

The Philosophical Society of Texas

PROCEEDINGS

1970

(Preprint, Proceedings for 1970)

THE STATE OF THE SOCIETY

CAREY CRONEIS

Thank you, President Kempner. Members of the Philosophical Society of Texas and guests: one may appropriately question the wisdom of our nominating committee, but the sincerity of my appreciation of the Society's action is not open to question. I can only add that I value the confidence that you have shown in me — although in this quasi-democratic Society you had no other choice — and hope that I may merit your trust.

I *can* assure you that I did not campaign for the office — which is understandable. Most college administrators these days work hard to keep a low profile. High visibility turns out to be counter-productive, not only for the individual himself but for the organizations he may seek to serve. This problem, however, is not as new as one might suppose. Samuel Langdon, who was elected president of Harvard as long ago as 1774, was driven out of office by protesting students. The Harvard Corporation, acquiescing to their demands, discovered that a student committee had informed Langdon that “as a man of genius — we respect you; as a man of piety — we venerate you; as a president — we despise you.”

Sam Hanna Acheson's obituary of John Elijah Rosser — who served as the perennial chairman of our Society's nominating committee — records that once, when Rosser was “being taxed — for his part in what was described as a ‘steamroller’ election of officers,” he replied, sardonically, that it made little difference because the Society was a Kakistocracy. Then — when forced to explain to his less learned friends — he stated that Kakistocracy is government by the worst citizens.

At the 1964 meeting of the Society, however, Herbert Pickens Gambrell presented the new president, Edward Randall, Jr., who responded by observing — among other things charmingly said — that he considered “membership in this Society the highest honor that can come to a citizen of Texas.”

If I had to choose between Rosser's pessimistic exaggeration and Randall's optimistic hyperbole, I would cast my vote for the

Randall version. It is, I submit, more than a minor honor to belong to this Society — even if Kakistocratically elected! Founded by such men as Sam Houston, Lamar, and Rusk at Houston just 133 years ago last Saturday, the Society was “reconstituted” 34 years ago last December 5, the date of the recent Texas-Arkansas “shoot-out.” This latter event presented scheduling difficulties which our first and second founders, for all their wisdom, had failed to anticipate.

When one looks over the roster of past presidents of this Society, he becomes particularly impressed by his own inadequacies. Inevitably I must now succeed those distinguished men, but it will be difficult, if not impossible, to follow them. Consider Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, our first president. The resounding historicity of the very name is formidable. It is some small encouragement to me, however, that of the 37 previous presidents, I have known 21, at least casually, and in all cases favorably. Moreover 12 of the 21: Edgar Odell Lovett, Umphrey Lee, dear Ima Hogg, Burke Baker, Jesse Andrews, James Pinckney Hart, Robert Gerald Storey, Harry Hunt Ransom, McGruder Ellis Sadler, William Alexander Kirkland, Herbert Pickens Gambrell, and Harris Leon Kempner, in more ways than they are aware, or could be expected to remember, have made life richer, not only for their fellow citizens, but also for this relatively late-comer to the great state of Texas — who nevertheless became a frequent visitor in the 30’s speaking before local geological societies in both East and West Texas.

Similarly the roster of the Society contains the names of many other public-spirited members who have doubtless helped you — as they have me. A *partial* list includes Herbert Allen, George Rufus Brown, Morgan J. Davis, Frederica Gross Dudley, Oveta Culp Hobby, and Gus Sessions Wortham; as well as others no longer with us, such as Everett De Golyer, Lamar Fleming, Jr., Harry Clay Hanszen, and Harry Carothers Wiess. After Mr. Wiess’ death, his generous wife and daughters provided the wherewithal to entice me from the frigidity of the Great Lakes area to the warmth of Texas and — it was the Society’s late William Embry Wrather, then director of the United States Geological Survey who, among others, influenced the Wiess family to do so.

I cannot in this connection fail to mention the unusually warm and profitable relationship I have had with other Texas educators, including Society members too numerous to mention without getting myself into real trouble — but philosophers all. None of them unnamed will, I am sure, take umbrage if I do mention a member

missing for the first time from these sessions — our *bona fide* philosopher *par excellence*, Radoslav Andrea Tsanoff. What an adornment to *our* Society — and to Society generally!

There is a much worn, but — after last night's bombings at the University of Kansas — pertinent story regarding a faculty advisor who asked a seemingly unmotivated freshman advisee to be *specific* about what he intended to take. The answer: "I plan to take the ROTC buildings, the administration offices, and the computer center, probably in that order." This is a common type of modern, potentially destructive criticism, in which I do not plan to indulge. I do want to examine our Society, and constructively criticize in a non-critical fashion — if that is possible. As Emily Dickinson once wrote "— truth, like ancestors' brocades, can stand alone —." She was right about truth, of course, but the Society's ancestral brocades may need some starching before they can stand completely erect.

Early this year President Harris Leon Kempner appointed an *ad hoc* committee to study the membership and the By-Laws of the Society with a view toward their possible refurbishing. The committee membership was, as follows: Dillon Anderson, Jacob W. Hershey, William Kirkland, and Carey Croneis, chairman. Harris Kempner and Herbert Gambrell served, *ex officio*. As so often happens with *ad hoc* groups, we met but once, but the views exchanged were very helpful. Meanwhile I have examined the records directly available to me — which are limited — and have carried on a correspondence with Messrs. Kempner and Gambrell, the latter of whom could provide us with perhaps more than we would want to know about our Society.

In order that we may properly discuss our strengths and weaknesses, however, let us consider some Society data on which any informed decisions for action, or inaction, will have to be based.

Current Membership

Membership statistics reasonably current for June of this year reveal a total of 203 members. This number has been reduced by 13 deaths; eight in the active category, five in the inactive group. Therefore earlier this fall our membership presumably stood at 188. Generously stretching several points, of the 188, 125 could be considered "active," but 63 would actually have to be listed as "others." Even with our nine newly elected members, the total membership today has declined to not more than 197. Unfortunately it may be a few less. Our membership data are not, for various good and sufficient reasons, always precisely up-to-date.

It should be noted that the By-Laws of the Society, adopted by the founders, December 5, 1837, revised by the incorporators, May 7, 1936, and amended in 1939, 1953, 1955, and again slightly, in 1960, provide for three classes of membership: "(1) active members, the number of which will not ever exceed 125; (2) inactive members, the number of which will not be limited; and (3) associate members, the number of which shall not at any time exceed 25."

There is no mention of "life members" who constitute a group, authorized some quarter century ago, to include the survivors of those who had become members during the first year of the "reincarnation of the Society." They were to be relieved of the necessity to pay dues. Five members of this group fortunately are still with us. Possibly for the record, mention should be made of this category in any revision of the By-Laws.

As most of you are aware, Article I of the By-Laws states that "to be an active, inactive, or associate member the person shall reside in, have been born in, or have at some time resided in, the geographical boundaries of the late republic of Texas *and* must be a person of distinction whose life and character have furthered the purpose for which the Society was organized. *Only active members may vote.*" Quoting further from Article I, we find the quaint statement that "an active member who at any time on or after December 8, 1956, has been absent from the annual meeting five consecutive years, and has attended no meeting since, shall automatically become an *inactive* member. He shall continue to pay dues and may attend annual meetings." Presumably such a member has no vote. Quoting still further, "the directors shall have authority, at the request of an active or inactive member to transfer his name to the roll of associate members." The actual role and scope of the associate category, however, is not really described, although it is stated that the associate members "shall not at any time exceed 25." In practice, however, the "associates" have *not* been required to pay dues.

The last paragraph of Article I states that "all members shall be listed in alphabetical order in the *Proceedings* without indication of the class to which they belong." This, at least, is clear — and commendable.

Now for some additional comments. When the Society was revived in 1936, the By-Laws then fixed 100 as the number of active members, 50 for associate members, and specified that vacancies in the active list "may be filled from the associate membership only." As Herbert Gambrell points out this was a "dead letter" from the

start. Actually all members elected during the intervening years have been designated as active members; some later did ask to be transferred to the associate's list, which, as previously noted, has given them the advantage of not having to pay dues. The knowledge of the advantage, however, was obviously picked up in a clandestine fashion — for the By-Laws have kept the secret.

The limitation of 100 active members has been ignored from time to time. Herbert Gambrell tells me that in 1940 a huge ballot of nearly 100 nominees was submitted, and that 24 were elected. One member who began by marking his ballot "yes and no," finally gave up on the second page adding the caustic note, "take them all, why discriminate?". Later, that particular member resigned. It must be stated, however, that resignations from the Society have been rare.

There is another matter which has complicated the actual membership number and limits. This is a scheme which has become known as the Andrews Plan since it was devised by Jesse Andrews some 15 years ago. The Plan required the submitting of all nominations to the membership, but limiting those elected to 10. Mr. Andrews considered the first part of his idea to be "democratic," and the second part of the plan, "prudential."

It might be wise not to fix the limit on active memberships. Similarly it may be the better part of wisdom to remove the restriction of only 10 new members permitted per year. It is clear that our roster should be kept sufficiently small that there is at least a presumption of some distinction attached to membership. It is also obvious that our roster should not be so large that a member could possibly be caught up in that absurdity which led the Philadelphian to insist that his tombstone state simply, "Member of the National Geographical Society." Yet the Society must be sufficiently large to attain critical mass. Today its membership is declining rather than increasing.

In 1936 when the Society was reorganized, the population of Texas was slightly over 6,000,000. At that time, a membership of 100 may have been reasonable, as was the vague "limit" of 125 established a few years later. Today, with the Texas population approaching 12 million, it apparently would not be out of order to have an *active* membership of 200. As a matter of fact, many of our By-Laws, throughout the history of the Society, have been knowingly or inadvertently violated. For example, only active members are supposed to have the right to vote. In accordance with the so-called Andrews Plan, however, a member could miss any number of meetings and then show up at one and become active again.

Therefore, we just don't know exactly who is "active" and who is "inactive." No one in the history of organizations such as ours has been as generous with donated secretarial time and services as the Gambrells, but with limited resources it has appeared impractical to try to establish a rigid *who is who* among us. Thus, ballots have been sent to both classes of membership, and all ballots returned have been counted. Even so, however, little more than half of our members, of all classes, return ballots. Ours, then, is the very model of a philosophical society and it is perhaps inevitable that we run it philosophically, if improperly.

The foregoing remarks then are not really carping criticisms — they are cautious commendations. Probably, however, the "inactive" category of membership should be abandoned — possibly with the "associates" class — in favor of a new category which might be called simply, "emeritus members." For them we might do as is done by the Chicago Literary Club, i.e., provide that in the case of individuals of any class who have been members for say, ten years or more and have reached the age of 65, "the payment of further dues by them shall be optional." Such members, however, are sent annual dues notices, and some do elect to pay.

Election of Members

As revised in 1960, Article II reads in part, "vacancies in the class of active members shall be filled by vote of such members; not more than 10 active members may be added in any one year. All names proposed 90 days prior to the next annual meeting shall be submitted to the active members on a ballot." But this year we asked that ballots be returned by June 20 so that new members could attend, and be presented, at the annual meeting.

The number of individuals recently nominated for membership has been averaging something less than 20 a year. The total votes cast from all categories of membership tends to run slightly over 100, or about 50-55 percent of our total roster. Herbert Gambrell agrees that in the election process we find "the real nub of the problems of the Society's survival. None of the processes we have tried is entirely satisfactory. Members tend to nominate whoever they happen to be thinking of at the moment, kinfolk, business associates, bridge or poker partners, fishing companions, locally prominent public figures, or even people they recently read about." Those receiving ballots are asked to write "yes" by the names of those approved and "no" for those disapproved. Blank votes are very commonly cast, and very few nominees have ever received unani-

mous approval. Some nominees, who apparently are simply not well known, receive as little as 12 percent affirmative votes of all those cast; and a very few of the nominees have received as high as a total of 85 affirmative votes.

For the curious, and those who simply like to be in on the gossip, it may be stated that with all of the nominations and voting records before one, it is still not possible to define trends or, with confidence, assign reasons to the vagaries of our members' voting habits. In short, although our election process may be, and probably is, relatively democratic, it cannot develop a very satisfactory distribution of membership, either vocationally, geographically, philosophically or by age groups. The Society does appear to be nominating, and electing, older and older persons on a jagged but progressively upward trending age curve toward, to put it politely, full-blown maturity. The founders average age was about 35. In more recent years, however, the average of the age of the *nominees* has been 59, and the average age of those *elected* to membership is 62. In the past decade the range in age of individuals elected to the Society has varied from the high thirties to the late seventies, with most members recently elected being in their late fifties or early sixties.

There is thus a clearly established tendency for the membership to grow in average age, not alone because of the inexorable passage of time but also because the Society has been electing somewhat, to considerably, older candidates to membership with each passing year. Obviously it is imperative that some system be devised so that it would be possible to recruit individuals to the Society who have considerable life expectancy and yet whose careers already suggest further developing distinction. Some of us have considered the appointment of an anonymous committee whose members have a wide acquaintance with, and sound judgment on, individuals "going places" in a broad range of endeavors, which have at least some philosophical import. Such a committee could assemble a group of worthwhile nominees, but they would thus negate the Society's tradition of democracy because members would be asked to vote without having been involved directly in the nominating process.

Whatever changes may be made I suggest — as an oldster myself — consideration of the idea that those who make the final membership choices — including the determination of the numbers to be elected — should, as near as may be, see to it that the number of those elected at age 60 and over be paired with an equal number of those elected at age 40 and under.

Meetings of the Society

Section 1 of Article III states that the annual meetings may be held in the city of Dallas or at such other places in the state of Texas as the Directors may select. "The annual meetings shall be held on the fifth day of December ---; if December 5 falls on Saturday, if not, on the Saturday next following". As I have earlier pointed out, Section 1 has been violated this year. Section 2 indicates that the meeting is to be held on Saturday only. Recent custom has been to start on Friday evening prior to the Saturday of the annual meeting. Section 3, Article II, concerns called meetings, which require that the secretary notify in writing all active members of the Society, at least 10 days before the time set, but I do not, myself, know of recent specially called meetings.

Section 4, Article III, deals with quorum requirements, and states that "10 percent of the active members of the Society, *who are in good standing*, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business". A rigorous examination of the record to determine how many active members the Society actually possesses, and how many of these are *really* in good standing, might well reveal that some 8 or 10 individuals of the Society actually might constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Should this Section be altered?

Section 5, Article III, considers "expulsion" and states that "members may be expelled for improper conduct by vote of a majority of the members present at an annual meeting." *Member attendance* at recent annual meetings has ranged from the low thirties to the low fifties. Though I know of no expulsions — and would not admit to them if there had been — it appears that under the present By-Laws less than — perhaps even many less than — 25 members of the Society, in an irascible mood, could expel a supposedly offending member.

At the Society's 1960 meeting, held at historic Fort Clark, there were only 61 individuals in attendance, of whom 32 were members including two whose election was announced at the sessions. The average age of the newly elected members was approximately 54. At the 1965 meeting at Salado, the total attendance was 104, of whom 53 were members, including five newly elected. The guests numbered 51, including four whose spouses were new in the Society. Stated in another way, approximately nine percent of the total attendance was provided by the newly elected members.

At the 1968 meeting, held in San Antonio, 53 members attended; six of the 10 new members were in attendance. The guests numbered 54, of whom most were wives of members including those newly

elected. Thus, of the total attendance of 107, new members and wives accounted for about 11 percent. At last year's meeting, also held at the Stagecoach Inn, 50 members were in attendance, and of the 10 new members five were with us. Guests numbered 45, of whom most were wives of members including those newly elected. Of the total attendance of 95, the new members and wives accounted for over nine percent of the total.

