

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

PROCEEDINGS

*1980*

---

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

AT SAN ANTONIO

DECEMBER 5 and 6, 1980

XLIV

---

AUSTIN

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS

1981

---

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 III, Umphrey Lee, Charles Shirley Potts, William Alexander Rhea, Ira Kendrick Stephens, and William Embrey Wrather. December 5, 1936, formal reorganization was completed.*

*Office of the Society is in the Texas State Library, (Box 12927, Capitol Station) Austin, 78711.*

---

# *The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

FOR THE 143RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS, members and guests returned to San Antonio for the annual meeting on December 5 and 6, 1980. The hospitality in 1980 was up to the high marks set by the local arrangements committee when the Society met in St. Anthony's town during the 1976 American Bicentennial.

On Friday evening a reception and dinner were held at the Institute of Texan Cultures. President Durwood Fleming welcomed the guests and introduced the following new members:

Christopher M. Harte  
Ruth Hartgraves  
Decherd H. Turner  
Peter B. Wells  
Charles Alan Wright

During the business session on Saturday the membership was informed of the deaths during the past year of the following members:

Morgan Jones Davis  
June Hyer  
Ralph Wright Steen  
Lon Tinkle  
James B. Winn, Jr.  
Lyndall Finley (Mrs. Gus S.) Wortham

Officers elected for 1981 were Charles A. LeMaistre, President; Abner V. McCall, First Vice-President; Edward H. Harte, Second Vice-President; Dorman H. Winfrey, Secretary; and Mary Joe Carroll, Treasurer.

*Attendance at 1980 Annual Meeting*

Members attending included: Misses Carrington, Cousins, Cullinan, Hartgraves; Mesdames Carpenter, Hill III, Johnson, Knepper, Lee, McDermott, Moore, Randall, Jr., Rostow; Messrs. Thomas D. Anderson, William Leland Anderson, Ashworth, Baker, Bennett, Beto, Boyd, Caldwell, Carmack, Clark, Coke, Collie, Crim, Crook, Daniel, Denius, Dick, Doyle, Evans, Fisher, Fleming, Frost, Garrett, W. St. John Garwood, Gordon, Gray, Greenhill, Hall, Hanna, Hargrove, Frank Harrison, Hart, Christopher M. Harte, Edward H. Harte, Heinen, Hershey, John L. Hill, Jr., Hoffman, Holtzman, Hook, Hunt, Jaworski, Jenkins, Jordan, Harris L. Kempner, Sr., Harris L. Kempner, Jr., Dan E. Kilgore, William J. Kilgore, Law, Levin, Lindsey, Livingston, McCorquodale, McGinnis, McKnight, Maguire, Middleton, Mills, Moseley, Page, Pate, Pool, Ragan, Reavley, Richardson, Schachtel, Shuffler, Frank C. Smith, Jr., Sutton, Vandiver, Ruel C. Walker, Watkins, Wells, Gail Whitcomb, Dan C. Williams, Jack K. Williams, Wilson, Winfrey, Winters, Wray, Charles Alan Wright, James S. Wright, Young, Zachry.

Guests included: Mrs. Thomas D. Anderson, Mrs. William Leland Anderson, Mrs. Rex G. Baker, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Joe Belden, Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. Bell, Mrs. J. M. Bennett, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Tom Bentley, Mrs. Howard Boyd, Dr. and Mrs. James C. Cain, Mrs. John Clifton Caldwell, Mrs. George Carmack, Chris Carson, Mrs. Edward Clark, Mrs. Henry C. Coke, Jr., Mrs. Marvin K. Collie, Mrs. J. R. Cravens, Mrs. William Robert Crim, Mrs. William H. Crook, Mrs. Price Daniel, Sr., Dr. and Mrs. John Davis, Mrs. Franklin W. Denius, Mrs. Gerry Doyle, Mrs. Joe J. Fisher, Mrs. Durwood Fleming, Dr. and Mrs. Jon Fleming, Mrs. Tom C. Frost, Jr., Mrs. Jenkins Garrett, Mrs. W. St. John Garwood, Mrs. William Edwin Gordon, Mrs. John Ellis Gray, Mrs. Joe Greenhill, Mrs. W. G. Hall, Mrs. Richardson Hamilton, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Hanna, Mrs. Ralph Hanna, Mrs. James Ward Hargrove, Mrs. James P. Hart, Mrs. Edward H. Harte, Mrs. Erwin Heinen, Mrs. J. W. Hershey, Mrs. John L. Hill, Jr., Mrs. Philip G. Hoffman, Mrs. Wayne H. Holtzman, Mrs. Harold Swanson Hook, Mrs. Wilmer Brady Hunt, Joe Brown Hyder, Mrs. Leon Jaworski, Mrs. Harris L. Kempner, Sr., Mrs. Harris L. Kempner, Jr., Mrs. Dan E. Kilgore, Mrs. William J. Kilgore, Mr. and Mrs. Truett Latimer, Mrs. Thomas H. Law, Mrs. William C. Levin, Mr. and Mrs.

Wm. Lewis, Mrs. John H. Lindsey, Mrs. William S. Livingston, Mrs. Malcolm McCorquodale, Jessie McGaw, Mrs. Robert C. McGinnis, Mrs. Joseph W. McKnight, Mrs. Jack Maguire, Mrs. Harry J. Middleton, Mrs. Ballinger Mills, Jr., Mrs. John D. Moseley, Mrs. Louis Charles Page, Mrs. A. M. Pate, Jr., Mrs. Cooper K. Ragan, Richard Royall, Mrs. Lemuel Scarbrough, Mrs. Hyman J. Schachtel, Mrs. Ralph H. Shuffler II, Mrs. Frank C. Smith, Jr., Mrs. R. P. Smith, Miss Lois Stoneham, Mrs. John F. Sutton, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Trotti, Mrs. Frank E. Vandiver, Dr. and Mrs. George Vaughan, Mrs. Ruel C. Walker, Mrs. Edward T. Watkins, Mrs. Peter B. Wells, Mrs. Gail Whitcomb, Mrs. Dan C. Williams, Dr. and Mrs. Ed Williams, Mrs. Jack K. Williams, Mrs. Logan Wilson, Mrs. Dorman H. Winfrey, Mrs. J. Sam Winters, Mrs. A. J. Wray, Curtis Wright, Mrs. James S. Wright, Mrs. Sam D. Young, Mrs. H. B. Zachry.

SYMPOSIUM  
CAN THE U.S. PRESIDENCY SURVIVE?

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR EDWARD CLARK

Next month a solemn ceremony will take place on the steps of the Capitol in Washington, D.C. when the 40th President of the United States is sworn into office.

The presidency is the most powerful elective office in the world today. The office of President of these United States is unique because it blends enormous power with effective responsibility.

The President has so many different and important duties that he may be described as "many men in one."

As chief of state, the President conducts many ceremonial affairs.

As chief executive, he makes sure that federal laws are enforced.

As commander-in-chief of the armed forces, he is responsible for national defense in peace or war.

He directs United States foreign policy and plays an important role in world affairs.

As leader of his political party, the President helps shape the party's stand on domestic and foreign issues.

The list could go on and on. In the years since the Founding Fathers established the presidency, the President's powers and responsibilities have grown tremendously.

The modern-day President has a job from which he can never escape. Sometimes during crises the Chief Executive works around the clock. The problems of government are with the President not only in Washington but wherever he may be in some faraway corner of the world. And for a number of years Americans by means of radio, press and television have been able to observe the U.S. presidency rather closely.

The repeated success of U.S. Presidents in leading the nation in periods of challenge and change has produced much of the office's enormous prestige. The presidency is always an accumulation of triumphs, failures, and practices of the past. And the office is always bigger than the man.

The program committee met early in the year to develop a program that would not only be of interest to our membership but a program that would challenge, cause debate, bring questions from the floor. A number of program topics were considered but the program committee concluded no one subject was of more interest,

more timely or more open to debate than the topic selected, "Can the U.S. Presidency Survive?"

It is my pleasure to introduce one of our own members. She is the Dean of the LBJ School of Public Affairs and she runs that department of the University of Texas at Austin in good order. She is making progress. That school is more respected and more appreciated not only in Texas but throughout the nation and she is turning out products, graduates of that school, that are taking their place in government and private industry. She is a brilliant student and scholar and may I say that she thinks like a woman. That is intended to be a compliment to all my women friends here. She is a fine combination of beauty and brains, I present Dean Elspeth Rostow, our beloved member.



## THE FUTURE OF THE PRIME-TIME PRESIDENCY

ELSPETH ROSTOW

Mr. Ambassador, distinguished panelists, members of the Texas Philosophical Society, guests: yesterday in Washington I realized that the theme for this year's meeting, "Can the U.S. Presidency Survive?", is on everyone's mind. For example, in a bookshop window, I saw a stack of volumes with the eye-catching title *The Failed Presidency*. Later, I found some of my colleagues in an all-day meeting troubled about the future of this country as another President new to Washington takes over the Oval Office. Others were jubilant at the prospect but still uncertain about the manner in which executive power will be wielded. All were willing to discuss endlessly the problems the next President will face in attempting to put his stamp on this often intractable government.

Does all this presage an end to the presidency? Of course not. The presidency is the irreplaceable element in a system which requires such action and leadership as no one else under our Constitution can provide.

A more relevant question is whether the presidency will change. Of course it will. It always has. And, changing, it will remain an irresistible target for criticism — either because the current incumbent is moving too rapidly or not rapidly enough, or because he<sup>1</sup> has set an unpopular course.

It is easy to suspect that criticism of the presidency has become sharper, meaner, and more widespread in recent years. Easy — and wrong. A wholesome corrective to the belief that American presidents have traditionally been venerated comes from Henry Adams. Describing himself as a child, he said:

He felt no sensation whatever before Presidents. A President was a matter of course in every respectable family; he had two in his own. . . . Revolutionary patriots, or perhaps a Colonial Governor, might be worth talking about, but anyone could be President, and some very shady characters were likely to be. Presidents, Senators, Congressmen, were swarming in every street. . . .

No sort of glory hedged Presidents as such, and in the whole country one could hardly have met with an admission of respect for any office or name, unless it were George Washington.<sup>2</sup>

Henry Adams, who, despite his apparent detachment, more or less aspired to the presidency, never made it to the White House. Some of those who did lived up to his gloomy expectations. When

Lord Bryce nearly a century ago wrote about the chief executive in his perceptive volume, *The American Commonwealth*, he entitled one chapter "Why Great Men Are Not Chosen Presidents."<sup>3</sup> It was Bryce's argument that the nature of the American party system, the slow process by which potential candidates were winnowed out and the ultimate desire of each party to put before the voters a candidate who had made as few enemies as possible, tended to produce individuals whose strength of character was less notable than their pliability and whose policy initiatives were less well-developed than their willingness to go along. In short, the ideal presidential candidate (and by that token, the average presidential winner) was characterized by "availability." The available candidate, of course, makes as few changes as possible, shuns all substantive, and therefore controversial, issues and bases his appeal to the voter more on what he has *not* done than what he has accomplished.

Lord Bryce lived long enough into the twentieth century to see two exceptions made to his rule of nongreatness: Theodore Roosevelt on the Republican side, and Woodrow Wilson on the Democratic. Dying in 1922, Bryce missed the tradition of strong and able chief executives from Franklin Roosevelt to Lyndon Johnson — an era distorted into the concept of *The Imperial Presidency* by Arthur Schlesinger.<sup>4</sup>

As Bryce had underestimated the capacity of the presidential system to produce greatness (although he did observe that Lincoln had "wielded more authority than any single Englishman . . . since Oliver Cromwell")<sup>5</sup>, so Schlesinger overstated the case for the President as autocrat. The truth, as it so often does, lurked in between.

What does this prove about the "traditional view" of the presidency? That it is composed of mixed attitudes and perceptions, that the past yields no single-prism perception, and that there have been nearly as many interpretations of the presidency as there have been different human beings holding that office.

It is worth noting, however, that the presidency has been markedly altered by the technology of the mid-to-late twentieth century. When that first feeble signal came from radio station KDKA in Pittsburgh in 1920, new opportunities opened for presidents from Harding to Carter. When the experimental television equipment which had been tested in the decade before World War II began to be generally available after 1945, an even livelier chapter in presidential exposure had opened. Irving Berlin's song "I Like Ike 'Cause Ike Is Good on a Mike" was a fitting theme song for the first President who felt comfortable and effective in the new medium of television. Now, not

quite thirty years later, history has done the inevitable and given us an actor for the White House.

That brings me to my title, "The Future of the Prime-Time Presidency." I borrow the phrase — a polite way of saying steal — from Thomas Cronin in his valuable book *The State of the Presidency*.<sup>6</sup> Cronin, observing that the President in a television age is obsessed with "ratings," remarks that the danger lies in the "misplacement of values: in the subordination of doing what is right but controversial to postponement, ducking, or cover-up."<sup>7</sup> I shall explore this contention in respect to primaries, party attitudes, voter impulses, and related issues. Since the President's success in a democracy such as ours is a matter of general concern, I should then like to ponder the inferences that may be drawn from all of this for all of us.

The development of primaries in the twentieth century has produced a ritual which makes the candidate's performance on the campaign trail a more important variable than the way in which he might operate in office — a situation not wholly new. Bryce quotes a nineteenth century statesman who said: "Gentlemen, let there be no mistake. I should make a good President but a very bad candidate."<sup>8</sup> More recently, Senator McGovern's efforts to change his image after the Democratic Convention in 1972 proved unsuccessful; the voters remembered the primary emphasis on "acid, abortion and amnesty," not the positions of the more moderate man of midsummer. The loving care with which television monitors each primary and provides assessments as to who is ahead may be compared to the efforts of sportscasters to predict the Kentucky Derby, the World Series, or the Stanley Cup. Is this a good way to test a potential President? Perhaps. But only if we are testing for physical stamina, an iron stomach, and a willingness to give "the speech" over and over and over again.

For their part, political parties also tend to look at prospective candidates more and more through the prism of television. Concerned with winning, they tend to prize "image" more than future presidential effectiveness — a quality reasonably hard to evaluate in advance. If the candidate performs well, the media at the end of each day will applaud: a blessing from Cronkite or Chancellor or Rather is thought to translate into valuable votes. Yet, some critics argue that the qualifications of a successful candidate bear an inverse relationship to those required of the successful President; we thus neatly screen out those who would make the best Presidents and leave in their place a small number of durable political animals who have survived nearly forty primaries.

In contrast, the President in office must be an individual capable of dealing with the seamless mash of national and international problems, projecting to a troubled country the nature of the immensely difficult agenda on which it is embarked and also capable of making those statesmanlike decisions which his advisors are apt to tell him constitute poor politics and might cost him votes.

Despite the number of people who see presidential aspirants during primaries, most Americans derive from television the information on which a voting decision is made. Televised images prove more adherent than the printed word: Kennedy's smile and Nixon's five o'clock shadow in the 1960 first debate; Edmund Muskie crying in the snow in New Hampshire in 1972; Nelson Rockefeller booed away from the podium during the Republican Convention in 1964; Lyndon Johnson working the fence as his '64 campaign got under way; Governor Reagan's smile as he said that "There you go again!" during the debate with President Carter only a short time ago, etc. Politically aware voters pay more attention to coverage in newspapers and magazines; those less interested rely almost entirely on television. Thus, the bulk of the voters (who are not passionately interested in politics most of the time) receive only a headline impression of the qualifications of the candidates. There is simply too little time in a news broadcast to do more than indicate the most obvious points. Since high interest voters are in the minority (although a larger percentage of them tend to vote than do voters who are less interested), numerically the votes cast for both candidates reflect a heavy percentage of those whose information on the presidency is derived from television. Thus, the image of the candidate as projected through the tube becomes a major variable.

Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy were the first chief executives effectively to use television. However, even the less charismatic of those who followed them have had to rely on television to stimulate both voter awareness and voter support. And there are frequent penalties for Presidents who cannot use the media. Early in the 1960s, Norman Mailer wrote an article entitled "The President as Leading Man." His argument was that television had made it impossible for a President to succeed who did not have some of the qualifications of a star. A nice idea — but inapplicable (say) to Richard Nixon. President Carter's televised dilemmas in the presidency did little to assist him in his quest for a second term. In November, *Texas Monthly* described the problem as follows: "The role of the media in the 1980 campaign calls to mind the dilemma of a long-departed Texas politician who didn't know whether it was worse for the press

to lie about him or tell the truth. . . . No less an authority than John Connally has said that media treatment is 80 percent of a presidential race."<sup>9</sup>

With image an increasingly important dimension of presidential performance, the role of what have been called "image brokers" becomes significant. Compare, for example, the degree to which Franklin Roosevelt could count on contemporary poets and playwrights to imprint on the mind of the country during World War II the concept of the heroic. In sharp contrast, no Archibald MacLeish or Robert Sherwood came to the aid of Presidents Johnson or Nixon to explain the country's role in Vietnam. Instead, poets, playwrights and intellectuals in general by the sixties and seventies had turned into critics and even snipers whose target was not only a specific President but also the very concept of an activist presidency.<sup>10</sup>

A recent study has emphasized the fact that the press and (particularly) television are rarely concerned with issues. Television must be brief. "You can't put anything on the air that you have to sit there and explain. If the picture doesn't tell its own story, forget it. It's not there long enough."<sup>11</sup> How shall a President (anxious to discuss the subtle problems of diplomacy or the complex process of dealing with inflation) perform if he knows that only the most newsworthy element in his presentation will hit the evening news — and then for a matter of seconds?

The media, of course, brings advantages as well as costs. The sitting President can command a sizeable portion of prime time to develop his ideas in some detail, to defend a controversial position, to seek support in advance of an election, etc. But studies show that, during such presidential addresses, the citizens who try to flip to another station or simply do not turn on the tube often form a sullen majority. Although the President is never speaking only to the unconverted, he is rarely able to make many converts in this fashion.

Thus, the contemporary President is both the creature of and the victim of television. Insofar as he has become a familiar figure in the American living room — like Walter Cronkite but not as popular — the President has to keep dramatic elements high in order to attract an audience. One expert phrased it this way:

The game now is to strike a much subtler resonance with the country's appetite for drama. . . . In 1980, the real problem for Carter was to figure out how do we really keep the drama going over a thirteen-week period from the first primary to the crucial ones. But that is a television series length. It is a process of sustaining a drama, not wearing it out too fast, not bringing it on too soon, bringing it on with

all the family complexity, with all the personality sort of interest that television series require, and sustaining it over that thirteen-week bridge.<sup>12</sup>

This commentator goes on to suggest that the presidency is "a real-life television series" ("Washington" instead of "Dallas" or "Mash"). Anyone familiar with television knows that four years is a long time for a show to retain its appeal.

Despite the hazards of running an executive branch which is constantly on camera, it is possible to argue that not only will the U.S. presidency survive but that it may be restored to some of its earlier prestige during the balance of this century — but only if specific Presidents cope successfully with their massive agendas. The presidency survives simply because we have no alternative under our system but to repose a large amount of trust and prayer in the one person elected to represent the entire country. True, only twenty-six percent of eligible voters indicated in 1980 a desire for Mr. Reagan to accept that office; equally true, nearly three quarters of the nation's eligible voters stayed home on election day. However, declining voter turnout since 1964 should not be read as a rejection of the presidency but rather a growing suspicion that the scale of the country's problems may be too much for *any* candidate to solve. During any campaign, candidates tend to promise that they will solve all major issues with celerity. Once in office (unless endowed with the energy and skill of Franklin Roosevelt after his inaugural in 1933 or Lyndon Johnson at a comparable period in 1965) the winner often finds himself turning to television to explain that it will take a little longer than he had indicated — a little longer to control inflation, a little longer to increase productivity, a little longer to solve the energy crisis. This is not the way a television script is supposed to run. And the impatient viewing public demonstrated among other things in the election of 1980 that it was anxious for solutions.

Why then can anyone argue that respect for the presidency may be on an upward curve? The answer rests in part on the appetite of the American viewer for a successful series as the pre-inaugural appearances of President-elect Reagan in Washington suggested, the press and the public are prepared to accept a new image for the candidate as long as the supporting cast is adequate, as long as the script goes moderately well. As the Reagans swept through official Washington delivering smiles and handshakes, the temper of Washington visibly changed; the upside of the Prime-Time Presidency is its desire for things to work out well.

I cannot concentrate on technique, however, without closing with

a comment on the substance of a script that I think might work, not only to enhance a somewhat battered image of the presidency but also to address the major problems this President and his successors will have to confront. Look at the agenda items of the Eighties and you see they form a package of national and international actions crying to be taken, a package in which national and international elements blur into a larger whole. President Reagan will probably never have more power than in the months after mid-January, 1981; if he is to solve the agenda or begin to solve it, deferring the issues could prove a costly — even fatal — mistake.

