

The Philosophical Society of Texas

PROCEEDINGS

1972

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS FOR THE COLLECTION AND DIFFUSION OF KNOWLEDGE was founded December 5, 1837, in the Capitol of the Republic of Texas at Houston, by MIRABEAU B. LAMAR, ASHBEL SMITH, THOMAS J. RUSK, WILLIAM H. WHARTON, JOSEPH ROWE, ANGUS MCNEILL, AUGUSTUS C. ALLEN, GEORGE W. BONNELL, JOSEPH BAKER, PATRICK C. JACK, W. FAIRFAX GRAY, JOHN A. WHARTON, DAVID S. KAUFMAN, JAMES COLLINSWORTH, ANSON JONES, LITTLETON FOWLER, A. C. HORTON, I. W. BURTON, EDWARD T. BRANCH, HENRY SMITH, HUGH MCLEOD, THOMAS JEFFERSON CHAMBERS, SAM HOUSTON, R. A. IRION, DAVID G. BURNET, and JOHN BIRDSALL.

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

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

The Philosophical Society of Texas

THE SOCIETY CONVENED AT DALLAS ON DECEMBER 8 AND 9, 1972.
Headquarters were at the Hilton Inn.

After cocktails Friday evening, President Tate at dinner welcomed the members and their guests, outlined the agenda for the three symposiums planned for Saturday on the general theme, "Texas in Transition," and announced that in addition to the regular symposiums the program for the meeting would be enhanced by two outstanding speakers, Dr. Paul Horgan on Friday evening and the Hon. George Bush on Saturday evening.

Long time Secretary Herbert Gambrell was in attendance but because of a recent eye operation did not give his usual report. In his stead, President Tate announced the addition of these Texans to active membership:

Joe Lewis Allbritton of Houston
James William Aston of Dallas
Robert B. Cullum of Dallas
Price Daniel of Austin
Roscoe Plimpton DeWitt of Dallas
Charles O'Neill Galvin of Dallas
Wilmer Brady Hunt of Austin and Houston
Erin Bain Jones (Mrs. John Leddy) of Dallas
Bernice Milburn Moore (Mrs. Harry E.) of Austin
Maurice Eugene Purnell of Dallas
Charles Cameron Sprague of Dallas

Secretary Carroll read the names of valued members lost by death since the last annual meeting, as all stood in silent tribute to them:

Sam H. Acheson
Robert Lee Bobbitt
Carey Croneis
Gibb Gilchrist
Houston Harte
Edward B. Tucker
W. M. Whyburn

Paul Horgan was the keynote speaker. His topic Friday evening was "Toward a Redefinition of Progress."

The first symposium was held at the Hilton Inn on Saturday morning. Thereafter the members and their guests went to the campus of nearby Southern Methodist University where President Tate hosted a luncheon in the grand ballroom of the Umphrey Lee Student Center.

After a tour of the Owen Fine Arts Center, including the Meadows Museum, the second symposium was held in another unit of the center, the Caruth Auditorium.

For the third symposium the group went back to the Hilton Inn where the final dinner also was held. At the dinner the officers for 1973 were elected and introduced. The Hon. George Bush climaxed the meeting with his address on "World Transition."

The Society adjourned to convene in December, 1973.

Attendance at 1972 Annual Meeting:

Members attending included: Misses Friend, Hargrave; Mesdames Carroll, Dudley, Gambrell, Jones, Knepper, Moore, Northen, Randall; Messrs. Albritton, Anderson, Banks, Bennett, Blocker, Boner, Caldwell, Carrington, Clark, Coke, Davis, DeWitt, Dickson, Doty, Dougherty, Doyle, Elkins, Ewing, Fleming, Frantz, Gambrell, Hall, Harbach, Harrington, Hart, Hershey, Hoffman, Horgan, Hunt, Jeffers, Jordan, Kelsey, Kempner, Kilgore, Kirkland, Law, Mallon, Moore, Owens, Pool, Ragan, Richardson, Sealy, Storey, Tate, Thompson, Tinkle, Tips, Wardlaw, Winfrey, Winn, Wortham, Wozencraft.

Guests were: Mrs. Claude C. Albritton, Mrs. Dillon Anderson, Mrs. Stanley Banks, Mrs. J. M. Bennett, Dr. Virginia Blocker, Mrs. Paul Boner, Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Bywaters, Mrs. Clifton Caldwell, Mrs. Paul Carrington, Mrs. Edward Clark, Mr. and Mrs. W. P. Clements, Jr., Mrs. Henry C. Coke, Jr., Miss Nina Cullinan, Mrs. Morgan J. Davis, Mr. and Mrs. Everett DeGolyer, Jr., Mrs. Roscoe DeWitt, Mrs. Fagan Dickson, Mr. J. Henry Doscher, Jr., Mrs. E. W. Doty, Mrs. J. Chrys Dougherty, Mrs. Gerry Doyle, Capt. and Mrs. James E. Doyle, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Doyle, Mrs. Maurice Ewing, Mrs. Joe B. Frantz, Mrs. A. S. C. Fuller, Mrs. Walter Hall, Mrs. Lucy Richardson Hamilton, Mrs. Franklin I. Harbach, Mrs. M. T. Harrington, Mrs. James P. Hart, Mr. and Mrs. S. J. Hay, Mr. and Mrs. Erwin Heinen, Mrs. Jacob W. Hershey, Mrs. Philip Hoffman, Mrs. Wilmer B. Hunt, Mrs. Leroy Jeffers, Mrs. Bryce Jordan, Mrs. Mavis Kelsey, Mrs. Harris Kempner,

Mrs. W. J. Kilgore, Mrs. W. A. Kirkland, Mrs. Tom H. Law, Mrs. Amy Freeman Lee, Mr. and Mrs. William M. Lewis, Mr. and Mrs. L. W. MacNaughton, Mr. and Mrs. Austin McCloud, Mrs. Charles T. McCormick, Mrs. Fred H. Moore, Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Pate, Mr. and Mrs. Risher Randall, Mr. John A. Rose, Mrs. Tom Sealy, Mrs. R. G. Storey, Mrs. Willis M. Tate, Mr. and Mrs. Steve Thayer, Mrs. J. Cleo Thompson, Mrs. Lon Tinkle, Mrs. C. R. Tips, Dr. and Mrs. Charles R. Vail, Mrs. Frank H. Wardlaw, Miss Ruth Williamson, Mrs. Dorman Winfrey, Mrs. Gus Wortham, Mrs. Frank M. Wozencraft.

TOWARD A REDEFINITION OF PROGRESS

PAUL HORGAN

Honored as I am by this occasion, and my invited part in it, I must disclaim at the outset any purpose of assuming powers and making claims to wisdom based upon systematic thinking or educational preparation. I do not speak as a sociologist or a philosopher — only as a writer in history and the novel, a maker who regards both literary forms as matters of art. I speak, otherwise, from experience observed as a contemporary American who would like to see our practice match our preachment and who has generally proceeded in his work from the promptings and convictions of intuition. Primarily, my reflections, for what they are worth, are here concerned with an artist's response to the quality of contemporary life and the hope of its salvation through enlightened stability, which must demand a revision of the values which have given us our idea of progress.

The path to a better condition of our life leads, I believe, through a humanscape vastly complicated by the simultaneous existence of, on the one hand, the most familiar and basic of individual human desires and needs and, on the other, the most increasingly ingenious and finally rigidly uniform means of fulfilling these.

Who can blame anyone for wishing for relief from the tyranny of work so long as work remains impersonal — so long as it makes demands beyond the individual desire to create or to choose?

Who can feel satisfaction when work and the fulfillment of needs cease to bear personal relation to the individual and serve only to advance a general condition of collective convenience, in which personal anonymity prevails?

The questions are large indeed and deserve better than glib or expedient replies, but it seems possible that something near the heart of their ultimate resolution in harmony is the problem of what people agree to call progress.

Our history in recent movements beginning with the inception of the industrial age has seemed to equate progress with — size, volume, infinite duplication, impersonal corporate power, wealth so great that it seems to approach abstraction, and in doing so to invite the ultimate impotence of any energy which outgrows the national dimensions of man as an individual model of his own mass society; and finally, to see progress as an end in itself, merging inevitably and imperceptibly with the idea of power.

Power, when identified with a collective national character, tends to operate beyond the nation and to enter world-wide ventures in which progress is finally seen as bestowal, often by force, of our own local and domestic vision of life, as though this were the sole criterion for life everywhere. Disavowing *material* colonialism, we do not seem immune to a state of spirit which might be called *philosophical* colonialism.

Much of this attitude reaching through an innocent love of and belief in progress finally leads toward corruption in terms of power. I believe that this is reflected in many aspects of our life and its society. All I can do with so weighty a subject is to reflect my own single and personal response to it through that medium of intuition concerning life which the artist, whatever his degree of achievement, can dare to offer.

It is in this character that I speak; and it is by the limitations of this character that I am bound.

Still, for what they may be worth, I submit certain doubts about where progress has brought us, hoping that a redefinition of progress by others more able and responsible may help to perceive and alleviate the malaise, individual and collective, which people feel today. They have a right to ask themselves why unprecedented material abundance has not brought men and women the sense of ease, within and without, which all people desire and why material discoveries do not bring us closer to our content. Among possible answers, there is a religious answer, but it would take a theologian to make a public case for it; and accordingly I do not trouble you with any statement of my personal faith.

It seems to me, then, that in values of interest to the artist, contemporary life, which is changing so rapidly, is doing so for the worse, in all the aspects which affect the aesthetic atmosphere.

The basic cause for this, I believe, is that contemporary designers and visionaries in the arts which reach the vast public seem to emphasize sterile functionalism at the expense of celebration.

Art which celebrates finds the organic wholeness of life and results in acts of praise and love. Art which attempts merely to meet and reproduce the restless social energies of a period seems to substitute the material view for that of the spirit. In our time, this has led to the stylish but fugitive excitement of presenting merely the mechanical stuff of our machine industry and commerce as art itself.

To illustrate this notion I must take certain risks and now do so, in dangerously condensed form.

In that most pervasive and enclosing of our great arts, that is, architecture, it seems to me that the characteristic style of our time is that which couples massivity with triviality. Time and again one sees huge ambitious structures on a great scale which seem to have exceeded in size the essential validity of their original concept in design. They resemble drawing-board doodlings enlarged beyond their inherent formal capabilities. In this process, not only human scale but joy in decoration is lost sight of.

In the art of painting, we have seen a couple of generations at work attempting to make psychological statements of a merely subjective nature, leaving the observer to take whatever satisfaction he can from a longing examination of the raw materials of the fabricator in order to surprise some aesthetic interest from material ingredients as such. In the process, fashion forces him to see the emperor's new clothes and little else.

Sculpture has for some time given itself to the task of using the detritus of our industrial age in cleverly suggestive non-industrial fabrications. For aesthetic purposes, this would seem unnecessarily repetitious, as the industrial originals fare better as works of art which have also a productive function.

Music has made the absurd error of turning from all analogy of the human voice as the simplest model of musical capability and has sought in technology and its sounds various systems whose purpose is to reproduce the non-musical environment.

In literature we have seen a sustained point of view, essentially sophomoric in its amazed cynicism, which holds life to be absurd — a contention which the merest glance at the organic splendor and constant new fulfillment of natural forms would negate.

