

*The Philological Society of Texas*

PROCEEDINGS

2006



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 Waverly 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. On December 5, 1936, formal reorganization was completed.*

*The office of the Society is housed with the Texas State Historical Association, P.O. Box 160144, Austin, TX 78716.*

*Edited by Ashley Brown, Terri Killen, Julie Pennington, and Sherry Crickmer.*

©2012 by *The Philosophical Society of Texas*

# CONTENTS

---

## *Texas Tomorrow: The Impact of Immigration*

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS 2006 ANNUAL MEETING	5
WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION	7
S. Roger Horchow, President, Philosophical Society of Texas	
E PLURIBIS, PLURES	9
Caroline Brettell, Dean ad Interim, Dedman College, Southern Methodist University	
THE NEW ORDER: CAN IT WORK?	28
Lee Cullum, <i>moderator</i> , Journalist, Dallas Morning News	
James Hollifield, Arnold Professor of International Political Economy, Director, Tower Center for Political Studies, Southern Methodist University	
Jack Hunt, President/CEO of King Ranch	
Harry J. Joe, Partner, Jackson Lewis LLP	
Carole J. Wilson, Assistant Professor of Political Science and Political Economy, School of Social Sciences, University of Texas at Dallas	
THE POLITICS OF IMMIGRATION	46
Kay Bailey Hutchison, United States Senate	
A CASE OF FOREIGN POLICY	57
Theodore H. Strauss, <i>introduction</i> , Chairman of the Advisory Board, Dallas Region, Texas Regional Bancshares, Inc.	
James M. Lindsay, Director, Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin	

MIGRATION AND THE NEW CONGRESS John Cornyn, United States Senate	68
AMAZING LIVES OF NEW AMERICANS Pia Orrenius, <i>moderator</i> , Senior Economist, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas  Joe Chow, Mayor, Addison, Texas  Michael Hinojosa, Superintendent, Dallas Independent School District  Tom C. Kim, Director of Sales & Marketing, PrimeSource Food Service Equipment  Prasad Thotakura, Chief Operating Officer, DLT Networks, Inc.	82
A MATTER OF MONEY Richard W. Fisher, President and CEO, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas	99
MEMORIALS	110
OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY	119
PAST PRESIDENTS	120
MEETINGS	122
PREAMBLE	123
MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY	124
IN MEMORIAM	147

# The Philolophical Society of Texas

---

The 169th anniversary meeting of the Philosophical Society was dedicated to the topic of immigration. President S. Roger Horchow put together "Texas Tomorrow: The Impact of Immigration" to discuss the political, economic, and social implications of the immigration policy reform debates that are currently rocking the United States. The meeting was held in Dallas, Texas at the beautiful Fairmont Hotel. An astounding total of 366 members, spouses, and guests were in attendance.

The meeting began on Friday December 1, 2006 with optional tours of the Nasher Sculpture Center and the Dallas Museum of Art. The evening ended with a reception and dinner at the Fairmont Hotel. President Horchow announced the 39 new members and presented them with their certificates of membership. The new members are: Charles Lynde Babcock, Houston; Richard C. Bartlett, Carrollton; James Bass, Dallas; Richard D. Bass, Dallas; Penny Beaumont, Bryan; Fred Burns, Houston; W. Amon Burton, Jr., Austin; Robert S. Capper, Fort Worth; Paul H. Carlson, Ransom Canyon; Donald Coers, San Angelo; James Crisp, Raleigh, NC; R. Ted Cruz, Austin; Elizabeth Yeager Edwards, Wichita Falls; James B. Francis, Jr., Dallas; L. Frederick (Rick) Francis, El Paso; Julius Glickman, Houston; George Jay Gogue, Houston; Michael H. Granof, Austin; William C. Gruben, Dallas; James C. Ho, Dallas; Clay Johnson, III, Washington, DC; Neal Lane, Houston; Garland Lasater, Jr., Fort Worth; Elizabeth Maxwell (Liza) Lee, Dallas; Vidal Martinez, Houston; Roy M. Mersky, Austin; Erle Allen Nye, Dallas; Thomas O'Toole, Dallas; Raymund A. Paredes, Austin; Patricia M. Patterson, Dallas; Fred Pfeiffer, San Antonio; Jeanne Johnson Phillips, Dallas; Joyce Gibson Roach, Keller; Jesse W. Rogers, Wichita Falls; Kathryn Sheaffer Stream, Houston; Gail Thomas, Dallas; Jane Roberts Wood, Argyle; William Patrick Wynn, Austin; and Jay Thornton Young, Plano.

The 2006 Award of Merit for the Best Book on Texas was given to Mavis P. Kelsey Sr. and Robin Brandt Hutchinon for *Engraved Prints of Texas, 1554-1900*, Texas A&M University Press, 2005. This award is given annually for the best book published on Texas, fiction or non-fiction.

Politicians, academics, businessmen, and first generation immigrants contributed to the thought-provoking program, held in the International Ballroom at the Fairmont Hotel. Given the many facets of immigration, the program required the entire day, including presentations at lunch and dinner.

The annual business meeting was held on Sunday morning. The names of Society members who had died during the previous year were read: Lloyd Millard Bentsen, Chester Ray Burns, James A. Elkins, Richard J. V. Johnson, Thos H. Law, Ben F. Love, and Fred Newton White, Jr. Secretary Ron Tyler announced Society membership stood at 201 active members (according to the recently amended Bylaws, the number of active members was increased to 201 due to a tie in the most recent election), 75 associate members, and 71 emeritus members, for a grand total of 347 members. Officers elected for the year 2007 are as follows: Isabel Brown Wilson, president; Boone Powell, first vice-president; Michael L. Gillette, second vice-president; J. Chrys Dougherty, III, treasurer; Ron Tyler, secretary.

A lively roundtable discussion about the weekend's topic followed the business meeting. President Horchow adjourned the meeting until December 7-9, 2007 in Houston, Texas.

# WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

---

S. ROGER HORCHOW

Good evening! I'd like to welcome all of you to Dallas and to our annual meeting of the Texas Philosophical Society. We have a wonderful turnout and hopefully a very interesting and timely program to present. We have been able to prevail upon a group of very well informed and articulate speakers to enlighten and inform—which is, after all, part of our organization's mission.

Immigration is one of the “hot topics” of the day, and the better informed we are, the more likely we will be able to influence our leaders towards a sensible policy. I encourage you all to attend all the sessions tomorrow and will look forward to seeing you during this weekend.

I want to thank the staff of the Society for all their hard work in arranging the logistics of the weekend, and especially to thank in advance, Lee Cullum, who will moderate the sessions and who helped put together the stellar group you will hear tomorrow.

So, have a good dinner and visit with your friends and we'll look forward to seeing you tomorrow bright and early.





*Immigrants awaiting inspection at Galveston, circa 1909. Photo Courtesy Galveston County Historical Museum, Gift of Judith Edworthy Wray.*

*From 1906 to 1914, about 50,000 immigrants arrived in Galveston by ship. Most were from Central and Eastern Europe. Before a new federal quarantine station opened in 1909, incoming immigrants were processed in warehouses meant for cargo storage. Many families spent the night in the railroad depot before boarding trains to their final destinations. While most immigrants moved to other parts of Texas and the Southwest, some remained in town to settle and establish businesses. Galveston became known as the second Ellis Island.*

# E PLURIBUS, PLURES

---

MR. HORCHOW: Good morning. I hope you all had a good night's sleep and are well rested and ready for this program that we've prepared for today.

I would like now to introduce our moderator for the program, whom I must thank publicly for all that she did to bring this whole program together. Without Lee Cullum, we wouldn't have such an interesting program. She's arranged all of the topics and all of the speakers. As I gave credit to my wife for the topic, "Immigration," I give credit to Lee Cullum for this entire program.

Lee, as you probably know, is a very well-known author, columnist and TV personality, and I'm happy to announce ahead of the press, that she will be launching a new program this February called "CEO," and it's going to be on public television, so please tune in immediately, beginning in February.

Lee will now introduce our various speakers and lead the program the rest of the day. Eating will take place in the Venetian Room. Talking will take place in here, visiting in the hall. This evening we will have a similar program outside and then the dinner in the Venetian Room. At the conclusion of our program today at 3:30, we'll have cookies and various things here. Those of you who would like to stay around and visit with the panelists and with each other, you're welcome to stay as long as you want, as long as you're ready to come back at 6:30.

Thank you very, very much, and without further ado, I would like to introduce Ms. Lee Cullum.

• • •

LEE CULLUM  
*Moderator*

Roger and I first discussed this program last January at lunch, and, of course, my worry was that this would all be settled and Congress would have passed all the necessary reforms and it would be a dead issue. Well, I needn't have worried about that. Senator Cornyn is here and he knows how hard he worked to try to get it settled, but it's still very much a live issue and I'm so pleased we're discussing immigration today.

When I think about migration, I'm reminded, oddly enough, of Virginia Woolf, who I thought was the finest novelist of the 20th century. She wrote once about her mother, the beautiful Julia Duckworth, who was

widowed at a young age with three children: two sons and a daughter. She remained widowed for eight years and then married the intellectual Lesley Stephen and had four more children, including Virginia Woolf. And Woolf wrote this of her mother, upon her remarriage: "She came to see, in all its ramifications, that joy must be endured along with sorrow."

We are going to talk today about the joys of immigration, along with the sorrows that inevitably attend it, at least in the minds of some. It's a very misunderstood subject. Phil Martin of the University of California at Davis, said at a symposium here in October, put on by the Tower Center and the Dallas Federal Reserve, that "Migration is a process to be managed, not a problem to be solved." Not everyone agrees with that formulation, but one who knows a great deal about immigration is Dr. Caroline Brettell, who is going to survey the situation for us here in Texas.

Carol Brettell is the interim dean of Dedman College at SMU. Dedman is the humanities college, the core college of SMU, and to my mind, she has the second most important academic post on the campus. We're very lucky to have her there. Before that, she chaired the anthropology department at SMU, developed great expertise in the area of immigration, and is currently doing a special study on migrant communities in Dallas. Carol doesn't just study these communities; she gets to know the people living in them and she tries to be helpful.

Earlier last year Carol brought to my house one afternoon, two engineers from India who were facing very great personal difficulties because of a fluke in our visa laws. One of them worked for Texas Instruments. He was married to a woman who worked at TI also. They had a baby daughter named Tricia, but before too many months, his wife was going to have to return to India because she couldn't get her work visa renewed and she would not be able to return to the country for over five years, nor could he go and visit her in India for longer than six months or he would risk losing his place in line for citizenship. Their daughter was an American citizen, born here, could stay here, but as a practical matter, she would go to India with her mother. And it was a very difficult situation. The other engineer was facing exactly the same thing.

Carol hoped that some media attention might call this problem to the attention of politicians in Washington and maybe they could correct the fluke in the visa laws. I don't know if that has happened yet or not. Senator Cornyn is speaking after lunch. He chairs the Immigration Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; he will have all the answers to legislative questions, and we're happy that he's here today. Plus Senator Hutchison will be speaking this morning.

I would like to add that Carol became interim dean unexpectedly and very luckily for the university. She quite reasonably could have backed off from this commitment, but she didn't, and I appreciate it and I know Roger Horchow does too. So thank you for that, Carol.

I would also like to add that our last panel of the day—which was Roger's idea—a group of great success stories among immigrants, was

put together pretty much by Carol. Over half the people I found through her. Carol Brettell is the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end of this program. And moreover, she corrected my Latin. I thought that the title should be *E Pluribus Pluribus*. She and her husband, Rick Brettell, realized the Latin was all wrong and she changed it to the plural, I believe, *Plures*. And I'm grateful for this correction, too, and happy to introduce Carol Brettell.

• • •

DR. CAROLINE BRETTELL

Good morning. I want to thank the Philosophical Society for this invitation. I'm looking forward to a very interesting day and learning from other people as I share some of my own thoughts.

I will begin by warning you that I'm going to present you with a lot of material very quickly because this is a very complex and multifaceted problem, and the complexity is part of the significance of my title: "Out of Many, Many Things." That's really what we're facing. So bear with me; listen hard.

The first thing I want to present is a little bit of historical background. Scholars of immigration divide the history of immigration in this country into several waves. We are now in the fourth wave with an open time period. But the point here is, of course, that immigration goes way back to the founding of the country and different things happened during different waves. Particularly important is that during each wave of immigration, different kinds of newcomers came, and each of these populations was defined as "other" at the time. Catholics were very much "other" during the second wave of immigration; eastern and southern Europeans were very much "other" during the third wave of immigration which ended in 1924 with the National Origins Quota Act. Then we had a rather quiet period, with very limited immigration until we reopened the United States to immigrants in 1965. Although a return to European immigration was expected, pretty quickly the major sending countries were from Latin American and Asia.

The figures demonstrate that during the second and third waves, roughly 14% or almost 15% of the U.S. population was foreign-born at the high points for these waves. Then you come to the fourth wave. Between 1970 and 2000, we admitted more than 20 million persons as permanent residents. Some three million of these in 2000 were formerly illegal and able to legalize. The proportion of the foreign-born increased from 7.9% of the total population in 1990 to 11.1% in 2000; the estimate for 2005 was 12.4%.

The main point here, thinking historically, is that the total number of foreign-born was smaller at the height of the third wave of immigration, but the proportion of the total population was larger. This is an interesting

difference between the third wave—many of our grandparents, our great grandparents came during that third wave—and immigration today.

In talking about the fourth wave, which is really what we're focused on and why we're dealing with these policy issues today, here are some of the things to which I will draw your attention: where are immigrants going nationwide; how does the state of Texas fit into the national picture of immigration; what is happening in Texas metropolitan areas by comparison with other metropolitan areas across the nation. Toward the end of my presentation I will focus on the study funded by the National Science Foundation that we've been doing over the last several years in the Dallas area. Clearly, this is the city I live in and the city that I know best. I will conclude with a consideration of the title of this talk—what we need to be thinking about regarding *E Pluribus Plures*, "Out of Many, Many Things."

To begin, where are the immigrants going nationwide? Immigrants are settling in traditional gateway cities of immigration in significant numbers. What are these cities? They're cities you all know: New York City, with a foreign-born population that was 34% of the total population in 2000; Chicago, another city where over a third of the population was foreign-born in 2000; Los Angeles, with almost 41% of the population foreign-born in 2000; and then Miami where almost 60% of the population in 2000 was foreign-born. People tend to think about Miami as a Latin American city, with good reason.

Figure 1 shows the top ten receiving states, with California and New York at the top and Illinois at the bottom. To some extent these rankings are fueled by those big metropolitan areas that are in the list of traditional gateway cities, but the inclusion of Nevada and the District of Columbia on this list is rather interesting.

Figure 1:

*Top Ten States for the Foreign Born as a % of the Total Population, 2000, 2005*

California: 26.2% (2000);	27.2% (2005)
New York: 20.4% (2000);	21.4% (2005)
Hawaii: 17.5% (2000);	17.2% (2005)
New Jersey: 17.5% (2000);	19.5% (2005)
Florida: 16.7% (2000);	18.5% (2005)
Nevada: 15.8% (2000);	17.4% (2005)
Texas: 13.9% (2000);	15.9% (2005)
District of Columbia: 12.9% (2000);	13.1% (2005)
Arizona: 12.8% (2000);	14.5% (2005)
Illinois: 12.3% (2000);	13.6% (2005)

If you look at the top ten states according to the change in the foreign-born population between 1990 and 2000, some other interesting dimen-

sions being to emerge. States like North Carolina and Georgia appear at the top of the list; Nevada, number three; Arkansas, number four; and, of course, Texas is in there as a reference point at number seven. You can begin to see that there's something else that has been going on in the last 15 years, particularly during the decade of the '90s: states without traditional gateway cities are experiencing the most dramatic change in relation to the growth of foreign-born populations.

Finally, if you look at the data by the rank of the percent change in the foreign-born, additional states comes on line so to speak: Arkansas and Georgia are there, but also Tennessee and Nebraska, and between 2000 and 2005, South Carolina and New Hampshire join the list. This illustrates that the foreign-born population continued to grow in new regions of the country, even after 9-11.

What conclusions can we draw from these tables? A number of interesting trends have been happening; in addition to the traditional gateways, there are these emerging gateway cities which have seen a rapid increase in the proportion of the foreign-born, particularly during the 1990s. For examples: Las Vegas, Washington, D.C., an extremely interesting case, Atlanta, and also the Dallas-Fort Worth and particularly Dallas metropolitan area.

These terms of emerging and pre-emerging gateways I borrow from my friend and colleague, Audrey Singer, at the Brookings Institution who has written a particularly interesting paper on these urban classifications. She and I and a geographer at the University of Oregon are working on a Brookings book, actually, on suburban gateway cities, which I'll come back to in a minute.

Among pre-emerging gateways are cities such as Charlotte, North Carolina, that have seen a significant change. The "New South" is a term that refers to those states that didn't have a lot of experience prior to 1990 with foreign-born or immigrant populations, but that now have intense experience and are trying to adjust to that experience in terms of bilingual education in the schools and all kinds of issues that one faces when you have a rapid increase in the foreign-born population. States like North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee are all in this category.

Two other trends: immigrants are directly settling in suburban America, and I'm going to come back to that in particular. They are also settling in rural areas, so you get states like Arkansas on the list, and again, a lot of that is in relationship to jobs. Also Iowa and Nebraska, again, places without a whole lot of experience prior to 1990 with the foreign-born are now experiencing population change. The issue is widespread distribution, not to say that the bulk of immigrants aren't still going to those traditional gateways, but there are all kinds of other trends happening.

So what about the state of Texas—because I know that's partly what you're interested in. To kind of situate the state of Texas, it's ranked 3rd out of 51 in the size of the foreign-born population in 2000; 7th out of 51 in the percent of the foreign-born in the total population in 2000; 2nd out

of 51 in the numeric change in the foreign-born population from 1990 to 2000; 23rd out of 51, as you saw, in the percent change in the foreign-born from 1990 to 2000 (note that 51 includes the District of Columbia).

Some other issues: 46.1% of the foreign-born in Texas entered during the 1990s—just to reemphasize how important that decade was for the kinds of questions and issues we are confronted with today. In 2000 the proportion of foreign-born, in terms of countries of origin, was almost three-quarters coming from Latin America, not something that would surprise you at all.

Of the total foreign-born in Texas, broken down by country of origin, shows that almost 65% were born in Mexico, and then the next largest group are the Vietnamese at 3.7%. You can see the huge gap between the proportion of Mexicans and the next largest group. Comparing that to the rest of the nation, where nationwide the Mexicans are the largest group of foreign-born (29.5%) followed by the Filipinos (4.4%) and the Indians (3.3%).

A third of foreign-born individuals in Texas are citizens. We are under the national average (40%), but I think that's also explained probably by, again, the disproportion number of people from Mexico. Also, almost 90% speak a language other than English at home. A quarter of Texas' foreign-born live in poverty, which is 15.8% of foreign-born citizens. Compare that to the national average, which was 18% in 2000, just to situate, again, your state.

If we look at 2005 American Community Survey data—and this is going to get me into the urban issues that I'm going to focus on as we go on this morning—I've divided the cities of Texas into three categories.

The border metropolitan areas where you see over 25% of the population is foreign-born; cities like Brownsville, El Paso, Laredo. I think that's one issue to deal with. I think we need to start looking at different urban metropolitan areas because you're going to face really different kinds of issues in relationship to the proportion of foreign-born and the composition of foreign-born, and of course, then local economies and all kinds of other things.

Then we have West Texas metros, like Amarillo, Abilene, and San Angelo, with much smaller percentages of foreign-born, but nevertheless, not insignificant which I think, again, reflects this trend of foreign-born populations moving into more rural areas, obviously following the jobs, whatever they are. But that's a second category in our state.

And then the big metropolitan urban areas like Houston, Austin-Round Rock, and San Antonio. Austin, in fact, in Dr. Singer's categorization, is a pre-emerging gateway. It hasn't quite had as dramatic an increase as the emerging gateway cities. Actually, Austin is a chapter in our suburban gateway books. There's a very good geographer down at UT Austin named Emily Skop, who has written the chapter on Austin for our publication.

So let's get to the Dallas metropolitan area, an emerging gateway city of immigration. In figure 2 you simply see the increase in the population itself. Those of us who are living in this area know that we now

have traffic problems which we probably didn't have in 1980. Overall, the population itself, of course, has increased dramatically both in the city of Dallas and in the larger metropolitan area. This has been one of the biggest growth areas in the country in general.

*Figure 2:  
Dallas Population*

1980: Approximately 974,000 in the city  
(Metropolitan Area: 2,055,000)

1990: Approximately 1,006,000 in the city  
(Metropolitan Area: 2,676,000)

2000: Approximately 1,188,000 in the city  
(Metropolitan Area: 3.5 million; CMSA\*: 5.2 million)

2005: Metropolitan Area: 3.8 million; CMSA\*: 5.7 million)

\*Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area

In terms of the growth of the foreign-born population, between 1990 and 2000, the foreign-born population almost doubled (from 7.9% to 15% of the total population), and that's one of the criteria for these emerging gateway cities: the doubling of their foreign-born population in a short ten-year period. And you also see that this proportion is still going up between 2000 and 2005 (to 17.7%).

This is an area that has attracted both high and low human capital immigrants, and by human capital I mean education; I mean English-language skills, those kinds of resources that people have. There's a significant population of Asian-Indians in Dallas and you're going to hear from one of my friends in the Asian-Indian community this afternoon, but obviously, there's also a significant population of lower human capital immigrants. Of course, it's because we have an economy that attracts both high and low human capital immigrants.

The important thing, coming back to this issue of suburban settlement, is that we no longer have a concentric zone model of cities. During the third wave of immigration, everybody knew about New York City and the lower east side; the kind of older, cheap housing, inner-city neighborhoods. This is where immigrants went during the third wave; this is where they first settled. And then they moved out into the suburbs in the second, but particularly in the third generation. The grandchildren of the immigrants who arrived were the ones who would grow up in the suburbs. Well, what we have now is direct settlement in suburban communities around these gateway and particularly emerging gateway cities, so you see here that 15.3% of the population of the suburbs of the Dallas area was Hispanic in 2000. A lot of the affordable housing is in the suburbs now. A



lot of jobs are now in the suburbs, so it's a completely new phenomenon.

I apologize for these tables. I know at the back you're probably not going to be able to see the numbers, and so I'll point out what's important here. I've chosen one county, Collin County, which, of course, was one of the fastest growing counties in the United States between 1990 and 2000. It is a suburban, wealthy county. The proportion of foreign-born in Collin County changed dramatically between 1990 and 2000. When you have increases over 300%, and in one case (in terms of Africans, of course, the numbers are smaller) over 400%, something interesting is happening in terms of the changing dynamics and composition of the population of this suburban county.

For those of you who are not from this area, I just put a map up (figure 3) because I'm going to be talking about a couple of these communities. Particularly so that you can fix in your mind where Plano is, Farmers Branch, Richardson, Lewisville, McKinney, Allen.

Figure 3:  
*Dallas—Fort Worth Metropolitan Area*



Source: The Firm List, 2006 <http://us.firmlist.com/texas/dallas/dfwmetro.php>

I think about the inner and outer ring suburbs. We have the central city of Dallas, then we have this inner ring of suburbs that might include Garland and Richardson and Farmers Branch and maybe even Plano, at this point at the heart of Collin County, and then outer ring suburbs (or ex-urbs) like Denton and McKinney.

The next table shows the foreign born in these inner ring suburbs. We've heard a lot about Farmers Branch in the news recently and I'm going to come back to that—a quarter of the population in that community was foreign-born in 2000 and that has only increased in recent years. You also see in Irving, another inner ring suburb with over a quarter of the population foreign-born, Plano with 17% foreign-born, and Richardson, an older receiving area where Asians have been settling since 1980. Richardson's population was 19% foreign-born in 2000. And then there are these outer ring suburbs, not insignificant proportions, way out there in McKinney, with 12.6% of the population in 2000 foreign-born. So this is just to stress the point about these suburban communities of major metropolitan areas being places of immigrant settlement.

I know for sure you cannot see this table at the back of the room, but I'm just going to point out two figures to you because I'm going to come back to them. In Farmers Branch, almost 60% of the foreign-born population is from Mexico. Contrast that with Plano, where 21 or 22% of the foreign-born population is Mexican. If you add up those the next three groups, all Asian (Chinese, Vietnamese, Indian), they comprise slightly over 30%.

There are a couple of maps we've generated out of our project. This is the settlement pattern for Indians, and I know you can't see it, there are all those little red dots from the generated census data, but the point to take away from this, and it's really contrasting this map with the next two that come, is the Indians have settled in the suburbs in a kind of arc around the city. This is the dispersed settlement pattern of the Asian-Indian population.

Contrast that with the Vietnamese settlement pattern. Just focus on those two intense areas of blue; this is in Arlington and in Garland, they are the centers of the Vietnamese community. They are much more tightly knit and intense settlement in a couple of suburban areas gathering together.

Then the Salvadorans, who are in these inner ring suburbs (and Irving is in there and Farmers Branch is in there) where you see that kind of pinky color, but again, some concentration. And then there is the yellow of the Mexican settlement all around the city in both suburban and urban areas. You also see Denton and McKinney at the northern top of the map and so that shows you that the Mexicans are settling in those communities as well as more around the metropolitan core.

I've become very interested in the attitudes of metropolitan areas towards immigrants, and I think there are multicultural-minded municipalities, and here I take a quote from a study by a fellow named Alexander. "The multicultural-minded municipality is sensitive to the particular needs and problems arising from the migrants' otherness. The positive potential of the migrants for the city is also acknowledged and their otherness is also perceived as enriching the local host culture and economy."

I would take Plano, Texas, as a multiculturally-minded suburban com-

munity. There are lots of programs that Plano has put in place for their foreign-born population. They have a very active multicultural roundtable which has been inclusive in getting the foreign-born population, the immigrants involved in the community. There are extensive library programs. Libraries are at the front of the integration process of immigrants, in my view, in terms of the programs that they offer. I have a lot more information on this, but I'm just giving you an idea.

What's happening in the schools in terms of this multiculturally-minded approach to the foreign-born and this rapid growth in the foreign-born? There are citizens academies where they reach out to the foreign-born and try and include them in the urban government process in their city, and then, of course, the kinds of things where people are allowed to express their cultural diversity. The mayor of Plano described Plano as the cricket capital of North America and claimed they're equally very good in table tennis. Well, that's obviously the involvement of those significant numbers of Indian and Chinese immigrants.

The mayor of Plano was quoted in the Dallas Morning News: "Given current demographics, we'll have this diversity forever. It is never going to be reversed, and since that's the case, then, let's embrace it."

Now, this was not always the case. The Indians in the Dallas area in 1980 had some land in Plano where they wanted to build their Hindu Temple, and there was a lot of negative attitude about that. It's a long, complicated story, but the end result was that they were forced to sell that land. The mayor of Irving was much more hospitable at the time, and the DFW Hindu Temple now is in Irving, Texas and is a very active center point for the Indian community. So Plano was not always multiculturally-minded; in the 1980s it was not, but it had a change of attitude and I think currently does an excellent job of integration.

Well, then we come to Farmers Branch, about which we have, at least in the Dallas area, been reading a lot about. I think it has also been covered in the national press. Here I think there is an excluding approach. It is not a multiculturally-minded city. Approximately one-third of the population in 2005 was foreign-born and it's gone up from the one-quarter figure that I gave you for 2000. You all know from reading the papers what the city council there has proposed: to bar landlords from leasing units to the undocumented and penalizing employers who hire them, to make English the official language of Farmers Branch, and to train law enforcement to process and detain illegal immigrants, which I think is a particularly controversial issue which we could come back to.

Here are some quotes, taken from the newspaper, representing the kind of attitude that has been fostered in that community, which personally I don't think is really productive in dealing with the issue of unauthorized immigrants. But I'm sure there are people out there who disagree or who want to discuss it, but these kind of quotes really represent an attitude which is more confrontational than problem-solving.

I want to discuss a little bit about immigration status and citizenship,

and again, if you look at this, it's a complex problem: we're dealing with both legal and illegal immigrants; we're dealing with people who come in as refugees and then very quickly get their green cards and probably move fairly quickly towards naturalized citizenship; we're dealing with people who are on work permits, not necessarily defined as immigrants, defined as temporary workers—and we all know there is a guest worker program that is back on the table. So we're dealing with all kinds of different populations when we talk about the issue of immigration.

I'm going to show you a couple of charts, again from our study; I'm not going to explain the estimator that was used to do this. But when we were interviewing immigrants, we documented an immigration status trajectory from the way that they entered the country all the way to what kind of status they had at the time of our interview. Now, some people entered illegally and they are still undocumented; other people entered with a work permit and they are now either legal permanent residents or citizens.

So here are three graphs: A-1 represents people who came into the country as undocumented workers, and the important point is just the trajectory of these lines, that over time—and this compares the Salvadorans with the Mexicans—they have changed their status. For a long time we've had this change of status possibility. I don't know if you want to call it a policy, but this is the experience, that people come in under one status and they end up under another status, very often legalized. So whether it's written policy or not, this is what has been happening.

In the case of the more rapid linear decline of Salvadorans (representing more possibility for a change of status) by comparison with Mexicans, it's because we've extended to them something called Temporary Protective status. This status is issued because of conflicts and natural disasters in El Salvador to allow people to be here temporarily, legally and to work legally. But even the graph of the Mexicans shows that over time they become legalized in some way.

Here are the H-1-B workers. Pay attention only to the black line because the N for the Nigerians, who are also in our study (a smaller group, but the biggest African group in the state of Texas) is too small to be significant. However, the Indian trajectory there, shows you that people who come in under Temporary Worker status, these skilled worker visas, over time have been able to convert that status into a green card holder status, and then ultimately into citizenship. The decline in the graph shows you that trajectory.

Here are legal permanent residents, people who came in or at one point were able to get that status, so this is about the move to citizenship. And the interesting thing there, just in terms of the groups, the light blue line at the bottom is the Vietnamese, people who come in as refugees, become green card holders very quickly and they become citizens. Of course, there are obvious reasons for that in terms of your ability to go back to your home country—not something the Vietnamese want to do.

The Mexicans at the top in red, show a much slower process. Again,

I'm probably not telling you anything that you don't already know, but it's interesting to see this sort of stuff graphed out. And the Indians, the black line in the middle, in terms of movement from holding a green card to becoming a citizen.

What Lee Cullum didn't mention to you in her introduction, is that I was born and raised in Montreal, Canada. I came to the U.S. on a student visa; I became a green card holder in 1976; it took me until 1993 to become an American citizen. But I've gone through this experience of changing status myself and I have some relationship to it.

So coming back to the general, broader issue that we're discussing, *E Pluribus Plures*, "Out of Many, Many Things," there are lots of things to discuss and I'm going to go through these quickly: the issue of becoming a citizen; the issue of being an American; the issue of being an Indian, Vietnamese, Mexican, Salvadoran at the same time that you're also perhaps an American; the issue of what I call cultural citizenship; and then some final concluding remarks. So we're getting to the last little bit of this presentation.

Talking a little bit about citizenship, I thought I would present you with just some quotations from the interviews that we did. These are responses about people's attitudes towards citizenship, which I think is particularly telling. I've divided these into the different groups that we were looking at in this large study.

#### Indian Responses:

- 1). "To me, it is not unpatriotic to India to do it—that is, to become an American citizen—you have to be true to where you live. You plant a seed somewhere else and the roots are the same, it just bears fruit in a new place."
- 2). "It is our responsibility to be part of the country and do something for the country. We are taking all the privileges and benefits, why not become a citizen. I did it with no hesitation."

#### Vietnamese Responses:

- 1). "It would be impossible to have Vietnamese citizenship, given the nature of the regime there. The Communist government in Vietnam may consider us to be citizens, but all they are interested in is money, getting us to send money back." This respondent refers to the important issue of remittances, and the element of suspicion that a lot of Vietnamese here—and that's a very interesting issue—have about Vietnam.
- 2). "The U.S. is my second home country. This is the place where we have come to live to improve our lives and gain freedom, so the kind of values that are absorbed by newcomers to this country, so it is important to formally join the society and become a citizen."

Mexican Responses: Now, when you get to the Hispanics, then, people

who work very, very long hours and who have less education, becoming a citizen is more of a challenge.

- 1). "It takes too long, too much time and effort." These are concerns to them in terms of the challenge of becoming a citizen.
- 2). "It's not worth it and the system is getting worse because of terrorism, but I'll try again in the future but not now." Note that some of these interviews were done a couple years after 9-11.

Many of the Mexicans we interviewed were not eligible, they were undocumented, they had no interest, but those who were, who had the possibility because they were already legalized said things like: "Because it is my country, my home now, I want to be like everyone else," a sentiment which is not so different from that of the Indians. Said another: "It gives you fewer problems to find work and receive benefits."

What does it mean to be an American? That was another question that we asked, and here I want you to pay attention to the kinds of values that have been absorbed. We just heard in the newspaper that the country is considering a new citizenship test, much more meaty questions about American history, but I think we are concerned about the absorption of values and I think actually some of these responses represent that this actually is taking place.

Mexican Response:

- 1). "It means to have freedom, the opportunity to have a brilliant future, to fulfill one's dreams. What do I say? I have no words; the United States is the maximum; I have a good image of this country."

Salvadoran Responses:

- 1). "It means that one has opportunities, the chance to prosper and get an education; the education must come first—things can be accomplished in El Salvador, but it is harder."
- 2). "Being an American means being an international figure because of both the power and the image of the country in the rest of the world's minds."

Vietnamese Response:

- 1). "To be an American means that you have the freedom to express yourself without anyone stopping you, the freedom of speech, one of the basic rights in our Constitution. An American also has the freedom to succeed in life with all the opportunities given by the government, a government." That the U.S. is a democracy, which is the way I would phrase that response.
- 2). "It means I have been upgraded, like from economy to first class." I love this last quote; it is really my most favorite of every single interview that was done on this project.

Indian Response:

- 1). "In India, we are all brought up like followers, to do things when somebody else asks and to do it well, but not to take a leadership role. In the U.S., I have learned how to be a leader and it means a lot to me." I think that's a very poignant comment about an interpretation.

And then we asked people about multiculturalism, or being both; being both American and being true to your origins and to your roots, Most people said, "Sure you can be both, this is the country that allows you to be both."

Salvadoran Response:

- 1). "By law, one can be both, but in one's heart, where you work and live determine what you are, especially once you adapt to life here. I think I would feel like a foreigner in El Salvador now."

Mexican Response:

- 1). "People identify me as Mexican, so I must embrace it too."

That raises interesting issues about to whom do we accord the right to be American citizens. And sometimes somebody asks where they are from, and they say America; no, but where are you really from? Well, think about when you ask that question; what you're really asking and what you're taking away from people when they give you a response that they are from America.

Vietnamese Response:

- 1). "I'm American first, but I respect the Vietnamese values. It depends on what you are talking about. If it is about culture, personality and character, I think you can draw from both; if it is about a conflict between the U.S. and my country, I think I would be loyal to where I live; I'm here using the resources here so I think I would have to be loyal to the United States."

Indian Response:

- 1). "When I think of my identity, I feel that my soul values are Muslim; my intellect, confidence and freedom to reason are American; my heart, my emotions are Indian; my work ethic is Asian. I'm one person, but in me are all these identities operating at the same time." And this, I think, is the most poetic comment that we ever got in an interview.

In terms of "Out of Many, Many Things", what has happened? Well, I'm going to race through this rather quickly. The urban landscapes of America have changed in terms of these ethnic shopping malls. These are just images of the kinds of things that exist in the city of Dallas, but they exist in Washington, D.C., in Houston, Texas, and elsewhere. The diversity of religious institutions: here you have the DFW Hindu Temple, and

the Mar Thoma Church. There are 17 Indian Christian churches in the DFW area. You have new voluntary organizations where people learn citizenship and learn leadership. Here is an image of the India Association of North Texas which was founded in the early 1980s, a very active organization.

Cultural citizenship represents the right to be different. I think this country has been built on allowing people to maintain some of those cultural differences. International festivals and claims-making on the urban landscape in terms of these international festivals: national days. The Indians here in the DFW area, sometime in August close to the 15th—which is, of course, Republic Day when the British walked out of India and left it to build its own democracy—between 20,000 and 25,000 Indians in the area gather at Lone Star Park, the racetrack, and you feel like you're in India and you eat wonderful food and are wonderfully entertained.

Some concluding thoughts: Where do immigrants fit into American identity? Are we a nation of immigrants? History shows that immigrants have frequently not been welcome, and that was the point that I made in the beginning by talking about somebody always being “other,” but we've gotten over those hurdles all the time. The country is resilient, the country is flexible, the country is welcoming, and we've been able to absorb these differences and build very loyal American citizens.

But we need to think about what's happening globally, so I quote the anthropologist Arjan Appadurai. He suggested the United States is in transition from being “a land of immigrants to being one node in a post-natural network of diaspora.” So maybe we need to think about the world differently as we address this particular problem.

English is a unifying language. However, it tears some communities apart. Again, I give you some historical perspective—Jane Adams, who founded the Hull Settlement House in Chicago would not have been surprised when told that there were more than 100 languages spoken in the schools of our major gateway or emerging gateway cities today. She confronted the same thing at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century.

What are we? A melting pot, a salad bowl, or the demographic re-Conquista? Is that what's happening? I don't happen to think the latter is what's happening, but what kind of metaphor are we going to use for this country?

I'm just putting these out without saying what the issues are because I think these are the issues that we're going to be discussing for the rest of today:

- The issue of legal versus illegal immigration and where to situate the concept of a nation of laws, which is also really fundamental to our identity in relationship to all of these other issues.
- The economic issues of whether immigration depresses wages or whether immigrants are taking jobs that no one else wants to do.
- The issue of federal responsibility versus local responsibility. Local



communities, like Farmers Branch, are frustrated with the stalling of national immigration policy, and of course, they're the ones integrating these immigrants. There's a kind of tension there, I think, between the local and federal levels on this issue.

- Immigration policy versus integration policy; should we be thinking more about integration policy than we perhaps have? And it's not to say that one precludes the other, but perhaps we need to be thinking along both trajectories as we move forward.

Finally, I'd like to thank the National Science Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation which is funding some current work that I'm doing on citizenship and incorporation, Roger Horchow and Lee Cullum, and of course, Southern Methodist University which has housed my project and housed me for a very long time. I'm very grateful to them. Thank you. I'm happy to take some questions or comments. I apologize for throwing so much at you so fast.

### *Discussion:*

AUDIENCE: What about the bilingual education in the Dallas-Fort Worth area?

DR. BRETTELL: I can tell you that Southern Methodist University has a bilingual education program which is still going on and very successful. We are short on bilingual teachers in the state. It's not a topic that I've worked a lot on; there are a couple of things I could just say in terms of what I think about it.

I grew up in Quebec; I grew up bilingual. I actually think being bilingual is an asset in this global world. I think there are a lot of bilingual education programs that have probably not been successful in terms of the original spirit of bilingual education, which was to help young students transition into English, and sometimes they are stuck in these bilingual education programs and that's not to their benefit. We're talking largely about Hispanics, although, again, there are some critical mass issues for other languages. Their parents aren't even enthusiastic about that. I mean, parents want their children to learn English.

The other thing I would say is I think that some of this issue about language is a non-issue. If we were to transport ourselves back to the third wave of immigration, to those first generation immigrants, they were all speaking their own languages. Now, there were multitudes of languages back then, and so there's a difference between the kind of hegemony and the Hispanic language because the largest proportions now are Mexicans, with smaller numbers for other populations. But regarding the immigrants of the past, their children and their grandchildren spoke English, and sometimes their grandchildren did not speak the native language, which in some ways, I think, is a bit lamentable or sad—let's put it that way. I think

the children of Mexican immigrants, whether legal or undocumented, are learning English. I hope they keep their Spanish, too, because I think these are assets globally.

