist principles. With regard to domestic politics they continued on a familiar course also, in

no connection more adamantly than in dealing with those unfortunates who, having become entangled with the law, had been adjudged guilty, though not so guilty as to merit hanging, but guilty enough to be transported out of the kingdom for seven or fourteen years or for the terms of their natural lives. These, in 1786, the government resolved in future to send chiefly to a new settlement to be set up on that east coast of the land mass known as New Holland, which Captain James Cook had traversed in 1770 and taken possession of for the British Crown and dubbed New South Wales. This decision made and acted upon, a penal colony, with Captain Arthur Phillip, R.N., as founding governor, was established as Port Jackson in 1788 and named Sydney. This was the first step along the historical road which leads to what we in 1968 — eighteen decades later — know as the Commonwealth of Australia. It was the first European settlement on the continent of New Holland; indeed the first European settlement in the Southwest Pacific which in time the British came effectively to dominate by establishing themselves in New Zealand, Fiji, the Solomon Islands, several lesser groups, and New Guinea.

In 1786 the British authorities knew little about New Holland — the term “Australia” did not come into use until about 1825. Nobody knew much about it in spite of the fact that the Dutch, working east from the Cape of Good Hope en route to Java and out of Java, had been accumulating knowledge of the northern, western and southern coasts since 1606. The Dutch had seen nothing along these coasts that gave them any idea that it was worth even thinking about settlement. Only when Captain Cook, travelling west from Tahiti and New Zealand, hit upon the eastern coast that land of any attractive power over Europeans was seen. However, Captain Cook’s assessment of it in such terms was extremely temperate; and that of Joseph Banks, his famous companion on the voyage, equally temperate. However, Banks advised the British government about “New South Wales” when it was struggling to decide what to do about transportees in terms somewhat more enthusiastic, probably because it appeared to satisfy the government’s requirements for a place remote from Europe from which escape was unlikely, yet which offered the hope of early self-support in the essentials of subsistence. Convicts did escape from Sydney; self-support eluded for about 16 years; and it took about thirty years before a use for the natural resources was hit upon that led to the establishment in Australia of a truly dynamic economy. The natural resource which then came into use was the indigenous grasses — the pastures — and the pastoral industry of running sheep for wool was

rapidly built and expanded. Up to that time the jail economy was based in largest measure upon crop agriculture, and one of a rather bedraggled description: poor soils common in the immediate vicinity of Sydney, erratic rainfall, poor seeds, low grade culture methods, and *scale*. Except in very special situations small farms have never succeeded under Australian conditions. Yet even so, once supply matched needs, the problem of a market raised its ugly head. For crop agriculture the market was the commissary of the jail organization, and its capacity was limited. The Imperial authorities, of course, took the view that the Australian settlements were jail settlements, that crop agriculture was necessary for convict subsistence, and that freed convicts who stayed on in Australia should be settled in it to serve jail needs. A remunerative market for capitalist crop agriculturalists was not on their agenda. However within a few years of original settlement, free men, free enterprisers, percolated into the jail settlements, although not welcomed heartily by the governors, and they sought profit and found it in merchandizing, wholesale and retail, of imported goods, sealing, whaling, and gathering in the island. These people were the thin edge of a wedge which would burst up the jail society; they were, in their peculiar way, harbingers of the Australian future.

While these free settlers originally had no nobler aspiration than to get rich, as "rich" was measured in that rather constricted society, their noses for the main chance led to the economic future; and their acute sense of being freeborn subjects of the King led them on to demand, even in this jail society, the rights of Englishmen. In this respect, also, they were in harmony with the future. In spreading sheep stations — not ranches, a term never used in Australia — over the land, they burst the bounds of the old jail territory and stimulated the exploration of the interior. It is astonishing how much of Australia was originally explored in the hope of finding new, useful pastoral country. They indeed found much useful pastoral country; they found, rather quickly too, its outermost margins, beyond which was desert, or something so close to it that it didn't matter. Australia might, over a staggering number of square miles, be useful for sheep, but a staggering number of square miles beyond had simply the potential of cattle country, marginal country in the Australian calculus. By 1850 economic Australia had been outlined on the basis of pastoralism, sheep for wool. Wool growing thrived because wool was an exportable commodity in increasing demand in England. Thus Australia subordinated crop agriculture to a rather miserably marginal position. The orientation of this economy was from ports inland in more or less the shape of a fan. The ports grew

quickly into small cities; the bush, ran from the city's edge to the outback and beyond that to the back of beyond, the never-never country. This economy supported by 1850 about 400,000 people, the majority free men and probably one-third of them in coastal towns, the rest scattered thinly over the interior. Imagine this distribution of people in a country about the same size as continental United States and you'll have a rough idea of what Australia was like about 1850. In building this economy the boundaries of the jail economy had been trampled down, the governors protesting, and convictism itself was slowly submerged, to the point that, after a painful and luckily abortive experiment with a mixed labor force, transportation was abolished in the eastern continental area in 1840, in Van Diemen's Land in 1852, but in the remote, disconnected, isolated west on the Indian Ocean in 1869. Convictism was a damper on working-class welfare; it was a definite impediment to progress in political freedom.

The abolition of transportation, stopping the steady replenishment of those in bondage, opened the way to rapid progress in political freedom. In this business few gave even a tinker's damn about those in bondage, only a tiny fraction of the free elite cared about the ex-convicts; the concern was, pretty steadily, with the rights of the always free. The Imperial authorities, dubious about the morality of a society convict in its foundations, were extremely reluctant, as long as transportation continued, to extend the freedoms of the always free because they could not see their way to extend the same freedoms to those now free but formerly in bondage. Therefore a peculiar political progression is observable: First a preoccupation with establishing the civil rights of the ex-convicts, a struggle in which the opposition came not so much the Imperial authorities in London as from the London-appointed place-holders on the spot in Australia in alliance with a large proportion of the free elite in Australia; next the struggle to feel out the limits of what the British call *representative government*, an enterprise which reached its limits in the late 1840's, once convictism was abolished; and then in the middle eighteen-fifties the realization of *responsible government* in all the Australian colonies then existing except remote, laggard Western Australia far away on the Indian Ocean, which is to say *local self-government* under the terms and conditions then existing in the British Imperial community.

By the late 1850's the political geography of Australia became fixed in all essentials. Out of the eastern two-thirds of the continent plus the island Van Diemen's Land there had been created by carving up the old original New South Wales, the colonies of Van

Diemen's Land (which on the abolition of transportation was renamed Tasmania), Victoria, first settled in 1835 and given independent colonial status in 1851, South Australia a separate colony from its beginnings in 1836, and Queensland set up as a separate colony in 1859. This left old New South Wales sadly truncated but still by European (or American) standards with a very commodious territory. In the north of this portion of the continent there was a dubious, problematical block of territory to which was given the name of Northern Territory. In 1867 it was given into the charge of South Australia, with which it was contiguous on the south. The remaining third of the continent was assigned to Western Australia, settlement of which had begun as long ago as 1829. All these colonies were based essentially on running sheep for wool. Only South Australia had a significant crop agricultural industry: wheat growing. Barring a miraculous and therefore anomalous discovery of good country in the untraversed areas of the interior, it was apparent that every Australian colony had some good country, but that most of the good country was in the southeastern portion of the continent beyond a line drawn from, say, Brisbane in southern Queensland across to the head of Spencer's Gulf in South Australia. Here, it was already apparent, but not to be acknowledged for many years to come, was the heartland of Australia.