Although based on insufficient evidence, it seems clear that out-of-the-way places — however attractive, or however easily arranged for as headquarters for the sessions — will not likely build up a large attendance. In fact, comments and correspondence indicate that, as the membership has grown older, it prefers meetings in hotels such as was possible at the Nacogdoches session, where all activities — except excursions to historic sites or dwellings — can be under a single roof. Nevertheless an unscientific survey also suggests that the Stagecoach Inn meetings have, on the average, attracted the largest number of members and guests — but the evidence cannot be stated to be statistically valid.

Dues

Article IV, which deals with dues, begins, "each active member shall pay an initiation fee of \$25.00 and shall pay annual dues of \$10.00. Funds so received shall be used by the Directors for such purposes as they see fit", and so forth. "Should a member continue in default of payment of his dues after two notices the Directors may drop his name from the membership", but, in fact, no one is dropped. "There shall be no further dues payable by any member of the Society. The Board of Directors, may, by a majority vote, fix an assessment on all members, but it shall never exceed \$5.00 in any one year."

The truth of the matter is, the initiation fee for membership in the Philosophical Society is ludicrously low. For example, the fees for members of the Houston Engineering and Scientific Society range from \$25.00 to \$150.00 depending on age at initiation, and the *quarterly* dues range from \$9.00 to \$24.00. Similarly, the Chicago Literary Club, an organization rather similar to our Society, charges annual dues of \$45.00. As Herbert Gambrell so pointedly remarks, "we have behaved like starry-eyed philosophers in one respect at least. We *never* bill members for dues directly; we only mention casually in the notice of the upcoming annual meeting that dues are now payable." Letting you in on a little-guarded secret, some members overlook paying their dues year after year, but others, who have rarely, or never, attended a meeting, pay promptly. Further-

more, some members of the Society of more than average distinction, have failed to pay *any* initiation *fee* or *dues* whatever, but still such persons retain membership. It is clear that it is time for a change.

A little over a month ago only 99 of our members had paid their \$10.00 dues; this included the nine new members. Recently our total 1970 receipts were \$1,280.00, but the printer's bill for the *Proceedings* for 1969, recently issued, was \$1,339.85! As Herbert laments, "looks like we'll have no stock dividend this year".

It is obvious that Article IV regarding dues should be recast. We can no longer assume that we will have such self-sacrificing, financially unrewarded services as the Gambrells and others have donated the Society for many years. Moreover, we may have to pay for a central office, rather than being virtually nonpaying guests of the "Hall of State". Unfortunately it is going to be a matter of sheer necessity that the initiation fee be raised from \$25.00 to \$50.00 — not because I am presumably already initiated! Annual dues should be increased from \$10.00 to \$20.00 — whether or not I might squeeze in under an optional dues clause! It is even more certain that we must in the future bill each member of the Society, in any category which now exists or may later be established, and bill him individually — with all the callosity of a loan shark collector.

If such new rates of dues and fees were to be established it probably would be necessary for the Directors to refrain from dropping any name from the membership until perhaps three rather than two notices had been disregarded. They would then presumably ask the member in default to elect emeritus status — if he could qualify for that category — when and if established — under the rules. In the cases possibly presented by a few individuals of younger age, and a briefer term of membership, and known to be in rather difficult financial straits, the limited associate membership category might be suggested. I realize that a Society officer who suggests higher costs is as welcome as a S.D.S. Weatherman in a presidential office, but there may be no other recourse.

Directors

Article V, regarding Directors, has been consistently violated in our operational procedures, probably without disastrous results. Section 1 reads, "the management of the Society shall be vested in a Board of Directors of 10 active members to be elected by a majority vote of the members present and voting at a regular annual meeting". Actually, although there may have been, as tonight, a *pro forma* vote, our Directors recently have tended to be the current president and nine past presidents. Of course this is "establishment" with a

capital "E", but the procedure has the advantage of giving our Society a governance by men who have been most directly concerned with its operation.

Section 3 of Article V states that "a majority of the Board shall constitute a quorum and a majority of those present and voting shall be authorized to act". Inasmuch as there are 10 members of the Board, six members constitute a quorum, and a majority of six, or four members of the Board obviously are "authorized to act". I do not see any necessity of changing Section 3 but others may think the possibilities conjured up by this section frighteningly undemocratic.

The Officers

Article VI, which pertains to officers, requires little emendation, as we see it. Section 4, however, states that "in case of the death, sickness or inactivity of the president, his duties shall devolve on the vice presidents in the order of their rank". It is not necessarily true, however, that the first vice president of one year succeeds to the presidency in the next, and there appears to be some possibility of misunderstanding in this connection. There is no rigid up-the-ladder sequence of command, and it should be clear to the membership as well as the vice presidents that this is indeed the case.

Various

Article VII has the charming heading, "Various". It should be clear by now, however, that all of our By-Laws could be construed as falling under the rubric "variations". At any rate, Section 1 reads that "the Society shall use the Seal now customarily used by it". I am not aware that the seal is customarily used. Section 2, states that "the Society shall use the certificate of membership now customarily used by it". Dual use of the phrase "customarily used" reminds me of the lines, "I never saw a moor, I never saw the sea, but I know how the heather looks and what the sea must be". But I *don't* know how the "certificate" looks and I never saw the "seal". Should the *seal* be resurrected, redesigned, or abandoned? Should the *certificate of membership* be re-issued, redesigned or merely customarily *not* used?

Section 3 of Article VII states that "the Society was organized and is maintained for patriotic, social, literary or educational purposes. No part of its funds shall inure to the benefit of any individual and no *substantial* part of its activities shall be used in carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation". Perhaps this section should have the benefit of another inspection by a keen legal eye. I am not so sure that the word "substantial" would hold water in today's federal courts.

Amendments

Article VIII merely states that the By-Laws may be altered, changed or amended and tells us — as if you did not know — just how easy it would be to do so. The question I ask is “Do you want to pursue such a course?” If you don’t, why not? If you do, we will try to send out detailed proposals. In the meantime we would more than welcome suggestions regarding the By-Laws as well as ideas about next year’s program, both as to topics, participants and procedures.

I am sorry I have had to make pedestrian rather than philosophical remarks but, in the parlance of the early Texas hawker of fraudulent oil leases, “In order to make my subject clear, I have attempted to eschew all sesquipedalian words”. Yet I know that my verbosity has been exceeded only by your patience in hearing me out.

In 1944 I was elected the fifth president of Beloit College in its first century, the College having been chartered by the Wisconsin Territory. One acidulous octogenarian miss — who had known all my predecessors — was asked — “what do you think the new president will do?”. She replied: “Same as the last four.” “What’s that?” “Make a speech every time he comes to a slight elevation in the sidewalk.”

I consider the Presidency of the Philosophical Society of Texas a very high elevation indeed — so forgive me — and thank you.



The Philosophical Society of Texas



PROCEEDINGS
OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

AT SALADO

DECEMBER 11, 12, 1970


XXXIV



DALLAS

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS

1971



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 incorporated as a non-profit, educational institution on January 18, 1936, by George Waverley Briggs, James Quayle Dealey, Herbert Pickens Gambrell, Samuel Wood Geiser, Lucius Mirabeau Lamar IV, Umphrey Lee, Charles Shirley Potts, William Alexander Rhea, Ira Kendrick Stephens, and William Embrey Wrather. December 5, 1936, formal reorganization was completed.

Offices and library of the Society are in the Hall of State, Dallas, 75226.

The Philosophical Society of Texas

STAGECOACH INN AT SALADO WAS THE SCENE OF THE 1970 ANNUAL MEETING, December 11 and 12. President and Mrs. Kempner were official hosts at cocktails Friday, preceding the "no program" dinner. Dion Van Bibber, our faithful honorary Sutler, resplendent in sequined dinner jacket and ruffled shirt, provided elaborate hors d'oeuvres and other refreshments Saturday.

Four Symposium sessions occupied members and guests Saturday morning and afternoon. At dinner Saturday, President Kempner presiding, election to membership of nine Texans was announced:

Mary Joe (Mrs. H. Bailey) Carroll of Austin
Durwood Fleming of Georgetown
David W. Guion of Dallas
John W. McCullough of Galveston
Fred Holmsley Moore of Austin
William A. Owens of New York City
Harry Province of Waco
Dorman H. Winfrey of Austin
Stewart Wolf of Galveston

Names of five valued members lost by death during the year were read, members and guests standing silently in tribute to them: William Campbell Binkley, Parks Johnson, Francis Marion Law, Summerfield G. Roberts, and Earl Rudder.

Report of the committee on officers was presented by Senator Redditt, numerously seconded and adopted. Carey Croneis, in accepting the presidency for 1971, delivered a thoughtful analysis of "The State of the Society," tactfully suggesting a few changes for consideration by the members.

After expressing appreciation to all those who contributed to the stimulating program and social delights of the Annual Meeting, the Society recessed until its 1971 Annual Meeting, to be held in Nacogdoches and San Augustine, December 10 and 11.

Members attending included: Misses Allen, Friend; Mesdames Carroll, Dudley, Gambrell, Jones, Krey; Messrs. Albritton, Dillon, Anderson, Banks, Bates, Caldwell, Carrington, Edward Clark, Tom Clark, Coke, Cottam, Croneis, Doty, Dougherty, Flawn, Durwood

Fleming, Richard T. Fleming, Frantz, Gambrell, Garrett, Garwood, Guion, Harbach, Hall, Hart, George Hill, Hogan, Kelsey, Kempner, Kilgore, Kirkland, Lindzey, Law, Minter, McCall, McCullough, Fred Moore, Olson, Pitzer, Pool, Prothro, Ragan, Redditt, Richardson, Sharp, Shuffler, Storey, Tate, Thompson, Tips, Vandiver, Wardlaw, Winfrey, Winn, Wolf, Wood, Wozencraft.

Guests were: Mrs. Claude Albritton, Mrs. Dillon Anderson, Mrs. Stanley Banks, Mrs. W. B. Bates, Dr. and Mrs. Edward Blackburn, Mrs. Clifton Caldwell, Mrs. Paul Carrington, Mrs. Edward Clark, Mrs. Henry C. Coke, Jr., Mrs. Carey Croneis, Mrs. William Doty, Mrs. J. Chrys Dougherty, Mrs. Peter T. Flawn, Mrs. Joe B. Frantz, Mrs. Jenkins Garrett, Mrs. W. St. John Garwood, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Geis, Mrs. W. G. Hall, Mrs. James P. Hart, Mrs. George A. Hill, III, Mrs. William R. Hogan, Mrs. Helen W. Homeyer, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur B. Hunt, Judge and Mrs. Wilmer Hunt, Mr. and Mrs. John M. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. A. V. Jones, Jr., Mrs. Mavis Kelsey, Mrs. Harris Kempner, Mrs. Jack Kilgore, Mr. and Mrs. W. M. Lewis, Mrs. Gardner Lindzey, Mrs. Tom Law, Mrs. Charles McCormick, Mrs. John W. McCullough, Mrs. Merton Minter, Mrs. Bernice Melburn Moore, Mrs. Fred H. Moore, Mrs. Stanley W. Olson, Mrs. Kenneth S. Pitzer, Mrs. Fred Pool, Mrs. Charles N. Prothro, Mrs. Cooper K. Ragan, Miss Mary Russell, Mrs. R. Henderson Shuffler, Mrs. Robert G. Storey, Mrs. Willis M. Tate, Mr. and Mrs. J. U. Teague, Mrs. J. Cleo Thompson, Mrs. Charles R. Tips, Mrs. Frank Vandiver, Mrs. Frank H. Wardlaw, Mr. Terrell Maverick Webb, Mrs. Dorman Winfrey, Mrs. Stewart Wolf, Mrs. J. Ralph Wood, Mrs. Frank M. Wozencraft, Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Young.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

PRESIDENT KEMPNER

You have been promised that this dinner will be free of formal addresses and I expect to live up to the promise. In a few moments I shall introduce the recently elected members who are in attendance. Otherwise, I crave your indulgence only to outline a new concept of these meetings which we have begun this year. In the past the officers of the Society have presented speakers on a variety of subjects — usually disparate. For this meeting at least we have decided it would be more “philosophical” to choose a specific subject to which all speakers would address themselves. The subject is a broad, general one, and each speaker has been asked to treat a different aspect. By announcing the subject and the speakers in advance, members have had an opportunity to do homework to qualify themselves for discussion from the floor. We hope to have an active, informed forum, as well as comprehensive treatment of the subject by our selected speakers.

I hope that you will like this year’s experiment and that it may serve as a paradigm for future meetings; but if you do not like it the cure is simple: your officers will — as usual — follow the membership’s wishes.

CAN WE RECONCILE INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF MODERN SOCIETY?

A Sociological and Family Point of View

BERNICE MILBURN MOORE¹

May we begin with an expression of trepidation in attempting to speak on the reconciliation of individual freedom to the requirements of modern society? Admitting anxiety is, in itself, an indication of individual freedom. Many times in the history of this nation, we have hesitated to admit fear, or a sense of insecurity. The privilege of talking of emotions, as well as of rational thoughts, has fortunately become more acceptable and is now even encouraged.

David Riesman says that whenever we speak, we speak out of our own characteristics, backgrounds, points of view and even out of our own fears. Harry Estill Moore would have added that the hearer hears in the same way that the speaker speaks. Effective communication, he would have continued, is cutting down the range of misunderstanding.

T. V. Smith,² a long time member of this Society and a beloved Texan, wrote as a philosopher, a poet, and a politician, about the American philosophy of equality and its origins. His works remind us that as this land was settled, every day brought the unexpected, demanded initiative for survival, and required cooperative compromise. Flexibility, spontaneity, adaptability were essential to meet situations for which no previous experience had prepared the settlers of the new continent. In our own time we live in a different world. Nonetheless, our horizons are both new and far-reaching. T. V. Smith's comments about our forebears still hold true for us.

It is trite to say, but we do live in a world of rapid, complex social change. This is a fact of life. Change in itself is not necessarily good, but without change, what opportunity would there be for progress? We, too, face the unexpected and the unexperienced. We encounter demands for flexibility and adaptability. These requirements will not ease in the years ahead unless this nation becomes stagnant. Any free society keeps reorganizing, redesigning, devising new ways of doing things, and experimenting with untried pat-

¹ Dr. Moore is a long time member of the staff of the Hogg Foundation of the University of Texas, as was her husband, the late distinguished sociologist, Harry Estill Moore.

² See his "Life and Its Leeways," *Proceedings* [V] (1940), 13-32; and XXVIII (1965), 50-51.

terns of relationships. We depend upon creativity and spontaneity to meet situations as they arise. Our scientific orientation and our search for new truths preclude the static and accept change as the normal.

Harry Moore's view was that the basic goal for citizens of this nation could not and should not be peace of mind. He considered to be far more appropriate what he termed "Divine discontent," the motivating force which made us what we are. That attitude is the foundation for hopefulness for man, hopefulness for our culture, our society, our way of life.

Often we are apprehensive and rightly so. We fear the new and the unexplored. Sometimes we are angered by frustration. We see no simple way to meet a problem or to face a situation never before encountered. We find ourselves unsure as to whether change is merely change, or change is progress. But healthy anxiety is also basic to motivation.

"The individual," "the person," "the personality," "the self," each term is so much a part of our vocabulary that we interchange them with little or no awareness of differences in meaning. "The integrity of the personality," "the dignity of man," "freedom of the individual," and "the rights of men," also are commonly used phrases which quite literally describe a way of life, a way of relationship of person to person.

David Riesman has pointed out that we talk of false dichotomies: the individual *or* society; the person *or* the group; the personality *or* culture. The connecting link should be "*and*," not "*or*." We are intrinsically a part of all that we have created, all that we are now doing, all that we will become. Emile Durkeim believed that the "cult of the individual" began its demise with the astronomy of Galileo, the physics of Newton, and the biology of Darwin. Scholars in social psychology such as George Meade and Charles Horton Cooley have emphasized that the individual and society, the personality and culture are inseparable.