AUDIENCE: I think a lot of the attitudes toward immigration depend on whether or not immigrants are viewed as an economic asset. Have you explored how Farmers Branch and Plano would differ in that regard? Why, say Farmers Branch people wouldn't consider immigrants to be an economic asset the way Plano people would?

DR. BRETTELL: Well, I want to make a comment first. I was struck by an op-ed by Thomas Friedman yesterday and by an analogy. He was talking about Iraq, and he made some reference to the Israel-Palestine issue and Israel had gone through several strategies and finally decided to build this wall. Of course, we know a wall is on the table in terms of the security aspects of immigration. And by the way, since 9-11, the security aspects of immigration have been put on the table like they never were before, so that's an interesting issue to discuss. But then he got to the point where he said, "The real way that we're going to deal with this problem," and he said it before, but he said it very powerfully yesterday, "is to get off our addiction to oil and to really explore alternative energy sources."

Some of the issue about immigration, I think, is getting off our addiction to cheap labor, and if we're going to deal with this, we're going to have confront that. I do think there are a lot of jobs for which we need immigrants, and that's been the history of the United States. In the third wave of immigration, it was the immigrants fueling the steel industry and the kind of industrial growth that this country experienced in the late 19th century in particular. There's a kind of parallel there; we need people to come in and do these kinds of jobs.

In terms of Plano and Farmers Branch, point one was, again, the dynamics of the foreign-born populations are different. Plano has both those high human capital and the lower human capital immigrants; they are equally employed doing various kinds of things that we need in the DFW economy, just in different areas. I think the sort of demographic dynamic allows them to operate that way.

I've actually done a lot of interviews in Plano with various people in the city, but I haven't had the chance to do that in Farmers Branch—because they asked me to be dean; otherwise, I would have been out there in the streets, in Farmers Branch. So, I'm a little less confident talking about it, but I think the large hispanic population probably presents different kinds of challenges to that community. You know, it's almost politically correct to be anti-Hispanic. I mean, there are certain groups where people can say what they want to say and I'm not so sure that that's productive.

We've had a law on the books since 1986 about employer sanctions, I suppose we could enforce it, but there's a reason why we haven't enforced it—again, it goes back to economy. The housing issue is also important—

access to cheap housing. I just think that the Farmers Branch approach is not the way to deal with the problem. You know, people wouldn't be here if they couldn't find work, and they find work.

Now, if you read your paper this morning, the new president of Mexico was installed and he was talking about something that I think this country needs to work with Mexico on. He was talking about creating more jobs in Mexico and attracting more foreign investment. People don't necessarily want to leave their homes, but you know, the Mexicans who are here have the same goals that you do, which is to give shelter to your families, provide for your families, and if you can't do it where you live, you tend to look elsewhere. If you could do it where you live, you might not look elsewhere. Of course, the other thing is the wage difference between Mexico and the United States which is also an issue that we have to confront.

AUDIENCE: Maybe I misunderstood your slides, but I thought that it said that 60 percent of Farmers Branch population was of Mexican national origin?

DR. BRETTELL: Sixty percent of the foreign-born population is Mexican. In 2005, I believe it's about a third of the population of the community is foreign-born, and then of those foreign-born, 60% are Mexican. So I was making two points: looking at what the total proportion of the population is foreign-born, and then within that, what's the composition of the foreign-born population. And it's quite distinctive between Plano and Farmers Branch.

AUDIENCE: I see. Well, the Farmers Branch movement has gotten national attention, and my real question is, once a foreign citizen becomes a U.S. citizen, do they tend to change their attitude towards being exclusionists as well?

DR. BRETTELL: You mean the sense of belonging? You're talking about the immigrants themselves. Right?

AUDIENCE: Yes. Well, actually once they become national citizens. If their ethnic background is from Mexico and they are now U.S. citizens, and they've been that way for maybe a generation or two, do their attitudes change towards Mexican immigrants?

DR. BRETTELL: Towards other newcomers?

AUDIENCE: Yes, from their ethnic backgrounds.

DR. BRETTELL: Well, you know, that's an interesting question. It's not something that I've really worked on, but there is a little bit of not wanting other people to come in and share the pie. I don't know if you've ever

seen the film "Lone Star" which was a film set on the Mexican border, and there's a woman there who owns a restaurant, I believe, and she is very against the undocumented workers, the wetbacks coming across the Rio Grande River. You get to a point in the film where the fellow who works for her brings his girlfriend across or something happens—it's been a long time since I've seen the film—and you see a flashback to the fact that she herself entered the country that way. That's a piece of fiction and a piece of literature, but there are, I think, undocumented workers is the demonized population these days.

Not to say that I don't think we should try to solve this problem, because I actually think when you're undocumented, you're open to all kinds of exploitation. There's a lot of stuff going on that I wish were not going on. So yes, I agree with you. I originally thought you were talking about just when people become citizens, what attitude they have. I presented those quotes earlier to show you that people really do absorb core U.S. values. I've been at naturalization ceremonies and I can't tell you the positive enthusiasm that occurs at those ceremonies. People are very proud to take American citizenship when they're able to do it.

Ms. CULLUM: Carol, that was a breathtaking tour de force. Thank you very, very much.

# THE NEW ORDER: CAN IT WORK?

---

LEE CULLUM, *Moderator*

JAMES HOLLIFIELD, JACK HUNT, HARRY J. JOE, CAROLE J. WILSON

**M**S. CULLUM: Now we need Jim Hollifield, Harry Joe, Carole Wilson, and Jack Hunt. We're going to be looking at this "New Order" that Carol has just described with such expertise, dazzling expertise. We are going to be asking: "Can It Work?" We have panelists today who have spent a lot of time pondering this question.

I'm going to begin by interviewing Jim Hollifield, who is here to my right. Jim Hollifield runs the Tower Center at SMU, and he has transformed the Tower Center into a vital forum for the discussion of foreign relations in this part of the world. I think when you take the World Affairs Council of Dallas-Fort Worth, chaired by Pat Patterson, one of our new members, and the Tower Center, there is always something compelling going on in this area.

Jim Hollifield is also a professor of political science at SMU. He teaches European History and he, too, is an expert in immigration. He gives papers on immigration all over the world. I frequently receive emails from him from Turkey or France or New York, and he flew back from New York last night especially to be here this morning. And Jim, I appreciate that very much.

Harry Joe is an attorney with Jenkins and Gilchrist which is one of the most respected law firms in Dallas. He specializes in immigration law, and he can be quite inventive in his advice. Last year I traveled to Taipei and I interviewed a very impressive trade minister, and shortly after I returned home, I received an email from that trade minister saying that he had a son living in Seattle who was desperate to stay in this country. He had studied computer science on various campuses and run out the string on his student visa, he had worked at high tech companies and played out the string on his worker visa, and he didn't know where to turn. Well, Harry had two pieces of advice. First, marry an American citizen; that would solve everything.

Well, I got in touch with the young man and I suggested this. He said he had already thought about that, but he had been unable to find a candidate that would work, that would say "yes." So I went on to Harry's second piece of advice, which was move to Canada. Canada has far more

advantageous migration laws. If he could establish himself in Canada, and from that base move back to the United States, he could do so on far more favorable terms. I bring this up just to show you how very creative Harry can be, and also how very generous. He was giving his time away in this instance and it was very kind of him.

Carole Wilson is a political scientist at the University of Texas at Dallas, and her expertise is in the politics and elections of the European Union and Mexico. Carole has at least two books from the presidential election in Mexico this year. You all remember it was held in July, and finally settled in September when Felipe Calderón was named president, having won by half a percentage point, and sworn in yesterday in a melee that looked like something from Gilbert and Sullivan. The ceremony lasted four minutes, which was all he could stay safely in the chamber. And of course, his opponent, Lopez Obrador, has been demonstrating on the streets for months; he swore himself in on November 20 in a mock alternative ceremony.

I want to add that Carole, Harry, Jim, and I did a program on immigration for the Dallas Committee on Foreign Relations summer before last, and it's very good to have the gang together again.

I'm very pleased that we're joined this morning by Jack Hunt. If you read Jack Hunt's resume, you will see that he is the quintessential Texan. He's involved in agriculture, land rights, grazing rights, water rights; he is the Texan of our imagination. And what's more, he went to Harvard. Jack Hunt runs the King Ranch, and in the past year he has developed a second career: debating the president's proposed guest worker program with Dallas Congressman Pete Sessions all across the state. The congressman does not favor this program, opposes it; Jack Hunt favors it. And we'll be hearing more about that. I certainly want to thank Barney Young for persuading Jack to be with us today. That was a great help, Barney.

Jim, let's start with you. At the symposium that you put on, that the Tower Center put on with the Federal Reserve Bank in October, Barry Chiswick, of the University of Illinois in Chicago, said: "The question is not why there is so much immigration, but why there is so little." Do you agree with that formulation?

DR. HOLLIFIELD: Yes, I do. If you look at the world migrant population today, the best estimate we have is a quarter of a billion people living outside of the country of their birth. Now, you may think that 250 million people is a lot of people, but when you compare it to the size of the world's population, you only have less than 3 percent of the people in the world today who live outside of their country of birth.

So the big question—and I agree with Professor Chiswick, a good friend of mine—is why more people don't move? The vast majority of people stay in the villages where they were born, but the fact of the matter is, we are seeing increasing movement, increasing numbers, and as my colleague, Caroline Brettell, pointed out earlier, we are now at historic highs

in this country in terms of numbers; we haven't quite reached the percentages that we saw at the end of the 19th century.

I think Americans, in particular, are very well placed to feel the brunt of this world migration because we are a classic nation of immigrants or, as some have said, a nation of nations. This is something that has happened multiple times in our history, although we've only had four great waves of immigration. I think one of the things that makes this latest wave a bit more problematic is that it was a long time between the third and the fourth wave of immigration. So this is a relatively new experience for Americans. Most people don't remember or didn't experience the third wave of immigration.

I'm not surprised that the political pot is boiling in this country, and I would just add that Americans are profoundly ambivalent about immigration. They worry about it; they want it controlled; they want it reduced—if you believe opinion polls—but on the other hand, I was tempted to ask how many people in this room have Irish ancestry, how many of you in this room have German ancestry.

We know that Ben Franklin, for example, said that Germans will never make it; they cannot be Americans because they're medieval peasants, basically, and they don't know how to live in a free and democratic society. Well, guess what? Ben changed his mind about that because those Germans turned out to be constituents there in Pennsylvania; he shifted his thinking.

I would just conclude with one other anecdote about the Irish. Probably many of you in this room have Irish ancestry. I love to tell the story about an African-American young man who, like so many, fled the south in the 19th, early 20th century, and went to New York looking for fame and fortune. He'd heard stories about all the Irish people there, and he got to New York City and he wrote a letter back home and said, "I've met these Irish people, and guess what, they're white; they are white."

MS. CULLUM: Harry Joe, we had a precipitous fall in foreign students in this country after September 11th. Students like Carol Brettell, who came to go to universities in the United States. It's beginning to pick up again. In the last twelve months, I understand we issued about 590,000 student and exchange visas. Nonetheless, the growth in foreign students in Japan, France and Germany exceeds the growth here in this country. Do you think we're doing all that we need to do to attract and keep the talent we need?

MR. JOE: No, I do not. After 9-11, we saw a precipitous drop in overall immigration and specifically legal immigration to the United States. We became a nation inhospitable toward foreign students, toward foreigners in general, and obviously, the reason was pretty clear: our country had just been attacked by terrorists. But I want to point out what former INS Commissioner James Ziegler said, and that was *these* are immigrants; *they*

were terrorists. And that's the distinction that a lot of people have failed to recognize.

Because we stopped giving visas, because we made it practically impossible for scientists and performing artists to meet their commitments due to visa delays, we became viewed as a country that really didn't want them here, and that was unfortunate for us because it gave an opportunity for other countries to open their doors and to tap into the tremendous brain power that foreign-born people can bring to this country.

We're now beginning to recognize the need to open ourselves up. We have a very antiquated visa system; we have unrealistic quotas for allowing temporary workers to become permanent residents. And like the example you pointed out, the very highly trained engineer who could not fit into our immigration system because our laws didn't allow it, he had to go elsewhere. Well, Canada gained from that. Other countries have benefitted from all the scientists that we have basically turned away because we have a non-responsive system.

Earlier Caroline Brettell mentioned the shortage of bilingual teachers. We have a tremendous need for bilingual teachers in our school systems here in this very county, in this very city. The H-1-B visa system, unfortunately, does not cut out or exempt bilingual teachers from the cap. As a result, numerous school districts, like Dallas and Irving, have a crying need for bilingual teachers and no access to them. They're desperately trying to hire bilingual teachers. The truth of the matter is the market is not there; there are not enough of these qualified workers.

An interesting figure: we have 37 million foreign-born residents in the United States; 30 percent of that number, 12 million, are unauthorized workers, they're illegal migrants. That's really the crucial problem we're confronting today.

You know why these people are here? I will tell you this: there is no physical fence or virtual fence or any other legal system that is strong enough to stop the basic human need and desire for economic improvement; finding a way to better themselves and to make life better for their family. That emotional need will overcome any physical obstacle you wish to put up.

We have an antiquated immigration system that has not enabled these 12 million workers, the predominant number of which are from Mexico and South America, to become legal. We are in the 21st century with a 19th century set of laws for these people. That's why we have 12 million undocumented, illegal workers. They have come to this country and are performing jobs that, quite frankly, my children and your children and your grandchildren simply will not do. They have established residences here; have developed lives here and have U.S.-born children.

The politics of demonizing these people will not be viewed favorably in the history of our country. When you have communities like Farmers Branch and Hazleton, Pennsylvania, enacting a set of laws that you can easily compare to those laws that existed in this country for the earliest



part of the 19th century to the mid-1950s, the Jim Crow laws, the internment policies that we subjected our Japanese-American citizens to, the Chinese exclusion laws that were enacted in the 1880s, and the Nuremberg laws of the 1930s. Those are laws that human society is not proud to have on the books. When you look back and see what Farmers Branch has done, what Hazleton, Pennsylvania, has done and what many other cities could very well do, they are politically demonizing the politically disenfranchised, those who do not have a voice in government.

So we're facing a very serious issue. I think it is the most paramount immigration issue that our country faces today, and will continue to face as long as our political leaders are not willing to address it. There is a realistic, pragmatic approach that must be achieved and it is not realistic for politicians to believe or wish that the problem would just go away.

MS. CULLUM: We're going to hear from a couple of our political leaders, Senator Hutchison this morning, Senator Cornyn this afternoon. We'll let them have their say.

Carole, turning to you, I've heard you say, and I've heard your husband, Matthew Wilson, at SMU, say that evangelical churches, particularly in North Carolina and elsewhere, are doing a remarkable job of looking after immigrants; bringing them in, finding them jobs, finding them doctors, really helping them, and of course, encouraging them to vote in an evangelical way at election time. Tell us more about that.

DR. WILSON: I went to school in North Carolina—my Ph.D. is from Chapel Hill—during the time that there was a massive change. Caroline Brettell's numbers show that during that period, primarily Hispanics were immigrating to North Carolina. From my experience, it appeared to be seasonal agricultural workers who moved from the South, from Georgia picking peaches, to North Carolina to pick tobacco on the farms or work on chicken farms, and eventually stayed there. So there was a major demographic shift in North Carolina during that period.

And one of the things in that area, and throughout the South and Georgia that we've seen, is that evangelical churches have done a very good job of attracting and providing services to immigrant communities. As Caroline Brettell noted, these new areas for immigrants, these new gateway cities, suburban and rural areas, lack a lot of the infrastructure to deal with immigrants. What we see is an increasing number of non-governmental organizations that provide some of these services for immigrants.

One of these organizations or groups is evangelical churches. First of all, they provide Spanish language services for a group of people who have historically strong religious values and strong ties to religious organizations, usually the Catholic Church, but given that the Catholic Church has not filled that void and doesn't have that many services in North Carolina or rural Georgia; evangelicals have been filling that role.

They provide services like childcare opportunities and negotiations

between immigrants and landlords, and this has been a very interesting goal of these churches to provide and proselytize at the same time, to immigrants in these areas.

It will be interesting to see, if these immigrants are able to vote at some point, if this socialization has had an impact on them. I think we see the same thing here in the Dallas, Texas area where evangelical services have attracted a number of immigrants and provide a lot of these same structures.

MS. CULLUM: Jack Hunt, after the 1986 Reform Act was passed, a number of people living in Mexico, rural areas of Mexico, flocked to the United States to work on farms in this country, and then their numbers began to fall off a bit. Then NAFTA was enacted. The same thing happened; people flocked back and their numbers began to drift downward. And this fall I was reading—maybe some of the rest of you were—stories about farmers who couldn't get their crops harvested because they didn't have enough migrant workers. Have you had problems like this at the King Ranch? Have your friends or colleagues had this difficulty?

MR. HUNT: Yes, there have been a lot of anecdotal and actual stories relating to that. A good example is the Florida orange crop. You all know we've had two severe hurricane seasons prior to this year. The crop was the lowest, I think, it's been since the freeze-damaged crops back in the 1970s. I think four to five million boxes of oranges were not harvested this year because we couldn't get labor to pick the oranges. Similar stories in California.

There's been a lot of coverage in the press about various farmers who haven't been able to pick their crops or harvest their crops, and particularly for the fresh and the fruit crops, timing is critical. You can't wait for some Homeland Security person to clear some guy in Mexico under the H-2-A program when your pears are rotting on the trees or the oranges are rotting. I think agriculture is facing what I would call a "perfect storm" on the labor situation.

Keep in mind that for each agriculture production job, there are about four to five jobs upstream to get that food to the consumers. Especially with fresh crops, if we don't deal with this problem effectively, we're going to be exporting the production of those crops overseas, and that has implications not only for our food supply, but also for the kind of society and land use we want to have in this country. So it's an enormous problem.

We have four ranches pretty close to the border. We have scores of people that die on our property every year trying to come into the United States. We have a very, very close relationship with the Border Patrol, and if you can get a Border Patrolman to talk when he's not on the record, he'll tell you that if they didn't have to deal with the people that are coming here to work, they could do a lot better job on border security than they're

doing now. So we must have some effective guest worker programs for agriculture, or as I said, it's going to be a "perfect storm" shortly.

Ms. CULLUM: Jim Hollifield, Phil Martin, who was at your symposium, proposed that the federal government charge a fee to employers of migrant workers—people like Jack Hunt—and that those funds be used to promote mechanization and job restructuring. I guess he meant to reduce the need for migrant labor. What do you think of that idea?

DR. HOLLIFIELD: Well, as much as I like and respect my colleague, Phil Martin, I think that would be a band-aid fix on this problem. There is a tremendous demand in this country for both skilled and unskilled labor.

Later on this afternoon, you're going to hear from the senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank, Pia Orrenius. When she comes, I hope you will ask her this question, because there are all these thorny issues about how much one kind of labor substitutes for another kind of labor. In other words, do unskilled immigrants compete directly with unskilled Americans? She can show you, chapter and verse, that that is, in fact, not the case. The number of unskilled, that is less than high-school educated, workers in this country has fallen precipitously; you don't have those kind of people, those kind of workers available at the bottom end of the labor market and immigrants come in to fill that void.

Now, immigrants do compete with other immigrants. Earlier somebody raised the question of why is it that immigrants who are here might want fewer immigrants coming. Well, that's a perfectly rational thing because those new immigrants are going to compete directly with the immigrants that are already here.

Can capital-intensive techniques, new technologies substitute for labor? That's a huge question. I think it can. It's a long and arduous process. We've seen some of this already in agriculture, but it's not something that's going to be an immediate fix. I'd like to hear what Mr. Hunt has to say about this, in particular.

I would like to very briefly, for the audience here, lay out what I consider the three models of immigration policy that we historically have seen in our country. I want to say to the two senators who are sitting in the back of the room that I, in particular, feel your pain politically on this issue. It was the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Tip O'Neill, a great Irishman from Boston, Massachusetts, who said, and I quote, "Immigration is political death." He said, "If you get started down that path, you're going to make everybody angry and it's just not going to do anybody any good."

He may be right about that, but it is an issue, as Harry Joe just pointed out, that we can't run and hide from. I mean, how many illegals are we going to have in this country? Is 15 million too many? How about 20 million; how about 30 million? I mean, sooner or later we're going to have to confront that issue. But let me just lay out these three models very

quickly. I think you go back to the Colonial Period in our history; there are the three models that I would describe as follows.

First of all, the Massachusetts model, which was the Puritan model. You can come here, but you better have the right kind of beliefs; the right kind of attitudes. You better look the right way and sound the right way. Even Roger Williams, if you remember, got into trouble with the Puritan fathers and they chased him off, and he went to Rhode Island and founded his own little colony. But that's one strand of thinking in our history which my colleague, and one of the great political scientists of the 20th century, Sam Huntington, is very worried about. He thinks that is what's happening to America, to American identity. Sam is the latest incarnation of the Puritan fathers' thinking: this is a WASP country; it was founded by WASPs and it should always be a WASP country. I don't know what my Chinese-American cowboy neighbor here would have to say about that.

The second model is one that's come back over and over again in our history and it's the Virginia model. I think the two senators, in particular, should think about this Virginia model which is equivalent to the guest worker model: we don't care who you are, what you look like, what you think, what you believe, but we need your labor and we want to get you here, get you working. And of course, in the darkest periods of our history, that meant bringing in slaves because they were the best form of labor since they didn't have any voice or any rights. We also had a lot of indentured servants, if you remember.

There is no such thing as a pure guest worker program, not in our age, simply because it rests on the fallacy of homo-economicus which is that people are pure economic units, that they're pure commodities. We know that's not the case. Immigrants are people and they're going to have to be ultimately treated like people. And to quote my friend, Phil Martin, "there's nothing more permanent than a temporary worker". Once they get here, they are going to put down roots; they're going to marry; they're going to have kids; they're going to want to settle. We've got to leave a pathway. We can argue in a democratic society about where that path leads, but there's got to be a path to a green card and somewhere down the line to citizenship.

The third model comes from our friend, William Penn, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, and I'm happy to say I think this is the model where we more or less settled. We welcome you to come here; you don't have to believe all the things that we believe; we can tolerate lots of different views—this goes back to Caroline Brettell's presentation earlier—you can work and you can, to quote Abraham Lincoln, "Rise as high as your talents will take you." This is, after all, the American way; it's the American dream, but you do have to accept a certain core set of values that we have in this country, which are basic democratic and republican values in the old sense of republicanism, that you believe in representative democracy and you buy into the founding principles of our country and our republic. As long as you accept those values, you can believe what you want; you

can practice the way you want, and you can work, find your way, find your opportunity, and pursue your dream.

I would plead that we try to go back to that Pennsylvania model.

MS. CULLUM: Harry Joe, there are those who say we need a national identity card. What do you think of that idea?

MR. JOE: Thank you, Lee. I'm not opposed to having a national ID card. I would like to look at it more; how you achieve it, what are the obstacles to receiving it. It may be a piece of the chit that you have to give to reach a political resolution of this huge issue.

When the idea first came up in the early 1980s—actually, back in the late '70s when President Carter instituted the Select Commission on Immigration Reform—people didn't buy the initial idea of employer sanctions. But you know, we have it; it's a very flawed system, but we have it.

Certainly now, post 9-11, the issue of national security is something we never would have believed back then. While I still believe that there are a lot of problems with a national ID card, I'm not totally convinced that you can say never. It may be a viable piece of the overall solution.

MS. CULLUM: Carole Wilson, Mexican workers in this country send home to their families in Mexico about \$6.6 billion a year. Now, this is Mexico's second largest source of hard currency, after oil revenues, and I heard one Mexican official—now out of office after the election—say that what he, and I'm sure others, want most to see is integration between the two economies. Do you see anything like that ever happening? I don't know what he meant. Perhaps he meant the labor market.

DR. WILSON: The idea of an integrated North America, something akin to the European Union. In 1930 if you had predicted a united Europe, everyone would have laughed and said that it was politically impossible. I'll repeat that mistake, potentially, and say no, it will never happen between the United States and Mexico.

NAFTA is certainly an effort at integrating markets between the two countries, but the idea of a unified labor market where we actually adhere to the capitalist notion of free movement of labor is largely impossible.

The remittances to Mexico from the United States are a tremendous source of Mexican financial security, and clearly, Mexico likes that. But I think Mexico has a vested interest in developing the Mexican economy, even if that eventually dries up, because there's much more to be gained from developing the Mexican economy in such a way that it keeps its workers, keeps its skilled workers who leave. It would keep the capital from Mexico in Mexico. Currently anyone who has any large amount of money in Mexico will invest in the United States, rather than in Mexico because it is a much more secure financial situation in the United States than in Mexico. Although Mexico is clearly improving and stabilizing, if

you've got a tremendous amount of money, you'd rather hide it from the Mexican government in the United States.

Mexico needs to put in considerable effort to stabilize its economy, to increase its collection of taxes, to maintain its workers. Now, the scary part from the United States' side; the Pew Charitable Trust did a survey last year, I believe, and one of the figures that came out of it was that more than 45% of Mexicans said that if they were able to, they would come to the United States. Now, that is a tremendous potential population movement. If we had an integrated system where people could easily migrate, the idea of 45% of the Mexican population coming to the United States would obviously overwhelm the United States.

What would have to happen, before we could see some sort of labor market integration, further financial and capital integration between the United States and Mexico, is that Mexico would have to solidify and stabilize its economy and raise its economic status in such a way that it would be financially in the United States' interests to do so. This is a similar trajectory of what we've seen in Europe—that is, as the European Union has expanded, it has expanded with very specific targets that the southern European countries, first of all, then the eastern European countries had to meet before being fully integrated into the European system.

MS. CULLUM: Jack Hunt, NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, is still controversial. From your perspective, what do you think its impact has been, both on Mexico and on the United States, after several years of experience with it?

MR. HUNT: I have to think about specific commodities because NAFTA has different impacts on different commodities. King Ranch is a large sugar producer, there are some things about NAFTA that we don't like. But on the balance, I would say the other commodities we're involved in, which are grains and meat and so forth, I think it's worked pretty well. I don't have any statistics to cite, but I think Mexico is now our second largest trading partner and perhaps our largest beef customer, and of course, a lot of their cattle come over here.

MS. CULLUM: I believe it's Canada, Mexico, now China, then Japan.

MR. HUNT: Yes. So obviously NAFTA has had a significant impact. It's hard for me to generalize because you've got to go to industry sector and to commodity sector, and different people have been affected differently. But overall, it has been a good outcome, compared to the fearful talk at the time.

MS. CULLUM: I think I'm mistaken. I think China has now supplanted Mexico and is now number two, and will probably be number one within five years.

Jim Hollifield, back to you. Speaking of China, a dean at the China University for Politics and Law said that in China today the primary concern is not so much poverty of material resources as it is poverty of rights and power. You said exactly the same thing last spring during the immigrant demonstrations here in the United States, that the primary issue is rights. Do you still think that's true?

DR. HOLLIFIELD: Yes, I do. We are witnessing in the world today, or we have witnessed—I hope it will continue—a wide range of democratic transitions, and Mexico is a case in point. Mexico is our neighbor and Mexico has gone through an enormous amount of political and economic change over the past 20 or 30 years.

If I could just go back to NAFTA for a moment. I remember the famous statement by Ross Perot, the giant sucking sound that was going to occur if we had this agreement with Mexico. Well, we know that the agreement did not materialize—I don't know if Ross is here in the audience; if so, I apologize.

MS. CULLUM: Oh, no, he would speak for himself if he were here.

DR. HOLLIFIELD: I'm sure he would speak for himself.

MS. CULLUM: There would be no apology needed.

DR. HOLLIFIELD: If he were here, he would definitely be up and ready to take me on. But the fact of the matter is, if you look at the Mexican economy at the time of NAFTA, it was slightly smaller than the economy of Ohio in terms of its output. Mexico is our neighbor; it is going through a tough time right now with its politics. If you think back to what Mexico was like 40 or 50 years ago when it was all just basically gringo bashing, I think Mexico is now undergoing a democratic revolution. And a wise commentator writing about NAFTA said, "Forget the economics; it's foreign policy." Mexico is our neighbor and we need to work with the Mexicans.

I would slightly disagree with Carole Wilson in the sense that I do think there is at some point—I don't know if it will be in my lifetime—there will be a fully integrated North American market, even on the labor side, but we've got a long way to go before we get there.

But to go back to your question about rights, there are three things that drive people to leave their country; that drive their thinking about leaving. One of them is obviously economics. As Harry pointed out in his opening statement, people are looking for opportunity, and as long as we have the kind of differentials that we have in the world today and markets are allowed to function at a certain level, people are going to move; the basic push-pull dynamic is always going to be there. But that's only the necessary condition for people to move; it is not sufficient. There are two other sufficient conditions for that to happen.

One of those sufficient conditions is you've got to know where you're going and you've got to have some idea that there's going to be something or somebody when you get there. That's what the sociologists and the anthropologists tell us about the networks, the family networks, the kinship networks. If you look at the Mexican migrants here in Dallas, you know they're coming from specific places and villages in Mexico, they've got relatives here, and it's almost like a rite of passage, going north to seek your fortune when you're a young man. Those are the networks. So you've got to have the networks that connect the economies together and the sending place and the receiving place.

The third factor, however—and Lee, this goes to your question—really has to do with politics and with rights, in particular and the issue of status. People do make a decision about moving for political reasons. I was just at Columbia University yesterday, participating in a seminar, presenting some of my work, and one of the scholars there, Rodolfo de la Garza, who was many years at the University of Texas at Austin, has found that a lot of Mexicans, when they come here, think about how bad things are politically back in Mexico and how much their opportunities are limited there; how wide open it is here in terms of rights and the openness of this society. That's the third and sufficient condition. Americans have to be open; they have to be relatively open and welcoming for people to come here.

Now, we cannot throw open our borders. I think everyone in this room, hopefully, would agree with that. That would be a catastrophe. But we do have to find a system that manages this, that allows people to come here and work, that gives them an ultimate path so they can fully enjoy the rights that come with being a member of our society. It is very unhealthy for us, as a country, as a democracy, to have millions and millions of people who are living in the shadows just outside of the social contract.

So the question of rights is key, and I'm happy to say that we have been on a positive trend. Democracy has been spreading in Mexico. I know that they're having a setback right now; I know we're seeing some setbacks in Latin America, but we've got to keep the faith on this and keep pushing for an open society, open markets, and societies where rights of individuals are respected.

I would make one final plea with respect to where we're going politically in this country. I think we are stronger; we are healthier as a society when we are open, when we allow markets to operate within the constraints of our laws. And I would say that on the side of trade, free trade, it's very politically difficult to take the short term political heat to fight to keep our economy and our society open. The same is true with immigration. It's very hard politically to take the heat necessary to allow markets to operate within bounds that are acceptable to the American people.

Ms. CULLUM: Harry Joe, I heard a German economist say that within five to ten years the average age in France, Germany, Italy will be 47, 48, 49, something in that vicinity, while the average age in the United States will be exactly as it is today, 35, which gives us an enormous advantage in the



world of commerce. Would you say that some of that advantage is due to immigration?

MR. JOE: Oh, I would definitely say so. Before 9-11, from the period of 1990 through well into the late 1990s, early 2000, we saw a huge influx of immigrants. I think we had something like 14.7 million new immigrants during that period of time. The majority of these were either family-sponsored immigrants which were primarily younger people; they were two-thirds, and the other third was predominantly employment-based. These were the new engineers; these were the young people who came to this country under exchange visitor programs and under student visas. They studied in this country and they chose to subsequently seek employment and seek permanent resident status in the United States, and they subsequently became U.S. citizens.

The United States has and will continue to be the country of choice for immigrants. I heard an immigration officer tell me one time, he said, "You know, Harry, it's funny, we have one-fourth of the world's population and the other three-fourths want to come here." There's a lot of truth to that. I think it's very true. I think a lot of it was attributable to immigration, and if we get our house in order, that will continue to be the case.

MS. CULLUM: Carole Wilson, one observer said at Jim's conference that wages in Mexico are beginning to converge with wages in the United States. Is that the case, and if so, can we expect a decline in migration from Mexico?

DR. WILSON: Yes, there is some wage conversion, I think, in some sectors of the economy. By and large, the wages in the United States are still much better, certainly for the average Mexican worker. I think there's good reason over the next few years to think that while immigration might not decline overall from Mexico, simply because even if things stabilize well in Mexico, Mexico will still have a number of immigrants from Central America who will be traveling through Mexico to the United States. We will still have, I think, a large number of immigrants.

But I think there are reasons in the Mexican economy, should it stabilize, that will keep people in Mexico. I think one heartening development over the past ten years has been the stabilization of mortgage rates in Mexico, of interest rates in Mexico. At one point ten years ago, or a little bit longer than ten years ago, mortgage rates were well above 30% for people with credit. Now, the idea of buying a home in Mexico with that type of interest rate, or owning property, is an absurdity.

If we think about Mexicans who want to have a home, who want to establish a home, it's much easier to do in the United States. You can go to the suburbs in Dallas and purchase relatively easily. For those men, for example, who come to the United States to work and eventually realize that they could keep sending their money home or they could save it and

bring their family to the United States and can actually buy a home here at some point. That's an obvious thought process for these people.

With the stabilization of interest rates in Mexico gives people some hope of gaining a home. With the rising wages in Mexico, I think this establishes a much more conducive situation for at least a lower-middle class and middle class Mexican families and gives some hope to Mexico itself. I think this is a product of political stabilization across certainly the past 15 years in Mexico as a result of that.

MS. CULLUM: Jack Hunt, Ken Auletta has a story in the current issue of *The New Yorker* on Lou Dobbs. They had lunch. Lou Dobbs suggested the Four Seasons which is one of the most elegant restaurants; this man of the people suggested the Four Seasons. He arrived, driven in a Town Car, very expensively dressed, looking terrific—he's done well with his populism. I just wonder what you think of Lou Dobbs and his stand on immigration.

MR. HUNT: Well, one of the things I've learned is not to get in arguments with people that buy ink by the barrel or have TV cameras at their beck and call. Obviously, I would disagree with much of what he would say.

One of the issues we see with migrant workers that we employ, either directly or indirectly, is that a lot of them currently want the ability to go back and forth. But because of the increased enforcement and the threats from Homeland Security and others, they aren't. Either they're afraid to back and forth or they're going underground.

I would also like to mention the fact that the people we employ earn well above the minimum wage. A vigorous orange picker can make \$100 a day doing that work. It's hard, hard, tough work. I know people that work in the vegetable fields make \$10 or \$12 an hour. So it's not the labor price; it's the nature of the work; it requires young, vigorous people to do the work, and there probably aren't many folks in this room that would want to do that work, or even their grandchildren or children would want to do that work.

I think if we're going to have a domestic food system, and particularly in the higher value crops that aren't really subject to automation and mechanization—and there are a number of crops that just aren't—I think having a guest worker program is absolutely vital. We need some system that allows people to come over here and work for these seasonal crops, or they can rotate from crop to crop or they can get back and forth to Mexico or wherever they're from rather easily as part of an organized program. I don't think Lou Dobbs would agree with that at all, frankly.

MS. CULLUM: Probably not. Does anybody want to take up for Lou Dobbs?

AUDIENCE: On this last issue, your statement that the laborers can make

much above minimum wage, I think Lou Dobbs would say, and others have said, that if the minimum wage had kept pace with, say, CEO compensation, it would now be about \$23 an hour. And so the freezing of the minimum wage throws that statement well off. If you have somebody working ten hours, they should be making \$230. So that's kind of Dobbs's perspective on that.

MS. CULLUM: Lou Dobbs thanks you.

AUDIENCE: Can I change from Lou Dobbs, or do you still want to beat on him?

MS. CULLUM: No, we've done our bit there.

AUDIENCE: I'd like to specifically ask Dr. Wilson a question because the European and British bona fides haven't been utilized as much as I think they should. Those are societies, both in the EU and Britain, that are also dealing with the "other," and the question that I have for you is: what can we learn from their approaches to immigration and/or groups of people who haven't quite integrated into their society in comparison to our own policies? And I know that this is both a political and social question and I know that it's a big one, but I would appreciate any insights that you want to share with us about that.

DR. WILSON: Sure. I'll make a few comments and then I'll hand it over to Jim who also does a good bit of research on immigration policy in Europe. Just a couple of things that I'd like to point out on that: Yes, this is a worldwide question. The issue of immigration in the United States is not unique in the sense that every major developed country in the world has an issue of immigration, and the European Union, Britain, France, Germany have had histories of dealing with immigration. I think we can take insights in each of these countries, aspects of what we would want to do and not to do.

In Britain's case, with the issue of recent terrorism, the question of developing what are essentially ghettos of immigrants, and the problem of isolation of immigrants rather than incorporation of immigrants and the result of not accepting these social values that Caroline Brettell talked about, that Jim Hollifield talked about, and the result of that being anti-British and anti-U.S. sentiment and the resulting potential for terrorism.

Germany has had a history of problems with Muslim immigrants in Turkey. The questions there include whether to extend full rights, economic rights and/or social rights to guest workers. Here is a guest worker program that turned to a permanent worker program, and generations of essentially disenfranchised, secondary citizens without educational opportunities, without the opportunities, created a permanent lower class in Germany that only now has to be dealt with.

France, likewise, has an issue of riots; we've seen burning cars in certain areas as a result of lower class immigrants. The question is whether this is a social or an economic problem, and I think it's both; combined with the questions of should Muslim schoolchildren be allowed to wear the Muslim garb. And these are social questions as well.

So the United States is not unique in dealing with this problem, and I think no country has got it perfectly right. The idea of European integration, allowing greater access and mobility of labor, of citizens will create new challenges for Europe as well. With the influx of eastern European immigrants into Western Europe, Britain is going to be a massive receiver, we've already seen, of Polish immigrants, of Lithuanians, and there are concerns about gypsies coming out of eastern Europe into Britain. There was a big series of articles in Britain about this.

DR. HOLLIFIELD: I'll just add a few things to this. I spent many years of my life in Europe and studied Europe for almost 30 years. Caroline Brettell, sitting back there, also started as a scholar of Europe, looking at Portuguese migrants back in the days when the Portuguese were one of the largest groups migrating from southern Europe into northern Europe.

To address your point about the European comparison, as societies and economies grow and expand, we want our economies to grow as fast as they can; we want our pie to expand so that it can service a larger population. I think what we have to avoid is falling into what I call the Malthusian trap. Some of you may remember Parson Malthus back in the 18th century, I believe it was, who said there's no way Europe will be able to sustain a population of X; everybody will starve to death. Well, it turns out Parson Malthus was overly pessimistic about this.

What we saw after World War II in Europe was economies that were devastated and had to be rebuilt and reconstructed and when you have extraordinarily high rates of growth, you're going to need labor and you're going to need lots of it. The Europeans brought in millions and millions of workers. First of all, they were lucky, I guess, in the sense that they had a ready supply of culturally compatible Catholic workers coming from the south. They came from Italy; they came from Spain; they came from Portugal. Well, eventually, all those people would become citizens of the European Union which is what they are today. And to go back to Mr. Hunt's point, they don't have to worry so much about going and settling somewhere and being trapped in one place because they can move around relatively freely. So I think that's a page we should take out of the European book.

Unfortunately, there are two downsides to this for the Europeans in comparison with the United State—or three, if you want. Try to remember these three. Number one, the Europeans did not have in place the kind of expansive naturalization and citizenship regimes that we have in this country. Our citizenship is defined in the 14th Amendment which says that anybody born in this country is automatically a citizen of the United

States, and that had absolutely nothing to do with immigration. Does anybody know why that was in the 14th Amendment?