The nation's agenda for the rest of this decade places before the President at least these major issues: inflation, energy, productivity, the U.S. role in the world and peace-keeping. Most public opinion polls show inflation as the top concern of Americans; this concern may have been one of the major reasons for Ronald Reagan's victory. In respect to energy, it seems apparent that the time has run out for easy solution but also obvious that there are still many things that can and should be done to make America not just energy independent but even to turn us into an energy-exporting country by 1990. Closely entwined with these two points is the need for what some have called "the Revitalization of the U.S. Economy" — the return to an America capable of operating successfully in both national and international markets. The obvious deterioration of the U.S. posture in the world can be related to many matters — from the initial taking of hostages to the Russian willingness to risk international contumely by moving into Afghanistan. However, a reversal in the decline of U.S. leverage abroad cannot be achieved without a commensurate improvement in the U.S. economic performance at home. Moving to a more stable international equilibrium will of necessity preoccupy the presidents of the eighties. The determination of each President and his capacity to articulate the goals he seeks will surely be either a major element in the successful attainment of these goals — or, should he fail, an explanation that historians will advance for a decade of disaster.

In other words, the success of the presidency hinges upon the incumbent's capacity to define the policy-lines of his administration and, having made them clear, to implement them. The earlier he defines the major policies he will recommend, the greater will be his chance to persuade Congress, the country — and the world — of the wisdom of his choices. Advocacy is thus an essential weapon in the President's armory and his access to prime-time a key component in effective leadership.

Will this lead to a return of the imperial presidency? Since there never *was* an imperial presidency, the answer obviously has to be "no." But I do argue that the continued importance of the presidency will be a function of the decision of future presidents to use the office, both as the "bully pulpit" that Theodore Roosevelt termed it, and also as the vehicle for instant communication which television has made of it. If the script is right, a President comfortable with a microphone can be regarded as an unquestioned asset. A President who can both write good lines and read them well serves the national interest; a President who realizes that the office itself is still respected and honored can make of that office the educational tool that it has been in the hands of the more distinguished of his predecessors. To turn the usual television argument around, the very fact that the medium compresses ideas into headlines means that the President's message can be absorbed by a wide variety of citizens. The very fact that well over seventy percent of all Americans tune in the evening news and listen with varied degrees of attention to the staccato items presented provides a remarkable window through which the President can project his visions of a world that could be. The very fact that he is assigned the role of the leading man turns out to be a plus, not a minus. The only problem is to write a first-rate, thoughtful and sound script.

Let us end with a supposition that President-elect Reagan decided to work out a script embracing the points that I mentioned a moment ago: an inflation policy which might or might not include wage/price controls, a set of productivity targets geared at restoring rates which this country has not enjoyed for quite awhile; an energy program targeted at an energy export position by 1990; and a clearly stated set of international goals comprehensible not only to the Russians and the Chinese, but also to our allies in NATO, and the people of the developing countries. Let us imagine that the President plans to move in these related but different directions during the hundred days after the Inaugural. Imagine further that the reaction abroad turns out to be good and that, after the usual noisy debate, support within Congress and throughout the country grows. Would anyone at that stage raise the question of whether the presidency can survive? I think not. Will President Reagan be able to achieve these goals? I know not. But is the effort worth making? Unquestionably.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Throughout this talk I refer to the president as "he." I do so for simplicity, but with the expectation that, before the end of this century, it is likely that the appropriate pronoun will be "she."



<sup>2</sup>*The Education of Henry Adams: An Autobiography* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961), pp. 46-47 (1st edition: 1918).

<sup>3</sup>James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (New York: Macmillan, 1972), chapter VIII (1st edition: 1888).

<sup>4</sup>Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Imperial Presidency* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Co., 1973).

<sup>5</sup>Bryce, *op. cit.*, I, p. 65.

<sup>6</sup>Thomas C. Cronin, *The State of the Presidency* (2nd edition, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980), chapter 3.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 114.

<sup>8</sup>Bryce, *op. cit.*, I, p. 79.

<sup>9</sup>Paul Burka, "Behind the Lines," *Texas Monthly*, November, 1980, p. 5.

<sup>10</sup>Alfred H. Jones, *Roosevelt's Image Brokers, Poets, Playwrights, and the Use of the Lincoln Symbol* (New York: The Kennikat Press, 1974).

<sup>11</sup>Warren Mitofsky, quoted by James David Barber, ed., *Race for the Presidency: The Media and the Nominating Process* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: 1978), p. 186.

<sup>12</sup>Christopher Lydon, John Foley, Dennis Britton, Eugene B. Everett, Jr., *Nominating a President* (New York: Praeger, 1980) pp. 60-61.

*Ambassador Clark:* Your tremendous applause speaks much better than anything I can say about how well the membership and our guests have enjoyed the address by our brilliant speaker and fellow member this morning.

It has occurred to me that we would hear from the principal speaker and then from our two distinguished respondents first and then have a question period and we will have time for that and by the notes that I have seen some of my best friends making, I know that they were putting down some questions that we will enjoy and we have people here who are qualified to answer.

We have another speaker this morning who is a member since last night. He declared himself a true Texan after 25 years and 3 months residency in this state. I am pleased to say that I know of no law professor in the United States that is better known and respected by the bench and the bar than Charles Alan Wright. He is at the top of the list as a researcher, a writer, a teacher and as a practitioner, a practical practitioner for clients as he has done throughout the years. I am very proud that we have such a man at the University of Texas Law School and the students there are very proud and they clamor for his courses and they fill up the room and those that can't get a seat are disappointed and try to get on the next train that comes by. It is my pleasure to present a distinguished teacher and practitioner of the law, the Honorable or rather I prefer to say and I have always addressed him as Professor Charles Alan Wright.

## RESPONSE OF CHARLES ALAN WRIGHT

Thank you, Ambassador Clark.

Dean Rostow began by answering the question put to us, "Can the Presidency Survive?", in one word, "unquestionably." I agree with her. The next question that immediately occurs to my mind is what kind of presidency? Dean Rostow has held up the work of the framers creating the presidency as one of the finest achievements of the human mind. On that I agree also. I think it is perhaps the most original contribution to the science of government. But the people in Philadelphia in 1787 were breaking new ground and wisely they did not attempt to spell out in any detail whatever what they expected this office they were inventing to be. A few years back Colonel Jaworski and I had occasion to be involved, fortunately not at the same time in my point of view, in litigation on the powers of the presidency, and though I have never discussed the case with him, I daresay that he found, as I certainly found, how little there is either in the text of the Constitution or in authoritative decisions that speaks to what the presidency can be, and what legally it is to be. It's an office that is created in sketchy terms and it is left, as Dean Rostow told us, very much to the incumbent the view he takes to decide what the presidency is going to be at any particular time. Woodrow Wilson in 1888 in his book, *Congressional Government*, said the President is "nothing but an ineffective figurehead." But 20 years later he took quite a different view in his work, *Constitutional Government* in the United States. He said: "The President has the right, in law and conscience, to be as big a man as he can." I think that is a very apt description of the presidency. Because men and women differ in how big they can be, the office is surely going to change as it has with each incumbent. Of the President, one hopes for great vision and leadership qualities using the technology of which Dean Rostow spoke. The President has to have most of all the confidence of people. If we trust the President, we are going to let him lead us. We are going to let him make very important decisions for us. When that confidence is shaken, then the President, no matter what his own desires may be, no longer can be a strong President. He becomes then only the figurehead of which Wilson spoke in 1888. Wilson himself is listed as one of our great Presidents by Dean Rostow. Indeed he was and yet the unhappy episode of the League of Nations ended his presidency in very tragic circumstances. He had lost the public's confidence on that issue in spite of all the good things that had gone before. A more recent example, Franklin Roosevelt, had the public completely with him. Not all the

public of course. I grew up in a Liberty League home and knew the attitudes of good Republicans in that period. But he had the great majority of the people with him. During the early years in office he was the voice of hope and of confidence in a very troubled period in national history. And indeed he stayed on for a very long time and was a fine wartime President, a leader in foreign affairs. But if one looks over chronologically the accomplishments of his administration domestically, you find that they come to an end rather early. After a great landslide reelection in 1936, in 1937 he announced what has become known as the Court Packing Plan. Remarkably the people did not like that a bit. The very people who stood most to gain from the New Deal legislation that the Supreme Court was routinely striking down were outraged at the idea of packing the Court. The sacredness that attaches to the symbol of the Supreme Court is much in the public mind. I think that it was then that President Roosevelt lost the confidence of the public. It is not mere coincidence that after the unsuccessful Court Packing Plan of 1937, in the remaining eight years that he was in office there was only one significant piece of domestic legislation, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, that the Roosevelt Administration was able to pass.

Perhaps because I see the question of public confidence as the key to what the presidency is and what one hopes that it will be, the one point where I am not persuaded by my colleague Dean Rostow is in her hope for more issue-related elections. I truly believe that that would be a mistake. I do not envy my English friends that in a few years are going to have the choice, as it now seems, between Margaret Thatcher and Michael Foot, in which issues will be strongly debated and polar positions taken by the two candidates. I think that is divisive and harmful to a country. The genius of the American political system has been that elections are not won or lost on issues, that parties do hunt for the person that will be the strongest candidate, that this inevitably pushes the party in the first instance and the candidate himself after he is nominated toward a middle position around which a consensus can be built. I think that that is a healthy way to move forward. Although it seems absurd that one's ability to trudge through the New Hampshire snow to get to a factory opening at 6 o'clock should be a test for obtaining this high office, still some of the instances that Dean Rostow gave us where candidates have failed because they could not meet tests of that kind, led me to wonder if indeed these failings, insignificant as they seem, were not perceived by the public as weaknesses of character that would betray the candidate if we

were to put him into a position where a mistake is something the nation can ill afford. The one sense in which I suppose that Chapquiddick is a perfectly legitimate political issue is what it tells us about Senator Kennedy's ability to respond at a time of great pressure and tension. That is something that we want to know about our President and if the process, weird as it seems, does allow us to sort out those who are strong, those in whom the public will have confidence, then I think a strong presidency will survive. Thank you.

*Ambassador Clark:* Thank you Professor Wright. Professor Wright is the only man that I can think of in Austin that I have sort of been put down by, or rather he has almost made me get the sermon. Professor Wright knows the words, it seems to me, of every hymn in the Episcopal hymn book. And not only that, he knows every response and every recitation in the prayer book without looking at it, and I can't find the right page and my wife is punching me, trying to straighten me out. But he does know that and he sings well, and I'm tone deaf, and he sings in a lusty manner. But in mentioning my wife, I will say that you must get used to this Mr. Pat Zachary and his new and beautiful and brilliant wife. My wife put me down this morning before 8 o'clock. I was talking about the subject to be before the Society this morning and she was provoked. It seems that I did not know or that I had missed it somewhere that all the Presidents of the United States up to Andrew Jackson were from Virginia or Massachusetts. My wife said that everybody that knows anything knows that. So your moderator, according to my beloved wife, knows nothing.

We have now another member of our Society, a distinguished lawyer, a native Texan, one who went to school in Virginia at Washington and Lee and then came back to the University of Texas and got his Bachelor of Arts degree and law degree from the University of Texas law school and has been a practitioner for a number of years, without saying how many, in Houston. In addition to being a practitioner of the law and specializing in all tax matters, both State and Federal, he has been an extremely active citizen in good work. He has been a fine churchman and he has advised with the many, many people that I have known that were raising money for good causes, he has helped them out in getting necessary tax exemptions in getting approval of their plan. And he has always done that in every case that I have known of as his own contribution to that cause because he approved of it. He is just someone we are delighted to have, and, fellow members of this Society, it is my great pleasure to present my friend, the Honorable Marvin Collie of Houston, Texas.

## RESPONSE OF MARVIN K. COLLIE

When Dean Rostow was speaking a moment ago of the tired campaigner, I was reminded of a night-time trip with Governor Shivers, one of our members. It was late at night. It was some ten years after he had ceased being Governor; but in making conversation, I remarked that this must be somewhat like some of his campaign days. He had just made a speech, he was obviously tired. I would have been exhausted and was. I asked him if he had not had many times like this during his three successful campaigns for Governor. He said, "Yes, and I want to tell you the worst part about it is that's when you make your bad mistakes. A campaigner that is going night and day and then has to come into a conference and make decisions about his campaign and the issues, must always be scared that he is going to make a drastically bad mistake at that late hour of night when he is exhausted."

Charles, I believe you mentioned some of the qualifications of the President. I would like to put one question to you of the trivia sort, in a sense, and that is do you know what President of the United States that served was constitutionally unable to serve? No, George Washington may not have been, but it was Herbert Hoover. Hoover had not lived in the United States 14 years before he was sworn into office.

I would like to discuss with you a little while the presidential appearances on the television media that Dean Rostow had referred to as the prime time presidency. Look at 1968 — the campaign there. Unquestionably, Humphrey was by far a better speaker on television, and otherwise. He had charisma, he had the ability to articulate his views, he was a wonderful television personality. And as Nixon proved in 1960 and again in later campaigns, he simply could not come across on television. Yet in 1968 and in 1972 Nixon won. In 1972, McGovern was not nearly the campaigner that Humphrey was, but certainly he was probably as good if not better a television personality than his opponent, Nixon. Then you come to 1976, and both campaigners were horrible on television. Neither one of them was able to be an effective television campaigner. Now in 1980, as Dean Rostow says, we had an actor who, according to a slim majority, came across better than the incumbent President on television.

The point that I am trying to make is that, at least within the period of time that television has been predominant in campaigns, it apparently has not been the force of a man articulating his views

and projecting his personality on television as much as it has been the issues. And if you go back and read Theodore White's books, as far as they went, and books since then, it has basically been the man that has articulated effectively what President-elect Reagan articulated — get the government off the peoples' back — who won. Look at the 1968 campaign, the 1972 campaign, the 1976 campaign and on into 1980. I say that particularly with respect to 1976, because you remember that that born-again Christian, who was the forerunner of the Moral Majority, ran on a campaign of getting the government off the peoples' back. So I suggest to you that we will not have a great change in who is elected President by reason of television, unless as Charles indicated a moment ago, we have a President that has lost the confidence of the people, or to put it another way, the people have lost confidence in the presidency. And that could happen in this way. I think that most of the people in this room are old enough to remember Huey Long. I only saw him on the floor of the Senate. I have read the biographies about him. But if we had great discontent with the way the office of the presidency was being run and a man with the ability to speak as Huey Long did and capture the imagination of the people in a time of discontent, then we have the great danger of television upon our country and upon the presidency.

One last observation, entirely dissimilar in a way, with respect to television, I suggest the President-elect has got to come on television early in his presidency and utilize it as a schoolroom if you will, and tell the people that he does not expect to turn this country around with respect to all of its problems in 100 days. Now the media will focus on the roles of FDR's 100 days and they will suggest something like that should and could be done. They forget that that 100 days was the culmination of 10 or 15 years work from the time of Wilson until the time of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The situation is entirely different today and the media must understand it, the American people must understand it, Congress must understand it. The President has got to go on television and tell the people to be patient; he is addressing these problems but it cannot be done immediately.

I think the presidential press conference ought to be torn apart and rebuilt. The presidential press conference is the most awful mishmash of irrelevant remarks taken out of context that is possible for the media to do and for the President to cooperate in. He, I suggest, should announce: "I am having a press conference. It will be 40 minutes long and the first 20 minutes will be devoted to

energy. I'll have a five minute statement and the next 15 minutes I'll take no questions except those upon energy. I may have another statement to make after that to summarize it and then in the last 10 or 15 minutes, we will talk about what you all want to talk about."

If we do that, then the country can be educated by a presidential press conference and we can have some cohesion in the educational process that this new President must bring to us. I was delighted to hear Dean Rostow say we never had an imperial presidency. If it were never proven any other way, though, it was when President Carter came on to make a speech in a sweater and came bounding off a plane carrying his own bags. That is not what the American people want, I suggest to you. They want a man standing up in a blue suit, with dignity, with a flag flying beside him and the band playing "Hail to the Chief."

#### REMARKS OF WILLIAM S. LIVINGSTON

Though our theme is the preservation of the democratic — if not the presidential — republic, nobody ever claimed that this was a democratic organization. Our president mandated that we should begin at 2 o'clock, but that was changed to 2:05. So at 2:05, I managed to turn my watch back 5 minutes in accord with the best legislative practice. It is now really 2:05, so in accord with the presidential mandate we shall begin.

The topic of our gathering today as it appears in the program is "Can The United States Presidency Survive?" I kept thinking all morning of the man who, when asked "How is your wife," answered, "Compared with what?" What occurs to me is what we are really talking about is viable and feasible alternatives. Can the United States Presidency survive what? This morning the main threats seemed to be the press, the electoral system, and the personal burden imposed on the incumbent by the manifold roles he has to play in the presidential office. This morning's exploration of the presidency was to me an exhilarating experience. If my picture and my memory of Dean Rostow's argument are accurate, she took the theme that we are dealing here with what I think is felicitously called the "prime-time president." The prime-timecy (you will permit me such a word?) of the presidency has certain consequences. One is the proliferation of primaries, which produce a candidate rather than a President. Second, it diminishes the importance of the conventions, which tend to become merely media events since the choice is already made in the primaries. Third, the prime-time presidency makes forward planning for policy and governance very difficult and perhaps im-

possible, since the candidate has had to give his whole attention to the tasks not of planning but of winning. Fourth, the prime-time presidency means that the issues do not get adequately discussed in the campaign.

On the other hand, Dean Rostow ended on an upbeat — the President does have access to the media and the bully pulpit of Teddy Roosevelt's presidency is more pervasive, more persuasive, more effective now than it was then. For the President can reach more people and his office and his access to the media are very useful — for education and persuasion and leadership. Marvin Collie, on the other hand, argued that despite the dominance of the media in the campaign, the better performer has not always won and that the issues themselves are still extraordinarily important. Charlie Wright concluded with the central and fundamental question whether the people have confidence in the President's character and capacity. And if I heard him right, he said that if we can provide a means of assuring that, the presidency will survive. I have been reflecting also on Professor Wright's citation of the multi-faceted Woodrow Wilson. On that particular facet which has him saying that the presidency is whatever the President can make of it. If you will permit a personal side-glance, I should like to tell you a very brief anecdote out of my own experience as a graduate student at Yale. I have to say it was at Yale because it couldn't happen just any place. A good friend of mine, my employer as a matter of fact, was lecturing in an introductory American Government course in which there were three or four hundred students. He was making this very point that Professor ascribed to Wilson — that the presidency is a weak office if the incumbent is weak and a strong office if the incumbent is strong — and he cited examples. The strong Presidents he thought of were Lincoln, the two Roosevelts, and so on; while the weak Presidents were Taft, Harrison, Hayes and one other. It turned out that a grandson of each of the four weak Presidents was in the class — four of them! It was we graduate students who subsequently had to bear the brunt in the discussion groups — the professor got off scot-free.

Given our 18th century heritage, our faith in the laws of nature, our faith that mankind can create and operate his own institutions, given our 18th century faith in our ability to establish mechanical systems, whether of machinery or of government — given all these things, we always operated in this country on the confident assumption that the machinery of government was adequate to the task. We also assumed that there was a self-regulating mechanism out



there that would produce the republic and sustain it regardless of how we mistreated it — that it was sufficient unto itself. We put so much faith in the system that we were confident that it would always right itself. I think that one of the important lessons we learned from the Watergate experience was that it *does* matter after all whether we elect good men to office.

And that brings me to our leading speaker of the afternoon whom I now propose to introduce and to yield to. In some ways the best introduction for a man like Leon Jaworski is the one that is customarily used for the President of the United States. If I were smart I would simply say "Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Leon Jaworski," and sit down. But, (a) I am not that smart, and (b) I am a professor, and I never speak so briefly as that. I shall not attempt the complete catalog of his accomplishments and virtues but I do want to say one or two things about him. (He has no right to get off scot-free.) He and I became friends last spring when the Magna Carta came to Texas, and particularly when it came to Austin. Leon Jaworski came to Austin on that memorable evening and gave a perfectly splendid lecture on the impact of the Magna Carta on American law and American liberties. It was an eloquent lecture and the book in which it is reproduced will appear within the next few weeks.

Leon Jaworski is a senior partner in the law firm of Fulbright and Jaworski, which is headquartered in Houston but has its tentacles in San Antonio, in Austin, in Washington and London. In addition to Leon there are some 300 other lawyers in that firm. He is past president of the American College of Trial Lawyers, of the American Bar Association, of the Texas Bar Association, of the Houston Bar Association, of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, and of some things which I have charitably omitted from this list. He is on the Board of Directors of Anderson-Clayton, he is Chairman of the Board of Southwest Bank Shares, he was the Colonel in charge of the trial section of the war crimes proceedings at Nuremberg after the Second World War. He is also a "Distinguished Alumnus" of Baylor University and of Baylor Law School. He is a great friend not only of Baylor but of the University of Texas, and of higher education in general.