In the same vein Helen Keller wrote dramatically, "Before my teacher came, I had no soul. I did not think. I did not even know that I am." She recognized, thus, that any personal development is interdependent. Communication is the mechanism for translation and transmission of culture by the family, in the neighborhood, through the schools, within all the primary social institutions. Man as a personality is a product of his culture and at the same time a modifier of it.

Various definitions of personality, of the individual, if you will, have been developed by scholars. Sometimes their orientation has been philosophical, sometimes clinical, sometimes from research,

sometimes from action, reaction and interaction as observed in human living.

Charles Horton Cooley, the first social psychologist of lasting consequence, in the early decades of the twentieth century described personality, primarily from observation, as the "looking-glass self." We look into the eyes of one another. We judge how others respond to us. Then we behave according to *our judgment* of how others see us. Sometimes there is misjudgment, of course. Sometimes such misreading causes difficulties in behavior and requires the help of others for a reorientation of how we feel others respond to us.

Erik Erikson's similar concept of self-identity was that we achieve self-identity, identity as individuals, when how we feel about ourselves corresponds to the way others behave toward us. In other words, his view was that we require re-enforcement from others to become ourselves. If there is a dissonance in how we feel about ourselves and how others respond to us, we question our own value as a person of worth and dignity. However, when important others — parents, teachers, and those we hold in high regard — re-enforce our value judgment of ourselves, a sense of self-identity or ego-identity is acquired.

Personality, said Harry Stack Sullivan, a social psychiatrist, is our habitual ways of behaving with other people. Through our behavior, others see us as we think and feel. The combination of that theory with Cooley's "looking-glass self" provides a clue as to how we come to understand ourselves.

William Menninger expressed it another way. He stated that our personality is all we have been; all we have experienced, perceived and learned; all that each of us is in the present, all that we may become. "Becoming" as a lifetime undertaking is comforting as one grows older! A discouraging belief is the opposite, "Give me a child until he is six and you can have him all the rest of his life." It would be devastating at sixty-six, or forty-six, or seventy-six to believe that between six years of age and any adult age, nothing had occurred which had changed the person or offered opportunity for development and improvement.

Life, according to Franz Alexander, is full of corrective experiences, social and emotional. That approach is fundamental to the dynamic concept of the person as a growing, changing, interacting, learning being and the antithesis of the pessimism of a never-changing life stream. Behavior can be changed, or at least modified, even though doing so may become more difficult with age. Middle-aged complacency, middle-aged comfort, dislikes being disturbed. But this does not mean we should, or even should want to, remain as we are.

All of us are more or less alike because we do function in relatively like situations. We share relatively common experiences. Gardner Lindzey, however, would emphasize genetic and biological differences. James Plant had a poetic way of stating these differences. He believed that each of us reacts to our experiences through "the envelope" of our own genetic and biological variations. For example, a sociologist could comment that there is always "sea change" in communication, the washing back and forth of words, through the way we each use and understand them. Constant variation and change in meaning is inevitable. Individual personalities create distinctions in both behavior and understanding. Recognized, allowed and accepted variations between persons are basic to freedom and essential to creativity.

Personalities have their origin in relationships within families. Child rearing patterns and the availability of opportunities to learn and to share in the richness of our culture are not all alike. As my father was wont to say, "No child ever asked to be born, nor can he choose the family into which he is born." The young come into the world in families of all types and kinds. What ideas, values, and attitudes are harbored within the family, including those concerning individual freedom, do much to determine the individuality and personality of children. Families offer experiences or lack of them which determine in part the ability to function in this pluralistic, heterogeneous, complex social order which we have created within our nation.

Herbert Ganns pointed out that the *idea* of individual freedom, of the development of the personality to the height of its potential, is basically an attribute of the more privileged. The ultimate statement of this concept of child rearing is observable in the life style of the professional, managerial, and other economically successful families, where experience is broad, opportunity is rich, and many different associations and relationships are available. Each person, adult or child, and his development is considered as a paramount function of the family. Each is offered opportunity for his own self actualization, to use Maslow's descriptive phrase. This pattern is restated in the relationship between husband and wife. Each is considered a distinctive personality, functioning in a complementary relationship, offering strengths, and hopefully minimizing weaknesses of each other by this process.

Another matrix of family relationships is apparent also within the diverse middle-class. Some families are child centered. Herein rather than emphasizing the development of the individual, per se, the focus is placed upon *the family* as an entity. Children are considered

children-within-the-family. Social life is confined largely to neighbors with similar views. Riesman deplored this subculture as "intensive groupism." Horizons are narrowed by too close association of those who are too much alike. All of us do tend to confine our associates, to a degree, to those who represent values which we hold, but our horizons can be broadened, and often consciously are, by a wider range of social contacts.

Working-class families represent still a different pattern of family organization with its own distinctive conception of the relationship of children to parents and parent to parent. Child rearing practices are quite distinct when compared with upper and middle-class families. Among blue-collar workers, a team relationship between husband and wife, as found in upper and middle-class families, is rarely present. Children are often considered possessions of parents. Little emphasis is placed upon them as individuals of personal worth. They are educated to go to work as soon as possible. They remain an economic asset of the family. Families of this grouping will sacrifice all they have when a family crisis is encountered, and even among those distantly related. Similarity to the extended, agrarian family is observed. Children from these families think, behave, and express emotions differently from the offspring of either upper or middle-class families. What the children of blue-collar families consider freedom is a far cry from our own conception of the word.

Children of poverty, children of the under-educated, of the unemployed, and the under-employed, have little or no opportunity for upward mobility out of their deprived situation. Their chances must come through other institutions such as the schools, the churches, social, recreational and family assistance agencies. Children of the poor are too often the unlovely and the most unloved. They suffer from deprivation of experience, of education, of expressed affection, of income, of future opportunity, and often have to fight the family to remain in school. What can freedom mean to them? These are the young ones for whom each of us must hold deep concern.

Individual freedom, then, is not and cannot be the same to everyone. All, however, believe in its desirability. To most of us, our individual freedom is a paramount value, but we express our faith and our desire for freedom in distinctive ways. It is a personal value as well as a national value in the lives of the working man and his family, in the family-centered middle class, and in the individualistic upper-class. Freedom is sensed as of worth even by those who have the least of it, those who live in poverty.

When we speak of individual freedom, then, we are talking of

a positive set of values. Personal freedom implies self-determination, the right of choice in marriage partners, in the number of children we choose to rear, in the work we will pursue, in the religion we espouse, in the politics we support, in the friends we make.

Perhaps we should add one other freedom — the freedom for name-calling! Sometimes we are astonished by the epithets we apply to others and find have been applied to us. Sometimes we are shocked, or should be, by the behavior our name calling triggers. We do have freedom to act, freedom to talk, but we should never forget that like freedoms belong to others. All of us can be hurt. All of us live in never-ending interaction.

Fortunately our campuses are relatively quiet this year. But we are not free from anarchical behavior on and off the campuses. Anarchy is the antithesis of freedom. Chaos and freedom cannot exist at the same time. Disorganized permissiveness and freedom cannot co-exist. The old concept of laissez-faire-run-rampant, of every-man-for-himself and the-devil-take-the-hindmost cannot be called freedom. For men to be free, organization and structure are requirements. Limitations upon behavior arising from the realization that our behavior always impinges upon the behavior of others is essential to freedom. Our ideas, our ideals, our ways of acting, feeling and believing are never divorced from like freedom for others. But freedom assures us that we are not privileged to destroy each other because of our differences.

Free men have to learn to live with authority. Living well *within* authority is basic to independence. In this sense authority has various facets. We live with the authority of our bodies, and this is never easy. Some of us would like to become free floating spirits, but we are forced always to live within the limitations of our physical selves. Citizens of our nation, even during the days of the exploiters and the spoilers, lived with the authority of conscience, with internalized ideals, goals, aims, and basic values. Conscience has been described humorously as always living as if someone were peeping! Perhaps self-control is similar in origin.

We always live with the authority of other persons. None of us has the privilege of freedom without allowing the same freedom to others. Empathy is a fundamental ingredient of this concept. Each of us is forced to consider what our actions will do to others. We should judge their impact upon others *before* we act. That is not easy, but it remains essential in any society where the dignity of each man is its criterion for greatness.

Folkways, mores, traditions, and customs are sources of control

within our lives. What we have inherited from the past is the foundation of our social order. The authority of law we accept as an eternal verity. Herein lies the right of free men to remain free. How we function through the legal process of our nation has literally guaranteed men their freedom as persons. Laws are not always easy to accept, but, when our laws become too galling, we are at liberty to do something about them and to do it *legally*.

James Plant also stressed the necessity of learning to live with the authority of the universe. This, stated with religious orientation, means we live under the authority of God.

Living as free men with authority, which we accept and which we impose upon ourselves, is a relatively new way of life. Franz Alexander pointed out in his *Age of Unreason* that man has tried freedom of imposition of self and social control only twice in recorded history — in ancient Greece and in Western civilization. Persons in other times and in our time have lived under the autocracy of feudalism, of absolute monarchy, of communism, of fascism, and with variations of national socialism. Our faith in the capacity of men to live as free men with self-imposed restraints, we maintain at all costs. These premises allow men freedom and a wider range of self-expression and a wider range of social choices than any other social organization which has been attempted.

Perhaps we are faced with the problem of a redefinition of freedom. Freedom in this day is freedom of relationships with one another rather than freedom from controls. In this context we do have individual freedom. Opportunity for sharing in decision making is becoming more widespread among all men in our nation. This is an important freedom. Personal decisions, decisions concerning the places where we live, decisions about our national, state, and local governments, and even international decisions offer freedom of participation.

Freedom of choice remains alive and well. We as persons can choose our ideals, our ideas, our values, our politics, our religion, our ways of rearing our children. A goodly measure of spontaneity remains in our lives. We do have conformity, but it is more of the obvious, of the exterior. In fact it contributes to the consistency necessary to our culture. Within the individual remains his freedom which has to do with his creativity, ingenuity, spontaneity and the development of new ideas. We are prone to decry our loss of freedom without being sure about what we speak. To paraphrase the French: Our inner freedom does not mean that each one of us can be idiosyncratic in our behavior or that every American can

afford to be totally different, and the more different he can become, the happier he will be! This caricatures the meaning of freedom.

Free men, free people, have no time for despair. We still maintain capacity, opportunity, ingenuity, resilience and flexibility. We are free to use energy in experimental solutions to problems, in the re-examination and reorganization of our social order. We still have the rare prerogative of self-identity. It is nice to know that no two of us are expected to be exactly alike. Who could tolerate a nation of such alikeness? We have the opportunity both to create and to meet new demands upon us and to find within these stimulation and excitement.

Elsie and Kenneth Bolding have described families that develop personalities with the capability to live with and accept change, to grow, to develop, to "become," to use Gordon Allport's phrase. Families which produce free persons are action oriented. It makes no difference whether "the action" is in business, professional, industrial, community, social or political leadership. Free persons arise from mobile families, those who see and seize the opportunity to move upward. Families offer much to their members if they live by the American dream: happy, hard working, achieving.

On the other hand, the Boldings have found that the producers of un-free men — may we use the term — are those who stifle, who try to block, and who will not attempt to adapt to change. These families are security oriented. "Security orientation" to the "nth degree" is totalitarianism; the state determines one's place and one's job, one's associates and one's way of functioning. Such security comes in trade for the freedom we cherish, precarious as it sometimes is. Un-free persons are niche seekers, those who want to be "out of it all." They strive to escape the turmoil of choices in life.

Today we can observe an interesting variation on this theme — our modern communes of the "hippie type." Some of these young ones try to withdraw into a never-never land that can, in truth, no longer exist. They apparently wish to escape any promise or problems of life, of movement, of change, of challenge that free men live. Communes are extended families in a sense. Young people of these groupings come from a conglomerate of family backgrounds. Some have been reared in wealth; some come from conservative, tradition oriented families. Nearly all are from middle and upper classes. Charles Kettering's clever comment of years ago seems to fit this current phenomenon: "Unfortunately we have a great many people who are so busy looking back that they are backing into the future."

These young persons appear to be in search of a utopia. The way in which Howard W. Odum of the University of North Carolina used to describe the Old South appears to be applicable. The Georgian said the romantic Old South was that which some wished it had been, but that it really never was. Persons who seek escape in any colony of unreality are not free. They are encapsulated in tight-knit groups incapable of functioning freely in the prevailing, moving, changing, social order.

Downward mobile, scared families also produce personalities who are rigid, inflexible, and unable to adapt to a changing culture. The welfare poor, tragic in themselves, belong in this category. So do the isolated and insulated families of suburbia where no great variability of association exists, where too much sameness becomes deadening mediocrity. Persons who live in isolated rural areas also may be limited in their intellectual and social stimulation. Isolated ghetto areas of urban society with little opportunity for cross fertilization of ideas, associations, and experiences offer little chance for the richness of freedom.

To restate our question of the day, "Can we reconcile individual freedom to the requirements of modern living?" My personal answer is yes. The answer is yes so long as we accept freedom in the context of man's responsibility for his own behavior, for his self-control in social relationships which offer like opportunities to others. This is the freedom of the person to learn, to change, to grow through sharing with both the like and the different. This concept of freedom requires that such freedom be equal and available to all. This freedom allows each person to function in a variety of ways, recognized as having origins in diverse points of view and backgrounds.

With all our differences, we accept the imperative commonality of *faith in freedom* as a basic social value. We accept the individual, the person, as of worth and dignity, in and of himself, no matter his origin or his status. We express our faith in freedom in our society.

Never can we forget, in the final analysis, that freedom of man, of all men, rests upon the individual, lies within the person. What each of us contributes is a growing understanding of *the self* as creative, productive, and capable of helping free like potentials in others. Herein rests the assurance of the eternal freedom of the individual, free to do his share in maintaining a free society of free men.

SOURCES OF IDEAS

- Gordon Allport. *Becoming*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Franz Alexander. *Our Age of Unreason*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1951.
- Charles Horton Cooley. *Social Organization*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.
- Erik H. Erikson. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1968.
- Herbert Gans. *The Urban Villagers*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1962.
- John Gardner. *The Recovery of Confidence*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1970.
- William C. Menninger. *You and Psychiatry*. New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1948.
- Harry E. Moore. *An Introduction to Sociology*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1940.
- James S. Plant. *The Envelope*. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1950.
- David Riesman. *Individualism Reconsidered*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.
- T. V. Smith. *The American Philosophy of Equality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.
George Meade, p. 242
Helen Keller, p. 244
- B. M. Stoodley. *Society and Self*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
Maslow, p. 645
- Harry Stack Sullivan. "Fusion of Psychiatry and Social Science," *The Collected Works of Harry Stack Sullivan*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1964. pp. 198-226.
- Robin Williams, Jr. *American Society: A Sociological Interpretation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
Durkheim, p. 463.

 FROM THE STANDPOINT OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
SABE McCLAIN KENNEDY¹

This occasion produces a variety of mixed emotions. As one who spent twenty years trying to teach a view of the world as it is organized politically, I welcome the chance to speak with any group showing any interest in that topic. It is such a far cry from the interest shown by some of my students.

The question "Can We Reconcile Individual Freedom to the Requirements of Modern Society from the Standpoint of Social Sciences?"— as put, is, in my opinion, self-affirming. A negative answer from a social scientist, particularly a professor of comparative government and an old academic administrator, would be equivalent to announcing that the social sciences have failed. No discipline ever admits its own decline, much less its demise. By the same token, however, few social scientists believe that "free societies" are either inevitable,

¹ Dr. Kennedy is Vice President for Academic Affairs, Texas Tech University.

immutable or static. The very factor of being "free" indicates volitional capability. An individual or society may "choose" to become "unfree." Some have. More, I am delighted to note, have chosen to try to become free. In my judgment, the most infectious and contagious political drive of the last three or four hundred years has been the drive of states or peoples to become "free." To define "free," however, is exceedingly difficult and general agreement is rare, but, at least states have tried to become "free" from outside direction. When the social scientist of the year 2500 starts looking for the cause of this dynamic quest to be free, the American Revolution rather than the French Revolution or the Russian Revolution or the Youth Revolution will, in my opinion, turn out to have been, by all odds, the most significant. So, we have ourselves, in part, both to blame and to praise for much of the present world's overwhelming preoccupation with the move toward freedom.