MS. CULLUM: Slavery.

DR. HOLLIFIELD: It was there to make slaves, African-Americans, into immediate and automatic citizens. That is our basic citizenship law, and I would say that it is a very good law because you don't want to build up enormous populations of people who remain outside of the bounds of formal citizenship. If you look at the Turks in Germany, for example, this is a source of enormous problem in Germany. The French are much better about this; the British are better about it. Not all the Europeans practice this kind of very narrow approach to citizenship. But you have third generation people living in Germany who can't become citizens. It is just not sustainable in a democracy.

And again, I would urge you to question Pia Orrenius from the Dallas Fed about this. She's done some brilliant studies, looking at the economics of immigration in Europe and the United States. We do much better because our labor markets are more open; they're more flexible. They do not drive people out of the labor market because of the regulations and inflexibility that you have in those labor markets. Actually, as bad as it is, we do pretty darn well. I mean, we get these people in here and we get them a job.

Somebody once said in Germany the greatest fear or the greatest nightmare is getting a refugee who comes into Germany—and the Germans get lots of refugees—and they get into the labor market and they get a job. The Germans don't want them to work; they put them in camps and they give them welfare. In this country, it's the opposite. The fear would be to get somebody in here who's a refugee. You've got to get them to work; you've got to get them started on a path for integrating into society.

The third thing—and this is the really sad thing that we all have to keep in mind and be sensitive to—in the 1960s they had exhausted the supplies of culturally compatible workers coming from southern Europe. Where did they look? Well, they began to look to their former colonies and especially into the Muslim parts of Africa, North Africa, West Africa, and the Middle East. They got workers who were working in the bottom of the labor market; very uneducated, poor Muslims coming into these societies, and their societies did not do well over time with these people, and of course, now you've got a lot of alienation. You've got second generation Muslims living in Europe who are connecting with the terrorists back in Pakistan, back in South Asia or maybe in the Middle East or somewhere else.

So the Europeans have a problem in the sense that they've got a really tough, culturally incompatible group here. Don't get me wrong; the vast majority of Muslims in Europe are doing very well. They're integrating just fine, but there are some on the margins and they tend to be the more educated ones who are tempted by this terrorist path oddly enough.

---

In comparison, the United States has been lucky because the Muslims coming here are educated, tolerant, liberal-minded Muslims. Many of them have come here, the best and the brightest. So we're getting the cream of the crop, whereas the Europeans have gotten those at the bottom.

Ms. CULLUM: Well, Jack Hunt, Carole Wilson, Harry Joe, Jim Hollifield, thank you. You've been voices of enlightenment. Thank you very much.

# THE POLITICS OF IMMIGRATION

---

MS. CULLUM: We are turning now to Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison. You all know that Senator Hutchison has just won election to her third term in the Senate. This is very good news for Texas.

Kay, as you all know, is a fine national senator. She has moved up to number four in the leadership of her party, and no doubt will play a pivotal role in the rebuilding of the Republican Party. She is a critical voice on the crucial issues facing the nation at the moment, but she also is a very fine senator for the constituents of Texas. She takes very good care of her constituents, both in the aggregate as a state, and as individuals.

She was instrumental in the passage of the repeal of the Wright Amendment at Love Field, and she offered a very sensible compromise for immigration when the House and the Senate were at an impasse earlier this year. She proposed that the Congress consider a guest worker program, a temporary worker program, after the president had certified that the border is secure. It made a lot of sense, and it may very well come up again in the 110th Congress—I hope it does.

It seems to me, and I know that you agree, that Kay is capable of running anything, from the state to the nation, and we're very lucky to have her back in the Senate. I think she's one of the most gifted politicians I have known, and even Kinky Friedman voted for her. I'm very pleased to introduce Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison.

• • •

## SENATOR KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON

**T**hank you. This program may be the best and most timely subject that we have ever addressed at the Philosophical Society. We are all lucky to be a part of this unique and wonderful organization, because it serves a different function from any of the others like it.

While reading a biography of Benjamin Franklin, I learned he started the American Philosophical Society in 1743. Benjamin Franklin did that because they did not have many books back then, and he thought people could learn from the body of knowledge created by the gathering of individuals. That is why he formed the American Philosophical Society.

When our founding fathers of Texas met in 1837, during the early

years of the Republic of Texas, it was Mirabeau B. Lamar, Sam Houston, Thomas Rusk, Anson Jones and others who came together on much the same premise. This was a young country, and they wanted to disseminate knowledge and create an education system, so they started the Philosophical Society of Texas that year. It went by the wayside around 1859. When Mirabeau B. Lamar was not president anymore, there was a gap. But here in Dallas, a group from SMU reconstituted the Philosophical Society in 1936, and it has been active ever since. We are very fortunate that our founding fathers started this organization and that the group from SMU revived it, because it has a flavor unlike any other institution in Texas.

Focusing on one issue, and particularly a timely one like immigration, is most enlightening. I have listened to the presentations this morning, and some wonderful points have been made. I am going to give you the more political, down-to-earth side of this issue. The academics have the luxury, of course, of discussing this without ever having to vote on it.

In my 13 years in the United States Senate, this is the most difficult issue I have ever had to address. It is complicated, it requires a delicate balance, and it is political. Texas is a state that is one of the easiest to represent on every issue but this one. While we are a diverse state, we are a state that has a basic philosophy that I am very comfortable to represent. While representatives from other states are pulled in different directions, I do not feel pulled, except with the immigration issue.

I am pleased that my colleague, Senator Cornyn, is also addressing you, because he has been a leader in this field since he came to the Senate. He is actually Chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship subcommittee, and he has made a huge mark. He can offer a different perspective, because he was involved in the discussions and the debate surrounding the writing of the immigration bill. He was also very active on the Senate floor when it was being debated. Our lieutenant governor, David Dewhurst, is also here, and he is going to be dealing with many of these issues as well. You are going to be presented with the political facts, which I think are very important.

Throughout our country's history, we have welcomed immigrants. We have welcomed the poor and the huddled masses, and known that when people come here, they come for freedom, to make a better life, and to be part of America. They did not come in the earliest years for "E Pluribus Pluribus." They came to be "E Pluribus Unum." They came to be part of this great country.

We must encourage people to celebrate their history and their ethnic backgrounds. All of us do that. We have traditions in our families that are passed down. But we cannot forget that the fundamental tenet of this country is that we are one. We are one.

During my time in the United States Senate, I have had more and more people and groups come to me and say, "I want you to take the position of my former country, whether it is in the best interest of the United States of America or whether it is in the best interest of our leadership in the



world.” That is something we must guard against, and we must fight against. We must welcome people who come to our country legally, we must welcome people who are going to become part of our society, and we must provide avenues for them to come here. We must also make sure that we are America, that they are Americans, and that they put America first in every way.

We have to come to grips with two different issues. We have on one side illegal immigration, and almost an acceptance by some of illegal behavior that has populated our country with illegal immigrants. This is at the lower end of the wage scale. On the upper end of the scale, we also have to address the shortage of engineers, scientists, and others who are doing highly skilled jobs. That has been largely forgotten as we have talked about immigration. While we have both problems, they are problems that we can deal with and problems that we must deal with. It will benefit our country to do so, but we must act appropriately.

Today we have 33-and-a-half million foreign workers in America. Some people may say, “How can we absorb that many workers in our system?” Well, today’s unemployment rate is near a four-decade low—4.6 percent.

It was said very well by Stephen Moore of the Wall Street Journal that if you look at what immigrants do in our country, they spur jobs. At the low end of the market, they are saving our declining industries. They help us compete with foreign competition. They also have children who generally strive to be successful. Immigrants who come to this country in the lower wage scale tend to have children for whom they have dreams and for whom they provide the opportunity to realize those dreams.

But we have a system that does not work, because we do not have a viable guest worker program. We have people living under the radar. This cannot be healthy for us and cannot be healthy for them. They do not play by the same rules. Many of them do not pay income taxes. Some do, but many do not. Many of them drive cars that are uninsured, and that becomes a problem if there is an accident. They are a huge cost in health care, and we know that because we know they use our emergency rooms for their primary health care if they are uninsured. These issues would be better addressed if these individuals were legally present, above board, and within the rules by which everyone lives.

The issue that has now come into the mix, and the reason that we are now addressing an issue that should have been addressed years ago, is security. Since 9/11, there have been security lapses. There is no question about it. We know that Osama Bin Laden has put out the word that the way to get into America is across the southern border. We know that there are people penetrating our border.

Ninety-five percent of the people crossing our borders are generally law-abiding, but they have broken the law to get here. They are looking for a better life. But there are also the five percent who are criminals. They are drug dealers, human traffickers, and potential terrorists. It is

our responsibility as members of the United States Congress to make sure that we have a secure border. We have every right as a sovereign nation to protect the people of our country in this way.

With any immigration reform proposal, border security must be the place to start. I have met with Hispanic organizations and officials, and I think it is unanimous among Hispanic-American groups and among everyone with whom I have talked that border security is legitimate, it is important, and it is a priority. In addressing immigration reform, you have to start with border security. We must do everything possible to make sure that our country has exercised this right of a sovereign nation.

The plan I put forward came after the House of Representatives passed a security bill with no guest worker component, and the Senate passed a bill that included a guest worker program and border security measures, but it continued many other features that were just unacceptable.

The difference between the House and the Senate bills was stark, so I got together with Congressman Mike Pence of Indiana. I asked, "As a starting point for negotiations, can we put something together that can pass both the House and the Senate?" Since bills had passed both houses, we wanted to give the conference committee a starting point. We talked for a month, going through the priorities of each house as outlined in the basic tenets of each bill, and tried to determine what would be passable in each house. We developed the Hutchison-Pence proposal as a place to begin conference negotiation.

Our view was that you obviously had to first address border security, but you also had to have a guest worker program balanced with protection of the American worker. You cannot allow foreign workers to come in at lower wages or without the same payroll deductions as an American worker, because naturally that would cause an employer to favor the foreign worker. Protecting the American worker is our responsibility, and the foreign worker must also be treated fairly.

The Hutchison-Pence plan has gotten terrific reviews, though not 100 percent, because there are people who want no guest worker program, and they do not like our plan. They call any guest worker program amnesty. Ours is not. There are many people who think it does not go far enough. There is not 100 percent support, but the Washington Post said it is a good place to start, and so did the Washington Times. It has universal acceptance as a place to start, even if people think we should go farther or not quite so far.

It begins with border security, and it has specifics about the number of border patrol agents. We say that there should be 12,000 border patrol agents. We have around 6,000 now. When I came to the United States Senate in 1993, I put forward a doubling of the border security force from about 3,000 to 6,000, but now we need at least 12,000. We're talking two borders now, not just the border with Mexico. We're also talking about a huge border with Canada.

Our plan also calls for 2,500 port of entry inspectors. We have to

remember that there is commerce between Mexico and the United States, as well as Canada and the United States. We must have ports of entry inspectors to allow free access to the border. If you have to wait two hours at a border station to get in, that does not foster commerce. That is going to suppress commerce.

We also call for adding customs enforcement officials and using more technology. We need surveillance cameras, infrared technology, and strategic fencing. We are not going to have a 1,400 mile fence, but we do need fences in strategic places.

Congressman Sylvester Reyes was the border patrol chief in El Paso who put up the first fence, and it worked. It was a two-mile fence in El Paso at strategic points where they needed to cover territory where they did not have enough people and cameras. That worked very effectively and it started the process for putting in the next fence in San Diego, which was the next place that needed an extra barrier. If we use common sense, we understand that there are places where we need fences. There are also many places where do not need them, and they should not be erected because the geography is wrong. I have told my colleagues in Washington, D.C., and so has Senator Cornyn, that we're not going to tell the people of Laredo that we are going to put a Bastille on the banks of the Rio Grande. It is part of their city and their culture, and they have development there. There are many issues here, and we must use common sense with the goal of border security.

We must have a guest worker program that works. Our proposal is based on the Canadian guest worker program. It is essential that we find a way to allow for guest workers who are treated fairly and who have a good feeling about working in our country without forcing a citizenship track upon them. When I speak to people along the border or to Hispanic groups, they say that not everyone wants to become a citizen of the United States. Even if they like America and want to have the opportunity to work here, they do not necessarily want to give up allegiance and ties to their country, and they do not necessarily want to stay here permanently.

The Canadian system has been in place for many years and has worked very well. It is an agreement between Mexico and Canada. My proposal is based on that system, but it does have some differences. It would require Ellis Island Centers, which would be private employment agencies licensed by the Department of Labor, to set up in those foreign countries where workers seek to come to our country. In our proposal, the NAFTA-CAFTA-DR countries that have a working trade relationship with the United States would be eligible. This is a starting point, but it encompasses the nations from which 90 percent of illegal immigrant workers come. Ellis Island Centers in these countries would match willing workers with employers who need workers. The Secretary of Labor would first certify that there is a need for workers in a particular field, giving Americans a chance to do these jobs before employers seek foreign workers.

Applicants would undergo a criminal background check and a public

health check. They would then be issued what we call a Good Neighbor SAFE Visa, a tamper-proof visa that is good for two years and renewable five times for a total of 12 years. This would allow workers to come into our country and allow employers to be sure that the visa was absolutely legal and non-transferable.

It is so easy to beat up on employers and say, "We ought to crack the whip on employers who hire illegal aliens." But if any of you have been an employer, you know that you can look at a counterfeit Social Security card and it can look absolutely legitimate. There are so many Social Security cards that are not legal and valid, and many times you have no way of knowing they are counterfeit. That is why it is so important to give employers the tools to know that they have a legal worker before we start cracking down on them. There has been a disconnect with the real world in this instance until now.

A person could leave the system anytime. But after 12 years, if the person has had all of the renewals and is still eligible for the program, they would be eligible for a permanent work visa without having to apply for future renewals. This would be valid for as long as they wanted to work here. It would be a permanent card called an X-visa, or exchange-visa. After five years in the permanent program, if they decided they wanted to apply for a green card, then they could do it, but it would not be required. After 17 years, if they wanted to stay here and go into the citizenship route, they would then be eligible. However, they would not be forced into the citizenship track as required by the immigration bill that passed the Senate.

There has to be an avenue for people to come here and still have the option of returning home after being compensated and well treated. This proposal does not shut out options available under the present law. If you want to wait and enter the existing citizenship route, that is still available. We are just offering another opportunity to people who want to get into the system more quickly from outside the country and come in legally.

Once a verification system is put in place, which would be necessary for this to work, employers will start favoring those with the tamper-proof visa. This would provide closure, as employers will opt for legal workers and force those who are here illegally to go home and if they choose to return, do so legally. This is necessary in order to have a guest worker program in which everyone is legal. Because applicants have to apply in their home country to become legal, this program is not amnesty. Workers accepted into the program would be coming into the country legally.

Here are the parameters of the program. Workers would have the same deductions from their salaries as everyone working here, but they would not be eligible for Social Security, welfare, nor unemployment compensation. Their Social Security deductions would be kept in a fund, and they would be allowed to take the contributions with them when they leave the program and go back home. They would have this for their nest egg, their retirement, or whatever use they choose, and it would have come from their paycheck.

Their Medicare withholding would go into a fund to pay for health care costs for foreign workers not covered by their employers. This would help stop the drain on public hospitals and health care providers by providing a fund from which they could draw to offset the cost of treating undocumented foreign workers. It would also provide workers the ability to be treated if they are not covered by their employers. There is a fund that was put in place two years ago which partially compensates health care providers for treating illegal immigrants. This has been helpful to our public hospitals and very much needed, but it does not cover the full cost, and we need to improve that. Once the verification system is in place, the legal workers will be preferred. Employers will have no incentive to hire illegal entrants.

I was very encouraged that President Calderon said he wants to increase job opportunities and investment in Mexico. He was educated in America, and he knows what is required to attract investment in Mexico, to keep people there, and to provide proper training. That is a major step in the right direction, and I hope that he can accomplish that goal because no country wants their people to be leaving in droves. No president can be happy with that, particularly when the people who are coming here are the entrepreneurs who are going to go for it even when it is tough and even if it is hard. He wants to keep people in Mexico, and he should. It will help the economy of Mexico immensely to become more equivalent with ours. The draw will not be so strong if he can do that, and that starts with a good education system that works.

What was said here earlier regarding highly educated immigrants is absolutely true, and it has been documented in a study called "Rising Above The Gathering Storm." This study was commissioned by the National Academies of Science and headed by Norm Augustine. It concludes that we are losing our magnet-like appeal to the best minds around the world. In the past, we have attracted the most talented individuals because this is where they could do their research and work in freedom. There was a year in which all of the Noble Prizes for sciences were given to Americans who were foreign-born—every one that year. It would benefit us to keep that stature for a variety of reasons, yet we have not.

There is a bill that has been introduced, of which I am a co-sponsor and Lamar Alexander from Tennessee is also co-sponsor, called the SKIL (Securing Knowledge, Innovation and Leadership) Act. It increases opportunities for people to come to our country to pursue advanced degrees with a focus in science and math, and it does not discourage them from staying here after they earn their advanced degrees. It has been harder since 9/11 for our colleges and universities to get students in from foreign countries.

For one thing, colleges and universities did not have systems to document that students arrived and stayed in their system. That was one of the security risks that had to be closed. Now we are beginning to again attract the top students while having a system that ensures that they are enrolled

in their university and remain in the program, for which their visa has been issued.

We want to attract those students, because it is a win for everyone. If we have foreign students come here and stay, they enrich our society, and if they leave, then they are going home as great believers in America. They have friendships and ties with America. We want to keep that kind of growth in our society.

The SKIL Act addresses some of the concerns that were highlighted in the "Rising Above The Gathering Storm" report. I believe Congress, in a very bipartisan way, is going to pass that bill. We are going to increase H1B visas for highly qualified technical workers. We also want to offer more opportunities to encourage our young people to earn math, science, and engineering degrees. There are many incentives in the legislation we have introduced to encourage our young people from middle and high school to take the courses needed to then go into these college programs.

Very few—under 10 percent—of American high school graduates have done the prerequisite study for engineering. We have to make sure our young people are encouraged to take those courses. We must also encourage people who have majors in those fields to teach in high school. We have an incentive for that, and we also have an incentive for high school teachers to go back and earn graduate degrees in fields such as chemistry, physics, and math. I absolutely believe that we will be able to take on these issues in the next Congress because there is complete bipartisan agreement that these are issues that we must face.

We do have challenges. We have to find a legal way for foreign nationals to come into the country and to be part of our economy, and to bring in workers to do the work that Americans are not doing in agriculture and in service industries. We must also secure our borders so we know who is in our country and so we can continue to protect our people. We know that there are still people who want to come in to the United States and kill Americans, and it is our job to see that we do everything possible not to allow that to happen.

We also need to make sure that people with high potential have an avenue and incentive to come. We need to increase our higher education facilities to accommodate more students to fill the good jobs. Last but not least, we must make sure that we keep "E Pluribus Unum." We must make sure that Americans want to be Americans, and that they never put their former country ahead of the interests of our country and our place in the world. We need to assure that we continue to welcome immigrants to our country as we always have. Thank you very much.

### *Discussion:*

Ms. CULLUM: Kay, congratulations. Obviously you have put a huge amount of thought and effort and time on this very issue. We are all grateful as always that you are in Washington and doing such a fine job. There

is a grandmother I know in Colorado who emigrated from Mexico quite some time ago who has had her children and grandchildren here but is not legal. She is washing dishes. How does she become legal, what is her avenue, and how do we work with this person and the almost 10 million like her?

SENATOR HUTCHISON: She would be able to have an expedited process to go home to Mexico, go to one of the Ellis Island centers, and apply for the job that is available. She would be able to be matched to an employer. If she has 10 years experience in a restaurant, that restaurant would be able to match her to their position so they could keep her as an experienced worker. But she would have to go back and apply. I would envision a two-week process, and I don't think that would be onerous at all because many of the immigrants do go home for two weeks a year, or more. The Ellis Island Centers would be established while the borders are being secured so once the border is certified secure, those systems would be in place for people who want to come here legally. Applicants could go home for two weeks and have the public health test and criminal background check.

Ms. CULLUM: Who would pay for that?

SENATOR HUTCHISON: The employer.

AUDIENCE: Thank you for a wonderfully intelligent, thorough and politically grounded presentation. I wanted to take up the last point about the emphasis on bringing in people from abroad through science, engineering, and technology. I have read all of the versions of Charles Miller's Department of Education report on Higher Education that came out between June and August, and one of the things that concerned me was the emphasis, almost exclusively on these three categories. I was at the National Security Agency giving a talk on decipherment theory last December, and when I sat down for lunch almost everyone around the table at the NSA that I was dealing with were people trained in the humanities; they were trained in classical languages, they were trained in history and so forth. And one of the critical areas we heard mentioned earlier today included even bilingual high school teachers. Is the next stage going to be looking at other areas we can open up, such as people who could make us better aware of Arabic culture, foreign cultures and histories, and also just the basic languages? You know there is a big problem getting Arabic speakers, Farsi speakers to even interpret the intelligence they do there. So is that on the table? Is that something that was discussed?

SENATOR HUTCHISON: It was not discussed in this particular report because they were asked to look at the science and engineering shortages. But it is an excellent point. One thing that we have already done to address part of that is providing Pell Grant enhancements for young people who will

agree to major in science, engineering, and languages that we are in need of having more people speak. Arabic is certainly one of those, but your point is beyond that, and it's a good one. We also need more people to be able to come in with those skills and the knowledge of the culture. If there is anything that has become crystal clear, it is that we did not understand the culture well enough to do the follow through in the War on Terror, particularly in Iraq. That is a very valid point, and when we are looking at H1B visas, which would be part of this, I am going to take that back and incorporate it. We have tried to bring people in to speak Arabic, and I think we need to have more in the area of understanding the culture, too.

AUDIENCE: Senator, I'm Eduardo Rodriguez from Brownsville. Senator, two things. I applaud you for your thoughts on this problem. Does your bill include people who have come in illegally? Would they be ineligible for the guest worker program? Number two, with respect to those who have been here some 15 or 20 years, would you consider setting up those kinds of Ellis Island places of employment for those people here in the United States, so they would not have to travel to Mexico? There is a great fear among some people who have been here for many years that if they go back, they can never come back.

SENATOR HUTCHISON: We would envision that if you were here with a job illegally that you would be able to go back to your country of origin and be able to come back in after passing the health and criminal background checks. That is why some people call it amnesty. I do not think it is amnesty if there are people who wait to apply legally or if people who have been here apply legally in their home country. I think that is how you get a handle on the system. There definitely is the fear for people who have been here that if they go home, they will never get back. We have to overcome that by showing that the system works. I think when people start coming in with the tamper-proof visas legally, they will be the preferred employees hired. I also think that when people see that happening, they will see that that is the way to start accumulating your own Social Security contribution. Today people are here illegally with a false card, and they are getting no credit for their contributions that are being taken out of their paychecks, so there will be an incentive for them. They will see that it works because after the program is up and going for a period of years a verification system will begin, and every employer will be required to show that their employees are all legal workers. You will have the incentive when people see that it works. Then, you will have the willingness for people to go back, and now they will have that opportunity.

Secondly, the Ellis Island Centers will be American companies. They will be private employment agencies contracted by the American government, so you would be able to have an American company with an employment agency in Dallas, Texas, with an arm in Nuevo Laredo. The worker would then be able to have the application process start in Dallas,



Texas, and then go to Nuevo Laredo to do the final background check and public health check to come back in. I think you will have the ability to do this efficiently once it's up and going.

AUDIENCE: Senator, Carolyn King from Houston. I was curious about how you are going to define, for purposes of this act, a secure border. You spoke in terms of 12,000 border patrol agents, various other types of agents, and better equipment. Is it in terms of goals like that or is it in terms of the border patrol's getaway rate and their estimate of how many people come into the country and do not get caught? It is a pretty high rate. Is it in terms of certain levels that you are going to establish once we get this border enforcement level or is it in terms of the getaway rate?

SENATOR HUTCHISON: What we would do is set out what we believe to be the requirements for securing the border, which would be 12,000 border control agents, DEA agents, et cetera. Then when the President certifies that those things have been done, that is the certification. It cannot be subjective, because you might never get there. We set out those parameters. A lot of people think that we have made no progress, but we have made progress. We have added a lot of resources to the criminal justice system at the federal level in West Texas and South Texas because dealing with illegal immigration was straining the counties in those areas. But we have also added detention beds to stop the catch-and-release program, because if people come in from anywhere but Mexico, you cannot just turn them back to Mexico. Mexico has no responsibility to take a Salvadoran. We have not had the detention space to hold people until we could process them back to their home country. That has caused a huge number of people to come in, and say, "I'm from El Salvador," and they are let go and usually never seen again. Those people now will be detained until all of the proper procedures have been put in place to send them back. That is going to be part of a system that secures the border against all illegal entry. We have people coming in who are from China, Indonesia, and Saudi Arabia. We have a lot of different types of illegal immigrants, besides Mexican illegal immigrants. Thank you.

# A CASE OF FOREIGN POLICY

---

MR. HORCHOW: I'd like to ask for Lee Cullum, who will move our program forward. I hope you understand that having a working lunch was to allow you at the end of the day to go rest a little bit before the evening. It's purely social. We're not going to have anything during dinner, but afterwards we'll have a wonderful talk by Richard Fisher.

MS. CULLUM: Thanks, Roger. I am not introducing our speaker at lunch today, but I do want to tell you that the new Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law at the LBJ School is exceedingly lucky to get Jim Lindsay as its first director. He will be an enormous asset to the university and to the state of Texas.

Ted Strauss will be introducing him today, and Ted now is associated with two institutes at the university: one is the Robert Strauss center that I mentioned, the other, the Annette Strauss Center for Civic Participation. Ted knows a lot about civic participation. He is campaign chairman for one of the candidates running for mayor next year, Max Wells—the least I can do, Ted, is plug your candidate today—and he, of course, knows a great deal about the office of mayor. His wife, Annette Strauss, was one of the great mayors of Dallas. Ted wanted to know if he could be humorous today, and not pompous like everybody else—I think he meant me—and of course, we wouldn't miss a chance at the Ted Strauss wit. So Ted, you're on.

• • •

THEODORE H. STRAUSS

I am delighted to be here and I'm surprised to be here. I looked at the distinguished roster and it reminded me of the time at Stanford when my mother told me not to go to a certain place. She never wanted to hear that I was in there. I did go and I was surprised how many people I knew. And I know that Dan Arnold is out there somewhere, my good friend from Houston, and Chuck Story and Jackie Blanton, and many, many others.

I have been selected, obviously, because this is my brother's namesake school. My brother is an exceptional man. I just wish my mother and father were still here to see the naming of this school. My mother would

have been thrilled; my father would have been shocked. But so be it for the wit that I promised Lee I'd leave at home.

Jim Lindsay is our first director of this school, and I have been advised that I would find his bio quite interesting. I also found it quite heavy. He is a man who has accomplished so much and I can see why he has been chosen to be the director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law at the University of Texas, where Jim holds the Tom Slick Chair of International Affairs in the LBJ School of Public Affairs. He is a leading authority on the American foreign policy making process, and the domestic politics of American foreign policy. And as you know, my brother has been pretty active in politics, so I know that Jim is more than just an appropriate choice; he's an excellent choice.

Before becoming director of the Strauss Center, Dr. Lindsay was vice president, director of studies and Maurice R. Greenberg Chair at the Council on Foreign Relations. He previously served as deputy director and senior fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution. From 1987 to 1999, he was a professor of political science at the University of Iowa, where he was an award-winning instructor.

Dr. Lindsay has authored, co-authored or edited more than 15 books and 50 journal articles and book chapters on various aspects of American foreign policy and international relations—a great accomplishment. His book with Ivo Daalder, *America Unbound, the Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy* was awarded the 2003 Lionel Gelber Award, named a finalist for the Arthur S. Ross book award, and selected as a top book of 2003 by *The Economist*. His other books include *Agenda for the Nation* with Henry J. Aaron which was named an outstanding academic book of 2004 by the choice magazine, *Defending America*.

Dr. Lindsay holds an AB in economics and political science, highest distinction, highest honors, from the University of Michigan, and a MA, master of philosophy and a Ph.D. from Yale University. He has been a fellow at the Center for International Affairs and the Center for Science and International Affairs, both at Harvard University. This is some fellow. He is a recipient of the Pew Faculty Fellowship in International Affairs and an International Affairs Fellowship from the Council on Foreign Relations. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

With that formal description, I would say I've had the pleasure of talking with Jim and he's the luckiest guy I know. He's getting ready to move to Austin, Texas, which is, I think, everyone's place they would choose; it would be mine. I wish I were there with you, Jim, and I'm proud to introduce you to this distinguished group. Thank you very much.

• • •

## JOHN M. LINDSAY

Ted, thank you for that very warm and very kind introduction. I must say it's an honor to be introduced by you and it's an honor for me to be associated with the Strauss family name. I know how much you and your brother and Annette have contributed, not just to Texas, but to the country and, again, it's quite a privilege for me to be the director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law.

I also want to say thank you to Lee Cullum for having invited me to come here. I met Lee through my work at the Council on Foreign Relations where Lee did an absolutely outstanding job as a member of the board of directors. She is a role model for all of us. So Lee, thank you very much.

And I also want to thank all of you for coming here and putting up with me this afternoon. As Ted mentioned, I have recently moved to Texas. Yes, I'm one of those Yankees who migrated down from up north. I probably should let you in on a little secret—you have a great state. I've had a chance to travel around much, but not all of Texas. It's quite wonderful. My only regret is that it took me 47 years to get the sense to come down here. So I'm looking forward to being at the University of Texas.

Now, I am a professor by training, a job that a student of mine once defined as somebody who talks while other people sleep. I'm going to try not to live up to that definition here today, though I realize I may be at a disadvantage after that very nice lunch which can tend to make people's eyes a little heavy.

Lee asked me to talk about foreign policy. That is obviously a very broad and very deep topic, far broader than anyone can do justice to in a luncheon talk. So in my remarks here today, I'm going to leave out a whole lot more than I'm going to put in. We'll try to remedy that at the end by having time for question and answer.

What I'd like to do in my time here today is to address what I see as the great danger and the great challenge facing the United States in foreign policy. The great danger is that we will overreact to our problems in Iraq by replacing an overly ambitious foreign policy with one that is overly timid. The great challenge that we face in the next several years is to restore trust in American global leadership.

But in keeping with today's theme of immigration, I'd like to begin by talking about what I don't think will be a significant problem for the United States in foreign affairs going forward, and that's America's foreign-born population. I think actually it's a great strength for America in foreign affairs and not a great weakness.

Now, I understand that concern about immigrants and their impact on foreign policy has spread in recent years. It has come in two broad forms, both of which we heard a little bit about earlier this morning.

One strand argues that immigrants undermine social cohesion which in turn undermines national identity and national interests. This argument

has been presented in its most presentable form by Harvard Professor Sam Huntington, who Jim Hollifield referred to this morning. Caroline Brettell also mentioned Professor Huntington in one of her power point charts. In a book called *Who Are We?* Professor Huntington worried at exceedingly great length that the growing number of Mexican-Americans was going to be the undoing of America.

The other strand argues not so much about immigrants undoing social cohesion, but that ethnic groups will distort our foreign policy. Cuban-Americans exercise veto power over U.S. policy toward Cuba, Armenian-Americans do the same thing with U.S. policy toward Armenia, and most famously—or notoriously, depending upon your perspective—Jewish-Americans control U.S. policy toward Israel.

Now, these arguments provoke great passion—sometimes you can hear them being talked about on talk radio—but both of them melt under reasonable scrutiny. Fears of immigrants coming into the United States and undermining social cohesion are as old as the Republic. Strike the word “Mexican” where it appears in Professor Huntington’s book, substitute the word “Italian,” and Professor Huntington’s book could have been published in 1910; strike “Mexican” and substitute “Irish” and it could have been published in 1860. American national cohesion is far more durable and far more accommodating to influxes of immigrants than the nay-sayers acknowledge.

But what about ethnic lobbies? They’re certainly nothing new. For those of you who remember your American History books, Irish and German lobbies fought to try to keep the United States out of, first, World War I, and then out of World War II. In the United States, global politics is often local politics, and local politics can frequently be about ethnic politics. Nothing new about that; that’s the way our political system works.

But I would want to also point out that most ethnic groups never become significant foreign policy lobbies. You can search in vain to find the French-Canadian lobby or the Italian lobby or the Dutch lobby or the Norwegian lobby in American foreign policy. It’s not because these people did not come to the United States in large numbers. It’s not because they didn’t settle in geographically defined areas where they would have had the opportunity to exercise clout. It’s largely because these immigrants came to the United States primarily for economic reasons. They were not motivated by political reasons, and so there was never any issue around which they could mobilize.

Moreover, many ethnic groups or ethnic lobbies that we read about in the paper are actually far less successful than they are active, and they generally accomplish little. Just to single out one classic case, the Armenian-American lobby in the United States is very active and very vocal on Capitol Hill. Their great success has been to turn Armenia into the largest single per capita recipient of U.S. foreign aid. But in terms of the broader agenda of trying to get the United States to rethink its relations with Turkey, it has been a failure.

But of course, some lobbies do become significant, and in those cases

what's really remarkable is oftentimes their successes have as much to do with events beyond their control or the actions of other actors than their own activities. Cuban-Americans have always benefitted from the fact that Fidel Castro refused, despite much advice from Latin American leaders, to engage in a rapprochement with Washington. Cuban-Americans also benefitted from the fact that they inherited the policy of isolating Cuba. It was instituted before Cuban-Americans were a significant factor in American politics. One of the lessons of American politics for any lobby, foreign or domestic, is that it is a lot easier to defend the status quo than it is to change it.

Or take the existence of the Israeli lobby. Two political scientists, one from the University of Chicago, another from Harvard University, wrote a paper that created a lot of commotion earlier this year. The paper talked about the Israeli lobby exercising excessive control over American policy toward Israel.

One of the more remarkable things about the paper is that it defined the Israeli lobby so broadly it included not just Jewish-Americans but virtually every evangelical living in the United States. That's actually much of the population. Indeed, one of the things that those Jewish-Americans who have been active on Israeli issues have always benefitted from is that they are advancing a political agenda that resonates with most Americans.

Finally, much of the discussion about the role of ethnic lobbies in American foreign policy tends to focus on feared costs, costs that are often imaginary, and to miss very real benefits. The immigrant transmission belt works in reverse as well as it does in forward: it injects American perspectives into the deliberations of lots of other governments.

I'll just cite one example because of its significance. If you've watched the evolution of American and Indian relations over the last decade or so, it has been enabled by and partially driven by the prominence of Indian-Americans living in the United States. They recognized that the strategic disassociation or estrangement between Washington and New Delhi did not make sense.

So I'm not worried—or my fear is not that the United States is going to be undone by its new immigrants and their offspring. My fear instead is something different. It's that our excessive exuberance in foreign policy is going to give way to an excessive timidity when it comes to events overseas.

Mark Twain tells the story of the cat that sat on a hot white stove. It was burned so badly that it never sat on anything white ever again. America's hot white stove today is Iraq. Whether you supported the decision to invade Iraq or not, whether you blame the Pentagon for failing to send enough troops to Iraq or blame the Iraqis for failing to seize the opportunity to remake their country, Iraq is now in crisis. Sectarian violence is exploding and Washington's ability to influence events is shrinking.

Indeed, if you needed any sort of visible testimony to that reality, the president of the United States recently went all the way to Jordan to meet with the Iraqi prime minister, who decided to not go to the first meeting.

No one in Washington these days is talking about victory in Iraq. Most of the discussion in Washington today is about how to prevent a catastrophe or how to pick among bad options.

The American public understands that Iraq is a hot white stove, and they are understandably reluctant to touch anything white any time soon. That was the lesson of the 2006 midterm congressional elections. Democrats gained control of Congress by running against the administration's handling of Iraq. They implicitly, and sometimes explicitly, promised a smaller, less exhausting foreign policy. To be honest, it's not just the public that feels this way. In my business of writing about American foreign policy, professors and pundits have weighed in with a whole bunch of new concepts—offshore balancing, the return of realism, the importance of prudence in foreign policy—largely because they understand and in part feel that America needs a foreign policy that requires us to do less and requires others to do much more.

Now, this desire to retrench is nothing new. After most wars, and especially after wars that are perceived as not having gone well, Americans have sought to step back from global affairs. In some sense it's in our political DNA; it's part of the rhythms of American history. It happened after World War I; it happened after World War II, and as everyone in the room no doubt remembers, it happened after the Vietnam War.

What history also tells us is that those retrenchments are usually overdone. The pullback after World War I eventually gave rise to isolationism, generally regarded nowadays as one of the great strategic missteps in American foreign policy history. It happened immediately after World War II. The great desire to bring the boys back home created a strategic opening in Europe and elsewhere for the Soviet Union. And again, it certainly happened in Vietnam.

The lesson is clear: a smaller foreign policy is not necessarily a wiser one. I'll even go further and argue that the temptation to retrench today is especially strong. It is strong because globalization is producing competitors overseas who are raising a very real challenge to American middle class prosperity. That's one of the great concerns the public has as it looks ahead, the fear that tomorrow may not be better than yesterday.

Very clearly in both parties, among Democrats and among Republicans, you can see the rise of economic nationalists—or less charitably, populists—who are arguing that they have policies that will solve the problem. These tend to be policies that seek to protect Americans from competition rather than giving them the tools to compete. The debates over immigration in the United States could turn even more controversial if we see a global economic downturn that aggravates our existing economic problems.

The situation today is especially dangerous because in a globalized world the philosophy of live and let live does not work. Problems no longer stay home, they cross borders. Indeed, as you look at September 11, you talk to many people who do work on the roots of Islamic terrorism, what they will tell you is this is less about the United States and the

Islamic world and more about a civil war within the Muslim world. Likewise, think of the great challenges out there today: climate change, flu and other pandemic diseases. These are problems that do not respect borders. As powerful as the United States is—and we are an enormously blessed and powerful country—we do not have enough guards, guns or gates to keep every problem from coming home.

We can, of course, hope that somebody else will pick up the slack and take care of the problems for us. But, they can't and they won't. The fact is Madeline Albright was right: the United States in many ways is an indispensable nation. Collective problems are required to solve global challenges, but collective problems only get solved by leadership, and if the United States doesn't lead, who will?

But that immediately raises a different question, and it's not a question I would have thought several years ago I would ask, but it goes as follows: If the United States leads, who will follow? Sadly, far fewer countries than we need to accomplish what needs to be done. That is why the great challenge for American leadership is to restore international trust in the United States. With Iraq, Abu Ghreib, Guantanamo, the departure from Kyoto, and a whole other set of foreign policy missteps, the foreign policy approach of the past five years has destroyed the good will that many around the world feel toward America. The Pew Center for the people in the press have made a living of doing polls, going around the globe asking people about their attitudes toward the United States. They're clearly far less favorable towards us than they were a decade ago.

Now, I raise this not because popularity is the goal of foreign policy. It isn't. Good will matters not as an end but as a means, a means to achieving our goals abroad. Simply put, countries, especially democratic countries, follow those whom they trust. They don't follow those whom they distrust and resent. And quite honestly, given the plate of problems for this administration and its successor, we need others to want to follow our lead.

The importance of good will is something that our adversaries understand—some far better than we do. Hugo Chavez, up for reelection this weekend in Venezuela, and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of Iran have been quite open in manipulating and inflaming anti-American passions to advance decidedly anti-U.S. agendas. Russian and Chinese leaders are far more subtle in the practice, but they're playing the same game. Even some of our closest partners are working to distance themselves from Washington. I would submit that you know you have a problem when the new leader of Britain's Conservative Party, the party of Margaret Thatcher, uses one of his first speeches to distance himself and his party from the United States.