As for what is popularly regarded as criticism, in all the arts, it is so low in quality as hardly to deserve recognition as reviewing or even reporting. With few exceptions, either academic or journalistic, this branch of expression, so wonderfully capable of reaching the estate of art, is either so subject to cliquish tyrannies, or so un-informed, and so taken for granted in its vested incompetence, as to endanger any enlightened acceptance of all the arts today.

Now, none of these directions in human expression is deliberately or even consciously charted and then followed. If they are thoughtless, but not vicious, they are none the less harmful; and they reflect the turning away by so-called educated mankind from the essential nature of man. Human respect has been supplanted by respect for machines and their products — that is to say, abstract, impersonal

substitutes for man's own act and scale, in all significant respects but one, and that is the creation, the seizure, and the use of the resulting unit of power, whether this be political or monetary.

In consequence, it seems to me, we must come, in our time, to our own re-examination of the terms of humanism. It will probably contain more than one paradox, but the one which seems to me to stand out is that one which tries to express man's greatness, which is essentially spiritual, in terms of fantastically material achievements. True, these have made *Homo Americanus* so rich that he is able to share his wealth, if not at home, then with undeveloped nations overseas — on some of which the impact has been dismaying. This is surely intended as a generous act, even if its end results might seem to be self-serving.

But with prosperity, we, as individuals and as a people, too often seem to think we acquire virtue. With virtue to buttress our power, we then are easily self-persuaded that our methods and ways and views of man are the correct ones — the *only* correct ones, we imply by our actions; and we become impatient of all other views, and at times we go so far, in our foreign policy, as to impose upon others what we have decided upon as our way of life, because it seems to us the best, the most prosperous, and the most conspicuous.

Next thing you know, we are brought face to face with the question of whether our fantastic command of technology really produces greater *human* fulfillment than the primitive technics of less sophisticated peoples, who in their employment of nature have managed not to destroy it.

Before we affirm our up-to-date position as a great power, then, we might in all humility, as well as in qualified gratitude for our bounty, consider the hideousness produced in much of our home environment, created in the name of convenience, labour-savings, hygiene, "beauty," marketing, and all the rest of the technics of which we are masters in our moment, thought without much knowledge of what their effect may be in the moment following.

Convenience requires everyone to adopt the same methods and life styles. Is this really humanistic? Labor-saving releases us for the most banal of recreations, hygiene entraps us in transparent cellulose tissues and balances our diet with preservatives; "beauty" assaults us with badly imagined, shoddily executed and wildly expensive structures of all kinds, from residences to the optical cliché of the skyscraper office. Our most pervasive communication — that through advertising, exists to extract commercial gain — not invariably on

a basis of truth — from artificially and often needlessly created consumer demand, thus grossly overstepping its only decent function, which is simply to meet an essential need.

If we recklessly destroy our past by our furious pace in the present, we have lost our sense of historical time, because we have made our technological revolution so rapidly.

We are, therefore, all of us — the responsible scientist and artist, philosopher and industrialist, statesman and teacher — in search of a contemporary humanism which will rescue man from his material achievements. True humanism may now have to take the form of letting people alone. In order to exist, this view will require two circumstances: (1) Absolute respect for the individual and the proffering to him of multiple choices in life and styles of living, and (2) The subordination of mass technics (which tend to see men and women as demographic units, of which more later), to political, spiritual, and educational opportunities for the individual in which the popular will of men and women may, if individually desirable or necessary, defeat by personal preference the impersonal control of social functions which are invariably seized, largely through individual default, and because of the increasingly astonishing ingenuities of applied science, by mankind's truant child, the runaway technic of modern society.

We must spare the next generation the dismay which has come upon us — the dismay, through terrible novelty, caused by the engulfing power of the commonplace — that statistical force which now presses mankind into demographic duplication in which the sacred individuality fashioned in God's image is in hideous danger of being rendered impersonal, faceless, and powerless except in collective terms. With our eyes fixed upon the delights of the functional, we have missed the essential humanity of our needs in the enthusiasm for what has seemed the necessary terms of progress. But, in an early book of his, Aldoux Huxley said:

"All the valuable things in life, all the things that make for civilization and progress, are precisely the unnecessary ones. All scientific research, all art, all religion are (by comparison with making coffins or breakfast food) unnecessary. But if we had stuck to the merely necessary, we should still be apes. According to any proper standard of values," he concluded, "the unnecessary things and the unnecessary people who are concerned with them are much more important than the necessary ones."

There is, thus, more than a little reason to suspect that what we regard as efficiency may in the long run turn out to have been more

costly than intended. In social forms, we already see evidence of how efficiency seems to serve corporations rather than consumers — industries and businesses operated for their own, rather than the customers', convenience. One small, daily, but multiple example: because of mechanical record machines of one sort or another — I do not want to know anything about them in detail — you cannot cash a cheque on your own bank account unless you write it on the form issued by the bank with your own account number on it. This surely serves the convenience of the bookkeeping — but the old-fashioned counter-cheque or blank cheque form served the individual far better when he had need of these in emergency. The convenience of a machine must not take precedence over an individual's convenience.

In transportation, we are already at the point where the traveler has almost no options in the means by which he may travel. The individual is ignored rather than served. So, in our urban clusters, he is lost rather than recognized in his personal circumstance. How many people have we all heard say something like this — “Only four or five years ago, I enjoyed going to New York. Now I go with great reluctance,” Why? The answer seems to lie in the sudden transformation of a huge city, with untold resources of human pleasure, enlightenment and service, into a place where an attitude of such human social ugliness prevails that people are unwilling to encounter it except under imperative necessity. Everyone talks of the dreadful public manners in our cities, not to mention the actual dangers to person and property there. We have entered an age of the assertive personality, and it does not take much reflection to conclude that the assertive personality emerges as a result of a threatened human anonymity on a scale hitherto unknown.

It is that demographic anonymity to which I alluded earlier, and it earns perhaps most vigorous resistance in a large segment of our youth, who may not entirely understand their acts of refusal even as they make them, but who know with a sudden consciousness, as it were, that they were not born to join a faceless mass.

In the name of their passion, they commit willful and destructive acts as ruinous as the impersonality they defy. Vandalism by the young turns out to be a misguided but passionate cry to be heard. It is idle to blame the young if they so often demonstrate the behavior of an indulged, spoiled, barbaric generation. Vandalism may cease when the elders develop a noble and unselfish civilization to hand to their successors. When more than in any period of history the human spirit is in desperate need of its exaltation by analogy —

architecture whose volume and vista presuppose the heroic in man rather than his greedy efficiency, social action which honors rather than ignores human distress, corporate mercy equivalent to that of which the individual is capable, educational ideals which value the child's natural genius over any pedagogical method — in our period, the young have been driven to reject ideals which have resulted in marvels of material functionalism at the expense of genuine human communication. In search of this, the young have been driven into pitiful role-playing and retreats into intimacies in which their willful appetites can find crowded assuagement, in terms as different as possible from the conventions of the larger society in its own search for pleasure and material gain.

I suppose there must always have been persons who disliked the sort of life that went on around them, even at its best. But I doubt that the percentage of these has ever been so great as now in proportion to the culture at large — at least in those societies which claim to be civilized in the usual sense. Privacy is always the victim.

Today, with our ingenious instruments, we have contrived simultaneous assaults upon our senses by all energies of modern life — noise, light, odor. Many of these are kineticized by management of electric impulses, as in electric advertising display signs, and every variety of auditory insult (to adapt a medical term). I recently saw with mournful satisfaction the phrase “acoustical pollution,” which perfectly describes the prostitution to which music and the public air have been reduced by indiscriminate devices like Muzak and public radio and TV sets, not to mention the circumambient transistor radio. And of course, beyond these, the rushing motor car and the shrieking aircraft have their domains between and above. Construction of apartment buildings, hotels, motels, and such, is so flimsy and cheap that almost all domestic sounds are unwillingly overheard by neighbors. There can hardly be a more expensive commodity in the world today than perfect silence in populated areas.

As for privacy — who ever expected to discover in a free society that government and business have combined to develop a vast industry of personal information about individual citizens which can only be called spying and exploitation?

Who ever expected to observe a government elected to fulfill the wishes of the people appear unresponsive to those wishes — indeed, to seem in certain urgency issues of human decency to be simply absent?

I need not particularise any such issues — a moment's reflection upon the expressed intention of the nation's founders will suggest

them. But old-fashioned politics and their encrustations of patronage, regional prejudice, cordial accommodations as between legislators willing to trade this for that in the interest of constituent pressures, seem inadequate in these days of wild break-throughs in technology, social consciousness, and a sudden new sense of what the earth can be made to support and what to lose.

C. P. Snow said, "We have to stop being trivial. Many of our protests are absurd, judged by the seriousness of the moment in which we stand."

Perhaps a new humanism, looking toward a stable society in which a restored sort of classicism might be found, could contain the beginning of our answer to the material mobilities which have brought us where we are. For the artist, anyhow, the perdurable in life represents the perceived, expressed intuition as against the sort of restless intellect which hungers only for transient novelty.

All insentient nature is full of marvelous forms. It is the civilized being's task and duty to find human analogies for such forms in order worthily to fulfill the sentient human order.

The artist's share in this task is of course to give form to his vision of life. It is his prime function to create form. In doing so, he must create his own rhetoric, and abjure second-hand insights even at the risk of ignoring contemporary enthusiasms of powerful cults or modish styles, which tend to echo the trivialities which are fugitive rather than the verities which are constant in human life.

To do this, the artist now faces more obstacles than ever before, if he is at all sensitive to the life about him. Today, much of this life seems devoted to a wreckage of form which we would call infantile if it were not willfully organized in the employment of sophisticated energies.

His chief obstacle seems to be the survival beyond adolescence of the ideal of total reversal, mindless destruction, innovation for its own sake, revolution as an end instead of as a means . . . and a means, at that, which to produce results of value would have to be achieved without the lust which begets lust in terms of violence.

Here I adduce the thought of the greatest artist of the century, who in almost reaching the age of ninety remained profound and ageless in thought. "I am completely insensitive," he said with his particular dry fastidiousness, "to the prestige of revolution. All the noise it may make will not call forth the slightest echo in me. For revolution is one thing, innovation another. And even innovation, when not presented in an excessive form, is not always recognized by its contemporaries . . ." Disdaining the anarchy which holds that

only by destroying tradition can art come to terms with the profile of its own times, he said further, "Far from implying the repetition of what has been, tradition presupposes the reality of what endures. It appears as an heirloom, a heritage that one receives on condition of making it bear fruit before passing it on to one's descendants."

The words, of course, are those of Igor Stravinsky. They do not, of course, "explain" his transcendent genius; but they do propose in the field of the arts a lesson which could well be studied in all other extensions of restless human endeavor, in the search for progress.

For as we recognize the discontents so wretchedly plentiful all about us, we are forced to wonder if our notions of progress in material and social terms have after all been the only proper ones. Progress? we ask, and we remember the enthusiasm which brought commerce, material expansion, individual luxury and convenience, the delights of technical discovery all careless of ultimate possible effects, into our contemporary character with almost the force of natural law. But it of course had nothing to do with natural law — only marvelous application of "innovation in excessive form," for its own sake. A writer in a recent issue of the magazine *Fortune* — Mr. Max Ways in April 1971 — touched a raw nerve when he stated, "The awful truth seems to be that as knowledge advances ignorance does not diminish."

Abstractly, progress is a not ignoble idea . . . it is full of hope, and it stretches the faculties of man in useful exercise. But when we tick off some of the almost literally dead ends to which progress has brought us, we must perhaps consider that it is time not to condemn progress but to redefine our concept of it and, more carefully than before, project its effects and measure its goals.