It is, however, one thing to speak about individual freedom and another thing to speak about individual freedom from the standpoint of the social scientist. Under the word "freedom," a dictionary frequently directs, "see liberty." Under "liberty," it says, "see John Stuart Mill." So, I went to John Stuart Mill. In his magnificent statement on "liberty" Mill wrote:

"This, then, is the appropriate region of human liberty. It comprises, *first* the inward domain of consciousness; demanding liberty of conscious in the most comprehensive sense; liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral or theological. The liberty of expressing and publishing opinions may seem to fall under a different principle, since it belongs to that part of the conduct of an individual which concerns other people; but, being almost of as much importance as the liberty of thought itself, and resting in great part on the same reasons, is practically inseparable from it. *Secondly*, the principle requires liberty of tastes and pursuits; of framing the plan of our life to suit our own character; of doing as we like, subject to such consequences as may follow: without impediment from our fellow-creatures, so long as what we do does not harm them, even though they should think our conduct foolish, perverse, or wrong. *Thirdly*, from this liberty of each individual, follows the liberty, within the same limits, of combination among individuals; freedom to unite, for any purpose not involving harm to others: the persons combining being supposed to be of full age, and not forced or deceived."¹

¹ Mill, John Stuart, *On Liberty*. In *The World's Great Thinkers — Man and the State: The Political Philosophers* (Saxe Commins and Robert N. Linscott, eds.), p. 147. Random House, New York, 1947.

Mill did not define "full age." Probably eighteen could have fit his specifications as well as thirty or twenty-one. He has been dead for over a century, but his writing shows that the topic itself was as current in his time as it is in our own. Freedom in the twentieth century obviously did not spring into being without roots in the past. If freedom is lost, it will not be lost except because of forces that also had their roots in the past; the problem of maintaining equilibrium of freedom is as old as man. Among the classifications of government, ancient scholars, particularly the Greeks, were very concerned with the concept of freedom. There are questions about sub-divisions of freedom as a social scientist categorizes the subject. First of all is "Freedom For Whom?" We do not have the answer to this question yet, but man has fought over it at least since Aristotle in the introduction to Chapter I in his *Politics*, observed that:

"We must distinguish the members of the state from those who are necessary as its servants, but no part of it. There must be men who are able to provide food, to practise the arts, to bear arms, to carry on the work of exchange, to supervise the state religion, to exercise political and judicial functions. But of these classes we should exclude from the citizen body (1) the mechanics, (2) the traders, (3) the husbandman. Warriors, rulers, priests remain as eligible for citizenship. The same persons should exercise these three professions, but at different periods of life. Ownership of land should be confined to them."

When one speaks then, of the magnificent freedom of ancient Athenian society at its height, its articulate and comprehensive spokesman still had not resolved the question "Freedom For Whom?" except in terms of the society of which he was a part — a highly caste-structured society.

"Freedom For What?" Does this mean freedom to do what every individual would choose to do? I was all set to ascribe the following quotation to Judge Learned Hand until I heard a few minutes ago that it should be attributed to a law professor at the University of Texas. The statement was, "Your Honor, I have the full right, freely to swing my fists." But the judge, whether Judge Hand or another, responded to the defendant, "Your right to swing your fist stops just before it touches your neighbor's nose." That is about as good a definition as I have ever heard or read, whoever said it, about the extent of one's "Freedom For What?" The idea that under any set of social restraints of any political society in the past one

² Aristotle, *Politics* (Benjamin Jowett, Translator), pp. 45-46. The Modern Library, New York, 1943.

was absolutely free to do anything he wanted to do at any time to anyone cannot be validated.

"Freedom From Whom?" This question has touched about as many lives through history as any other. There have been times, for example, when children did not have even the right of survival in the family. The ancient Spartans had a system of population control, not birth control. If an infant appeared to be the sort of baby that they did not think would grow up to be the sort of Spartan of which a Spartan could be proud, he was left out in the woods at a tender age. Few survived; many lost even the elementary freedom of the right to grow up. If one does not have freedom to survive within the family union, his freedoms are few indeed.

"Freedom From What?" This question was probably answered most succinctly by the late President Franklin Roosevelt in his inaugural address in 1933 when he assured an anxious nation that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Freedom from fear is the most liberating of freedoms. Trying to free himself from the fear of the unknown is what has pushed man into areas to see how high the mountain is or what is inside the atom.

Freedom from fear of the beyond is the goal about which the theologians have speculated for so long. Another aspect is freedom from the fear of disease. There have been times when man has been fearful and unfree to speculate in polite society on a particular disease. One did not even talk about whether a disease such as syphilis existed. How could one expect, then, to find a cure for it? Man has too often followed this approach in regard to social ills of this time and other eras as well. Freedom from fear of one's neighbors, individual or collective, whether private or public, is fundamental and often in peril. Freedom from fear of hunger or want is another aspect. I consider it most important that one have the option to be free from fear of self-disappointment. I believe this to be the most damaging of fears. Some people just do not think anything they ever do will satisfy either themselves or anyone else. There is little to be done for these tragically inadequate people. Others fear that not everything they did was recognized as right from the beginning.

Obviously freedom is rarely an absolute. Individual and collective freedom may, in fact, inhibit each other. The choice of one may preclude the other. Freedom to be a hermit, for example, negates one's freedom to participate in four-handed bridge games. One must make a choice and then live with the choice or be unhappy either as a bridge player or as a hermit. I would argue that the right to be heard does not exclude the right not to listen. And the right to

come and go, the right to disappear, may sometimes be interfered with by the right not to be lost. I am not the least bit interested in having a little beeper in my pocket so that I can always be found. I hate to be lost, but I do not always want to be found.

For much, if not most, of history, man has been concerned both with the ideas involved in determining an acceptable equilibrium of freedom versus order and with the social and political mechanisms for maintaining this fragile balance. Society has not generally been crystal clear or wholly consistent in either its definition or its practice. Freedom of privacy in one's own home is rarely so absolute as to deny admission to firemen to chop their way through the kitchen door to put out a fire even in one's absence. One does not have the choice, in fact, to burn down his own home since he could not guarantee that the sparks would not fly over and burn his neighbor's house.

The Greeks were also concerned with the balance of freedom versus order. And one of the most far-reaching, I think, is the judgment made by Socrates. He viewed the freedom of Athens to be wrong as being greater than his own right to be right or to be free or to survive. Aristotle contended that one had a free society if he had a form of government which functioned according to the general interests rather than the special interests. I tried to find out what Julius Caesar thought about freedom but he was apparently content that Romans were free, the barbarians were kept out of town, and Caesar was on the front row. The Romans did not always theorize.

To continue in somewhat the same vein, when man has viewed himself as being endangered from outside the parameters of his unit, he has for a limited period of time generally acquiesced in the temporary suspension or diminution of his personal options. To illustrate: when bombings are imminent, blackouts are enforceable and voluntarily so. Those who were in England during World War II remember how shortly before sundown every Briton scurried around to be sure no lights shone. They did not need a constant reminder to "get those lights out." When invasion is feared, conscription is endured.

Willingness on the part of masses of people to accept reduced freedom in time of crisis is a well-known phenomenon, but one which has often fed the appetites of megalomaniacs. Dictatorships have consistently developed crises to facilitate their totalitarian and authoritarian ends. One might add that other systems, from time to time, have invoked the specter of crisis to justify or enhance absolutist tendencies or to avoid accountability. "Crisis" management and cries of "emergency" and "extraordinary circumstances" pose as great a threat to freedom in a self-governing society as do the

forces from without who seek our collapse or those from within who plot systematically to lay us low.

Historically, one may find ample illustrations of the difficulty of providing strength for survival when free men are in jeopardy. The Comanche Indians, in their simplicity, had a delightful system. They believed that war chiefs were for war and peace chiefs were for peace, and they chose leaders for each time based on the goals of the tribe for that moment. The British, in 1740 and again in 1745, did precisely the same thing, but they had not announced earlier that it was their custom so to do.

The French, in their quest for self-government, after centuries of Bourbon absolutism, fell into the worst of both worlds. Self-government quickly became anarchy and the Reign of Terror. Their revulsion against license and terror and their longing for some semblance of order made possible the rise of an already anxious Bonaparte who promised order and efficiency at the price of absolute obedience and national greatness at the price of the national levee and, having exacted both tolls, delivered neither product.

The thirteen colonies were, by no means, united or unanimous in their quest for freedom from Britain, and they found that political sovereignty, when it came, did not bring freedom from each other's restrictive actions and trade limitations, or economic independence from British manufacturers. One can trace a progression from the unlimited prescriptions for freedom in the Declaration of Independence to the limitations imposed by state powers under the Articles of Confederation and a far more centralized authority under the new Constitution. All of this took place in less than a decade after the surrender of Cornwallis.

Clearly, however, our political system neither faced its last crisis at Yorktown nor made its final adjustment when it ratified the new Constitution. My conviction is that the social scientists in the twenty-first century will find the real strength of the United States to have been its continuing ability to change its Constitution and pragmatically, although fitfully and sometimes violently as in the case of the Civil War, to incorporate enough adjustments to keep the system functioning. Changes have never come at the speed sought by the loudest advocates of change, many of them social scientists, whether in the days of Tom Paine, John Brown, or almost any student leader. Fortunately, changes have come, in spite of the resistance of George III, the Duke of Wellington, the Ku Klux Klan, or any other bastion of the ostrich-like view of the world.

Our system has absorbed and has progressed with the largest ex-

tension of the suffrage known, even to the present point of enfranchising eighteen-year-olds. Parenthetically, there is one thing that all of us have in common with the youth, whether they accept this viewpoint or not: once we were as young as they. And they have never been our ages. When the present young have a true basis for comparing both viewpoints, I hope to hear their comments. The political figures who are so worried about the eighteen-year olds need to remember one thing — they will only get to vote one time as an eighteen-year old. When the next presidential election rolls around, they will be over twenty-one. Then they will see what miracles have been wrought or not.

In addition to extensive participation in political activities, the suffrage, and the like, our system has also expanded educational opportunities to an amazing extent, and not just for groups but for individuals. One does not educate groups, but individuals. Hopefully they group together for effective and useful purposes although I still think there is a possible truth in the legend that the camel is the result of a committee attempting to build a horse.

Despite the abrasiveness of war and crisis, the variety of ethnic backgrounds in this country has both increased in number and increased in making the variations known and appreciated and incorporated into the total society. In the light of so sanguine a view of the past, what of the future? Beyond question, change cannot stop now if the problems which beset this land are to be ameliorated. Change for the sake of change is, at the same time, not really an answer. Here is where those of us who are past twenty-one may face our most difficult problems. It will not suffice to point with pride to old solutions for no longer existent problems, though those problems in their time were as critical as are those we face now. Roosevelt can only be run for president against Hoover so many times, and then the winning candidate or his political heirs must have a new issue.

The most critical issues which face us now and which appear most likely to require our best efforts over the decade ahead are people-related problems. Solutions to people-related problems are most apt to be found in the realms of knowledge in which people are the principle objects of study and concern. By definition, the broad area that concerns itself most directly with man as a social or political animal is the area of social sciences. It would seem, therefore, that the social sciences, as confused as they may be, are by the very nature of their emphases on the threshold of their best opportunities. Certainly man will be concerned with his relationship to space, on

earth and off the earth, to material goods, to pollution, to congestion, to transportation and to many other spheres in which many disciplines do and may continue to flourish. But if man is to make real progress in causal areas, in human relationships, he must make significant advances in these realms. Freedom is one aspect of human relationships. Peace is a condition of human relationships. War, poverty, happiness, misery, acceptance, rejection, understanding, alienation — each of these terms is a condition of people as understood by people.

Freedom is an attitude about or toward human relationships. Freedom for individuals in the aggregate has resulted from consensus to insist upon and to allow, and in fact to nurture, the concept that man is an individual of great value as a human personality and is entitled to be viewed in that light in political, educational, social, ethical, and other relationships. Therefore, unless mankind is viewed essentially as a conglomerate of discrete and disparate individuals rather than as an organic whole composed of animated atoms organized into a societal monolith, there can be no real freedom as Western civilization has evolved that term.

What have been some of the views of social scientists in this regard? What about the old question of freedom versus order? When one moves out a little to the left or in some direction away from any kind of restraint toward more and more freedom, finally one gets to license and out of "license" so often comes again the "law of the jungle." One man's license is stronger than others and he begins to overpower the weaker ones. The old force theory of the origin of the state has come right back into operation. Away from the happy mean or balance or equilibrium between freedom and order toward more order, one finds the absolutist from another orientation coming into power. More threats have come from the "order" side in one sense because man has not been willing to stomach the excesses of license very long and has generally solved the problem of license when it arose. He has not been quite so successful in identifying and containing tendencies toward absolutism from another direction. Absolutism's tendencies have often been fed on crisis — war, famine, or depression. The thing that motivates most of my generation appears to be the fear that our children might one day be in another depression. When we talk to our children about a depression they do not have the foggiest idea what that term really means. It is amazing, however, what people will do in real disasters. Several days before a devastating tornado struck Lubbock, I remained in my office three evenings until eleven o'clock wondering whether or not

the people demonstrating on the campus would remain peaceful or not. Within thirty minutes after the tornado hit, some of the same persons who had been leading the demonstration two days before were calling the president to see what they could do to help the storm victims. Many of them went to the coliseum, where 5,000 people were sheltered, and stayed to help. The point is that in a real disaster, for a short period of time, man will voluntarily submerge his fundamental differences in the face of a greater danger, but one can only continue a disaster so long.

"Crisis" is one of the terms that has given an excuse for vitiating freedom. "Efficiency" is another term that, with the best of intentions, sometimes gets bandied around and before long may well diminish freedom. People sometimes say, "we cannot afford the time it takes to study this problem through — we have got to act." Others may say, "my system will save money and you do not have an alternative response so we will use mine." Another will say, "I am a much more efficient and knowledgeable person than you are so we are going to do it my way." And, then, as was indicated above, man has sometimes chosen to be unfree. The tragedy is that occasionally large groups of people will say to a person such as Napoleon or Hitler or Stalin, "we defer or waive all our options to participate or decide and will do it your way, without question." They have just voted to be unfree without announcing that that was their intent. Societies have had other sources of problems which have diminished freedom, too. There have been the "elitists." Generally, these have been the traditional hereditary rulers. This country was founded on the assumption that our fathers had had enough of that concept; one cannot confer a U. S. title of nobility on a U. S. citizen. We may, however, have worked up new types of elites. Students are not always wrong when they say that new titles for the new "elitists" includes "Ph.D." or "Professor." My colleagues often consider "Dean" or "Academic Vice President" to be in the same category. We have some elitists on race. We have elitists among the social scientists. These are often extremely articulate and, I hope, always to be read and frequently discounted. I refer to the so-called "determinists." Despite all the problems we have had through history and in our present society, and as complex as the problems have appeared to be, there has been a great yearning in man for a simple formula or simple solution that he could use to resolve all issues. Were it possible to get something that solved man's problems as easily as the formula for finding the area of a circle, for example, then one could put metes and bounds and speak with more precision. There

have been social scientists and others who got their materials printed and read by the social scientists who proposed simple formulas. There have been others, relatively few in number, who argue that heredity is the controlling factor. These believe there is not much to be done about social adaptations. Just check genes or lineage and that is it. Others have made an equally strong case for environment. If one can just create a nice environment or if one can get a disadvantaged person out of this kind of home life and into another, or out of this ghetto and into another setting, these changes automatically resolve the problems. We know, of course, that people are different. We know that identical twins can be raised in identical circumstances and one of them will grow up and vote one way and the other may not vote at all or if he does vote, he may cancel out the other.