Into this congeries of colonies there poured during the 1850's a host of gold seekers. The alluvial gold was chiefly found in Victoria, secondarily in New South Wales, and only later on in Queensland and Western Australia. The golden decade was the '50's. The resident population of Australia rose from 400,000 in 1850 to 1,146,000 in 1860. The prime beneficiary was Victoria, the population of which increased from 70,000 to 538,000, surpassing that of New South Wales, the Mother Colony. This rapid increase in the resident population was a challenge to the Australian politicians, then just undertaking self-government. The story of Australia from around 1860 to 1914, and the outbreak of World War I is essentially a story of how that challenge was met — successfully. The economy was expanded and diversified, railways were provided, ports modernized, the cities enlarged, debt for development piled up, booms engendered, the vagaries of prices for Australian exports in world markets coped with, busts endured and survived. The basic industry remained the running of sheep for wool. The numbers of sheep run were strikingly increased by more intensive use of the land and by dispersal of stations into the dry country. The country still lived on the sheep's back. Cattle, aside from the meat animals

for city consumption, were scattered across the north, beyond the bounds of sheep country, from Queensland, through Northern Territory into Western Australia. Slowly, now crop agriculture came into its own, with the emphasis overwhelmingly on wheat in a great sweep of country from Eyre Peninsula in South Australia through Victoria and New South Wales up into southern Queensland, with a subsidiary wheat area in far Southwestern Australia. By the beginning of the twentieth century Australia was one of the Big 4 wheat exporters, ranking with but after the USA, Canada, and Argentina. The basic experiments in irrigation agriculture were made, particularly along the Murray River in the great Southeastern quadrant. Tropical agriculture, the emphasis on sugar cane, was established in that long finger of well-watered country along the coast of Queensland within the fabulous Barrier Reef. Dairying took hold in northeastern Victoria and southeastern New South Wales. Base metal mining established itself, with most striking symbolism with the great and enduring silver-lead-zinc mines at Broken Hill in the dry southwestern corner of New South Wales, from the 1880's. Only manufacturing failed to make much headway during this period. It remained at the end a cluster, perhaps better a clutter, of small scale light industries serving chiefly consumer needs, mostly around Melbourne and Sydney. When World War I broke out Australia was a foodstuffs, raw materials, and manpower resource, but hardly worth talking about as a manufacturing resource, of the British Empire. Politically, however, considerable and for the future, *portentous*, changes had lately taken place. In 1901 the six Australian colonies had been federated into the Commonwealth of Australia. In the 1890's a new political party, the Labor Party, expressive of the widespread discontent with the colonial bourgeoisie of Australia had taken its rise, and by 1910 it held office *and power* in the Commonwealth. It was still in power when World War I broke out. And a great private enterprise, the Broken Hill Pty Ltd., producer of base metals, had in 1912 made a fateful decision: it had decided to go into steel-making and in 1915 opened a works, fundamentally American in character, at Newcastle in New South Wales on the best soft coal fields in Australia.

Now let us recall that this Australia was a *BRITISH* country. Its trade ties were with Britain, its exports chiefly went there, its imports came from there, it borrowed its money from there, it took its politico-constitutional ideas from there, its culture was British, its people were, as the boast was, 98% British: a scattering of Americans, descendants of men left behind by the gold rushes, plus

waifs and shays who had arrived later, and a minority of Orientals, Chinese, remnants of an emigration to the gold fields that had inspired the idea that Australia was to be reserved for Europeans, by overwhelming preference, British Europeans: the so-called white Australia policy, confirmed on a continent-wide basis by the federal parliament in 1901. This Australia was linked to Britain by steamship lines which were British, by cables which were British. It had no separate international personality: its foreign relations were handled by the United Kingdom. Yet underneath this seemingly solid British crust a ferment was at work: the ferment of nationalism, a sense of an Australian identity, first given clear expression in the 1880's by the painters and writers, but contained by the politicians by their claim to be *Australian Britons*.

World War I stimulated the Australian sense of identity. It was confirmed in the Australian imagination by the performance of its armed forces in the Middle East, particularly at Gallipoli, and in France; it was given a fairly strident political expression at the Peace Conference by the then Commonwealth Prime Minister, William Morris Hughes; but in the decade after the war it was damped down, not least politically, and the Australians were indifferent and even hostile bystanders when the South Africans and the Canadians put on their drive for constitutional recognition of separate identity which was summed up pro-tem in the Statute of Westminster, 1931.

The Australians did not have a boom in the 20's like the Americans. They made progress, they borrowed heavily to finance progress, but they achieved only a propped-up economy. Of the significant exports, only wool consistently resisted support and continued to be sold in open auctions. By 1925 it was obvious something was wrong, in 1927, when I was first in Australia, an economist published a famous tract warning that a bust like that of the 1890's was imminent. The Australian bust came as the worldwide Great Depression which hit Australia very hard indeed. The struggle for economic viability was intense; it wrecked governments; it was conducted without the benefit of the Keynesian revelations; and such recovery as was achieved derived quite obviously from rearmament, even as in the United States. However, a significant idea emerged. While the pastoral industry would undoubtedly recover strength and crop agriculture get on its feet once more, the likeliest road forward seemed to be factory industry. This idea I date from 1929, and certain it is that it achieved dominance in the Australian imagination during the 'thirties. An achievement of the 'twenties was securely to establish the steel industry and to begin the proliferation of the steel fabricating industries. This trend continued during the

'thirties; and Australia entered World War II with a far more useful supporting factory industry than had existed in 1914. The idea survived the war and was dominant in the post-war planning of the Labor government which held power from 1941 to 1949, and it was a basic preconception of the Liberal-Country Party coalition which succeeded Labor in 1949 and continues to rule the Commonwealth to this day. An important reason for the proliferation of factories was that factories would not only employ the labor being given up by the rural industries as they mechanized, but would also allow the absorption of immigrants from overseas and thus satisfy an ancient Australian need: the need for a larger population. This idea, too, was taken up and turned by Labor during its time of office into a great campaign for immigrants, a remarkable departure, for Labor orthodoxy for generations was hostility to immigration, interpreted by them as malicious flooding of the labor market to the employer advantage. The conservative coalition has, of course, followed suit to the present day. The Australian preference was — and is — for British immigrants, but Labor's adoption of an aggressive immigration policy, was accompanied by a receptivity to continental, non-English-speaking immigrants: Latvians, Lithuanians, Germans, Dutch, Italians, Spaniards, Greeks, Maltese, Yugoslavs, Turks, a mixture of peoples comparable to the immigrations into North America, with the attendant immediate and long-term consequences to the local folkways.