In many respects we seem to have forgotten what man and woman and child are really like. The artist who tries to remember what they are like, and who succeeds, will survive in the end to tell others; for if we are entering the penumbra of the new dark ages, as much evidence suggests, it will be defenders of man's humanity rather than its distorters who will keep alive the seeds of the rebirth of culture in the images of man, and not in that likeness of sterility inherent in the organized abstractions or reflections of the mechanized society. "Most people," wrote the critic Naomi Bliven in a recent *New Yorker*, "are better than what happens to them."

I should think that in our task of redefining progress the first thing that we as a national society have to do is discover humility.

In too many sectors of our life — the individual's employment of the surrogate strength of the machine, the disappearance of public

civility under the crowded conditions of our population centers, the complete indifference to private taste in the public commercial use of marvelous means of audio-visual systems of reproduction, the failure to acknowledge by truly fraternal acts the very existence of abused minorities among us, the Neo-Roman extension of our national character in foreign parts — the bad trait which obscures so many of our good traits is arrogance.

For the most part, this may well be the innocent arrogance of power unaware of itself; nevertheless, arrogance begets arrogance, in every case, foreign and domestic.

The only cure for such a dis-humane procedure is the cultivation of humility. This will mean first of all the cultivation of the capacity to know empathy to such a degree that our salvation as a species may be assured.

There have always been persons capable of feeling the suffering, the needs, of others, and of acting to assuage these. The Sermon on the Mount is quoted often enough to remind us. But in our vast population pressures today this most primal of virtues — St. Paul's "greatest of these" is surely a reference to empathy as well as to charity — is harder than ever to find in individual and national behavior in many quarters of the world. Who wants to remember that if he hurts when wounded, so does his enemy? Or that any bomb, used in any cause, by anyone, can be as disagreeable and often as terminal to its living target as it would be to its dispatcher, if he happened to find himself in its field of annihilation?

I quote Lord Snow again: "If there are sane, humane and reflective people living in a better world than ours in five hundred years, they will look back on some of our callousness with incredulity."

I think it apposite to quote also at this point some recent words of Jacques Monod, the French molecular biologist, who declared that, "We must aim at stable-state society and the destruction of nuclear stock piles."

The *individual* human being has first of all the instinct for self-preservation and is able through both hindsight and foresight to desist from activities which plainly threaten his survival.

But the *collective* humanity evidently cannot repeat this behavior, and so proceeds witlessly to its doom by new powers of war-making, environment-changing, exaggerated competitiveness, and reckless ideas of progress.

In public and private life, we have great and good individuals, who live humbly on behalf of others. Why cannot we seem able to do so collectively as a people?

It is not an artist's duty, and may well not lie within his capability, to provide answers in which salvation may lie. But in his relation to life, and the love that begets it, he may have, in his terms, a right to pose relevant questions.

WORLD TRANSITION

GEORGE BUSH

Rather than delve into Texas in transition, I want to take a few minutes to share with you some observations on a broader scale about our world in transition. I shall use my rather unique and frustrating and fantastically interesting place at the United Nations — this Window on the World, if you will — from which to make these observations. My basic premise comes from an experience I had last week at a Jets football game. Just before the game when we were being served a buffet lunch, a serious, worried-looking woman sat down next to me. Someone had told her what I did for a living, and she approached me with the question, "Do you see anything at all to be optimistic about?" My mind flashed through the last couple of years in foreign policy, the transition, if you will, in our own foreign policy, the transition in the world — in the way one country looks at another today as opposed to several years ago — and I said, "Yes." She asked, "What?" I said "Peace." Just about that time Joe Namath trotted out on the field, and the game was on. I never really had a chance to explain.

What I meant was that the world now is not a bipolar world anymore with Russia here and the United States there; it's a multi-polar world. You can name the power centers as you see them. President Nixon in Kansas City a year and a half ago talked about five centers — Russia, United States, China, Japan and the economic community of Europe. Today Germany might be added as a separate entity in terms of power.

The United States has changed its relations with two great powers. President Nixon has taken a new direction with both the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China while remaining determined to get along with other power centers. Much has been done to shore up our friendships and our relationships with Japan, but the major changes have been in our dealings with the Soviet Union and with China. The Soviets are still profoundly dedicated to their

own system. Let us make no doubt about that, but there is within the Soviet Union a certain restlessness. The restlessness has resulted in a growing desire for increase in trade. Russia also has a China Problem which, for Russia, dictates better relations with western Europe and better relations with the United States. The Russians want to get the pressure off — what they see as pressure on the west. They want to be able to concentrate on what they see as a fantastically important and threatening problem on the east. We at the United Nations see this change. We may not cope with it, but it is one of the great exciting experiences of service with that body. When many experts in our country were saying that because of escalation of the fighting in Vietnam, there was no way Nixon could go to Moscow, we knew and said quietly to each other, the President is going to Moscow. We could predict correctly because the Russians signalled their attitude. There was no disruption in relationships; the contacts grew even closer as anticipation of the trip went forward; so we felt that the trip was going to take place.

Russia is still tough, still arming, still contentious, still extremely strong, but Russia's own interests now dictate and, during the years of transition from bi-polarization to multi-polarization, have dictated that better relations be maintained with the United States. Our President has grasped and acted on that concept. Where there are differences, it is extremely important to find a commonality, to find grounds for agreement. That is what the President is attempting to do now, as he develops cultural and trade ties with Russia.

With regard to China, the transition is somewhat easier to analyze. Luckily or happily, I am in one of the most unique positions to view United States-China relationships because I have more contacts with the Peoples Republic of China officially than almost anybody else in this country. When the Chinese representatives first came to the United Nations, there was understandable restraint on their part. The United States had battled to preserve representation for the Republic of China — not to keep the Peoples Republic of China out, but there had not been any communication with the Peoples Republic of China for a long time, and its officials thought that by advocating dual representation we were trying to keep them out. At first there was no social contact, no communication at all. One day I passed in the main corridor two Mao suited Chinese representatives; I was determined to start communicating — that is what it is supposed to all be about at the United Nations, but one looked one way and one looked the other way. I walked around the corner and met Harry Thayer, one of our Chinese speaking officers. I said,

“Harry, those of guns, they saw me and they wouldn’t speak to me.” He said, “You’re darned right, I heard them say in Chinese, here comes Ambassador Bush.”

That happened just one year ago today. Now we have communications all up and down the line; we have consultations before the General Assembly on potential differences; we have discussions of positions where we agree, where we are going to be on the same side of an issue. The relationships are not effusive or even humorous or warm as they are at times with the Soviet representatives, but they are improving. The Chinese are beginning to understand the United States, and I think we are beginning through this communication to understand the Chinese a little bit. Their representatives are serious; they are able; they are cultured people. One of them, my counterpart, Ambassador Huang Hua is a man of dedication. Because we have been out of touch with China for so long, there is misunderstanding on both sides. They feel that the United Nations is a Western oriented organization. My colleagues and I feel that the United Nations is highly favorable to China and the East. The Chinese representatives deal in what they call principal. To their credit, they have elected not to disrupt the United Nations.

The Chinese are left of Russia in terms of say Security Council Resolution 242 which is the basic agreement of peace in the Middle East. This year, the United Nations sent a mission under the guidance of the Secretary General to go to Nigeria to talk to Voester and the South Africans to try to get communications started. The Chinese took the position that they would not participate, but they did not veto the resolution as they could have done. The vote was 14 in favor, none opposed, none abstaining, and the Peoples Republic of China not participating. That is a whole new concept for the United Nations, and it is quite important. The Chinese representatives spelled out their principal but did not use their charter power to veto or to stop something from happening.

In international relations, the Chinese and the Russians both are trying to be champions of the third world. The third world was voting almost unanimously for the resolution. The Chinese did not want to lose favor with the third world by vetoing the resolution, but on the other hand, neither did the Chinese want to fail to express what they call principal.

From a geo-political standpoint one must look at China to see why the Chinese seek improved relations with us. They are tremendously concerned, as every debate at the U.N. reveals, with the problems along the Mongolian and Russian borders to the north

where the massing of troops on both sides is tremendous in terms of numbers. Although they are seeking to improve relations with what they consider a militaristic Japan, the Chinese are still concerned in that area. To the south, the reason they were so disturbed last year at the time of the India and Pakistan war was the feeling of an encirclement. Think where China is on the map; the situation could be construed as some kind of encirclement of the Peoples Republic of China. Its officials, therefore, have reason to seek better relations with the United States just as we have to seek better relations with China.

An interesting example of the difference between China and Russia took place just three days ago at the United Nations during the Middle Eastern debate. China was accusing Russia of aiding Israel or damaging the Arab cause by demanding bases in return for military hardware for the Arabs. Russia was furiously replying that if China would have done as much to help the Arabs as they the Soviets had, then the problem of Israel would have been solved a long time ago. Overriding the very delicate problems in the Middle East was the fight between these two super powers at the United Nations.

The reason I answered, "Peace," to the question as to whether there was something to be optimistic about, however, was really more complex than just Russia and China, more complex than the further emergence of the Common Market or the increased maturity of Africa, more complex than the inevitability of peace in Vietnam. Also basic is the movement in the world today toward negotiation as opposed to confrontation, bi-lateral negotiations outside the United Nations.

The fact that the United Nations could not solve the problem of Vietnam does not indicate failure or ineffectiveness. Last year some college professors came to the U.N. and chained themselves in — in indignation because our government had not taken the question of Vietnam into the United Nations. Their memory was short — they had not done their homework. They forgot that Arthur Goldberg left the Bench of the Supreme Court to try, under President Johnson, to bring the question of Vietnam into the U.N. They forgot that only last spring when Secretary General Waldheim had offered his good offices to do something about being a catalyst in a Vietnam settlement, the Chinese on the behalf of North Vietnam had circulated a document that accused the U.N. of "meddling" — exactly the same word they used in 1967 — and accused Waldheim of

“illegally conspiring with Nixon” to bring the question of Vietnam to the United Nations.

The professors were concentrating on the Security Council. We resorted to two methods to get them out. One was an isolation policy, just leaving them sitting there, and as they unchained themselves one-by-one, quietly showing them out onto First Avenue. The other one was explanation, handing them the Chinese letter and showing that it was not the United States that had avoided the question. We had made 14 separate overtures to get parts of Vietnam into the United Nations, all were to no avail because Russia and China, representing their client well, said that the United Nations intervention in Vietnam would be meddling in the internal affairs of a country.

Now we are bi-laterally negotiating with Vietnam. The Koreans are talking, again “climate for peace.” Who would have thought a year ago that North and South Korea would be making progress towards peace given the differences that they have? This year the Chinese wanted to debate the question of Korea and the United Nations. We opposed them, but we told that we were going to oppose them because of our belief that the best way to progress on those terribly difficult issues was to continue the favorable climate for negotiations. We had strong diplomatic initiative and, with the help of our traditional allies, prevailed with a vote of 70 to 35; the question of Korea was not debated. Hopefully the climate for bi-lateral progress was preserved.

In the sub-continent a year ago today there was war between India and Pakistan. There also, some progress toward peace had been made. The Germanies have talked and hammered out an inter-agreement. Inevitably that will lead to membership in the United Nations and already has led to a reduction in tensions. There have been inter-communal talks on Cyprus, which in itself might seem insignificant, but which because of its geographical position has a wide political importance. The whole surrounding area is fraught with mischief if there is not peace on Cyprus.