For centuries there have been people who say that the factors of environment or heredity do not make much difference. They claim to have found the formula by which society operates. Aristotle, with his encyclopaedic knowledge, got carried away with the cyclical theory. There have been those who said that if one asks the right questions and grinds them through this or that process, out will come the right answers. We now call that the "systems" approach. Thomas Aquinas used the same sort of process but asked different questions. One must ask all the questions and ask them in the right sequence. Finally at the end of the sequence the answer would appear. Hegel had a formula, too. Unfortunately, many did not understand what he said but Marx and then Engels thought they did and they came up with a formula which is fundamental to Soviet theory. I do not trust people who come up with simple formulas for complex social problems.

Recently I read a fascinating book — *Cure for Chaos*. I was all set for solutions for all the social problems because the work was asserted to present "fresh solutions to social problems through the systems approach." The author appeared to have asked nearly all of the right questions, but, when he got to the very end, he admitted that:

"Perhaps the narrowest constriction in the bottle's neck that will limit the flow of useful systems analyses and designs will be our limited ability to measure, simulate, and test systems and system elements that depend on the reactions of human beings. We shall have to develop better ways to tap preferences, judge needs, present possibilities, and evaluate alternatives for the many systems and parts of systems that relate directly with or

are dominated by the human factor.

Still, it would be nice to imagine that period ahead, when the only thing that stands in the way of full application of logic, objectivity, and all the facets of science and technology is that we don't have enough trained professionals. That will be the beginning of the golden age. Once most people are wedded to creative logic and objectivity to get solutions to society's problems, the world is going to be a lot better. Then maybe we can say an important thing, namely, that science and technology are then being used to the fullest on behalf of mankind."³

Many studies do not recognize their own built-in limitations. That is why I mentioned this one by name; it is an excellent tool but recognizes that it is not an end to society's problems.

In the light of these generalizations, what may be expected of social scientists and the preservation of freedom? Society has shown on many occasions that it has the capability politically to destroy itself. We have had already the review of the twenty-two civilizations cited by Toynbee, but there are institutions, including political systems, which have been strong enough to take a careful look at themselves and see their weaknesses and then start work toward improvement.

If you are depressed and pessimistic over conditions of the last two or three years in this country, let me suggest that before you jump off London Bridge you remember what the British did about the time the bridge was new. British experience, from approximately 1800 to 1836, was remarkably similar to the experience of the United States between 1940 and 1970. Britain had not always been a world power. The British had often tried to be a world power and had won some and lost some of their struggles.

By the time of the American Revolution or certainly by the end of the wars against France, British emergence as a world power was clearly evident. The British dominated almost everybody everywhere for decades.

But, in that period from 1800, when they were engaged for fifteen long years with Napoleon, their industry began to grind itself down. It became obsolete, their labor force was disrupted, and they had population dislocations. The people left those beautiful pasture areas and went to the cities to man the factories. They found absolutely miserable living and working conditions. Their crime rate, measured against a penal code that had about 300 capital offenses in 1800, was producing more capital crimes than ever before experienced in

³ Ramo, Simon, *Cure for Chaos*, pp. 115-116. David McKay Company, Inc., New York, 1969.

the history of England. Today we do not remember that part of English history. We simply note that now there are more murders in any one of the four or five larger cities in Texas than there are in all the British Isles despite the great disparity of population. If one looks carefully to see what the British did when they had their problems, there may be some illustrative hope for us. The war against the French finally came to an end, and the British had to decide whether their society, as they had known it, would rebound or come apart at the seams. They tried the dragoons, and they tried the riots. They expanded electoral opportunities, they argued about economic opportunities, but none of these was an instant solution. They began a systematic examination of their own institutions — political, economic, social. They reformed their legal system to the point where it became the one after which we patterned so many of our reforms. They reformed their bureaucracy and provided the model we used for our Civil Service. We missed part of the model. We missed the fact that they recruit the best prepared young people at the start of their careers and hope to end up with the best trained senior people. They did not believe in latter day infusions into their highest level bureaucracy. They were convinced that if society wanted to have a very well trained public servant, they selected him young. They reformed their local government. They reformed their tariffs. They reformed their economic system. They reduced the list of capital crimes and then toned up the court system so that when crime had been committed they could catch the criminal, and when caught, if found guilty, the criminal could be punished. Most vital to this presentation, those reforms were done without denying any of the individual liberties and freedoms which made their system what it was.

I mention this era of reform not to suggest that we go back and try to become the Britain of 1840, but to mention that there have been highly complex societies with much greater relative population problems than we have had, with problems of not even being able to feed themselves from their own resources. Within rigid societies such as England before 1832 at least, the man who happened to be born poor or in the wrong part of England could never aspire to leadership. It has not been too long since one of the grocery clerks in England became Lord Chancellor, the highest member of the British judiciary. The long record of Britain is good example of a people who have faced real internal problems in times when it looked as though they were about to lose both freedom and order and have

utter chaos. Instead, they took stock, determined what their freedoms were and which ones they insisted on keeping; they made adjustments in the system so that it could produce; and they did these things in such a way as not to lose sight either of the best features of their traditional system or the personal freedom that they wanted. No one could dispute that the British are, as individuals, significantly freer in larger numbers now, whatever their economic plight, than they were at the time of the end of the French Revolution and the Battle with Napoleon.

One who explores the problem of whether or not the social scientists can examine, identify, and then suggest mechanisms for retaining individual freedoms, can argue that today's topic is not really a new question. The continuing question is "in which are we the most interested — freedom or order?" This cannot be answered in the absolute because there is nothing left if you choose one and omit the other. The real question is, "how may an equilibrium be maintained?" One does not maintain it today, declare that the task is finished, and eliminate the need to be concerned for another 500 years.

Balances just do not work that way. Each of us makes a choice. My personal prejudices emerge once again — if it should come to a point where efficiency or "order" becomes our total goal, I opt for less efficiency. Put another way, if the price of getting trains to run on time is another Benito Mussolini, I intend to ride the bus.

FROM THE STANDPOINT OF GOVERNMENT

KENNETH SANBORN PITZER

It is a pleasure to return after a few years absence to this Society. I thank President Kempner for his invitation to lead this portion of the discussion and for his assuring me a considerable degree of flexibility in interpreting the title.

Much argument these days centers on national priorities. There is a question of priorities implied in the title suggested by President Kempner. Which should be reconcile to what? Is "individual freedom" more or less important than the "requirements of modern

society?" My approach to this general subject is as if it were stated: how should we design a modern society consistently with the maintenance of individual freedom? In other words, individual freedom is so important to me that I am prepared to sacrifice many other things, if necessary, to maintain it.

How is individual freedom maintained insofar as government is concerned? The framers of our constitution recognized that the primary danger lay in too strong an executive in government. King George III was the current model of that evil. Although his misuse of power was recognized and challenged in England by political leaders like William Pitt, his power was so great that it prevailed, and the colonies declared independence.

A few years ago some members of the President's Science Advisory Committee joined in a semi-formal exchange of views with several leaders of British governmental science policy. We met in London at Whitehall; I happened to be seated under a portrait of George III as the meeting opened on July 4 — which is not a holiday in London. This situation provided the basis for some novel opening remarks.

The forces tending toward excessive executive power are different today, but they are no less real, and it is still important that the Congress remain strong enough to challenge the President on most, if not all, major policy decisions.

As was shown by the years between independence and the adoption of our Constitution, it is also possible for an executive to be too weak. The President needs sufficient power and influence to provide a basis for personal national leadership. He must have authority to carry out efficiently the approved policies. It is with respect to policy adoption — not implementation — that the balance of power limiting the executive is desirable.

The recent ascendancy of executive power began in the administration of Franklin Roosevelt. He was not inclined to abrogate individual rights, but he did shift the balance of power far toward the White House. Initially it was the urgency of economic and social reform that allowed Roosevelt to draw power to himself. His rebuff by Congress on the proposal to "pack" the Supreme Court restored at least some balance before the military crises of World War II again shifted almost unrestrained power to the executive.

In the post-war years the complexity and secrecy associated with national security in the cold war provided the basis for Congressional acquiescence to the President on defense matters. Recently the Sen-

ate has sought to regain its traditional influence as, for example, in the debates on the anti-ballistic missile system as well as those on Vietnam.

As a point of departure for further discussion, I quote a news report based upon remarks of McGeorge Bundy to a meeting in Scotland.

“Ford Foundation president McGeorge Bundy said Wednesday that nuclear defense systems had become too complex for decisions to be made by debate.

“Alluding to congressional debate over the anti-ballistic missile system, he said a condition of safety in the nuclear problems of superpowers was central control and decision.

“Bundy said that three years had been spent discussing a single proposed component of U. S. strategic defense, and the results were not encouraging.

“‘I do not mean at all that there should have been no argument over the development deployment of an ABM system. I mean only that the intrinsic complexity of the topic has made the process of debate both difficult and unsatisfactory,’ he said.

“‘Debate is sometimes necessary to sustain democratic confidence in the process of choice which runs from technical analysis to command decision, but debate is no substitute for that process, which is inescapably hierarchical and tightly organized.’”

Possibly this report is unfair to Mr. Bundy; certainly it is not my purpose to attack him but rather to use this statement as representative of arguments that are commonly expressed and even more frequently implied.

There is no question about the complexity of issues such as the ABM. The technological factors are extremely complicated; for many years an anti-ballistic missile was thought to be utterly impractical by those most expert in missile engineering. Now it is believed, with good reason, that an ABM is feasible, but it is by no means clear how well the present proposed system would actually work or whether another design would be better. Only professionals in this technology have informed opinions on these questions, and they do not agree. Also since secrecy is involved, only those with access are informed. The President and his associates, as well as members of Congress, must base their decisions on the testimony of these professional scientists and engineers.

Another factor in the ABM situation is intelligence about the weapon systems of Russia, China, and possibly other countries. Here there is even more sensitivity to secrecy; only an extremely limited group has first-hand access to reliable data.

The operations, both in intelligence and in research and development, are either in or related by contract to executive departments or agencies. Hence the expert opinions are available initially and directly to the representatives of the President and become available only indirectly, if at all, to Congress. Thus, unless the Congress insists upon comparable access to professional testimony, it cannot compete with the President in decision-making on this type of subject.

The President and his immediate associates, however, are dependent just as much as is Congress upon the advice of those technically expert. Hence there is no reason why Congress, if it informs itself properly, cannot continue to play its full constitutional role in a modern society insofar as complex decisions of this type are concerned.

Executive decisions are not, by hindsight, infallible; I do not even think their "track record" is very good. The greatest weakness might be described as tunnel vision; frequently this is reinforced by undue deference to the President.

Most persons find arguments unpleasant and like their associates to agree with them at least much of the time. In making executive appointments Presidents tend to select those with views similar to their own. Even if the chief executive encourages differing views, it is discouraging to be repeatedly on the losing side of the internal debates and then be constrained against open expression of one's personal views. Thus individuals, who find their views almost never accepted within an executive organization, tend to leave that administration in favor of more pleasant or fruitful activities. Hence, the longer a given administration remains in office, the lesser the chance that there is real consideration of different viewpoints.

No one could dispute the President's right, if he chooses, to present an apparently united front toward Congress and toward the public on major matters of controversy. It would be absurd if the Secretary of Defense advocated before Congress a position on a military question different from that held by the President. Even those in a part-time advisory role, if at the presidential level, recognize that the access to the President for confidential expression of views implies a restraint on expression of those views elsewhere until the President makes his own decision. After the President has reached his conclusion, if it is contrary to the view of the advisor, he should at least offer to resign before making a public attack on the President's recommendation or decision. It is easy to see how these factors may lead an administration into a position where im-

portant differences in judgment never come to the attention of the President.

The basic pattern in Congress is different. Representatives and Senators are elected by many different constituencies and are under no obligation to suppress their personal views even after decisions are reached in committees or at other intermediate levels. Congressmen act in public view; even when a Congressional committee takes testimony in executive session, the witness is not restrained from subsequently expressing his viewpoint to the President or to a committee of the other house of Congress. Open difference of opinion is just a more intrinsically acceptable part of life in the Congress than it is in the White House.

Congressional decision-making has, of course, serious weaknesses. One is slowness; it is necessarily a long process even if there is no deliberate effort to delay. Hence, if prompt decision is essential, it must be delegated to the President. Modern technology has created some situations, most notably that with respect to the use of intercontinental ballistic missiles in case of attack, where instant decision is essential. But this does not really constitute a departure from constitutional processes since Presidents have always undertaken to defend against an actual attack on U. S. territory without further authorization.

Another inherent characteristic of Congressional decision-making is the role of committees. The complexity of modern problems makes the effective use of committees more important than ever. Congressmen must specialize, and testimony of experts is better taken before a committee than before a full house.

Some Congressional committees have a good record in dealing with complex problems. I have had most experience with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and would give it good marks (although I could also mention serious errors). Good staff support is essential and the JCAE has had that most of the time. Its first Chairman, Brian McMahon, was a remarkably able and perceptive man who established excellent traditions.

Probably the greatest need for Congressional committee reform concerns their chairmen. A weak or bad chairman can destroy the effectiveness of a committee; Congress must find some means to replace an unfortunate choice of a chairman without losing the advantage of reasonable continuity of service.

My conclusion is that the balance of power designed by the framers of our Constitution is still feasible and still desirable in the

modern world. In contrast to the views attributed to Mr. Bundy, I believe Congress can make good policy decisions on matters which involve complex technology. Indeed, the intrinsic tendency of Congress to invite differences of opinion is a good counterbalance to the tendency of an executive organization toward tunnel vision. There is, however, serious need for Congressional reform so that all or most committees can attain the level of effectiveness which a few committees have demonstrated to be possible.

Finally, individual freedom needs to be continuously reasserted. We must individually exercise our freedom regularly even in situations where there is some risk. If we suppress our own views from fear of possibly losing a business deal or a salary raise, the climate for freedom suffers. Conversely we need to defend not just the legal right but also the personal welfare of individuals who exercise their individual freedom in ways which are fundamentally acceptable even though momentarily unpopular. Whenever business or other non-governmental organizations demand undue conformity of all their members, individual freedom suffers. Equally, when individuals suppress their opinions because they are unwilling to risk criticism and possible financial disadvantage, individual freedom also suffers. The cost of exercise of individual freedom must not be too high; we need both a government which protects rights and an informal community atmosphere which likewise protects individual freedoms.

THE STATE OF THE SOCIETY

CAREY CRONEIS

Thank you, President Kempner. Members of the Philosophical Society of Texas and guests: one may appropriately question the wisdom of our nominating committee, but the sincerity of my appreciation of the Society's action is not open to question. I can only add that I value the confidence that you have shown in me — although in this quasi-democratic Society you had no other choice — and hope that I may merit your trust.

I *can* assure you that I did not campaign for the office — which is understandable. Most college administrators these days work hard to keep a low profile. High visibility turns out to be counter-productive, not only for the individual himself but for the organi-

zations he may seek to serve. This problem, however, is not as new as one might suppose. Samuel Langdon, who was elected president of Harvard as long ago as 1774, was driven out of office by protesting students. The Harvard Corporation, acquiescing to their demands, discovered that a student committee had informed Langdon that "as a man of genius — we respect you; as a man of piety — we venerate you; as a president — we despise you."

Sam Hanna Acheson's obituary of John Elijah Rosser — who served as the perennial chairman of our Society's nominating committee — records that once, when Rosser was "being taxed — for his part in what was described as a 'steamroller' election of officers," he replied, sardonically, that it made little difference because the Society was a Kakistocracy. Then — when forced to explain to his less learned friends — he stated that Kakistocracy is government by the worst citizens.