But this is not all. During the thirties there was an upward swing of creative energy in both writing and painting. This too survived the war and achieved an efflorescence in the post-war which caused the Australians to talk of their cultural maturity. Similarly with regard to education, scarifyingly criticized before the war, characterized after the war by a rapid multiplication of universities and the numbers of university students. And libraries, badly battered in prewar criticism, on the up-and-up today. Yet significant and important as all these things are in the domestic life of Australia — industrialization, the heavy inpouring of diverse peoples, better books and paintings, more universities and university students, more and far better libraries — they lack for outside observers the drama of the great transformation of the international personality of Australia. It is this more than anything else that has led to Australia being so much more vivid in the American imagination today than forty years ago when I got involved. There is a disposition for Americans to think that Australia is a post World War II "happening." I think I have made it clear that this is nonsense. The Americans first had dealings with Australia in 1792 when the ship *Phila-*

delphia, out of Philadelphia, Captain Patrickson, called at the four-year-old settlement at Sydney and sold the authorities an assortment of much needed foodstuffs and materials; and in no decade since have American-Australian contacts been wholly absent — creative, disastrous, comic, tragic, as the case may be. During the gold rush days of the 1850's there were more true and *soi-disant* Americans in Australia than at any time until World War II. Even in 1927, a low point in American interest in Australia and of Australian interest in America, there were enough Americans in Sydney for Olson and Johnson, later to achieve theatrical renown in New York with *Hellzapoppin*, to put on a 4th of July party which was a blast. Jascha Heifitz played the piano in imitation of a player piano. But the point I want to make is this: the redefinition of Australia's international personality began in the 1930's with a great debate over whether or not it should develop a foreign political policy of its own, partly stimulated to this by the difficulties it was experiencing with the depression-generated trade problems, partly because of the alarming shape then being taken by "foreign relations" in the Far East (which the Australians were beginning to call their Near North). The agreed upon conclusion was that Australia had her own special interests in the Pacific, distinguishable from Britain's though hopefully not outside the ambit of Britain's concern; and that sooner or later this would require Australia to establish direct diplomatic relations with the United States, Japan and possibly China. This conclusion the Australians began to implement in 1940, when the first Australian minister ever sent abroad was sent to Washington and the first Minister from the United States went to Canberra.

Let us look at the situation then emerging in the Western Pacific as the Australians saw it. The first point to be made is that the Australians were deeply implicated in the defense system of the British Empire. The quid pro quo for assistance in British Imperial defense, was assistance *from the British* in any extremity involving Australia. In World War II, Australian assistance to Britain was concentrated in North Africa and the Middle East; while the focal point for British cooperation in Australia's defense was the great base at Singapore. This implied another cardinal principle: that the defense of Australia was best conducted *as far away from Australia as possible*. Now even before World War II broke out, Australia's heavy reliance on Singapore for defense was called into question. It was improbable that Britain could adequately reinforce Singapore with ships and planes if it was heavily engaged in Europe. In the event, as will be recalled, the latter was a decisive reason

for the rapid collapse of British power to the north of Australia, signified thunderously by the fall of Singapore late in 1941. It was a premonition that something like this, though nothing quite so definitely horrible, might occur that motivated the Australian diplomatic approach to the United States in 1940. Essentially what the Australians wanted to know was what the United States would do if the Japanese marshalled their strength for an all-out southward drive — and menaced Australia. In the end this question was answered by events, and the inexorable logic of the situation led to Australian-American collaboration in stopping and repelling the Japanese.

Now it must be kept in mind that the wartime Australian-American collaboration was regarded by the Australians as a temporary expedient; they entertained the supposition that after the war Britain would recover enough of her strength and be a satisfactory collaborator with a much stronger Australia in the Far East. Not that the Australians thought of dumping the Americans. Rather they forecasted a collaboration, Britain and Australia on the one side, with the United States on the other. As we know it didn't work out quite that way. Inexorable forces were at work which progressively reduced British power and influence in the East which will culminate in the British withdrawal from East of Suez in the early 1970's. It has been almost as if there were a cosmic conspiracy to force the Australians to act on their own to protect their position as a European people close to a free but troubled and volatile Asia. The Australians have risen manfully to the challenge. They have seized upon the creative trends which began in the nineteen-thirties and, in the light of present day thinking, carried them forward. They have imported capital freely to get on with the job rather faster than ever before, not least by drawing in American capital. They have shifted their security reliance from Britain to the United States. They have refocused their defense preoccupation, for years on Suez and its vicinity, to Southeast Asia. They have put immense effort into diversifying their trading outlets and have found in Japan a partner which is rapidly overshadowing Britain. Currently they are making a strong trading effort in Latin America. They persist in the wrestling with the problem of successfully trading with the United States, a vexing conundrum since 1792. They are active participants in all organizations concerned with world trade and finance. They have vastly expanded their diplomatic service. They have, in short, done what anyone who has known the Australians as long as I have — forty-two years — would have anticipated: They have faced up to the

global and area realities which environ their particular country after two World Wars and a great depression, pulled up their socks, and dedicated themselves to the proposition that while they may never be a Great Power, they can be, come what may, a great and distinctive people, Euro-American in fundamental character, and well-worth anybody's knowing.



GENESIS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN TEXAS

JAMES A. TINSLEY

FROM THE PERIOD OF THE REPUBLIC and early statehood, say down to 1870 or 1880, the initiative in higher education was taken by Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists. These men not only expected support from their denominations but subventions from government in the form of land grants, scholarships, or cash. The great debate from the 1840's through the 1880's was whether Texas would adopt the New York system of subsidizing private colleges or, like the southern and midwestern states, establish its own colleges and universities.

Denominational leaders, including Baptists whatever their notions on separation of church and state, sought, unsuccessfully, state aid. The A&M College was created in 1876, Sam Houston Normal Institute in 1879, and the University of Texas in 1883. It is worth noting that after the state committed itself to supporting only its own institutions, denominational and private educational efforts declined rapidly. Southern Methodist University and Rice University as notable exceptions, but leadership in higher education had passed to the state institutions by the turn of the century. Recognition of pluralistic system of higher education remains, however. The Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, is charged to take cognizance of programs and aspirations of private colleges in determining when and where new programs are to be offered at state expense, lest in expanding its services, the state harm private schools. We also have the recent instance of Baylor University College of Medicine being divorced from denominational control

in order to receive state and federal assistance. The fact is, of course, that the laborious distinctions of fifty or sixty years ago between private from public colleges have largely lost their meanings since the federal government enlarged its support of higher education in the 1950's. All of which brings us back around full circle: Daniel Baker, Marcus Montrose, Martin Ruter, Rufus Burleson, William Carey Crane, and Addison and Randolph Clark all thought of their educational efforts as a public service as well as a sectarian one, which justified their seeking public support.

Some of those early personalities and institutions deserve to be remembered for their contributions to the genesis of higher education in Texas.

One of the earliest was Martin Ruter, born in Charleston, Massachusetts, in 1785. Licensed to preach, Ruter also became active in college work, serving as president of three Methodist colleges, including Allegheny College. After the Battle of San Jacinto, Ruter came to Texas as a missionary. He also projected a Methodist college and had received pledges of support from citizens and officials of the Republic before he died in 1838. The following year Rutersville College was organized through the auspices of the Texas Conference of his church, under the presidency of Chauncey Richardson. The college received a grant of four leagues of land from the Republic and enrollment rose steadily until the middle and late 1840's when it suffered from Indian raids, the Mexican War, competition from Baylor at Independence, and internal strife and bickering.