There is something to be optimistic about because there is a chance for peace when countries that historically have not been willing to talk are at least sitting down trying to negotiate rather than to confront. The negotiations are being conducted outside the United Nations, but the concept that people should have regional or bi-lateral discussions that might lead to agreement is basic to and deeply ingrained in the charter of the United Nations.

The one basically troubled area in the world, where there are no talks going on, is in the Middle East. The best explanation for that situation may be in a story which the Israel Ambassador told to the General Assembly. The story was about a scorpion. There was a river in the Middle East which was flooded. The scorpion asked a turtle, "Will you take me across the river? I want to get over to the other side." The turtle said, "No, if I do you will sting me." The scorpion answered, "No, I won't sting you; you're the only way I've got to get over. If I stung you I couldn't make it. You'd be poisoned, and you'd drown, and I'd drown too." The turtle then agreed, saying, "Well, okay, I'll take you over." He was almost all the way across when the scorpion stung him. As the turtle was about to drown, taking with him the scorpion, he said, "Why did you sting me? We're both going to drown." The scorpion replied, "Because it's the Middle East." That story illustrates the depth of feeling and depth of frustration of some of the parties involved in this area.

My optimism about a world in transition is also in part optimism about the United Nations. Politically the United Nations is much less than its founding fathers thought it would be. Some, with a wonderful and wholesome idealism, thought it would provide an instant world government. It is not that. It is not going to be that for some time. The United States and the Soviet Union must work out some fundamental differences that exist about the role of the Security Council and the role of the Secretary General in peace-keeping, but there is a chance for success and for peace-keeping. There is a Cypress peace-keeping force at the present time. The United Nations clearly will have a role when and if peace arrives in the Middle East. The basic document for peace in the Middle East remains Security Council Resolution 242.


Moreover, even though the political functions are imperfect and fraught with frustrations, consideration must be given to the whole economic and social side of the United Nations — environment and population, narcotics and health, development, refugees, all of these things that can remove and have removed tensions of peoples before they might otherwise resort to war. These functions constitute 80 per cent of the United Nations' activity. Bengledesh Relief through the U.N. saved an untold number of lives. U.N. aid kept the area from famine and political deterioration. No headlines, nobody on TV about it, that was just a quiet job that it was better for the United Nations to do than for Americans to do bi-laterally.

Another little publicized benefit of the United Nations is that it provides the opportunity for peoples of different nations to acquire

some insight into the daily lives of others. That is peculiarly important between Chinese and the United States. Little things like an explanation of our celebrations of Thanksgiving can be most meaningful in providing a basis for understanding.

When we think about our own blessings, we have much for which to be thankful. Your previous discussions probably highlighted some of the problems, but I will bet there was a typically Texan matrix for optimism. When I look at the world, I think not just of our own bountiful harvest, not just of the dynamism that is our society, not just of the country that I am privileged to represent; I think also of the world in transition. There is much to be done. Undoubtedly there are hazards ahead, but as the world changes, there seems to be developing a general awareness that the world is too small for war. Negotiation is preferred over confrontation; new contacts are being made between foes — some ancient, some not so ancient. The United Nations is in transition away from the unrealistic super idealism of instant government toward effective economic and social progress in the alleviation of human suffering.

Thus, I do see something to be optimistic about, not naively optimistic, not optimistic to the point of unreality where we might underestimate the very threat that exists and that would exist even more if we permitted our country to grow weak. The optimism that I feel stems from change. It is optimism about peace.



SYMPOSIUMS

President Tate: We shall examine "Texas in Transition" as it is concerned with and affected by changes in I, Economy, II, Culture, and III, Politics. Symposium I, moderated by Morgan Davis, includes James Elkins Jr., Erik Jonsson, John Bennett, and Richard Gonzalez. On II, chaired by William Doty, we will hear from Henry Hopkins, Amy Lee, Kermit Hunter, and Eugene Bonnell. Lastly, on III, Fagan Dickson, Joe Frantz, Abner McCall and Tom Sealey will consider, with James Hart, Political Change.

I. ECONOMIC CHANGE

Elkin: I am honored to be part of the Philosophical Society of Texas' annual meeting here today. It is also a pleasure, as always, to be in this remarkable City of Dallas. In the financial world of Texas, Dallas has made tremendous strides and — through the vision and daring of its banking community — has often blazed financial trails for the rest of us in the same line of commerce. For that; we bankers feel a great debt of gratitude. This morning I would like to focus my remarks on Southeast Texas, the part of the State with which I am most intimately acquainted.

The people of Texas have always enjoyed a relative prosperity, thanks to the God-given combination of bountiful natural resources and imaginative citizenry. The Texas *earth* has been the greatest benefactor. From the initial stimulus of farming, cattle, and lumber, Texans were able to progress to an apex of economic growth with the literal and figurative unearthing of great petroleum reserves.

The Texas oil business came into its own south of Beaumont in 1901. That keystone in the economic history of the state was important also to the economy of the entire nation and the world for it gave impetus to the internal combustion engine, which in turn made automotive vehicles practical, revolutionized maritime transportation, and later made possible the age of aviation.

Through the early years of this century, the discovery of oil at Spindletop in the famous Lucas Gusher, financed by the Mellon brothers of Pittsburgh, led to the creation of such industrial giants as Gulf Oil Corporation, Texaco, Humble Oil and Refining Company, and others. As time passed, all of these companies, with the exception of Humble, moved their operating headquarters to the North and East. In recent years, however, most of these, including

Shell Oil Company, have returned their operations to Texas and especially to Houston.

Of equal importance, Spindletop was the starting point for an army of independent operators which spread out from Beaumont in every direction. Although the earliest refinery in Texas was at Corsicana, the first modern refineries with oil pipelines, docks and other essential facilities, started in the Beaumont-Port Arthur area. The opening of the Houston Ship Channel brought major oil company refining facilities and a concentration of important pipelines to Harris County.

Today, Houston is internationally recognized as the petroleum center of the nation, if not the world. Even as the energy shortage approaches the stage of crisis in this country, and oil and gas fields of Texas face almost impossible demands on their productivity, Houston's position of knowledge and sophistication in the world of petroleum seems to grow in importance. Since most major oil companies started expanding some time ago into the field of coal, nuclear energy, shale oil and thermal energy, it is apparent that in the future Houston will remain the energy center of the nation and the world.

Southeast Texas is the only area where all of the elements of petroleum, including exploration, production, transportation, marketing, refining, petrochemicals, synthetics, and oilfield equipment manufacturing, supply and service are so heavily concentrated. The concentration has resulted in a mass migration of new people, especially from the North and East, into the golden crescent of Southeast Texas — the Gulf Coast. These companies have brought new skills, new ideas, new attitudes, and new vigor to the remarkable life style of that section of the state. Growth has also been aided by a salubrious climate and unlimited opportunity for year-round sports and other leisure-time activities. All of this has made a myriad of new service industries and retail outlets flourish throughout the area. To say that oil and natural gas development along the Gulf Coast accelerated progress and prosperity would be something of an understatement.

While natural resources of Southeast Texas, including agriculture, lumber, water, and petroleum have provided the firm base for progress and prosperity, the important fact is that they have led to today's multi-faceted economy. Without these resources, that part of the state would hardly enjoy its enviable position in the world of industry, commerce and finance — or its rapidly expanding population. Yet, overall dependence on these resources is diminishing, for even as the energy base broadens beyond petroleum in the future,

wide diversification is promised in all forms of economic activity.

Concomitant to the development of petroleum and its allied industries in Southeast Texas, came the remarkable growth in construction, manufacturing, real estate, insurance, utilities, and finance. The coming of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration added another dimension to progress and world-wide recognition. The accompanying highly sophisticated world of science contributed much to development in the fields of technology, electronics and medicine.

Shipping, which is one of Southeast Texas' oldest industries — starting with the historical Port of Galveston and flourishing with the man-made ship channels at Houston, Beaumont and Port Arthur, as well as the much newer port facilities at Freeport faces a new era of unlimited growth. Presently, Southeast Texas should be the natural choice for one of the nation's new superports for the importation of petroleum from the rich oilfields of the Middle East, Africa, Southeast Asia, and South America. The recent wheat sale to the Soviet Union, which will probably lead to further such arrangements with additional goods for other nations of the world, will bring even greater activity to the ports of Southeast Texas in the next few years.

All these developments both required and inspired a modernization of the state's banking structure. Traditionally, Texas has been strapped with its limited intrastate unit banking system, whereby a sprawling, privately owned banking system has been unable to keep pace with and properly meet the growing needs of the state's economy. The pressing monetary problems of the 1930's retarded the implementation of more advanced, enlightened, and sophisticated banking developments. For years all of Texas' unit banks had difficulty in meeting the capital requirements of their constantly prospering customers. This forced many large borrowers to turn to banks outside the state to meet many of their financial needs. The state lost not only loans but also capital, as the necessity for customers to keep balances outside the state increased.

There was a threat in the direction of greater banking flexibility in 1956 when Congress passed the National Bank Holding Company Act. Amendments in 1966 and 1970 liberalized this important legislation and with each new phase the banking industry made significant progress. The changes came at the right time for all sections of Texas and allowed tremendous industrialization to develop in every direction.

Today the banking industry throughout the state is seeking to meet the challenge of a burgeoning economy by expanding asset

bases through multi-bank holding company structures. The geographic and economic coverage which this form of banking affords the entire state should produce a mutuality of benefits for industrial and financial communities everywhere. This new concept makes possible the free flow of financial resources and know-how between communities and markets on the basis of where they are most needed and where they can be most efficiently and economically employed. Certainly these expanded banking conditions mean that the days of provincial and petty competition between the prosperous areas of Texas are ending.

Southeast Texas and the Gulf Coast area should be as interested in the progress of Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio, the Panhandle, West Texas, and other parts of the state, as it is in its own growth. All are parts of the most dynamic, progressive, promising and prosperous state in the nation. Where this tremendous combination of natural, financial, and human resources is coupled with a determined effort for statewide progress, Texas will insure its role as the brightest star in this country's past, present, and future.

Jonsson: In order to establish a frame of reference, my comments will be directed toward that portion of the state lying north of a line extending from Andrews County in the west to Panola County in the east. This area contains 110 counties and nine Standard Metropolitan Areas (SMSA). The area may be divided into two parts: West Texas to the west of Wichita Falls and North Texas to the east. West Texas contains 70 counties and 4 SMSA's: Amarillo, Lubbock, Abilene, and Wichita Falls. North Texas contains 40 counties and 5 SMSA's: Dallas, Fort Worth, Sherman-Denison, Tyler, and the Texas portion of Texarkana.

In attempting to assess long-term economic change, and then to report this assessment in a brief period of time, one must cast about for one or two rather concise indicators. Shifts in population tell a great deal about the economic vitality. If a region is losing population, the indication is that the economic base of the region can no longer adequately support that level of population, and vice versa.

During the 1950 to 1960 decade, both areas experienced significant population gains. North Texas inhabitants increased by 24 per cent (2.0 million to 2.5 million), fueled in part by gains in the manufacture of durable goods, such as electronic components and equipment, aircraft, and autos. An oil boom helped push the population of West Texas up from 1.0 million to 1.2 million, a 20 per cent growth during the decade.

The patterns of the two areas shifted during the 1960 to 1970 decade. Manufacturing continued to grow in North Texas as did population: 2.5 million to 3.2 million, or 28 per cent; but the oil boom subsided in West Texas, and population declined from 1.2 million to 1.1 million, or 5 per cent. The population decline in West Texas was widespread, affecting 57 of the 70 counties included in the area.