Now, restoring international trust is not easy to do. As the saying goes, you don't get a second chance to make a first impression. But doing so is, in my judgment, essential. Now, I'm not going to lay out an entire agenda for doing that, but I think broad brush, we need to do three things.

One is to renew our commitment to creating a better world for others



as well as ourselves. If you travel a lot outside the United States—as I've had the good fortune of doing—the complaint that you commonly hear, both from elites and non-elites, is that Americans in recent years have spent far too much time telling others what they can do to help America and spending far too little time talking about how we can help them. Indeed, one of my concerns about the rise of nationalist or neo-isolationist strategies is that they would ultimately end up confirming this view that America is self-interested and is only worried about things that directly affect it.

Second, it's important to be generous and interested in the rest of the world. Abe Lincoln liked to say that a drop of honey works better than a bucket of gall, and he was on to something there. That advice applies not just to personal relations, but also to international relations. Not surprisingly, the United States is most popular and has the warmest relations with countries where it has done the most to help.

I'll just give you one example because I spent a week there talking to senior officials, and that's Indonesia. The change in attitudes in Indonesia toward the United States after the tsunami, after Indonesians saw American generosity, saw what the American military was capable of doing, is quite remarkable. I was there about a year after the tsunami, and the message that I heard from Indonesians—again, both inside government and out of it—was why don't you do more things like that? You are capable of doing more than that, but usually what we hear from you is what you need us to do.

The third suggestion I would offer is to be committed to the rule of law. As long as the United States continues to be seen as saying to the rest of the world, effectively, the rule of law applies to thee, but not to me, we will have a problem. We will find it difficult to advance our agenda; we will find it particularly difficult to bring our European allies along. This is one of their standard and most vocal complaints. The United States needs to stress working with others, and also working to build effective international institutions. Indeed, part of the great challenge is that most of our partners expect us to work through institutions and to help build them. Americans, however, have tended, historically to like institutions when they work and to go around them when they don't think they are going to give them the outcome they desire.

But I would add that in terms of working to build more effective international institutions, there's clearly a lot of work that needs to be done. Competent international institutions are desperately needed to deal with the problems unleashed by globalization. As I have said, we're increasingly facing problems that cross borders. In such a work we need the cooperation of others to achieve our ends. In addition, one of the benefits that comes with establishing and shaping an international framework is that it creates the opportunity to build a world order that will push others closer to our interests and values.

Now, none of this will be easy to do. I make no argument that it will. It will be necessary, though, if we are to be spared the misfortune of dis-

covering that doing too little can be as damaging as trying to do too much. As for now, I hope that I have neither said too little nor talked too long.

*Discussion:*

AUDIENCE: Can you apply what you just said specifically to NAFTA and our relationship with Mexico? Our conference theme here is immigration and that's one of the big topics out there.

DR. LINDSAY: President Bush, when he ran for the White House in 2000, talked about the United States having no bilateral relationship more important than Mexico. In many ways, he was right. The fact is that we share a 2,000-mile long border. The United States is a very wealthy country, while Mexico is aspiring to become one. Among other things, the very dramatic difference in wage levels that exists in the United States versus Mexico creates a very long term dynamic in which people travel in search of jobs and to make more money. It's a very common and very old tradition.

But the United States and Mexico haven't always had the best of relations. The shadow of the past weighs very heavily over the relationship. And it seems to me that further integration of the Americas is natural. In part it's going to be driven by the realities of globalization, as other regions begin to integrate more and more. There are many obstacles, however, to making that happen. The fear on this side of the border is that they will take over. The fear in Mexico is quite different. Their fear is that we will take over.

What this points to is the importance of working out an immigration policy that we feel comfortable with and that the Mexicans feel comfortable with. When we talk about immigration, the tendency is to talk about it as a domestic issue. But it's also a foreign policy issue. The decisions we make on immigration will have very real ramifications for the U.S.-Mexican relationship.

Again, as you know, Vicente Fox, when he was elected, part of his pitch to the Mexican people was: I know Americans, I have very good relations with them, I'm going to go and be able to produce a better policy that will serve our interests and that will advance the cause of democratization and economic growth in Mexico. For a variety of reasons, most of them beyond President Fox's control, that hasn't happened.

As we discovered this morning, immigration is an extraordinarily complicated topic, both domestically and in foreign policy terms.

AUDIENCE: What steps should be taken in the World Trade Organization?

DR. LINDSAY: You raise one of the great debates among people who are interested in trade, and that's the question to what extent should you work through universal, multilateral organizations like the WTO versus pursuing bilateral deals. And here the real challenge lies with countries

other than the United States. The current Doha round was intended to provide a leg up to impoverished countries by bringing them further into the international trading system. The idea was that developed countries would get rid of the policies, subsidies and protectionism that tended to be more destructive or harmful for economic development overseas. For a whole variety of reasons, that hasn't happened. The whole Doha round has come to a halt.

The position the United States took was, in my judgment, reasonable. The problem now, as one Brazilian official put it to me, is that Brazil and the other emerging powers, including India, have to stop thinking of themselves solely as developing countries looking to get something. They need to think of themselves as global powers that have a stake in creating a more open economy.

My great fear is that the WTO will break down. It's unlikely that the Doha round will resume. That's in part because next July 1, the president's trade promotion authority expires. Trade promotion authority is a procedural device in which Congress gives the president authority to negotiate and limits itself to holding an up or down vote on the final agreement. TPA makes other countries more willing to negotiate because it limits Congress' ability to reopen any trade deal.

President Bush found it very hard to get Congress, even when Republicans controlled both houses, to give him TPA. My guess is that for Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senator Harry Reid of Nevada, giving President Bush trade promotion authority is not at the top of their list of priorities.

So if the United States can't negotiate, no one else will negotiate and efforts to open the global economy will stall. Then we'll start to see more bilateral and regional deals. My friends who are trade economists argue that these kinds of deals are less efficient and will impede growth internationally and domestically.

For the United States, this compounds the problem I've already talk about, namely, the challenge of maintaining American global leadership. The United States can do deals with small countries because it is in a very strong bargaining position given the size of its economy. It can make tough demands, and many smaller countries will feel they have no choice but to accept Washington's terms. However, this can create very real resentment among their populations.

What is playing out here is one of the most interesting trends in global affairs. More and more countries have become democratic. That is good. But in many ways it was a lot easier for Washington to deal with the Soviet Union than to deal with a democratic country. Why? Because when the politburo made a decision, it could enforce it. When you are dealing with democracies, you're often engaged in what political scientists like to call two-level games. You negotiate with the leader of another country, but you have to hope that he or she can keep his or her domestic coalition together. Sometimes, however, those coalitions fall apart.

More broadly, one of the real challenges for the United States, particularly in Europe, is that even countries who want to do right by the United

States can face constraints. Leaders that want to do right by the United States also want to get reelected. And the desire to get reelected can overwhelm the desire to do right by the United States.

AUDIENCE: What would be your recommendation to stay away from the white hot stove and still deal with Iran and Korea?

DR. LINDSAY: I think, personally, that it makes no sense not to engage with Iran. Our ability to prevent the Iranians from getting a nuclear device is low. Now, others would dispute that. If that is your operating assumption, then you probably would not favor engagement.

One of the questions that historians will ask down the road is why the United States and Iran didn't find a way to reestablish a working relationship. We once had a very good relationship with Iran, and it wasn't based on similar religions or similar cultures or similar visions of a just world. It was based on pure realpolitik. They lived in a neighborhood in which many of their neighbors didn't like them, and we made a very good friend.

As we all know, the Iranian revolution ended that friendship. What we are less sensitive to is that when we made Iran part of the axis of evil and decided to invade Iraq, we created, just in pure geopolitical terms, a real problem for the Iranians.

One of the great concerns that Iranians have is that if Arab Muslims think of themselves more as Arabs or more as Sunni Muslims than as Muslims than Iran faces a threat. One of the ways that the Iranians have reacted, most clearly with Mr. Ahmadinejad, is to redefine the terms of debate in the Middle East by emphasizing Islam over sect or nationality. Mr. Ahmadinejad has, in essence, said I'm going to be more Muslim than anyone else and take up every pet cause of Muslims, particularly by denouncing Israel. This has created a very real problem for the United States in the region.

The United States would have been in a stronger position to engage the Iranians three years ago when we were winning than we are right now. The general rule of international relations, as well as in the rest of life, is that you have a stronger hand when you're winning than when you're losing.

But the critical thing is whether you believe that you can stop the Iranian nuclear weapons program. I haven't seen anyone make what I would consider to be a credible case that we can. But if you believe otherwise, you would look to a whole different set of policy recommendations.

MS. CULLUM: Thanks, Jim. I would like to say thank you to Jim Lindsay. He just moved to Austin two weeks ago with a wife and four children, and in those two weeks they have acquired two dogs. The deal was their kids would move to Texas if they could have a dog and they now have two. But he will be with us tomorrow morning so we can continue this conversation; I think there's a lot more to talk with Jim about.

# MIGRATION AND THE NEW CONGRESS

---

MR. HORCHOW: We've had a wonderful program this morning, thanks to Lee and her group, the panelists, everyone who spoke. I think that we really have a lot of food for thought, starting with Dr. Brettell. We're going to have a quiz at the end to see who can remember those statistics, but you'll pass the immigration statistics and then you'll become a citizen of the Philosophical Society. I now turn the program, once again, over to Lee Cullum.

MS. CULLUM: Our next speaker is one of the most influential voices in the country when it comes to immigration. Senator John Cornyn chairs the Immigration Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He is absolutely central to any effort to pass a reform bill on this subject, and he has proposed more than one bill over the past few years, and these are bills that make very good sense. I think he has just moved into, is it number five in the leadership of the Republican Party, so we should be very proud, as Texans, to have number four and five be senators from Texas. He too will be involved in the rebuilding of the party and the re-emergence of the Republican Party in Washington and across the country.

I also want to say that he has been quoted in a very sensible way recently—and I hope *The New York Times* quoted you correctly, Senator—they were talking about the great wall that everybody is discussing to go along the U.S.-Mexico border, the 700-mile wall, and he said that he wasn't sure that the \$2- to \$9 billion it might cost would be the most economical use of that money. He also pointed out that it's a long road from authorization to actual appropriation, and I think that makes very good sense.

So listen carefully to what he has to say. Even in a minority position in the new Congress, the 110th Congress, I don't think anything important will happen without his effort and his support. And we're very happy to have you here today. Thanks, Senator.

• • •

SENATOR JOHN CORNYN

One of the first phrases I learned when I went to serve in the United States Senate four years ago—given my junior status, I was number 99 out of 100 when I started—is this phrase which I

think is appropriate for the time on the agenda in which I'm speaking. The phrase is this: Everything has been said, but not everyone has said it yet.

My task this afternoon is not only to rouse you from your post-luncheon slumbers, but to try to talk about this issue in a way that hasn't already been discussed, maybe from a little bit different perspective, and one that will help shed a little bit of light and maybe provide some food for thought on what I believe is the single most important domestic issue that faces our country today.

In many ways the challenge is how we achieve an immigration system that reflects American values and reflects American interests. Of course, we know—and Senator Hutchison spoke to this subject—in a post 9-11 world the environment has changed. Just last year, out of the 1.1 million people that were detained coming across our international border with Mexico, 160,000 of them came from countries other than Mexico, so-called OTMs, Other Than Mexicans.

Well, the fact is we do have a broken and porous border along our southern border, but if you think ours is bad, just look at Mexico's southern border and Mexican officials acknowledge this up front. And so what I hear from my constituents, as I travel in the Rio Grande Valley and South Texas and El Paso and all along the border is people are worried because they can no longer assume that the people who are coming across their ranches and across their property along the border, they can no longer assume they're just immigrants who want to come and work and want a better life.

Matter of fact, recently I had the occasion to talk to one of my friends from Houston who owns a ranch along the border, and he said, "The border patrol came to my ranch house the other day and told me they had detained twelve people; guess what country they were from?" I said, "I don't know, where were they from?" He said, "Albania."

The fact of the matter is because of Mexico's porous southern border, Central America, South America, Mexico have become literally a land bridge for illegal immigration into the United States. That, I believe, along with the post 9-11 consciousness we have about our vulnerability to those who would exploit such things, really, I think, has caused more people to focus on our immigration system and broken borders than perhaps we have in the past.

The problem is, of course, you know we've been there before. Many people remember 1986 which was supposed to be the very last amnesty, the solution to all of our problems. Matter of fact, I would commend for your reading an op-ed in *The New York Times* that Ed Meese wrote. He was the attorney general, to then Ronald Reagan, who signed an amnesty for 3 million people. The tradeoff was supposed to be—and I'm just summarizing here—Ed Meese said the tradeoff was supposed to be an immigration enforcement system that actually worked. But we got an amnesty for 3 million people and we got virtually no enforceable immigration system. And so I think many people come to this debate skeptical of the

federal government's commitment to deal with this problem, and I think, unfortunately, with good reason.

So my goal, simply as an individual member of the United States Senate: How can we achieve an immigration system that reflects our national values and reflects our national interests? Well, I think, as Senator Hutchison said this morning, you certainly have to start with security—that is the single most important element of the federal government's responsibility. She mentioned her ideas, many of which I share completely. We need to at least double the number of border patrol agents.

Do you know how many police officers there are in New York City? About 40,000. And you can reflect upon the number of people we have along our 2,000-mile border and understand why, notwithstanding their professionalism and their good work, they're overwhelmed. And yes, there may be some need for physical barriers in hard to control places, but no one believes that a 700-mile fence is a complete solution to our problems.

I happen to think that technology is a substantial part of the answer here, and you know what, we don't have to start from scratch to figure out what kind of technology might work because the Department of Defense is using that technology now in places like Iraq and Afghanistan, everything ranging from ground sensors to thermal imagery cameras to night vision technology, to unmanned aerial vehicles that can create a technological web that will allow our border patrol agents and other law enforcement professionals to secure our southern border.

Now, of course, some are skeptical, and I understand way, of our ability to do that while we maintain the open access for legal commerce and trade that's so important to our economy and to who we are as a state and nation, but I think we can do it. I believe that deterrence, of course, has to be credible. One of the problems we've had is the catch and release program because we simply have neglected over the last 20 years to build the infrastructure and the capacity necessary to provide for a secure border.

Let me just give you one example. You heard me mention the number of people who have been detained just last year alone from countries other than Mexico, 160,000. Well, you would perhaps be surprised to know that we only have about 20,000 detention beds for people to be detained, and on average, it has taken anywhere from 30 to 60 days to process individuals who've come from countries other than Mexico back to their countries.

So what has happened, to further compound people's skepticism, and some would say cynicism about some of the proposed efforts to deal with this issue is the Department of Homeland Security had for a long time a so-called catch and release program. Now, this is releasing people on their own recognizance, asking them to come back 30 days hence for their deportation hearing. Well, you're not surprised—I can tell by your reaction—to know that only a fraction of those who are asked to return did so, the rest melted into the American landscape, and I've always wondered about those who did return.

They must have known that we did not have the capacity at the time

to actually enforce the law and actually locate them and to deal with that problem. Well, it's somewhat humorous but it's also a terrible shame that the federal government has neglected this issue for such a long time and has allowed this sort of cynicism and skepticism to creep into our need to deal with this very real problem.

Let me just share one other sort of frightening number with you, and then move on to perhaps some other issues. It may surprise you to know that there are about 500,000 so-called civil and criminal absconders who have had their day in court for violation of immigration laws and who have not shown up for their court date, but simply, again, like the catch and release folks I mentioned a moment ago, melted into the American landscape. These are people who've already had their day in court, as I say, but defied the lawful judgment of our courts and gone their own way. Of those individuals, 80,000 are criminal absconders, people found guilty of crimes which subject them to deportation, but have simply gone on the lam, and we cannot, given our current capacity, locate them and make sure that justice is meted out.

Well, I believe that we have an immigration system that is out of control, that's broken, does not meet our needs or our interests. At bottom, I think what frustrates people so much is they know we are a nation of immigrants, we all know that, everybody in this room, perhaps without any exception, came from somewhere else at some time in the last couple hundred years, somewhere down your family tree, and we are a better nation for it. We are the nation that has benefitted the most from the brain drain from the rest of the world; from the people who have been the best and the brightest, the risk-takers, the people that are willing to risk life itself to come to America for a better life.

But our immigration system has always been one that has believed in assimilation and the melting pot that has made us so great. You know, we are perhaps the only nation in the world that it doesn't really make any difference where you came from originally or how you pronounce your last name, as long as you're committed to American values of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and to the concept embedded in who we are in our DNA that believes in equal justice and equal treatment under the law.

That has been the sort of platform that people have come to when they came to America and worked hard, taken advantage of the opportunity they've had, and simply embraced that concept in their hearts and become Americans, and that has made us the envy of the world.

You know, I have to tell you that when I hear people talk about what's wrong in the United States, I agree, we're not perfect. We killed 600,000 people in our Civil War, for too long we denied African-Americans equal status in our society, we denied women the right to vote, but you know what, ultimately in 2006, people are voting with their feet when they want to come to America to have a better life. And I guess maybe in a perfect world we would say it would be great if we could accept anybody and everybody who wants to come to America and they could have what we



have, perhaps by accident of our own birth, but unfortunately, we all recognize that a human tsunami like that would swamp our nation, would make it impossible to continue assimilating people from all walks of life and from all parts of the world, and would make it impossible for the melting pot concept—which has been so important to who we are—to work.

So what I think people are telling me and what I sincerely believe is we need to have some standards, we need to have some reasonable policy that determines who can lawfully come to the United States. And again, it ought to be based on American self-interest. I'm sorry, but that's what I believe. And so we need to look at things like Canada's and Australia's point system where they determine 60 to 70 percent of immigration based on the attributes and qualifications of the immigrant. Sixty to 70 percent of the visas are based upon characteristics that those countries find desirable among the immigrant population that they say we need you, please come to our country and become one of us.

In America, it might also interest you to know, that only about 16 percent of our visas are issued based on similar considerations. The rest is family-based migration, and yes, we want families to stay together, but I think it raises a very interesting issue, a very important and pertinent issue about what kind of immigration system really reflects America's national interests. That's why I believe it's so important to provide the kind of incentives that Senator Hutchison talked about this morning in the SKIL Bill to attract the best and the brightest, to continue to attract them to our schools and our universities so they can study.

I believe, like Thomas Friedman said, we ought to staple a green card to graduate degrees in math, science and engineering and encourage those folks to stay here, because the alternative is if we're unable to develop enough of our own brainpower domestically in some of those key areas, and we're unable to admit more foreign students and encourage them to stay here, we're going to see more and more of those jobs, along with the economic activity associated with them, outsourced to other countries where those people with those qualifications and attributes exist.

I also happen to believe that we need an effective guest worker program, here again, based upon American interests. Clearly, as Jack Hunt and the panel talked about this morning, we have to have a guest worker program that provides an opportunity for individuals who want to come to the United States, who are willing to be screened, who are willing to pay taxes and play by the rules to do so to satisfy the demand that this big booming American economy has for that workforce.

I think perhaps the worst part about our current situation is that illegal immigration harms the immigrant perhaps more than anyone else because these are the same people who are turning their lives over to coyotes and other human smugglers, perhaps to die in the back of a cattle trailer in Victoria, Texas, when the law enforcement shows up and the coyote runs and leaves people to die in the back of 120-degree temperatures in the

back of a cattle trailer. That's the kind of conditions that exist, unfortunately, under an illegal immigration system.

Immigrants who are afraid to go to law enforcement when they're the subject of domestic violence or an assault or when their employer doesn't pay them for their lawful wages that they've earned, they're the ones who are exploited. And so that is why I believe it is in the interest of the immigrants who are exploited under the status quo for us to create a legal system, as well as allowing America to once look ourselves in the mirror again and say yes, we are a nation of immigrants and we're proud of that, but you know what, we are also a nation of laws. And we believe that there is no problem too big or too hard for us to try to figure out and to do our best. We're not going to be perfect but we are going to create a system that is going to reflect American interests and American values.

I think the worst part about the status quo, of course, is that it tolerates so much illegality within our midst, and you'll have to forgive me, as a former judge and attorney general, I'm very worried that we find ourselves in—I guess it was James Q. Wilson that talked about the broken windows concept where cities, in order to deal with big problems had to deal with petty crimes like broken windows and graffiti because they realized that if you allow individuals to determine which laws are important and which laws are unimportant, then that confides in the individual the authority to make a decision on what they're going to comply with and what they're not.

I think we suffer as a nation if we have a society that says yes, some laws are important, but you know what, if it's inconvenient, if it's not advantageous, you can ignore these other laws. So I think it is our responsibility, those of us who you have entrusted with the duty to represent you, with the honor and privilege of representing you in the halls of Congress, to sit down, roll up our sleeves and figure out what kind of immigration system really does reflect America's interests and values, and I think we can do it if we have the political will.

But what we can't do is repeat what happened in 1986, and I know there's a lot of debate about what constitutes amnesty and what doesn't constitute amnesty, but I have to tell you, I honestly believe that if we will do our very best to create a border security system that will allow us to determine who's coming into our country and why they're here, close off the ability of those folks to come here illegally, while opening the doors wide open to lawful commerce and trade and legal visitors, if we will create a system that will allow employers to determine who is eligible to work and who is not eligible to work by creating the kind of tamper-proof and secure identification card that will allow employers without having to be a forensic document examiner make that determination, if we will create a guest worker program to satisfy the huge supply of individuals who want to come to America simply to provide for their family and put food on the table while at the same time provide our employers with a legal workforce to allow them to satisfy their legitimate concerns, I think

the American people will be enormously generous in terms of resolving what I believe is the single most difficult issue in this whole debate.

And that is one which we really haven't talked much about to this point, and that is what you do with the 12 million people who are already here. Well, according to the Pew Hispanic Center that provides great data on this whole subject—I commend it to you, commend the organization to you and their research—they estimate that about 6 million of the 12 million people who are here, either who came illegally—that is, in violation of our immigration laws—or came legally and overstayed— interestingly, about 45 percent of illegal immigration is people who came legally but who've overstayed—they estimate out of about the 12 million people who are here in that condition, about 6 million have either American citizen spouses or American citizen children.

Now, you tell me whether the American people are going to support a program that says all 12 million of those people, including the 6 million with American citizen spouses or children, have to be deported. I have a difficulty accepting that and the will to make that actually happen. I do believe there are also, by the process of definition, a lot of single adult individuals who've come to the United States who want to work and perhaps are not necessarily interested in permanently immigrating to the United States.

And I believe we need to create our guest worker program to accommodate both the demand, as I said a moment ago, and the supply, but also to restore what our friends in Mexico call circularity of migration that has historically existed between our two countries. In other words, people would come, and have come for many, many, many years to the United States to work on a temporary basis and then return home with the savings and skills they've acquired working in the United States, send remittances home in the interim. And paradoxically, what has made that harder to do is the emphasis on border security and some of our immigration laws which create a bar if you come and you've violated one of the immigration laws, you're no longer eligible to participate in a legal program of immigration.

We need to create a mechanism that will allow that circularity of migration to be restored. It's in our best interests, for the reasons I've described, but if you think about it, it's also in the interests of countries like Mexico that are net exporters of human capital. I don't know of any nation in the world that can long sustain the permanent exodus of its young workers—our nation couldn't do it.

And we need to help Mexico create conditions through our laws that are in our interests but also in the interests of Mexico that allow people to come work for a period of time and then return home with the savings and skills they've acquired working in the United States, as we continue to encourage Mexico to open up its economy to foreign investment, to reform its oil and gas sector by allowing foreign investment there, by encouraging them to eliminate the monopolies in telecommunications

and other industries which are stifling their economy, because frankly, the United States and Mexico are married and we can't get a divorce.

Our prosperity in the long run and what happens in the United States is going to continue to depend, to some extent, on conditions in that country and whether it deals with its own border insecurity problem, along with the problems that that produces for us here.

So I do think that we can, if not re-create the amnesty of 1986—which I do not support—I do believe we can give people a second chance. I mean, we are a country, if there is a country in the world that believes in second chances, I believe we can achieve that goal of giving people a second chance.

Again, I'll quote the Pew Hispanic Center that took a poll of 5,000 applicants for the Matricular Consular card, the Mexican ID card, in Mexican consulates all across this nation. They asked them this question, they said, Would you participate in a temporary worker program if you knew that at the end of a designated period of time you would have to return home to your country of origin? Seventy-one percent said they would do so.

I believe that there is a huge desire on the part of illegal immigrants who are in this country, came illegally or those who came legally and overstayed, to come out of the shadows and to get the proper documentation, to get the protection that our laws allow and provide to them so that they're no longer victimized by the status quo. And we can have some very good debates, and I'm sure we will, about exactly how we deal with the details of this second chance that I have suggested.

By the way, I would invite you to look at my website, [www.cornyn.senate.gov](http://www.cornyn.senate.gov), and you'll see a bill that I introduced about a year and a half ago, along with Senator Jon Kyl of Arizona, called the Comprehensive Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2005. And really what it boils down to is the components that I've mentioned here today: measures to enhance border security; measures to provide employers a means to verify the eligibility of workers to work; it provides a guest worker program that I've described here based on this concept of circular migration; and it provides immigrants who have perhaps become trapped here by virtue of their actions or own inactions, who do want to continue to contribute to our country, who do want to become part of that *E Pluribus Unum*, who do want to assimilate into American society, become Americans and share the values and commitments and dreams that we all share as Americans an opportunity to do so.

As I say, I think this is one of the biggest challenges that confronts our nation today on so many fronts. We must be a nation of immigrants, we must continue to be a nation of immigrants, but we must restore our legacy as a nation that believes in and enforces the rule of law. We've got to, as a federal government, regain the confidence of the American people that we're actually serious about creating an immigration system that works rather than coming up with half-baked solutions that really are

not solutions themselves, hoping that you can slide by the next election and kick the can down the road.

I believe in the end what people want out of their government are public officials who will actually roll up their sleeves and try to solve hard problems, and there is no harder problem, in my opinion, in America today, in terms of our domestic concerns, than dealing with this issue. But we can't ignore it any longer and it's up to us to solve it, and I trust and hope we will when we return to Congress in January. Thank you.

### *Discussion:*

AUDIENCE: Senator, for the past six years we've had the same party in both houses and in the White House. What is the other component that's missing that's kept Congress from tackling the issues that you described? What you and the Senator talked about this morning seems very reasonable. Some people would disagree on parts of it, obviously, but it seems like there's something missing we're not hearing about. Are the rest of the states disinterested? Are the rest of the members of Congress seeing this totally differently?

SENATOR CORNYN: I think it's a matter of political will. Part of it is a structural problem because our budget makes it very difficult for us to fund some of the measures that have to be undertaken as part of this confidence-building process, starting with border security and a work-site verification program. But of course, you know, we did pass a comprehensive Senate immigration bill, the House passed a border security bill which is clearly not enough, but what hung up is there were some who calculated that it would be better from a political standpoint, going into the election, not to do anything and throw stones at the proposed solutions by the other body. That was really what Chairman Sensenbrenner of the House Judiciary Committee and others calculated, and frankly, I think they were wrong.

In terms of what the process looks like going forward, it doesn't get any easier, I'm sorry to say. While Republicans had a majority in the House and the Senate, there were many Democrat candidates for Congress who even appeared to run to the right of Republicans in their race on some of these issues. And a lot of that is based on local considerations because, of course, they were trying to get elected which is the first order of business when you're trying to effect public policy as a member of Congress.

Labor unions are split, as you know, on this issue. Byron Dorgan from North Dakota introduced an amendment during the Senate debates to strip the guest worker program out completely. The AFL-CIO doesn't like it one bit. Service Employees International Union has split off from the AFL-CIO on that issue. And frankly, I think there is a bipartisan or maybe non-partisan consensus or concern, skepticism about the sorts of things that I mentioned.

I mean, grandiose solutions sound pretty neat, and of course, they are, but I think people want to see some details, they want to see some political will to put the money and the programs in that are actually going to make the system work. Then I think they will listen with a lot more of America's typical generosity in dealing with immigrants and the need for a guest worker program.

AUDIENCE: Senator, I just want to thank you for very thoughtful remarks there, and I can speak for myself and maybe for others in the room that we appreciate the efforts that you and others are making to try to deal with this issue.

I have two questions, they're not directly related. We know that there's a tremendous demand for legal immigrants to come to the United States, and we have some pretty severe limits in terms of the number of visas that we give out. So my first question is: Would you be willing to consider seriously raising the caps and the quotas that currently exist so that we could have a system that's a little bit more in line with the demand that we see around the world, not just in Mexico? Because you know, Mexicans are a major source, but not the only flow coming to the United States. That's my first question.

The second question is: What would it take to get the Mexicans to cooperate with us? I think that is a real stumbling block in dealing with immigration from Mexico, that we can't do this by ourselves; we're going to have to have some help on the Mexican side. Thank you.

SENATOR CORNYN: Jim, I agree with your first point, and we have set unrealistically low caps on legal immigration. The other component of it is the administrative delays associated with people immigrating to the United States, even if they try to do so legally, can span a decade, and some simply decide, well, maybe it's just easier to join my spouse or my family by coming in courtesy of a coyote, paying 1,500 bucks and coming in illegally.

You know, our relationship with Mexico is an important one. I'm the co-chairman of the U.S.-Mexico Inter-Parliamentary Meeting where we meet annually—we'll meet this year in Austin, last year we met in Mexico—talking about some of these issues. This is the number one domestic issue in Mexico. Because so many of their countrymen and women are living in the United States, they realize the importance of dealing with this issue. President Fox and President Bush had a meeting immediately before 9-11 saying we're going to get this done, and then, of course, 9-11 occurred and changed the whole paradigm.

But Mexico continues to cooperate with us a lot on homeland security matters, and unfortunately, they have problems with their economy which I hope President Calderon will be able to deal with. After 70-some years of predomination, I've told people that Mexico discovered democracy when Vicente Fox was elected, then they discovered gridlock. My

hope is that the PRI and PAN will create a coalition—perhaps especially in light of Lopez Obrador's antics since the election—that will allow the new president to work more closely with the Mexican Congress, their governing coalition, which will allow them to deal with some of their economic issues in Mexico, and I hope allow us to work together. But as I said earlier, we're married and we can't get a divorce. We've got to work it out, and I believe we can do a lot better than we have.

AUDIENCE: Senator, I'm Bill Gordon from Ithaca, New York, so I can't vote for you. You mentioned the advantages of the brain drain and what the scientists and engineers who have come to this country have produced in terms of our prosperity. You didn't mention the reverse brain drain, and we now have a very serious one with the best people who work on stem cell research, they are leaving the country to go abroad where the materials are readily available for their research and where the regulations permit it. If you'd like to comment on that, please.

SENATOR CORNYN: Well, of course, the policy of the United States government is that stem cell research, whether it's adult or embryonic stem cell research, is a lawful enterprise under most circumstances. The real debate has been to what extent the federal taxpayer will fund research into expanded lines of embryonic stem cells, and whether the current line that the president drew a couple of years ago is sufficient to provide the stem cell lines to allow the research to go forward.

Obviously, that's a matter of debate in the halls of Congress, and like every time you mix science and politics, usually science is the loser, but I will tell you that many people have firm moral and ethical concerns about what might happen if the federal government simply funded embryonic stem cell research without adequate conditions to make sure that there weren't new embryos created for the purpose of research and research only.

So to some extent we've seen states act, California and other states act, as they certainly can do, to provide embryonic stem cell research. It's only a question of whether the federal taxpayer will fund expanded lines or not, and certainly people have to make their own decisions about where they want to work and where they want to do their research, and obviously, it continues to be a matter of some vigorous debate about where that line ought to be drawn.

AUDIENCE: Hi, Senator. I think you made the very valid point that there is certainly not a will in this country to ship off 12 million people—which could really be more like 20 million people, we don't know for sure. In thinking about these Ellis Island Centers that would be the only way to get a second chance, it seems equally impractical that 12 million people could leave this country and have to go back to those centers to reenter. Would you comment on that?

SENATOR CORNYN: Sure. Well, I invited you to look at my website. Senator Kyl and I have come up with the best proposal that our brains and our staff would allow us which would provide people a period of five years, after having come forward to identify themselves, to essentially get their affairs in order and make a basic decision. Now, I'm talking about the 12 million who are already here, not people who are not yet here.

AUDIENCE: Would they still have to leave the country?

SENATOR CORNYN: They would in order to return in a legal basis. But the goal would be to provide them a way to do that on an expedited basis, perhaps a matter of days, through a consulate in their country of origin. Some have expressed skepticism that that's workable. I'm concerned about it because I've seen even our immigration system and the processing of visas get backlogged and turn out to be something we didn't intend in the first place. But I think we can actually create a system that would allow people to do that, sort of what some people have called a touchback, but return and return in a legal status.

I have to tell you there's a political calculus there because the word "amnesty"—some people will see the word "amnesty" behind every bush. I'm not one of them. But I think with some element of a touchback, I think it ameliorates, to some extent, the political resistance to creating a way to give that population a second chance.

Now, there's some of the population that I think would like to return home. I agree with some of the comments made earlier, that it's not lightly that people make a decision to leave their country and their culture and their family permanently. Some people would like to come here and work, and if we lifted the bar to returning in a legal status as part of this comprehensive reform, I think that could address many people's concerns.

But I'm sure each of these is sort of an individual story and people would have to make their own decision whether this is the right tweak. I just think that from a political standpoint, there's a lot of resistance to repeating the mistake that was made in 1986, where people almost felt like: Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. That they want to make sure that what we are promising in terms of a system that will actually work and will be implemented, money will be appropriated, the infrastructure will be built, the people will be hired and trained to make it work, and then I think the hardest questions, such as the ones you raise, we'll have a lot more flexibility to deal with that.

AUDIENCE: I've read about the number of billions and billions of dollars that are being returned by immigrants to the United States back to Mexico. I wonder if you'd comment on the effect of that income for Mexico and what effect it has on its immigration problems.

SENATOR CORNYN: Well, I think Lee was the one who mentioned that the



remittances are second only to oil revenue, it's a huge sum of money, and some have said, well, Mexico has avoided making the hard decisions at home because they can simply send their people abroad and they'll send money back home and that sort of solves their problem; they don't have to deal with their political problems or economic problems at home because they can just send their people abroad and they'll send that money.

I had an interesting lunch meeting with Secretary Derbez, the foreign secretary under President Fox, who said, "You know, if you think about that, Senator, that doesn't make a lot of sense that that would be a willful calculation by the Mexican government." He said, "Let's say the figure is \$20 billion, if you figure that people save about 10 percent of their income and send \$20 billion home, that means that there's roughly \$180 billion in other economic activity occurring in the United States that could occur in Mexico." He helped me understand that it is a calculated position by the Mexican government.

I think we have to continue to work with the Mexican government. They're not going to accept American direction, they are a proud country and a proud people and they're going to do it their way, but I think we can continue to try to encourage them. I think the election of President Calderon is encouraging. I wouldn't be saying that if Lopez Obrador was elected, I'd be saying the opposite. But I think his election is encouraging, and the sorts of things he said when he was sworn in, might give us an opportunity, together with, I hope, a little less gridlock in the Mexican government on some of these critical questions.

AUDIENCE: I want to applaud you for an outstanding presentation. I really think that between what you have presented and what Kay Bailey Hutchison presented this morning, we have an opening of a window in which the next Congress can make some real strides.

SENATOR CORNYN: I hope so.

AUDIENCE: One of the key factors in this, of course, is the extent to which what you're talking about and what Kay talked about this morning, will actually happen. Senator Hutchison talked about her apparent conference agreement where there was close to 100 percent agreement between the Senate and the House in this small group that was meeting with respect to the detailed plan that she outlined this morning in her presentation.

Now, in either case, going with your bill of 2005 or going with her emerging bill that seems to be coming out of this conference, it will require a lot of delicate maneuvering with Mexico because both of them require something like the Ellis Centers in Mexico that are high fidelity, working closely with us in our government. Do you see this as happening over the next two or three years or so, and will the Congress that's coming together actually come together?

SENATOR CORNYN: Well, that's the \$64,000 question and I wish I could tell you with complete confidence the answer was yes. I will tell you with complete confidence, I hope so. We can't ignore it; we can't kick the can down the road. And the devil is in the details. The good thing about the debate we've had over the last couple of years in the country, as painful as that has been, perhaps, to listen to—and I will tell you, as a combatant to participate in—that I think it's helped people sort of sound it out and we've had sort of a national brainstorming session.

The American people are smart, they can sort of figure out for themselves what makes sense and what is fantasy, and I think it's helped us build a better consensus over the last two years about where that middle ground is. And I would say that there's not going to be universal acceptance of any particular program, but all we need is a majority in the House and a Senate, on a bipartisan basis, to come together to try to come up with a solution. I don't think anyone believes that we will finally solve this problem forever. If we're lucky, maybe we can manage it on an acceptable basis for the next 20 years. Then I would count that as a tremendous success. Thank you very much.

MS. CULLUM: Well, Senator Cornyn, you've been a tremendous success here in this session. Thank you for being here. He's a very loyal member of the Texas Philosophical Society, as is Senator Hutchison.

# AMAZING LIVES OF NEW AMERICANS

---

Ms. CULLUM: Our last panel of the day was Roger Horchow's idea and I think it's going to be simply wonderful. These are immigrants who have come to the United States who also have succeeded mightily, and they truly embody the American idea. I hope they will come forward.

We have Pia Orrenius, who is the moderator; Prasad Thotakura, Mayor Joe Chow of Addison; Tom Kim of the Lewisville School Board; and Michael Hinojosa, who runs the Dallas Independent School District.

I'm only going to tell you this about Pia; I want her to tell you her own story. She is an immigrant from Sweden; she is an economist with the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas. She put on the symposium, along with Jim Hollifield of the Tower Center, at the Federal Reserve Bank. It was an excellent symposium. Pia's presentation was superb; her written work is extremely impressive. She has an important story to tell, and so does everybody sitting at this podium. Pia Orrenius.

• • •

PIA ORRENIUS, *Moderator*

JOE CHOW, MICHAEL HINOJOSA, TOM. C. KIM, AND PRASAD THOTAKURA

**D**R. ORRENIUS: I was born in Stockholm, Sweden, and immigrated to the United States in 1978 with my mother, stepfather and golden retriever. We came at the height of socialism in Sweden. The year we left, my parents recalled paying a marginal tax rate exceeding 100%. You didn't need to earn a lot of money at the time to reach a 100% marginal rate on your income tax. Those were bad years, particularly for high-income earners in Sweden, many of whom were trying hard to leave. Meanwhile, it seemed the only migration to Sweden was the Finns trying to get out from behind the Soviet Curtain. In reality, Sweden was already taking in asylum seekers from around the world, a humanitarian immigration policy that continues to this day.

I recall the experience of coming to the U.S. as a "dream come true," particularly for a child who didn't have to deal with the headaches, including the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the anxieties and costs of a transnational move.

I grew up on the north side of Chicago, in Evanston, and over time my

fascination with the U.S. only grew. If you think of Sweden, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, it was a very homogeneous society. Coming to the United States, I saw the heterogeneity, the different races, ethnicities, and backgrounds of people. It was new and amazing. Another big benefit was the weather. My mother reminded me often how much better the weather was in Chicago than in Stockholm. You may laugh, but remember, everything really *is* relative.

I went to the University of Illinois to begin my path toward a career in economics and later to UCLA for graduate school. For me, economics was the perfect tool because I could use it to explain my life: why we left Sweden, a fundamentally socialist economy at the time, and why we came to America; for greater opportunity. As I could see around me, many others had come for the same reasons, although perhaps from different backgrounds. My doctoral dissertation discussed migration from Mexico, the single largest source of immigration to the United States.