As Rutersville declined and finally lost its identity through a merger with the Texas Monumental and Military Institute in the late 1850's, John Witherspoon Pettigrew McKenzie, born in 1806 in North Carolina and educated at the University of Georgia, began missionary work in the Clarksville circuit and in 1841 established McKenzie College. Although the Texas Conference supported it only one year, McKenzie continued his work and trained most of the Methodist ministers of the state until the Civil War. Floundering during the war, the school closed in 1868. A third Methodist institution, Soule University, organized in 1855 from the male department of the Chappell Hill Male and Female Institute, lingered on until 1888. A fourth Methodist school, Wesleyan Male and Female College, was organized in 1846 in San Augustine to compete with the Presbyterian-sponsored University of San Augustine. A year later, the two schools consolidated under the imposing name University of East Texas. It was succeeded by the Masonic Institute of San Augustine in 1851.

The important thing about the four abortive Methodist efforts is that they led the church to establish Southwestern University at Georgetown in 1875, legally a continuation of the four earlier colleges.

Presbyterians — two varieties of them — were as active as Methodists in establishing colleges in the wilderness. Citizens of San Augustine in 1842 employed the Rev. Marcus A. Montrose, recently arrived from his native Scotland where he had attended the University of Edinburgh, to take the presidency of their university. William R. Hogan's *Texas Republic*, records how the Rev. Mr. Montrose was chosen:

It was evident that no one in the town was adequate to the examination of so learned a man. The committee, consisting of I. D. Thomas, Matthew Cartwright and Phillip A. Sublett, decided to make it a mere matter of form. Mr. Thomas asked, 'Can you figure?' Mr. Montrose, who was a master of calculus, modestly admitted that he thought he could, and Mr. Thomas announced that he was satisfied. Mr. Cartwright then asked, 'Can you calculate interest?' Mr. Montrose thought he would be equal to the task, and Mr. Cartwright declared himself satisfied. Mr. Sublett then asked, 'Can you turn the grandmother's trick?' (a trick at cards well known among gamblers). This puzzled the worthy Scotchman and he was obliged to confess his ignorance. 'Then I am satisfied,' exclaimed Mr. Sublett, and Mr. Montrose was accordingly employed.

But Montrose's career was neither long nor distinguished at San Augustine. He resigned in 1845 to serve as president of neighboring University of Nacogdoches — non-sectarian but with Presbyterian overtones. Thereafter he moved to Masonic Collegiate Institute at Fanthorp then to the La Grange Female Institute before he died in 1855. The Presbyterian effort at San Augustine did not survive.

Presbyterians made a more successful start at Huntsville under the leadership of Daniel Baker, who was born in Georgia in 1791, attended Hampden-Sidney College and was graduated from Princeton (College of New Jersey) in 1815. Before 1848 he preached and taught in Washington, and several southern states. His first trip to Texas, 1840, was to investigate possible missions. Then he moved to Mississippi. In 1848 he was back in Texas as a missionary and next year he promoted the establishment of a college at Huntsville. Baker sought denominational and public support and Samuel McKinney was the first president of Austin College. The college opened in 1852 and Baker was president from 1853 to 1856, and died in 1857. Austin College prospered until the Civil War, thanks to about \$100,000 Baker raised, but after 1860 enrollment

dwindled and support declined. In 1878 the college was moved to Sherman where it remains an important part of our system of higher education. The buildings vacated in Huntsville were turned over in 1879 to the new Sam Houston Normal Institute, the first institution of this kind operated by the state. Meanwhile, the Cumberland Presbyterians in 1869 merged the Chappell Hill College of Daingerfield (1850), Ewing College (1860), and Larissa College (1856) into Trinity University at Tehuacana where it remained until 1902 when it relocated in Waxahachie and later in San Antonio.

The Baptist efforts at higher education in Texas were tied in large part to two personalities, Rufus C. Burleson and William Carey Crane, presidents of Baylor University at Independence and at Waco. Burleson, born 1823 in Alabama, attended Nashville University and Western Baptist Theological Seminary in Kentucky. Coming to Houston in 1848, he preached briefly in the Bayou City and in 1851 became president of Baylor University at Independence. Baylor University's charter was signed by Anson Jones, last President of the Republic, in 1845 and opened a year later. Henry Lea Graves, the school's first president resigned in 1851 and was succeeded by Burleson. In 1861 Burleson and the faculty and senior class of the male department quit Independence and moved to newly organized Waco University. After the Civil War, Burleson also served as state agent for the Peabody Fund. Meanwhile, as the railroads bypassed Independence, so did progress and Baylor University suffered declining enrollments and dwindling revenues. William Carey Crane, who succeeded George W. Baines, grandfather of a member of this Society, was one of the ablest educators in his day — but was unable to stem the tide. In 1886 Baylor was merged with Waco University, bearing the old name in new location.

Some pre-Civil War colleges and universities were not church affiliated. Texas Military Institute, first organized in 1858 at Bastrop, moved to Austin in 1870, was nominally independent of church control. Its guiding light was John Garland James, a graduate of Virginia Military Institute in 1866 who served as professor in the Kentucky Military Institute before coming to Bastrop in 1867. James and his faculty were hired en masse in 1879 to replace the first administration and faculty of Texas A&M College. James remained at A&M until 1883. Salado College was another departure from the norm. Founded in 1860, the college was backed by the Salado Joint Stock Company, of which Colonel Elijah Sterling Clack Robertson was a major stockholder. The college averaged 250 students a year between 1866 and 1872 when the panic of 1873

caused a sharp drop in enrollment. In 1880 the charter expired and the property was turned over to the Salado public schools. The college was unique, however, in that it operated twenty-four years on tuition alone.

Professor Richardson has noted that from annexation to the beginning of the Civil War the Texas legislature granted charters to thirty colleges and seven universities. Many never operated and some of those that did were hardly "institutions of higher learning." Parents who could afford it sent their children east to school. In Texas, administrators lacked funds, many faculty members were ill prepared and overworked, and students were rebellious. But on balance these schools were not only an important civilizing influence on the frontier, but they were early supporters of state institutions. Burleson and Crane led the movement to establish the normal institute at Huntsville and the University of Texas at Austin.

The movement for state colleges and universities, long discussed, bore fruit in the post-Civil War period. First, Texas in 1866 claimed the 180,000 acres of federal lands in Colorado, available under the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, and sold the land to open A&M College in 1876. Sam Houston Normal Institute, with \$6,000 from the Peabody Board, and \$6,000 state funds, opened in 1879. Two years later the legislature authorized a "university of the first class" which opened in Austin in 1883.

Within a forty year period, 1840 to 1880, the people of Texas put together the framework of a mixed system of higher education composed of private (mostly church related) colleges, and a state supported system. Years were to pass before any of these schools was to attain wide recognition but the basis for future growth had been well laid.

And who is to say that later generations of Texans have done as much with the resources at their disposal as did these early pioneers.

COMMUNICATIONS OVERKILL?

DILLON ANDERSON

I HAVE BORROWED THIS TERM, "Overkill", from the Military who begin by estimating the number and kind of nuclear bombs it would take to devastate an enemy — to kill them all. They call the use of more bombs than that "overkill" for that enemy. (Of course, that was some time ago when overkill related to the developed nations. Now there are enough of these weapons to go all around — enough for the under-developed nations as well to provide enough overkill to take care of every living soul.)

We have a number of other overkills around these days — enough for apocalyptic results. We may or may not have one in the field of communications. That's the reason for the question mark in the title. A brief look at the broader spectrum of overkill may help to put the communications one in its place.