Increase in the combined population of the two areas kept pace with that of the state during both decades. The population level as a per cent of the state total has remained constant at 39 per cent.

Growth of employment and shifts in employment by industry indicate trends both in the economic vitality of an area and in the diversity of its economic base. According to data which pertain to SMSA's only, total employment in West Texas has grown 32 per cent (127,000 to 168,000) during the past two decades. In the 1960-1970 decade, however, the gain was only 10 per cent. The North Texas area experienced an overall gain of 119 per cent (495,000 to 1,085,000), split rather equally between the two decades. Comparable figures for the state show a twenty-year gain of 52 per cent (2,760,000 to 4,181,000), with the majority of the overall percentage gain occurring in the latter decade.

Not surprisingly, there has been continuous shrinkage of agricultural employment levels, both absolute and relative, in each of the two areas as well as in the state. The decline may be attributed to the increasing intensification of capital in the agricultural industry.

Employment in the construction industry increased from 42,000 to 72,000 (1950-1970) in North Texas, but the gain was not sufficient to maintain its relative standing (8.5 per cent down to 6.7 per cent). Comparable data for West Texas and for the state indicate the same trend.

The big shift has been toward manufacturing, particularly in North Texas, where this industry has grown from 98,000 to 280,000 (186 per cent gain) between 1950 and 1970. Manufacturing now provides 26 per cent of the employment in North Texas, 12 per cent in West Texas and 17 per cent statewide. Comparable data for 1950 are 20 per cent, 8 per cent and 14 per cent, respectively, indicating a healthy thrust toward manufacturing. The trend is expected to continue.

There is a widespread concept that economy is becoming increasingly service-oriented, but that has not been true in North Texas. During the two decades, employment in the North Texas service industry broadly defined to include wholesale and retail

trade, utilities and finance grew from 323,000 to 705,000; but its relative share remained constant at 65 per cent. Surprisingly, in West Texas the relative share increased from 69 per cent to 76 per cent during the same period.

The past and present provide bases for predicting growth prospects. The Dallas-Fort Worth airport will unquestionably draw new businesses and industries to North Texas. In West Texas a new aspect of the cattle industry provides an interesting twist. The cattle feedlot business began in the high plains areas during the mid-1960's with a capacity for approximately 900,000 head. There are now more than 2 million cattle in the feedlots, placing Texas number one in this industry. Eight new feedlots are currently under construction. Several processing plants have already located in the area, and more are expected in the future as the industry increases its degree of vertical integration. An expected boost to North Texas should be a step-up in ranching activities in order to supply cattle to the West Texas feedlots. Cattle, which provided much of the original economic base for the west, appear to be coming to the foreground once again in a slightly different format.

If the past was good, the future looks equally bright. Some measure of this can be seen from the 1971 edition of the Economic Potentials Handbook published by the Goals for Dallas. The Handbook, prepared by the institute of Urban Studies of SMU, projects economic growth for the Dallas Metropolitan Area. Both population and employment are projected to increase at about the same rapid rate of the past decade. Total gross product is projected to reach over \$25 billion by 1985 compared to \$9.5 billion in 1970. The combined Dallas-Fort Worth area has been one of the leading growth areas of the state for the past decade, and all indications point that this growth will continue.

Bennett: Texas today is experiencing a phenomenal transition in the cattle business, largely resulting from a tremendous expansion of the feedlot business throughout the state and especially in the Panhandle. The massive impact caused by this growth of a single segment of the industry is without precedent. Virtually every facet of the beef business today, from commercial producers and marketing structures to distribution of the finished product, has felt the impact of the large feedlots.

There are four phases of the beef economy. The first is the producer who has a cow herd which is supposed to be a "calf factory." When the calf is weaned, it is sold to the feeder who owns the animal for about 5 months and adds about 400 pounds. The feeder sells to

the packer who in turn markets the slaughtered product to the retailer. New modern efficient packing plants have been built in the Panhandle to receive the product of the equally efficient feedlot operators.

To meet the increased meat consumption per capita and the population increase between now and 1980, the cattle business must produce 25 per cent more beef in the next eight years. The retailer, packer and feedlot operators are all geared to meet this challenge. What is the cow-calf operator doing about it? Frankly, as one in this latter business, I am afraid I must admit we are behind the times. There appears to be more slippage in the producer's antiquated procedure than anywhere else. What is the answer?

One of the most foresighted men in that business, Tom Lasater, has predicted, "As land values continue to rise, there will be fewer and fewer range operations and far more intensification. We call it 'stock farming' where the individual pushes the production capability of his land to the limit through the use of irrigation and fertilization."

These same high land prices can reasonably be expected to break up the huge ranches via the progressive estate tax. At the other end of the scale, however, the small operators with less than 100 cows will probably disappear. The cost of labor and the price of machinery will make it difficult for him to survive. The outlook is for fewer giant ranches and more large stock farms.

The calf crop percentage must be increased; we cannot afford a cow that misses a calf even one year. Cross breeding will continue and will probably include such exotic breeds as Limousin, Simmental and others. The best cycle will be controlled by hormones which will shorten the breeding season. Pregnancy testing will be widely used, and the technique of artificial insemination will be greatly improved. Calves will be tested for rate of gain and efficiency of feed conversion. A good gainer today will put on one pound for every seven pounds of feed. That ratio must be improved. There will be greater use of fertilizers, irrigation and chemicals.

Do I like all of this? Not a bit. I am a romantic. I love the big round ups, cutting horses, roping and branding, but those things are of the past. For example, identification in the future may well be made by an already invented pellet that can be inserted in a calf's ear. The pellet requires no power or battery. When the yearling walks through the chute, an electronic gimmick interrogates the pellet, and a computer prints out a complete history of the calf's parents, his weaning rate, his rate of gain, etc. Who invented this? Boeing Aircraft.

Research will be applied more rapidly than in the past. There will be an increasing use of business techniques, mechanism, inventory control, cost accounting, and the like. Better breeders will retain ownership of their yearlings through the feedlot to enjoy the profit from having raised efficient animals. In the competitive years ahead only the most resourceful cow-calf operator will survive.

Even now a rancher may round up and pen nearly 200 cows with the help only of a twelve year old son, a seven year old daughter, a horse and a pickup truck. He can drive out into the pasture and blow the horn of his truck. The cows, fed as heifers from the truck, recognize the sound and gather around the truck. Then the rancher can drive slowly to the pens while his daughter spills a few cotton seed pellets out of the back of the pickup. The son, on horseback, can push the few stragglers.

That is a far cry from the cigarette ad about "Marlborough Country." Maybe old time cattle men will have to start watching TV westerns with their children and grandchildren, as that may be the only way they can see the ranching they once loved.

Gonzales: Scores of large new buildings rising in major metropolitan areas provide evidence of the rapid growth of office work and service industries in the economy. The buildings are primarily administration headquarters, research laboratories, shopping centers, hotels, and facilities to house employees engaged in education, medical care, and government operations.

The trend continues away from blue collar jobs in agriculture, mining, construction, and manufacturing to white collar employment in offices, stores, banks, and other service institutions. For a number of years, employment has been declining in agriculture and mining, holding rather steady in construction and manufacturing, and increasing rapidly in government, in service, in trade, and in various financial activities.

Normal experience with births and deaths plus net migration into the State caused population in Texas to increase by 17 per cent in the 1960s. That gain moved Texas to fourth place behind California, New York, and Pennsylvania. The increase occurred principally in the four largest metropolitan areas which now account for about one half of the population of the state — namely, Houston, Dallas, San Antonio, and Fort Worth. Houston and Dallas both experienced population increases of 40 per cent in the 1960s. Population on farms and in rural areas has declined. In Texas, only 20 per cent of the population lived in rural areas in 1970 compared with 37 per cent in 1950.

Per capita income in Texas has been improving at a slightly better rate than the average for the nation. For 1972 the average will be about \$3,850, nearly twice the level of 1960, reflecting substantial real gains as well as some change resulting from decline in the purchasing power of the dollar. The state still falls about 10 per cent below the national average in per capita income. An important factor contributing to this difference is the relatively high proportion of minority groups with low levels of education and income.

Opportunities for good employment are best in metropolitan areas and in jobs requiring technical skills in addition to general education.

The smooth functioning of businesses and households becomes more dependent on specialists with technical knowledge and experience. The advantages of specialization in terms of efficiency continue to work toward urban living and economic interdependence.

Concentration of millions of people into small areas creates new environmental problems that demand attention and good solutions at reasonable costs. The solutions will not be found in an unattainable and undesirable return to the past. The problems of big cities must be solved instead by institutional and technological advances which can improve the environment at the same time that the opportunity is provided for capable workers to enjoy rising real income.

Although Texas has been moving away from its earlier heavy reliance on output of raw materials, it still leads the nation in mineral production. The value of mineral production in Texas increased from \$2.7 billion in 1950 to \$4.1 billion in 1960 and to \$6.3 billion in 1970. While this value continues to increase at a rate of about 4 per cent a year, a distinct decline in the development of new resources must be noted as the highly significant change that will affect Texas and the nation in the future.

Production of oil and gas are now at capacity levels after some 23 years during which output was restricted by the size of available markets. Texas' production for 1972 is estimated at more than 1.2 billion barrels of crude oil and about nine trillion cubic feet of natural gas, equivalent in energy content to 1.7 billion barrels of crude oil. It should be noted that gas provides more energy than oil, a highly significant fact in view of the environmental advantages of gas. Furthermore, gas from wells in the United States is much cheaper than any liquefied natural gas imported from overseas. Considering oil and gas together in the quantities used and needed by consumers, domestic supplies are cheaper than imports as well as

more secure and of greater benefits in terms of employment, income, and tax revenues.

The reserves known to exist in Texas as a result of drilling to date have declined in the past five years by 7 per cent for oil and by 18 per cent for natural gas. Reserves and production will continue to decline from current levels unless Federal policies are improved to encourage more exploration, discovery, and development of oil and gas. Geologists estimate that potential resources exist for further expansion of production, but the remaining resources appear to be smaller, deeper, and more expensive to develop. It is clear, therefore, that improved technology and better prices in keeping with costs will be required to reverse the incipient downward trend in production of oil and gas in Texas. Oil and gas have provided such substantial contributions to local and state tax revenues that any significant decline in output and value would have far reaching consequences for all the residents of the state.

The inevitable increase in energy demands required to meet economic goals and aspirations, such as the reduction of poverty, poses serious problems for this nation as it becomes more and more dependent on imports. These problems can be alleviated and possibly solved by more rapid development of domestic energy, including nuclear power. Now that gas reserves are fully committed on long-term contracts, electric utilities in Texas are turning to lignite and to nuclear power for future expansion of capacity to meet the needs of customers. Energy from these sources will cost more than the electricity generated from cheap gas, but will have to be used because gas will not be available in the quantities needed and will be more expensive. Even at higher costs, oil, gas, and electricity will still be bargains in terms of their value in improving productivity and living standards and in providing power needed to achieve desirable environmental improvements.

Nuclear power provides a good example of how knowledge and capital can be utilized to make available to society resources previously of no value. Einstein's concept of the relation between mass and energy can now be put to practical use for the welfare of mankind. Power from the atom will become of increasing importance and may have as great an impact on the next century as oil and gas have had in the present century.