I arrived at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas during the height of the "new economy" boom in 1999. The Dallas Fed sought an immigration expert, and back then, there were relatively few economists working in the field. In 2004, I was asked to serve on the President's Council of Economic Advisors in Washington, D.C. Once the elections were over and President Bush had won another term, we got busy in the White House working on an immigration overhaul.

This was a chance to apply what I had learned in school about migration drivers, at the Fed about economic growth, and in my personal life about the hopes and aspirations of immigrants. A large piece of the President's proposal was a temporary worker program. It made sense, particularly in the Mexican case.

First on our panel is Mayor Chow. You've had so much success in the U.S. Could you tell us a little bit about your story?

MAYOR CHOW: Thank you very much, Pia. Before I go further, I want to thank Lee Cullum for inviting me here, and I also want to make two corrections to the bio you have in your hand: I graduated from Southeastern Oklahoma State University instead of Southwestern, and I was remarried in March of this year, so no longer my fiancée; she is my wife.

I was born and raised in a very ordinary, middle income, military family; both of my parents are Chinese Air Force officers. I came into the United States in 1979. I remember 1979 was the year the United States recognized China, and it had created a big instability in Taiwan. Many people wanted to go abroad, but the reason I came abroad was for further study. People ask me why I choose Southeastern Oklahoma State; it is not a well known university. But I can tell you, my mom had her life savings and she gave me her savings passbook account and said, "Joe, you withdraw as much as you need." I didn't want to withdraw a lot, so I picked the least expensive university, which was Southeastern Oklahoma State.

I had to line up in front of the embassy in Taipei at 6:00 p.m. the day

before for the interview for my visa, which was at 9:00am the next morning. We just sat there all night until the next morning.

I flew into DFW Airport. I knew no one. It was just 5:30 in the morning and I looked around and thought, where should I go? I need to go to Oklahoma. I waited until after 7:00 then I took a shuttle to the Greyhound Bus Station, right next to McDonald's and the Federal Building. I bought a ticket, waited for an hour, and I took the Greyhound all the way to Durant, Oklahoma—if you know this little town. On the road, I said to myself, Oh, vacant land, this is Texas.

I got to the depot with one big luggage and one guitar, since I like to play a little guitar, and then I asked a man, "Mister, can you find a cab for me?" I waited for 30 minutes. Finally the cab showed up, I put everything in and it was only two street turns to the university. I probably could have walked over. The cab ride was like a \$1.55, I remember. And I said, "Oh, that's expensive, if you calculate it by 42." Back then \$1 U.S. dollar was equal to \$42 Taiwan dollars.

So that's how I started. After I graduated in December of 1980, I started to work waiting on tables in the restaurants and then became manager, general manager. I worked my way up; I worked very hard. And back then I set one goal in my mind: I wanted to have my own restaurant. So I did. In 1986, I opened up my own in Addison.

In 1998, I had been out of college for 17 years already and I need to do something else. Being a restaurant owner was just not good enough. So I started to learn insurance. I started with life and health insurance, security license, and then later I learned about homeowner insurance, car insurance. You know why I picked insurance? Because insurance is involved in your daily life; you do need it. You need homeowner's insurance if you have a home; if you rent an apartment, you need renter's insurance; you have car insurance, life insurance, health insurance. So insurance basically is the most important thing in your life.

I felt like that wasn't enough, so I got into real estate; I got my Realtor's license. You know why? If you sell homeowner's insurance, you should also know about a home. For most people, a home normally is your number one investment.

Since I got involved with restaurants, insurance, and real estate, I knew more people and I learned more English; I gained more knowledge. I had seen so many Asian-Americans having problems. Some of them didn't speak English at all; some people spoke only broken English. Sometimes I've got a little comment to myself too. I thought it was time to give back to the community, to help the people who need help.

In 2001 I moved from Dallas to Addison, established my one-year residency, then I told my good friends, a city manager and a former mayor, I said, "I'm interested in running for city council." The they both told me, "Joe, don't feel bad, but you never got involved in Citizens Academy which is our leadership program, you never served any P&Z voluntary committees, and you will run against incumbents, you have no chance at all." I said, "No, it's not like that. I'm a businessman, even small businessman."

So I started to learn. I said, "One thing I know is if you want to get elected, you've got to have more votes." But most people only vote for incumbents, so what can you do? You need to add more votes; you need to bring in more new votes. By doing what? Knock on every door, two to three times. Addison is not a big city; we have 1,800 houses. So I knocked on every door two or three times.

I learned all the issues; people complained about Addison Airport, complained about the need for streetlights, but not in front of their homes; all kinds of issues. I learned so I could try to help them solve those issues. I got the highest votes; I shocked every one of them. Then in 2004, the second term reelection, I had 75% of voters. I still knocked on every door, two or three times, to build up my confidence to run for mayor.

In 2005 I decide to run for mayor. I had my council colleague run against me. He had more experience. He was 67 years old; I was only 49. But I thought, no, I have more experience because since I was 25, I worked more than 16 hours a days, so 25 years times two is 50, 50 plus 24. . . . I'm 74 years old in experience.

So of course, I knock on every door, this time four or five times, five or six times; I wore out three pair of shoes. I won—I won by 18 percent. For over 18 years Addison never had an opposed mayor election. This was the first time. I became the second Asian-American to be mayor in the state of Texas, in which there are 1,340 cities. The first one was in San Marcos and he served one term, and then me. But in North Texas, I'm the only one.

DR. ORRENIUS: I would also like to introduce Dr. Michael Hinojosa, who is the superintendent of the Dallas Independent School District.

DR. HINOJOSA: Thank you very much. I'm honored to be here. My story started in 1957. My parents lived in Mexico and my father was an Assembly of God minister. He moved us all over Mexico, from Tampico to Padilla to Ciudad Victoria, and he kept moving closer to the border. I was the eighth of ten children in my family; I was the last one born in Mexico. My parents had a formal third grade education; my father self-taught himself the Bible and then went to seminary without a formal education. He had a vision of bringing his family to the greatest country in the world so that his children could get an education. And he was very blessed by the Lord to be given a church in Lubbock, Texas.

We moved to Lubbock in 1959, and my story started there. When I went to first grade, the teacher saw my name, which is Eriu Misael Hinojosa de Rodriguez Valez Salazar Gomez Gutierrez, and in 1962 Ms. Jones had a beehive haircut and she couldn't say anything of those things. So she gave me the name of Mitchell because Misael sounded like Mitchell. So in first grade I was Mitchell.

We lived in Lubbock for about six years and then my dad got a church in Dallas. He got a church in west Dallas and we moved to Big D when I was in second grade. When I got there, there were already two Mitchells

in the class, so I became Michael. But when I was in second grade, when we moved to Dallas, they had just shot the president of the United States, and my immigrant parents piled all us kids—by then there were ten of us—in a station wagon and we drove.

When you try to convince your kids that you're moving; it's to a better place, the grass is always greener. My dad told us we were going to move to a two-story house. Well, it was two stories all right, but it wasn't a house. It was the West Dallas Housing Projects. The second week we were there, my mom asked, "Where's your dad going, Misael?" And I said, "Dad is downstairs." She said, "Well, someone stole our station wagon," and that was our welcome to Big D.

But my father persevered. He taught us to work hard. I'm one of the least intelligent people in my family. We have a family reunion every year either on my father's birthday or on Thanksgiving, and I hardly ever get to talk. Any of you know my sisters? There are five of them. I never get a word in edgewise, and they're all very intelligent.

My father then started to build a church off of Fort Worth Avenue, between West Dallas and Oak Cliff, and he was able to get us a rent house in Oak Cliff. I grew up in Oak Cliff. I went to Sunset High School; I went to Griner; I went to several schools. In fact, in 1971, I was a student when the federal government desegregated the Dallas schools, and I had to go from one school to the other in August without knowing about it, just having to show up and get on a bus and go to a new school. So I was a product of that environment.

I graduated from Sunset High School, was very blessed to have some great teachers in Dallas. I went to Texas Tech, got my bachelor's degree, came right back to Dallas and became a teacher in Oak Cliff. I taught for eight years at Stockard Middle School and Adamson High School. I wanted to be a teacher and a coach all my life, but people kept pushing me into other things.

While I was at Adamson High School, I got my master's at the University of North Texas, and then people pushed me into administration, and they said, "You need to apply for a job as an administrator." I said, "No, I want to be a teacher. They won't hire me as an administrator, I promise you. I'm too young and I'm an immigrant and they might ask me for my green card and the only green card I've got is an American Express card, so that's not going to work."

But they asked me to apply, but I couldn't get any administrative job in Dallas so I went to Grand Prairie. I was the first Hispanic administrator in Grand Prairie. I went from assistant principal to assistant superintendent in seven years, and then I had a first chance to be a superintendent in Fabens, Texas, which is eight miles from the Mexican border; 18 miles east of El Paso. That was the greatest experience for me because I got back in touch with my roots, and I saw very poor children doing great things academically. Then I realized that a superintendent could impact the academic performance of students.

Then I worked for the state. I was the executive director of Region 19 Education Service Center for several years, and then I got a superintendency in the Austin area. I was superintendent at Hays Consolidated between Austin and San Marcos. I went to the University of Texas at Austin and got my doctorate. And then I was selected as superintendent for Spring ISD and then I had a chance to come back home.

And I'm not running for any office, but in case I ever do, I taught at A&M, so I've been to every university and I've been all over the state.

But now I'm back home and I've been the superintendent in Dallas for 18 months. People ask me what's the greatest accomplishment so far as superintendent of Dallas, and I say the greatest accomplishment is that I am still in Dallas. We've had seven superintendents in the last ten years, and my good friend, Dr. Moses, chewed up four of those years. But I have a great board; the board has been the least of my problems.

But if you take it all the way back, it was the vision that my father had to bring us to the greatest country in the world where we can get the greatest education, and that benefitted my family. I've got a sister who is an executive with SBC and retired a millionaire because she was able to invest wisely. I have a sister who was an executive for Baylor Hospital. I have two brothers that owned a barber shop in Highland Park and sold it. If you go to Highland Park—they were making a lot of money. Sometimes they were making more money than I was. And they're very successful; all of my brothers and sisters were very successful. But we had the opportunity to have a great education in this country, so I'll stop there and then we'll come back with some of the questions that might be pertinent.

DR. ORRENIUS: Next I would like to introduce Mr. Tom Kim, who is a trustee of the Lewisville Independent School District.

MR. KIM: Thank you for the invitation. I definitely appreciate being here with this distinguished panel. I almost didn't make it here. I was out in the lobby, and of course, I was watching the Army-Navy game and someone had to drag me out of the bar.

I have a little different immigration story. My dad was the oldest out of eight children and he always worked hard at whatever he did. I was born in Taegu, South Korea, in 1969, and the story takes place actually before my birth. In 1962, my dad was in the Korean Army and worked for an American colonel as a *gotuso* [phonetic] which was kind of a liaison officer between the American and Korean armies. The American colonel, Colonel Dick Nisper, worked with him for several years, and when my father got out of the Korean Army, decided to hire him as a civilian liaison officer between the American and Korean armies.

During those nine years, they developed a strong bond. When the Vietnam War was over and Colonel Nisper retired and came back to America, he became CEO of Alfred's Refrigerated Warehouse, which is actually a historical landmark here in south Dallas. He flew back to Korea and



asked my dad to come to America and work for him. So in 1971-72, my dad came to America to work for the CEO of Alfred's Refrigerated Warehouse, and a few months afterwards, the whole family came over to the United States and made our home in Big D also. That story right there speaks highly of what my dad did. He embellished what I saw in his life, which was hard work, hard work, hard work and dedication to his family.

How many people have heard of Lewisville? The home of the Farmers, right? I get harassed for that. I met my wife in Maryland and she still doesn't know what a farmer is. I did my entire schooling in Lewisville Independent School District; I went K through 12 there, and I was blessed to have had some remarkable, remarkable teachers, and part of this is a credit to what Dr. Hinojosa and other administrators and teachers have done in the state of Texas.

I graduated number 13 out of a thousand in 1987, and was blessed to receive a nomination and appointment to the United States Naval Academy in 1987. I had never been on a plane before, never been away from my family, but in July 1987 I flew up to the Naval Academy to get yelled at.

My four years there at the Naval Academy was remarkable. I graduated in 1991. I did service tours in the Persian Gulf, the first on the USS Tuscaloosa, and then my second tour was with the Helicopter Anti-Submarine Squadron 8 in the Persian Gulf. We patrolled the no-fly zone in Iraq in support of Operation Southern Watch. And then, consequently, after that, my last tour was at Naval Station North Island. With Naval Station North Island, if you can think about it, on a daily basis our galleys served around 5,000 men and women. That's a feat in itself, and my wife always asks me why I tell her to not keep food for more than 24 hours. Well, if you get 5,000 people sick, you're probably not in your job for very long.

I want to say I'm really thankful for the men and women who serve in today's military. It's a whole lot different than when I was there, and we should all be thankful for the freedom that we have today.

My immigration story is a little bit different, I didn't come over here as an older adult; I came over here as a baby. It wasn't really my choice, but I'm very thankful and blessed for that. Through the years, as I was growing up, I knew I was a little bit different, growing up in Lewisville being one of the only Korean family at the time. You can probably count on one hand how many Asian families that lived in Lewisville at that time. And so I knew I was a little bit different, but I never told myself I was different. The only thing I told myself was that I was going to somehow repay the blessings that we received because of my parents immigrating over here.

I started thinking about volunteerism, what I could do to pay back the country that offered me so much, and the first thing I thought of was, of course, joining the military and that's why I went to the Naval Academy. The military has always, always been a big part of my life, and even when I got out of the military in 1996, I decided to see how I could touch young people.

I became the Blue and Gold Officer for the Lewisville Independent School District for two schools: Flower Mound High School and Marcus High School. Basically what that meant was that I was the eyes and the ears of the admissions department for the Naval Academy and I interview the candidates that were applying for the school. I basically informed them, met with their parents, interviewed them and I wrote up a brief that I send back to the Naval Academy. That gives me so much pride to see all the young men and women that are dedicated to their country and the parents that support them.

The joys of my life—my wife couldn't be here; she's taking care of my youngest—my wife June and I have two boys, Alex and Tyler. They both go to school in the Lewisville Independent School District. We're very, very active in our community. She's part of the PTA, she volunteers at church, and we have been very blessed to be able to be a part of our community.

I've been on the school board for nine years, this is the end of my third term; I'll be up for election next year. If anybody lives in Lewisville Independent School District, don't forget to vote for me next year. I'm the vice president, currently serving my third term, and with the nine years of experience I've seen, I have made it a priority to focus on the kids and the dedication of what we can do to support our kids because they're our future. They are the future of the United States, and we spend many hours trying to give direction and guidance to our district. We encompass 13 cities. We don't have as big a student population as Dr. Hinojosa. We have 50,000 or so; roughly about a third of his students. Being a part of the school board was a way that I could give back to the community where I grew up, and I just get so much gratification for doing this.

People ask me how much we get paid because we spend a lot of hours outside of our normal work. Believe it or not, school board members in Florida actually get around \$27,000, but we get paid a big goose egg. The gratification of seeing the children and seeing the success of the children is enough for me.

DR. ORRENIUS: And the last of our panelists, I would like to introduce Mr. Prasad Thotakura, who is the Texas state coordinator of the Indian-American Friendship Council.

MR. THOTAKURA: It is a great honor and a special privilege to be here among this distinguished panel and audience. I really thank you, Lee Cullum for inviting me to this meeting.

I want to share my story about why and how I came to be here. First of all, I came to the USA 20 years ago with my wife on an immigration visa. My wife and I used work as lecturers in colleges in India. We had a dream of furthering our education and opportunities. In my opinion, there's no other country on this earth than USA to realize that dream.

But leaving the motherland is not that easy because of the affection

and bonds that we develop among families and friends. But we made that choice of migration for the betterment of our next generation—our kids. We left our three-month-old son and a four-year-old daughter with my parents and came to the USA. We decided to complete our education, get good jobs and bring our kids to this country when we had settled down in our lives.

We worked very hard, graduated with MBA-MIS and got jobs. I started with the Mobil Oil Corporation and my wife used to work as a chemist with one of the pharmaceutical companies in New Jersey. Almost 15 years ago, we moved to Dallas, Texas.

We had some challenges in not only assimilating ourselves in this new mainstream, but getting our kids adapted to this country as well. It is not that easy. When my daughter came to this country, she was in sixth grade. She used to come home almost every day crying, not wanting to go back to school because other kids were laughing at her funny accent, funny hair and funny dress. We used to console and encourage her to go back to school, to try and understand whatever they were commenting and beat them academically. That's exactly what she did.

When she got to the ninth/tenth grades, her teachers used to show her essays to the other students as the best model essays. She used to get all "A" grades. It takes a lot of courage and stamina to reach that stage. I'm very proud to say after graduating from high school, she got direct admission into medical school and graduated with a medical degree. Just recently, she has completed her residency and is currently doing her fellowship in oncology right here in Baylor Hospital in Dallas.

My son has the same story; he used to be very bright in Math and Science, but very poor in English. He went the same route as his sister did, he worked very hard and got direct medical admission at Texas Tech in Lubbock.

What I meant to say is—coming to this country, working hard and reaching your goals is the only way to succeed in this country. First of all, one needs to understand the culture of this country and be good law-abiding citizens. The opportunities are abundant and unlimited. So that is my story so far. I have more stories to tell, how our fellow Indian-Americans are doing in this country, why they are so successful. I will give you some secrets recipes for success later on. Thank you.

DR. ORRENIUS: Mayor Chow, obviously you've had success in the U.S. and we really enjoyed hearing your story. Much of it is due to your own tenacity and abilities. In statistics, we would call you an outlier because you are very far from the average. I'd like to know what you think it is about the United States that makes immigrant success more likely, perhaps, than in other countries like in Western Europe and so forth. What do you think are the unique factors that help immigrants achieve a better life?

MAYOR CHOW: The United States is a melting pot. I believe the audience is full of immigrants; it just depends on how long ago. That has made this country a greater country than any other country. As long as you're willing to work, work hard, set a goal, then your dream will come true. It happened to other panelists that we have heard from today. I always encourage youngsters to not ask focus on how much you get paid, but on how much you can accomplish for the community.

DR. ORRENIUS: There was some interesting legislation passed recently in your neighboring town of Farmers Branch. Could you give us a summary of some of the laws that they passed that refer to immigrants, and if in the city of Addison, you've considered any similar laws?

MAYOR CHOW: It has been a very touchy issue. Whether you say yes or no, it is going to create some unhappiness among the citizens. As mayor, I would really hate to see us spend a lot of the taxpayers' money on potential legal battles over the next five years; probably costing at least \$500,000. That's my number one concern, that's my duty; we want to spend the taxpayers' money frugally and steer the money wisely, number one.

Number two, I have full confidence with the new Congress coming in and I know they will work together with President Bush and will come up with a new program, as Senator Hutchison and Senator Cornyn just mentioned. I am really for the guest worker program. I am thinking about the jobs, not because we need to pay for more. The thing is, even though you pay for more jobs, nobody really likes to do those jobs. How often do you see that roofers are local people; how often you see a local citizen as the dishwasher or farm worker? The majority of them come from South and Central America.

DR. ORRENIUS: For those of you who haven't followed the developments in Farmers Branch, they passed three laws that affect immigrants and particularly illegal immigrants. I suppose the most controversial of those is the one that would forbid apartment owners to rent to illegal immigrants or have to check people's documents before they rent to them.

Turning to you, Dr. Hinojosa, let's talk a little bit about education. I was amazed the other day when I read that over 50% of school children in California are either immigrants or the children of immigrants. It's a much lower share in Texas, but I'd like you to tell us a little bit about the immigrant population in the DISD schools; how well do they do?

DR. HINOJOSA: Thank you for the question. You'll be surprised with the response. Believe it or not, in Dallas ISD we have 50,000 immigrant children, students of limited English proficiency. That's the size of Lewisville, that's the size of Plano, that's the size of Garland. We have 160,000 students, and then you take the students that have exited the Limited English Proficient program, and that's another 30,000. So 80,000 of the students

in the Dallas Independent School District are either limited English proficient or have been through the LEP program.

How do they do? Well, let me also give you a couple of other statistics that will surprise you. We have more LEP students than El Paso, San Antonio, Brownsville, or any border city. In fact, El Paso has a higher percentage of white students than Dallas ISD. Dallas ISD has 5% white students, we have 25% African-American students and 67% Hispanic students, and half of those Hispanic students are LEP children.

And here's the big fallacy. You notice that two of the four of us up here on the panel have less of an accent. In fact, my accent is more West Texas because I grew up in Lubbock for six years, so I've still got that West Texas twang. But language acquisition is so critical at the early stages. Some of us came to this country when we were very young. You develop your ability to speak clearly early in your childhood development. People that come in at an older age, my brothers and sisters, you line us up and you would say you're not from the same family. But I was fortunate because I was able to come to this country when I was very young.

And the other thing that needs to be very clear. Have you heard our backgrounds? Three of the four of us, our parents had very professional backgrounds: two were in the military in foreign countries; one was already a professor in his home country. My parents had a third grade education. So when people are not even literate in their own language, how can you expect them to become literate in a second language?

And that's the whole premise behind bilingual education. The goal of bilingual education is to become literate in English. But there is new research out and there's a longitudinal study that shows over a ten-year period—there's 3.5 million students in this study, including 250,000 in Texas—that if you have a dual language program that the students will flourish because you have to become fluent in a language, and if it's easier to become fluent in your native language first, then it's much easier to transfer to a second language.

That's where we've gotten it all wrong. Last year we had a thousand exceptions with the Texas Education Agency where we were providing no services to students, and the research is abundantly clear that all students perform well at third grade level, regardless of which program you do, even if it's no program, but they pay the price down the road because they don't learn an academic language, either one. If no services are provided, their performance goes down to the 20th percentile in reading. If we pull out English as a second language, it goes down to about 30th percentile. Then you go across with the typical bilingual program and it's still less than 50th percentile.

But there is new research out on dual languages. There are two ways to teach in dual languages. One way is one group. That means students learn English and Spanish simultaneously and they're above the 50th percentile. Two way is where you take students who are non-Spanish speakers and you teach them Spanish—whether they're African American or

whether they're Anglo, or believe it or not, we have a lot of second, third and fourth generation Hispanic children who don't speak Spanish—if you take people that don't and teach them and you have two groups, there's a bunch of research that shows they even perform higher in the long run.

In Dallas we're very optimistic about where we're going and 85% of children in Dallas ISD are economically disadvantaged—that means they live at the poverty level. But if you take Dallas County, it's not just a Dallas phenomenon; if you take Dallas County, there are only two districts, Highland Park and Coppell, that have over 50% white students, and Irving ISD has the same percentage of limited English proficient students as Dallas. When people leave the border, they don't stop, they go where the jobs are, and we have a lot of LEP students in the northern part of Dallas because that's where the jobs are.

So that makes our job more difficult, but I'm not going to ever make an excuse because I don't want to be an anomaly; I don't want to be an exception that I was one that was born on a dirt floor in Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas, Mexico and I made it, because I don't want to be the exception. I want us to make sure that all of our kids make it. You people love Dallas; I love Dallas. For Dallas to be prosperous, we can't build a wall around certain parts of Dallas. We all have to be successful and it's in your best interest if we're successful. And I have every confidence, with the research that we have and the professional development and the talent that we have, that we'll be able to overcome the challenges.

That's why I said earlier the best thing that ever happened to me was going to El Paso because I got back in touch with my roots and I saw poor children doing great things academically, not just on the TAKS test. The TAKS test is the floor. Rigorous academic instruction, as these gentlemen have proven, from the Naval Academy, from the other institutions, that's what will make you successful and that's what will get you out of college.

That's my biggest chore in Dallas. And I'm not against the state accountability test. I'm not against No Child Left Behind, but we have succumbed to the lowest possible element instead of shooting for the highest possible rigor that we can have.

**DR. ORRENIUS:** Mr. Kim, you deal with many of the same issues. By now, immigration has come even to Lewisville. Could you explain the issues that you guys are dealing with regard to immigrant children?

**MR. KIM:** Yes. As Dr. Hinojosa said, it's starting to migrate north where the jobs are, and so for Lewisville Independent School District, we've turned into a more diverse school district. I mentioned earlier, we encompass 13 cities, the biggest, of course, including Lewisville and Flower Mound, The Colony, we have parts of Plano, Coppell, even parts of Frisco in the Lewisville Independent School District. It's amazing how many different cities that we have to cater to, so it just makes it a little bit tougher when we talk about policies.

With the immigration, we have to deal with the diversity, and it makes it tough because you have a section of our cities that are very, very affluent. If anybody is familiar with Flower Mound, it is a very affluent neighborhood. As a board member and as an administrator—Dr. Roy is our superintendent—we have to deal with that type of mind-set.

One of the good things about Lewisville, the board members are still able to run as an at-large board member which means we're not geared towards one little area of our city, we run at large, we run in all 13 cities. That helps us say we're going to take all the kids up to that high standard that Dr. Hinojosa talked about. We're not going to just take the Flower Mound kids because we know they can do it; we're going to take the Lewisville kids with us and we're going to raise that standard, as he said. We're not going to expect Flower Mound and Highland Village to do this and we expect Lewisville to do this. We're not going to do that. Everybody is going to be taken to the same bar.

Now, there are things that we've done in our school district to help us to do that. The first thing we did was we created a group of administrators that were located in the lower economically disadvantaged areas that actually worked with kids, tutored them, helped them out, found out what we could do better, and encouraged them to succeed. Lots of times these kids don't have parents at home at six o'clock at night. So our administrators developed programs to do that.

I'm also a board member of Communities in Schools of North Texas. If you haven't heard of that organization, it's a non-profit organization that works with at-risk students, and they're in three or four of our at-risk schools. And what they do is they have a counselor on campus and they work programs so after 3:30, the kids aren't out on the streets, they're at a program at our schools.

So the diversity has come up north to where we live, but we're not making any excuses either. The standards are raised for everybody, and we're going to bring everybody up to that level.

I mentioned Lewisville High School. I graduated from Lewisville High School and I was probably one of three Asians in Lewisville High School. Now if you're Caucasian, you're the minority in Lewisville High School.

Well, we've had some success, but we've also had trouble in the ninth to tenth grade campus. What we did several years ago was decided to give the freshmen another year to mature, another year away from the seniors and juniors and we built a brand new school in Lewisville and we only made it a ninth grade campus. What we did was we celebrated that new school with the city. The city was invited; all the parents were invited. They helped decorate it, theme it and everything like that, and so we instilled some pride into that. And even though Lewisville is a lower economically disadvantaged area, Lewisville High School North now is an exemplary campus. That's the highest rating that you can get. And they were barely recognized and acceptable before.

So that's some of the success stories; that's some of the things that we've had to do with the migration north.

DR. ORRENIUS: Mr. Thotakura, I was reading your biography and seeing how active you are in the Indian-American community and how you worked to preserve your language from the region of India from which you're from, Telugu. A good question for you would be about this idea that the problem with immigration, or the thing that comes up a lot, is that people born here sometimes feel that immigrants don't assimilate, that they don't learn our language, they don't learn our customs. How would you address this issue? Have you personally dealt with this issue of allegiances of identity and have your children done so? What is the appropriate balance for us, as immigrants, in being honest and paying respect to our roots, but at the same time, assimilating and becoming Americans?

MR. THOTAKURA: Actually, that was the biggest challenge for our children while they were growing up here because at home we wanted them to learn our language, follow our customs and eat our home cooked food. But when they went out, they saw entirely different things. All their friends did different things other than what mom and dad told them at home. Those kids got more freedom to do whatever they wanted, even come home late after midnights. On the other hand, our kids needed to be home before dark, go to the Temple on weekends, learn Kuchipudi dance (a form of dance) and participate in all kinds of extracurricular activities which are directly related to their education.

But the biggest challenge for them was balancing two cultures—no to be alienated from the mainstream and at the same time keep up their own identity; not lose integrity and honesty. In any culture, there are good and bad things, so we need to take good things from the society.

For example, if I tell my son or daughter that as Hindus we should not eat beef, they grow up like that and they can understand our way of life. In the beginning it may be little hard for them to tell their friends that they won't eat beef, but they will get used to it as time passes by.

AUDIENCE: I want to say that I think this session has been inspiring. I thank you very much for what you've had to say and you've inspired me to ask you each for your opinion as to whether or not English should be made the official language of this country.

MR. THOTAKURA: Definitely. English must be the official language of this country. In India, though there are several official languages and hundreds of dialects. The national language is only one, that is Hindi. Unfortunately, all Indians can't speak this language and almost every state has its own language. If you visit different states in India you feel you are visiting different countries, as every state has a different language, food habits and dress code.

I can't imagine not having English as our primary language in the USA. When people migrate to this country, it is their responsibility to learn English and at the same time to adapt to this culture and customs. Even



though we come from different ethnic backgrounds, once we land here, we need to respect the laws of the land and become law-abiding citizens.

MAYOR CHOW: I would echo this. English should be the primary, official language for everybody coming into the country. We do need to get used to the customs, culture and language itself. I think a lot of discrimination is actually not discrimination, but miscommunication and misunderstanding.

I can give you one example. Several years back, my older sister's son came to study at Newman Smith. The school had so many students that they spread lunch time out from 10:30am all the way to 1:30pm. After he finished his lunch, at about 11:00am, he didn't know he needed to get a pass to go to his locker, so he just went to his locker without getting a permit from his teacher. He had no prior knowledge at all.

He went to his locker and the school police came. They were very friendly and nice and ask him for his pass. You know, he really didn't know what pass meant. Even though for you, for me, we know. But he didn't. They asked, "You don't know pass? P-A-S-S, you don't know that?" He just stood there smiling and the school policeman smiled back to him for a while. And that's all he could do because he didn't know. The school policeman thought he was joking, that he was being disrespectful and not answering. So he took him to the assistant principal. The principal, without asking, just immediately scolded him, but the boy still didn't understand why he was being scolded.

So that's the reason language is important. I think all the school systems need to have a better program to assist the new immigrated student to avoid those misunderstanding.

AUDIENCE: Tom Palaima, from Austin. Kay Bailey Hutchison, John Cornyn and some other speakers this morning talked about this process of creating a way for people to go back. All of you on the panel are success stories; my grandparents were success stories from Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine. Michael Granoff's parents are success stories of coming to this country. I really do subscribe to this notion that we all are part of a great success story, those of us in this room, certainly. But what do you feel about this idea that there are millions who want to go back, readily, to where they came from?

I write columns for the Austin American Statesman, if you'll permit me a little bit of an aside because I think it's a poignant thing. My cousin, Joey, was in the Marines. He was in Iwo Jima and other terrible battles in the Pacific. He came back a man with post-traumatic stress, as we would now call it. When I moved my father from Cleveland about four years ago, I came across letters that he wrote to my mom—my mom wrote to him regularly. My father had just gotten off of Iwo and he wrote to my mother and he said *I lost Mike's address on Iwo, could you find it for us? And what about my brothers who are back home and are not writing me?*

And then he said, *When I come back home, I never want to leave home again. I remember talking to my mother—that is my grandmother—and she told me what it was like to leave her parents in Poland, knowing that she would never see them again—which was absolutely impossible to ever get back for a woman of her situation. And he said it's only now that I've been off here in the Pacific, fighting in these terrible battles, that I understand why she was crying when she told me that story about leaving her parents because she knew she would never see them again.*

We heard this morning that one of the other factors in immigrant success was the impossibility of returning. So what I'm asking you about, by this long-winded question, is if there are people who do want to go back, who think that the problems here are too enormous, that intolerance of certain sorts is too extreme?

And then the second question: Is it realistic to assume that those who are making it here, but are under an illegal status will want to go back and queue up in lines at Ellis Island Centers, privately run with all the corruption that's going to be attendant upon them?

DR. HINOJOSA: Let me go first real quick because, being of Mexican descent, I don't know, but my suspicion would be it would be very few. And yes, in our culture it's very difficult to leave your family, but once you make that decision, the conditions that some of our immigrants live under are deplorable. If you've been to some of the places along the border, they're deplorable, but they're so much better than what they left.

I don't know the real answer to that. If I were to guess, based on my own background, I would say a very small percentage would want to go back permanently.

MAYOR CHOW: Let me just add something on this. I think some countries, after they develop into better countries, such as Japan and Taiwan, have less people who want to immigrate to the United States, more people would rather stay in or go back to their own country. When people decide to move from their country to the United States, they always look for job opportunities, they want to work here in the states.

I was not here in the morning, but I a lady sitting right next to me and told me a little bit about what Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison mentioned about a guest worker program where the people can go back to their country, wait for two more weeks, then come back. But who is going to pay for the bill? That's the argument. As a small business owner, I really don't think it's applicable, having the employer pay for all the expenses, like getting a health examination. You can do a survey, ask all the small business owners if they are willing to spend the money and take the risk and do all those things, to have their employees leave and then come back in two weeks.

DR. ORRENIUS: When it comes to Mexico, it makes sense that migrants

would want to work here and keep their families in Mexico. After all, it is much cheaper to live in Mexico. If you can earn your money here and spend it in Mexico, that's a good deal for many families. We thought that if people had the ability to move back and forth across the border, some would take advantage of it and not bring their whole families to the United States. Of course, it was a different matter entirely to discuss those migrants who had settled here already. Not many want to go back, at least not permanently. It was generally agreed at the time that something like an earned legalization program would benefit the migrants, the economy and national security.

Ms. CULLUM: Thank you to our panelists, thank you to our audience, a really enjoyable session.

# A MATTER OF MONEY

---

Ms. CULLUM: We're going to go back to the great age of enlightenment to which this organization is committed. One of my very favorite novels is *Howard's End* by E.M. Forster, and there's a wonderful line from *Howard's End*, which paraphrased goes like this: "Better to be taken unprepared than prepared and not taken."

Our speaker tonight is prepared; he is always prepared. Richard Fisher was born to be a central banker and now he is. He is president and CEO of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas and he brings to this assignment considerable experience. He was deputy trade representative under Bill Clinton, working with Charlene Barshefsky, mainly in East Asia and in Latin America. I turned on the BBC one night, on National Public Radio very late, and there was Richard being interviewed about a speech he had given that day in which he said that housing had fallen about as far as it was going to go and he didn't expect it to get any worse, but he still had fears about inflation; the markets had shifted that very day. When Richard Fisher speaks, people listen.

I'm happy to introduce Richard Fisher to you tonight. Richard, we are all ready to listen to you.

• • •

RICHARD W. FISHER

Well, the nice thing about that introduction is it was short. I appreciate it. Lee is always so sweet. She always spoils everybody that she introduces, and she always lionizes everybody, and as you know the only person that didn't enjoy being lionized was Daniel.

Sorry, couldn't resist that one. Anyway, Lee, you've always been sweet to me and we love you for it.

Well, I did sit through most of the discussion today, starting with Dr. Brettell's fantastic presentation early this morning. I didn't realize that she was a Canadian émigré. You know the old saying about Canada, the vichyssoise of nations: cold, half French and difficult to stir. And Carol was anything but. She was spicy, and I found her presentation riveting, and I thank her so much for that magnificent presentation.

Senator Hutchison reminded us this morning that this kind of discussion is what makes the Philosophical Society so interesting and vital. My wife, Nancy, and I are delighted to be back with so many friends here at the home that Mirabeau B. Lamar built. I'm not talking about the Fairmont, of course, I'm talking about the Philosophical Society, although I am happy to be at the Fairmont because, believe it or not, this is where we spent our wedding night 34 years ago.

Lee mentioned I was the deputy U.S. trade representative and then worked with Henry Kissinger for four years, so I've been gone for eight years in Washington, D.C. We're very glad to be back home. In so many ways—and Senator, I hope you'll forgive me—as you know, Washington is best admired from afar. Ronald Reagan used to wonder out loud what the Ten Commandments would have looked like if Moses had been required to run it through Congress, and I know the answer: we would have had ten thousand commandments. And then Harry Truman, of course, nailed it when he said Washington is the place where a friend is someone who stabs you in the chest.

We loved being there, but it's as brutal a place as it can sometimes be inefficient, and I can't tell you how refreshing it is to be back home in the can-do, no-nonsense, straight-up, look-em-in-the-eye place like Texas.

And given the nature of Washington, Senator, I feel pain for you and for your colleague, Kay Hutchison. I have a great luxury, being from the Federal Reserve. All we have to do is worry about little things like monetary policy, and Kay and John have to worry about the tough stuff; how their Texas sensibilities work their way through Congress to make the laws to solve this Gordian knot of immigration that we've been talking about today.

Listening to the two senators, I was reminded of my favorite Federal Reserve story. One of the legendary Federal Reserve chairmen was William McChesney Martin. Bill Martin served under four presidents; he served even longer than Alan Greenspan and he was very popular in the nation's capital. Every year, usually in January, there's a meeting of the group called the Alfalfa Club in Washington. Now, the Alfalfa Club is named after the alfalfa plant because it will drink anything, anywhere.

The annual Alfalfa dinner is a tremendously fun affair. One of the periodic rituals is to nominate a candidate for the presidency of the United States, and these nominees, by the way, are simultaneously inducted into what's called the Stassen Society, named for Harold Stassen, who, as you know, John, ran for the presidency nine times legitimately. Then he ran for a tenth time as an Alfalfa candidate, and of course, he lost every single election. Their motto in Latin is *Veni Vidi Deficit*; "I came, I saw, I lost." And some very notable Texans have been Alfalfa candidates: John Connally, Bob Strauss and Lloyd Bentsen, and before they were elected to the real thing, both Bush 41 and the current president.

Now, Bill Martin, the chairman of the Fed, received the Alfalfa nomination for the president of the United States in 1966. In his acceptance

speech he said that as a good Federal Reserve man, he took his cues from the German philosopher, Goethe, who said, "People can endure anything except for continued prosperity." Therefore, Martin pronounced that if he were to adopt a political platform as a presidential candidate, he planned to make life endurable again by stamping out prosperity entirely. "I shall conduct the administration of this country," he said, "exactly as I have so successfully conducted the affairs of the Federal Reserve, and to that end, I shall assemble the best brains that can be found, ask their advice on all matters, and completely confound them by following all of their conflicting counsel." And he said, "I say to you that America is at a crossroads and I shall do everything I can to keep it there."

Well, today, as our many speakers made crystal clear, we are at a crossroads on immigration, but we can't, "keep it there." Action is required, and to this end, the two senators are getting all kinds of conflicting counsel. Unlike Bill Martin and his tongue-in-cheek platform as an Alfalfa candidate, these two wonderful senators could not follow all of the conflicting advice, but instead, they must navigate through to come up with legislation that will enhance and not harm the prosperity of this great country.

If I were to offer any advice to you, Senator, and particularly to the other lawmakers contemplating this matter, I would say two things: first, fend off those with baser instincts by invoking history; second, as Margaret Thatcher loved to say—and she was always right, ask Dennis Thatcher—do the math or at least walk your way through the economics.

So first let's talk about fending off the lessons of history. We've been through many bouts of anti-immigration fever; a lot of it was discussed today. History indicates that even the best brains can get it wrong. Jim Hollifield today mentioned Ben Franklin. Let me take you back to 1751. Here's what Ben Franklin had to say about the German immigrants in Pennsylvania: "Why should the Germans be suffered to swarm into our settlements, and by herding together, establish their language and manners to the exclusion of ours? Why should Pennsylvania, founded by the English, become a colony of aliens who will so soon be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of our Anglifying them and will never adopt our language or customs any more than they can acquire our complexion?" Sounds familiar.