In another category related to war — the Red Horseman of the Apocalypse — the major world powers are said to possess elements of bacteriological warfare which if unloosed upon an enemy could produce overkill upon him and, perhaps incidentally, upon all his neighboring states. Then there is chemical warfare — a truly horrific killer. I am told that overkill is also possible here.

There are those who see apocalyptic implications in the matter of air pollution. Responsible authorities predict that in less than a century even man's peaceful consumption and use of the earth's crust and its atmosphere will so poison and pollute his vital ambience as to produce his own extermination. The Pale Horseman.

And last month at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, another kind of overkill was predicted by Lord Snow, British statesman, novelist, scientist, and philosopher. He revived the Malthusian specter of the human race engulfed in a sea of starvation. Lord Snow confessed utter despair at the prospect and prophesied that by the end of the century, mankind would be overtaken by famine and pestilence. The Dark Horseman of the Apocalypse.

So this seems to be a time for taking stock of old dangers freighted with new techniques, a season for viewing with alarm. Our odds do not appear to be getting any better; only one horseman has to win and the human race has had it. It is in this rather harsh context that I should like to concentrate on the question mark following my

subject, Communications Overkill? Will man be able to cope with the communications avalanche, or does it actually threaten to envelop him in confusion and chaos?

One clue may be in the factor of sheer time. Though we can only speculate on how long man has been capable of more elaborate communications than the birds and the beasts of the field, it seems safe to suggest that the difference appeared long long ago, even though it came first in grunts and squeaks, of the sort porpoises utter to make known to other porpoises their moods and needs. The growth of language must have been a slow and torturous process, in the thousands upon thousands of years before words even designated objects. Then, thousands upon tens of thousands more years must have passed before abstract thinking became articulated and thus communicated.

Marshall McLuhan has said that until writing was invented, man lived in acoustic space, boundless, directionless, horizonless, in the dark of the mind, in the world of emotion, by primordial intuition, by terror.

Perhaps we shall never know whether crude pictures on the walls of caves came before or after the caves rang out with words. We can only feel fairly sure that the development of speech and its link with the written word came very late and over such a long period that the last hundred years would be, in relation to it, no more than the twinkling of an eye.

As articulate and as literate as man had become in the days when civilization flowered in ancient Greece, the means for wide dissemination of knowledge were hardly in the bud. The invention of the printing press was still far in the future.

Five hundred years ago in these precincts where we meet tonight, communications were surely of a most rudimentary sort. Any message beyond word of mouth, or beyond the sound of a voice, must have been by smoke signal — a medium I have always felt to be especially vulnerable in an area as subject to whirlwinds as South Texas.

During Washington's presidency, he once said of our Minister to France, "We didn't hear from Ben Franklin in Paris last year. I think I will write him a letter."

In this day when we take complete communications for granted, it is hard to believe that which history tells us is true about a major battle in the nineteenth century. The Battle of New Orleans — the last in the War of 1812 — fought nearly a month after the Treaty of Ghent — the treaty that ended that war.

Thus man — the walking, talking, laughing, fighting animal — came almost all the distance that sets him so far apart from all other creatures here below with the handicap of severely limited communications. For the past century has seen telegraphy, wired then wireless, and the Gramophone; then radio and motion pictures, gray and silent; then with sound and in colors; and finally television with instantaneous transmission now by satellite to any corner of the globe. These techniques perfected in our own lifetime have burgeoned in our presence and enveloped us with information enough to give mental indigestion to the Gods. As Lord Snow also pointed out at Fulton, "We know incomparably more than any human beings before us about what is going on in other cities, in other countries."

What, then, is the outlook? What will be the effect, for better or for worse, of even more complete communications? What are some of the visible effects? Let us examine some of them — they may provide a clue.

Television — perhaps the biggest part of the communications miracle — has produced other discernible, though not yet calculable effects.

For the first time in history we live in one world. Mr. McLuhan thinks we are back in acoustic space. He says we have begun again to structure the primordial feeling from which a few centuries of literacy divorced us. Whether this is right or not, I believe we can see the dramatic effect of the change in our own time. When televised films and tapes bring into more and more of our homes the intimate bleeding specifics of human suffering, however induced, the impact is bound to be infinitely greater than it was when printed, or other forms of second-hand accounts, left such subjects far away and easily dismissed. A dry report of malnutrition on the other side of the world, appearing in Volume II of Stoddard's lectures, was one thing; the haunting eyes of a starving Biafran child on the television screen is another. The youth who have always borne the brunt of fighting our wars, are conditioned by vivid knowledge never before available. Once they saw the parades and the flags and heard the martial music; today they see the bloody side of the hide in live, satellite transmitted, broadcasts of Vietnamese battle scenes and post battle scenes.

When films and television show the have-nots at home and abroad just how much the haves do have, who can doubt that the have-nots will want more and want it to an unprecedented degree? And will the have-nots, so motivated, work for what they know can

be had; or, acting in reckless desperation, will they go out and try to take it?

Sukarno, a knave but a perceptive one, saw mass communications — films and television — as playing a very large part in the national revolutions of postwar Asia. "It is not generally recognized," he said, "that a refrigerator can be a revolutionary symbol — to a people who have no refrigerators."

The Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia earlier this year was not some remote episode we heard or read about in the far-away Balkans; we could see it happen on television — and we could see and hear the gunfire and the rioting on the streets of Prague. These scenes are indelibly a part of us all who saw them, and they will enter into and be a part of our mental processes for as long as we are alive. So will the live T.V. scenes of Watts, Newark, Detroit, and Washington — our symbol city beneath boiling plumes of smoke. Who can assess the traumatism to our national psyche when we saw Washington aflame? Or its impact abroad on our friends and enemies?

And Chicago last August. Speculation over the respective merits of the combatants in the streets of Chicago would be no part of my subject; but I think we might agree that the timing and the selection of the scenes broadcast made all the difference in the world; and when the live pictures were going out to tens of millions of viewers, the man wielding the T.V. camera had in his hand a weapon more persuasive than all the arrows of Attila.

Two years ago in Berkeley, California, some college students and non-students were able to disrupt the education process there for months, and just about everybody in the United States knew all about it. Early this year some students occupied Columbia University and shut it down. Meantime, other kids with haircuts, clean clothes and school books went quietly about their education in hundreds of colleges all over the country. The ratio between the clean quiet ones and the rebellious element was maybe 1,000 to one nationwide, or call it 100 to one; the point is the same. Yet the exposure to public notice was just in reverse — unless you count the football players.

Dr. Herbert A. Otto, an eminent psychologist, recently wrote on "The Influence of the Communications Media on the Caliber of American Civilization." He felt perfectly certain that the overwhelming emphasis on bad news contributes to the climate of violence which characterizes this country today; that the glorification of crime by excessive and detailed reporting, in itself, contributes to and creates more crime. Was Dr. Otto right? Do words and

scenes and accounts of violence make people want to go out and do violent things? Or does this vicarious participation by the viewer, in knockdown and drag-out mayhem and brutal murder, help to work off the need for violence in the animal that still lurks in us beneath civilization's veneer? The experts disagree.

Professor Charles Seipmann of New York University questions this nation's ability to retain its mental health under this "constant barrage" from the mass media. Dr. Seipmann sees a communications overkill. He suggests a moratorium on mass communications — one day a week when we could hear our own hearts beat and the inner voices which are our own.