At the 1964 meeting of the Society, however, Herbert Pickens Gambrell presented the new president, Edward Randall, Jr., who responded by observing — among other things charmingly said — that he considered "membership in this Society the highest honor that can come to a citizen of Texas."

If I had to choose between Rosser's pessimistic exaggeration and Randall's optimistic hyperbole, I would cast my vote for the Randall version. It is, I submit, more than a minor honor to belong to this Society — even if Kakistocratically elected! Founded by such men as Sam Houston, Lamar, and Rusk at Houston just 133 years ago last Saturday, the Society was "reconstituted" 34 years ago last December 5, the date of the recent Texas-Arkansas "shoot-out." This latter event presented scheduling difficulties which our first and second founders, for all their wisdom, had failed to anticipate.

When one looks over the roster of past presidents of this Society, he becomes particularly impressed by his own inadequacies. Inevitably I must now succeed those distinguished men, but it will be difficult, if not impossible, to follow them. Consider Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, our first president. The resounding historicity of the very name is formidable. It is some small encouragement to me, however, that of the 37 previous presidents, I have known 21, at least casually, and in all cases favorably. Moreover 12 of the 21: Edgar Odell Lovett, Umphrey Lee, dear Ima Hogg, Burke Baker, Jesse Andrews, James Pinckney Hart, Robert Gerald Storey, Harry Hunt Ransom, McGruder Ellis Sadler, William Alexander Kirkland, Herbert Pickens Gambrell, and Harris Leon Kempner, in more ways

than they are aware, or could be expected to remember, have made life richer, not only for their fellow citizens, but also for this relatively late-comer to the great state of Texas — who nevertheless became a frequent visitor in the 30's speaking before local geological societies in both East and West Texas.

Similarly the roster of the Society contains the names of many other public-spirited members who have doubtless helped you — as they have me. A *partial* list includes Herbert Allen, George Rufus Brown, Morgan J. Davis, Frederica Gross Dudley, Oveta Culp Hobby, and Gus Sessions Wortham; as well as others no longer with us, such as Everett De Golyer, Lamar Fleming, Jr., Harry Clay Hanszen, and Harry Carothers Wiess. After Mr. Wiess' death, his generous wife and daughters provided the wherewithal to entice me from the frigidity of the Great Lakes area to the warmth of Texas and — it was the Society's late William Embry Wrather, then director of the United States Geological Survey who, among others, influenced the Wiess family to do so.

I cannot in this connection fail to mention the unusually warm and profitable relationship I have had with other Texas educators, including Society members too numerous to mention without getting myself into real trouble — but philosophers all. None of them unnamed will, I am sure, take umbrage if I do mention a member missing for the first time from these sessions — our *bona fide* philosopher *par excellence*, Radoslav Andrea Tsanoff. What an adornment to *our* Society — and to Society generally!

There is a much worn, but — after last night's bombings at the University of Kansas — pertinent story regarding a faculty advisor who asked a seemingly unmotivated freshman advisee to be *specific* about what he intended to take. The answer: "I plan to take the ROTC buildings, the administration offices, and the computer center, probably in that order." This is a common type of modern, potentially destructive criticism, in which I do not plan to indulge. I do want to examine our Society, and constructively criticize in a non-critical fashion — if that is possible. As Emily Dickinson once wrote "— truth, like ancestors' brocades, can stand alone —." She was right about truth, of course, but the Society's ancestral brocades may need some starching before they can stand completely erect.

Early this year President Harris Leon Kempner appointed an *ad hoc* committee to study the membership and the By-Laws of the Society with a view toward their possible refurbishing. The committee membership was, as follows: Dillon Anderson, Jacob W.

Hershey, William Kirkland, and Carey Croneis, chairman. Harris Kempner and Herbert Gambrell served, *ex officio*. As so often happens with *ad hoc* groups, we met but once, but the views exchanged were very helpful. Meanwhile I have examined the records directly available to me — which are limited — and have carried on a correspondence with Messrs. Kempner and Gambrell, the latter of whom could provide us with perhaps more than we would want to know about our Society.

In order that we may properly discuss our strengths and weaknesses, however, let us consider some Society data on which any informed decisions for action, or inaction, will have to be based.

Current Membership

Membership statistics reasonably current for June of this year reveal a total of 203 members. This number has been reduced by 13 deaths; eight in the active category, five in the inactive group. Therefore earlier this fall our membership presumably stood at 188. Generously stretching several points, of the 188, 125 could be considered "active," but 63 would actually have to be listed as "others." Even with our nine newly elected members, the total membership today has declined to not more than 197. Unfortunately it may be a few less. Our membership data are not, for various good and sufficient reasons, always precisely up-to-date.

It should be noted that the By-Laws of the Society, adopted by the founders, December 5, 1837, revised by the incorporators, May 7, 1936, and amended in 1939, 1953, 1955, and again slightly, in 1960, provide for three classes of membership: "(1) active members, the number of which will not ever exceed 125; (2) inactive members, the number of which will not be limited; and (3) associate members, the number of which shall not at any time exceed 25."

There is no mention of "life members" who constitute a group, authorized some quarter century ago, to include the survivors of those who had become members during the first year of the "reincarnation of the Society." They were to be relieved of the necessity to pay dues. Five members of this group fortunately are still with us. Possibly for the record, mention should be made of this category in any revision of the By-Laws.

As most of you are aware, Article I of the By-Laws states that "to be an active, inactive, or associate member the person shall reside in, have been born in, or have at some time resided in, the geographical boundaries of the late republic of Texas *and* must be a person of distinction whose life and character have furthered the

purpose for which the Society was organized. *Only active members may vote.*" Quoting further from Article I, we find the quaint statement that "an active member who at any time on or after December 8, 1956, has been absent from the annual meeting five consecutive years, and has attended no meeting since, shall automatically become an *inactive* member. He shall continue to pay dues and may attend annual meetings." Presumably such a member has no vote. Quoting still further, "the directors shall have authority, at the request of an active or inactive member to transfer his name to the roll of associate members." The actual role and scope of the associate category, however, is not really described, although it is stated that the associate members "shall not at any time exceed 25." In practice, however, the "associates" have *not* been required to pay dues.

The last paragraph of Article I states that "all members shall be listed in alphabetical order in the *Proceedings* without indication of the class to which they belong." This, at least, is clear — and commendable.

Now for some additional comments. When the Society was revived in 1936, the By-Laws then fixed 100 as the number of active members, 50 for associate members, and specified that vacancies in the active list "may be filled from the associate membership only." As Herbert Gambrell points out this was a "dead letter" from the start. Actually all members elected during the intervening years have been designated as active members; some later did ask to be transferred to the associate's list, which, as previously noted, has given them the advantage of not having to pay dues. The knowledge of the advantage, however, was obviously picked up in a clandestine fashion — for the By-Laws have kept the secret.

The limitation of 100 active members has been ignored from time to time. Herbert Gambrell tells me that in 1940 a huge ballot of nearly 100 nominees was submitted, and that 24 were elected. One member who began by marking his ballot "yes and no," finally gave up on the second page adding the caustic note, "take them all, why discriminate?". Later, that particular member resigned. It must be stated, however, that resignations from the Society have been rare.

There is another matter which has complicated the actual membership number and limits. This is a scheme which has become known as the Andrews Plan since it was devised by Jesse Andrews some 15 years ago. The Plan required the submitting of all nominations to the membership, but limiting those elected to 10. Mr.

Andrews considered the first part of his idea to be "democratic," and the second part of the plan, "prudential."

It might be wise not to fix the limit on active memberships. Similarly it may be the better part of wisdom to remove the restriction of only 10 new members permitted per year. It is clear that our roster should be kept sufficiently small that there is at least a presumption of some distinction attached to membership. It is also obvious that our roster should not be so large that a member could possibly be caught up in that absurdity which led the Philadelphian to insist that his tombstone state simply, "Member of the National Geographical Society." Yet the Society must be sufficiently large to attain critical mass. Today its membership is declining rather than increasing.

In 1936 when the Society was reorganized, the population of Texas was slightly over 6,000,000. At that time, a membership of 100 may have been reasonable, as was the vague "limit" of 125 established a few years later. Today, with the Texas population approaching 12 million, it apparently would not be out of order to have an *active* membership of 200. As a matter of fact, many of our By-Laws, throughout the history of the Society, have been knowingly or inadvertently violated. For example, only active members are supposed to have the right to vote. In accordance with the so-called Andrews Plan, however, a member could miss any number of meetings and then show up at one and become active again. Therefore, we just don't know exactly who is "active" and who is "inactive." No one in the history of organizations such as ours has been as generous with donated secretarial time and services as the Gambrells, but with limited resources it has appeared impractical to try to establish a rigid *who is who* among us. Thus, ballots have been sent to both classes of membership, and all ballots returned have been counted. Even so, however, little more than half of our members, of all classes, return ballots. Ours, then, is the very model of a philosophical society and it is perhaps inevitable that we run it philosophically, if improperly.

The foregoing remarks then are not really carping criticisms — they are cautious commendations. Probably, however, the "inactive" category of membership should be abandoned — possibly with the "associates" class — in favor of a new category which might be called simply, "emeritus members." For them we might do as is done by the Chicago Literary Club, i.e., provide that in the case of individuals of any class who have been members for say, ten years

or more and have reached the age of 65, "the payment of further dues by them shall be optional." Such members, however, are sent annual dues notices, and some do elect to pay.

Election of Members

As revised in 1960, Article II reads in part, "vacancies in the class of active members shall be filled by vote of such members; not more than 10 active members may be added in any one year. All names proposed 90 days prior to the next annual meeting shall be submitted to the active members on a ballot." But this year we asked that ballots be returned by June 20 so that new members could attend, and be presented, at the annual meeting.

The number of individuals recently nominated for membership has been averaging something less than 20 a year. The total votes cast from all categories of membership tends to run slightly over 100, or about 50-55 percent of our total roster. Herbert Gambrell agrees that in the election process we find "the real nub of the problems of the Society's survival. None of the processes we have tried is entirely satisfactory. Members tend to nominate whoever they happen to be thinking of at the moment, kinfolk, business associates, bridge or poker partners, fishing companions, locally prominent public figures, or even people they recently read about." Those receiving ballots are asked to write "yes" by the names of those approved and "no" for those disapproved. Blank votes are very commonly cast, and very few nominees have ever received unanimous approval. Some nominees, who apparently are simply not well known, receive as little as 12 percent affirmative votes of all those cast; and a very few of the nominees have received as high as a total of 85 affirmative votes.

For the curious, and those who simply like to be in on the gossip, it may be stated that with all of the nominations and voting records before one, it is still not possible to define trends or, with confidence, assign reasons to the vagaries of our members' voting habits. In short, although our election process may be, and probably is, relatively democratic, it cannot develop a very satisfactory distribution of membership, either vocationally, geographically, philosophically or by age groups. The Society does appear to be nominating, and electing, older and older persons on a jagged but progressively upward trending age curve toward, to put it politely, full-blown maturity. The founders average age was about 35. In more recent years, however, the average of the age of the *nominees* has been 59, and the

average age of those *elected* to membership is 62. In the past decade the range in age of individuals elected to the Society has varied from the high thirties to the late seventies, with most members recently elected being in their late fifties or early sixties.

There is thus a clearly established tendency for the membership to grow in average age, not alone because of the inexorable passage of time but also because the Society has been electing somewhat, to considerably, older candidates to membership with each passing year. Obviously it is imperative that some system be devised so that it would be possible to recruit individuals to the Society who have considerable life expectancy and yet whose careers already suggest further developing distinction. Some of us have considered the appointment of an anonymous committee whose members have a wide acquaintance with, and sound judgment on, individuals "going places" in a broad range of endeavors, which have at least some philosophical import. Such a committee could assemble a group of worthwhile nominees, but they would thus negate the Society's tradition of democracy because members would be asked to vote without having been involved directly in the nominating process.

Whatever changes may be made I suggest — as an oldster myself — consideration of the idea that those who make the final membership choices — including the determination of the numbers to be elected — should, as near as may be, see to it that the number of those elected at age 60 and over be paired with an equal number of those elected at age 40 and under.

Meetings of the Society

Section 1 of Article III states that the annual meetings may be held in the city of Dallas or at such other places in the state of Texas as the Directors may select. "The annual meetings shall be held on the fifth day of December ---; if December 5 falls on Saturday, if not, on the Saturday next following". As I have earlier pointed out, Section 1 has been violated this year. Section 2 indicates that the meeting is to be held on Saturday only. Recent custom has been to start on Friday evening prior to the Saturday of the annual meeting. Section 3, Article II, concerns called meetings, which require that the secretary notify in writing all active members of the Society, at least 10 days before the time set, but I do not, myself, know of recent specially called meetings.

Section 4, Article III, deals with quorum requirements, and states that "10 percent of the active members of the Society, *who are in*

good standing, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business". A rigorous examination of the record to determine how many active members the Society actually possesses, and how many of these are *really* in good standing, might well reveal that some 8 or 10 individuals of the Society actually might constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Should this Section be altered?

Section 5, Article III, considers "expulsion" and states that "members may be expelled for improper conduct by vote of a majority of the members present at an annual meeting." *Member attendance* at recent annual meetings has ranged from the low thirties to the low fifties. Though I know of no expulsions — and would not admit to them if there had been — it appears that under the present By-Laws less than — perhaps even many less than — 25 members of the Society, in an irascible mood, could expel a supposedly offending member.

At the Society's 1960 meeting, held at historic Fort Clark, there were only 61 individuals in attendance, of whom 32 were members including two whose election was announced at the sessions. The average age of the newly elected members was approximately 54. At the 1965 meeting at Salado, the total attendance was 104, of whom 53 were members, including five newly elected. The guests numbered 51, including four whose spouses were new in the Society. Stated in another way, approximately nine percent of the total attendance was provided by the newly elected members.

At the 1968 meeting, held in San Antonio, 53 members attended; six of the 10 new members were in attendance. The guests numbered 54, of whom most were wives of members including those newly elected. Thus, of the total attendance of 107, new members and wives accounted for about 11 percent. At last year's meeting, also held at the Stagecoach Inn, 50 members were in attendance, and of the 10 new members five were with us. Guests numbered 45, of whom most were wives of members including those newly elected. Of the total attendance of 95, the new members and wives accounted for over nine percent of the total.

Although based on insufficient evidence, it seems clear that out-of-the-way places — however attractive, or however easily arranged for as headquarters for the sessions — will not likely build up a large attendance. In fact, comments and correspondence indicate that, as the membership has grown older, it prefers meetings in hotels such as was possible at the Nacogdoches session, where all activities — except excursions to historic sites or dwellings — can be under a

single roof. Nevertheless an unscientific survey also suggests that the Stagecoach Inn meetings have, on the average, attracted the largest number of members and guests — but the evidence cannot be stated to be statistically valid.

Dues

Article IV, which deals with dues, begins, “each active member shall pay an initiation fee of \$25.00 and shall pay annual dues of \$10.00. Funds so received shall be used by the Directors for such purposes as they see fit”, and so forth. “Should a member continue in default of payment of his dues after two notices the Directors may drop his name from the membership”, but, in fact, no one is dropped. “There shall be no further dues payable by any member of the Society. The Board of Directors, may, by a majority vote, fix an assessment on all members, but it shall never exceed \$5.00 in any one year.”

The truth of the matter is, the initiation fee for membership in the Philosophical Society is ludicrously low. For example, the fees for members of the Houston Engineering and Scientific Society range from \$25.00 to \$150.00 depending on age at initiation, and the *quarterly* dues range from \$9.00 to \$24.00. Similarly, the Chicago Literary Club, an organization rather similar to our Society, charges annual dues of \$45.00. As Herbert Gambrell so pointedly remarks, “we have behaved like starry-eyed philosophers in one respect at least. We *never* bill members for dues directly; we only mention casually in the notice of the upcoming annual meeting that dues are now payable.” Letting you in on a little-guarded secret, some members overlook paying their dues year after year, but others, who have rarely, or never, attended a meeting, pay promptly. Furthermore, some members of the Society of more than average distinction, have failed to pay *any* initiation *fee* or *dues* whatever, but still such persons retain membership. It is clear that it is time for a change.