In conclusion, the steadily increasing role of technical knowledge and capital commands attention as the outstanding aspect of the continuing economic transition in Texas. Much has been accomplished since 1940 when this state was still predominantly rural and

heavily dependent on agriculture and raw materials. Much remains to be done before this century ends to improve further the economic welfare of most families, especially those still at or below the middle rungs of the ladder of opportunity which some have been so fortunate as to ascend rapidly.

Education, capital, mineral energy, and individual initiative have been responsible for past progress and will be the keys to future advances. We cannot afford to turn against technology and retreat back to another dark age. Our only intelligent course is to move forward with more attention to planning ahead as a means of enhancing the good aspects of progress and of bringing the undesirable side effects under control. The intelligence and capacity to build a better world is at our command if we have the will to move forward with courage and confidence.

II. CULTURAL CHANGE

Hopkins: The currently accepted role of an art museum in America is defined as being "an institution which collects works of art, preserves those works of art for posterity and interprets them for its audience." This is a fairly new definition, accepted by the American Association of Museums, and while American art museums have traditionally been more education oriented than their European counterparts, it has been only in the last forty years that such emphasis has been placed upon interpretation. Art museums are now, beyond anything else, educational institutions. But, it should not be forgotten that they are educational institutions which rely for their effectiveness upon the quality of the collections and the state of preservation of the objects to be interpreted. For, in true art education, as opposed to much of what passes under that title, the art object is not only the tool for educational purposes but is also in itself and in its conjunction with other objects from different and similar times and cultures an education. Perhaps a quick look into why, how and what a public institution collects will yield up the key to this seeming paradox.

First why — man as an individual seems to collect by instinct. He likes to gather around himself bits and pieces of the droppings of mankind. Sometimes this collecting habit has no clear purpose but generally it reflects a desire in the individual to be a part of something larger than himself — to be part of a continuum — in touch with the past and the present through which there is some implication of a future. The why of public collection is simply an extension of that individual principal at a larger and more im-

portant level because it is communally financed and purposefully collected with expertise.

How one collects can be private and personal, sometimes to the point of mania, or public, as is the role of the art museum. Public in this sense means the concerted functioning of informed minds towards the collection and preservation of art objects which not only stand as creative landmarks in their own right but which also reflect in a reasonably unbiased fashion social, cultural and historical evolution.

What one collects can be determined by interest or by dictate which again separates the private from the public collection since the policies concerning what one collects in a public museum are dictated by a collective governing board.

A good current example of the real benefits of collective action on the part of men of good will can be found in Fort Worth, Texas. That city, blessed with three art museums, has had the good fortune to be able to rely upon the various boards to function for the public good by intelligently dividing up the history of art and assigning each institution a role which it can handle both financially and expertly: the Kimbell Art Museum, the history of art with the exception of American and recent art; the Amon Carter Museum, American art except the most recent; and the Art Center Museum, recent art of all nations. This uniquely cooperative situation is already returning handsome educational and societal dividends.

For example, even though there are great gaps yet to be filled, for the first time in Texas museum history, in one community one can on any given day witness man's artistic achievement and his estimate of himself through time. Thus the educational tool becomes the educator. A situation is provided where each visiting personality can, according to his broad or narrow vision, educated or uneducated view of art as such, find sustenance. He can escape into an English landscape, confront the realities and fancies of contemporary expression or play cowboys and Indians. Art has the sometimes almost overwhelming capacity to signify personal achievement at the same time that it is taking a social stance and serving as an historical document. Few documents are as accurate as the artifacts of any given period. They cannot lie. Interpretation of an object can be, and is, twisted to meet varying social needs, but the object remains as truth.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, it is the action of man, for whom art is produced, which determines by virtue of what is preserved, what face a given era will present to the future. Sometimes foolish

decisions are made as when the Egyptian government, after the 18th dynasty ruler Ikhnaton, felt that it could erase his monotheistic influence by destroying documents and crumbling his stone images. Fortunately, no destruction is ever complete so that through a limited number of objects, his misty presence is still felt.

In almost every American art museum confrontation with the individual work of art is backed up with changing exhibitions which are calculated to amplify through numbers the ideas about which individual works may only make hints. Hundreds of art publications, scholarly and popular, are produced annually to interpret and re-interpret art according to the sensibility of the times. Lectures and films and tours are made available to museum visitors to provide information and variety. One likes to feel that all of these various enterprises are having something to do with building art awareness and involvement for the future benefit of the individual and the community. One hopes that with each passing year art interpretation is getting closer to the truth of the object which it pretends to represent.

And yet, ultimately, real art awareness — real knowledge of the power, the compassion, the majesty of art — real understanding of its meaningfulness to each succeeding generation — real feeling for its strength of determination to exist in all times at all places — can only be gained through individual confrontation with the object itself. In the end result, most of art educational efforts seem to be games that we play with ourselves to divert attention from — to de-energize — the very power source. Perhaps we fear the truth that art is its own education.

Lee: On Sunday, January 14, 1973, the University of Texas will open an exhibition of my work comprised of painting and sculpture of an experimental nature, during the five-year period from 1965 through 1972.

Will the exhibition be typical of the art work that is being executed by contemporary artists in Texas, the Southwest and/or in the United States? The answer is, "yes," but in a very ironical way. If you believe in the truth of the following statement written by Dr. Carl G. Jung in his book, *The Archetypes and the Creative Unconscious*, then my work and my exhibition are typical in that they bespeak the individual expression of at least one living artist:

"Individuation means becoming a single, homogeneous being, and, in so far as 'individuality' embraces our innermost, last, and incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one's self. We could, therefore, translate individuation as 'coming to

selfhood' or 'self-realization' . . . the self is our life's goal, for it is the completest expression of that fateful combination we call individuality."

By all of man's abilities, perhaps the one that has intrigued him the most is the enigmatic potential called creativity. Scholars from many different disciplines have hunted this elusive bird, but, ironically, they have not even been certain about its natural habitat save for some comparatively vague notion that it flies from the uncharted area of intuition.

Among the most fascinating contemporary studies of creativity are Dr. Hanns Sach's *The Creative Unconscious* and Brewster Ghiselin's anthology, *The Creative Process*. As for definitions of creativity, none seems to surpass that of Michael Drury:

"Creativity is change in a forward direction; it is a quickening, a yearning up, a search . . . A simple purpose, seen, loved, understood and acted upon. Creativity is work that goes some place; it is sustained effort toward an ideal. It is not so much an aptitude as an attitude; it is not the kind of work we do but our disposition toward it . . . being creative is a discovery . . . like getting born or dying, it is something one does alone."

The chicken and the egg argument has never been really settled for me. While I believe that the point of origin lies primarily in the intuitive process, I, at times, think that the door of the bird's cage is opened by the conscious mind, which then had to retreat and hide so that the bird would not be afraid to leave the cage and fly freely. I agree with my philosopher friend, Dr. Ruth Nanda Anshen, who says that everything depends on the "aims we cherish." All of my life I have cherished two basic aims, to be humane and to be an artist. I have tried assiduously and sustainedly to achieve those goals. Through intuition, intellect, emotion and experience, I have learned that there are two fundamental principles, that of interrelation and that of "reverence for life," which if used as motivations for conduct, will lead to the achievement of these aims.

Francis Thompson's superb poem is the Foreword for my exhibition, because in five lines he says succinctly all I hope to convey about my purpose and motivation:

"All things, by immortal power,
Near or far, Hiddenly
To each other linked are,
That Thou canst not stir a flower
Without troubling a star."

Since I believe that everything in the universe is part of a divine creation, I believe that I am consonantly related to every mineral,

vegetable, insect, fish, reptile, bird, animal and man. For many reasons, including that of enlightened self-interest, I am convinced that human survival itself depends upon the application of a high quality of awareness to every aspect of life. Unless human conduct is motivated by the philosophy of "reverence for life," soon there will be no earth on which to exact any purpose or event. While the underlying theme of this exhibition and all of its details from concept through media to execution is the principle of interrelation, the cognizance of this principle and my attempts to express it with love through the art forms I have created comprise the *raison d'être* of this show.

In some ways, this entire exhibition can be thought of as a large scale assemblage, because I want in every detail from the aforementioned concepts through media to completed art object to suggest the major theme of interrelation. Among the categories of art forms you will find drawing, painting, sculpture, collage and assemblage, and among the media, paper, pencil, ink, watercolor, X-ray, film, photography, plastic, neon (gas and electricity), wood, metal, shell, bone, rock and flowers. Regardless of the number, they all add up to ONE! Not only is this not new math, actually, it is as old as man himself.

Specifically, how did I plan to make witness, through my art work, of my belief in the principle of interrelation and my faith that the paramount responsibility of every human being is to put this belief into practice in his daily conduct primarily by having "reverence for life" and by being, above all else, HUMAN with all of life? I knew that if I hoped to be successful in persuading western man in my own time, that I would first of all have to be realistic. My late, distinguished teacher, Dr. Raymond E. Roehl, always stressed the necessity to try to experience reality but cautioned that in order to do so one had to understand the nature of reality. Dr. Roehl often quoted his colleague, the late philosopher, Dr. John G. Vance, who wrote:

"From first to last the Principle of Causality is bound up in our thought with the 'fact' of change or becoming."

Dr. Roehl tried to persuade his students that reality is comprised of inevitable change, flux and development and that if one hoped to know the reality of another human being, he had to observe that person develop from the infant to the young child, the youth, the mature person, the aged and the dead.

Later on, I added to what I had learned from Dr. Roehl some wise counsel from the artist to whose work I feel most closely akin, Paul Klee, who wrote:

“Not form, but forming, not form as a final appearance, but form in the process of becoming as genesis.”

Because I am anxious to experience reality, I have tried to observe people, places and things as they grow and change. Since I also have the desire to share these experiences, and since I am a painter, the core of the paintings in my exhibition centers around five series or developments of the aforementioned philosophic concept of reality as change, and so I have used the overall title of “Reality Is Becoming.” In retrospect, it seems to me that the basic concept for the entire series was conceived in my intellect after I became cognizant of the philosophic principle of becoming. As I review the development of the series in its five phases, while the progression seems quite logical, I have no memory of having started with a master plan or blueprint. My feeling is that the egg was incubated and hatched in my conscious mind but grew in the lush rain forest of intuition where it learned to take wing and fly.

Throughout the entire series, I have used a number of successive pages for each work in order to give the concept of growth and development literal interpretation through physical manifestation. The specific manner in which I treated the handling of the pages bespeaks the growth and, I trust, the blossoming.

Series I consists of drawing and painting on only one side of the pages, conventionally framed. To provide another dimension to the depiction of becomingness, I have presented the paintings in Series II in quite another manner. Again, although several pages are used to show the stages of growth, each page is framed separately so that every single unit is a painting in itself but at the same time forms part of the overall individual painting as well as part of the consummate statement. Since every framed unit is designed to be turned like pages of a book should the viewer so desire, still another insight into becoming is made available. Also, in Series II both sides of each page are painted to create shadow as well as substance, polyphony as well as melody and subtlety as well as directness. Just as the Cubists endeavored to imbue the art of painting with a quality it innately lacks, namely motion, through their use of a device known as “simultaneity of vision.” So I, too, have tried to enhance the nature of painting by bringing a device of motion *per se* to its otherwise static self.

My colleague, William Moore, who served as the creative engineer for this exhibition, deserves credit for the idea that became the springboard Series III. One day when we were working on Series II, he asked in a casual way why I did not execute some paintings on architectural tracing paper. Why not? SERIES III is the obvious result. Through Series III, I have used successive pages, some of which I have painted on both sides but framed traditionally.