But I think that the nicest thing I can say about this fellow is what Tom Sealy said about him in Austin last spring when he was introducing him on the occasion of the Magna Carta. He said that, "In every sense of the word he is a Christian gentleman." It's my pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, and my privilege to present to you

one of the most distinguished, admired, and respected citizens of our State and of our Nation, the Honorable Leon Jaworski.

## CAN THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENCY SURVIVE?

LEON JAWORSKI

When our distinguished President Fleming approached me on addressing you on the subject of "Can the U.S. Presidency Survive?", I wondered — why me? Then came the realization that along with my fellow-Americans I had better be contemplating this subject, for it is becoming more timely, more pressing with each passing year. So I paused to think about it — and I hope I did not pause in vain.

The signers of the Constitution did not all view the presidency in the same light. The ultimate provisions relating to the presidency were based on a consensus and certainly not on a unanimous view.

Benjamin Franklin, the oldest signer of the Constitution at 81, favored an executive power residing in the hands of several men rather than in a single President. It is interesting to note that concerning the Constitution itself he said: "We must not expect, that a new government may be formed, as a game of chess may be played, by a skillful hand, without a fault."

Charles Pinckney who was the originator of the so-called Pinckney Plan for a Constitution pointed out with much force that "the citizens of the United States would reprobate, with indignation, the idea of a monarchy. But the essential qualities of a monarchy — unity of council — vigor — secrecy — and despatch, are qualities essential in every government."

It should be recalled that the delegates of the small states of the Constitutional Convention were fearful that the Virginia Plan for the new government would swallow up the small states by not permitting them an equal vote with the large states in the new Congress. For this reason the delegates from Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey and New York drew up what came to be called the New Jersey Plan which was presented to the Convention on June 15, 1787 by William Paterson of New Jersey. On the subject of the presidency, Section 4 of this Plan provided:

"Resolved, That the United States in Congress be authorized to elect a federal executive to consist of \_\_\_\_\_ persons; to continue in office for the term of \_\_\_\_\_ years; . . . to be ineligible a second term."

Following the proposal of the Constitution on September 17, 1787 by the Philadelphia Convention, many New Yorkers objected to its provisions and during the last week of September and the first weeks of October 1787, an abundance of articles appeared in the New York papers denouncing the new government proposal. There were some who defended it in the news columns, but a constructive and enlightening explanation of the advantages of the provisions of this proposed Constitution was lacking.

The decision was made to publish a series of essays explaining and defending the proposed Constitution. Alexander Hamilton wrote some of these essays, although at the time all were written under the pseudonym "Publius." James Madison became a collaborator in the writing of such essays. John Jay also joined in this undertaking. James Madison later recorded that the effort was proposed by Alexander Hamilton to James Madison with a request "to join him and Mr. Jay [John Jay] in carrying it into effect."

The three authors did not initially outline any division of the work to be done, but their writings drew much attention and undoubtedly assisted greatly in reducing, if not allaying, the fears of the New York people.

It has been said that the Federalist ranks with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution as the three most historic documents of major importance in the history of the United States. The work has been referred to as "the most significant contribution Americans have made to political philosophy."

The Federalist Papers have become sources of reference in the interpretation of provisions of the Constitution of the United States. It is not infrequent for the United States Supreme Court to refer to these Papers in its opinions, as they are often cited by lawyers in briefs in cases before the Court dealing with constitutional interpretations.

The Federalist Papers reveal that the drafters of the Constitution, in providing for the presidency, looked to the then existing framework of the governorship of the State of New York and the governorship of the State of Massachusetts, especially the former. Some of the members of the Convention strongly believed that the governorship of these two states had proven satisfactory in fundamental respects and that the Constitutional Convention should borrow from these experiences.

It is also quite evident from the Federalist Papers that the framers had uppermost in their minds the aversion of the people to a monarchy.

In one of the papers bearing date of March 14, 1788 (attributed to Alexander Hamilton) directed, "To the People of the State of New York" it was written:

I proceed now to trace the real characters of the proposed executive as they are marked out in the plan of the Convention. This will serve to place in a strong light the unfairness of the representations which have been made in regard to it.

The first thing which strikes our attention is that the executive authority, with few exceptions, is to be vested in a single magistrate. This will scarcely however be considered as a point upon which any comparison can be grounded. . . .

That magistrate is to be elected for *four* years; and is to be re-eligible as often as the People of the United States shall think him worthy of their confidence. In these circumstances, there is a total dissimilitude between *him* and a King of Great-Britain; who is an *hereditary* monarch, possessing the crown as a patrimony descendible to his heir forever; but there is a close analogy between *him* and a Governor of New-York, who is elected for *three* years, and is re-eligible without limitation or intermission. If we consider how much less time would be requisite for establishing a dangerous influence in a single State, than for establishing a like influence throughout the United States, we must conclude that a duration of permanency far less to be dreaded in that office, than a duration of *three* years for a correspondent office in a single State.

Although it represents a diversion from my text, I cannot resist calling to your attention the succeeding paragraph in this Federalist paper which has been labeled "Federalist No. 69" and which you must bear in mind is attributed to Alexander Hamilton. In analyzing the provisions of the Constitution relating to the presidency, we find:

The President of the United States would be liable to be impeached, tried, and upon conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors, removed from office, and would afterwards be liable to prosecution and punishment in the ordinary course of law.

Hamilton makes it clear that the President of the United States would be "liable to prosecution and punishment in the ordinary course of law" *after* he had been impeached, convicted and removed from office. The cries of those who were insisting on former President Nixon's indictment prior to impeachment are still ringing in my ears. It had always been my view that had an effort been made to indict Nixon prior to his resignation, the United States Supreme Court

would have held it unconstitutional, our entire timetable would have been upset and the effort of clearing up the Watergate mess then may well have become irreversibly clouded.

In concluding his presentation in Federalist No. 69 Hamilton said:

Hence it appears, that except as to the concurrent authority of the President in the article of treaties, it would be difficult to determine whether that Magistrate would in the aggregate, possess more or less power than the Governor of New-York. And it appears yet more unequivocally that there is no pretence for the parallel which has been attempted between him and the King of Great-Britain.

In their wildest flights of imagination, Hamilton, Madison and Jay would not have viewed the presidency as it exists today. Perhaps the explanation lies in what James David Barber tells us in *The Presidential Character* in these words:

The Presidency is a peculiar office. The Founding Fathers left it extraordinarily loose in definition, partly because they trusted George Washington to invent a tradition as he went along. It is an institution made a piece at a time by successive men in the White House. Jefferson reached out to Congress to put together the beginnings of political parties; Jackson's dramatic force extended electoral partisanship to its mass base; Lincoln vastly expanded the administrative reach of the office; Wilson and the Roosevelts showed its rhetorical possibilities — in fact every President's mind and demeanor has left its mark on a heritage still in lively development.

But the Presidency is much more than an institution. It is a focus of feelings. In general, popular feelings about politics are low-key, shallow, casual. For example, the vast majority of Americans knows virtually nothing of what Congress is doing and cares less. The Presidency is different. The Presidency is the focus for the most intense and persistent emotions in the American polity. The President is a symbolic leader, the one figure who draws together the people's hopes and fears for the political future. On top of all his routine duties, he has to carry that off — or fail.

I cannot in this presentation detail all of the roles of office that the President fills. It would be all too time consuming as well as space consuming. He has been described as "many men in one." It has been pointed out that in other countries his duties would be performed by more than one official.

Some of his more important functions, duties and responsibilities as prescribed by the Constitution may be classified as follows: "As

Chief Executive he has the responsibility of enforcing the federal laws. As Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces it is his responsibility to defend the nation in peace or war. He directs United States foreign policy and should play an important role in world affairs. As leader of his political party he helps shape the party's stand on domestic and foreign issues. He submits to Congress and urges Congress to act on legislative proposals. He conducts many ceremonial affairs. He appoints most other high officials of the executive branch of government. He appoints members of the Supreme Court."

The Constitution did not deal with a President's social responsibilities which have become quite burdensome as a result of tradition. As Chief of State he gives official dinners in the White House for the diplomatic corps, the Supreme Court and the Vice President. He holds a number of formal receptions a year as well as special dinners and receptions for visiting dignitaries.

That there has been a tremendous growth of presidential powers since the framing of the Constitution is uniformly acknowledged. The *World Book Encyclopedia*, Volume 15, Page 680f, describes the escalation of presidential powers in these words:

In the years since the Founding Fathers established the presidency, the President's powers and responsibilities have grown tremendously. Power, personality, and circumstance have contributed to the development of the presidency. The legal powers granted to the President have not changed greatly since 1789. But the use of these powers has differed strikingly among Presidents. The Presidents have varied in imagination, energy, political know-how, speaking skills, and other qualities. Presidents with strong personalities often excelled at "selling" their policies to the public or to Congress. The nature of the times may greatly affect what the President can do with his legal powers. During periods of peace, the power of the presidency may decline. In time of war, economic depression, or social reform, its powers may greatly increase.

Erwin C. Hargrove is Chairman of the Department of Political Science at Brown University. In his essay on "The Crisis of the Contemporary Presidency" he relates the problems of the presidency to be as follows:

1. We sense more clearly that at *key moments of crisis the personality of the President is the decision system.*
2. The rich firsthand accounts of presidential policy-making processes that have been published in recent years show clearly that *the presidential personal style of authority is the crucial variable in what the top leaders of the execu-*

*tive branch know, consider, and debate and in how discussions at the top are carried on.*

3. *The White House, including the Executive Office of the President, as an institution presents new problems of accountability — a number of phenomena cluster together and reinforce each other but they can be separated analytically. Presidential advisers who are not subject to direct congressional scrutiny exercise great personal authority. The White House has become the center for policy development in the executive which has led to a demoralization of the bureaucracy and an effort to do too much at the center. The atmosphere within the White House is too often one of 'we-they,' and a dedication to the President's interests often actually undercuts his political needs through arrogance toward the other parts of government. And finally, the excessive deference to the President within the White House can produce a myopia which dictates reality for all within, including the President.*

4. *Abuses of bureaucratic power congruent with presidential interests occur all too frequently and go unchecked.*

5. *The chronic problem of deadlock between the President and Congress in matters of domestic policy and the great difficulty the White House seems to have in securing responsiveness from the domestic bureaucracy are still with us.*

6. The recurring constitutional crisis of 1973 having to do with Watergate have revealed that *there is little short of impeachment that the rest of the polity can do to restrain a President who may abuse his constitutional powers, in areas in which he is autonomous.* The Constitution provides no mechanism for the resignation, whether forced or voluntary, of a President who has lost the confidence of the great majority of the people. And impeachment is such a drastic measure that members of Congress shrink from it. The political system relies upon observance of self-restraint and political accommodation by all parties, publics, and interest groups, as well as leaders. When a President lacks this commitment the other principal actors in the system stand baffled.

The powers inherent in the presidency and its use — even its abuse — are factors that are germane to our discussion. How the Presidents of the past have viewed the office, how they have used it or even misused it, are all legitimate inquiries in weighing the survival of the presidency.

As far back as 1841, Ralph Waldo Emerson in his "Essay on Compensation" commented, "The farmer imagines power and place are fine things. But the President has paid dear for his White House.

It has commonly cost him all his peace, and the best of his manly attributes.”

Henry Brooks Adams, an American historian and philosopher whose nine volume history of the United States was written in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century and is considered an outstanding account of the administrations of Jefferson and Madison, made the following observations: “Power is poison. Its effect on Presidents had been almost tragic, chiefly as an almost insane excitement at first, and a worse reaction afterwards; but also because no mind is so well balanced as to bear the strain of seizing unlimited force without habit or knowledge of it; and finding it disputed with him by hungry packs of wolves and hounds whose lives depend on snatching the carrion.”

Reactions I formed to a few of the Presidents I had occasion to observe may be summarized as follows:

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a President who used power with apparent relish, and as the Commander-in-Chief of a nation engaged in a colossal war, he needed to exercise his prerogatives of authority without restraint. But even before this war of survival, Roosevelt sought to use the power of the presidency unreservedly to implement his New Deal programs. When the United States Supreme Court declared some of these measures unconstitutional, including Roosevelt's pet National Industrial Recovery Act, Roosevelt proposed a reorganization of the Court. Legions of Americans assailed this effort, viewing it as a court-packing plan. While congressional debates were being held, the plan was abandoned.

Harry Truman was never accused of being a power-hungry President. But he did not hesitate to use the authority of the presidency. The atom bomb decision, in graveness, equaled, if not excelled, that faced by any other President. His dismissal of General Douglas MacArthur required courage. Truman announced a policy of international resistance to communist aggression known as the Truman Doctrine. He did not hesitate to seize the steel mills and operate them as a government enterprise during the Korean War when steel production was halted because of strikes. The Supreme Court declared the seizure unconstitutional. Although no power-grabber, Truman had no hesitancy in using the power of the presidency wherever he thought appropriate.

President Dwight Eisenhower, who as General Eisenhower had exercised almost unlimited authority in the conduct of war, knew how to wear the mantle of authority. He instituted a staff system



patterned after the Army. Each Cabinet officer or other executive was made responsible for a particular area of government affairs. Instead of holding to himself the powers of the presidency, he readily delegated them.

President John F. Kennedy, despite the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion, was not one to stretch or even freely use the powers of the presidency. I was privy to his agonizing delays and fervent pleas to Governor Barnett before he sent the United States Marshals to Oxford, Mississippi during the James Meredith integration confrontation. But he did not fail to use whatever powers were needed for the security of the nation. By the display of courage and the exertion of strong leadership, he forced the Russians to withdraw missiles from Cuba.

President Kennedy was asked by Fred Blumenthal, then Washington correspondent of *Parade Magazine*, to comment on the lessons of the presidency, and here is how Kennedy put it:

The first lesson of the presidency is that it is impossible to foretell the precise nature of the problems that will confront you or the specific skills and capacities which those problems will demand. It is an office which called upon a man of peace, Lincoln, to become a great leader in a bloody war; which required a profound believer in limiting the scope of federal government, Jefferson, to expand dramatically the powers and range of that government; which challenged a man dedicated to domestic social reform, Franklin Roosevelt, to lead this nation into a deep and irrevocable involvement in world affairs.

For one who knew so well the efficacy of power tactics during his Senate Majority Leader days, Lyndon Johnson appeared restrained in the use of power as President. A good persuader and a talented arm-twister, he appeared to bend over backwards to avoid the appearance of misuse of power. He was ever striving to have the good will, even the affection of the nation. He inherited the Vietnam War which proved to be an albatross. He also faced domestic unrest. He instituted highly significant social programs and averted a railroad crisis. Although his critics faulted him sharply for his Vietnam policies and some of his domestic programs, he appeared to strive to conduct the affairs of the presidency within the restraints of constitutional limitation.

My reactions to President Nixon's presidency are controlled largely by impressions based on personal experiences. After carefully measuring his actions during the first few years in office and demonstrating qualities of capable leadership, he became detached and some-

what arrogant. He construed the landslide electoral victory of 1972 as a broad mandate for his policies. Still worse, he regarded this one-sided vote as endowing him with the prerogative of running the office on his own terms. He became vindictive toward critics. Towards the end of his first term, in taped conversation with staff members Haldeman and Dean, Nixon directed that "comprehensive notes" be taken of all of the activities of these opposing voices. Then he added, "We have not used the power in these first four years. . . . we haven't used the Bureau (IRS), and we haven't used the Justice Department, but things are going to change, and they are going to get it right." John Dean interrupted to say, "That's an exciting prospect" to which the President replied, "It's got to be done. It's the only thing to do."

The tapes showed that by January 1973 Nixon had begun to bristle over every criticism of the bombing in Cambodia. He vehemently denounced everyone who failed to give him strong support, cursing those who had been close friends for years.

In phone calls at night with Charles Colson, his aide, he was particularly bitter. But the significant part of these conversations was his reference to his sixty-two percent of the vote in the election. After denigrating some person, he would ask Colson, "Does not this fellow realize that I have a mandate at the hands of the American people?" It was clear that he had interpreted the vote as a grant of unlimited power, and he left no doubt that he intended to use it.

As a member of Congress and later as Vice President, President Gerald Ford had watched the presidency in operation for many years. He assumed the duties of office in stride. There were those who thought that he usurped his powers of office by granting the Nixon pardon. Without passing on the propriety of the pardon, I stated publicly while still Special Prosecutor that I concluded he was within his constitutional power in granting it. All subsequent attacks on the pardon have been dismissed by the courts. The rightful exercise of this power may well have cost Gerald Ford his reelection. Even his strongest critics will admit that in conducting the affairs of the nation from the White House, Gerald Ford was in no sense a rabid wielder of power.

The smoke of the last presidential campaign battle has not cleared away fully, and from my standpoint it appears untimely to undertake to analyze President Carter's term of office except insofar as it has a bearing on a one term presidency — and this I shall treat later. Suffice it to say that historians will analyze his tenure from the standpoint of the *lack* of the use of power as well as its overt use.

In the November 10 issue of *Time Magazine*, only a few weeks ago, the interviews of Presidents Ford and Nixon were carried under the heading, "Two Ex-Presidents Assess the Job." One of the questions posed to them read, "Is the job simply too much for any one man to handle?" President Ford commented that we do not have an "imperial presidency" but an "imperiled presidency." It is his opinion that the presidency does not operate "effectively." He attributes this to the lack of a working relationship between the Congress and the presidency and places the blame for this failure on the so-called "reforms" that have taken place and congressional rules that he believes have stripped the leadership of power that it needs. A part of the blame for the weakness in the presidency he attributes to the "inability of the White House to maintain control over the large federal bureaucracy."

President Ford believes that the President is enabled to exert leadership through the Cabinet and that so long as he has an effective Cabinet, the President can operate with a good measure of success. Although he describes the presidency as being "a hard job," he does not regard it as being too big for any one individual. He denounces suggestions of having "two Presidents." He describes the job as taking "about twelve to fourteen hours a day" and regards this as being quite in order. He deplors the length of time taken for ceremonial matters.

Finally, President Ford believes that many of the problems of the "imperiled presidency" could be solved by using the Vice President as a "real Chief of Staff, both to control the administrative bureaucracy and to see that administration relations with the Congress really mesh." He believes that the Vice President should be moved into the west wing of the White House as the "Chief of Staff of the whole administration."

Whereas President Ford believes in a strong "Cabinet" government, President Nixon opines that there have "to be limits on the individual Cabinet members' independence, and that the Cabinet as a collective body is not suited to decision making." He makes the point that "at least for the balance of this century, the survival of freedom and peace in the world will depend on the strength and effectiveness of the American presidency." He recognizes the "power" inherent in the presidency — believes that it should be used "effectively" and "selectively."

President Nixon brushes aside any suggestion that a "Cabinet" government would relieve the pressure on the presidency. He adds: "In this country, every new President takes office promising a strong

Cabinet of independent members, and some new Presidents take office really believing this promise. But each soon learns that there have to be limits on the individual Cabinet members' independence, and that the Cabinet as a collective body is not suited to decision making."

President Nixon insists that "at least for the balance of this century, the survival of freedom and peace in the world will depend on the strength and effectiveness of the American presidency."

The Constitution of the United States does not mention a Cabinet, but it does refer to the principal officer in each of the executive departments and the option of the President to require a written opinion from them on any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices. In 1789 three departments were established, State, War and Treasury, and the office of the Attorney General. It is reported that President George Washington frequently consulted with the secretaries of these departments and, of course, with his Attorney General. It was not until 1791 that a first recorded meeting was held of these advisors. Historians indicate that in 1793 James Madison first used the term "cabinet" for this group. In succeeding terms, some Presidents discontinued Cabinet meetings. Others, notably Andrew Jackson, used a group of personal advisors which were referred to as the kitchen cabinet.

Today the heads of the executive departments are generally referred to as "the Cabinet." Of course, the President has the prerogative of conferring Cabinet rank on other advisors and to invite them to participate in Cabinet meetings. Recently the press reported that President-Elect Ronald Reagan had announced that he would confer Cabinet rank on his Counsel.

As department heads the members of the Cabinet are legal officers of the federal government, but as Cabinet members per se, they have no official standing in law. When effective use is made of the Cabinet, the President has it meet once a week. A secretary to the Cabinet prepares and circulates the agenda, although no formal votes are taken.

Wholly apart from obtaining the views of the members of the Cabinet and the benefit of the discussions that take place at Cabinet meetings, it is plain to see that as heads of departments in the Executive Branch, the President can make substantial use of their services to lighten his own load. He can give them a rather wide range in their field of operations or he can restrict their activities and reduce them to White House puppets.

In some recent administrations, Cabinet officers operated mostly ministerially, taking their instructions on policy matters from the White House staff. I have personally witnessed instances when a member of the President's staff would telephone a Cabinet member and inform him of the President's wishes in certain situations without prior consultation with the President.