A little over a month ago only 99 of our members had paid their \$10.00 dues; this included the nine new members. Recently our total 1970 receipts were \$1,280.00, but the printer's bill for the *Proceedings* for 1969, recently issued, was \$1,339.85! As Herbert laments, “looks like we'll have no stock dividend this year”.

It is obvious that Article IV regarding dues should be recast. We can no longer assume that we will have such self-sacrificing, financially unrewarded services as the Gambrells and others have donated the Society for many years. Moreover, we may have to pay for a central office, rather than being virtually nonpaying guests of the

“Hall of State”. Unfortunately it is going to be a matter of sheer necessity that the initiation fee be raised from \$25.00 to \$50.00 — not because I am presumably already initiated! Annual dues should be increased from \$10.00 to \$20.00 — whether or not I might squeeze in under an optional dues clause! It is even more certain that we must in the future bill each member of the Society, in any category which now exists or may later be established, and bill him individually — with all the callosity of a loan shark collector.

If such new rates of dues and fees were to be established it probably would be necessary for the Directors to refrain from dropping any name from the membership until perhaps three rather than two notices had been disregarded. They would then presumably ask the member in default to elect emeritus status — if he could qualify for that category — when and if established — under the rules. In the cases possibly presented by a few individuals of younger age, and a briefer term of membership, and known to be in rather difficult financial straits, the limited associate membership category might be suggested. I realize that a Society officer who suggests higher costs is as welcome as a S.D.S. Weatherman in a presidential office, but there may be no other recourse.

Directors

Article V, regarding Directors, has been consistently violated in our operational procedures, probably without disastrous results. Section 1 reads, “the management of the Society shall be vested in a Board of Directors of 10 active members to be elected by a majority vote of the members present and voting at a regular annual meeting”. Actually, although there may have been, as tonight, a *pro forma* vote, our Directors recently have tended to be the current president and nine past presidents. Of course this is “establishment” with a capital “E”, but the procedure has the advantage of giving our Society a governance by men who have been most directly concerned with its operation.

Section 3 of Article V states that “a majority of the Board shall constitute a quorum and a majority of those present and voting shall be authorized to act”. Inasmuch as there are 10 members of the Board, six members constitute a quorum, and a majority of six, or four members of the Board obviously are “authorized to act”. I do not see any necessity of changing Section 3 but others may think the possibilities conjured up by this section frighteningly undemocratic.

The Officers

Article VI, which pertains to officers, requires little emendation, as we see it. Section 4, however, states that "in case of the death, sickness or inactivity of the president, his duties shall devolve on the vice presidents in the order of their rank". It is not necessarily true, however, that the first vice president of one year succeeds to the presidency in the next, and there appears to be some possibility of misunderstanding in this connection. There is no rigid up-the-ladder sequence of command, and it should be clear to the membership as well as the vice presidents that this is indeed the case.

Various

Article VII has the charming heading, "Various". It should be clear by now, however, that all of our By-Laws could be construed as falling under the rubric "variations". At any rate, Section 1 reads that "the Society shall use the Seal now customarily used by it". I am not aware that the seal is customarily used. Section 2, states that "the Society shall use the certificate of membership now customarily used by it". Dual use of the phrase "customarily used" reminds me of the lines, "I never saw a moor, I never saw the sea, but I know how the heather looks and what the sea must be". But I *don't* know how the "certificate" looks and I never saw the "seal". Should the *seal* be resurrected, redesigned, or abandoned? Should the *certificate of membership* be re-issued, redesigned or merely customarily *not* used?

Section 3 of Article VII states that "the Society was organized and is maintained for patriotic, social, literary or educational purposes. No part of its funds shall inure to the benefit of any individual and no *substantial* part of its activities shall be used in carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation". Perhaps this section should have the benefit of another inspection by a keen legal eye. I am not so sure that the word "substantial" would hold water in today's federal courts.

Amendments

Article VIII merely states that the By-Laws may be altered, changed or amended and tells us — as if you did not know — just how easy it would be to do so. The question I ask is "Do you want to pursue such a course?" If you don't, why not? If you do, we will try to send out detailed proposals. In the meantime we would more than welcome suggestions regarding the By-Laws as well as ideas about next year's program, both as to topics, participants and procedures.

I am sorry I have had to make pedestrian rather than philosophical remarks but, in the parlance of the early Texas hawker of fraudulent oil leases, "In order to make my subject clear, I have attempted to eschew all sesquipedalian words". Yet I know that my verbosity has been exceeded only by your patience in hearing me out.

In 1944 I was elected the fifth president of Beloit College in its first century, the College having been chartered by the Wisconsin Territory. One acidulous octogenarian miss — who had known all my predecessors — was asked — "what do you think the new president will do?". She replied: "Same as the last four." "What's that?" "Make a speech every time he comes to a slight elevation in the sidewalk."

I consider the Presidency of the Philosophical Society of Texas a very high elevation indeed — so forgive me — and thank you.

N E C R O L O G Y

WILLIAM CAMPBELL BINKLEY

1889-1970

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY at Tulane University and former editor of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, died August 17, 1970 at Oschner Foundation Hospital in New Orleans. He was 81.

Dr. Binkley, who was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Tulane University in 1964, was a teacher, scholar, editor, and administrator throughout his distinguished academic career.

Born in Dyer County, Tennessee, he was educated at the University of California, where he received his B.A. in 1917, his M.A. in 1918, and his Ph.D. in history in 1920.

He began his teaching career at Colorado College in 1921 and was appointed full professor in 1925. In 1930 he became professor, and chairman of the department, of history at Vanderbilt University, where he served until 1953 and was instrumental in developing one of the South's chief centers of graduate training and historical research, including his editorship of the *Journal of Southern History*.

In 1953, he was named professor of history at Tulane University and editor of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, which positions he held until he retired in 1963.

Dr. Binkley spent 1964 in Austin, in historical research, writing and editing. From 1965 through 1966 he served as distinguished professor of American history at the University of Houston.

Upon his return to New Orleans he taught Western history in University College of Tulane, until February, 1970.

Dr. Binkley's research and publication interests centered upon the Southwest, and especially early Anglo-American Texas, in United States history. His three major books — *The Expansionist Movement in Texas, 1836-1850*; *Official Correspondence of the Texas Revolution, 1835-1836*, 2 vols.; and *The Texan Revolution* — were models of scholarly achievement. High professional recognition came to him as president of the Southern Historical Association and of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. He was best remembered, perhaps, for his warm interest in his graduate students and of his colleagues throughout his profession.

He became a member of this Society in 1940.

—W.R.H.

CHARLES PEARRE CABELL

1904-1971

CHARLES PEARRE CABELL, GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, (Ret.), died in Arlington, Virginia, May 25, 1971. After thirty-six years of military service, he retired in 1963 as a four-star General. His varied assignments included nine years as Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Born in Dallas, scion of a family distinguished in Virginia, Confederate and Texas history, he was graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1925. Chief of advisory council of the U.S. Air Force, commander of the 45th Combat Boom Wing of the 8th Air Force during World War II, director of the Strategic Air Command, Air Force military adviser to the United Nations, and director of staffs for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. His decorations included Distinguished Service Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, and honorary Commander of the British Empire, among others. His last assignment was to a presidential commission to evaluate the nation's science position.

Grandson of General William L. Cabell, C.S.A., he was a son of Ben E. Cabell, longtime Mayor of Dallas, and brother of Earle Cabell, former Mayor and now Member of Congress. He is survived by his wife; two sons, Major Charles P. Cabell Jr., U.S.A.F. and Ben D. Cabell; a daughter, Mrs. Cherled T. Bennett; and two grandsons.

He was a member of this Society for fifteen years. Truly "an officer and a gentleman," he exemplified the century-old military and civic traditions of an honored family, and added luster to them.

—H.G.

EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY

1892-1971

"TEXAS HAS HAD HER CAPTAINS, LET HER HAVE HER WISE MEN," the Philosophical Society of Texas hoped in 1837. E. B. "GENE" GERMANY exemplified that during his long life of service to his state and to his fellow man. He was a farm boy who helped work his

father's 40 acres near Grand Saline until he had saved up enough money to enroll as a student at Southwestern University.

Following his college days, he returned to Grand Saline as a teacher and high school principal (salary \$60 a month). Evenings he filled bags for the Morton Salt Company to augment his income. Often his wife, the former Maggie Wilson, whom he had married in 1915, filled sacks while Gene sewed them at piece rates, as their baby played on empty bags nearby.

After five years he resigned to enter the oil business, finding his first production in the Mexia field, and was for years the senior partner in E. B. Germany & Sons, independent oil producers.

A man of many talents, he wrote extensively for business and professional publications. His widely-read column, "The Way I See It," appeared regularly in East Texas newspapers.

In 1947 he founded Lone Star Steel Company and was its president until 1963. Under his direction, the company expanded into a fully integrated steel mill serving industrial markets over a wide area. It is a classic story of sound, imaginative, enterprise.

A tough bargainer of union contracts, but always a union member himself, (he continued paying dues to the musicians union which he joined as a member of the Morton Salt Company band and kept his dues paid up after he became one of the industrial leaders of Texas).

Germany believed that every citizen should be active in civic affairs, and he practiced that philosophy from youth onward. He was mayor of Highland Park, 1934-1942, and in 1940 he managed the John Nance Garner campaign for the Democratic nomination for President. He served as state Democratic chairman under Governors W. Lee O'Daniel and Coke Stevenson, and in 1958 he was appointed chairman of the Texas Industrial Commission by Governor Price Daniel.

His activities did not diminish during a long lifetime. He was president of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, the Texas Manufacturers Association, the Philosophical Society of Texas; and he served as chairman of the board of the Preston State Bank in Dallas and was honorary chairman at the time of his death.

He served on the boards of the Scottish Rite Crippled Children's Hospital, the Dallas Methodist Hospital and the Dallas YMCA. He was a longtime trustee of Southwestern University, of which he was a sort of "professional alumnus," and which honored him with a Doctorate of Laws degree.

But "Gene" Germany always preached that the soil was the basis of all our wealth, and he dreamed of the day when he could retire to his Grand Saline farm, tend his herd of black Angus cattle, and entertain his children, grandchildren and friends with an occasional picnic and fish fry, catching fish from his own lake.

Although born in Sweetwater, his family returned to East Texas in 1894 in a covered wagon, and he was as typically East Texas as pine trees and sandy land.

E. B. Germany was a "captain" in the industrial sense; but he was also a "wise man" the founders of this Society hoped for. He became a Member of the Society in 1957 and was its President in 1962.

—F.P., H.G.

WILLIAM PARKS JOHNSON

THAT AWKWARD-SOUNDING WORD, INDEFATIGABLE, IS FOR ALL THAT the best to describe the late Parks Johnson, who died at his ranch home, Sabino, near Wimberley, in the Texas hill country, on October 4, 1970. To those of us who remember the impact of his personality in radio's heyday it is difficult to believe that the voice of Vox Pop is silent.

Parks "discovered" the roving interview and give-away program format for radio and, eventually, television. He began this essentially simple approach to entertainment while working as a one-man advertising agency in Houston in 1932 in the depths of the Depression. Two years later he was in New York with his program and off and running; and he didn't slow this cross-country and later global-circling pace until well after World War II. Or, for that matter, until he died, for Parks was the embodiment of the civic-minded American, incorruptibly optimistic, unbelievably energetic. In truth it was not so much the "idea" of Vox Pop that was new, it was the American "drive" that we generally associate with the yankee but which was in this instance in the person of a born Southerner that made this program not only exciting, but important for its day.

Perhaps it was in his blood from his circuit-riding forbears, for Parks was the son, grandson, and nephew of Methodist clergymen. He was born in Sheffield, Alabama, attended Emory College and

after a succession of jobs, became a captain in the Infantry in World War I. He migrated to Houston and there began his career in advertising.

Parks married Louise Johnson (no kin) of San Marcos, and she accompanied and assisted him wherever Vox Pop went. She survives Parks, along with their son Bill and daughter Betty (Mrs. Boyd Willett), and seven grandchildren.

—R.Y.

EDWARD RANDALL, JR.

1891-1971

EDWARD RANDALL, JR., BORN IN GALVESTON, OCTOBER 1, 1891, died there March 11, 1971, after a distinguished career as a physician, Professor of Medicine, civic, business and cultural leader. He attended the Universities of Texas, Chicago, Berlin, Yale (B.A., 1913) and Pennsylvania (M.D., 1917), and was acting chief of medical services at Walter Reed Hospital during World War I service. On the fiftieth anniversary of his graduation, The University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine recognized him "as a distinguished alumnus in commemoration of his years of skilled and dedicated service to humanity and his profession." (quoted from plaque) He succeeded his distinguished father as a professor in the Texas Medical College, forerunner of the Medical Branch of the University of Texas, and served the latter institution half a century. He established the John Sealy Hospital Fever Therapy Unit and other research projects. He was the first Texas diplomate of the National Board of Medical Examiners and a Fellow of the American College of Physicians, among other professional honors. A devoted Episcopalian, he was a vestryman of historic Trinity Church and trustee of the Diocese of Texas. He was buried in Trinity Episcopal Cemetery, as were his forebears and his parents. He was a member of the board of directors of the Sealy and Smith Foundation 25 years; a trustee and director of the Rosenberg Library 25 years; medical director and member of the board of directors of the American National Insurance Company; president of the trustees of the Galveston Historical Foundation; a Scottish and York Rite Mason and Shriner for over 50 years.

Among his Texan ancestors were members of the 1837 Philosophical Society of Texas, including Patrick C. Jack, imprisoned at

Anahuac, member of Conventions of 1832, 1833, represented Brazoria in Second Congress, district judge 1841-44. Both his father and mother were long time members of this Society. He became a member in 1958 and was elected President in 1964 — an office which his father held at the time of his death two decades earlier.

He was a man of rare and unique charm. His vast fund of knowledge in fields beyond his profession, his ready and spontaneous wit and humor, and his genuine talent for friendship, endeared him to all members of this Society and, in fact, to all whom he came in contact.

He is survived by his wife, the former Katharine Risher, two sons, Edward III and Risher Randall, and a daughter, Laura Randall Schweppe, and eleven grandchildren.

—H.G., H.L.K.

FRANCIS MARION LAW

1877-1970

FRANCIS MARION LAW WAS 93 YEARS OF AGE WHEN HE DIED JUNE 2, 1970. He had retired from active banking in 1955 after an unusually distinguished career. Born in Bryan in 1877, a graduate of the A&M College of Texas in 1896 and winner of a law degree from the University of Texas a year later, Mr. Law was employed in 1897 as a bookkeeper for the First National Bank of Bryan. Transferring in 1908 to a Beaumont bank soon to be merged into the First National Bank there, he had advanced to the cashiership when called in 1915 to be Vice-President of the First National Bank of Houston. Shortly thereafter Mr. Law was designated Senior Vice-President and in 1930 he became its President. After leading the bank through a remarkably successful reorganization in 1933, he became Chairman of the Board in January, 1946 and for many years following his retirement, in fact, to the day of his death, he was Consultation Chairman of First National, and after merger, of First City National Bank.