Move forward 100 years to the 1850s when an entire political party, popularly known as the Know Nothing Party, emerged in the United States on an anti-immigration platform. Their argument was published in 1854 and in an editorial it was summarized as follows: "The enormous influx of foreigners will, in the end, prove ruinous to the American working man by reducing the wages of labor to a standard that will drive them from the farms and workshops altogether or reduce them to a condition worse than that of Negro slavery."

Harry Joe today on that panel mentioned the Chinese Exclusion Act and the Anti-Japanese laws in his discourse. Here's what the partisans of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 said: "It is the duty of the miners to

take the matter into their own hands and erect such barriers that shall be sufficient to check this Asiatic inundation. The capitalists who are encouraging or engaged in the importation of these burlesques of humanity would crown their ships with the long-tailed, horned, and cloven-hoofed inhabitants of this infernal region of the world if they could make a profit from it." I bet you Yo-Yo Ma, and I.M. Pei find that verbiage just a little bit offensive.

In 1903, George F. Bayer, the president of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad, testified before Congress on the conditions of the Chinese and other immigrant laborers who were building his railroad. In his testimony he said, "These men don't suffer. Well, hell, half of them don't even speak English."

And in 1913, when California Governor Hiram Johnson signed a law forbidding Japanese immigrants from owning land, he boasted, "We have prevented the Japanese from driving the roots of our civilization and their civilization deep into Californian soil."

These two particular laws, by the way, inspired others who, in hindsight, we might have preferred not to inspire. In 1926, an observer in German took note of our anti-Asian laws and other legal restrictions on immigration and commented that, "At present there exists one state which manifests at least some modest attempts that show a better appreciation of how things ought to be done in this matter. It is in the United States of America that efforts are made to conform, at least partly, to the counsels of common sense. By excluding certain races from the right to become naturalized citizens, they have become to introduce principles similar to those on which we wish to base our people's state." That was Adolf Hitler.

Then there were the comments of rising immigration in Britain by the conservative politician, Enoch Powell. In his famous "Rivers of Blood" speech on April 22, 1968, arguing against immigration to England, Powell pointed to the United States and he said, "That tragic and intractable phenomenon which we watch with horror on the other side of the Atlantic is coming upon us here in Britain. Indeed, it has all but come. In numerical terms, it will be of American proportions long before the end of this century. Only resolute and urgent action will avert it even now. Whether there will be public will to demand and obtain that action, I do not know. All I know is that to see and not to speak would be a great betrayal."

Which goes to show that A, Enoch Powell never saw Max von Sidow or Liv Ulman in the movie "The Immigrants"; and B, even cultivated minds—and Powell had a superb Etonian education— can reach harsh conclusions about immigration.

One of today's great cultivated minds belongs to Samuel Huntington, who was also mentioned earlier today by Jim Hollifield. Huntington is an iconic professor at my alma mater. In his book *Who Are We?* he elaborated on Mexican immigrants in the following way: "Unlike past immigrant groups, Mexicans and other Latinos have not assimilated into the mainstream U.S. culture, forming, instead, their own political and lin-

guistic enclaves and rejecting the Anglo-Protestant values that built the American dream. The United States ignores them at its peril.”

And then Professor Huntington rips into Lionel Sosa—who, by the way, is a member of the Texas Business Hall of Fame, and according to *Time Magazine*, one of the 25 most influential Hispanics in America. “Sosa,” Huntington writes, “ends his book *The Americano Dream* with encouragement for aspiring Hispanic entrepreneurs. The American dream, he asks, it exists, it’s realistic, and it’s there for all of us to share.” And then Huntington said, “Sosa is wrong. There is no Americano dream; there is only the American dream created by an Anglo-Protestant, English-speaking society.”

With this introduction, I thought I would just remind you that the subject is not new to America. We profess, as the Senator said today, always to be a nation of immigrants. This is certainly true, as economists would say, *ex post*, but *ex ante*, the case for immigration has never been a pleasant one.

Well, my second suggestion to political leaders would be to insist, as I mentioned earlier, in the words of Margaret Thatcher, do the math. We heard a lot of statistics today: there are 36 million immigrants in the United States, roughly a third are illegal, *et cetera*. What we didn’t hear was this: immigration increases the labor force, heightens efficiency, and spurs innovation to higher productivity. We didn’t hear that immigration also tends to be what economists at the Federal Reserve call *pro-cyclical*. Not only do immigrants come in greater numbers when labor demand increases, they also tend to move to areas where jobs and labor demand is the highest.

And in fact, in the last five years during which we have undergone a significant economic expansion, immigrants, legal and illegal added together, contributed 46 percent of the labor force growth of America. Forty-six percent of the growth of the labor force in this country was legal and illegal immigrants added together, and we have prospered, and as Kay Hutchison said today, unemployment has been driven down to 4.4 percent.

The bottom line, from a macroeconomic standpoint, is that immigrants grease the engine of economic growth by allowing for both a closer correlation and the factors of production with output and alleviating shortages when they exist. In this way, immigration makes it easier for monetary policy makers like me. They increase the speed limit of the economy and its expansions, they hold down inflation, and they reduce slack when we go into an economic downturn.

I want to touch briefly on the economic effects of immigration on native workers, on non-foreign-born workers. A lot of concern about immigration centers on labor market impacts. Despite the massive immigration of the last 30 years, the U.S. labor market has done well, posting, as Kay Hutchison mentioned earlier, declining unemployment rates and robust job and output growth.

Now, to be sure, this does not mean that some U.S. workers have not



suffered. Research suggests the wages for low-skilled native workers, non-foreign-born workers, are between 1 and 5 percent lower as a result of the immigrant presence in the labor force. Wage effects on high-skilled native workers, on the other hand are either estimated to be zero or slightly higher.

Another concern is about the fiscal impact of immigration. The fiscal costs related to immigration stem mainly from the provision of education and healthcare to low-skilled immigrants, as was discussed today. Based on National Research Council estimates, each native household—that is, each non-foreign-born household in the United States pays about \$245 per year more in federal, state and local taxes combined as a result of immigration. Now, that may strike you as a very low number, but it's because the high-skilled immigrants compensate for the fiscal burden of the low-skilled immigrants. Moreover, with time the fiscal cost of immigration changes dramatically. As immigrants assimilate, their incomes grow and their reliance on public services falls.

The bottom line is that the economics of immigration are, like the music of Wagner, not as bad as they sound. It's very important to bear this in mind as we sort through the cacophony of the political debate in Washington.

From almost every speaker, we heard a little bit of repetitive Latin today: *E Pluribus Unum*, *E Pluribus Pluribus*, and as the hour is late, let me just conclude with one of my favorite Latin phrases: *Vibamus Morientum Est*; "Death is Unavoidable." Especially if I keep speaking—so let's have a drink. Thank you very much.

Now, I know you didn't come to hear me speak about immigration policy, and so I would be happy to avoid any questions you have about monetary policy. Lee wants me to take questions. I'm happy to do it if anybody has any.

### *Discussion:*

AUDIENCE: How serious is the decline in the value of the dollar?

MR. FISHER: How serious is the decline in the value of the dollar? No central banker and no secretary of the Treasury wants to talk about specific exchange values, but let me ask you to consider the following. If you learn anything from participating in markets—and I ran a hedge fund for quite some time—or you read about great investors like Warren Buffet, markets are manic-depressive mechanisms; they have huge emotional swings.

And the job of the Federal Reserve is not to please markets; the job of the Federal Reserve is to get the economy right. We set the base interest rate on the basis of a mandate we're given by the Congress of the United States, going all the way back to 1913 and updated in later history. We're responsible for maintaining the monetary conditions, creating the mon-

etary conditions for sustainable, non-inflationary growth. If we just get that right, then the markets will adjust accordingly.

We have huge fiscal imbalances in this country, not so much the short term imbalances. By the way, despite what I call the “Eeyores” are saying about this president, if you look at the current fiscal situation in terms of what’s on the books of the United States—not what’s off the books which is substantial—substantial progress has been made in terms of what was promised, with tax cuts and revenues increasing. The real problems are the long term deficits that we have in terms of our Social Security, our healthcare and our long term balance of payments. And the markets have a choice: they can invest here or they can invest elsewhere. If you’re a big investor—let’s say the Bank of China with a trillion dollars in reserves—you have to think about this. Your choices are limited: you can buy dollars, a liquid market, or you can buy euros; you can buy Japanese yen; you can even buy some British pounds.

If you look at the way rates are trading around the world to the longer term of the yield curve, that is, further out than overnight money which is what we work on at the Fed, say the Fed Funds Rate, the yields are not tremendously attractive. Spain and Greece borrow money cheaper than the United States. Where would you prefer to put your money? There are limited options. And it is natural that at different points in time you’re going to have different preferences, depending on the moods of the marketplace.

But I don’t for one nanosecond feel that suddenly everybody is going to dump dollars in the marketplace. First, if you were the central bank governor of China and you dumped all your dollars, you’d take a loss and you’d be fired, or worse. But I want to remind you also that we do have some great assets in this country. We’re the one place that is reproducing itself. We like to breed and our immigrants love to breed, and we reproduce our population. We have better demographics, not only better than France and Germany and Italy, we have better demographics than Japan, and we have much better demographics than China because of their one-child policy. We rejuvenate ourselves; we’re flexible; we have a system of laws that for the most part upholds itself. And we have constitutional unity.

Europe is an attractive place. The European central bank does its job just like we do, but we have a senator sitting in the corner here that represents a United States. There is no constitutional unity in Europe.

And I must tell you that long term the question, and I’m not the only person that would raise this question—great German bankers formerly from the Bundesbank and others—of how viable the euro is. Well, we run fiat currencies. The United States dollar is a fiat currency; nothing backs it up. The euro is a fiat currency. Nothing backs it up except for the confidence in our fiscal authorities, and forgive me, Senator, especially in our central bank. As long as we do our jobs, I don’t worry about the day-to-day fluctuations of the United States dollar.

AUDIENCE: What is it like to be under the scrutiny of the whole country?

MR. FISHER: Well, Alan Greenspan gave me some good advice. He told me two things when I was hired. And by the way, the bank presidents are hired by their boards of directors; Ray Hunt is my chairman. Only the central authority, the governors, of which there are seven—presently there are six—appoint three of the nine members of my board. We put up their names and they approve them. The other six are my shareholders—that is, the banks that our bank regulates here.

But when I sat down with Greenspan after I had been offered the job by Ray Hunt, he said, "There are only two things you have to do, Richard: one is remember you're paid to pursue the truth. This is the only job in Washington where you'll never be penalized for saying what's right. The second is just remember this, if you're standing at a building outside on the sidewalk and someone drops off the top of that building and lands right next to you, you're going to get the blame for it because you're going to be watched very, very carefully."

And the way it works—since this is all off the record, right? And Senator, you know how reliable that assurance is. Whenever I speak in public—which is not this evening—there are usually four or more reporters there. We call it the suicide watch, Bloomberg, Reuters, Dow Jones and other. They stream everything you say. They are usually young; some people disparagingly call them 20-somethings. Not all of them are educated in economics, but they're journalism students.

I've found often before I speak the article is already written. We had an experience in New York a couple of weeks ago: a minute before I stood up to speak, I was handed a BlackBerry that had an article written with quotes from my speech that had been injected a minute before I said them. These are the wire services. You have to think about how these TV shows work, in particular, which is why TV is not necessarily the best medium to pick up financial information. Let's take someone like Larry Kudlow, an old friend of mine, a difficult individual, but a friend. He has a 20-something that prepares his teleprompter. You know, these fellows. They're actors. Larry is an actor and he's going to put emotion behind it. So one 20-something picked up something, wrote an article, puts it up on a screen. Another 20-something puts it on a teleprompter, and Larry reads it and acts it out. And then supposedly I move the markets. Lee mentioned that: 20-somethings move the markets.

The big boys read; the big girls read everything that we say. I like to say that we're the only species left where like in ancient times, they slit us open and study the entrails to try to figure out what the heck we're saying. And with Alan Greenspan, you had to slit him every which way because you weren't quite sure what he was saying.

The sophisticated investors in the other central banks and the firms like Goldman Sachs and so on, they parse every single word, analyze everything you say, read things very, very thoroughly. The day-traders don't; they get their information out of the public media. And now I know what it's like to be a senator or a president because now that I'm inside what's

called a temple, the Federal Reserve, and I see what they write about us, I wonder what they write about other good people that are just trying to do their jobs.

So it's an enormous burden, you have to be extremely careful what you say, and in all cases, avoid television.

AUDIENCE: Paul Woodruff and I are members of Powell & Powell in Austin, Texas, and we heard J.D. Galbraith give an analysis of international monetaries. When you mentioned that the head of the Chinese national bank would be fired if he tried to turn in his dollars, J.D. said more or less the same thing, and he gave the impression that we are essentially holding the rest of the world hostage to our quite confident ways. So what's the long term prognosis in terms of consumer indebtedness, national indebtedness, the weakness of the dollar? What's the long term look at this? Really, are we holding these other nations hostage to our ways of operating?

MR. FISHER: Well, we're part of a system. We're the largest, most powerful economic machine in the world. And I'll answer your question in just a second, but let me put things in perspective for you. We produce \$13 trillion a year in output. We produce so much that the state of Texas with 24 million people produces 25 percent more than India with 1.1 billion people. California, the 12th Federal Reserve Bank, headed by my friend, Janet Yellen, produces \$189 billion more than China per annum. That's how big we are.

We consume a lot in the United States. Seventy percent of our GDP, our gross domestic product, is consumption. Americans will buy anything that smells good, looks good, feels good, tastes good, and the world is grateful for it. And actually, I have some friends in this room who probably are helping hold up the rest of the world economy.

But I make that as a serious point because if we were to suddenly, let's say—I'll go back to my semi-Norwegian answer—all become Lutherans overnight and stop consuming, we'd have the greatest depression you've ever seen. Germans don't consume; Japanese don't consume. Chinese are building a society; they need our consumption, and we perform a valuable function. Now, I'm not saying that jokingly. I'm very serious about this.

We should, of course, always try to be conservative and correct our ways, but we can't do it alone. There is surplus liquidity worldwide. The Arab countries have been accumulating enormous resources because of oil prices. They can't spend it at home no matter what they do in Abu Dhabi or Dubai or wherever it may be; no matter how many ski slopes they build inside that building, they cannot consume everything they make. They have to put it somewhere, and where are they going to put it—getting back to this gentleman's question—dollars, euros, yen, pounds.

The Germans produce and export; they don't consume domestically. The French don't grow; the Italians don't grow. The Chinese, who are

very important to us in terms of having a peaceful mass of people—I was part of the team that negotiated W2 accession for China; I was part of the team that negotiated with Deng Xiaoping in 1978 and '79 that normalized relations. We don't want them as our enemy; we want them as part of the process. They have to grow in order to prosper, to feed their people, and they sell us things to do that. In selling things to us, we put clothing on the backs of our children and shoes on the feet of our poor people. It's a symbiotic relationship.

I happen not to be as pessimistic as your average *New York Times* reader, for example, which is very pessimistic. I happen to be optimistic that somehow we will find a way to correct some of these excess imbalances. But I would urge you, again, not to be an "Eeyore" and to remember that all this is linked together and that we cannot unilaterally correct for whatever excesses you think there are without others taking a counteraction not to create excesses, but at least to provide some kind of balance. We don't have the freedom to act that independently anyway. We live in a globalized world and everything is interconnected.

Let me tell you how globalized this world is. This is my favorite little anecdote. Forgive me because I get very excited about this. By the way, the Dallas Fed is the center of research on globalization for the Federal Reserve System; we're very proud of that. And it's natural for Texans to do this: we're used to living with the poorest border; we are the largest trading state in the country—we just surpassed California in terms of exports. We are part of the international community.

But here is the story that I love. I was asked to go speak to the Ka Dong Ren which is the business roundtable in Tokyo. I was in London at the time, in fact, staying with a Dallas couple, the Muses, and I got a call from the chairman of the Ka Dong Ren—I wasn't expecting it. And he said, "Would you fly over to Japan tomorrow, give a speech for dinner and then go back to London?" I was in the private sector there and I was working with Henry Kissinger and I was getting a Kissingerian price—which was outrageous—to give the speech, and I said, "Of course, I will do that."

He said, "Well, here's the way it's going to work. You're going to fly on Virgin Air, what they call upper class. A car will pick you up. Here's the number you call if anything goes wrong. Click." Well, I'm waiting; I'm very excited about this. I'm going to make a lot of money giving this speech. It's a wonderful opportunity: I get to go to Tokyo for an evening, come right back, fly first class on Virgin Air, which is quite an experience. But the car doesn't show up, so I call this number.

I get a frightfully British woman answering the phone, and I said, "Could you please tell me where my car is?" Well, her frightfully British accent became a deep southwestern accent immediately, and she said, "Y'all don't worry; the car is on its way. Let me tell you where it is." And she said, "It's two blocks away. The driver's name is such-and-such, and it's on its way." She asked if I needed anything else and I said, "Yes, I do. Where did you get that accent from? You answered as a Brit; you

answered like me.” And she said, “Well, I know where you’re from. You’re from Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico.” I said, “Well, how do you know that. Where are you?” She said she was in Bangalore, India. And I said, “Well, how do you learn to speak like people like me?” She said, “Oh, that’s easy. We watch a show called Walker, Texas Ranger.” This is a true story.

I asked, “Well, what if I was from Boston?” She said, “Oh, that’s Cheers.” Think about it—this is a great image of globalization. Here’s a woman in Bangalore, a telephone operator, with a GPS tracking a car in London that’s going to take a Texan to speak in Tokyo, flying on a British plane. That’s the way the world works; we’re interconnected.

Ms. CULLUM: Thank you. Before you leave, I just want to tell you that I know a great deal more about Richard Fisher than I told you tonight, but I’m saving it up. Roger was kind enough to mention that I’m starting a television show in January called *CEO* and the very first interview is with Richard Fisher. And I wanted it to be Richard because I knew he would be dynamite. I’ve been reading his speeches. They are unbelievably brilliant, a staggering range of expertise and interests, and I’m saving it up. The show will air Friday, February 23 at 7:30. Please tune in.

After breakfast tomorrow, Jim Lindsay and Jim Hollifield will hold forth once again on all that we’ve learned this weekend. Thank you, Richard. Thanks to all of you.

# MEMORIALS

---

LLOYD MILLARD BENTSEN, JR.  
1921-2006

Lloyd Millard Bentsen, Jr, an illustrious member of the Philosophical Society of Texas, died at his home in Houston on May 23, 2006, from complications of a stroke suffered in 1998. He had been born 85 years earlier in Mission, Texas, just a few miles from the border with Mexico. His grandfather had immigrated from Denmark to South Dakota and then to the Rio Grande Valley after World War I.

The Bentsen family had arrived with very little, but within a few years Lloyd Sr. and his brother, Elmer, had become the biggest land developers in that area and amassed a fortune. The region is a prime citrus growing area and the Bentsens were among the earliest and most successful.

Bentsen Jr graduated from Sharyland High School and received a law degree from the University of Texas in 1942. He enlisted in the U. S. Army as a private and was transferred to the Air Force where he flew 35 combat missions and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and four awards of the Air Medal. He was promoted to major at age 23 and commanded 600 men.

After the war he returned to the Valley and was elected Hidalgo County judge at age 25. In 1948 Bentsen was elected to Congress, where at age 28 he was the youngest member. By 1954 he decided he needed to raise some money to support his young family, so he left Congress and moved to Houston. There he set up the Consolidated American Life Insurance with \$7 million, provided by his father. That company evolved into Lincoln Consolidated holding company, which controlled mutual funds, oil interests, a saving and loan company, and even a funeral home.

By 1970, Lloyd Bentsen felt financially secure enough to return to politics. He ran for the U. S. Senate as a Democrat, where he beat Ralph Yarborough in the primary and then defeated future President George H. W. Bush in the general election. He was elected to the Senate four times and served until President Clinton asked him to become Secretary of Treasury in January, 1993. He left the administration in December of 1994. Prior to that he was helpful in securing the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and assisted in major changes to laws governing pensions and catastrophic health care.

Although Bentsen had presidential aspirations, he was nominated to be vice president with Candidate Michael Dukakis in 1988. It was during

this campaign in a debate with Republican vice presidential candidate Dan Quayle, that his most famous quote was made. When Quayle said he had as much political experience as John F. Kennedy did when he ran for the presidency, Bentsen quickly retorted: "I served with Kennedy. I knew Jack Kennedy. Jack Kennedy was a friend of mine. Senator, you're no Jack Kennedy." Although he lost the vice presidential election, he simultaneously was reelected to the Senate with 59 per cent of the vote.

When he left to become the 69th Secretary of the Treasury, he was replaced by a Republican, Kay Bailey Hutchison, another member of the Philosophical Society of Texas. Bentsen resigned his cabinet post in early December, 1994. He served on several national boards and travelled frequently. It was after a flight in Europe that his first stroke occurred. Unfortunately, it was not recognized as a stroke and so was not treated. He was confined to a wheelchair thereafter.

In 1999 he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Clinton.

He died at his home in Houston and is survived by his wife of 63 years, Beryl Ann (B. A.) Longino Bentsen; three children, Lloyd Bentsen III, Lan Bentsen and Tina Bentsen Smith, all of Houston; and eight grandchildren.

I.B.W.

### CHESTER RAY BURNS

1937-2006

Chester R. Burns was born December 5, 1937 in Nashville, Tennessee, where he spent the first 26 years of his life. After completing undergraduate studies with a major in Philosophy at Vanderbilt University, he received a B.A. degree, *cum laude*, in 1959. Between 1959 and 1963, he attended the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, receiving the M.D. degree in June, 1963 followed by an internship at the University of Oklahoma Hospital in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. In August 1964 he began work on a second doctorate at Johns Hopkins University Institute of the History of Medicine in Baltimore, Maryland, and in June 1969, became the first American-born physician to receive a Ph.D. in the history of medicine from The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. Dr. Burns joined the faculty at the University of Texas Medical Branch in 1969 as director of the new History of Medicine Division, which evolved into the Institute for the Medical Humanities. Serving as associate director for five years, Dr. Burns guided the Institute's growth using philanthropic support from private individuals and foundations and a major curriculum development grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

As the James Wade Rockwell Professor of the History of Medicine, professor in the Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, and member of the University of Texas Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Chester Burns was a devoted teacher and scholar. The



history of medical ethics, the history of health care in Texas, and the history of humanities education in medical schools were Dr. Burns' principal research areas. In addition to writing many articles, reviews, reports, and commentaries, Dr. Burns edited or co-edited five books and authored *Saving Lives, Training Caregivers, and Making Discoveries*, a landmark centennial history of the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston.

Dr. Burns was an active member of several professional societies. In 1995-96, he was elected president of The Society for Health and Human Values (now The American Society for Bioethics and Humanities). He served on the executive councils of the American Association for the History of Medicine, the American Osler Society, and the Texas State Historical Association and the International Society for the History of Medicine. In 2005, he received the Texas Medical Association's Special Recognition Award for championing the history of medicine in Texas.

R.A.C.

### JAMES ANDERSON ELKINS, JR.

1919-2006

One of Jim Elkins' close friends said that you can't compare Jim Elkins to anyone else, because there was never anyone else like Jim Elkins. No one ever graced the city of Houston that was more caring, more loving, or more generous than Jim.

Born on Galveston Island on March 24, 1919, he was the son of Isabel Sims Mitchell and Judge James A. Elkins, the founder of the internationally renowned law firm of Vinson & Elkins and of the group of banks which became First City Bancorporation of Texas. In 1945, Jim married Margaret Keith Elkins, the daughter of Harry C. Wiess, one of the founders of Humble Oil and Refining Company. Jim Elkins died in Houston on February 26, 2006.

Jim graduated from Princeton University with honors in 1941 and continued his banking career with what became the First City Bancorporation where he had originally started as a runner at age 13. He succeeded his father as Chairman of the Board of that banking organization and led it to become the 16<sup>th</sup> largest banking organization in the country.

Jim was a very loving and devoted husband, father, grandfather and friend. He and Margaret had three children, James A. Elkins, III, Elise Elkins Joseph and Leslie Elkins Sasser, and thirteen grandchildren.

Jim and Margaret loved to travel. On a trip to China in 1974, Jim came to know that country's finance and banking leaders and established possibly the first banking relationship since World War II between that country and the United States. One of their favorite places was London where they would sometimes visit the great sculptor, Henry Moore. Jim and Margaret developed a strong interest in art and were good friends of Mrs. Dominique de Menil. She was one of the original benefactors of

the Menil Collection, donating significant works to the museum, including pieces by Michael Heizer and Ellsworth Kelly. Over the years, Jim accumulated an impressive personal art collection and also a significant corporate collection at the First City.

Medicine was another of Jim's favorite causes. He was a founding trustee of Baylor College of Medicine where he served as Chairman for many years. In addition to Baylor, Jim served on numerous other boards in the Texas Medical Center including Texas Medical Center, Inc., The Methodist Hospital and Texas Children's Hospital.

Among Jim and Margaret's recreational interests was a strong love of baseball, particularly the Houston Astros, and thoroughbred horse racing. In 2003, Mineshaft, a horse in which he had a one-third interest was declared the United States Horse of the Year.

Throughout his life Jim Elkins, and his family, were a part of almost everything that was good for Houston. In addition to supporting the arts, baseball and the medical community, he supported educational programs at all levels. He served on the boards of St. John's School, Princeton University and the University of Houston. Other board memberships included the Houston Grand Opera, Society for the Performing Arts and the Smithsonian Institute. Jim was a long time member of the boards of American General Corporation, Cameron Iron Works, Eastern Airlines, Freeport-McMoran Corporation and the Hill-Samuel Group in London.

D.C.A.

### RICHARD J.V. JOHNSON

1930-2006

On Saturday, January 14, 2006, Richard J.V. Johnson passed away at home surrounded by his family and friends following a lengthy illness.

Dick was born on September 22, 1930 in San Luis Potosi, Mexico to Clifton W. and Myrtle H. Johnson. When he was seven years old, his family moved to the United States. At age eleven, his parents divorced and Dick, his sister, Bette, and his mother moved to Houston. They faced difficult times, but Dick assumed the role of father to his sister Bette and also became the head of the household. His mother became a secretary and bookkeeper and Dick had a *Chronicle* route with Bette as his assistant. Dick attended Harris Elementary and Lanier Jr. High. He then entered San Jacinto High School where he became a three sport star in baseball, basketball and football and was named to the All-City teams in each sport. Fifty years after his San Jacinto days, Dick recalled with affection his coaches: Vic Driscoll, Van Viebig, and Dike Rose—who is still active. In 1948, he entered Texas A&M on a partial basketball scholarship and in 1949 he transferred to the University of Texas at Austin. He loved to joke that "he attended A&M, but received his education from the University of Texas." He excelled as both a student and an intramural athlete and

fondly recalled his days as an active member of the Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity. His senior year, he was voted an outstanding athlete.

Following his graduation from the University of Texas, he served two years in the U.S. Army. Then, in 1955, Dick joined the Texas Daily Newspaper Association as assistant to the executive director. One year later, Dick began his career with the Houston *Chronicle* as a copywriter in the Promotion Department. His success at the *Chronicle* has been remarkable. In 1957, he became assistant promotion manager. The next year, he was promoted to research and promotion manager, and in 1965, he was named director of research and promotion. He was named director of sales and marketing in 1971, and the following year he was made an executive vice president. In 1973, following the death of *Chronicle* President Frank E. Warren, Johnson became the youngest president of a major daily newspaper in the United States. Following the sale of the *Chronicle* to the Hearst Corporation in 1987, he became chairman and publisher until his retirement on April 1, 2002.

From the beginning of his career with the TDNA and the following years with the *Chronicle*, Johnson was active in a wide variety of newspaper-related organizations. He was past director of the Houston Chapter of the American Marketing Association; past director of the National Newspaper Promotion Association; and second vice-president of the NNPA Southern Region. In 1964, he was general chairman of the Houston Advertising Club's Annual Ad Forum and a past director of that club. Johnson served in a leadership capacity with virtually every organization related to the newspaper and communications fields. A past president and former chairman of the executive committee of the Texas Daily Newspaper Association, in 1983, he received the Pat Taggart Newspaper Leader of the Year Award, the first and only recipient of that award to have begun his career with the TDNA. In addition, he was past chairman and president of the American Newspaper Publisher's Association (now the Newspaper Association of America). A recipient of the Houston Advertising Federation's (HAF) esteemed Silver Medal Award, Johnson was again recognized by the organization with an Honorary Life Membership and the prestigious Trailblazer Award.

Throughout his career, his public service was laudable. He was past chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Texas Medical Center, and a member of the Center's Board of Directors and Executive Committee. Johnson was also a past chairman and member of the Board of Visitors of The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center. He served as director of State Fair of Texas, Texas Taxpayers Research and Mutual Insurance Company Limited and also as the chairman, chief executive officer and director of the Robert A. Welch Foundation. He held leadership positions in numerous local civic and service organizations throughout Houston. By virtue of his exemplary service in virtually every facet of public, cultural and professional affairs, Johnson received numerous prestigious accolades including the Sam Houston Area Boy Scouts of America

Distinguished Citizen Award, the National Conference of Christians and Jews Brotherhood Award, B'nai Brith Anti-Defamation League Torch of Liberty Award, the Rotary of Club of Houston Distinguished Citizen of the Year Award, the American Diabetes Association Generosity to Mankind Award and the Texas Society to Prevent Blindness People of Vision Award. He was also named a Distinguished Alumnus by the University of Texas Ex-Students' Association.

He was loved and will be deeply missed by his wife of 50 years, Belle Griggs Johnson; daughter, Shelley Gottschalk and husband Art Gottschalk; son, Mark Johnson and wife Laura Johnson; grandchildren, Paige, Morgan and Cameron; sister, Bette Burkett and husband Jeff Burkett; nephews, Brian James and Clark James; sister-in-law, Gloria Hodge; and nephew, Bill Hodge.

Mark Johnson

THOMAS H. LAW  
1918-2006

It's no surprise that Tom Law for many years was the go-to attorney in Fort Worth. He had the ready-made name: Thos. H. Law. In fact, during law school at the University of Texas, he and classmate (and future federal judge) William Wayne Justice contemplated forming a firm called Law & Justice.

Instead, Law spent his career with Law, Snakard & Gambill, one of Fort Worth's most venerable and influential institutions. Quiet and courtly, Law exerted influence across and beyond Tarrant County. He died Saturday at age 88.

Over the years, he could be found representing major companies, being called upon by government entities such as Tarrant County College and even administering a blind trust for then-U.S. House Speaker Jim Wright. But Law didn't confine himself to advising clients or litigating lawsuits. During his presidency of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Leadership Fort Worth—a program for nurturing future community leaders—was born. He served as president of the Rotary Club of Fort Worth and the Fort Worth Exchange Club, among other organizations, helped start the Tarrant County Bar Association and was a deacon and elder at First Presbyterian Church.

Law was named to the University of Texas board of regents, the system's governing body, in 1975—just in time for controversy over the selection of UT-Austin's first female president, Lorene Rogers. Law was elected vice chairman of the board in 1979. "Regent" might have been his highest-ranking UT position, but it was only one of many posts through which he served his alma mater. At various times, he was president of the UT System Foundation, vice president of the UT Law School Association and a leader in the Ex-Students' Association.

Of course, he bled burnt orange. His father had taught Shakespeare at "The University" for decades, and Law not only lettered in track and captained the debate team but also lost the student body presidency to future Texas Gov. John Connally.

In 1992, the Texas Exes named Law a Distinguished Alum, along with former Dallas Mayor Annette Strauss and Broadway director and dancer Tommy Tune.

In May, he was still advocating for his community. "It was 60 years ago this month that I left the aircraft carrier on which I was serving in the Pacific," Law wrote to Navy Secretary Donald Winter, joining the campaign to name a new littoral combat ship the USS Fort Worth. "I believe that this designation would be well deserved by the City of Fort Worth and that it would both attest to the collaborative relationship in the past and encourage it in the future," he wrote.

Back in 1975, when then-Gov. Dolph Briscoe chose three new UT regents, one drew fire in the Texas Senate because of past membership in the John Birch Society; another prompted one senator to vote "no" and a second to abstain. But Law won easy approval. "I wish we had three Tom Laws to confirm instead of only one," said Lloyd Doggett, then a state senator and now a member of Congress, according to Star-Telegram archives. That's a sentiment widely shared among those who benefited from his counsel.

©2006 *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*  
Reprinted by permission

BEN F. LOVE  
1924-2006

Ben Love's life consisted of one major accomplishment after another; whether it was winning state-wide debates while attending high school in Paris, Texas, being awarded the Distinguished Service Cross by the United States Army Air Corps for his 25 missions over Nazi Germany during World War II, thereafter leading the Delta Kappa Epsilon softball team to championships at The University of Texas, being a visionary entrepreneur in the gift wrap business, to applying the business principals he developed in his start up Gift-Wrap, Inc. to the Texas banking business that resulted in Texas Commerce Bank being the most profitable and service oriented bank in Texas history.

Along the way, and after his retirement, Ben participated or led the way in many significant civic endeavors. He served as the first President of The Greater Houston Partnership, Chairman of the Host Committee for the 1992 Republican National Convention in Houston, led bond drives to finance infrastructure and civic improvements, supported the growth of the Texas Medical Center and particularly M.D. Anderson Cancer Hospital where he served as Chairman and the Margaret and Ben Love Hospital

is located, chaired the Houston Grand Opera, led the effort to inaugurate rail service in Houston, and was the Chairmanship of the Texas Aviation Hall of Fame.

If Ben could tell his own story today, he would say that his greatest accomplishment in life and the greatest sale he ever made was talking Margaret McKean into marriage in 1947, which produced the children and grandchildren who brought so much happiness and pleasure to his and Margaret's lives thereafter.

I.B.W.

FRED NEWTON WHITE, JR.  
1927-2006

Fred N. White was a scientist whose work saved lives and affected the world but who, like many such, was little known to those outside his disciplines and academia. He was also one of those rare persons who could enjoy fishing with his father in Louisiana, discovering *homo habilis* with Louis Leakey in Africa over brandy and cigars, strolling with the Pope discussing his work with acid-base regulation, and meeting with the Rotary Club in Alamo Heights, Texas.

Fred was born in Yelgar, Louisiana, but raised in Fort Worth. Very early he came to love the earth's creatures and decided that they would be his life's work. He enlisted in the Army at age 17 in World War II, rising to platoon sergeant while training troops. Here he developed a talent for teaching and following the war, entered upon an academic career, earning a BS in Biology (University of Houston) and PhD in Physiology (Illinois, 1953).

He worked as an assistant professor of Biology at Houston and of Experimental Medicine at UT Southwestern Medical School, co-authoring papers with Arthur Grollman that became classics in the field of physiology.

In 1959 Fred began a three-year term as associate professor of Biology at American University of Beirut, developing a life-long interest in Middle Eastern culture. He traveled extensively in Africa, visiting anthropological sites and studying the biochemistry of snake venom. His knowledge saved the life of Jonathan Leakey, leading to a friendship and collaboration with the famous Leakey parents. Following these adventures, he was offered a professorship of Physiology at UCLA, where he won some of the highest awards for teaching in the medical field.

While teaching in his 40s, Fred led many scientific expeditions financed by National Geographic and universities studying animal behavior: iguanas in the Galapagos, elephant seals on Guadalupe Island, penguins in the Antarctic, weaver-birds in the Kalahari. He became director of the Physiological Research Laboratory at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, also serving as professor of Medicine at San Diego, and earned both fame and

reputation in these fields. His greatest contributions included discoveries relating to acid-base regulation of body fluids during hypothermia, which changed some accepted procedures in anesthesia worldwide. He also found time to assist the San Diego Zoo with its ground-breaking experiment in the Wild Animal Park.

His contributions, while impressive and lasting in his fields, were not the sort to excite the media or bring him public attention, as in some areas of medicine and science. He received numerous prestigious awards and honors, including the Humboldt Prize from West Germany which allowed him to live and do research at the Max Planck Institute in Goettingen.

Fred was known for a pixy wit and sense of humor as well as incisive intellect. He made friends and kept them in all phases of his life and career. Colleagues remember him as brilliant, gracious, an idea man, enormously meticulous in research, yet gently modest.

He was married to Maxine E. White of Little Rock and from 1997, to Rosanne Son White, both of whom survive him. He was buried with full military honors at Fort Sam Houston Cemetery, San Antonio, Texas.

T.R.F.

# OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

---

*For the Year 2006*

*President*

S. ROGER HORCHOW

*First Vice-President*

ISABEL BROWN WILSON

*Second Vice-President*

BOONE POWELL

*Secretary*

RON TYLER

*Treasurer*

J. CHRYS DOUGHERTY III

*Directors*

S. ROGER HORCHOW  
ISABEL BROWN WILSON  
BOONE POWELL  
HARRIS L. KEMPNER, JR.  
ALFRED F. HURLEY  
J. SAM MOORE, JR.

GEORGE C. WRIGHT  
ELLEN C. TEMPLE  
A. BAKER DUNCAN  
PATRICIA A. HAYES  
WILLIAM P. WRIGHT JR.  
JACK S. BLANTON SR.