Still fresh on my mind is a talk I was privileged to have with our President Lyndon B. Johnson. We lunched in the Rose Garden at a time when President Johnson had already decided not to offer for another term. I listened to his plans regarding the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library and the Lyndon Baines Johnson School for Public Affairs. Soon his observations drifted to the complexities and perplexities of the presidency with particular emphasis on the innumerable demands that are made on the incumbent. Some of the comments were not unlike those of Presidents Ford and Nixon just referred to. President Johnson made it clear that many of the ceremonial responsibilities now discharged by the President should be transferred to someone else. In fact, President Johnson left the distinct impression with me that all duties and responsibilities of the presidency not required by the Constitution should be undertaken by another individual such as an "executive vice president" as he termed it. He made it ever so clear that the efficacy of the presidency was gravely hampered by the multitudinous duties and functions that the President is now called on to perform.

A decade ago there were few Americans advocating a reduction in the present two term span in the presidency. Today a ground swell of public opinion is forming calling for a re-examination of our present constitutional provisions. Keeping the issue aflame is the prestigious Foundation for the Study of Presidential and Congressional Terms in which Charles L. Bartlett, Pulitzer prize winning columnist, is a prime movant. This Foundation recently published a booklet entitled "Presidential and Congressional Term Limitation: The Issue that Stays Alive."

The presentation in this booklet begins with a quote attributed to Benjamin Franklin as follows: "In free governments the *rulers* are the servants, and the *people* their superiors and sovereigns. For the former, therefore, to return among the latter was not to degrade them but to promote them." I doubt that on today Jimmy Carter agrees with that piece of philosophy.

The historical travail of the issue of presidential terms is traced in this booklet from the time of the drafting of the Constitution. The following excerpt is peculiarly apropos to our discussion.

The first President to firmly embrace the single-term concept was Andrew Jackson. He argued repeatedly for the change in his messages to Congress, maintaining that this was the best way of keeping Presidents 'beyond the reach of any improper influences' and of insuring that he follow 'the strict line of constitutional duty.' In his last message to the legislators, Jackson said that if Presidents were restricted one term, 'I think our liberties would possess an additional safeguard.'

William Henry Harrison, who died soon after he reached the White House, was a fervent advocate of term limitation. In his inaugural address he vowed to serve only a single term saying, 'It is a part of wisdom for a republic to limit the service of that officer at least to whom she has intrusted the management of her foreign relations, the execution of her laws, and the command of her armies and navies to a period so short as to prevent his forgetting that he is the accountable agent, not the principal, the servant, not the master.'

Subsequently, the Whig Party embraced the single term in its platform and it won support from a succession of Presidents who, caught in the travails of those times, were given only single terms by the voters. Presidents James Polk, Millard Fillmore, and James Buchanan all declared themselves in favor of the reform.

When the Confederacy was formed in Montgomery, Alabama in 1861, the secessionists drafted a Constitution closely modelled, except in respect to states rights, on the U.S. Constitution. But one major change was a provision that the President would be ineligible for reelection after six years.

Anent the views of President Eisenhower on this subject, this booklet points out:

After he left office, Mr. Eisenhower frequently met with his brother, Milton, and other friends and advisers to discuss what could be done to give the nation a better government. From these discussions he became convinced that the Constitution should be amended to put a single-term, six-year limit on the President along with a limit of no more than 12 consecutive years of service in the House and Senate.

President Nixon, in his *Time Magazine* interview, concedes that consideration should be given to such "proposals as limiting the President to a single six year term or creating a second vice presidency to assist with day-to-day oversights of the Executive Branch."

President Carter, in a postmortem election session, reiterated his preference for a single six year term for the presidency saying, "it would add to the stature of the presidency."

But if it appears in the second or third year that a newly elected President is unable to offer the needed leadership, should the nation be saddled with his incompetence for a full six years? I think not. I would prefer to select another leader at the end of four years.

Perhaps I can best explain my view by recalling John Winthrop's reaction when in 1645 as Deputy Governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony, charged with having exceeded his authority, he survived a bitter impeachment trial. He reminded his fellow citizens that when you call one to be a magistrate, "you must run the *hazard* of his skill and ability." Thus, my simple answer is that I do not want to continue to run that "hazard" for longer than four years.

I began putting this address together before I knew the outcome of our recent presidential election. What follows is a post-election observation. A President considered by a majority of the voters to be ineffective and undeserving of a second term has had his tenure of office ended. Thus, you may ask — why not leave it to the voters — if he has not done the job, vote him out at the end of four years. The recent election result does not militate against my view that the constitutional *limitation* should be one term of four years. Even the most ardent Carter supporter, if he is informed of the facts, will have to admit that politics with an eye to re-election controlled many of President Carter's decisions and actions during his term — especially in the latter part. This demeans the presidency. Moreover, the vast amount of time, effort and money channeled in the re-election effort is to be deplored. How many of the taxpayers' dollars were distributed in one locality or the other for political advantage is conjectural, but it is generally recognized that such sizeable apportionments were made. To point to this having been the practice in prior elections is not an extenuating circumstance — on the contrary it proves the point I make.

The American people have come to want a strong President. They believe him to be invested with much power, and they expect him to exert power. Especially do they like to see in him strong leadership qualities. When, prior to our last election, a Gallup poll was run on "perceptions of the presidency," it was found that a two to one edge — sixty-three percent to thirty percent — favored strong leadership over those who thought leadership might be dangerous. When asked what "presidents people would like to see in the White House now," John Kennedy received thirty-seven percent followed by Franklin Roosevelt with sixteen percent, Harry Truman with thirteen percent and Dwight Eisenhower with six percent. Asked

what leadership qualities the President showed, the public described John F. Kennedy as a "strong leader."

Americans take an exalted view of their presidency. They want to regard it as a sacrosanct establishment. In the Watergate days, when President Nixon fired the first Watergate special prosecutor, he did not have in mind the appointment of another prosecutor. He was determined to let his own Department of Justice appointees wind up the investigation which, of course, would then have been under his domination. But the American people would have none of that. The institution they worshipped was involved. An avalanche of protests came to members of Congress and directly to the White House. Nixon's Chief of Staff, Alexander Haig, told me that the public reaction to Nixon's plan was so overwhelmingly adverse and its widespread disapproval so unanticipated that Nixon had to abandon his plan. In Haig's words, "the reaction is almost revolutionary — things are about to come apart." This accounted for my appointment as Special Prosecutor — an appointment that never would have come about but for the unwillingness of the American people to accept a threatened chink in the armor of the presidency.

In my view it is a lead-pipe cinch — to use a good slang expression — that the presidency will survive. The presidency is a revered institution in the eyes of the American people. It has been from the time of George Washington, and it will always remain such.

To be realistic, it must not be overlooked that it was *one* President who was serving a population of less than four million people at the time of the ratification of our Constitution. In 1970 when our population was almost two hundred million more, there was still only one President serving our nation and today with an estimated 212 million there is still no change. Does not this continual increase in constituents suggest that remedial measures are needed. In my judgment the following steps should be taken.

(A) Limit the office of the President to one term. I prefer four years; I am willing to accept a six year term. A one term presidency makes for more courageous decisions uninfluenced by re-election concerns. It will avoid the spectacle of tactics acceptable in political campaigns yet demeaning to the office of the presidency. Thus, it will exalt the office in the eyes of the people. It will mean that the President can devote his full efforts to the labors of his office and not be diverted to spending time and effort on re-election undertakings.

(B) There should be provided the office of Executive Vice President. He should have responsibility for the performance and delegation of all administrative functions which, under the Constitution, do



not have to be performed by the President himself. These functions would not be designed to diminish the prestige of the presidency but would vastly curtail the time he is now devoting to their performance.

(C) The offices of the Vice President should be moved into the White House, and he should assume as many of the ceremonial functions as feasible and appropriate.

(D) There should be a strong Cabinet and fewer of the functions should be performed by the White House staff. This can only be done by invoking the assistance of highly competent men and women.

Now you have my prescription. It is highly unlikely that all of these components will ever be used. But should they be, let us hope that the patient survives.

*Dr. Livingston:* I really don't know which is the prospective and which is the proper remark. I do know that Amy Freeman Lee is in bad shape, for there is an ancient show business adage that says "never follow the juggler." Mrs. Lee is now going to have to follow the juggler. It is wholly appropriate I think that Leon Jaworski be the man to speak to the structural and organizational aspects of the presidency because it was he more than any other man who played that central and vital role in the complex and tragic events that demonstrated that what was viable was the presidency, not the President. To comment on Mr. Jaworski's prescriptions we have two distinguished Texans. The first will be Mrs. Amy Freeman Lee, long-time resident intellectual in San Antonio, principally known, I suggest, as an artist, as a painter, as an art critic who has put on what she has pleased to call "one-man shows" all over Texas and the Southwest. Her interests range over a broad arena of concerns — in the arts, theater, poetry, ballet, music, in education, libraries, wildlife of most any sort as well as in art and painting. She was a sometime student at the University of Texas and at other institutions; more recently she has served as a member of the University of Texas at Austin Fine Arts Advisory Council. The author of books, catalogs, articles, she is a critic of man and his works, including his political works. I present to you a distinguished citizen of San Antonio. I give you Amy Freeman Lee.

## RESPONSE OF AMY FREEMAN LEE

*LOOKING: Out to Sea  
In to See*

Often when we try to answer substantive questions including the one about the possible survival of the U.S. presidency, we look through the wrong end of the telescope, and we examine the incorrect objects. We should not be looking OUT TO SEA but IN TO SEE. Instead of scanning the outscapes, we should be scrutinizing the inscapes for the sake of analyzing ourselves as individual citizens of the democracy. Perhaps we would be more inclined to do just that if we would recall the following words of the eminent British writer, Aldous Huxley:

There's only one corner of the universe that you can be certain of improving, and that's your own self.

Surface appearances and superficial considerations of obvious elements never suffice and certainly not when the problem is as vital as that of the possible survival of the office of the President of the U.S. Because of our inability to use our imagination and to practice empathy, we human beings have shown little evidence that we are capable of learning from vicarious experience. As a result, most of us continue to repeat the mistakes of history.

If one takes even a cursory look at the routine of campaigning for the presidency, the absurdity of the physical demands alone becomes obvious immediately. The prodigious amount of personal appearances over a period of months requires the stamina of a professional athlete, and, consequently, throughout the campaign, the candidates prove to be far more peripatetic than prepared.

In addition, the economic demands grow ever more astounding. To spend \$250 million on one presidential campaign, in my opinion, is nothing short of obscene, especially in a world in which two out of three people are starving to death at the rate of 1,160 every hour. Last year alone, thirty million children under the age of five died of starvation. In view of these facts, even if we were to correct one of the major political procedural errors by abolishing the electoral college, the change would be primarily cosmetic.

To achieve a penetrating look, we should take the advice of the distinguished German writer, Goethe, who reminded us that if we wanted to read in the definitive sense, we must learn to read between the lines. One of our leading, contemporary educators, Dr. James Zumberge, has reiterated Goethe's suggestion by advising us to

examine "the hidden agenda" that lies beneath the surface. This approach is not only congruous and pertinent to a genuine philosophic society's *raison d'etre*, but in Holmesian terms, it is elementary.

Obviously, any objective approach takes into consideration the pros and cons of a subject, but since time is of the essence, let us place the spotlight on our limitations, since this is our best hope to improve. Specifically, to evaluate the essence of the U.S. presidency, we must not only see it in the full context of our society, but, above all else we must not be satisfied with a consideration of comparatively minor elements of civilization such as economics and politics, for they are merely reflections of the essence of our society. The society's core is constituted of the philosophic underpinnings and spiritual principles which determine human motivations, priorities and conduct. In colloquial terms, to arrive at an objective conclusion means that we must examine the proverbial powers behind the throne and capture a realistic portrait of the ubiquitous kingmakers.

Throughout our history, mankind has been fraught with practitioners of bi-directional rationalizations, which are passed off as philosophy. The exclusive concentration on self-interest motivates many people to move in two directions simultaneously. Politically speaking, they pull back as radical conservatives in the hopes of rushing forward to grasp great personal, material gains. Our society is inundated with salient characteristics that substantiate this fact. For example, the general lack of personal responsibility was made more than a little evident in the most recent presidential election in which more than fifty percent of the eligible voters did not bother to go to the polls. We also manifest a sustained desire for scapegoats in our evasion of personal responsibility. The very fact that we refer to our federal government as though it were a foreign enemy and to our press as the perennial distorter of facts shows how really desperate we are to find someone else or something else to blame. We are also inclined to worship The Unholy Trinity comprised of apathy, indifference and ignorance. Our basic desire seems to be how to become an autonomous big wheel instead of a sturdy spoke in the commonweal.

On a recent motor trip, I found our salient characteristics that form part of our "hidden agenda" to be not all that hidden after all. The ever present American graffiti provided insights into many aspects of our contemporary society. Scrawled on the walls of a powder room, I read: "The world is a ghetto." Indubitably, it is for far too many of us. Even moving traffic provided revealing indications by way of bumper stickers. One such sticker that would be hard to

surpass gave the following advice: "Have fun. Beat the hell out of someone you love." How sick can you get? Under a highway bridge, someone had drawn a swastika on a supporting wall and topped off the visual image with a verbal one that stated, "Medea is God." As you recall, Medea was the consummately destructive goddess of Greek legend.

In summary, we are simplistic, superficial, cynical and selfish. Ironically, the only constancy is change. Frequently, we change for the sake of change, because, for one thing, we forget that it is possible to change for the worse. We are far more frenetic than forensic. We demand simplistic answers and solutions to complex questions and problems. These childish urges account in large measure for the current syndrome of westernism and for our love affair with villainy. When you have the magic combination of the big hat on the head of J. R. Ewing, you are in business — big business. We seem so desperate for heroes to worship that we are eager to make one if necessary by trying to make a hero out of an anti-hero. Our insatiable appetite for immediate gratification proves that we have no real insight into the basic nature of politics or into the office of the presidency, which must function within the framework of constitutional boundaries.

The immutable principle of interrelatedness bespeaks the fact that you cannot separate our superficial analysis of the presidency from the superficiality that pervades the society in general. Our concentration and our focus is on image, charisma and surface appearance. Our oblique, tangential approach skirts the issues, and we are as unrealistic in our expectations as in our evaluations. We expect the President to wave magic wands and create miracles. Characters in television manage to create miracles in every episode, so why not the President?

Perhaps the gravest fault of all is our rampant cynicism. The dishonesty, intellectual and otherwise, is so widespread in our society and in our government, that the public is disillusioned and cynical. Through this psychological device of negativism, we have chosen a horrendous form of suicide. We used to define politics as the art of the possible. In reality, politics has become the craft of special interests personated by their well-heeled lobbyists. In the recent past, President Carter called for sacrifice on the part of every citizen. The sad truth is that practically nothing in the life pattern of western man in the twentieth century has prepared him for sacrifice. On the contrary, we have been trained to consume at any cost in order to boost our economy, and built-in obsolescence has been an integral

part of our entire economic thrust. If anyone sells you something and promises you that it will last a lifetime, he is lying to you unless you are in the last stages of a terminal disease.

Unfortunately, we have an arrogant way of dismissing those who oppose the *status quo* as unpatriotic, traitors, lunatics or gadflies. These insults are generally accompanied by implied threats. It is wise to remember that what appears to be a gadfly may, in reality, be a Godfly.

In the midst of all of these destructive thoughts and acts, what is a possible solution for problems besetting the U.S. presidency that would help to make its future secure? In my opinion, a development of "sacred discontents" in the form of non-violent, legal philosophic and spiritual revolutions would prove effective. Perhaps no one has stated the solution more succinctly than the late, distinguished psychiatrist, Dr. Carl Jung:

. . . only if we understand that we have an innate connection with the infinite will we be able to disconnect from trivia . . .

We are speaking of genuine philosophic and spiritual principles, not of absolutist concepts emanating from what is, in my opinion, a group of zealots characterized by religiosity and an obvious attempt to pass themselves off as a political front.

Our immediate job is not to look OUT TO SEA but to look IN TO SEE with our inner eye and to find the core of our spiritual selves, for this is the best antidote with which to combat mankind's persistent poison, selfishness. If we succeed in looking IN TO SEE, we have a sporting chance to save the office of the presidency and also the republic.

*Dr. Livingston:* So far as I know, I never saw Amy Freeman Lee in my life until last night. I wonder if you believe, as I do again, in love at first sight. I withdraw my earlier remark about jugglers. And I extend my sympathy to John Moseley who has two of them to follow.

John Moseley is another Texan of high achievement and high morals, and like Colonel Jaworski and Mrs. Lee, he is also the recipient of many honorary degrees. Although John Moseley is a cosmopolitan, he is mostly an East Texan. He was born in Greenville, he was educated at Commerce (also in Austin, I should add), and he spent the last quarter of a century in Sherman. But that doesn't tell you the whole story about John Moseley. After completing his bachelor-of-law and his master-of-arts degrees at Austin

in 1942, he went on to Washington for the war years. He helped organize the O.P.A. — indeed he became the director of administration in the O.P.A. He served in what was then called the Bureau of the Budget and he emerged from those war years in the Washington bureaucracy with a very lofty reputation for high-mindedness and for extraordinary skill in organizing new administrative entities and in managing them once they were organized.

Then after the war he was persuaded to come back to Texas— particularly back to Austin — to supervise the creation (and manage it once it was created) of one of the nation's early attempts at providing a legislature with adequate policy guidance, administrative advice, and legislative help. He created and managed the Texas Legislative Council, which is one of the models and forerunners of such institutions in the entire nation. He was also at that time my back door neighbor, and I claim the principal responsibility for his nurture and his success. He was always an interested and active member of any community of which he was a part, and he was especially active as a lay member of the Presbyterian Church, in which he has held virtually every office that is open to a layman. Unlike Mrs. Lee, he does sometimes include preaching in his habits.

In 1953 he went to the presidency of Austin College at Sherman, which he has molded into one of the really splendid, small, private liberal arts colleges in this region and in the nation. A couple of years ago he retired as President and became Chancellor of Austin College.

But it didn't make much difference: he's still John Moseley.

### RESPONSE OF JOHN D. MOSELEY

Mr. Jaworski has certainly given us an excellent reminder both of the historic beginnings of the office of the President and the experience and reactions of recent Presidents to this position. I think he's correct in his judgment regarding the status and the strength of the presidency, and that the people want and expect strong leadership.

I agree that the presidency will and must survive, but we must recognize, as Mr. Jaworski has pointed out, it's not the same job as was first created. One man now serves 53 times the constituency as the first President. We also have to admit that the complexity of the world, the interdependence of the problems, and the changed condition in which the presidency must operate call for some reforms of the presidency and the system to match these changed conditions.

It's easy for us to talk about the changed conditions, but I'm not so sure we realize the subtlety of the way in which those changes come about. We generally react to a particular event or problem and do not see what we are doing in terms of a total system. I think if we are going to respond to reforms in the presidency, we need to be as much concerned with the context in which that presidency is operating now and will operate in the future as we need to be concerned with its origin. And, therefore, I would like to make my response in terms of a list of five factors or conditions, five attitudes as it were, that may help us define or understand the context in which some of these reforms ought to be considered.

The first I've called the paradox of the educated citizen. It's interesting to me that as a nation, our founders designed a system of representative democracy we call a republic. But in the constitutional convention, our forefathers weren't so confident the masses could really govern themselves. Some of the language of the convention says they wanted to structure the representative type of democracy that would "define and enlarge the public view by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens" that would be wiser and more deliberate than possible in mass assemblies. Yet in the last 100 years or more, we have really bet on education. We said, let's educate all of the people so they can help make these decisions and have a broader base of educated citizenry. We have gone through the public education route with elementary and secondary schools. In the recent decade we've said let's have universal post-secondary education for all to go as far as they can in securing education. We have also established broad open access so that no one would be denied because of race, religion or even economic condition.

We are now seeing the impact of this broad base educated citizenry, not as an elite educated group for leadership, but for a broad base of citizen participation. That participation has become increasingly expressed as a right and has been carried over from government to other organizations so that a person now feels that when any decision affects his life or controls his destiny he or she has a right to participate in that decision. This has led to an increasing populist approach and a participatory democracy. We see evidence of this in demands for public referenda, Proposition 13 approaches, and recall petitions.

With all of this, however, we see the paradox of smaller percentages of registered voters voting in the presidential elections. In the last election, some refused to vote protesting that they did not like any of the candidates.

Second — and in some ways this is an outcome of the first — is the pluralistic nature of our society. We have increasingly developed an individualistic approach, each person wanting to do his own thing, to pursue his own interests and individual concerns. This has led not only to special interests and special lobbying but to one-issue politics with report cards on politicians on very specific issues, the latest example being the Moral Majority approach. This is a kind of evidence of the decline of representative government, for each individual feels that he or she is not represented in the legislative process if the legislator does not vote the “right” way, whether this is in the local school board or city council, the state legislature, or the Congress. We have not learned the skills of leadership for such a pluralistic society. Certainly, we cannot settle our future with a lowest common denominator.