From that point the development grows more unconventional. Series IV depicts the process of wrestling directly with reality. The earlier series were designed to provide an insight into the reality of the subjects primarily by employing several pages for each work to convey actual evolution of the individual work and by painting on both sides of both regular watercolor paper and tracing paper to permit the viewer literally to penetrate the painting's surface. Series IV is still another step toward complete revelation. It is comprised of the pure essence of painting — light. The paintings are designed to be seen from both sides and through! They provide visual hints that a common meeting ground for painting and sculpture has been established and, further, that the field is highly likely to be occupied in the immediate future.

Series V fulfills the promise by providing a three-dimensional motorized form which not only contains a painting as part of its innate self but also brings the visual presentation of "Reality Is Becoming" full round by literally turning each part of the painting so that the viewer may observe the becomingness of the work as well as its reality!

Because I believe that there is nothing new in the world, I am delighted to be able to use "The Way of Suiseki", an ancient Chinese and Japanese expression of man's "reverence for life" *per se* and for nature, especially rocks, in particular in my meteorological surrealism series. The name of the game is to put oneself so in tune with the universe that one can know from experience what Loren Eiseley knows when he says, "The very flight of birds is a writing to be read."

Hunter: Theatre in the United States was culturally insignificant until the 20th century. The Southwest was one of the last places for theatre to penetrate. During the frontier days of the 1800's there were a few traveling companies that visited Texas and the Southwest, but west of Fort Worth there was not too much city life in the 1800's and, therefore, little theatre except an occasional home-talent play, or a solitary traveling company perhaps once a year or so: El Paso, Tombstone, Virginia City, and on toward San Francisco.

Dallas was no exception; theatrical enterprises in the 1800's were hard to find.

In the early 1900's, while the East and Midwest had showboats, traveling companies, minstrel shows, and other kinds of entertainment, little swept down into Texas until after the First World War. Then there was a spasm of town theatres, or community theatres, where local citizens did a play or two each year. By 1920 relatively good New York shows, making tours occasionally, stopped off in Dallas and Houston.

Then came motion pictures, spreading into every corner of the nation, including the most remote town of the Southwest. The old English spelling of t-h-e-a-t-r-e was changed to t-h-e-a-t-e-r, and usually pronounced THEE-ater, and even today this spelling usually refers to the motion picture house; whereas the stage play is done in a t-h-e-a-t-r-e. By 1940 Texas had as many theatres and thee-aters as any other state, and such organization as the Dallas Little Theatre achieved real stature, creating an audience hungry for live entertainment. Texas was hungry, and it became known as a warm place to perform, a good movie state.

Then came television, and while New York and Hollywood struggled to find out how to deal with this new medium, pouring all kinds of entertainment forms into the cavernous jaws of the new machine, places such as Texas simply accepted both and went their way, glad to have another form of entertainment. The happy marriage of these two was finally achieved to some extent in the 1960's with the so-called "late movie" on TV, the use of old films for TV entertainment, to fill up the long hours of TV where there were sponsors to spend money and where entertainment had to be found. The final step came in the late 60's with the TV companies actually filming moving pictures independently for showing on television, with no thought of a movie house. Meanwhile, the motion picture houses found that the smart thing was to have four, six, or eight auditoriums and show as many as six or eight different shows simultaneously, all the while making more money on popcorn and candy than on ticket sales. The movie house of today is half theatre and half eating place. We have a whole generation of people who cannot think of a movie except in terms of popcorn. Take away the popcorn and people will stay away simply because sitting down to watch a screen is synonymous with sitting down to eat. Nowadays the TV viewer likewise must munch in order to enjoy the show, munch or drink beer.

Meanwhile the town theatre prospered, the little theatre, the community theatre, or whatever we choose to call a live stage performance. Dallas built a Theatre Center, and Houston built Alley Theatre, both famous as semi-professional stages, and both proving that live entertainment is here to stay. Theatre has always had a "bad name," because the Puritans who fled from England brought with them a rigid moral code that forbade anything which could be interpreted as immorality on the stage, and theatres were associated with all manner of evil. For a girl to leave home and go on the stage meant the primrose path to perdition, unless, of course, like Tallulah Bankhead, she happened to become famous; in which case she was always welcomed home on a visit with much fanfare. Censorship and morality have had a lot to do with theatre, especially here in the Southwest, and it seems too bad somehow.

The artist does not preach, or sermonize, or attempt to correct the morals of the world around him. He leaves that to the church, to the school, to the essayist, the moralist. The artist is concerned with entertainment, with creating some kind of symmetry and beauty out of disorder and chaos. The artist is done a disfavor if accused of immorality or lack of ethics, because he had no more professional concern with such matters than a plumber or astronaut. His job is to create something which the public is willing to pay to see, and which has something thrilling and exciting about it, not moral or immoral, but artistic and challenging.

Thus, the theatre is a mirror of the times, and plays are at their best when they imitate life, when they present action which is believable and acceptable, when they lead to understandings and fulfillments which otherwise would not have been experienced. Those characteristics are basis to all great theatre; the state of the theatre reveals the state of society.

Fortunately, the theatre is now in good condition — the theatre of live actors performing on a stage, with lighting, scenery, costumes, and the rest. In that type of theatre there are three major areas of consideration: educational theatre, professional theatre, and amateur or community theatre.

Educational theatre encompasses programs in colleges, universities, junior colleges, and high schools. There must be in Texas three hundred or more, and they run the gamut from bad to good. Obviously there is not enough time in high school or junior college to produce outstanding theatre. The important point is that more plays are being done now than ever before, more audiences are gathering to see plays, and more money is being spent. The average overall

growth in Texas colleges and universities has been around 10 per cent a year. Theatre enrollments grow about 20 per cent a year.

Professional theatre consists mainly of such institutions as the State Fair Musicals, the dinner theatres, and the various plays which are brought to Texas by professional touring companies. These, likewise, have shown an increase in recent years, because people seem fascinated with the live performance, perhaps because they grow tired of the television screen. Dallas has three or four dinner theatres. Houston has half a dozen. There are professional performances all over the state from time to time.

Community theatre, some of it very highly professional, and much of it with professional or paid performers, is fairly good in Texas. The more famous ones perhaps are at Midland, Dallas, San Antonio, and Houston. Art Cole has made the Midland theatre a model of community involvement. Nina Vance has a national institution in the Alley Theatre at Houston, and Paul Baker has brought renown to Dallas with the Theatre Center. These theatres are a combination of three types, because they provide educational training, they provide professional or semi-professional quality, and they also involve community or amateur workers. There are hundreds of others: in the Dallas area alone there are eight community theatres doing four or five plays a year, in areas such as Garland, Irving, Arlington, Mesquite, Richardson, and so on.

Art Cole, at Midland, reports that audiences have increased at least 25 per cent in the last ten years, and memberships in the organization at least that much. The growth of children's theatres in connection with these community theatres has also been phenomenal, and there is no sign of any slowdown. According to Art Cole, the impact of TV in the past ten years has been of tremendous value for two reasons: it increases the human appetite for good entertainment, especially for live entertainment, and it improves and raises the amateur level of acting by forcing amateurs to be better performers.

Pulling this together leads to the following conclusions about Texas in transition:

1. The three forms of theatre in Texas (Educational, Community, Professional) are all prospering; audiences are increasing; and the level of performance is improving.

2. The impact of television still remains to be estimated. The idea of sitting comfortably in a living room, a camper by a lake, or a private club and seeing movies, sports events, and plays on a large

screen, in color, is the major entertainment factor of our time. The State of Texas had made some giant steps in dealing with these new forms: (A) The State has encouraged film making, so that Texas now stands third in the nation. Dallas is the Number 3 film-making center, after New York and Hollywood; (B) Governor Preston Smith appointed a director for film activity, and the office has done an excellent job in attracting the industry to this State.

3. Federal and state aid for theatres has been growing in recent years. At the last granting by the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, two grants out of a total of 41 were made in Texas, and both were comparatively large. \$75,000 went to the Alley Theatre in Houston and \$35,000 to the Dallas Theatre Center. Fifteen of the 41 grants were smaller than either of these.

4. A healthy theatre ordinarily reflects a healthy cultural atmosphere, but that is not always true. Theatre can flourish during the darkest periods, and at times the golden ages produce only a lackluster theatre. The signs in Texas, however, point to a growing interest: a deeper awareness, a broader understanding.

There are, however, two areas of real concern. The first is the absence of a native theatre growing out of Texas itself. A Texas theatre has not happened here in the same way that it has happened in North Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, California. Few plays are being written about Texas. Perhaps motion pictures have taken over Texas, on the assumption that anything this big cannot be brought into the theatre. But what about the giant character of Sam Houston, or Mirabeau Lamar, or Stephen Austin? No monumental play or movie has been produced about any of these men. Texas had not inspired playwrights as it has painters and musicians and dancers. Only the Paul Green production at Palo Duro Canyon speaks this state, and that is not indoor theatre.

A second item of concern is the whole matter of entertainment in the life of this nation. While Art Cole at Midland believes that TV and motion pictures help the live stage, there are far-sighted men in various places who wonder what the future is going to bring to the entertainment world. They speak of the great turn to the outdoors, to boating, to hiking and camping, to "activity" entertainment. They point to empty motion picture houses as signs that the public wants a different kind of entertainment. They speak of cable television, or cassette television, where one can choose his own entertainment, his own drama, by either renting or buying a tape. They point to the incredible number of automobiles as indications of a people devoted to wheels and motion and restlessness, and they

end up by saying that our entertainment in the future will be in small doses, a few minutes at a time snatched here and there in the car, the mobile home, the restaurant, where plays and symphonies and operas will be a thing of the past because they are too long, too slow and boring, requiring too much thought and concentration.

In reply one can only point to England in 1640. The theatre died out completely. Performances were banned by law, playwrights disappeared, and for twenty years there was nothing anywhere. Yet in 1660 it all came back. With every temporary eclipse there has invariably come a new beam of light. The theatre is changing, not dying. The people of today demand a closer study of the human mind, more intense involvement, more psychological study; but the final end is the same: to amuse, entertain, excite, challenge, capture the imagination. The theatre will not die as long as there is one man to sit and look at another.

Bonelli: Transition in music in Texas is a part of a general cultural transition. Even as far back as 1956, Lynn White, Jr., writing in *Frontiers of Knowledge*, noted that a number of major canons of culture, as he called them, were changing. The canon of the Occident dates back to the days of the Greeks. This is the unexamined assumption that civilization *par excellence* is that of the Western tradition. Today, this canon of the Occident is being displaced by the canon of the Globe. Few realize the extent to which ordinary actions and thoughts are being framed according to non-Occidental models. Here in Texas the sea trade on the coast and the expanding contacts to be brought about by our new international air terminals will accelerate this thrust.

The second major canon inherited from the Greeks is the canon of logic and language. For more than 2,000 years in the West, it has been axiomatic that logic and language are perfected instruments of intellectual analysis and expression; but there is a new and more complex canon today, one that does not deny the validity of logic and language, but which puts it in a wider context. The second new canon is the canon of symbols. The distinctive thing about the human species is that man is a symbol-making animal. Even the way experience is reported by the senses may be structured by the conventions of language, art or the like. The most important aspect of the canon of symbols is realization that while man creates the symbols, these creatures in a peculiar way come alive, turn upon us, and coerce us and our experience to conform to the anatomy.