I should like to turn now to that which is classed, sometimes rightly, as entertainment communicated. A hundred years ago there was a role in the affairs of men for the mimics, the jugglers and the clowns. It was a gay and happy one — but relatively minor. The troubadours' rewards were enough, but inconsequential really. Now films, radio and television multiply to infinity just one performance. Jackie Gleason's antics are seen by forty million people every Saturday night, and his annual gross equals the annual pay of nearly a thousand mathematics teachers in the public schools of this state. (I don't mean to take sides here. For actually I am an avid Gleason fan, and I had real trouble with arithmetic at Boyd High School.) And there is a guitar player who sings and wiggles his hips on television and films. The material rewards for his efforts each year are more than those of the Law School facilities of Texas, Baylor, and S.M.U. — all three combined. Sinatra's annual gross is about the same as the gross pay of the entire staff at one great Houston hospital I asked about. Then there are the Beatles and their effect on England's balance of payments.

Let us turn to another effect: that of the commercials. The multiplication of the impact of sales techniques — communications as a persuader. The advertising agencies today will give your company a pretty fair estimate of the cost of a 1% increase in nationwide market participation of your brand of cigarettes, deodorants, dog-food, detergent, or razor blades. The media selected to make the sale will be mixed, according to scientific polls. And the result will be predictable — within a very few percentage points.

No one is unaware of the implications of stepped-up communications in the political field. Last year a journalist named James M. Perry reported on a case study in depth he had made of a political campaign — that between Nelson Rockefeller and Frank O'Connor for the governorship of New York in the year 1966. Mr. Perry's

report cites chapter and verse in describing the successful Rockefeller campaign. The essence of the Perry report:

1. In January Governor Rockefeller's acceptance by his constituents was at a very low ebb — between 25 and 30% of those interviewed in sample polls.

2. The campaign for the Governor's re-election began early when he brought in the Jack Tinker Advertising Agency, one which had proved its mettle on Braniff Airways, Alka-Seltzer and the Maiden-form bra.

3. The Rockefeller campaign — with emphasis on radio, but by far its greatest emphasis on television — cost an estimated 10 million dollars.

4. That campaign included between three and four thousand commercials on New York State's 22 commercial television stations. The Rockefeller-O'Connor spending ratio was about 10 to 1. From Rockefeller's re-election to the governorship at the end of that campaign in the fall of 1966, journalist Perry concludes his article with a question:

"Is there a lesson in New York that almost anyone can be elected, given money, television experts and time? Perhaps not . . . yet a note of doubt remains. These new techniques," Mr. Perry went on to say, "are so overwhelming, so terribly effective that some day they may elect a truly dangerous and sinister man to high public office."

There are ominous possibilities, other than the one Mr. Perry suggests. One that comes to mind is that of a young man having political ambition and ample personal wealth with which to hire these overly persuasive techniques of the several media. We can assume he has no executive or administrative experience whatever. We can visualize such a candidate: Cosmetized by experts to show his rugged handsomeness on the T.V. screen; camera angled to bring out his resemblance to John Wayne; trained in the sincere elocution of slogans in beautiful prose. Such a winsome young figure could, despite his inexperience, become elected to the greatest executive responsibility in the world — the President of the United States. He could pose a real threat to our national well being in the atomic jungle our world has become.

So what of the communications avalanche? Would we be better off or worse without it? Is it overkill? A backward glimpse might be edifying. For without irreverence, I think we can ruminate with Malcolm Muggeridge on whether the Crucifixion itself would have had the same beneficent impact, providing, as it has, the basis for two thousand years of the greatest civilization so far known, if it

had been projected live and in living color to all and sundry, as, for instance, the Vietnam war is today. Or the Resurrection.

Communications overkill? Will it become the fifth Horseman? Must we color it deadly?

I think not. There is comfort in Alfred North Whitehead's reminder that "the major advances in civilization are processes that all but wreck the society in which they occur."

This generation is threatened by the pace of change as no other in the history of man's existence. Yet we have seen only the beginning of all the overkills we must try to live with. We, who are the targets of all the media — we, the millions of readers, listeners, and viewers, may not be ready to select, assimilate and live comfortably with all that is aimed at us.

But we will live with it. Not only will we live with it: I believe that communications will be the miracle that enables us to live with all the other threatened overkills: that communications will perhaps be the one redeeming advance.

Man has not achieved his dominance of the earth by being dumb, or sluggish, or slow to adapt to change. Knowledge and the means of sharing it were perhaps his greatest tools in the long struggle for ascendancy. But the upward course was ever uneven.

This can perhaps best be illustrated by the way one eloquent viewer with alarm saw a communications explosion. He said:

"This latest discovery will create forgetfulness in the learners' souls, because they will not use their memories: they will trust to the external imaged characters and not remember of themselves . . . You give your students not truth but only resemblance of truth; they will be heroes of many things, and will have learned nothing; they will appear to become omniscient and will generally know nothing."

The author of that dark prediction was Socrates, and he was damning not television, but the invention of the Greek alphabet!

Let us reach for a little more perspective and dare to imagine the day when present communications techniques begin to look as primitive as smoke signals do to us today. What of the day of direct brain impressions and transmissions? What of the day of instant learning? These and other now undreamt of techniques will create new explosions of communications for future generations — new sources of knowledge.

May we dare here to think a far-out thought? We are entitled to consider, I submit, the prospect of messages to and from outer space. By the law of averages and other more esoteric laws, life elsewhere in the cosmos almost certainly does exist.

We may then contemplate the exchange of knowledge and ideas with sentient beings, if not on the other planets of our solar system, then in other worlds in our own galaxy. True, communication beyond our own solar system would be slow — four or five years to send a message one way — but, after all, what development in the history of man has failed for lack of enough time?

We could dare to believe, then, that others in the cosmos could learn from us — at least as much as they might want to know. And hopefully, we earthlings could learn much from remote societies more advanced than our own. We might thus avoid some of the costly mistakes that have to be made in the course of discovery. Breakthroughs made the hard way, billions of miles away, might become ours. Fortunately, perhaps, sheer distance would limit such intercourse with galaxy sharers; otherwise, I fear we earthlings would likely start things off with a war.

Whether we fly as high as we have just been flying — among the stars — surely we must lift our eyes above today's horizon in assessing these several overkills and how we are to live with them.

In this outlook, and in the belief that with knowledge we may find wisdom, we can recognize that progress is often painful. Yet there is but one way to go, the way man appears always to have gone over the long pull, despite his setbacks. Somewhat forward.

He will live with all threatened overkills — albeit in the anguish of knowledge that they are all around him. He will not live happily ever after. For, as we read in Ecclesiastes, "He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow, and in much wisdom is much grief."

N E C R O L O G Y

W. BROWNE BAKER

1900-1968

W. Browne Baker, banker; b. Houston, Jan. 23, 1900; son of James A. and Alice (Graham) Baker; grad. Hill Schl. Pottstown, Pa.; grad. Princeton 1921; m. Adelaide Lovett, Dec. 23, 1922; children — W. Browne, Lovett, Graeme. With South Texas Natl. Bank (now Texas Natl. Bank of Commerce); Dir. Guardian Trust Co., Graham Realty Co., Oriental Textile Mills, Heitman, Bering-Cortes Co., Houston; Dir. & V. P. Houston YMCA. Served with USN World War I; chief negotiation div. Office Sec. Navy World War II. Recipient Distinguished Civilian Service Award USN 1945. Mem. Philos. Soc. Tex., English Speaking Union, Newcomen Soc. N. Am.; Friends of Rice; Episcopalian. Clubs: Ramada, River Oaks Country, Princeton (NYC); Cottage (Princeton).