Third, the impact of Watergate. Watergate had not only a devastating impact on the presidency, but it has created a new level of suspicion and cynicism throughout the nation and toward almost every level of government. The anti-government feeling, especially as that relates to political leaders and to the bureaucracy, is getting blamed for everything that is frustrating to individuals and groups. This has been accentuated on the part of the press in its investigative reporting where the right to know is greater than any responsibility of the government. We now have new ground rules of public information acts, open meetings that help us as citizens to know what is going on but which have compounded the problems and made us all very suspicious of government leadership. This tends to make some of the most capable leaders of our nation refuse government service.

Fourth, Dean Rostow made much of her excellent address on this fourth point — the impact of electronic communication and journalism. I don't believe we have thought about this or taken it into account in terms of the structure of the system or how basically this affects our life. The impact of television on the nature of the political system has been tremendous. It has been evident that an interview can make or break a presidential candidate. The primary processes and TV coverage have changed the style and personal characteristics of the candidates. It has changed our system of selection so that political parties and their conventions are much less significant. The electoral college, necessary in the beginning of our nation, is now of questionable usefulness. The kind of additional communication breakthroughs and ability to respond as well as receive may offer new kinds of possibilities for instant citizen response and communi-



cation. The predictors and the results of the polls being quickly announced have undoubtedly affected the election process. This is a tremendous new force that has not been adequately understood nor taken into account in the system of our government.

Fifth, the evolutionary change of our society which history records is becoming so rapid that it is almost revolutionary — in terms of technology, values, economic and social processes.

Look at the impact of the changes on the lives of people, the frustration they experience as their styles of life and values change. Still they expect a President to point the way, to provide leadership to cope with the new dimensions of life.

Look at the global situation in terms of population, hunger, the threat of a nuclear holocaust. The impact of the presidency in world leadership is more significant than ever.

if these are at least some of the dimensions of the context in which the presidency is to operate, and there are needs for new techniques and new skills and new structures that are required, perhaps we had better think about the presidency, not only in historic terms and in regard to the powers and current leaderships, but also in terms of the future. The future is obviously going to be quite different from the present, one that involves new ways of life, possibly more north-south global concerns than the previous east-west. Concerns grow over the haves and the have-nots in a world grown small with new technologies of communication and travel, and indeed involving space exploration and possible colonization and manufacturing. Peter Drucker, in a new book, says that the planning techniques — the projections and trends, etc. — of the 1960s and 70s just won't be adequate for the turbulent times of the 80s and 90s. The presidency must take into account the changed future as reforms are considered.

This is the new context, and we must be concerned with what reforms an individual needs, not just to have the presidency survive but to provide the leadership and the challenge necessary for a great nation and necessary for a world of freedom and peace.

## ANNUAL BANQUET

### PRESIDENT DURWOOD FLEMING PRESIDING

President Fleming called on the Reverend Ralph Henderson Shuffler II to give the Invocation.

After dinner Mrs. Lyndon Johnson introduced the banquet speaker, Liz Carpenter.

MRS. JOHNSON: The privilege of introducing our main speaker tonight is one I undertook with great delight — and I must admit — a little trepidation! It is difficult to describe Liz Carpenter in just a few words!

But, one thing I know I must include is that Liz is a fifth generation Texan. Her roots are deep in this State. She is a descendent of Sterling Clack Robertson, the early colonizer who brought 600 families to settle in Central Texas between 1821 and 1835, and also a descendent of George Childress, one of the signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

A graduate of The University of Texas at Austin, Liz began her career in Washington, D.C. as a reporter, where several years later she would found and co-direct the Carpenter News Bureau with her late husband, Les. They covered the Washington scene for 18 newspapers in the Southwest. In 1960, Liz joined the Kennedy-Johnson campaign, and then Lyndon's vice presidential staff. When we moved to the White House, she became my press secretary and staff director, and a companion and indispensable helpmate down many roads of my life since.

Liz is the author of a best-selling book, *Ruffles and Flourishes*, a former vice president of Hill and Knowlton, the world's largest public relations firm, a frequent contributor to national magazines and Texas newspapers, and is best known now as the Assistant Secretary of Education for Public Affairs.

Her many awards have included the National Headliner Award of Women in Communication, and outstanding woman of the year in public affairs and politics by *The Ladies Home Journal*. She has been honored by the Business Council of the United Nations for her contributions in the field of equal rights and is a distinguished alumna of The University of Texas.

Liz brings to life boundless energy and a lively, facile mind bubbling with ideas. She is an effervescent mix of creativity, humor, grass roots common sense and compassion.

Most of us perceive Liz as a mover and shaker, and I have heard

her identified as a great natural force like the sun or Niagara Falls. But, she is also the first person her friends turn to in quiet times of need — if there is a death in the family or an emergency in the middle of the night, Liz is that rare person who makes your cares her own.

Mother of two children, devoted grandmother, loving friend, a success in her careers in the news media, government, and as an author and journalist, I am extremely proud to invite Liz Carpenter to the podium.

## THE FUTURE OF THE REPUBLIC

ELIZABETH (“LIZ”) CARPENTER

Mrs. Johnson, have you ever thought of being a press secretary?

Sister and brother philosophers, I’m deeply touched by Mrs. Johnson’s being here to introduce me. We’ve been part of each other’s “entrances” and “exits” to Washington forever, it seems. I’m even more flattered knowing she had to cut short a favorite excursion to see some of the few remaining examples of a passing species — the whooping cranes.

We “admitted Democrats” also fight extinction — we struggle to take flight, but once aloft, and soaring — what a sight to behold! Thank you for always being on hand to try and save us.

And, thank you for inviting me to speak. I’m amazed — but flattered — that anyone wants to hear what those of us in the Carter Administration have to say at this stage of the political season.

Of course, I was not your first choice for speaker tonight. When Mrs. Johnson, ever honest and considerate, called me one Sunday morning last summer to relay your invitation, she gently made that clear. John Connally had been asked. Then, George Bush had been asked. It was August. How did they know then they would not be available at this time and I would?

I am not hard to get. As it turned out, I am totally available — one slightly used assistant secretary with fine old Chippendale legs. Available for everything: making speeches; singing duets in a swing band with Amy Freeman; rebuilding old political parties; enjoying the lost art of conversation and ready for high adventure. Trying to keep myself alive and well, laughing in Adolfo suits and pearls — trying to learn how to roll an orange down an airplane aisle.

Therefore, I stand here tonight, a lame duck who is limping but still quacking — an object of Ronald Reagan’s hit list, not once, but

twice. I am a woman for the Equal Rights Amendment, now and forevermore. I work for the new Department of Education which we hope will not become the late-lamented Department of Education. Age spares me revenge from the Reagan abortion plank.

And — I can bring you this good news from Washington: Hard liquor is back at the White House. Hollywood has also substituted popcorn for peanuts.

How to relieve this winter of my discontent? Humor certainly helps! One of the most amusing things these days is the number of Republicans who were born again on November 5. One staunch Republican heard from 82 known Democrats after election day — all of them declaring, "Isn't it terrific, WE won!"

Face it, friends, we are seeing the wonderful world of politics at its funniest. This is the season when normally rational people lose their balance and behave like a pack of dogs chasing one batch of leftovers. If you are marked for extinction, it is resumé time. Resumé advice is rampant throughout Washington:

- \* If you've been an active feminist, play that down.
- \* If you've worked for Republicans in the past, play that up.
- \* If you know influential Republicans, use them as references.
- \* Buy a new Reagan bumper sticker — preferably from Justin Dart's drugstore.
- \* Write if you get work.

This quadrennial run-for-jobs for "ins" or "outs" is no new thing. It even dates back to the beginning of this country. When George Washington took office, he found "three thousand applicants for Federal employment even before a single job was created."

The spoils system reached its worst during the Administration of Honest Abe, who had to put up with job-hungry Republicans enjoying their first victory after the birth of their political party. They flocked to the Capitol demanding employment to pay for party services. The restless tromp of job seekers up and down the White House stairways was to plague Lincoln during his Administration. "I am like a man so busy letting rooms at one end of his house that he has no time to put out the fire that is blazing and destroying at the other end." When he became ill with smallpox, Lincoln rejoiced and invited them in because "at last, I have something I can give to all of them."

If I have any claim to this podium, it is that I have done time in Washington — 35 years of it. I've grown accustomed to the place: its smiles, its frowns, its ups and downs are second nature to me now. I went there in 1942 after graduating from The University of

Texas. I arrived with my journalism degree in hand and my virtue intact. I still have my journalism degree. I was brunette, and so naive, I thought the body politic was a Congressman's wife.

Then came the night when Wilbur Mills got hold of Burt Reynolds' pacemaker and there was hell to pay all over town.

During my early years as a reporter covering the Capitol and White House, I worked with both editors and politicians who could drive you to drink — and sometimes they did. My editor at *Variety* once told me, "Liz, write everything like you've had two martinis. Better still, have two martinis!" Those were some of my happiest years in Washington — to the best of my recollection.

Strange that I would have been back in Washington this year. Strange because after the 34 years there from FDR to Jimmy Carter, I had returned to Texas in 1976 to lead a quieter, saner life. So much for good intentions!

But just when I had settled in to enjoy the blue skies of Texas, the deer feeding on my geraniums, just when my Jacuzzi reached sensual perfection, the new Secretary of the new Department of Education telephoned. With persuasion I hadn't heard since LBJ lifted me up by the ears, she insisted: "I need you; America needs you." I was about to tell her I wasn't all that valuable, when I said to myself, "Who am I to contradict a Cabinet officer?" I was in Washington before my Jacuzzi was cold!

It wasn't the bright lights and high living of Washington that lured me, but my sense that in a time when so few things work, education, above all things, should work. I thought I should do what I could to make the new department work. "Education is a loan to be repaid with the gift of self." That is a line Lady Bird Johnson once used in a speech at Radcliffe, and it, like she, marked my life.

I went. I worked. We created a Department that will help education progress in our still unfinished society, help lift our sights along with the lamp of learning. Here I am back again in Texas permanently.

Durwood Fleming set the topic for tonight. What is the future of the Republic? I offered half a dozen other topics, but he stuck to his. Throughout the weeks that followed, I found my mind going back to that question because it is a challenge to speak to an audience as divergent in age as Christopher Harte and Dr. Richardson and as divergent in thought as Walter Hall and Abner McCall. I can say now the topic is inspired . . . so timely, it is as though Durwood Fleming knew months ago what the fate of the recent election would

be. Not even the pollsters knew. And certainly those of us toiling out there on the campaign trail did not have a hint about the potential changes that would occur in our political history on November 4.

What is the future of the Republic? In a sentence — the Republicans are going to smile, the Democrats are going to gripe; the press is going to make mischief for the “ins”; the lobbyists and the lawyers are going to make money from both the “ins” and the “outs.” It is ever thus.

The question of who will smile is determined every four years after we engage in our periodic civil war, proving once again that this nation — this Democracy — can long endure.

Over and over, we have managed to survive what de Tocqueville, with his Gallic genius, marvelled at as early as 1835:

For a long time, the election becomes the important and all-engrossing topic of discussion. Factional ardor is redoubled and all the artificial passions which the imagination can create in a happy and peaceful land are agitated and brought to light . . . as soon as the choice is determined, this ardor is dispelled, calm returns, and the river, which had nearly broken its banks, sinks to its usual level; but who can refrain from astonishment that such a storm should have arisen?

In the past, we Americans have always had a whopping good time during our political storms. Maybe not the candidates. But the bands, the bunting, the buttons, the crazy songs, the crazier hats, and all the hoopla and trappings — and occasionally some good speeches.

When I think of campaigning as I came to know and love it, I see a day in 1960 in Culpepper, Virginia. Running as the Democratic Vice Presidential candidate, LBJ was whistlestopping Dixie for votes for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket against Richard Nixon when our train stopped in Culpepper. LBJ stood on the back platform of the red, white and blue draped train as the crowd gathered around — a crowd of townspeople and farmers from neighboring counties. He was so wound up, he just didn't want to wind down, so he kept on talking. Knowing we were already late at the next stop 30 miles down the track, the time-keepers signaled the engine to pull out of the station with LBJ still talking. But even the moving train didn't stop him. He shouted back at his audience, still standing there amazed at this spectacle, “I ask you, what did Dick Nixon ever do for Culpepper?”

One old gentleman standing near the track shook his cane, and shouted back at the departing candidate, “Hell, what did anyone ever do for Culpepper?” As it turned out — we did a lot for Culpepper —

from Headstart to Medicare. Programs that filled in the gaps for the less fortunate American, and showed our faith in people. That to me was personal campaigning at its best — the speech before the townspeople, the doubting questioner, the results.

I didn't worry about policies so much when candidates were out in the hustings and the public participated in the campaigns. But today elections are a spectator sport for most voters. Television and a conglomerate press devour all the political dollars and most of the fun. Even buttons and bumper stickers are in short supply. As a personal link the public tunes in on the image of its candidates thousands of miles away from them and their managers. The formula of the political manipulators — pollsters and PR people and all the show — seems to be: Shrink American politics to TV tube size, serve up the pabulum, gimmicks rather than issues, style over substance — our vision of reality is in the eye of the TV director.

Believe it or not — our least known, least useful President, Millard Fillmore, predicted this very formula for success long ago: he advised any candidate to “wear a clean shirt, never swear in company, and never utter a sentiment that all the asses around you don't recognize as that of a good friend.”

I believe political parties should be more than money changers — they must also be soul searchers. So this fall I went out campaigning to all sorts of unlikely places for — as it turned out — an unlikely candidate. Three guitar players and a handful of us riding in Buddy Temple's posh camper bus attacked 29 courthouse squares in Texas. The one that stands out in my mind is Edna in Jackson County. Inside the courthouse — where we had to literally “pull out” our crowd — the somewhat reluctant county office holders on the Democratic ticket — I noticed a mail bag divided into two parts. One side read “Edna” — the other said, “Rest of the world.” (Obviously, we scrapped the speech on the SALT Talks!)

Outside was just as disillusioning. I kept noticing one attentive listener with a Reagan button on his hat, squinting at me. I thought of my father's warning “to never trust a man with his eyes set too close together.” After our speeches and immortal words, this man came up to me and said, “Liz, I'm your cousin Frank, and I certainly hope you don't believe all that Indian Medicine you're putting out.” So much for my personal campaigning!

With that as a prelude, I thought it might be worthwhile this evening to ponder our country, our role in it, winner or loser. What do we do with the rest of our lives in the life of our country? What

can we do to keep complacency from robbing us of the meaning of our lives? We need commitments that are larger than our own egos, and we need to keep them whether we are the "ins" or the "outs."

Looking over this crowd, I'd say we all have at least four more years — if we take our Geritol and stay off Razorback airlines. Many of us have 10, 20, 30 or maybe 50 years to go.

What do we do to renew our goals — so we don't throw out the baby with the bathwater?

Yes, there are troubles with single-issue politics and yet they did sensitize blind and deaf political parties to the reality that this is not an all-white, all-male world.

Party conventions were friendlier when there were only 9 percent women as delegates, and virtually no minorities. But they never looked like America and they weren't American.

There are troubles with an oversized bureaucracy. Everything seems too big.

Now as I lie awake nights worrying like a mother hen about how to find nests for all my schedule C chicks — I do privately smile in visualizing the "new folks" grappling with the new bureaucratise — the hand-to-hand combat with the waiting bureaucracy that I so recently discovered when I returned to Washington last year.

In my White House years, I was near the center of power. In the bureaucracy — the Cabinet — you are farther from the center, vying for power. So, for the first time I met what Maury Maverick always called "gobbledygook." In the bureaucracy, the experts never use a single syllable when they can tell it in five. The first day I arrived at the Department, they kept talking about FIPSI — I thought it was that frizzy haired blonde down the hall — only to discover that she was like BEOGS and SEOGS, a government program.

You see, unfortunately, someone from the Harvard Business School wandered into Washington a few years ago and changed everything, creating a whole new management class of government workers who speak ACRONYM — a strange new tongue to me, graduate of the Rayburn-Johnson School of Personal Politics.

The GS levels of government service still do not come trippingly off my tongue. I had never met an organizational chart face to face. Indeed, I had never known anyone over the age of 10 who spent their time drawing squares and lines and shading little boxes in crayons with the primary colors. Frankly, I have never met a computer I really liked.

I am shocked that I could have lived so long without knowing the importance of all of this. But to show you what a fast learner I am,



I soon found myself secretly drawing lines and little boxes and shading them in red, blue and yellow.

Of course, this isn't what is going to make the government programs work. Somewhere between the technocrats and the idea-o-crats, the mechanics and the creators, we lose a lot, not only in education, but in all the potentials we seek for our country, whether it is more energy resources or clean air. Even in the best of Administrations, too much is lost between olympic ideas, charts and humans.

If we want a truly educated country, somehow we have to master the art of taking little children with their bright, flowering curiosity and help them retain it through life. Too often, it is wilted, gilded and bronzed by the process. Somehow we must be smart enough and care enough to do this for all our mutual needs; the way we live, the way we move about, the air we breathe, the scenes we look upon.

More and more, as I think about the future, I follow three simple basic beliefs. First, that we are now the forefathers of this land; second, that we the people are the Republic; and finally, that we are the future of the Republic.

These points trigger a further question: Have we as a Republic lost our ability to dream? People who concern themselves only with the stockpiles and levels of this and that make me wonder if we have lost sight of the American dream? Have we lost sight of the HUMANITIES and what they do to shape every individual into something that is more true and more beautiful.

There are sensible answers to be found in the give and take of democracy. Of course, the government "regs" need more common sense at the top and less complacency at the grassroots. But unleash Detroit, and we'll cough ourselves to death. The bilingual education plans may be tough and costly, but do we really want to leave floundering 3½ million kids (the exact population of America when our Constitution was written)? What a difference their salvation can make to our tax bills if they can emerge from our school system — whole, working citizens! What a lot of misery if they don't — and a miserable reflection on us if we weed them out of society as slow learners. This country with all its mechanical superiority suffers an anti-intellectual approach to languages. So many of the hand-wringers and doomsday prophets simply want to close their eyes to reality. They prefer no answers to imperfect answers.

Two thinkers I respect have supported this notion: John Gardner claims that the best-kept secret in America today is that people would rather work hard for something they believe in than enjoy

pampered idleness. John Mason Brown says: "Existence is a strange bargain. Life owes us little. We owe it everything. The only true happiness comes from squandering ourselves for a purpose." I know he is right, and only by squandering ourselves — using our clout for a purpose — can we find satisfaction in life.

What is the future of the Republic? No one knows — but something inside me insists on being optimistic. Perhaps it is our youth as a nation, our questioning and our soul-searching for values.

In the eyes of the world, our country is an obstreperous teenager, struggling with its conscience to make the right decisions. We should think of ourselves that way; as growing, struggling, mellowing — but far from spent. We have learned, as maturity always teaches, it is not as important to be "first" as to be constant.

I have been thinking a lot about my own time and my country's this year particularly. Maybe it was my 60th birthday that did it. That and some overly enthusiastic friends who produced three cakes and 180 candles! It was truly a breathtaking celebration. Blowing out those candles made me aware that I have been alive almost a third of the life of this nation.

I invite you to reach back in your mind to the person you have known that stretches time back the farthest. Add it to your own years and see how much of our 200-year national life your personal ties encompass.

I did this, and for me it took me back to 1865 and Lincoln's funeral train. I wasn't there, but when I was a high school reporter, I interviewed a Confederate veteran who had stood on the rail siding near Springfield, Illinois and watched the casket of the 16th President slowly roll past. How much struggling that milestone in America embodied! Yet, "lilacs did by the dooryard bloom!"

Some of us, through people we personally have known, can almost touch the birth of the nation. It was not too long ago that Francis Biddle, the Attorney General under Franklin Roosevelt, celebrated his eightieth birthday. He, too, marvelled at the youth of America, recalling that as a five-year-old boy he sat on the knee of his 95-year-old grandfather, who told him how he had entertained General Lafayette when the General came to Philadelphia in 1826.

Biddle had another story that day, reaching even further back into American history. He was a striving law clerk to Chief Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Holmes' 93rd birthday, by chance, was the eighth birthday of Biddle's son.

Holmes wrote the boy a note that said, in essence: "This won't mean much to you now, but when I was your age, my grandmother

told me how she had to leave Boston at age 20 because General Washington was coming. The American Revolution had begun! When you are older you will realize you have been talking to a man whose grandmother was present during the Revolutionary War — and you're only three people apart — from my grandmother, to me, to you."

I became so intrigued with our own personal links to history that I started asking everyone about their connections to the past. One friend had a grandmother who told her of watching the Cherokee Indians pass her home in northern Alabama on the Trail of Tears. My nephew's grandmother was the only survivor of the last Indian raid on the Texas frontier — she was scalped, lived to tell about it and, he claims, never once referred to Indians as "native Americans." My oldest brother met an ancient woman from Mexico who kept talking about seeking the "Redcoats" in her childhood — Maximilian's Army, no doubt. Last night, Watt Matthews told me his grandmother was born in 1816. When he was a child, she would tell him of Indian raids in West Texas. "Were you scared?" he would ask. "No, but I was all fired mad about it," was her reply.