# 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	1941
* George Alfred Hill Jr.	1942
* Edward Henry Cary	1943
* Edward Randall	1944
* Umphrey Lee	1944
* Eugene Perry Locke	1945
* Louis Herman Hubbard	1946
* Pat Ireland Nixon	1947
* Ima Hogg	1948
* Albert Perley Brogan	1949
* William Lockhart Clayton	1950
* A. Frank Smith	1951
* Ernest Lynn Kurth	1952
* Dudley Kezer Woodward Jr.	1953
* Burke Baker	1954
* Jesse Andrews	1955
* James Pinckney Hart	1956
* Robert Gerald Storey	1957
* Lewis Randolph Bryan Jr.	1958
* W. St. John Garwood	1959
* George Crews McGhee	1960
* Harry Hunt Ransom	1961
* Eugene Benjamin Germany	1962
* Rupert Norval Richardson	1963
* Mrs. George Alfred Hill Jr.	1964
* Edward Randall Jr.	1965
* McGruder Ellis Sadler	1966
* William Alexander Kirkland	1967
* Richard Tudor Fleming	1968

\* Deceased

*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
Charles A. LeMaistre	1981
*Abner V. McCall	1982
*Leon Jaworski	1983
Wayne H. Holtzman	1983
Jenkins Garrett	1984
Joe R. Greenhill	1985
William Pettus Hobby	1986
Elspeth Rostow	1987
John Clifton Caldwell	1988
J. Chrys Dougherty	1989
*Frank McReynolds Wozencraft	1990
William C. Levin	1991
*William D. Seybold	1992
Robert Krueger	1993
Steven Weinberg	1994
*William H. Crook	1995
*Charles C. Sprague	1996
Jack S. Blanton	1997
William P. Wright Jr.	1998
Patricia Hayes	1999
A. Baker Duncan	2000
Ellen C. Temple	2001
George C. Wright	2002
J. Sam Moore Jr.	2003
Alfred F. Hurley.	2004
Harris L. Kempner	2005
S. Roger Horchow	2006

\*Deceased

# MEETINGS

*of The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

- 1837—Founded at Houston,  
December 5  
1840—Austin, January 29  
1936—Chartered, January 18  
1936—Reorganizational meet-  
ing—Dallas, December 5  
1937—Meeting and inaugural  
banquet—Dallas, January 29  
1937—Liendo and Houston,  
December 4  
1938—Dallas  
1939—Dallas  
1940—San Antonio  
1941—Austin  
1942—Dallas  
1943—Dallas  
1944—Dallas  
1945—Dallas  
1946—Dallas  
1947—San Antonio  
1948—Houston  
1949—Austin  
1950—Houston  
1951—Lufkin  
1952—College Station  
1953—Dallas  
1954—Austin  
1955—Nacogdoches  
1956—Austin  
1957—Dallas  
1958—Austin  
1959—San Antonio  
1960—Fort Clark  
1961—Salado  
1962—Salado  
1963—Nacogdoches  
1964—Austin  
1965—Salado  
1966—Salado  
1967—Arlington  
1968—San Antonio  
1969—Salado  
1970—Salado  
1971—Nacogdoches  
1972—Dallas  
1973—Austin (Lakeway Inn)  
1974—Austin  
1975—Fort Worth  
1976—San Antonio  
1977—Galveston  
1978—Houston  
1979—Austin  
1980—San Antonio  
1981—Dallas  
1982—Galveston  
1983—Fort Worth  
1984—Houston  
1985—College Station  
1986—Austin  
1987—Kerrville  
1988—Dallas  
1989—San Antonio  
1990—Houston  
1991—Galveston  
1992—Dallas  
1993—Laredo  
1994—Austin  
1995—Corpus Christi  
1996—Dallas  
1997—Houston  
1998—Abilene  
1999—Austin  
2000—San Antonio  
2001—Austin  
2002—Fort Worth  
2003—El Paso  
2004—Denton  
2005—Galveston  
2006—Dallas

# PREAMBLE

---

**W**e the undersigned form ourselves into a society for the collection and diffusion of knowledge—subscribing fully to the opinion of Lord Chancellor Bacon, that “knowledge is power”; we need not here dilate on its importance. The field of our researches is as boundless in its extent and as various in its character as the subjects of knowledge are numberless and diversified. But our object more especially at the present time is to concentrate the efforts of the enlightened and patriotic citizens of Texas, of our distinguished military commanders and travelers,—of our scholars and men of science, of our learned members of the different professions, in the collection and diffusion of correct information regarding the moral and social condition of our country; its finances, statistics and political and military history; its climate, soil and productions; the animals which roam over our broad prairies or swim in our noble streams; the customs, language and history of the aboriginal tribes who hunt or plunder on our borders; the natural curiosities of the country; our mines of untold wealth, and the thousand other topics of interest which our new and rising republic unfolds to the philosopher, the scholar and the man of the world. Texas having fought the battles of liberty, and triumphantly achieved a separate political existence, now thrown upon her internal resources for the permanence of her institutions, moral and political, calls upon all persons to use all their efforts for the increase and diffusion of useful knowledge and sound information; to take measures that she be rightly appreciated abroad, and acquire promptly and fully sustain the high standing to which she is destined among the civilized nations of the world. She calls on her intelligent and patriotic citizens to furnish to the rising generation the means of instruction within our own borders, where our children—to whose charge after all the vestal flame of Texian liberty must be committed—may be indoctrinated in sound principles and imbibe with their education respect for their country’s laws, love of her soil and veneration for her institutions. We have endeavored to respond to this call by the formation of this society, with the hope that if not to us, to our sons and successors it may be given to make the star, the single star of the West, as resplendent for all the acts that adorn civilized life as it is now glorious in military renown. Texas has her captains, let her have her wise men.

# MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

---

(NAME OF SPOUSE APPEARS IN PARENTHESES)

- ABOUSSIE, MARILYN (JOHN HAY), chief justice of the Texas Third Court of Appeals, *Austin and San Angelo*
- ADAMS, PHIL, board of regents, Texas A&M University; director, American Momentum Bank; Texas Public Policy Foundation Board, *Bryan*
- ALLBRITTON, JOE LEWIS (BARBARA), lawyer; board chairman, Riggs National Corporation, *Washington, D.C.*
- ANDERSON, THOMAS D. (HELEN), lawyer, *Houston*
- ARMSTRONG, ANNE LEGENDRE (TOBIN), former U.S. ambassador to Great Britain; regent, Texas A&M University System, 1997, *Armstrong*
- ARNOLD, DANIEL C. (BEVERLY), private investor, *Houston*
- ASHBY, LYNN COX (DOROTHY), former editor, editorial page, *Houston Post*; member, Houston Philosophical Society; author, columnist, *Houston*
- ATLAS, MORRIS (RITA), lawyer; senior partner, Atlas and Hall, *McAllen*
- BABCOCK, CHARLES L. (NANCY), general counsel, Texas Association of Broadcasters; chairman, Texas Supreme Court Advisory Board Committee, *Houston*
- BARNES, SUSAN J., reverend, assistant rector, St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, *Austin*
- BARNETT, LYNN (RANDY), director, Abilene Cultural Affairs Council, *Abilene*
- BARNHILL, JOHN W. (JANE), member, The University of Texas Board of Regents; Chairman of the Bank of Brenham; Board of Directors for Blue Bell Creameries; past president of the Texas Exes; past chair of The University of Texas System Chancellor's Council, *Brenham*
- BARROW, THOMAS D. (JANICE), president, T-Bar-X, Ltd., *Houston*
- BARTLETT, RICHARD C., Environmental Flows Advisory Committee; chairman, Advisory Committee on Outreach & Education, Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission, *Carrollton*

- BASH, FRANK (SUSAN), director, McDonald Observatory, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- BASS, JAMES (HONG), president, Ojai Goliad, LLC; chair, Life Sciences Committee of the Greater Dallas Chamber of Commerce, *Dallas*
- BASS, RICHARD "DICK" D. (ALICE), co-authored *Seven Summits*; board of directors, Y.M.C.A., Dallas; Lifetime Achievement, National Ski Area Association, *Dallas*
- BEAUMONT, PENNY (ROGER), Vice Chancellor, Communications and Development Texas A&M University System; State Board, Court Appointed Special Advocates, *Bryan*
- BELL, PAUL GERVAIS (SUE), retired general contractor, *Houston*
- BIGGS, EDWARD GLENN (ANN), former chairman, Baylor University Board of Regents and First National Bank, *San Antonio*
- BLANTON, JACK S., JR. (LESLIE), chairman, Nicklos Drilling Company; former chairman & CEO ADCOR-Nicklos Drilling Company; Chairman & CEO JEM Group, *Houston*
- BLANTON, JACK S., SR., former chairman, current board member, Houston Endowment Inc., *Houston*
- BOBBITT, PHILIP C., professor of law, The University of Texas at Austin; author, *Austin*
- BOLES, JOHN B. (NANCY), William Pettus Hobby Professor of History at Rice University, managing editor of the *Journal of Southern History*, *Houston*
- BONJEAN, CHARLES M., Hogg Professor of Sociology and executive director of the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- BRANDS, H. W., member of Society of American Historians; Dickson Allen Anderson Centennial Professor of History, The University of Texas at Austin; author, *Austin*
- BRANDT, EDWARD N., JR. (PATRICIA), physician-medical educator; Regents Professor, University of Oklahoma-Health Sciences Center, *Oklahoma City, OK*
- BRINKERHOFF, ANN BARBER, chair, UTMB Centennial Commission; Hogg Foundation national advisory board; vice president, Houston Community College Foundation; chairman emeritus, Liberal Arts Foundation, The University of Texas at Austin; chair, Women's Institute, Austin, *Houston*
- BROWN, MICHAEL S. (ALICE), professor of molecular genetics and director, Jonsson Center for Molecular Genetics, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas; 1985 Nobel laureate in physiology or medicine, *Dallas*

- BROWNELL, BLAINE A. (MARDI), president, Ball State University, *Muncie, IN*
- BRYAN, J. P., JR. (MARY JON), CEO, Torch Energy Advisors Inc.; former president, Texas State Historical Association, *Houston*
- BURKA, PAUL J. (SARAH), senior executive editor of *Texas Monthly*, co-creator of biennial Best and Worst Legislators feature; former attorney with the Texas Legislature, *Austin*
- BURNS, FRED C., chairman and managing partner, John L. Wortham & Son; President, Wortham Foundation, Inc.; board of directors, JP Morgan Chase Bank of Texas, *Houston*
- BURTON, W. AMON JR. (CAROL), attorney; adjunct professor, University of Texas School of Law; National Conference of Bar Examiners' Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination, *Austin*
- BUSH, GEORGE W. (LAURA), president of the United States of America, *Washington, D.C.*
- BUSH, LAURA WELCH (GEORGE), first lady of the United States of America, founder of the Texas Book Festival, *Washington, D.C.*
- BUTT, CHARLES C., chairman of the board and chief executive officer, H. E. Butt Grocery Company, *San Antonio*
- CALDWELL, JOHN CLIFTON (SHIRLEY), rancher; former chairman, Texas Historical Commission; former president, Texas State Historical Association, *Albany*
- CALGAARD, RONALD KEITH (GENIE), chief operating officer, Austin, Calvert, and Flavin, Inc.; former president, Trinity University, *San Antonio*
- CAMPBELL, RANDOLPH "MIKE" B. (DIANA SNOW), Regents Professor of History, University of North Texas, *Denton*
- CANTRELL, GREGG, professor of history, Texas Christian University, *Fort Worth*
- CAPPER, JOYCE PATE (ROBERT), founder, Abraham Lincoln Appreciation Society; honorary consular, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg; organized first Edna Gladney Auxiliary in 1965; opened Pate Museum of Transportation in Cresson, Texas, *Fort Worth*
- CAPPER, ROBERT S. (JOYCE), president, Fort Worth Chapter of the American Heart Association; vice chairman, Harris Methodist Health Foundation, *Fort Worth*
- CARDENAS, BLANDINA, president of The University of Texas-Pan American, former member of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; member of Mexico's "Orden del Aquila Azteca," *Edinburgh*
- CARLSON, PAUL H., professor of history, Texas Tech University; director, Texas Tech Center for the Southwest; author *The Plains Indians*,

*Pecos Bill: A Military Biography of William R. Shaffer, and Empire Builder in the Texas Panhandle: William Henry Bush, Ransom Canyon*

- CARLETON, DON E. (SUZANNE), director, Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- CARPENTER, ELIZABETH "LIZ," former assistant secretary of education, Washington correspondent, White House press secretary; consultant, LBJ Library; author and speaker, *Austin*
- CARSON, RONALD (UTE), Harris L. Kempner Distinguished Professor in the Humanities in Medicine and director of the Institute for the Medical Humanities, The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, *Galveston*
- CATTO, HENRY E. (JESSICA), former U.S. ambassador to Great Britain and El Salvador; vice-chairman, Aspen Institute; former vice-chairman, National Public Radio; former director, U.S. Information Agency, *San Antonio*
- CAVAZOS, LAURO F. (PEGGY ANN), former U.S. secretary of education; former president, Texas Tech University and Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center, *Port Aransas*
- CIGARROA, FRANCISCO (GRACIELA), president, The University of Texas Health Science Center; pediatric and transplant surgeon, *San Antonio*
- CIGARROA, JOAQUIN G., JR. (BARBARA), physician, internal medicine and cardiology, *Laredo*
- CLEMENTS, WILLIAM P., JR. (RITA), former governor of Texas; former chairman, SEDCO, Inc.; former U.S. deputy secretary of defense, *Dallas*
- COERS, DONALD, Provost, Vice President, Academic Affairs, Angelo State University; award winning author and international expert on the works of John Steinbeck; state president, Texas Council of Faculty Senates, *San Angelo*
- CORMIER, RUFUS (YVONNE), attorney and partner in the Houston office of Baker Botts L.L.P., *Houston*
- CORNYN, JOHN, U.S. Senator, Deputy Whip in Senate, *Washington, D.C.*
- COX, PATRICK (BRENDA), assistant director, Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin; historian; writer, *Austin*
- CRAIN, JOHN WALKER (MIMI), president of Summerlee Foundation; board of directors, Texas State Historical Association, *Dallas*
- CRAVEN, JUDITH LYNN BERWICK (MORITZ), past president, United Way of the Texas Gulf Coast; regent, The University of Texas System, *Houston*



- CRIM, WILLIAM ROBERT (MARGARET), investments, *Kilgore*
- CRISP, JAMES E., professor of history, North Carolina State University; member, Academy of Outstanding Teachers; author, *Raleigh, NC*
- CROOK, MARY ELIZABETH (MARC LEWIS), author; member, Texas Institute of Letters, *Austin*
- CRUTCHER, RONALD A. (BETTY), provost and executive vice president for academic affairs, Miami University; cellist, *Oxford, OH*
- CRUZ, R. TED (HEIDI), Solicitor General of Texas; Adjunct Professor of Law, The University of Texas School of Law, *Austin*
- CULLUM, LEE, journalist contributing columns to *Dallas Morning News* and commentaries to National Public Radio's *All Things Considered* and to *News Hour with Jim Lehrer*; author of *Genius Came Early: Creativity in the Twentieth Century, Dallas*
- CUNNINGHAM, WILLIAM H. (ISABELLA), former president, The University of Texas at Austin; former chancellor, The University of Texas System, *Austin*
- CURTIS, GREGORY (TRACY), editor, *Texas Monthly, 1981-2000*; author, *Austin*
- DAILEY, MACEO (SONDRA), director of African American Studies and assistant professor of history at The University of Texas at El Paso; board chair of Humanities Texas, *El Paso*
- DAVIS, D. JACK (GAIL), dean of the School of Visual Arts, University of North Texas, *Denton*
- DAVIS, RAMONA, executive director, Greater Houston Preservation Alliance, *Houston*
- DE WETTER, MARGARET BELDING, artist and poet, *El Paso*
- DEAN, DAVID A. (JEAN), lawyer; former secretary of state, Texas, *Dallas*
- DEBAKEY, MICHAEL E., cardiovascular surgeon; chancellor emeritus, Baylor College of Medicine, *Houston*
- DECHERD, ROBERT W. (MAUREEN), chairman, president, and chief executive officer, A. H. Belo Corporation, *Dallas*
- DELCO, WILHELMINA (EXALTON), former member, Texas House of Representatives; civic leader; adjunct professor, Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin; and chair, Board of Trustees, Huston-Tillotson College, *Austin*
- DENIUS, FRANKLIN W. (CHARMAINE), lawyer; former president, the University of Texas Ex-Students' Association; member, Constitutional Revision Committee; Distinguished Alumnus, The University of Texas at Austin; decorated veteran of World War II, *Austin*
- DENTON, P. LYNN (MARK), founding director of the Bob Bullock Texas

- State History Museum; past-president, Texas Association of Museums, *Dripping Springs*
- DEWHURST, DAVID, lieutenant governor of Texas, veteran, businessman, rancher, *Austin*
- DICK, JAMES, founder-director, International Festival-Institute at Round Top; concert pianist and teacher, *Round Top*
- DOBIE, DUDLEY R., JR. (SAZA), successor trustee, Clayton Foundation of Research; shareholder, Brorby & Crozier, P. C., *Austin*
- DOUGHERTY, J. CHRYS, III, retired attorney; former Honorary French Consul in Austin; former president, State Bar of Texas; former trustee, St. Stephen's Episcopal School, Austin; former trustee, The University of Texas Law School Foundation; trustee, Texas Supreme Court Historical Society, The Austin Project; Administrative vice-chair, Texas Applesseed, *Austin*
- DOUGHERTY, J. CHRYS, IV (MARY ANN), director of research, Just for the Kids, *Austin*
- DUGGER, RONNIE E. (PATRICIA BLAKE), reporter, writer, social structure activist, *Austin and Cambridge, MA*
- DUNCAN, A. BAKER (SALLY), chairman, Duncan-Smith Investments Inc., *San Antonio*
- DUNCAN, CHARLES WILLIAM, JR. (ANNE), chairman, Duncan Interests; former secretary, U.S. Energy Department; deputy secretary, U.S. Defense Department; president, The Coca-Cola Company; chairman, Rotan Mosle Financial Corporation, *Houston*
- DUNCAN, JOHN HOUSE (BRENDA), businessman; chairman, board of trustees, Southwestern University, *Houston*
- EARVIN, LARRY L., president, Huston-Tillotson College; former dean, School of Arts and Sciences, Clark Atlanta University, *Austin*
- EDWARDS, ELIZABETH YEAGER, director, secretary, Perkins-Prothro Foundation; chairperson, Harry Ransom Center Advisory Council; member, Foundation and System Board, Cook Children's Healthcare System, *Wichita Falls*
- EMANUEL, VICTOR LLOYD, naturalist and founder of Victor Emanuel Nature Tours, *Austin*
- FARABEE, KENNETH RAY (MARY MARGARET), former vice-chancellor and general counsel, The University of Texas System; former member, Texas Senate, *Austin*
- FAULKNER, LARRY R. (MARY ANN), president, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- FEHRENBACH, T. R. (LILLIAN), author; historian; former chairman, commissioner emeritus, Texas Historical Commission; former chairman,

- Texas Antiquities Committee; fellow, Texas State Historical Association, *San Antonio*
- FEIGIN, RALPH D. (JUDITH), president and chief executive officer of Baylor College of Medicine, *Waco*
- FINCH, WILLIAM CARRINGTON (LUCY), retired dean, Vanderbilt Divinity School; former president, Southwestern University, *Nashville, TN*
- FISHER, RICHARD (NANCY), ambassador and deputy U.S. trade representative; vice-chair, Overseas Private Investment Corp. (OPIC), former managing partner, Fisher Capital Management; former executive assistant to U.S. secretary of the treasury; adjunct professor, Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin; democratic nominee for U.S. Senate, 1994; founder, Dallas Committee on Foreign Relations, *Dallas*
- FLATO, EDWARD C. (KATY), architect, Lake/Flato, *San Antonio*
- FLAWN, PETER T. (PRISCILLA), president emeritus, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- FLEMING, CHERYL (JON), dean, Margaret Petree School of Performing Arts in Oklahoma City; served as advisor-consultant of the Metropolitan Opera; award-winning poet, *North Zulch*
- FLEMING, DURWOOD (LURLYN), former president and chancellor, Southwestern University, *Dallas*
- FLEMING, JON HUGH (CHERYL), educator; consultant; businessman; former president, Texas Wesleyan College; former member, Governor's Select Committee on Public Education, *North Zulch*
- FLORES, DIONICIO, regent, Texas State University; executive vice-president and editor, *El Paso Times, El Paso*
- FLOWERS, BETTY SUE, director, Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, *Austin*
- FRANCIS, JAMES B. JR., president, Francis Enterprises, Inc; board of directors, Silverleaf Resorts, Inc; trustee, Southwest Research Institute, *Dallas*
- FRANCIS, L. FREDERICK "RICK" (GINGER), vice chairman, director, Bank of the West; board of directors, Western Refining Inc; Board of Regents Chairman, Texas Tech University System; board of managers, El Paso Workforce Collaborative, *El Paso*
- FRAZIER, DONALD (SUSAN), professor of history, McMurry University; fellow and executive director, Grady McWhiney Research Foundation, *Abilene*
- FROST, PAT (KELLEY), president, Frost National Bank; serves on over ten non-profit boards in San Antonio, *San Antonio*

- FROST, TOM C. (PATRICIA), senior chairman of the board, Frost National Bank, *San Antonio*
- FURGESON, W. ROYAL, JR. (JULI), United States district judge, Western District of Texas Midland Division, *Midland*
- GALBRAITH, JAMES K. (YING TANG), professor, Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- GALVAN, ISRAEL J. (MARSHA ANN PERLMAN), founder and president of GHG Corp., *League City*
- GALVIN, CHARLES O'NEILL (MARGARET), centennial professor of law, emeritus, Vanderbilt University, Nashville; of counsel, Haynes and Boone, L.L.P., Dallas; distinguished professor of law emeritus, Southern Methodist University, *Dallas*
- GARCIA, JULIET VILLARREAL (OSCAR E.), president of The University of Texas at Brownsville and Texas Southmost College, *Brownsville*
- GARNER, BRYAN ANDREW (PAN), author; lecturer; lawyer; president, LawProse, *Dallas*
- GARRETT, JENKINS (VIRGINIA), lawyer; former member, board of regents, the University of Texas System; former chairman, board of trustees, Tarrant County Junior College; distinguished alumnus award, The University of Texas at Austin, *Fort Worth*
- GARWOOD, WILLIAM L. (MERLE), judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, *Austin*
- GEORGE, ROGER JAMES, JR. (CHERYL), trial lawyer, founding partner of George & Donaldson, LLP, *Austin*
- GILLETTE, MICHAEL L. (LEANN), director, Humanities Texas; retired, National Archives, *Austin*
- GILLIS, MALCOLM (ELIZABETH), president, Rice University, *Houston*
- GLICKMAN, JULIUS (SUZAN), chairperson, Chancellor's Council, University of Texas System; adjunct professor of Law, University of Houston; board of directors, Houston Symphony, Jack S. Blanton Museum of Art; European Subcommittee, Houston Museum of Fine Art, *Houston*
- GOETZMANN, WILLIAM H. (MEWES), Jack S. Blanton Sr. Endowed Chair in History and American Studies, The University of Texas at Austin, Pulitzer Prize-winning author, *Austin*
- GOGUE, GEORGE J. (SUSIE), Chancellor, University of Houston System; President, University of Houston; board of directors, Greater Houston Partnership; member, Texas International Education Consortium, *Houston*
- GOLDSTEIN, JOSEPH L., professor of medicine and molecular genetics, The University of Texas Southwest Medical Center; Nobel laureate in medicine or physiology, *Dallas*

- GORDON, WILLIAM EDWIN, distinguished professor emeritus, Rice University; foreign secretary (1986-1990), National Academy of Sciences, *Houston*
- GRANOF, MICHAEL H. (DENA HIRSCH), member, U.S. Comptroller General's Advisory Committee Council on Government Auditing Standards and Educational Advisory Committee; member, University of Texas System Advisory Council; professor of accounting, University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- GRANT, JOSEPH M., chairman and chief executive officer, Texas Capital Bancshares, Inc., *Dallas*
- GREENHILL, JOE R. (MARTHA), lawyer; former chief justice, Supreme Court of Texas, *Austin*
- GRUBEN, WILLIAM C. (MARILU), vice president, senior economist, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; director, Bank's Center for Latin American Economics; adjunct professor, Department of Economics, Southern Methodist University, & Department of International Studies, University of Texas at Dallas, *Dallas*
- GUEST, WILLIAM F. (AMY), attorney; chairman, American Capitol Insurance Company, *Houston*
- GULLETT, JOHN, physician, *Abilene*
- GUNTER, PETE A.Y. (ELIZABETH), Regents Professor of Philosophy, University of North Texas; member, Texas Institute of Letters; board of directors, *Southwest Philosophy Review*; president, Association for Process Philosophy of Education; lifetime board member and past president, Big Thicket Association, *Denton*
- GUTHRIE, JUDITH K., United States Magistrate Judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas, *Tyler*
- HACKERMAN, NORMAN (JEAN), former president, Rice University; former president and vice chancellor, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- HAMILTON, ANN THOMAS, grant officer, Houston Endowment, Inc.; director Jacob and Terese Hershey Foundation, *Houston*
- HAMM, GEORGE FRANCIS (JANE), president, The University of Texas at Tyler, *Tyler*
- HARDESTY, ROBERT L. (MARY), former president, Southwest Texas State University; former assistant to the president of the United States; former chairman, board of governors, United States Postal Service; former vice-chancellor, The University of Texas System, *Austin*
- HARRIGAN, STEPHEN MICHAEL (SUE ELLEN), author; contributing editor, *Texas Monthly*, *Austin*
- HARTE, CHRISTOPHER M. (KATHERINE STODDARD POPE), investments, *Portland, ME*

- HARTE, EDWARD HOLMEAD, former publisher, *Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Corpus Christi*
- HARVIN, WILLIAM C. (HELEN), lawyer, *Houston*
- HAY, JESS (BETTY JO), chairman, HCB Enterprises, Inc.; chairman, Texas Foundation for Higher Education; former member, board of regents, The University of Texas System, *Dallas*
- HAYES, PATRICIA A., executive vice-president and chief operating officer, Seton Healthcare Network, *Austin*
- HECHT, NATHAN LINCOLN, justice, Supreme Court of Texas, *Austin*
- HERSHEY, TERESE TARLTON "TERRY," civic leader; Houston Parks Board; National Association of Flood Plain Managers Foundation; National Recreation and Park Association; Texas Women's Hall of Fame; former board member, National Audubon Society; Trust for Public Lands, Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission; Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center; Frances K. Hutchison Medal for distinguished service to conservation, Garden Club of America, *Houston*
- HEYER, GEORGE STUART, JR., emeritus professor of the history of doctrine, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, *Austin*
- HIGGINBOTHAM, PATRICK E. (ELIZABETH), judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, *Dallas*
- HILGERS, WILLIAM B., attorney; former chairman, Supreme Court of Texas Grievance Oversight Committee, *Del Valle*
- HILL, JOHN L. (ELIZABETH), attorney, former chief justice, Supreme Court of Texas; former attorney general, Texas; former secretary of state, Texas, *Houston*
- HILL, LYDA, president, Hill Development Company and Seven Falls Company, *Dallas*
- HINES, GERALD DOUGLAS (BARBARA), chairman, Hines Interests, *Houston*
- HIXON, SARITA A. (ROBERT), commissioner Texas Historical Commission 2005, past chair of San Jacinto Museum of History; Elected Kenedy County Commissioner, Precinct 3 2008. *Houston*
- HO, JAMES C. (ALLYSON), attorney, Gibson, Dunn, & Crutcher, LLP; law clerk, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, *Dallas*
- HOBBY, DIANA (WILLIAM), *Houston*
- HOBBY, WILLIAM PETTUS (DIANA), lieutenant governor of Texas, 1973-1991; Radoslav A. Tsanoff Professor, Rice University 1989-present;; Sid Richardson Professor, Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, 1991-1997; chancellor, University of Houston System, *Houston*

- HOFFMAN, PHILIP GUTHRIE (MARY), president emeritus, University of Houston; former president, Texas Medical Center, Inc., *Houston*
- HOLLAMAN, ELIZABETH E., former head, Trinity Episcopal School, educational consultant; president, Cavalry Consulting, *Galveston*
- HOLTZMAN, WAYNE H. (JOAN), professor of psychology and education emeritus; special counsel, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- HOOKE, HAROLD SWANSON (JOANNE), retired chairman and chief executive, American General Corporation; trustee, Baylor College of Medicine; former national president of the Boy Scouts of America; Texas Business Hall of Fame, *Houston*
- HORCHOW, S. ROGER (CAROLYN), founder and former CEO of the Horchow Collection, author, theatrical producer, *Dallas*
- HOWE, JOHN P., III, physician; president and CEO, Project Hope, *Washington, D.C.*
- HUDSON, EDWARD R. JR. (ANN FRASHER), independent oil producer; board member, Kimbell Art Foundation, Burnett Foundation, Modern Art Museum of Fort Worth, Aspen Art Museum, and Aspen Center for Physics, Friends of Art and Preservation in Embassies, *Fort Worth*
- HUEY, MARY EVELYN (GRIFFIN), president emerita, Texas Woman's University, *Denton*
- HUFFINES, JAMES R. (PATTY), former chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas System and current vice chairman of the Board of Regents; Chairman, Central & South Texas for Plains Capital Bank, *Austin*
- HUGHES, VESTER T., JR.; lawyer; founding partner, Hughes & Luce, *Dallas*
- HUNT, WOODY L. (GAYLE), chairman and CEO, Hunt Building Corporation; member, The University of Texas System Board of Regents; member of numerous local and state business and charitable boards, *El Paso*
- HURLEY, ALFRED FRANCIS (JOANNA), chancellor, University of North Texas System, *Denton*
- HUTCHISON, KAY BAILEY (RAY), U.S. senator; former state treasurer, Texas, *Dallas and Washington, D.C.*
- INMAN, BOBBY R. (NANCY), admiral, U.S. Navy (retired); investor, *Austin*
- JACK, JANIS GRAHAM (WILLIAM DAVID), U.S. district judge, *Corpus Christi*
- JACKSON, LEE, chancellor, University of North Texas System; former member, Texas House of Representatives; four-time Dallas County Judge, *Denton*

- JACOBS, GARY, chairman, president, and CEO, Laredo National Bancshares Inc., *Laredo*
- JAMAIL, JOSEPH D., JR. (LEE), attorney; philanthropist, *Houston*
- JAMES, THOMAS N. (GLEAVES), cardiologist; Professor of Medicine, Professor of Pathology, Inaugural Holder of the Thomas N. and Gleaves T. James Distinguished Chair in Cardiological Sciences, former president, The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, *Galveston*
- \*JOHNSON, CLAUDIA TAYLOR "LADY BIRD," *Stonewall*
- JOHNSON, CLAY III, Deputy Director, Management, Office of Management and Budget, *Washington D.C.*
- JOHNSON, LUCI BAINES (IAN TURPIN), chair of the LBJ Holding Company, *Austin*
- JORDAN, BRYCE (BARBARA), former president, Pennsylvania State University, *Austin*
- JUSTICE, WILLIAM WAYNE (SUE), senior judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas, sitting by designation in the Western District of Texas, *Austin*
- \*\*KAIN, COLLEEN T., retired executive assistant, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- KECK, RAY M. (PATRICIA), president, Texas A&M International University, former provost & vice-president for Academic Affairs, *Laredo*
- KELLY, DEE J. (JANICE), attorney, *Fort Worth*
- KELSEY, MAVIS PARROTT SR., retired physician; founder and former chief, Kelsey-Seybold Clinic, *Houston*
- KELTON, ELMER (ANNA), fiction writer, livestock journalist, *San Angelo*
- KEMPNER, HARRIS L., JR. (HETTA), trustee, H. Kempner; president, Kempner Capital Management, Inc., *Galveston*
- KEMPNER, RUTH L., *Galveston*
- KESSLER, JAMES LEE (SHELLEY), Rabbi, Temple B'nai Israel; founder and first president, Texas Jewish Historical Society, *Galveston*
- KING, CAROLYN DINEEN (THOMAS M. REAVLEY), chief judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, *Houston*
- KING, ROBERT D., professor, Linguistics, founding dean, College of Liberal Arts, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- KLEBERG, SALLY SEARCY, financial educator; family office manager, *New York and San Antonio*
- KLEIN, MELVYN N. (ANNETTE), managing partner of GKH Partners, L.P., attorney; adjunct professor, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, *Corpus Christi*



- KRIER, CYNDI TAYLOR (JOSEPH), former member, Texas Senate; vice-president of Texas government relations, USAA; partner, Vallejo Ranch, *San Antonio*
- KRUEGER, ROBERT "BOB" CHARLES (KATHLEEN), U.S. Ambassador to Botswana; former U.S. senator, congressman, ambassador to Burundi, ambassador-at-large to Mexico; former Texas Railroad commissioner; former vice-provost and dean of Arts and Sciences, Duke University; president, Krueger Associates, *New Braunfels*
- LABOON, ROBERT BRUCE (RAMONA), partner, Locke Liddell & Sapp, *Houston*
- LANE, NEAL (JONI), senior fellow, James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rice University; director, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, *Houston*
- LARIVIERE, RICHARD W. (JANIS), dean, College of Liberal Arts, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- LASATER, GARLAND M., JR. (MOLLY), board member, Community Foundation of North Texas, McDonald Observatory of The University of Texas, Aspen Center for Physics, Museum of Science and History, *Fort Worth*
- LEBERMANN, LOWELL H., JR., president, Centex Beverage, Inc., *Austin*
- LEE, ELIZABETH MAXWELL (WILLIAM), executive director, Foundation for the Education of Young Women; founder, Irma Rangel Leadership School for Young Women, *Dallas*
- LEMAISTRE, CHARLES A. (JOYCE), president emeritus, the University of Texas System Cancer Center M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute, *San Antonio*
- LEVIN, WILLIAM C., physician; former president and Ashbel Smith Professor, the University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston, *Galveston*
- LINDSEY, JOHN H. (SARA), businessman; art collector; civic leader; former member, board of directors, Museum of Fine Arts; director, Alley Theatre; member, board of regents, Texas A&M University System; former member of the board of the United States Military Academy at West Point, *Houston*
- LIVINGSTON, WILLIAM S. (LANA), senior vice president, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- LOCHRIDGE, LLOYD (FRANCES), lawyer; former president, State Bar of Texas; former member, board of governors, American Bar Association, *Austin*
- LOCKE, JOHN PATRICK (RAMONA), president, Locke Holdings, Inc., *Dallas*
- LORD, GROGAN (BETTY), senior chairman, First Texas Bancorp; mem-

- ber, Texas Securities Board; trustee, Southwestern University, *Georgetown*
- LOW, GILBERT, lawyer, *Beaumont*
- LOWE, RICHARD (KATHY), Regents Professor, University of North Texas; author and recipient of Jefferson Davis Award of the Museum of the Confederacy for *Walker's Texas Division, CSA: Greyhounds of the Trans-Mississippi*, author of several books, *Denton*
- LOWMAN, ALBERT T. (DARLYNE), past president, Texas Folklore Society, Book Club of Texas, Texas State Historical Association; managing partner, Lowman Ranch, Ltd., *San Marcos*
- MACKINTOSH, PRUDENCE M. (JOHN), author; member, Texas Institute of Letters, *Dallas*
- MACON, JANE (LARRY), attorney, city and trial attorney, City of San Antonio, *San Antonio*
- MADDEN, WALES H., JR. (ABBIE), attorney; former member, board of regents, The University of Texas System, *Amarillo*
- MARGO, ADAIR WAKEFIELD (DONALD R. "DEE"), owner, Adair Margo Gallery; member, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board; State Advisory Council, Texas Book Festival; chairman, President's Council on the Arts and Humanities, *El Paso*
- MARK, HANS (MARION), professor of aerospace engineering, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- MARSH, GWENDOLYN "WENDY" O. (STANLEY), civic volunteer active in arts and education, *Amarillo*
- MARTIN, JAMES C., interim director, Texas State Historical Association; former executive director, San Jacinto Museum of History Association, *Austin*
- MARTIN, ROBERT S. (BARBARA), director, Institute for Museum and Library Sciences; former director, Texas State Library, *Corinth and Washington, D.C.*
- MARTINEZ, PHILIP, El Paso district judge; former director El Paso Legal Assistance Society, El Paso Holocaust Museum, El Paso Cancer Treatment Center, and Hispanic Leadership Institute, *El Paso*
- MARTINEZ, VIDAL G. (DEBORAH), partner, Franklin, Cardwell, & Jones; Chairman, Texas Public Education Reform Foundation, *Houston*
- MARZIO, PETER CORT, director, the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, *Houston*
- MATTHEWS, JUDY JONES, president, Dodge Jones Foundation, *Abilene*
- MATTHEWS, KATHLEEN SHIVE, dean, Wiess School of Natural Sciences, Rice University; elected to American Association for the Advancement of Science, *Houston*

- MCCOMBS, B. J. "RED" (CHARLINE), owner, Minnesota Vikings, *San Antonio*
- MCCORQUODALE, ROBIN HUNT; novelist, *Houston*
- MCCOWN, F. SCOTT (MAURA POWERS), executive director, Center for Public Policy Priorities, retired judge, 345th District Court, Travis County, Texas, named by *Texas Monthly* as one of "The 25 Most Powerful People in Texas Politics," *Austin*
- MCDERMOTT, MARGARET (EUGENE), The University of Texas at Austin Distinguished Alumna; patron of the arts, education, and medicine in various community involvements; member, International Council of Museum of Modern Art in New York and the Dallas Shakespeare Club; honorary alumnus of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, *Dallas*
- MCFADDEN, JOSEPH M., president emeritus, professor of history, University of St. Thomas, *Houston*
- MCHUGH, M. COLLEEN, member, Board of Regents, The University of Texas System, *Corpus Christi*
- MCKNIGHT, JOSEPH WEBB (MIMI), professor, Southern Methodist School of Law; legal historian; law reformer, *Dallas*
- MCLAUGHLIN, JOHN MARK (AMY), rancher, lawyer, and chairman of Texas State Bank, *San Angelo*
- MCNEILL, LARRY, board member, Texas State Historical Association; board member, Texas Supreme Court Historical Society; president, managing shareholder, Clark, Thomas & Winters, P.C., *Austin*
- MCREYNOLDS, JIM (JUDY), member, Texas House of Representatives; former faculty member, Stephen F. Austin State University; owner, Chaparral Energy, Inc., *Lufkin*
- MERSKY, ROY M. (ROSEMARY), professor of law, director, University of Texas Law Library; professor, University of Texas School of Information; board of trustees, Texas Supreme Court Historical Society, *Austin*
- MIDDLETON, HARRY J. (MIRIAM), director emeritus, Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library and Museum; executive director, Lyndon B. Johnson Foundation, *Austin*
- MILLER, CHARLES (BETH), chairman, Meridian National, Inc., *Houston*
- MONDAY, JANE CLEMENTS (CHARLES), former regent, Texas State University System; public commissioner, Southern Association of College and Schools; author, *Huntsville*
- MOORE, J. SAM, JR. (GRETA), retired lawyer; former chairman, Texas Committee for the Humanities; former member, Texas Law Review Association, *El Paso*

- MOSELEY, JOHN DEAN (SARA BERNICE), president emeritus, Austin College; former director, Texas Legislative Council; consultant, *Sherman*
- MOSLE, PAULA MEREDITH (JON), trustee and chairman, Hockaday School; former dean of women, Rice University; former governor current trustee advisor, Rice University, *Dallas*
- MULLINS, CHARLES B. (STELLA), professor of internal medicine, J. Fred Schoelkopf, Jr. chair in cardiology, The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, *Dallas*
- MURPHY, EWELL E., JR., lawyer, retired partner, Baker & Botts L.L.P.; distinguished lecturer, University of Houston Law Center, *Houston*
- NATALICIO, DIANA S., president, The University of Texas at El Paso; member, Texas Women's Hall of Fame; author, *El Paso*
- NICKLAUS, HELEN CAROL (TED), The University of Texas Liberal Arts Foundation Advisory Council, recipient of the Jim Veninga Award for Excellence in Humanities, Texas Council for the Humanities, *Amarillo*
- NYE, ERLE A. (ALICE), chairman, Board of TXU Corporation; chairman, vice-chairman, Board of Regents, Texas A&M University System, *Dallas*
- OLSON, LYNDON L., JR. (KAY), former U.S. Ambassador to Sweden, *Waco*
- O'TOOLE, THOMAS F. (JANE), managing partner, Glenhest, Ltd; Director, National Alliance for Mental Illness, *Dallas*
- OXFORD, PATRICK CUNNINGHAM (KATE), managing partner, Bracewell & Giuliani L.L.P.; board of regents, The University of Texas System; board member, M.D. Anderson Outreach, Inc. and Texas Medical Giants, *Houston*
- PALAIMA, THOMAS G. (CAROLYN), professor of Classics at The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- PAREDES, RAYMUND A., Commissioner of Higher Education, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board; board of directors, Texas Cultural Trust; board of trustees, Mercy College, New York, *Austin*
- PATTERSON, PATRICIA M., president, Patterson Investments, Inc.; board of directors, Hockaday School, *Dallas*
- PFEIFFER, FRED N. (ANN MARIA), engineer; attorney; General Manager, San Antonio River Authority, *San Antonio*
- PHILLIPS, JEANNE JOHNSON (DAVID), senior vice president, Corporate Affairs and International Relations, Hunt Consolidated, Inc., Hunt Oil Company, Inc., *Dallas*
- PHILLIPS, THOMAS ROYAL (LYN), chief justice, Supreme Court of Texas, *Austin*