THAT IS *Who's Who in America's* outline of the distinguished career of a banker and citizen who devoted time to the service of his country, state and city. This career was ended by his death at his home in Houston on Sunday, November 17, 1968.

W. Browne Baker was not only a leader in Houston civic and financial circles, but his interests and activities were many and varied. He had a fondness for Texas history; he enjoyed sailing, hunting, fishing, swimming and various other outdoor activities. He was a member of one of Houston's famous and distinguished families, being the son of Capt. James A. Baker, whose father was one of the founders of the great law firm of Baker, Botts, Shepherd & Coates. He was a charter member of the revived Philosophical Society, and first Chairman of the Board of Rice University. Browne's brother, James A. Baker, Jr., and his brother-in-law, Malcolm Lovett, are members of this law firm. Browne is survived by his wife, Adelaide Lovett Baker, whose distinguished father was the first president of Rice University; a daughter, Mrs. Clifford W. Vickery of San Mateo, California; two sons, W. Browne Baker, Jr. and Lovett Baker; two sisters, Mrs. Alice Baker Jones and Mrs. Preston Moore; two brothers, James A. Baker, Jr. and Malcolm G. Baker, both of Houston.

In World War II, Browne served as Head of the Negotiations Division in the office of the Secretary of the Navy. He saved the taxpayers of this country millions of dollars negotiating important war contracts for the Navy. For his outstanding service, he received

the Distinguished Civilian Service Award, the highest award for a non-Navy man.

Baker had a fine background for a successful banking career, not the least of which was his experience as a national bank examiner, which familiarized him with the financial situation throughout the Southwest. Subsequent banking experiences constituted a ladder in the banking world on which he climbed to the summit, being, at the time of his death, the Executive Vice President of the Texas National Bank of Commerce of Houston.

Browne Baker had a host of friends, not only in Texas but throughout the nation. He enjoyed the confidence and respect of men in various walks of life and from many different business sectors. He was a pleasant companion and an affable host. He was an avid reader, who loved good books, good companions and all of the nice things of life but always retained a friendly grip for and a complete understanding of those who had not been as successful in their efforts as some of their associates. In short, he was a man of broad sympathies and understandings of his fellow men and the society in which they lived.

Many times, I have been his hunting and fishing companion at Aransas Pass on the Gulf Coast, Fairview Farms in East Texas, and at my Hill Country ranch located in Kerr County on the North Fork of the Guadalupe River. Always armed with an abundance of books and magazines, he preferred to watch the game, assist others in fishing and shoot clay pigeons and skeet more than the quail, pheasants and deer. Best of all, he liked his long walks, reading aloud with his friends, and long talks about many different and varied things, historical and contemporary, in which he kept a lively interest and had a well informed opinion.

W. Browne Baker was an outstanding man in varied fields, business and social, in which he maintained an active interest to the very end of his life.

—C.I.F.

ANDREW DAVIS BRUCE

1894-1969

TEXAS HAS BEEN FORTUNATE in the number of her foster sons who have come from elsewhere to serve this state and our nation with distinction and devotion. The long and fruitful life of another such adopted Texan came to an end on July 27, 1969 with the sudden death of Lieutenant General Andrew Davis Bruce, U.S.A.

General Bruce came to these shores in early childhood as a resident of the Lower Rio Grande Valley, began a brilliant military record that was to encompass two World Wars and Korea with graduation from Texas A. & M. College, and completed his career with notable new accomplishments as president, chancellor and chancellor emeritus of the University of Houston.

As a member of the First Officers Training Camp at Leon Springs, General Bruce formed lasting friendships that brought him often to the Lone Star State during the years between 1917 and 1941, when he returned to Texas to organize, build and administer the Tank Destroyer Center at Fort Hood. He had in the meantime risen to the rank of lieutenant colonel while participating in many major engagements during World War I, returning home to graduate in turn from the Infantry School, Field Artillery School, Command and General Staff College, Army War College and Naval War College.

Service on the General Staff had preceded his assignment to Fort Hood, and it was at this famous Texas base that General Bruce was promoted to the rank of major general on September 9, 1942. The following May, he assumed command of the 77th Infantry Division and won the plaudits of General Douglas A. MacArthur for a tactically brilliant "end run" around Japanese lines at Leyte, capture of the strategic fortress of Ie Shima and his role in the bitter fighting on Guam and Okinawa.

After peace was established in the Pacific, General Bruce began a related yet second career as an administrator. He became the first military governor of Hokkaido, commanded the 7th Division as an occupation force in Korea, and came home to Texas again in the fall of 1947 as deputy commander of the Fourth Army at Fort Sam Houston.

On July 6, 1951, shortly before he became the first graduate of Texas A. & M. College to attain three-star rank, General Bruce was named commandant of the Armed Forces Staff College. It was from this post that he came upon retirement at age 60 to become the third president of the University of Houston, on September 1, 1954.

At the University of Houston, an institution which has progressed far in its brief 35-year history, General Bruce was known as an able administrator who prepared for much of the marked progress in recent years. Under his leadership, the University organized a Board of Governors whose members did much to bring the institution to the attention of prominent Texans.

General Bruce was proud of the administrative team he built at the University, and three of its key members, he liked to point out, were active in positions of higher responsibility 15 years after he first came to the campus. He took a leading role in the crucial campaign to bring the University into the state system, thereby providing Houston the major public university that exists in all U.S. cities of comparable size; after victory was assured, he requested retirement on August 31, 1961 at the age of 67.

Andrew Davis Bruce was a tall, handsome man of commanding presence and soldierly bearing. The twinkling eyes and ready laughter of Scots ancestors, however, were hallmarks as well of this friendly, always considerate man. "He looks like a general — and a gentleman as well," an acquaintance once said of General Bruce, who was characterized by his lifelong friend William B. Bates as "a great soldier, a fine administrator and an outstanding educator . . . who possessed every quality of a good citizen and of a gentleman."

General Bruce was buried in Arlington National Cemetery, with all the sad but inspiring and memorable ceremony the United States Army accords its fallen leaders.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Roberta Kennedy Bruce; his son, A. D. Bruce, Jr. and his daughter, Mrs. Claud K. Josey. The University of Houston has recently named one of its most handsome buildings The A. D. Bruce Center, as a memorial to its president and chancellor.

—P.G.H.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

For the Year 1969

President

HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL

First Vice-President

HARRIS LEON KEMPNER

Second Vice-President

ROBERT LEE BOBBITT

Third Vice-President

DILLON ANDERSON

Fourth Vice-President

JOHN MIRZA BENNETT, JR.