I picked up another story from Guiche Kooock, one of my traveling campaign companions. He told of his thesis he had written at Texas A&M about the children of slaves. One woman was about 115 years old and he asked, "How did you live so long, Aunt Toad?"

"Buddy, I'll tell you how I lived 115 years. I wuz born a long time ago, and I ain't daid yet!"

So much for Aggie questions!

So our American memories can stretch from our Revolution to the atom bomb, from Bunker Hill to Hiroshima and the space shots.

Now here we are — just entering a fresh, new decade and the carriers of gloom are saying we have reached a time of limits and must prepare to get along with less — that we are militarily weak and this may bring a nuclear holocaust — that our political parties are crumbling and our Presidency has become so weak that NO person can govern effectively.

As George Bush would say, "Balderdash!"

One of the few constructive results of the years of distrust which were spawned by the 60's and 70's is a new do-it-yourself attitude. Perhaps we've come to trust leaders and institutions less — Presidents, political parties, the AMA or Ralph Nader — but we trust ourselves more. There is a burst of "how-to" classes in auto mechanics or gourmet cooking, writing, plumbing and art. People are finding their own personal solutions to the energy crisis. Once again

Americans are showing their capacity to cope with change — creatively and imaginatively. It is mind-boggling to contemplate how rapidly things change.

Fifty percent of the American people earn their living in industries that didn't exist in the 1920's — radio, television, airlines, computers, plastics, heart surgery — to name a few. Education, fraught with all its problems, is bursting all around us.

In 1960, there were three and a half million college students in this country. Today there are 12 million — more than half are women and many minorities are among them. We're seeing third generation black college students. The corporation that doesn't have women in its hierarchy is paying for it. With all the searching and tumult of the last 20 years, we are moving history forward — helping the country mature. It is our country and its undaunted people that has produced and absorbed the great human liberation movements of recent years — from the Civil Rights revolution to the movement for women's rights.

Consider this: We have been the only nation in the universe without a minister or secretary of education. But we have brought that along now and made room at the President's table for education, along with "transportation," "agriculture," "energy," and other priorities.

The Department of Education has symbolized something worthwhile. Its existence affirms that this nation of farmers and merchants and scholars and workers believes in education and believes the country's future depends upon it. I heave a silent sigh of relief knowing that around that Cabinet table in 1980 the conversation turned once and a while from the nuclear arms race or the demise of the social security system to a discussion of the future of education. It happened because there was a Secretary of Education sitting there who liked to bring up the subject.

We put a man on the moon because John F. Kennedy — seeking a soaring dream that would lift the American spirit — had promised we would and from that achievement, thousands of blessings have flowed — from micro-computers to medical electronics to our recent closeup of the rings and moons of Saturn.

Our technical genius has its darker side, of course; we see it in the shadows cast by Three Mile Island and Love Canal. Again, history supports our belief that our society has the capacity to correct its worst excesses. If there are those who want to abandon environmental safeguards, there are also millions of citizens who will not

listen to the siren songs of the spoilers. They don't want to live their lives in polluted air.

If a pious and absolutist "moral majority" arises, it quickly is faced by a strong and reasoned opposition. Bill Moyers' incisive interview with the Rev. Jerry Fallwell was barely off the air, for example, when Norman Lear was rousing people and money to sponsor TV spots stressing that the American way is the way of many viewpoints, often in one family, and we are stronger for it. We reject an interventionist God or a monopoly on morality. "God's work must truly be our own."

If there are those who believe today that every foreign policy problem requires a military solution, there are millions of others with a different idea, that armies and missiles alone are not sufficient; that our ultimate weapons are our brains, our innovative diplomats, our educated and committed citizenry who will make peace work.

This constant play of contrary opinions in our Democracy works. It exposes divisions — but it also yields consensus. It is healthy.

It insures us against the stifling of stereotypes.

To be sure, the Democratic process eats up precious time. We have been too slow in rearranging our cities for human happiness. Only now are we really realizing how much difference the planners, the architects make. We have been slow to extend the blessings of freedom to all of our people. But the world is a better place because America's black citizens took to the streets to say "enough," and because women questioned their second-class status and because our nation responded with the underlying conscience of the American mind.

If I could make one plea, it is that as individuals and as practicing citizens, we stop searching for the heroes of yesterday; stop yearning for our departed forefathers as if they had all the answers — Lincoln, Jefferson, Rayburn, Truman, the Roosevelts — Teddy and Franklin — Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson and Hubert Humphrey; we look back and yearn for the inspiration of John F. Kennedy; the spirit and perception of Lyndon Johnson and his talent for moving the unmovable — a Gerald Ford who rather heroically set about restoring trust. Let us apply their wisdom — but let us rely upon ourselves.

It is 1980. We are the forefathers — the hope — the fully wise men and women the world must rely on. It is we who must surmount the treacherous tides that sweep our country — who must keep commitments, our senses, our balance, through the causes we embrace,

the checks we write, the words we speak, where we spend our strength and purpose.

I like the way philosopher Peter Drucker says it:

The past is going fast . . . A time like this is not comfortable, secure, lazy. It is a time when tides of history over which we have no control sweep over the individual. Everyone must be ready to take over alone and without notice and show himself saint or hero, villain or coward. The great roles are played out in one's daily life, in one's work, in one's citizenship, in one's compassion, or lack of it, in one's courage to stick to an unpopular principle, and in one's refusal to sanction man's inhumanity to man in an age of cruelty and moral numbness.

In a time of change and challenge, the individual is both all-powerless and all-powerful. He is powerless, however exalted his station, if he believes that he can impose his will, that he can command the tides of history. He is all-powerful, no matter how lowly, if he knows himself to be responsible.

What has saved us throughout our vibrant and successful history as a nation are those individuals who are individually responsible toward our dream of a civilized society. Many of them you know, many of them are you.

All about me I see the stirrings and struggles of a creative people; an imaginative, courageous, intelligent people. And what I see in the present makes me optimistic about the future of our Republic — even though I cannot discern its shape. It is in good hands because they are our hands — and praise God — free to work at our country's unfinished agenda.

“What is this I hear of sorrow and weariness, anger, discontent and drooping hopes?” It was the old woman, Lucinda Matlock, who asked that question in *Spoon River Anthology* and she answered it:

“Degenerate sons and daughters, life is too strong for you. It takes life to love life.”

That is what the future of our Republic must be . . . loving life and living it with strength.

# N E C R O L O G Y

## LEO BREWSTER

1903 - 1979

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE LEO BREWSTER, WHO FOR 18 years served on the firing line in the American sociological revolution, died at age 76 at his home in Fort Worth on November 27, 1979. He was born in Fort Worth on October 16, 1903, the son of C. B. and Mary (Thomas) Brewster.

The first case assigned Judge Brewster, after President Kennedy named him in 1961 a jurist for the Northern District of Texas, was the Fort Worth school desegregation suit. As judge for what he called "the people's court," he presided over many legal actions which made newspaper headlines in Texas and in other states where he was sent to be presiding judge. He was the judge for cases growing out of Vietnam protest demonstrations and for many racial disturbances. His legal views and opinions can be read in court records, such words as:

"Decisions should be made on the basis of what's right, not who's right."

"There can be no discrimination, no lack of equality under the law. Very few people would want it otherwise. It is the person who is the exception to this rule who causes trouble on the one hand, and on the other, the person who is asking for favored treatment instead of equality."

"One of the badges of maturity is discipline. Discipline means that one has to learn he cannot have everything he wants just because he wants it and that he cannot refuse to do a lot of things he would rather not do."

Judge Brewster explained his philosophy to a New York jury after he had successfully completed a case involving dissidents who had disrupted earlier trials, but had agreed to his edict that they bathe and comb their hair before appearing in his court. "I have found that it is a lot easier to keep troubles from getting started than it is to stop them after they get started. That is the reason I have been as strict here as I have," he said. "Strict," he said, meant cleanliness and respect for the law.

Judge Brewster was the eldest of three remarkably successful brothers who grew up in Fort Worth. One brother, Harris, became a justice on the Second Texas Court of Civil Appeals. The other brother, Burke, became a Fort Worth physician. Leo received his

degree from the University of Texas law school in 1926 and returned to Fort Worth to practice. His firm grew to be the partnership of Brewster, Pannel, Dean and Kerry. Active in Fort Worth civic circles, he became involved in professional affairs. He was president of the Fort Worth-Tarrant County Bar Association, served seven years on the board of the State Bar of Texas, and was president of the State Bar in 1958. He was elected to membership in The Philosophical Society of Texas in 1961.

Judge Brewster is survived by his wife, the former Lois Rice, a daughter, Mrs. Ben Rollert of Luling, his two brothers, four grandchildren and a great-grandson.

—K. D.

---

### MORGAN J. DAVIS

1898 - 1979

MORGAN J. DAVIS, SON OF JOHN WESLEY AND GABRELLA (JONES) DAVIS, was born at Anson on November 19, 1898. He was former Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Exxon Company U.S.A., and died at the age of 81 in Houston, Texas on December 31, 1979. He had a distinguished career as a petroleum geologist and oil company executive.

After receiving a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Texas in 1925, he joined Humble Oil & Refining Company and his entire business career was spent with that company except for the period 1929 to 1934 when he led geological expeditions in Java and Sumatra for Nederlandsche Kolaniole Petroleum Nij.

After serving in positions of increasing responsibility, Mr. Davis became Chief Geologist for Humble in 1941, Vice President in 1951, President of Exxon Company U.S.A. in 1956, and Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer in 1961.

He received numerous awards and was recognized by many organizations such as the Distinguished Service Award from Texas Mid-Continent Oil and Gas, the Award for Service from the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, an Honorary Life Member of the Houston Geological Society, membership in Sigma Gamma Epsilon, an honorary earth science fraternity, and Sigma Iota Epsilon, an honorary business fraternity. He also served as President of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. He was a member of the National Petroleum Council, and was a member and served on the Board of Directors of the American Petroleum Institute. Mr.



Davis also was a member of the Committee to Visit the Division of Geological Sciences at Harvard College, and the Committee to Visit the Harvard Business School. He served on the Alumni Advisory Committee on the Advanced Management Program at Harvard's Graduate School of Business Administration. He was a member and past Chairman of the Advisory Council of the Geology Foundation of the University of Texas. Mr. Davis was a member and served on the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas. He was a member of the American Institute of Mining, the Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers, the Texas Academy of Science, the American Geographical Society. He was a member and served as President of the Geological Society of America. He was a member of the Philosophical Society of Texas, a member and served on the Board of Directors of the Houston Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Davis was past Chairman, and a member of the Board of Trustees of the United Fund of Houston and Harris County. He was a Mason and a member of the Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity. Mr. Davis also held memberships in several scientific and cultural institutions such as the National Space Hall of Fame, where he served as President, the Permian Basin Petroleum Museum, the Energy Task Force, the Energy Research and Education Foundation, the Harris County Heritage Society, the Houston Citizens Committee, the Houston Area Forum, the Institute of Religion, and the Houston Committee of Foreign Relations. He served on the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees of the Houston Museum of Natural Science; was a member of National Citizens Committee; was on the Board of Trustees of St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital; was a member of the American Museum of Natural History and the Smithsonian Institution; served on the Board of Trustees of Kinkaid School; and was past Chairman of Radio Free Europe. Mr. Davis published several geographical papers in the *Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists*.

In 1947 Mr. Davis graduated from the Harvard Business School, Advanced Management Program and in 1964 received an Honorary Doctorate degree in Engineering from the Colorado School of Mines.

Mr. Davis is survived by his wife, Veta Clare Moore Davis, whom he married in 1926, by two sons, Morgan J. Davis, Jr. and James Harrison Davis, and seven grandchildren, all of Houston.

—H. P.

## JUNE HYER

1920 - 1980

JUNE HYER, THE FOUNDING VICE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST OF the University of Houston at Clear Lake City, died of a heart attack November 29, 1980, in Austin.

Dr. Hyer, born on June 12, 1920, at Sutton, West Virginia, became affiliated with the University of Houston in 1947. She also served as Academic Vice President and Dean of Faculties at the University of Texas at San Antonio and as adjunct Professor at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.

Ms. Hyer earned bachelor of arts, bachelor of science and master of arts degrees at the Texas State College for Women (now Texas Woman's University) at Denton. She earned her Ph.D. at the University of Texas at Austin.

During her career, Dr. Hyer held many legislative committee memberships. Among them were the Senate Interim Committee for Human Services and the Senate Interim Committee on Welfare Reform.

In 1972, she was appointed executive research assistant for Lieutenant Governor Bill Hobby. Governor Dolph Briscoe subsequently named her to the Joint Advisory Committee on Government Operations in 1975.

During the administration of Governor John Connally, Dr. Hyer served as assistant staff director of the committee of 25 which studied higher education and led the way to the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System.

Dr. Hyer was honored with numerous awards, including the Carl Bredt Award from the University of Texas for excellence in public affairs; the American Association of University Women Fellowship Abroad; the 3M Award for Geographic Research, and the Women of Achievement Award from the Texas AAUW.

In the last 15 years, Dr. Hyer had a direct hand in every major legislative change in education from elementary through university level.

In bringing academic knowledge and disciplines to bear on the problems of government, it generally is conceded that Dr. Hyer established a tradition of cooperation with government that should be maintained.

Her outstanding talk on "History Makers and Preservers of the Philosophical Society of Texas," appeared in the *Proceedings* for 1979 (pp. 9-20).

—W. P. H., JR.

## RALPH WRIGHT STEEN

1905 - 1980

RALPH WRIGHT STEEN, PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY, died in Nacogdoches on January 23, 1980. He was born December 26, 1905 in Clyde, the son of Preston Cunningham and Maude (Fleming) Steen.

After graduating from Clyde High School, he attended McMurry College in Abilene where he received a bachelor of arts degree. In college he became interested in history and changed his career plans. He enrolled at the University of Texas in Austin where he earned a master of arts degree in 1929 and later a doctor of philosophy degree.

Dr. Steen's teaching experience included McMurry College, the University of Texas in Austin, Reagan County High School at Big Lake, and Hillsboro Junior College. In 1935, he joined the staff of Texas A&M University in College Station in its history department where he spent the next 23 years, the last four as head of the department.

Dr. Steen became president of Stephen F. Austin State University on November 1, 1958, and retired from the position in June of 1976. Rapid growth of the University took place during Dr. Steen's 18-year period on the campus.

In the spring of 1976, the University's new library which was opened in 1973, was named in his honor. On the eve of his retirement, at the library dedication ceremony, Walter Todd of Dallas, chairman of the board of regents at that time, said, "Dr. Steen and SFA have formed a dynamic combination during these 18 years which long will be remembered as the most progressive period in the history of the University. It is fitting that we name the library in his honor as a tribute to the outstanding leadership he has provided the institution."

Recognized for many years as a noted author and historian as well as a leading educator, Dr. Steen wrote 15 books on Texas and American history and government, and several of his texts have been used in the Texas public schools.

In 1972, Dr. Steen received an award for "distinguished service to higher education in Texas" from the Texas Association of State Senior College and University Business Officers.

During 1973-74, he served as president of the Association of Texas Colleges and Universities. He was an active member of several historical associations, having served as president of the Texas State Historical Association and of the East Texas Historical Association.

In 1974, Dr. Steen received the Nacogdoches County Chamber of Commerce "Outstanding Citizen" award. He was a director of the Nacogdoches Savings and Loan Association, and a member of the Nacogdoches Rotary Club.

Dr. Steen was married to Gladys Edmonds on August 20, 1929, and she died on September 21, 1965. They were parents of one son, Joe Ralph.

—D. H. W.

---

## LON TINKLE

1906 - 1980

CALLED BY *Publishers' Weekly* "THE MOST CIVILIZED MAN IN TEXAS," Lon Tinkle was internationally acclaimed. He was a man of quality who brightened our lives and redeemed our region. Decorated by the French government, honored by our own government, and even appointed an Honorary Admiral in the Texas Navy, he held *every* literary distinction. A fellow of the Texas Institute of Letters, a member of the three-member judging jury for the Pulitzer prizes in fiction — one of the judges of the American Book Committee's highest award in America — holder of the distinguished E. A. Lilly Chair of Literature at S. M. U. It is hard to realize that Lon was not a royal import but a fourth generation Texan. He was born in Dallas on March 20, 1906, graduated from Adamson High School as an All-State Tennis Player, graduated from Southern Methodist University as a star in the Arden Dramatic Club — and although sought for prestigious positions around the world, remained where he loved his city, his university, and his beloved Texas. He died in Dallas on January 11, 1980.

We remember Herb Philbrick's T.V. series, "I Led Three Lives." Lon lived three lives — book editor and critic, author and professor.

His "book editor and critic life" brought him into close association with all of the world's literary giants. To reminisce about his famous colleagues and friends would last forever. One experience I had with Lon will bring many other memories to you. T. S. Eliot agreed at Lon's invitation to come to Dallas. Lon sent the agent his own personal check for \$5,000 (which had to be covered). He secured the funds and came to me for a place to meet. The campus was busy. McFarlin Auditorium booked — I suggested the small auditorium in

the Law School. Lon said, "We will book him in the Moody Coliseum." A poet in Moody? "Yes," he insisted. (He always got his way.) I worried — especially when it began to pour before the lecture. You may remember what happened — 500 extra chairs were set up. Nine thousand people braved the storm to hear T. S. Eliot read his poetry — amazing!

I could understand how Lon had the genius to write a book review each week, but he never could explain to me how he could read that many books with all the other things he did. — Of course, he was unofficial den mother for almost every cultural, musical, dramatic effort and organization in the city and was the founding father for many of them.

His books are classics and winners of all the prestigious awards — unborn generations of Texans will relive the Alamo through *Thirteen Days of Glory*. His recent *J. Frank Dobie, An American Original* fulfills the Tinkle obsession for Texas and Texans and his defense of rationality, freedom and individuality.

But much of this immortality will be in the lives of his students. Lon was a popular teacher who loved his students and was worshipped by them. Many claimed to have "majored in Tinkle" while undergraduates. His many friends praise him for his warm heart, his forthrightness. He was genteel without pseudo-sophistication. His demand for quality affected and shaped everyone who knew him.

His greatest love, his *first* priority, his rejuvenation, was his family. His wife, his three fine sons, their families and grandchildren were the center of his life. — How he adored them. How precious was their home life and family rituals. You know how Lon fell in love at first sight in Mexico City. He told Maria the only rival she had ever had before he met her was Paris. After he taught her to cook French food, he had the best of two worlds. How mutually supportive they have always been.

We will miss Lon, but his contribution will be lasting. He was the bridge between the real values and the beauty of quality. He was the turning point when Texas no longer celebrated itself as a glorified myth but could see itself critically with confidence. He was not the humanizer of Texas but discovered it was here, loved it, believed in it, defended it and proved it.

—W. M. T.

**JAMES BUCHANAN WINN, JR.**  
1905-1979

JAMES BUCHANAN "BUCK" WINN, JR., INTERNATIONALLY RENOWNED ARTIST, architect, and inventor, died in Wimberley on December 18, 1979. Born on March 1, 1905, in Celina, Collin County, Texas, Winn was married to Kathryn Butler of Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1931.

Winn began his career with studies at Washington University in St. Louis and the Julian Academy in Paris, France. Later, in retirement at Wimberley, Winn recalled his move from Celina, Texas, to Paris, France:

I was a young man, and I had reached that point when you look over the hill and see what you want to be. I love to draw and plot things now and I did then. Frankly, my parents didn't much approve of what I had picked for my career. They thought it was a waste of time, until they saw I was going to stick with it. Then they gave me moral support. I actually started out with serious contentions to make it my lifetime trade. Much of my work has been related to mural decorations which are closely related to architecture.

In 1929, Buck Winn took up residence in Dallas and was busy during the Texas Centennial doing historical murals at Gonzales and the Hall of State in Dallas. In 1940, he and his family moved to Wimberley and helped establish the Texas hill country as a gathering place for area artists.

Winn was commissioned to do major art in theatres, business establishments and public buildings throughout Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Arizona, and New York. Among his numerous works was a sculpted, gilded map of Texas at the Amon Carter Airport in Fort Worth, as well as the gates, fountains and skyride landing at Aquarena Springs in San Marcos. Winn also designed the official Texas Statehood Centennial Stamp in 1945 and served on the Bicentennial Medallion Commission for Texas in 1976. His works can be seen on the campuses of Southwestern University, Southwest Texas State University, and Texas Christian University.

One of Winn's creations was a mural for the First National Bank of Phoenix. Of sizeable dimensions, the mural was fashioned of carved clay tablets presenting the effect of dry Arizona land. After first arranging the mural in a field on his Wimberly ranch, Winn viewed the end result by flying over it in his airplane.