- POPE, JACK (ALLENE), former chief justice, Supreme Court of Texas, *Austin*
- PORTER-SCOTT, JENNY LIND (LAWRENCE E.), poet and educator, former poet laureate of Texas, *Austin*
- POWELL, BOONE (DIANNE), chairman, Ford, Powell, & Carson, Architects; College of Fellows, American Institute of Architects; former president, Texas Society of Architects; peer professional, U.S. General Services Administration, *San Antonio*
- POWERS, WILLIAM C., President, The University of Texas at Austin, Hines H. Baker and Thelma Kelly Baker Chair, University Distinguished Teaching Professor, *Austin*
- PRADO, EDWARD C. (MARIA), U.S. Circuit Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals; former U.S. District Court Judge, Western District of Texas; former U.S. Attorney, Western District of Texas, *San Antonio*
- PRESSLER, H. PAUL, III (NANCY), justice (retired), Court of Appeals of Texas, Fourteenth Supreme Judicial District, *Houston*
- PROTHRO, CAREN H. (C. VINCENT), member of board of Dallas Museum of Art, Dallas Center for the Performing Arts Foundation, and Southwestern Medical Foundation, *Dallas*
- RAMEY, TOM B., JR. (JILL), lawyer; chief justice, Twelfth Court of Appeals, *Tyler*
- RAMIREZ, MARIO E. (SARAH), physician; past member, board of regents, the University of Texas System; vice-president for South Texas Initiatives University of Texas Health Science Center San Antonio, *Rio Grande City*
- RANDALL, EDWARD, III (ELLEN), private investor; board of directors, EOG Resources Inc., Kinder Morgan, Inc., and EcPutlook.com, Inc., *Houston*
- RANDALL, RISHER (FAIRFAX), former senior vice president and director, American General Investment Corporation; manager, family trusts, investments, and real estate, *Houston*
- REASONER, HARRY MAX (MACEY), lawyer; senior partner, Vinson & Elkins, *Houston*
- REAUD, WAYNE A., attorney and philanthropist; member of The University of Texas System Chancellor's Council, *Beaumont*
- REAVLEY, THOMAS M. (CAROLYN DINEEN KING), judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, *Austin*
- REYNOLDS, HERBERT H. (JOY), president emeritus, Baylor University; Air Force/NASA psychologist and neuroscientist, 1948–1968, *Waco*
- RHODES, CHARLOTTE W. (ALEC), patron, Shakespeare at Winedale; chancellor's council, The University of Texas at Austin; Harry Ran-

- som Humanities Research Center Advisory Council, The University of Texas at Austin, *Dripping Springs*
- ROACH, JOYCE G., Spur Award winner, Western Writers of America; recipient, Carr P. Collins prize for non-fiction, Texas Institute of Letters, *Keller*
- ROBINSON, MARY LOU, U.S. district judge; former state appellate and trial judge, *Amarillo*
- RODRIGUEZ, EDUARDO ROBERTO, attorney, Rodriguez, Colvin & Chaney, L.L.P., *Brownsville*
- RODRIGUEZ, RAÚL (LORENA), managing director and CEO, North American Development Bank, *San Antonio*
- ROGERS, JESSE W. (KAREN), president, Midwestern State University; Commissioner, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, *Wichita Falls*
- ROMO, RICARDO (HARRIETT), president, The University of Texas at San Antonio, *San Antonio*
- ROSTOW, ELSPETH (WALT), Stiles Professor Emerita, former dean, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- ROVE, KARL C. (DARBY), senior advisor and assistant to the President of the United States, *Washington, D.C.*
- RUTFORD, ROBERT HOXIE (MARJORIE ANN), Excellence in Education Foundation Chair in Geoscience, The University of Texas at Dallas; former president, The University of Texas at Dallas; former director, Division of Polar Programs, National Science Foundation; president, Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research, *Richardson*
- SANSOM, ANDREW (NONA), executive director, River Systems Institute and Research Professor of Geography at Texas State University San Marcos; former executive director, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department; executive director, Texas Nature Conservancy; founder, The Parks and Wildlife Foundation of Texas, *San Marcos*
- SCHRUM, JAKE B. (JANE), president, Southwestern University, *Georgetown*
- SCHWITTERS, ROY F. (KAREN), S. W. Richardson Regents Chair in Physics, The University of Texas at Austin; former director, Superconducting Super Collider, *Austin*
- SELDIN, DONALD W., William Buchanan and The University of Texas System Professor of Internal Medicine, The University of Texas Southwestern Medical School, *Dallas*
- SHERMAN, MAX RAY (GENE ALICE), professor and dean emeritus, Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin; former president, West Texas State University, *Austin*

- SHILLING, ROY B., JR. (MARGARET), president emeritus, Southwestern University, *Austin*
- SHIPLEY, GEORGE, president and chief executive officer, Shipley & Associates, Inc., *Austin*
- SHIVERS, ALLAN "BUD", JR. (ROBIN), chairman, Shivers Group, Inc.; chairman, Seton Fund, *Austin*
- SMITH, BEA, Texas Court of Appeals in Austin, Adjunct Professor, The University of Texas School of Law, *Austin*
- SMITH, CULLEN (MICKEY), attorney, former president of the State Bar of Texas; member, Advisory Council, College of the Arts and Sciences, Baylor University, *China Spring*
- SMITH, EVAN, editor, *Texas Monthly*; secretary of the Boards of the American Society of Magazine Editors and the Austin Film Society; member of the Boards of the Jack S. Blanton Museum of Art, the Headliners Club, Marfa Public Radio, and Austin public television station, KLRU, *Austin*
- SMITH, FRANK C., JR. (KATHERINE), electrical engineer; specialist in data processing and geosciences, *Houston*
- SMITH, STEVEN ESCAR (NATALIE), director and C. Clifford Wendler Professor, Cushing Memorial Library and Archives, and associate dean for advancement, Texas A&M University Libraries, *College Station*
- SPECTOR, ROSE (MORRIS), former Texas Supreme Court Justice, trial judge, and District Judge, *San Antonio*
- SPIVEY, BROADUS A. (RUTH ANN), past president, State Bar of Texas, shareholder, Spivey & Ainsworth P.C., *Austin*
- STALEY, THOMAS (CAROLYN), director, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center; Harry Ransom Chair of Liberal Arts; professor of English, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- STEINER, FREDERICK (ANNA), dean, School of Architecture, The University of Texas at Austin; Henry M. Rockwell Chair in Architecture, *Austin*
- STEPHENS, F. L. "STEVE" (POLLYANNA), former chairman, CEO, and co-founder, Town & Country Food Stores, Inc., *San Angelo*
- STEVES, EDWARD GALT (NANCY), CEO, Steves & Sons, Inc.; member, Board of Directors, Chase Texas Bank; member, Young Presidents' Organization, *San Antonio*
- STOBO, JOHN D. (MARY ANN), president, The University of Texas Medical Branch, *Galveston*
- STOREY, CHARLES PORTER (HELEN), lawyer; trustee; former chairman, The Southwestern Legal Foundation, *Dallas*

- STOREY, CHARLES PORTER, JR. (GAIL), physician; author; Executive Vice-President American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine, Palliative Care Consultant, Colorado Permanente Medical Group, *Boulder*
- STRAYHORN, CAROLE KEETON (ED), former Comptroller of Public Accounts; former Texas Railroad Commissioner; Mayor of Austin; president, Austin Community College Board of Trustees; president, Austin Independent School District Board, *Austin*
- STREAM, KATHRYN SHEAFFER (RICHARD), City of Houston Mayor's Task Force for International Visitors; member, Harris County, Homeland Security Task Force for Emergency Management; appointed, Rice-Chertoff Initiative for International Visitors to the U.S., *Houston*
- STRONG, LOUISE CONNALLY (BEEMAN), professor of medical genetics; Sue and Radcliffe Chair, The University of Texas System Cancer Center; Phi Beta Kappa, *Houston*
- STUART, ANN, Chancellor & President Texas Woman's University, past President, Rensselaer at Hartford, Connecticut, *Denton*
- STUART, CLAUDIA (HAROLD), professor of Sociology, Criminal Justice, and Sports and Exercise Sciences at West Texas A&M University; author, *My Private Stock*, *Expressions*, *All Along Life's Journey* and *Living Out Loud*, *An Anthology of Poetry*, co-author *Sociology—The New Millennium*, second edition, *Amarillo*
- SULLIVAN, TERESA A. (DOUG LAYCOCK), vice president and graduate dean, professor of sociology and law, Cox & Smith Faculty Fellow in Law at The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- SUTTON, JOHN F. (NANCY), A. W. Walker Centennial Chair in Law Emeritus, The University of Texas at Austin; former dean, The University Texas Law School; former practicing attorney, San Antonio and San Angelo, *Austin and San Angelo*
- TAYLOR, LONN (DEDIE), historian, *Fort Davis*
- TEMPLE, ELLEN C. (ARTHUR "BUDDY" III), former member and vice-chair, board of regents, The University of Texas System; publisher, Ellen C. Temple Publishing, Inc., *Lufkin*
- TEMPLE, LARRY (LOUANN), lawyer; former chairman, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, *Austin*
- THOMAS, GAIL GRIFFEN (ROBERT), president, The Trinity Trust Foundation, Dallas; founder, CEO, Cities Alive, *Dallas*
- THOMASSON, CHARLES W. (WILLA), lawyer, *Corpus Christi*
- THOMPSON, JERRY D. (SARA), dean of the College of Arts and Humanities and professor of history at Texas A&M International University, *Laredo*



- TOBIN, DON, (PEGGY), former president, American Association of Petroleum Geologists, *Bandera*
- TOTTEN, HERMAN LAVON, dean, School of Library & Information Sciences, University of North Texas; member, National Commission on Library & Information Science; former president, Texas Library Association, *Denton*
- TRAUTH, DENISE, president, Texas State University; writer, *San Marcus*
- TROTTER, BILLY BOB (PEGGY), pathologist; emeritus director, Laboratories of Hendrick Medical Center, *Abilene*
- TYLER, RON C. (PAULA), director, Amon Carter Museum, Fort Worth; former director, Texas State Historical Association and the Center for Studies in Texas History; former professor of history, The University of Texas at Austin, *Fort Worth*
- VENINGA, JAMES F. (CATHERINE WILLIAMS), CEO and campus dean University of Wisconsin-Marathon County, *Wausau, WI*
- VENNEMA, DIANE STANLEY (PETER), author and illustrator, *Houston*
- VICK, FRANCES BRANNEN, former director and co-founder, University of North Texas Press; councilor, Texas Institute of Letters and Texas Folklore Society; board, Texas Council for the Humanities, *Dallas*
- WAINERDI, RICHARD E. (ANGELA), president and CEO, Texas Medical Center, *Houston*
- WALKER, E. LEE (JENNIFER VICKERS), chairman, Lance Armstrong Foundation, chairman, Capitol Metro Transportation Authority, 1998 Austinite of the Year, *Austin*
- WARNER, DAVID C. (PHYLLIS), professor in the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- WEDDINGTON, SARAH RAGLE, lawyer; adjunct professor, The University of Texas at Austin; former member, Texas House of Representatives; former assistant to the president of the United States; former general counsel, U.S. Department of Agriculture; author, *Austin*
- WEINBERG, LOUISE (STEVEN), William B. Bates Chair for the Administration of Justice and Professor of Law, The University of Texas at Austin, *Austin*
- WEINBERG, STEVEN (LOUISE), Josey Regental Professor of Science, The University of Texas at Austin; Nobel Prize in physics; research and publications in physics and astronomy, *Austin*
- WHEELER, JOHN ARCHIBALD (JANETTE), Ashbel Smith Professor Emeritus of Physics; former director, Center of Theoretical Physics, The University of Texas at Austin, *Hightstown, NJ*
- WHITMORE, JON S. (JENNIFER), president, Texas Tech University, *Lubbock*

- WHITTENBURG, GEORGE (ANN), lawyer; member, Council of the American Law Institute; Life Fellow, American Bar Foundation, *Amarillo*
- WILDENTHAL, C. KERN (MARGARET), president, The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, *Dallas*
- WILHELM, MARILYN, founder-director, Wilhelm Schole International; author, *Houston*
- WILSON, ISABEL BROWN (WALLACE S.), board of trustees: The Brown Foundation, Houston; Smith College, Northampton, MA; chairman, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston; board of visitors, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center; advisory board, J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, Texas, *Houston*
- WILSON, ROSINE MCFADDIN, historian and author; former president, Texas Historical Foundation; vice-chairman, Texas Historical Commission; president of the board, McFaddin-Ward House Museum; trustee, McFaddin-Ward Foundation; trustee, San Jacinto Museum of History, *Beaumont*
- \*WINFREY, DORMAN HAYWARD (RUTH CAROLYN), former secretary, Philosophical Society of Texas; former director, Texas State Library, *Austin*
- WINTERS, J. SAM (DOROTHY), attorney, *Austin*
- WITTLIFE, WILLIAM DALE (SALLY), typographer and publisher; president, Encino Press; movie scriptwriter and film producer; councilor, Texas Institute of Letters, *Austin*
- WOOD, JANE ROBERTS, English professor, Dallas County Community College District, Fiction Writing, SMU; fellow, National Endowment of the Arts, National Endowment of Humanities; recipient, Texas Institute of Letters Short Story Award, *Argyle*
- WOODRUFF, PAUL (LUCIA), professor of philosophy, The University of Texas at Austin; author, *Austin*
- WORSHAM, JOS. IRION (HARRIET), lawyer, Hunton & Williams, *Dallas*
- WRIGHT, GEORGE CARLTON (VALERIE), provost and executive vice-president for academic affairs, University of Texas at Arlington, *Arlington*
- WRIGHT, JAMES S. (MARY), architect; senior partner, Page Southerland Page, *Dallas*
- WRIGHT, LAWRENCE GEORGE (ROBERTA), author; staff writer, *The New Yorker*; screenwriter, *Austin*
- WRIGHT, WILLIAM P. "BILL", JR. (ALICE), investments, author, photographer, former chairman, Western Marketing, Inc.; former member, National Council on the Humanities; former chairman, Texas Council on the Humanities; board of managers, School of American Research, Santa Fe; director, National Trust for the Humanities; The University

of Texas Press Advisory Council; commissioner, Texas Commission on the Arts, *Abilene*

WYNN, WILLIAM PATRICK, Mayor of Austin; member, Urban Land Institute; founder, Envision Central Texas; director, Children's Museum of Austin, Heritage Society of Austin, *Austin*

YEAGER, KATHLEEN "KAY" (FRANK), former mayor, Wichita Falls, *Wichita Falls*

YOUNG, BARNEY T. (SALLY), founding partner, Rain, Harrell, Emery, Young, and Duke; of counsel, Locke, Liddell & Sapp, *Dallas*

YOUNG, JAY T. (LAURIE), director, Business Development, Perot Systems Corp; Lt. Commander, US Naval Reserve; board of directors, Admiral Nimitz Foundation; book reviewer, *Dallas Morning News, Plano*

YUDOF, MARK G. (JUDY), former chancellor, The University of Texas System, former president, University of Minnesota, *Austin*

ZAFFIRINI, JUDITH (CARLOS), senator for the twenty-first district of Texas; owner, Zaffirini communications, *Laredo*

\* Life Member

\* \* Honorary Member

# IN MEMORIAM

---

*(Date indicates year of Proceedings in which memorial is published.)*

- SAMUEL HANNA ACHESON (1971)  
NATHAN ADAMS (1966)  
CLAUDE CARROLL ALBRITTON JR.  
(1997)  
JAMES PATTERSON ALEXANDER  
(1948)  
AUGUSTUS C. ALLEN  
WINNIE ALLEN (1985)  
DILLON ANDERSON (1973)  
ROBERT BERNERD ANDERSON  
(1990)  
JESSE ANDREWS (1961)  
MARK EDWIN ANDREWS (1992)  
THOMAS REEVES ARMSTRONG  
JAMES WILLIAM ASTON  
WILLIAM HAWLEY ATWELL (1961)  
KENNETH HAZEN AYNESWORTH  
(1944)  
BURKE BAKER (1964)  
HINES HOLT BAKER  
JAMES ADDISON BAKER (1941)  
JOSEPH BAKER  
KARLE WILSON BAKER (1960)  
WALTER BROWNE BAKER (1968)  
CLINTON STANLEY BANKS (1991)  
EDWARD CHRISTIAN HENRY  
BANTEL (1964)  
REX GAVIN BAKER JR. (2004)  
EUGENE CAMPBELL BARKER (1956)  
MAGGIE WILKINS HILL BARRY  
(1945)  
WILLIAM BARTHOLOMEW BATES  
(1974)  
DEREK H. R. BARTON (1998)  
WILLIAM JAMES BATTLE (1955)  
WILLIAM BENNETT BEAN (1989)  
HENRY M. BELL JR. (19990)  
WARREN SYLVANUS BELLOWS  
(1966)  
HARRY YANDELL BENEDICT (1937)  
JOHN MIRZA BENNETT JR. (1993)  
LLOYD M. BENTSEN (2006)  
GEORGE JOHN BETO (1991)  
JOHN HAMILTON BICKETT JR.  
(1947)  
WILLIAM CAMPBELL BINKLEY  
(1970)  
JOHN BIRDSALL  
CHARLES MCTYEIRE BISHOP (1949)  
WILLIAM BENNETT BIZZELL (1944)  
JAMES HARVEY BLACK (1958)  
ROBERT LEE BLAFFER (1942)  
TRUMAN G. BLOCKER JR. (1984)  
ROBERT LEE BOBBITT  
MEYER BODANSKY (1941)  
HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON (1953)  
CHARLES PAUL BONER (1979)  
GEORGE W. BONNELL  
JOHN GUTZON DE LA MOTHE  
BORGLUM (1941)  
HOWARD TANEY BOYD (1991)  
PAUL LEWIS BOYNTON (1958)  
EDWARD T. BRANCH  
LEO BREWSTER (1980)  
GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS (1957)  
ALBERT PERLEY BROGAN (1983)  
GEORGE RUFUS BROWN (1983)  
JOHN R. BROWN (1994)  
ANDREW DAVIS BRUCE (1968)  
JAMES PERRY BRYAN (1975)  
LEWIS RANDOLPH BRYAN JR. (1959)  
BOB BULLOCK  
JOHN W. BUNTON  
RICHARD FENNER BURGESS (1945)  
WILLIAM HENRY BURGESS (1946)  
EMMA KYLE BURLESON (1941)  
JOHN HILL BURLESON (1959)  
DAVID G. BURNET  
CHESTER R. BURNS (2006)  
I. W. BURTON  
GEORGE A. BUTLER (1992)  
JACK L. BUTLER (1990)  
CHARLES PEARRE CABELL (1970)  
CLIFTON M. CALDWELL  
GEORGE CARMACK (2002)  
JOHN WILLIAM CARPENTER  
EVELYN M. CARRINGTON (1985)  
PAUL CARRINGTON (1989)  
H. BAILEY CARROLL (1966)  
MARY JO CARROLL (1994)

- EDWARD HENRY CARY (1954)  
 ALBERT V. CASEY (2004)  
 CARLOS EDUARDO CASTAÑEDA  
 (1958)  
 THOMAS JEFFERSON CHAMBERS  
 ASA CRAWFORD CHANDLER (1958)  
 MARION NELSON CHRESTMAN  
 (1948)  
 EDWARD A. CLARK (1992)  
 JOSEPH LYNN CLARK (1969)  
 RANDOLPH LEE CLARK (1993)  
 TOM C. CLARK  
 WILLIAM LOCKHART CLAYTON  
 (1965)  
 THOMAS STONE CLYCE (1946)  
 CLAUDE CARR CODY JR. (1960)  
 HENRY COHEN (1952)  
 HENRY CORNICK COKE JR. (1982)  
 MARVIN KEY COLLIE (1990)  
 JAMES COLLINSWORTH  
 ROGER N. CONGER (1996)  
 JOHN BOWDEN CONNALLY JR.  
 (1994)  
 TOM CONNALLY (1963)  
 ARTHUR BENJAMIN CONNOR  
 C.W.W. "TEX" COOK (2003)  
 JOHN H. COOPER (1993)  
 MILLARD COPE (1963)  
 CLARENCE COTTAM (1974)  
 MARGARET COUSINS (1996)  
 MARTIN MCNUITY CRANE (1943)  
 CAREY CRONEIS (1971)  
 WILLIAM H. CROOK (1997)  
 JOSEPH STEPHEN CULLINAN (1937)  
 NINA CULLINAN  
 ROBERT B. CULLOM  
 MINNIE FISHER CUNNINGHAM  
 THOMAS WHITE CURRIE (1943)  
 JEAN HOUSTON BALDWIN DANIEL  
 (2003)  
 PRICE DANIEL (1992)  
 WILLIAM E. DARDEN (1998)  
 HARBERT DAVENPORT  
 MORGAN JONES DAVIS (1980)  
 GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALEY  
 (1946)  
 JAMES QUAYLE DEALEY  
 EVERETT LEE DEGOLYER (1957)  
 GILBERT DENMAN (2004)  
 EDGAR A. DEWITT (1975)  
 ROSCOE PLIMPTON DEWITT  
 ADINA DEZAVALA (1955)  
 FAGAN DICKSON  
 CHARLES SANFORD DIEHL (1946)  
 FRANK CLIFFORD DILLARD (1939)  
 J. FRANK DOBIE (1964)  
 EZRA WILLIAM DOTY (1994)  
 GERRY DOYLE (1999)  
 HENRY PATRICK DROUGHT (1958)  
 FREDERICA GROSS DUDLEY  
 KATHARYN DUFF (1995)  
 J. CONRAD DUNAGAN (1994)  
 CLYDE EAGLETON (1958)  
 DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER  
 JAMES A. ELKINS (2006)  
 EDWIN A. ELLIOTT  
 ALEXANDER CASWELL ELLIS (1948)  
 JOE EWING ESTES (1991)  
 HYMAN JOSEPH ETTLINGER (1986)  
 LUTHER HARRIS EVANS  
 WILLIAM MAURICE EWING (1973)  
 WILLIAM STAMPS FARISH (1942)  
 SARAH ROACH FARNSWORTH  
 CHARLES W. FERGUSON  
 JOE J. FISHER (2000)  
 STERLING WESLEY FISHER  
 LAMAR FLEMING JR. (1964)  
 RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING (1973)  
 FRED FARRELL FLORENCE (1960)  
 JAMES LAWRENCE FLY  
 PAUL JOSEPH FOIK (1941)  
 LITTLETON FOWLER  
 CHARLES INGE FRANCIS (1969)  
 JOE B. FRANTZ (1993)  
 LLERENA BEAUFORT FRIEND (1998)  
 JESSE NEWMAN GALLAGHER (1943)  
 HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL  
 (1983)  
 VIRGINIA LEDDY GAMBRELL (1978)  
 WILMER ST. JOHN GARWOOD  
 (1989)  
 MARY EDNA GEARING (1946)  
 SAMUEL WOOD GEISER (1983)  
 EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY  
 (1970)  
 ROBERT RANDLE GILBERT (1971)  
 GIBB GILCHRIST (1972)  
 JOHN WILLIAM GORMLEY (1949)  
 MALCOLM KINTNER GRAHAM  
 (1941)  
 HOWARD DWAYNE GRAVES (2003)  
 IRELAND GRAVES (1969)  
 MARVIN LEE GRAVES (1953)  
 WILLIAM FAIRFAX GRAY  
 LEON A. GREEN (1979)  
 NEWTON GRESHAM (1996)  
 DAVID WENDELL GUION (1981)  
 CHARLES WILSON HACKETT (1951)  
 WALTER GARNER HALL (2000)  
 JOHN HENRY HANNAH JR. (2003)  
 RALPH HANNA  
 HARRY CLAY HANSZEN (1950)  
 FRANKLIN ISRAEL HARBACH (1998)  
 THORNTON HARDIE (1969)  
 HELEN HARGRAVE (1984)  
 JAMES M. HARGROVE (2004)

- HENRY WINSTON HARPER (1943)  
 MARION THOMAS HARRINGTON  
 GUY BRYAN HARRISON JR. (1988)  
 TINSLEY RANDOLPH HARRISON  
 JAMES PINCKNEY HART (1987)  
 HOUSTON HARTE (1971)  
 RUTH HARTGRAVES (1995)  
 FRANK LEE HAWKINS (1954)  
 WILLIAM WOMACK HEATH (1973)  
 ERWIN HEINEN (1997)  
 JACOB W. HERSHEY (2000)  
 J. CARL HERTZOG (1988)  
 JOHN EDWARD HICKMAN (1962)  
 GEORGE ALFRED HILL JR. (1949)  
 GEORGE ALFRED HILL III (1974)  
 GEORGE W. HILL (1985)  
 JOSEPH M. HILL (1999)  
 MARY VAN DEN BERGE HILL (1965)  
 ROBERT THOMAS HILL (1941)  
 JOHN E. HINES (1998)  
 OVETA CULP HOBBY (1995)  
 WILLIAM PETTUS HOBBY (1964)  
 ELA HOCKADAY (1956)  
 WILLIAM RANSOM HOGAN (1971)  
 IMA HOGG (1975)  
 THOMAS STEELE HOLDEN (1958)  
 EUGENE HOLMAN (1962)  
 JAMES LEMUEL HOLLOWAY JR.  
 PAUL HORGAN (1997)  
 A. C. HORTON  
 EDWARD MANDELL HOUSE (1939)  
 ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON  
 (1941)  
 SAM HOUSTON  
 WILLIAM VERMILLION HOUSTON  
 (1969)  
 WILLIAM EAGER HOWARD (1948)  
 LOUIS HERMAN HUBBARD (1972)  
 JOHN AUGUSTUS HULEN (1957)  
 WILMER BRADY HUNT (1982)  
 FRANK GRANGER HUNTRESS (1955)  
 PETER HURD  
 HOBART HUSON  
 JOSEPH CHAPPELL HUTCHESON JR.  
 JUNE HYER (1980)  
 JULIA BEDFORD IDESON (1945)  
 FRANK N. IKARD SR. (1990)  
 R. A. IRION  
 WATROUS HENRY IRONS (1969)  
 PATRICK C. JACK  
 HERMAN GERLACH JAMES (1966)  
 LEON JAWORSKI (1982)  
 JOHN LEROY JEFFERS (1979)  
 JOHN HOLMES JENKINS III (1991)  
 HERBERT SPENCER JENNINGS  
 (1966)  
 LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON (1973)  
 WILLIAM PARKS JOHNSON (1970)  
 RICHARD J. V. JOHNSON (2006)  
 MARGUERITE JOHNSTON (2005)  
 ANSON JONES  
 CLIFFORD BARTLETT JONES (1973)  
 ERIN BAIN JONES (1974)  
 EVERETT HOLLAND JONES (1996)  
 HOWARD MUMFORD JONES  
 JESSE HOLMAN JONES (1956)  
 JOHN TILFORD JONES JR. (1993)  
 MARVIN JONES (1977)  
 MRS. PERCY JONES (1978)  
 JOHN ERIK JONSSON (1996)  
 JACK S. JOSEY (2004)  
 DAVID S. KAUFMAN  
 PAGE KEETON  
 HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR (1955)  
 ROBERT MARVIN KELLY (1958)  
 LOUIS WILTZ KEMP (1956)  
 HARRIS LEON KEMPNER SR. (1987)  
 THOMAS MARTIN KENNERLY  
 (1966)  
 DANIEL E. KILGORE (1995)  
 WILLIAM JACKSON KILGORE (1993)  
 EDWARD KILMAN (1969)  
 FRANK HAVILAND KING  
 WILLIAM ALEXANDER KIRKLAND  
 (1988)  
 ROBERT JUSTUS KLEBERG JR. (1974)  
 DOROTHY W. KNEPPER (1998)  
 JOHN FRANCIS KNOTT  
 GEORGE KOZMETSKY (2003)  
 LAURA LETTIE SMITH KREY (1985)  
 ERNEST LYNN KURTH (1960)  
 POLYKARP KUSCH (1993)  
 LUCIUS MIRABEAU LAMAR III (1978)  
 MIRABEAU B. LAMAR  
 FRANCIS MARION LAW (1970)  
 THOMAS H. LAW (2006)  
 F. LEE LAWRENCE (1996)  
 CHAUNCEY DEPEW LEAKE (1978)  
 AMY FREEMAN LEE (2004)  
 UMPHREY LEE (1958)  
 DAVID LEFKOWITZ (1956)  
 MARK LEMMON (1975)  
 J. HUGH LIEDTKE (2003)  
 JEWEL PRESTON LIGHTFOOT (1950)  
 DENTON RAY LINDLEY (1986)  
 EUGENE PERRY LOCKE (1946)  
 JOHN AVERY LOMAX (1948)  
 WALTER EWING LONG (1973)  
 JOHN TIPTON LONSDALE (1960)  
 BEN F. LOVE (2006)  
 EDGAR ODELL LOVETT (1957)  
 H. MALCOLM LOVETT  
 ROBERT EMMET LUCEY (1977)  
 WILLIAM WRIGHT LYNCH  
 ABNER VERNON MCCALL (1995)  
 JOHN LAWTON MCCARTY

- JAMES WOOTEN MCCLENDON (1972)  
 L. F. MCCOLLUM (1996)  
 CHARLES TILFORD MCCORMICK (1964)  
 IRELINE DEWITT MCCORMICK  
 MALCOLM MCCORQUODALE JR. (1990)  
 JOHN W. MCCULLOUGH (1987)  
 TOM LEE MCCULLOUGH (1966)  
 EUGENE MCDERMOTT  
 GEORGE CREWS MCGHEE (2005)  
 JOHN HATHAWAY MCGINNIS (1960)  
 ROBERT C. MCGINNIS (1994)  
 GEORGE LESCHER MACGREGOR (2001)  
 STUART MALOLM MCGREGOR  
 ALAN DUGALD MCKILLOP (1974)  
 BUKNER ABERNATHY MCKINNEY (1966)  
 HUGH MCLEOD  
 LEWIS WINSLOW MACNAUGHTON (1969)  
 AYLMER GREEN MCNEESE JR. (1992)  
 ANGUS MCNEILL  
 JOHN OLIVER MCREYNOLDS (1942)  
 JACK R. MAGUIRE (2001)  
 HENRY NEIL MALLON  
 GERALD C. MANN (1989)  
 STANLEY MARCUS (2001)  
 JOHN L. MARGRAVE (2005)  
 FRANK BURR MARSH (1940)  
 HARRIS MASTERSON III (1997)  
 WATT R. MATTHEWS (1997)  
 MAURY MAVERICK (1954)  
 BALLINGER MILLS JR. (1992)  
 BALLINGER MILLS SR. (1947)  
 MERTON MELROSE MINTER (1978)  
 PETER MOLYNEAUX  
 JAMES TALIAFERRO MONTGOMERY (1939)  
 DAN MOODY (1966)  
 DAN MOODY JR. (2000)  
 BERNICE MILBURN MOORE (1993)  
 FRED HOLMSLEY MOORE (1985)  
 MAURICE THOMPSON MOORE  
 TEMPLE HOUSTON MORROW  
 JAMES M. MOUDY (2004)  
 WILLIAM OWEN MURRAY (1973)  
 FRED MERRIAM NELSON  
 CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ (1965)  
 PAT IRELAND NIXON (1965)  
 MARY MOODY NORTHEN (1991)  
 JAMES RANKIN NORVELL (1969)  
 CHILTON O'BRIEN (1983)  
 DENNIS O'CONNOR (1997)  
 CHARLES FRANCIS O'DONNELL (1948)  
 JOSEPH GRUNDY O'DONOHOE (1956)  
 LEVI ARTHUR OLAN (1984)  
 TRUEMAN EDGAR O'QUINN (1989)  
 JOHN ELZY OWENS (1951)  
 WILLIAM A. OWENS (1991)  
 LOUIS C. PAGE (1982)  
 GLORIA HILL PAPE (2002)  
 JUBAL RICHARD PARTEN (1993)  
 ADLAI MCMILLAN PATE JR. (1988)  
 ANNA J. HARDWICK  
 PENNYBACKER (1939)  
 HALLY BRYAN PERRY (1966)  
 NELSON PHILLIPS (1966)  
 GEORGE WASHINGTON PIERCE (1966)  
 EDMUND LLOYD PINCOFFS (1991)  
 BENJAMIN FLOYD PITTINGER  
 KENNETH S. PITZER  
 GEORGE FRED POOL (1984)  
 CHARLES SHIRLEY POTTS (1963)  
 HERMAN PAUL PRESSLER JR. (1996)  
 CHARLES NELSON PROTHRO (2000)  
 HARRY MAYO PROVENCE (1996)  
 MAURICE EUGENE PURNELL  
 CHARLES PURYEAR (1940)  
 CLINTON SIMON QUIN (1956)  
 COOPER KIRBY RAGAN  
 HOMER PRICE RAINEY (1985)  
 CHARLES WILLIAM RAMSDELL (1942)  
 EDWARD RANDALL (1944)  
 EDWARD RANDALL JR. (1970)  
 KATHARINE RISHER RANDALL (1991)  
 LAURA BALLINGER RANDALL (1955)  
 JO STEWART RANDEL (2002)  
 HARRY HUNTT RANSOM (1976)  
 EMIL C. RASSMAN  
 FANNIE ELIZABETH RATCHFORD  
 SAM RAYBURN (1961)  
 JOHN SAYRES REDDITT (1972)  
 LAWRENCE JOSEPH RHEA (1946)  
 WILLIAM ALEXANDER RHEA (1941)  
 JAMES OTTO RICHARDSON  
 RUPERT NORVAL RICHARDSON (1987)  
 JAMES FRED RIPPY  
 A.W. "DUB" RITER (2003)  
 SUMMERFIELD G. ROBERTS (1969)  
 FRENCH MARTEL ROBERTSON (1976)  
 CURTICE ROSSER  
 JOHN ELIJAH ROSSER (1960)

- JOSEPH ROWE  
 JAMES EARL RUDDER (1969)  
 THOMAS J. RUSK  
 MCGRUDER ELLIS SADLER (1966)  
 JEFFERSON DAVIS SANDEFER (1940)  
 MARLIN ELIJAH SANDLIN  
 HYMAN JUDAH SCHACHTEL (1991)  
 EDWARD MUEGGE "BUCK" SCHI-  
 WETZ (1985)  
 VICTOR HUMBERT  
   SCHOFFELMAYER (1966)  
 ARTHUR CARROLL SCOTT (1940)  
 ELMER SCOTT (1954)  
 JOHN THADDEUS SCOTT (1955)  
 WOODROW BRADLEY SEALS (1991)  
 TOM SEALY (1992)  
 GEORGE DUBOSE SEARS (1974)  
 WILLIAM G. SEARS (1997)  
 ELIAS HOWARD SELLARDS (1960)  
 WILLIAM DEMPSEY SEYBOLD (2004)  
 DUDLEY CRAWFORD SHARP  
 ESTELLE BOUGHTON SHARP (1965)  
 JAMES LEFTWICH SHEPHERD JR.  
   (1964)  
 MORRIS SHEPPARD (1941)  
 JOHN BEN SHEPPERD (1989)  
 STUART SHERAR (1969)  
 PRESTON SHIRLEY (1991)  
 ALLAN SHIVERS (1985)  
 RALPH HENDERSON SHUFFLER  
   (1975)  
 RALPH HENDERSON SHUFFLER II  
   (2002)  
 D.J. SIBLEY (2005)  
 JOHN DAVID SIMPSON JR.  
 ALBERT OLIN SINGLETON (1947)  
 JOSEPH ROYALL SMILEY (1991)  
 A. FRANK SMITH JR. (1993)  
 A. FRANK SMITH SR. (1962)  
 ASHBEL SMITH  
 FRANK CHESLEY SMITH SR. (1970)  
 HARLAN J. SMITH (1991)  
 HENRY SMITH  
 HENRY NASH SMITH  
 THOMAS VERNON SMITH (1964)  
 HARRIET WINGFIELD SMITHER  
   (1955)  
 ROBERT S. SPARKMAN (1997)  
 RALPH SPENCE (1994)  
 JOHN WILLIAM SPIES  
 TOM DOUGLAS SPIES (1960)  
 CHARLES C. SPRAGUE (2005)  
 STEPHEN H. SPURR (1990)  
 ROBERT WELDON STAYTON (1963)  
 ZOLLIE C. STEAKLEY (1991)  
 RALPH WRIGHT STEEN (1980)  
 IRA KENDRICK STEPHENS (1956)  
 MARSHALL T. STEVES (2001)  
 ROBERT GERALD STOREY (1981)  
 GEORGE WILFORD STUMBERG  
 HATTON WILLIAM SUMNERS (1962)  
 JEROME SUPPLE (2004)  
 ROBERT LEE SUTHERLAND (1976)  
 HENRY GARDINER SYMONDS (1971)  
 MARGARET CLOVER SYMONDS  
   (2001)  
 WILLIS M. TATE (1989)  
 JAMES U. TEAGUE (1996)  
 ROBERT EWING THOMASON (1974)  
 J. CLEO THOMPSON (1974)  
 BASCOM N. TIMMONS (1987)  
 LON TINKLE (1980)  
 CHARLES RUDOLPH TIPS (1976)  
 MARGARET LYNN BATTS TOBIN  
   (1994)  
 VIRGIL W. TOPAZIO (1999)  
 JOHN G. TOWER (1991)  
 HENRY TRANTHAM (1961)  
 FRANK EDWARD TRITICO SR. (1993)  
 ROBERT S. TROTTI (2005)  
 GEORGE WASHINGTON TRUETT  
   (1944)  
 RADOSLAV ANDREA TSANOFF  
   (1976)  
 EDWARD BLOUNT TUCKER (1972)  
 WILLIAM BUCKHOUT TUTTLE  
   (1954)  
 FRANK E. VANDIVER (2005)  
 THOMAS WAYLAND VAUGHAN  
   (1952)  
 ROBERT ERNEST VINSON (1945)  
 LESLIE WAGGENER (1951)  
 AGESILAUS WILSON WALKER JR.  
   (1988)  
 EVERETT DONALD WALKER (1991)  
 RUEL C. WALKER  
 THOMAS OTTO WALTON  
 FRANK H. WARDLAW (1989)  
 ALONZO WASSON (1952)  
 WILLIAM WARD WATKIN (1952)  
 ROYALL RICHARD WATKINS (1954)  
 WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB (1963)  
 HARRY BOYER WEISER (1950)  
 PETER BOYD WELLS JR. (1991)  
 ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST (1948)  
 CLARENCE RAY WHARTON (1941)  
 JOHN A. WHARTON  
 WILLIAM H. WHARTON  
 WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER  
   (1937)  
 GAIL WHITCOMB (1994)  
 JAMES LEE WHITCOMB  
 FRED N. WHITE (2006)  
 WILLIAM RICHARDSON WHITE  
   (1977)  
 C.G. WHITTEN (2001)



- WILLIAM MARVIN WHYBURN  
(1972)  
HARRY CAROTHERS WIESS (1948)  
DOSSIE MARION WIGGINS (1978)  
PLATT K. WIGGINS  
DAN C. WILLIAMS (2001)  
JACK KENNY WILLIAMS (1982)  
ROGER JOHN WILLIAMS (1987)  
LOGAN WILSON (1992)  
JAMES BUCHANAN WINN JR. (1980)  
STUART WOLF (2005)  
JAMES RALPH WOOD (1973)  
DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD JR.  
(1967)  
WILLIS RAYMOND WOOLRICH  
(1977)  
BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN  
(1971)
- SAM PAUL WORDEN (1988)  
GUS SESSIONS WORTHAM (1976)  
LYNDALL FINLEY WORTHAM  
FRANK MCREYNOLDS  
WOZENCRAFT (1993)  
FRANK WILSON WOZENCRAFT  
(1967)  
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER (1963)  
ANDREW JACKSON WRAY (1981)  
CHARLES ALLEN WRIGHT (2000)  
RALPH WEBSTER YARBOROUGH  
RAMSEY YELVINGTON (1972)  
HUGH HAMPTON YOUNG (1945)  
SAMUEL DOAK YOUNG  
STARK YOUNG  
HENRY B. ZACHRY (1984)  
PAULINE BUTTE ZACHRY (1998)