An eloquent speaker and an excellent raconteur, Mr. Law participated early in bankers' conventions and was elected in 1924 President of the Texas Bankers Association. Following the Bank Holiday of 1933, he was required as Vice-President of the Association to spend a great deal of time in Washington to help in

revision of the National Banking Act and in drafting a charter for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It was as President of the American Bankers Association that he was able to render great service to the nation at that time of slow economic recovery. "The money changers in the temple," deservedly or not, were generally in ill repute, particularly in Washington. Mr. Law conceived it his duty as the new head of ABA to re-establish communication between bankers and their government. Beginning with a luncheon of New York bank presidents, he outlined his plan to an ultra-conservative and distrustful group persuasively enough to gain grudging consent to a rapprochement with the President of the United States. Then carrying a conciliatory message from New York to President Franklin D. Roosevelt himself, he established for the Association through that doubting leader a channel of contact with the Administration. So effective was the lessening of misunderstanding that a year later, Mr. Law had the honor to present President Roosevelt to the 1934 Convention of the ABA in Washington. Also on this program, representing Wall Street banking, was Mr. Jackson Reynolds, President of the First National Bank of New York — perhaps the most conservative of all — a necessary symbol of the new cooperation.

Involvement in civic and public affairs was a lifelong practice with Mr. Law. His chief interest outside of banking was Texas A&M of which he was a director for twenty-eight years, 1919-1947, and Chairman of its Board for some twenty-two. Previously President of the Ex-Students Association and holder of the first honorary degree conferred by the College, he was heart and soul an Aggie. On January 3, 1968 — his 91st birthday — ill and a bit lethargic, he was asked if he had watched A&M defeat Alabama in the Cotton Bowl. Rousing a little he said that he had. When the questioner persisted with, "Did you see Bear Bryant lift Stallings on his shoulders?", the old gentleman beamed with alert enthusiasm.

There were many other interests to which Mr. Law gave devoted service. Each year he gave a stimulating address to United Fund workers. He was a charter member of Rotary in Beaumont, later a member and President of the Rotary Club of Houston. To the Memorial Baptist Hospital, this son of a pioneer Baptist minister and a good churchman, gave years of concern and supervision as a director. He was President of the Houston Symphony Society, and later a Regent of The University of Houston. Perhaps his last significant civic contribution was active work in behalf of the Port of

Houston. Issuance of bonds for the purchase of dock facilities had been rejected by voters after a bitter political campaign and needed improvements had to be delayed for several years awaiting a better climate. Finally, another bond issue was proposed and its success seemed to hinge on the attitude of the taxpayers of Pasadena, where the votes of men in the ship channel industries had previously been in opposition. Extra effort in that area was called for and a big campaign parade was staged to stir up favorable interest. Mr. Law, retired and over 80, certainly not a horseman, rode a white charger through the Pasadena streets to emphasize the rightness of that cause. The results were good and he got a generous share of the credit.

Mr. Law up until the last years had an amazing memory and a host of funny stories, many of them about his own mistakes. He knew well however that he had been a good banker and a good citizen.

He was a member of this Society through three decades, a Texan of unique and manifold distinctions and sterling character.

—W.A.K.

FRANK CHESLEY SMITH

1892-1971

FRANK CHESLEY SMITH WAS ENDOWED WITH A MANY-FACETED MIND. He thought on things of truth, justice and beauty not because of apostolic exhortation but because such thinking was inherent in his nature. Like the poet Browning, he eschewed the cheap and the sordid and marched breast forward over the uplands of clear, concise thinking to the heights of far flung spiritual horizon.

Yet he was a gay and not a somber man. His laughter was infectious and his host of friends delighted in his company. He loved good literature and was at home in the best of prose and poetry. He was a devotee of music and, indeed, of all the arts. In his extensive travels, he was no casual sightseer in art galleries and museums but one who loved to linger long enough to absorb the meaning and the beauty of the works displayed. He both preached and practiced the gospel of aesthetic integrity; freely giving praise where he felt it was merited, but just as forthrightly condemning the spurious and the unworthy.

On one of his last trips, he went to many small towns in northern Italy to see perhaps only one fine painting in each local church. An avid student of history, he reveled in a philosophic analysis of the ebb and flow of civilizations, each leaving its residue of knowledge and culture to add to the heritage of mankind.

He was intensely interested in education, having served on the Boards of two Texas universities for many years. He introduced the first course on gas technology in the United States while serving as Chairman of the Board of Texas A. & I. University. The Frank C. Smith Fine Arts Center at Texas A. & I. expresses the institution's lasting gratitude for his invaluable services and stands as a "permanent tribute to his leadership." He was a governor of the University of Houston for years and became a member of the Board of Directors of the University of Houston Foundation from its inception, serving until the time of his death.

In his chosen profession he rose to the highest national office, being elected President of the Natural Gas Association of the United States for several terms. He was highly respected throughout the industry not only for his technical knowledge but for his far sighted business acumen.

He loved life and fought valiantly to live. Yet he had no fear of death and approached it with the calmness and courage known only to those who have sifted the values of life through the fine sieve of wisdom.

Frank Chesley Smith achieved the *summum bonum* of life. He left the stream of human consciousness clearer and more sparkling than he found it. No man can do more for himself nor for his fellowman.

He was born in Kentucky, educated at Vanderbilt University, a longtime civic and business leader of Houston, where he died in 1971. He was a member of this Society for a decade.

—F.G.D.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

For the Year 1971

President

CAREY CRONEIS

Vice-Presidents

DILLON ANDERSON

WILLIAM WRIGHT LYNCH

WILLIS McDONALD TATE

BENJAMIN N. WOODSON

FRANK McREYNOLDS WOZENCRAFT

Secretaries

SAM HANNA ACHESON

MARY JOE CARROLL

HERBERT GAMBRELL, *acting*

Treasurer

BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN

Librarian

SAMUEL WOOD GEISER

Directors

CAREY CRONEIS

HARRIS LEON KEMPNER

HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL

RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING

WILLIAM ALEXANDER KIRKLAND

*EDWARD RANDALL, JR.

RUPERT NORVAL RICHARDSON

*EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY

HARRY HUNTT RANSOM

GEORGE CREWS MCGHEE

*Deceased, 1971

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
Herbert Pickens Gambrell	1969
Harris Leon Kempner	1970

*Deceased

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

- ACHESON, SAM HANNA, consultant, Southwestern Legal Center; editorial writer emeritus, *The News* Dallas
- ALBRITTON, CLAUDE CAROL JR., dean, graduate school of humanities and sciences, professor of geology, Southern Methodist University 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
- 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
- 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
- CALDWELL, (JOHN) CLIFTON, rancher, chairman Shackelford County Historical Survey Committee, director Texas Historical Foundation Albany
- 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
- CARRINGTON, PAUL, lawyer; past president, Dallas Chamber of Commerce; past president, State Bar of Texas Dallas

*Life Member

- CARROLL, MARY JOE DURNING (Mrs. H. BAILEY), lawyer; board member, *Texas Law Review*; ed. staff, *Handbook of Texas* (1952); former Parliamentarian, Texas Senate; Governor's Committee, 1969 Codification of Texas School Laws *Austin*
- CLARK, EDWARD, lawyer; former Secretary of State of Texas; former United States Ambassador to Australia *Austin*
- 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*
- COKE, HENRY CORNICK JR., senior partner Coke and Coke, director First National Bank; president Dallas Historical Society; past president, Dallas Symphony Society *Dallas*
- COLLIE, MARVIN KEY, lawyer *Houston*
- CONNALLY, JOHN BOWDEN, Secretary of the Treasury; former Governor of Texas and Secretary of the Navy *Floresville and Washington*
- 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*
- DOUGHERTY, J. CHRYS, attorney; member national panel, American Arbitration Association, advisory board Submerged Lands Board, trustee National Pollution Control Foundation, Advanced Religion Study Foundation *Austin*
- DOYLE, GERRY, typographer; director of publications, San Jacinto Museum of History *Beaumont*
- DUDLEY, FRADERICA GROSS (Mrs. Ray L.), chairman trustees University of Houston Foundation; vice president Houston Symphony; member Governor's Committee on Higher Education *Houston*
- DUGGER, RONNIE E., journalist; with Texas Observer since 1954 (owner); contributor to national and regional journals *Austin*
- 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, DURWOOD, president, Southwestern University; president Texas Assn. Church-Related Colleges, mem. World Meth. Council . *Georgetown*
- 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*
- 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*
- 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.*
- 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*
- GUION, DAVID, musicologist, pianist, composer . *Dallas*
- 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*
- 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 president emeritus, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University System . *College Station*
- HARRISON, FRANK, physician, president University of Texas at Arlington; former professor Southwestern Medical School . *Arlington*
- 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*

*Life Member

- HARTE, HOUSTON, publisher, *Standard Times* and other newspapers; vice president, Associated Press *San Angelo*
- HEATH, WILLIAM WOMACK, lawyer; chairman regents, University of Texas; former chairman, Board for Hospitals and Special Schools *Austin*
- HERSHEY, JACOB W., board chairman, American Commercial Lines; chairman advisory committee, Transportation Center, Northwestern University *Houston*
- HERTZOG, CARL, book designer and publisher, The University of Texas at El Paso *El Paso*
- HILL, GEORGE ALFRED, III, lawyer; president, San Jacinto Museum of History Association *Houston*
- 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*
- 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*
- 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*
- *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*
- JONES, RUTH LEGGETT (Mrs. Percy), director Dodge Jones Foundation, Conference of Southwestern Foundations *Abilene*
- JONSSON, JOHN ERIK, chairman, Texas Instruments; chairman, Graduate Research Center of the Southwest; trustee many institutions; former Mayor of Dallas *Dallas*
- KEETON, PAGE, dean of the school of law, University of Texas *Austin*

*Life Member

- 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*
- 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*
- 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, 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*
- LINDZEY, GARDNER, vice president for academic affairs, University of Texas; psychologist; author *Austin*
- 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*
- 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*

*Life Member

- MCCULLOUGH, JOHN E., banker, philanthropist; longtime president and director Sealy and Smith Foundation, trustee Rosenberg Library . . . *Galveston*
- MCDERMOTT, EUGENE, chairman, executive committee, Texas Instruments; past president, Society of Exploration Geophysicists . . . *Dallas*
- MCGHEE, GEORGE CREWS, former Ambassador to West Germany . . . *Dallas*
- McKILLOP, ALAN DUGALD, professor of English, Rice University . . . *Houston*
- MCNEESE, AYLMEER GREEN JR., chairman of the board, Bank of the Southwest; 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, FRED HOLMSLEY, former director and executive vice president, Mobil Oil Corporation, and former president, North American Division; member, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System; first vice president general, The Sons of the Republic of Texas; director, Texas Historical Foundation . . . *Austin*
- 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*
- NORTEN, 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*
- 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*
- OWENS, WILLIAM A., professor of English, Columbia University, formerly at Texas A&M University and University of Texas; author . . . *New York*
- 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 Commerce . . . *Longview*
- PROTHRO, CHARLES N., president, Perkins-Prothro Company, trustee, Southwestern University . . . *Wichita Falls*
- PROVINCE, HARRY, editor-in-chief, Newspapers, Inc., member Coordinating Board, Texas Colleges and Universities . . . *Waco*
- RAGAN, COOPER K., lawyer; vice president, Texas State Historical Association . . . *Houston*
- RANSOM, HARRY HUNTT, chancellor emeritus, University of Texas . . . *Austin*
- RATCHFORD, FANNIE ELIZABETH, retired librarian of rare book collections, University of Texas . . . *Austin*
- REDDITT, JOHN S., lawyer; former state senator; former chairman, Texas Highway Commission . . . *Lufkin*
- RICHARDSON, RUFERT NORVAL, professor of history, Hardin-Simmons University; past president, Southwestern Social Science Association . . . *Abilene*
- RIPPY, JAMES FRED, professor emeritus of history, University of Chicago . . . *Durham, North Carolina*

- ROBERTSON, FRENCH MARTEL, lawyer, oil operator; past president, Texas Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association; former chairman, Texas Prison Board; chairman, State Board for Hospitals and Special Schools; consultant, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization *Abilene*
- SANDLIN, MARLIN ELIJAH, lawyer; chairman of board, Great Northern Oil Company and Pan American Sulphur Company *Houston*
- SCHIWETZ, EDWARD MUEGGE, 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*
- 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, 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*
- TATE, WILLIS McDONALD, president, Southern Methodist University *Dallas*
- THOMASON, ROBERT EWING, United States District Judge, retired, Western District of Texas *El Paso*
- THOMPSON, J. CLEO, attorney; trustee Southwestern Legal Foundation, chairman Hatton Sumners Foundation; longtime member House of Delegates, American Bar Association *Dallas*
- 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 BATTS (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 Frenshley 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*
- WINFREY, DORMAN HAYWARD, director, Texas State Library; former State Archivist and researcher, Texas State Historical Association *Austin*
- WINN, JAMES BUCHANAN, JR., chairman, Archilithic Company; member, Academy of Applied Science; artist; rancher *Wimberley*
- WOLF, STEWART, professor of medicine and physiology, director, Marine Biomedical Institute, University of Texas Medical Branch; formerly with Cornell University, University of Oklahoma; past president, American Gastroenterological Association, American Psychosomatic Society, American Pavlovian Society *Galveston*
- 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*
- WOZENCRAFT, FRANK McREYNOLDS, attorney; former Assistant Attorney General of the United States; delegate to United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties *Houston*
- YARBOROUGH, RALPH WEBSTER, former United States Senator *Austin*
- 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.
WILLIAM CAMPBELL BINKLEY
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
CHARLES PEARRE CABELL
H. BAILEY CARROLL
EDWARD HENRY CARY
CARLOS EDUARDO CASTAÑEDA
ASA CRAWFORD CHANDLER
MARION NELSON CHRESTMAN
JOSEPH LYNN CLARK
WILLIAM LOCKHART CLAYTON
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
CHARLES INGE FRANCIS
JESSE NEWMAN GALLAGHER
MARY EDNA GEARING
EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY
JOHN WILLIAM GORMLEY
MALCOLM KINTNER GRAHAM
IRELAND GRAVES
MARVIN LEE GRAVES
CHARLES WILSON HACKETT
HARRY CLAY HANSZEN
THORTON HARDIE
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 VERMILLION HOUSTON
WILLIAM EAGER HOWARD
JOHN AUGUSTUS HULEN
FRANK GRANGER HUNTRESS
JULIA BEDFORD IDESON
WATROUS HENRY IRONS
HERMAN GERLACH JAMES

IN MEMORIAM

HERBERT SPENCER JENNINGS
WILLIAM PARKS JOHNSON
JESSE HOLMAN JONES
HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR
ROBERT MARVIN KELLY
LOUIS WILTZ KEMP
THOMAS MARTIN KENNERLY
EDWARD KILMAN
ERNEST LYNN KURTH
FRANCIS MARION LAW
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
JAMES TALIAFERRO MONTGOMERY
DAN MOODY
CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ
PAT IRELAND NIXON
JAMES RANKIN NORVELL
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
EDWARD RANDALL, JR.
LAURA BALLINGER RANDALL
SAM RAYBURN

LAWRENCE JOSEPH RHEA
WILLIAM ALEXANDER RHEA
SUMMERFIELD G. ROBERTS
JOHN ELIJAH ROSSER
JAMES EARL RUDDER
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
STUART SHERAR
ALBERT OLIN SINGLETON
A. FRANK SMITH
FRANK CHESLEY SMITH
THOMAS VERNON SMITH
HARRIET WINGFIELD SMITHER
TOM DOUGLAS SPIES
ROBERT WELDON STAYTON
IRA KENDRICK STEPHENS
HATTON WILLIAM SUMNERS
GARDINER SYMONDS
HENRY TRANTHAM
GEORGE WASHINGTON TRUETT
WILLIAM BOCKHOUT TUTTLE
THOMAS WAYLAND VAUGHAN
ROBERT ERNEST VINSON
LESLIE WAGGENER
ALONZO WASSON
WILLIAM WARD WATKIN
ROYALL RICHARD WATKINS
WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB
HARRY BOYER WEISER
ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST
CLARENCE RAY WHARTON
WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER
HARRY CAROTHERS WIESS
DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD JR.
FRANK WILSON WOZENCRAFT
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER
HUGH HAMPTON YOUNG