I wasn't happy with what I saw, but I sent it to the bank anyway. I wondered how it looked at the bank, so after about ten years I went there to see. I didn't want anyone to know I had built it, so I nonchalantly walked into the bank and past the bas-relief. It looked good. But as I was leaving, some guy said, "Hey! There's Buck Winn." It turned out to be one of the men that had commissioned me for the job. I told him I just came to see if the thing had crumbled yet.

For the invention of a construction shortcut which involved putting cement over fiberglass to make a solid wall, Winn was designated an architect by the American Institute of Architects. He taught and lectured at a number of Texas schools as well as Princeton and Stanford. Recognized internationally for his works of art, inventions and architecture, Winn addressed groups in Spain, Italy, France, Mexico, and Canada.

Buck Winn led an active and productive life. A friend observed that Winn was "too busy to settle down long enough for a biographical sketch. He so thoroughly enjoys his work that thoughts about it linger with him through his sleep. In all the time I've known Buck, I've never seen that man sit down . . . not once."

Winn once stated that "nothing in the universe is as amazing as the human hand. Why should I ever let my hands be idle? Through them, there is always something new for me to discover."

Winn was elected to membership in the Philosophical Society in 1963. He is survived by a son, James B. Winn III of Wimberley; a daughter, Kathryn Eoff of Houston; and four grandchildren.

—D. H. W.

---

## OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

*For the Year 1981*

*President*

CHARLES A. LEMAISTRE

*First Vice-President*

ABNER V. MCCALL

*Second Vice-President*

EDWARD H. HARTE

*Secretary*

DORMAN HAYWARD WINFREY

*Treasurer*

MARY JOE CARROLL

*Directors*

CHARLES A. LEMAISTRE

DURWOOD FLEMING

PRICE DANIEL

FRANK E. VANDIVER

TRUMAN G. BLOCKER, JR.

THOMAS HART LAW

EDWARD CLARK

LOGAN WILSON

WILLIS McDONALD TATE

HARRIS LEON KEMPNER



## 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
* Carey Croneis . . . . .	1971
Willis McDonald Tate . . . . .	1972
* Dillon Anderson . . . . .	1973
Logan Wilson . . . . .	1974
Edward Clark . . . . .	1975
Thomas Hart Law . . . . .	1976
Truman G. Blocker, Jr. . . . .	1977
Frank E. Vandiver . . . . .	1978
Price Daniel . . . . .	1979
Durwood Fleming . . . . .	1980

\*Deceased

## MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

(NAME OF SPOUSE APPEARS IN PARENTHESIS)

- ALBRITTON, CLAUDE CAROL, JR. (JANE), Hamilton Professor of geology, emeritus, and senior scientist, The Institute for the Study of Earth and Man . . . . . *Dallas*
- ALLBRITTON, JOE LEWIS (BARBARA), lawyer; board chairman, Pierce National Life Ins. Co.; president, Houston Citizens Bank and Trust Company; director, Southwest Public Service Company; trustee, Baylor University, Baylor Medical College . . . . . *Houston*
- ALLEN, WINNIE, retired archivist, University of Texas Library . . . . . *Hutchins*
- ANDERSON, ROBERT BERNARD, partner, Carl M. Loeb Rhoades and Company; former secretary of the treasury; former tax commissioner, Texas . . . . . *New York*
- ANDERSON, THOMAS D. (HELEN), lawyer . . . . . *Houston*
- ANDERSON, WILLIAM LELAND (ESSEMENA), retired financial vice president of Anderson, Clayton & Co.; former president of Texas Medical Center, Inc.; awarded Navy's Distinguished Civilian Service Medal in 1945 . . . . . *Houston*
- ANDREWS, MARK EDWIN (LAVONE), president, Ancon Oil and Gas Company; former assistant secretary of the navy . . . . . *Houston*
- ARMSTRONG, ANNE LEGENDRE (MRS. TOBIN), former U. S. ambassador to Great Britain . . . . . *Armstrong*
- ARMSTRONG, THOMAS REEVES, Armstrong Ranch; former president, Santa Gertrudis Breeders Association . . . . . *Armstrong*
- ASHWORTH, KENNETH H., commissioner of higher education, Texas College and University System; former executive vice president of the University of Texas in San Antonio and vice chancellor for academic affairs of the University of Texas System . . . . . *Austin*
- BAKER, REX G., JR., lawyer . . . . . *Houston*
- \*BANKS, STANLEY (ANNE), lawyer; former chairman, Texas Library and Historical Commission . . . . . *San Antonio*
- BARROW, THOMAS D. (JANICE), chairman of the board and chief executive officer, Kennecott Copper Corp. . . . . *Greenwich, Conn.*
- BEAN, WILLIAM BENNETT (ABIGAIL), professor of medicine, University of Iowa; former director, Institute for Humanities in Medicine and Harris Kempner Professor of Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston . . . . . *Iowa City, Iowa*
- BELL, HENRY M., JR. (NELL), chairman of the board and president, Citizens First National Bank of Tyler . . . . . *Tyler*
- BENNETT, JOHN MIRZA, JR. (ELEANOR), chairman, National Bank of Commerce and City Public Service Board; director, Texas and Southwestern Cattlemen's Association; Major General, USAFR . . . . . *San Antonio*
- BENTSEN, LOYD, United States senator . . . . . *Houston and Washington*
- BETO, GEORGE JOHN (MARILYNN), professor of criminology, Sam Houston State University; former director, Texas Department of Corrections; former president, Concordia College . . . . . *Huntsville*
- BLANTON, JACK S. (LAURA LEE), president, Scurlock Oil Company . . . . . *Houston*
- BLOCKER, TRUMAN G., JR., surgeon; president emeritus, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston; consultant to the Surgeon General . . . . . *Galveston*
- BOLTON, FRANK C., JR., lawyer, former head of legal department of Mobil Oil Company . . . . . *Houston*
- BOYD, HOWARD TANEY (LUCILLE), chairman, The El Paso Company; trustee, University of Southern California; regent emeritus, Georgetown University . . . . . *Houston*

\*Life Member

- BRANDT, EDWARD N., JR. (PATRICIA), physician—medical educator, Assistant Secretary for Health, U. S. Department of Health and Human Services . . . . . *Washington, D. C.*
- \*BROGAN, ALBERT PERLEY, professor emeritus of philosophy, University of Texas; former president, western division, American Philosophical Association . . . . . *Austin*
- BROWN, GEORGE RUFUS (ALICE), retired chairman, Brown and Root, Inc. . . . . *Houston*
- BROWN, JOHN R., senior judge, Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals . . *Houston*
- BUSH, GEORGE (BARBARA), vice president of the United States; former director, Central Intelligence Agency; former ambassador to United Nations; former congressman . . . *Houston and Washington, D. C.*
- BUTLER, GEORGE A., lawyer; board chairman, Bank of Texas; trustee, George Washington University, Grand Central Art Galleries, Washington-on-the-Brazos Association . . . . . *Houston*
- BUTLER, JACK (MARY LOU), editor, Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* . . *Fort Worth*
- CALDWELL, JOHN CLIFTON (SHIRLEY), rancher; former chairman, Texas Historical Commission; director, Texas Historical Foundation . *Albany*
- CARMACK, GEORGE (BONNIE), associate editor, *San Antonio Express-News* . . . . . *San Antonio*
- CARPENTER, ELIZABETH "LIZ," assistant Secretary of Education; former Washington correspondent, author, and White House Press Secretary . . . . . *Austin and Washington, D. C.*
- CARRINGTON, EVELYN M., retired child psychologist, staff of Children's Development Center, Shady Brook Schools, Children's Medical Center . . . . . *Dallas and Austin*
- CARRINGTON, PAUL (FRANCES), lawyer; past president, Dallas Chamber of Commerce; past president, State Bar of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- 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 (ANNE), 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 Health Science Center at Houston . . . . . *Houston*
- CLEMENTS, WILLIAM P., JR. (RITA), governor of Texas, former deputy secretary of defense; former chairman, SEDCO, Inc., and chairman of trustees, Southern Methodist University . . . . . *Austin*
- COKE, HENRY CORNICK, JR. (KATHLEEN), lawyer . . . . . *Dallas*
- COLLIE, MARVIN KEY (NANCY), lawyer . . . . . *Houston*
- COOPER, JOHN H. (DOROTHY), headmaster emeritus, KinKaid School; educational consultant . . . . . *Houston*
- COUSINS, MARGARET, writer and editor . . . . . *San Antonio*
- CRIM, WILLIAM ROBERT (MARGARET), investments . . . . . *Kilgore*
- CROOK, WILLIAM HERBERT, former U. S. ambassador to Australia; former president San Marcos Academy; commissioner U. S.-Mexican Border Development . . . . . *San Marcos*
- CULLINAN, NINA . . . . . *Houston*

---

\*Life Member

- DANIEL, PRICE (JEAN), chairman, Texas State Library and Archives Commission; former associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas; United States senator, attorney general and governor of Texas; author  
Liberty and Austin
- DARDEN, WILLIAM E., president, William E. Darden Lumber Company; former regent, University of Texas  
Waco
- DEBAKEY, MICHAEL E., surgeon; president, Baylor College of Medicine  
Houston
- DENIUS, FRANKLIN W. (CHARMAINE), lawyer; former president, University of Texas Ex-Students Association; member Constitutional Revision Committee  
Austin
- DICK, JAMES, founder-director of the International Festival-Institute at Round Top; concert pianist and teacher  
Round Top
- DOTY, EZRA WILLIAM (ELINOR), emeritus professor of music and dean of the College of Fine Arts, University of Texas  
Austin
- DOUGHERTY, J. CHRYS (BEA ANN), attorney; Honorary French Consul in Austin; trustee, St. Stephen's Episcopal School, Austin; University of Texas Law School Foundation  
Austin
- DOYLE, GERRY (KATHERINE), typographer; director of publications, San Jacinto Museum of History  
Beaumont
- DUDLEY, FEDERICA GROSS (MRS. RAY L.), chairman, trustees University of Houston Foundation; vice-president, Houston Symphony; member, Governor's Committee on Higher Education  
Houston
- DUFF, KATHARYN, journalist, author  
Abilene
- DUGGER, RONNIE E., publisher and editor at large, *The Texas Observer*; author and contributor to national and regional magazines  
San Antonio
- DUNCAN, CHARLES WILLIAM, JR. (ANNE), deputy secretary of defense; president of The Coca-Cola Company; chairman of the board, Rotan Mosle  
Houston and Washington, D. C.
- ELKINS, JAMES A., JR., president, First City National Bank; chairman Federal Reserve Bank of Houston; regent, University of Houston  
Houston
- ELLIOTT, EDWIN ALEXANDER (ORAL), 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
- EITTLINGER, HYMAN JOSEPH (ROSEBUD), professor emeritus 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  
San Antonio
- FINCH, WILLIAM CARRINGTON, retired dean, Vanderbilt Divinity School; former president, Southwestern University  
Nashville, Tennessee
- FISHER, JOE J. (KATHLEEN), chief judge of the U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, former district attorney and state district judge of the First Judicial District of Texas; Knights of the Order of San Jacinto  
Beaumont
- FLAWN, PETER T. (PRISCILLA), president, University of Texas at Austin  
Austin
- FLEMING, DURWOOD (LURLYN), president, Southwestern University; president, Texas Assn. Church-Related Colleges; mem., World Meth. Council  
Georgetown

- FRANTZ, JOE B. (HELEN), professor of history, University of Texas; former director, Texas State Historical Association; former president, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Austin*
- FRIEND, LLERENA BEAUFORT, professor emeritus of history, University of Texas . . . . . *Wichita Falls*
- FROST, TOM C., JR. (PAT), chairman of the board, Frost National Bank . . . . . *San Antonio*
- GALVIN, CHARLES O'NEILL (MARGARET), dean, School of Law, Southern Methodist University; began practice, Dallas, 1947; Lt. Comdr. USNR WWII; member Am. Judicature Soc., Intl. Inst. CPAs . . . . . *Dallas*
- \*GAMBRELL, HERBERT PICKENS, professor emeritus, Southern Methodist University; former president, Texas State Historical Association; former director, Dallas Historical Society; former president, Texas Institute of Letters; member, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . . . . . *Dallas*
- GARRETT, JENKINS (VIRGINIA), lawyer; member, Governor's Committee on Education Beyond High School; newspaper publisher . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- GARWOOD, WILLIAM L. (MERLE), lawyer; associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- GARWOOD, WILMER ST. JOHN (ELLEN), 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 . . . . . *New Hartford, N. Y.*
- GLASS, H. BENTLEY, president, Stony Brook Center, State University of New York; president, United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa; former professor of biology, Goucher College and Johns Hopkins University . . . . . *Old Field, N.Y.*
- GORDON, WILLIAM EDWIN (ELVA), dean of natural sciences and professor of electrical engineering and space physics and astronomy, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- GRAY, JOHN E. (MARY), president emeritus, Lamar University; chairman emeritus, First Security National Bank and First Security National Corporation; former chairman, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System . . . . . *Beaumont*
- GREENHILL, JOE R. (MARTHA), chief justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- GRESHAM, NEWTON, lawyer; former president, State Bar; former chairman regents, State Teachers Colleges; trustee, St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital; member, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System . . . . . *Houston*
- GUION, DAVID, musicologist, pianist, composer . . . . . *Dallas*
- HACKERMAN, NORMAN, president, Rice University; former president and chancellor, University of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- HALL, WALTER GARDNER, president, Citizens State Bank, Dickinson; former president, San Jacinto River Authority . . . . . *Dickinson*
- HANNA, RALPH (MARIE), physician-pediatrician . . . . . *Austin*
- HARBACH, FRANKLIN ISRAEL, consultant; Ripley Foundation, Houston Foundation . . . . . *Houston*
- HARGRAVE, HELEN, professor emeritus of law and law librarian, University of Texas; former president, American Association of Law Libraries; member State Bar of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- HARGROVE, JAMES W. (MARION), investment counselor; former United States ambassador to Australia . . . . . *Houston*

\*Life Member

- HARRINGTON, MARION THOMAS (RUTH), president emeritus,  
Texas A&M University . . . . . *Bryan*
- HARRISON, FRANK (ELSIE CLAIRE), physician; president, University of Texas  
Health Science Center at San Antonio; former president, University  
of Texas at Arlington . . . . . *San Antonio*
- HARRISON, GUY BRYAN, JR., professor of history, Baylor University . *Waco*
- HART, JAMES PINCKNEY (KATHERINE), lawyer; former chancellor, University  
of Texas; former associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas . *Austin*
- HARTE, CHRISTOPHER M., businessman; director, Texas Historical  
Foundation; Texas Nature Conservancy . . . . . *Austin*
- HARTE, EDWARD HOLMEAD (JANET), publisher, *Corpus Christi Caller*; vice-  
president, Texas Daily Newspaper Assn.; director, Texas Research League;  
member, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . *Corpus Christi*
- HARTGRAVES, RUTH, practicing gynecologist; recipient, The Ashbel Smith  
Distinguished Alumni Award, University of Texas Medical Branch;  
The Elizabeth Blackwell Award from the American Medical  
Women's Association . . . . . *Houston*
- HAY, STEPHEN J. (NADINE), former president, Great National Life Insurance  
Company . . . . . *Dallas*
- HEINEN, ERWIN, certified public accountant; former president, Southern States  
Conferences of Certified Public Accountants, member Houston Grand  
Opera Association . . . . . *Houston*
- HERSHEY, JACOB W. (TERESE), board chairman, American Commercial  
Lines; chairman advisory committee, Transportation Center,  
Northwestern University . . . . . *Houston*
- HERTZOG, CARL, book designer and publisher, University of Texas at  
El Paso . . . . . *El Paso*
- HILL, GEORGE W. (MYRA), president, Southern Heritage Foundation; former  
executive director, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . *Austin*
- HILL, GLORIA LESTER (MRS. GEORGE A. III), historical  
restoration and preservation . . . . . *Fredericksburg*
- HILL, JOHN L. (BITSY), former attorney general of Texas . . . . *Austin*
- HILL, JOSEPH MACGLASHAN, physician; director, Wadley Research Institute;  
past president, International Society of Hematology . . . . *Dallas*
- HINES, JOHN ELBRIDGE, 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, *Houston Post*; former Secretary of Health,  
Education and Welfare . . . . . *Houston*
- HOBBY, WILLIAM PETTUS, JR. (DIANA), lieutenant governor; president,  
*Houston Post*; chairman of the Board, Channel Five-TV, Nashville;  
Council on Foreign Relations; member, board of directors, Rice University;  
member, board of directors, Jefferson Davis Association . . *Houston*
- HOFFMAN, PHILIP GUTHRIE (MARY), president, University of Houston  
. . . . . *Houston*
- HOLLOWAY, JAMES LEMUEL, JR., Admiral (retired), United States Navy,  
former Superintendent, United States Naval Academy . *Washington*
- HOLTZMAN, WAYNE H. (JOAN), professor of psychology and education; presi-  
dent, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, University of Texas . *Austin*
- HOOK, HAROLD SWANSON (JOANNE), chairman and president, American Gen-  
eral Insurance Company; trustee Baylor College of Medicine . *Houston*
- 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*
- HUNT, WILMER BRADY (EUGENIA), judge 133d Dist. Court 47-70, now retired,  
serving as special judge; longtime chm. judicial section, State Bar of Texas  
. . . . . *Austin and Houston*

- IKARD, FRANK NEVILLE (JAYNE), lawyer; former president and chief executive officer, American Petroleum Institute; former member of U. S. House of Representatives . . . . . *Washington, D. C.*
- JAWORSKI, LEON, lawyer; president, American Bar Association; past president, Texas Civil Judicial Council and State Bar of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- JENKINS, JOHN H. (MAUREEN), author; publisher, the Pemberton Press; Owner, Jenkins Rare Book Company . . . . . *Austin*
- JOHNSON, CLAUDIA TAYLOR (MRS. LYNDON B.) . . . . . *Stonewall*
- JONES, EVERETT HOLLAND (HELEN), bishop of West Texas, Protestant Episcopal Church (retired) . . . . . *San Antonio*
- JONES, JOHN TILFORD, JR., president, *Houston Chronicle* . . . . . *Houston*
- JONSSON, JOHN ERIK, chairman, Texas Instruments; chairman, Graduate Research Center of the Southwest; trustee many institutions; former mayor of Dallas . . . . . *Dallas*
- JORDAN, BRYCE (JONELLE), president, University of Texas at Dallas . . . . . *Richardson*
- JOSEY, JACK S. (ELVA), president, Josey Oil Company; member board of governors, Rice University; former regent, University of Texas . *Houston*
- KEETON, PAGE (MADGE), former dean of the School of Law, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- KELSEY, MAVIS PARROTT (MARY), physician; clinical professor, University of Texas Graduate School of Biomedical Science; founder, Kelsey-Seybold Clinic . . . . . *Houston*
- KEMPNER, HARRIS LEON (RUTH), trustee, H. Kempner; chairman, United States National Bank, and Imperial Sugar Company . . . . . *Galveston*
- KEMPNER, HARRIS L. JR., trustee, H. Kempner; president of board, Temple Academy; board member, American Jewish Commission . . . . . *Galveston*
- KILGORE, DANIEL E., certified public accountant; former president, Texas State Historical Association . . . . . *Corpus Christi*
- KILGORE, WILLIAM JACKSON, chairman philosophy department, Baylor University; author . . . . . *Waco*
- KING, MAY DOUGHERTY (MRS. JOHN ALLEN), investor, oil exploration and development; founder, Dougherty Carr Arts Foundation; Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre . . . . . *Corpus Christi*
- \*KIRKLAND, WILLIAM ALEXANDER (LOIS), former chairman of the board, First City National Bank; trustee emeritus, Rice and Princeton Universities; regent, University of the South . . . . . *Houston*
- KNEPPER, DOROTHY WARDELL (MRS. DAVID W.), director, San Jacinto Museum of History . . . . . *Houston*
- KREY, LAURA LETTIE SMITH (MRS. A. C.), novelist and essayist . . . . . *Austin*
- KUSCH, POLYKARP, professor of physics, University of Texas at Dallas, formerly at Universities of Illinois, Minnesota, and Columbia; Nobel Laureate 1955 . . . . . *Dallas*
- LAW, THOMAS HART (JOANN), lawyer; member, Board of Regents, University of Texas System; former president, Fort Worth Area Chamber of Commerce . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- LAWRENCE, F. LEE (ANN), lawyer; trustee, Texas Christian University; former president, Texas State Historical Association . . . . . *Tyler*
- LEAVELL, CHARLES HOLLAND (SHIRLEY), chairman, C. H. Leavell and Company; director president, United Fund; director Symphony, Museum, Y. M. C. A., etc. . . . . *El Paso*