Fifth Vice-President

CAREY CRONEIS

Recording Secretary

SAM HANNA ACHESON

Treasurer

BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN

Librarian

SAMUEL WOOD GEISER

Directors

WILLIAM ALEXANDER KIRKLAND

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

HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL

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
Richard Tudor Fleming	1968

*Deceased

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

- ACHESON, SAM HANNA, consultant, Southwestern Legal Center; editorial writer emeritus, *The News* Dallas
- ALLEN, HERBERT, president, Cameron Iron Works; trustee, Rice University; former director, Texas Technological College; trustee, St. Stephens Episcopal School Houston
- ALLEN, WINNIE, retired archivist, University of Texas Library Dallas
- ANDERSON, DILLON, lawyer; former Special Assistant to the President of the United States for National Security Affairs Houston
- 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
- 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 Clayton Foundation for Research Texas Medical Center Houston
- BENNETT, JOHN MIRZA, JR., chairman, National Bank of Commerce and City Public Service Board; director, Texas and Southwestern Cattleman's Association; Major General, USAFR San Antonio
- BINKLEY, WILLIAM CAMPBELL, 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
- CARRINGTON, EVELYN, child psychologist, staff of Children's Development Center, Shady Brook Schools, Children's Medical Center Dallas

*Life Member

†Died July 27, 1969

- CARRINGTON, PAUL, lawyer; past president, Dallas Chamber 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, president, University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute; professor of surgery, University of Texas at Houston *Houston*
- CLARK, TOM C., retired Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States *Dallas and Washington*
- COLLIE, MARVIN KEY, lawyer *Houston*
- CONNALLY, JOHN BOWDEN, former 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*
- DICKSON, FAGAN, lawyer, former assistant Attorney General of Texas; vice president Dickson Properties, Colorado River Development; member Council on Foreign Relations *Austin*
- 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*
- DUDLEY, FREDERICA GROSS (Mrs. Ray L.), chairman trustees University of Houston Foundation; vice president Houston Symphony; member Governor's Committee on Higher Education *Houston*
- 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., former president, Bank of the Cooperatives and Federal Land Bank; member of the board, Texas A & M University System; trustee, Wortham Foundation *Houston*
- EWING, WILLIAM MAURICE, Wiggins professor of geology and director, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory, Columbia University; past president, Seismological Society of America, and American Geophysical Union *Palisades, New York*
- FLAWN, PETER T., director, bureau of economic geology, University of Texas *Austin*
- FERGUSON, CHARLES W., editor-at-large, *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*

†Died September 1969

‡Died November 1969

- 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, professor emeritus of history, University of Texas *Austin*
- *GAMBRELL, HERBERT PICKENS, professor emeritus, Southern Methodist University; past president, Texas 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, former professor of law, University of Texas and 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; chairman of the board, 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, 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*
- HALL, WALTER GARDNER, president Citizens State Bank, Dickinson; past president Mainland Chamber of Commerce; former director San Jacinto River Authority; trustee, Rosenberg Library *League City*
- 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 associate professor of law and law librarian, The University of Texas; member State Bar of Texas *Austin*
- HARRINGTON, MARION THOMAS, coordinator of International Programs, and 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*

*Life Member

†Died September 1969

- 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
- 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, former President of the United States
Johnson City and Austin
- 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
- KELSEY, MAVIS PARROTT, physician; clinical professor, University of Texas Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences; associate internist M. D. Anderson and other hospitals; editor Air Surgeon's Bulletin; formerly with Mayo Clinic and Mayo Foundation
Houston

*Life Member

†Died October 1969

‡Died October 1968

- KEMPNER, HARRIS LEON, trustee, H. Kempner; chairman, United States National Bank, Schwabach, Kempner & Perutz, and Imperial Sugar Company
Galveston
- KILGORE, WILLIAM JACKSON, chairman philosophy department, Baylor University; author
Waco
- †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
- 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
- LEMAISTRE, CHARLES A., deputy chancellor, University of Texas System; formerly professor, Southwestern Medical School; member Surgeon General's Advisory Committee; chairman, Governor's Committee On Tuberculosis Eradication
Austin
- 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; chairman of the trustees, 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, former Ambassador to West Germany
Dallas

*Life Member

†Died 1969

- MCKILLOP, ALAN DUGALD, professor of English, Rice University . *Houston*
 MCNEESE, AYLMEER GREEN JR., chairman of the board, Bank of the South-
 west; former regent, University of Texas; trustee, Baylor University
 College of Medicine; director, Texas Medical Center; trustee, M. D.
 Anderson Foundation . *Houston*
 MINTER, MERTON MELROSE, physician, former chairman of regents, University
 of Texas . *San Antonio*
 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, MARY MOODY, chairman, Moody National Bank and National Hotel
 Company; trustee, Moody Foundation; director, American National
 Insurance Company, Medical Research Foundation; member Texas State
 Historical Survey Committee and Texas Historical Foundation . *Galveston*
 †NORVELL, JAMES R., Associate Justice Supreme Court of Texas . *Austin*
 OLAN, LEVI, rabbi, Temple Emanu-El . *Dallas*
 OLSON, STANLEY, W., dean, Baylor University College of Medicine; chairman,
 medical board, Jefferson Davis Hospital . *Houston*
 O'QUINN, TRUEMAN, Justice, Court of Civil Appeals . *Austin*
 PARTEN, JUBAL RICHARD, oil and mineral investments; ranching . *Houston*
 PITZER, KENNETH SANBORN, president, Stanford University, former president,
 Rice University; former professor of chemistry and dean, University of
 California . *Palo Alto*
 PRESLEY, W(ILLIAM) DEWEY, president, First National Bank, trustee, Baylor
 University Medical Center; past president Cotton Bowl Association; vice
 president Baptist Foundation of Texas . *Dallas*
 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,
 University 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 presi-
 dent, 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
 Company and Pan American Sulphur Company . *Houston*
 SCHIWETZ, EDWARD MUEEGE, artist . *Hunt*

- 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; former president, United States Chamber of Commerce
Austin
- SHUFFLER, RALPH HENDERSON, director Texana Program, University of Texas and director, Institute of Texan Cultures
San Antonio
- SIMPSON, JOHN DAVID JR., president, Superior Dairies, Inc.
Austin
- SMILEY, JOSEPH ROYALL, president, University of Texas at El Paso; former president University of Colorado
El Paso
- 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, president, The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, The University of Texas
Austin
- SYMONDS, GARDINER, chairman of the board, Tenneco Inc.; trustee, Stanford and Rice Universities
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, acting president and professor of history, Rice University; former Harmsworth professor of American History, Oxford
Houston
- WALKER, AGESILAUS WILSON JR., lawyer
Dallas
- WALKER, RUEL CARLILE, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas
Austin
- WARDLAW, FRANK H., director, University of Texas Press; past president, Texas Institute of Letters and American Association of University Presses
Austin
- WHITE, WILLIAM RICHARDSON, president emeritus, Baylor University; former president, Hardin-Simmons University
Waco

- 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 Frenslley 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*
- YOUNG, SAMUEL DOAK, chairman, El Paso National Bank; director, El Paso Times Corporation, Hilton Hotels Corporation, Texas and Pacific Railway, Telefonos de Mexico *El Paso*
- 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
WALTER BROWNE 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
ANDREW DAVIS BRUCE
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 CHESTMAN
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

IN MEMORIAM

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
JEWEL PRESTON LIGHTFOOT
EUGENE PERRY LOCKE
JOHN AVERY LOMAX
JOHN TIPTON LONSDALE
EDGAR ODELL LOVETT
LEWIS WINSLOW MAC NAUGHTON
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 WAGENER
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