- 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. (JOYCE), president, University of Texas System Cancer Center, Texas Medical Center . . . . . *Houston*
- LEVIN, WILLIAM C. (EDNA), physician; president and Warmoth professor of hematology and medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston . . . . . *Galveston*
- LIEDTKE, J. HUGH, president, chief executive officer, chairman of board, Penzoil United; trustee, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- LINDSEY, JOHN H., businessman, art collector, civic leader, member, board of directors, Museum of Fine Arts . . . . . *Houston*
- LINDZEY, GARDNER (ANDREA), vice president for academic affairs, University of Texas; psychologist; author . . . . . *Austin*
- LIVINGSTON, WILLIAM S. (LANA), professor of government; acting vice president and dean of graduate studies, University of Texas at Austin . . . . . *Austin*
- LORD, GROGAN, chairman, First Texas Bancorp; member, Texas Securities Board; chairman, Texas Research League; trustee, Southwestern University . . . . . *Georgetown*
- LOVETT, HENRY MALCOLM (MARTHA), lawyer; former chairman of the trustees, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- LYNCH, WILLIAM WRIGHT, former president and general manager, Texas Power and Light Company . . . . . *Dallas*
- MACGREGOR, GEORGE LESCHER, retired president and chairman, Texas Utilities Company . . . . . *Dallas*
- MAGUIRE, JACK R. (PAT), executive director, Institute of Texan Cultures; author and syndicated newspaper columnist . . . . . *San Antonio*
- MALLON, H. NEIL, former president, board chairman, Dresser Industries; former 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, executive vice president, Carter Hawley Hale; chairman of the executive committee, Neiman-Marcus . . . . . *Dallas*
- MARGRAVE, JOHN L. (MARY LOU), professor of chemistry, Rice University; member, American Chemical Society, American Institute of Chemists (fellow); Guggenheim research fellow . . . . . *Houston*
- MASTERTON, HARRIS (CARROLL), estate management executive; member of the board of directors, Houston Symphony; Harris County Heritage Society; Knights of Malta . . . . . *Houston*
- MATTHEWS, WATT R., rancher . . . . . *Albany*
- MCCALL, ABNER VERNON, president, Baylor University; former associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Waco*
- MCCOLLUM, LEONARD FRANKLIN, president, Continental Oil Co. . . . . *Houston*
- MCCORMICK, IRELINE DEWITT (MRS. CHARLES T.) . . . . . *Austin*
- MCCORQUODALE, MALCOLM (ROBIN), executive vice president, Menil Foundation, Inc. . . . . *Houston*
- MCCULLOUGH, JOHN W., banker, philanthropist; longtime president and director, Sealy and Smith Foundation; trustee, Rosenberg Library . . . . . *Galveston*
- MCDERMOTT, MARGARET (MRS. EUGENE), vice president, Dallas Junior College District; board member, Hockaday School, Dallas Symphony Orchestra . . . . . *Dallas*
- MCGHEE, GEORGE CREWS, former U. S. ambassador to West Germany . . . . . *Dallas*
- MCGINNIS, ROBERT C., lawyer . . . . . *Austin*



- MCKNIGHT, JOSEPH WEBB (MIMI), professor, Southern Methodist School of Law; legal historian, law reformer . . . . . *Dallas*
- MCNEESE, AYLMER 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*
- MIDDLETON, HARRY J. (MIRIAM), director, Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library and Museum . . . . . *Austin*
- MILLER, JARVIS E. (ALMA), president, Texas A&M University . *College Station*
- MILLS, BALLINGER, JR., lawyer . . . . . *Galveston*
- MOORE, BERNICE MILBURN (MRS. HARRY E.); sociologist; staff, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health; author, lecturer and consultant . . . *Austin*
- 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 (SARA BETH), president, Austin College; former director, Texas Legislative Council . . . . . *Sherman*
- MOUDY, JAMES MATTOX (LUCILLE), chancellor emeritus, Texas Christian University . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- NORTEN, MARY MOODY, chairman, Moody National Bank and National Hotel Company; trustee, Moody Foundation; director, American National Insurance Company, Medical Research Foundation; member, Texas Historical Commission and Texas Historical Foundation . . . . . *Galveston***
- O'CONNOR, DENNIS, rancher . . . . . *Refugio*
- OLAN, LEVI (SARITA), rabbi emeritus, Temple Emanuel . . . . . *Dallas*
- OLSON, STANLEY W., provost, Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine . . . . . *Kent, Ohio*
- 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 . *Nyack, N. Y.*
- PAGE, LOUIS C. (VIRGINIA), architect, partner of firm of Page Southerland Page . . . . . *Austin*
- PARTEN, JUBAL RICHARD, oil and mineral investments; ranching . *Houston*
- PATE, A. M., JR., president and chairman, Texas Refinery Corp.; member Texas Historical Commission and Historical Foundation; founder Pate Museum of Transportation; Order of Merit, Luxembourg; student and collector of Texana . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- PITZER, KENNETH SANBORN, professor of chemistry, University of California; formerly president, Stanford and Rice Universities . . . . . *Berkeley*
- POOL, GEORGE FRED, former editor, *East Texas* magazine; former president, Southern Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives; foreign trade consultant . . . . . *Longview*
- PORTER, JENNY LIND, poet and educator; former poet laureate of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- PRESSLER, HERMAN PAUL (ELSIE), lawyer; retired vice-president, Humble Oil & Refining Company; president, Texas Medical Center, Inc.; chairman of the board of trustees, Texas Children's Hospital . . . . . *Houston*
- PROTHRO, CHARLES N., president, Perkins-Prothro Company; trustee, Southwestern University . . . . . *Wichita Falls*
- PROVENCE, HARRY, editor-in-chief, Newspapers, Inc.; member Coordinating Board, Texas Colleges and University System . . . . . *Waco*

- RAGAN, COOPER K. (SUSAN), lawyer; former president, Texas State Historical Association . . . . . *Houston*
- RANDALL, EDWARD III (ELIZA), chairman of the Board, Rotan Mosle Financial Corp.; president and chief executive officer, Rotan Mosle Inc. . . *Houston*
- RANDALL, KATHARINE RISHER (MRS. EDWARD JR.), former member Texas State Historical Survey Committee; regent Gubston Hall . . . *Galveston*
- RASSMAN, EMIL C., lawyer; former chairman of regents, Texas State University System . . . . . *Rockport*
- REAVLEY, THOMAS M. (FLORENCE), judge, U. S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit . . . . . *Austin*
- \*RICHARDSON, RUPERT NORVAL, professor of history, Hardin-Simmons University; past president, Southwestern Social Sciences Association . *Abilene*
- ROSTOW, ELSPETH (WALT), dean, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs . . . . . *Austin*
- SCHACHTEL, HYMAN JUDAH (BARBARA), rabbi, Temple Beth Israel . *Houston*
- SCHIWEZ, EDWARD MUEGGE, artist . . . . . *Hunt*
- SEALY, TOM (MARY VELMA), lawyer; former chairman of regents, University of Texas . . . . . *Midland*
- SEARS, WILLIAM G. (MAURINE), lawyer; former city attorney, Houston; European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of War, World War II . *Houston*
- SEYBOLD, WILLIAM D. (ADELE), surgeon; director, University of St. Thomas; former chief of surgery and chairman of the executive board, Kelsey-Seybold Clinic . . . . . *Houston*
- SHARP, DUDLEY CRAWFORD, former 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*
- SHIRLEY, PRESTON, lawyer . . . . . *Galveston*
- SHIVERS, ALLAN (MARIALICE), former governor of Texas; chairman, Austin National Bank; former president, United States Chamber of Commerce . . . . . *Austin*
- SHUFFLER, RALPH HENDERSON II, Episcopal priest-psychotherapist . . . . . *San Antonio*
- SIMPSON, JOHN DAVID, JR. (MARY), chairman of board, Superior Dairies, Inc.; chairman of board, Texas Rehabilitation Commission . . . . *Austin*
- SMILEY, JOSEPH ROYALL, former president, University of Texas at El Paso; former president, University of Colorado . . . . . *El Paso*
- SMITH, A. FRANK, JR. (MARY), lawyer . . . . . *Houston*
- SMITH, FRANK C., JR., electrical engineer; specialist in data processing and geosciences . . . . . *Houston*
- SPARKMAN, ROBERT S. (WILLIE), M.D.; chief, Department of Surgery, Baylor University Medical Center; clinical professor of surgery, University of Texas Southwestern Medical School; former president, Texas Surgical Society . . . . . *Dallas*
- SPRAGUE, CHARLES CAMERON (KATHERINE), dean, University of Texas Southwestern Medical School; former dean and professor, Tulane . . *Dallas*
- SPURR, STEPHEN H. (PATRICIA), former president, University of Texas; formerly at Harvard and Michigan; trustee, Carnegie Foundation Advancement of Teaching Educational Testing Service. The Nature Conservancy; pres.-elect, Soc. Amer. Foresters; author . . . *Austin*
- STEAKLEY, ZOLLIE COFFER (RUTH), associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Austin*

\*Life Member

- STOREY, ROBERT GERALD, president, Southwestern Legal Foundation; dean emeritus of the law school, Southern Methodist University; past president, American Bar Association . . . . . *Dallas*
- SUTTON, JOHN F. (NANCY), dean, School of Law, University of Texas at Austin; formerly practicing attorney, San Antonio and San Angelo; chief draftsman, Code of Professional Responsibility, American Bar Association . . . . . *Austin*
- SYMONDS, MARGARET CLOVER, board member, Garden Club of America; past trustee, Child Welfare League of America; trustee, Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden; past trustee, Northwestern University; Phi Beta Kappa . . . . . *Houston*
- TATE, WILLIS McDONALD (JOEL), chancellor, Southern Methodist University . . . . . *Dallas*
- TEAGUE, JAMES U. (MARGOT), former chairman of the board and chief executive officer, Columbia Drilling Company . . . . . *Sugar Land*
- TIMMONS, BASCOM N., Washington correspondent; past president, National Press Club . . . . . *Washington*
- TOBIN, MARGARET BATTS (MRS. EDGAR), former regent, University of Texas . . . . . *San Antonio*
- TOPAZIO, VIRGIL W. (JEWELL), dean, Humanities and Social Sciences, Rice University; writer and editor of numerous books and articles for professional publications . . . . . *Houston*
- TOWER, JOHN, United States senator . . . . . *Wichita Falls and Washington*
- TRITICO, FRANK EDWARD, educator and historian; chairman, San Jacinto Battleground Historical Advisory Board; former president, Sons of the Republic of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- TURNER, DECHERD H. (MARGARET ANN), director, Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin . . . . . *Austin*
- VANDIVER, FRANK EVERSON (RENEE), president, North Texas State University; former professor of history, Rice University; former Harmsworth professor of American History, Oxford . . . . . *Denton*
- WALKER, AGESILAUS WILSON, JR. (INA), lawyer . . . . . *Dallas*
- WALKER, EVERITT DONALD (KATY), chancellor, The University of Texas System . . . . . *Austin*
- WALKER, RUEL CARLILE (VIRGINIA), associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- WARDLAW, FRANK H. (ROSEMARY), former director, Texas A&M University Press; former president, Texas Institute of Letters and American Association of University Presses . . . . . *Fripp Island, S. C.*
- WARREN, DAVID B., associate director, The Museum of Fine Arts; senior curator, The Bayou Bend Collection . . . . . *Houston*
- WATKINS, EDWARD T. (HAZEL) . . . . . *Houston*
- WELLS, PETER B. (BETTY), lawyer . . . . . *Beaumont*
- WHITCOMB, GAIL (GERALDINE), lawyer; board chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank; former president, American Brahman Breeders Association and Houston Chamber of Commerce . . . . . *Houston*
- WHITCOMB, JAMES LEE (MARY HILL), former president Texas Manufacturers Association; member, Advisory Council CBA Foundation, University of Texas at Austin . . . . . *Houston*
- WIGGINS, PLATT K., retired lawyer . . . . . *Kerrville*
- WILLIAMS, DAN C. (CAROLYN), chairman of the board, Southland Financial Corporation; member, Board of Regents of the University of Texas System . . . . . *Dallas*

- WILLIAMS, JACK KENNY (MARGARET), director, Texas Medical Center; former chancellor, Texas A&M University System; former commissioner of higher education . . . . . *Houston*
- WILLIAMS, ROGER JOHN (PHYLLIS), distinguished professor of chemistry, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- WILSON, LOGAN (MYRA), former chancellor, University of Texas; former president, American Council on Education . . . . . *Austin*
- WINFREY, DORMAN HAYWARD (RUTH CAROLYN), director, Texas State Library; former state archivist and researcher, Texas State Historical Association . . . . . *Austin*
- WINTERS, J. SAM (DOROTHY), lawyer; member, American Law Institute . . . . . *Austin*
- WITTLIFF, WILLIAM DALE (SALLY), typographer and publisher, president, Encino Press; councillor, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Austin*
- WOLF, STEWART, director, Totts Gap Medical Research Laboratories; former president, American Gastroenterological Association, American Psychosomatic Society, American Pavlovian Society . . . . . *Bangor, Maine*
- WOODSON, BENJAMIN N. (GRACE), chairman and chief executive officer, American General Insurance Company; former special assistant to the Secretary of War . . . . . *Houston*
- WORDEN, SAM P. (HELEN), inventor . . . . . *Houston*
- WOZENCRAFT, FRANK McREYNOLDS (SHIRLEY), lawyer; former assistant attorney general of the United States; delegate to United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties . . . . . *Houston*
- WRAY, ANDREW JACKSON, consultant, Marsh and McLennan; former governor, University of Houston; Rice Associates . . . . . *Houston*
- WRIGHT, CHARLES ALAN (CUSTIS), William B. Bates Chair for the Administration of Justice, School of Law, University of Texas at Austin . . . . . *Austin*
- WRIGHT, JAMES S. (MARY), architect; senior partner of firm of Page Southerland Page . . . . . *Dallas*
- YARBOROUGH, RALPH WEBSTER (OPAL), lawyer; former United States senator . . . . . *Austin*
- 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

---

JAMES PATTERSON ALEXANDER  
DILLON ANDERSON  
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 BARTHOLOMEW BATES  
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  
ROBERT LEE BOBBITT  
MEYER BODANSKY  
HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON  
CHARLES PAUL BONER  
JOHN GUTZON DE LA MOTHE BONGLUM  
PAUL LEWIS BOYNTON  
LEO BREWSTER  
GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS  
ANDREW DAVIS BRUCE  
JAMES PERRY BRYAN  
LEWIS RANDOLPH BRYAN JR.  
RICHARD FENNER BURGESS  
WILLIAM HENRY BURGESS  
EMMA KYLE BURLESON  
JOHN HILL BURLESON  
CHARLES PRARRE CABELL  
H. BAILEY CARROLL  
EDWARD HENRY CARY  
CARLOS EDUARDO CASTAÑEDA  
ASA CRAWFORD CHANDLER  
MARION NELSON CHESTMAN  
JOSEPH LYNN CLARK

THOMAS STONE CLYCE  
CLAUDE CARR CODY JR.  
HENRY COHEN  
TOM CONNALLY  
MILLARD COPE  
MARTIN MC NULTY CRANE  
CLARENCE COTTAM  
CAREY CRONEIS  
JOSEPH STEPHEN CULLINAN  
THOMAS WHITE CURRIE  
MORGAN JONES DAVIS  
GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALAY  
JAMES QUAYLE DEALAY  
EVERETT LEE DE GOLYER  
ROSCOE PLIMPTON DE WITT  
ADINA DEZAVALA  
FAGAN DICKSON  
CHARLES SANFORD DIEHL  
FRANK CLIFFORD DILLARD  
J. FRANK DOBIE  
HENRY PATRICK DROUGHT  
CLYDE EAGLETON  
ALEXANDER CASWELL ELLIS  
WILLIAM MAURICE EWING  
WILLIAM STAMPS FARISH  
LAMAR FLEMING JR.  
RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING  
FRED FARRELL FLORENCE  
PAUL JOSEPH FOIK  
CHARLES INGE FRANCIS  
JESSE NEWMAN GALLAGHER  
VIRGINIA LEDDY GAMBRELL  
MARY EDNA GEARING  
EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY  
ROBERT RANDLE GILBERT  
GIBB GILCHRIST  
JOHN WILLIAM GORMLEY  
MALCOLM KINTNER GRAHAM  
IRELAND GRAVES  
MARVIN LEE GRAVES  
LEON GREEN  
CHARLES WILSON HACKETT  
HARRY CLAY HANSZEN  
THORTON HARDIE

---

---

# IN MEMORIAM

---

HENRY WINSTON HARPER  
HOUSTON HARTE  
FRANK LEE HAWKINS  
WILLIAM WOMACK HEATH  
JOHN EDWARD HICKMAN  
GEORGE ALFRED HILL JR.  
GEORGE ALFRED HILL III  
MARY VAN DEN BERGE HILL  
ROBERT THOMAS HILL  
WILLIAM PETTUS HOBBY  
ELA HOCKADAY  
WILLIAM RANSOM HOGAN  
IMA HOGG  
THOMAS STEELE HOLDEN  
EUGENE HOLMAN  
EDWARD MANDELL HOUSE  
ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON  
WILLIAM VERMILLION HOUSTON  
WILLIAM EAGER HOWARD  
LOUIS HERMAN HUBBARD  
JOHN AUGUSTUS HULEN  
FRANK GRANGER HUNTRESS  
JUNE HYER  
JULIA BEDFORD IDESON  
WATROUS HENRY IRONS  
HERMAN GERLACH JAMES  
LEROY JEFFERS  
HERBERT SPENCER JENNINGS  
LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON  
WILLIAM PARKS JOHNSON  
CLIFFORD BARTLETT JONES  
ERIN BAIN JONES  
JESSE HOLMAN JONES  
MARVIN JONES  
MRS. PERCY JONES  
HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR  
ROBERT MARVIN KELLY  
LOUIS WILTZ KEMP  
THOMAS MARTIN KENNERLY  
EDWARD KILMAN  
ROBERT JUSTUS KLEBERG JR.  
ERNEST LYNN KURTH  
LUCIUS MIRABEAU LAMAR III  
FRANCIS MARION LAW

CHAUNCEY LEAKE  
UMPHREY LEE  
DAVID LEFKOWITZ  
MARK LEMMON  
JEWEL PRESTON LIGHTFOOT  
EUGENE PERRY LOCKE  
JOHN AVERY LOMAX  
WALTER EWING LONG  
JOHN TIPTON LONSDALE  
EDGAR ODELL LOVETT  
ROBERT EMMET LUCEY  
LEWIS WINSLOW MAC NAUGHTON  
JAMES WOOTEN MCCLENDON  
CHARLES TILFORD MC CORMICK  
TOM LEE MC CULLOUGH  
EUGENE MC DERMOTT  
JOHN HATHAWAY MC GINNIS  
ALAN DUGALD MC KILLOP  
BUCKNER ABERNATHY MC KINNEY  
JOHN OLIVER MC REYNOLDS  
FRANK BURR MARSH  
MAURY MAVERICK  
BALLINGER MILLS  
MERTON MELROSE MINTER  
JAMES TALIAFERRO MONTGOMERY  
DAN MOODY  
WILLIAM OWEN MURRAY  
FRED MERRIAM NELSON  
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.

---

---

# IN MEMORIAM

---

LAURA BALLINGER RANDALL  
HARRY HUNTT RANSOM  
SAM RAYBURN  
JOHN SAYRES REDDITT  
LAWRENCE JOSEPH RHEA  
WILLIAM ALEXANDER RHEA  
SUMMERFIELD G. ROBERTS  
FRENCH MARTEL ROBERTSON  
JOHN ELIJAH ROSSER  
JAMES EARL RUDDER  
MC GRUDER ELLIS SADLER  
JEFFERSON DAVIS SANDEFER  
MARLIN ELIJAH SANDLIN  
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  
RALPH HENDERSON SHUFFLER  
ALBERT OLIN SINGLETON  
A. FRANK SMITH  
FRANK CHESLEY SMITH  
THOMAS VERNON SMITH  
HARRIET WINGFIELD SMITHER  
JOHN WILLIAM SPIES  
TOM DOUGLAS SPIES  
ROBERT WELDON STAYTON  
RALPH WRIGHT STEEN  
IRA KENDRICK STEPHENS  
HATTON WILLIAM SUMNERS  
ROBERT LEE SUTHERLAND  
GARDINER SYMONDS

ROBERT EWING THOMASON  
J. CLEO THOMPSON  
LON TINKLE  
CHARLES RUDOLPH TIPS  
HENRY TRANTHAM  
GEORGE WASHINGTON TRUETT  
RADOSLAV ANDREA TSANOFF  
EDWARD BLOUNT TUCKER  
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  
WILLIAM RICHARDSON WHITE  
WILLIAM MARVIN WHYBURN  
HARRY CAROTHERS WIESS  
DOSSIE MARION WIGGINS  
JAMES BUCHANAN WINN JR.  
JAMES RALPH WOOD  
DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD JR.  
WILLIS RAYMOND WOOLRICH  
BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN  
GUS SESSIONS WORTHAM  
LYNDALL FINLEY WORTHAM  
FRANK WILSON WOZENCRAFT  
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER  
RAMSEY YELVINGTON  
HUGH HAMPTON YOUNG

---