From the Greeks again comes the canon of rationality which assumes that reason is the supreme attribute and that anything

other than rationality is to be deplored as sub-human. The world now, however, dominated by the canon of the unconscious. The realization of the scope, the dangers, and the potentialities of the unconscious is essential to the new view of the person.

Almost through Western history it has been assumed and consciously taught that some types of human activity are more worthy of study and reverence than others, because the contemplation of them seemed to bring greater spiritual rewards. This canon of a hierarchy of values, expressed most clearly in the ancient concept of the liberal arts, has now turned at right angles to become a new canon of the spectrum of values. Whereas the old canon insisted that some human activities are by their nature more intellectually and spiritually profitable than others, the new canon holds that every human activity enshrines the possibility of greatness. These concepts of cultural change provide a necessary perspective for understanding the realities of music in Texas today.

An answer to the question "What is music?" seems far more difficult in 1972 than it did even ten years ago. Before 1900, a style or school in any of the arts endured as a rule for many generations. Compared with these earlier times, the tumultuous changes in the music of the last 72 years roar like a whirlwind. Paralleling the speed of other cultural changes, new compositional practices have followed one another in an accelerating pace. Since 1956, the impact of electrical technology has literally transformed soundscape as composers use electronically produced sounds both alone and integrated with other musical instruments and voices. Marshall McLuhan's concept of the "Global Village" certainly can be seen in music.

Beginning with the influence of Oriental and Near Eastern music in the compositions of Debussy, Stravinsky, and Bartok written earlier in this century, there has been an increasingly eclectic quality in the works of many Western composers of various nationalities. The new and expanded mediums of communication and the speed of travel have broken down the barriers between formerly distinct cultural traditions. In addition to Western concert music, today there are opportunities to listen to European and American folk music, both rural and urban, jazz, and various types of contemporary popular music, avant garde music incorporating all kinds of sounds, and the unbelievably vast repertoires of Asia and Africa, not to mention hybrids among all of these found in the works of both serious composers and popular groups. The distinction between composer and performer becomes cloudy as composers write what is called "chance music" in which some of the organizing responsi-

bility is delegated to the performer at the time of the performance. There is a striking parallel between this compositional style in music and the changing quality of kinetic art.

Basically, music is sound. Sound becomes noise when it is displeasing and unwanted. Sound becomes music when it is pleasing and wanted. Music is sound organized in such a way that small units combine to produce larger units which are perceived as having a coherent relationship.

Historically, there are two parallel streams of musical development in Texas: one educational and the other professional. Beginning with Southwestern University in 1840 and Baylor University in 1845, Texas has seen a gradually accelerating expansion of its educational establishments to accommodate the aspirations of its population. During the last fifty years music has become part of the curriculum of public as well as private schools, so that today, the department and schools of music in the colleges and universities form one of the major musical resources of the state. As centers of performance, composition, and musical scholarship, each institution now serves as an important cultural center for the community in which it is situated.

The growth of urban centers over the last 50 years brought an increasing interest in the establishment of professional music performing organizations. Major orchestras have developed in Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio. There are varying types of community or professional orchestras from Corpus Christi to Amarillo and from El Paso to Texarkana. Dallas, Ft. Worth, Houston and San Antonio have grand opera companies and in the last decade, Dallas, Houston and San Antonio have all received important new or renovated performance facilities.

Popular music is unquestionably another vital part of Texas life, both through recordings and live appearances. Dallas particularly has evolved as a center for commercial music and recording companies. Texas is also rich in groups with individual ethnic identity: Czechs, Germans, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, and the blacks. The music of each is receiving more attention and exposure in today's complex and eclectic mixture.

Two facets of Texas' recent economic growth have also had a profound effect on music. One is the development of the shopping center, which has now become a sort of cultural center in its own right providing lectures, art exhibits, and formal and informal concerts. The other factor is expanded communication media bringing

the sound of music into homes and automobiles. The development of two and four-track stereo systems has produced a profound change in the concert-going habits of the population.

In light of this complex fabric of music in Texas today, let me assume for a moment the role of a diagnostician to focus on some of our most pressing problems, particularly in relation to professional music organizations. Musicians in educational institutions often suffer from a disease I will call "academniasis." This may be defined as a mental aberration which consists of believing that all significant knowledge is to be found within the confines of one's particular institution, that what his department is doing is all that is significant. In terminal cases the sufferer concludes that he alone has all the answers. This particular disease relieves the sufferer of the necessity of listening either to students or to colleagues, much less those outside academia. As a result, curricular patterns and methodology are often antiquated and ineffective, both in training future musicians for careers that actually exist and in building larger, aesthetically sensitive audiences for music.

Professional musicians and managers of symphonies and opera companies can have a similar closed vision which I will call "professionalitis." Here the sufferer believes that the only real musicians are the professionals, and what they determine is good for the public is not open to question. Managers have simple needs — more and more money, a large and enthusiastic audience, and a reticence on the part of boards to ask any questions about what they are doing, why they are doing it, or if it is really significant in the musical life of the community. The striking absence of strong relationships between the academic and professional music communities has not been just a Texas phenomenon but has existed all over the United States. Recently in Dallas, Walter Anderson, program director in music for the National Endowment, referred to this situation as not only a waste of resources but a dispirited, humiliating, and schizophrenic posture.

Then there is that segment of music consumers who suffer from a disease I will call "dilitantitis." Here the patient believes that concert music is good for social prestige, civic pride, or the attraction of industry, but for God's sake don't expect him to enjoy it. This category of people has been referred to by Norman Lloyd as the "Music Lovers" — people who really do not like music. It is an excellent though boring prelude to after concert parties, and many men find it a useful diversion for their wives while they watch professional football games.

The seriousness of the financial situation currently facing symphonies and opera companies was pointed up earlier this year in a report written by two associates of the consulting firm of McKenzie and Company and published in the June issue of the *American Symphony Orchestra League Bulletin*. It was the first nationwide case study of the Arts made by professional business consultants, and it analyzed 48 major symphony orchestras with over 65 million in operating expenses. They reached some conclusions which I believe in broad principle apply to all the arts and are particularly applicable to professional music companies in Texas.

First, professional music groups, and by implication, other non-profit arts institutions are defenseless against increased inflation.

Two, their financial plight is at a crisis level and will worsen in the years ahead as costs of staff and performing artists rise.

Three, the solution of higher ticket prices and fewer concerts is not in the national interest as such action would sharply reduce these services to the general public.

Four, public sector support from federal, state and local government has been meager, only 9 per cent of operating cost, with federal aid barely 3.5 per cent of the cost in 1971.

Five, healthy operations can only be accomplished by an immediate and sharp increase in both federal and local government support to approximately 20 to 25 per cent of future operating cost.

Six, there must be an undertaking by the private sector to expand its share of total costs, particularly in relation to corporate giving potential.

Seven, there do not appear to be any other alternatives to such sharply increased public sector support.

From all this, it may appear that concert music, both in Texas and the nation, is in the state of crisis. That may indeed be true, but I would like to point out that when written in Chinese, the word "crisis" is composed of two characters — one represents danger and the other represents opportunity. Perhaps the crisis here also offers opportunities.

Music has something big going for it. Simply put, the enjoyment of music is truly for everyone, and today music is probably a part of the lives of more people than ever before in history. Just as the problems of pollution are dramatically causing people to protect the ecology, so the increasing disappearance of the human aspects of life is gathering people to the cause of all the arts. Almost without realizing it, the automation of living, the coldness of cities, the roar of concrete highways has created a vacuum, a void in the humane-

ness of society; and as this vacuum increases, the hunger for the arts in human expression rises. The new diversity of life styles and interests has destroyed a single monolithic audience for one type of music in one kind of location. All kinds of music have a rightful place in the life of Texas. A vital musical culture demands not only professional groups of the highest quality but also a new diversity in music opportunities and programming which recognizes the diversity of people. By necessity the academic and professional communities throughout the State are beginning to join hands with the business and civic leaders to think about the function of music as it affects the total community. Recently Dallas hosted the first North Texas Music Forum, bringing together representatives from the professional organizations, the academic institutions, and business and civic leaders of Dallas, Ft. Worth, and Denton to talk about problems and goals as well as the establishment of an ongoing machinery for regional cooperation and communication between these various segments. The financial problems of professional music groups may be eased in the coming years through the efforts of a great grass roots music lobby which is collectively asking the leaders of government to do for the arts in the 1970's what was done for the sciences in the '50's and '60's. Amyas Ames, chairman of the Partnership for the Arts and the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, stated recently in Minneapolis that he believed this will be the year for the Arts in the Congress of the United States. He predicted a meaningful commitment by the federal government to the Arts, perhaps starting at over a hundred million next year and rising by steps to two hundred million dollars. To promote this objective, he announced that the Associated Councils of the Arts, an organization working closely with all the state and community councils, and the Partnership for the Arts, have joined together in one association to make a more effective fight for government support. More local Texas governments are realizing the importance of music in people's lives, particularly when outdoor public concerts draw tremendous crowds and demonstrate the potential response to music when it is brought to people on their own terms. I am optimistic enough to believe that we are in a transition toward a true union of academic and professional music organizations with business and civil leaders to maximize the extensive musical resources which currently exist, as well as to coordinate future expansion on a regional basis. The goal is not only to respond to existing musical tastes, but also to build expanded and discerning audiences with a real need for music in their lives. Professional groups of high quality will then have both

the audience and the financial security they deserve. I believe this will happen because of something Ralph Waldo Emerson said many years ago:

“No man ever forgot the visitations of that power to his heart and brain which created all things new; which was the dawn in him of music, poetry, and art.”

III. POLITICAL CHANGE

Sealy: To undertake a rational discussion of Texas politics is like trying to sort out the heads and tails in a can of worms, but there can be one point of agreement — the fact of dramatic change in the Texas political scene. It is also apparent that this change is marked by contradictions.

Texas remains essentially a Democratic state. All of the state office holders are Democrats, most of our local officials are Democrats, our congressional delegation and legislature are overwhelmingly Democratic. Yet the Democratic candidate for President this year received only 33 per cent of the Texas votes. Texans re-elected a Republican United States Senator by a substantial majority, and the Republican candidate for governor made a strong showing in a losing race.

Moreover, the Democratic nominee for President was able to carry only eight of the 254 Texas counties. Only two of those counties, Cottle and Robertson, are outside of the so-called Brush Country of South Texas where you can count the Republicans on one hand. Even though the Democratic ticket carried some of these South Texas areas, approximately one-third of the Texans of Mexican descent voted for President Nixon — which may shatter forever the old adage that this ethnic group is in the hip pocket of the Democrats. The past year saw the rise of La Raza Unida, a splinter party composed mostly of Mexican-Americans. The spirited campaign of its candidates had a profound effect on the governor's race and was probably responsible for the failure of the Democratic candidate to achieve a clear majority of the vote on November 7.

By the best calculations, only one-third of the voters in Texas voted a straight Democratic ticket. The percentage of straight ticket voters has been on the decline, and the trend accelerated in 1972. It further appears that the ultra-liberal student vote is a myth. While young people vote somewhat more liberal than their elders, most of them are not the radicals some politicians thought them to be.

Any casual observer of Texas politics would conclude that the greatest inroads of Republican strength are in the major cities and

their suburbs. Rural Texas still tends to vote Democratic, except in this unusual year when the Democratic party nominated a presidential candidate who was totally out of step with the average voter. In the 1970 senatorial race, for example, the Democratic candidate, Lloyd Bentsen, lost both Harris and Dallas counties by substantial margins and yet won a comfortable victory over his Republican opponent by carrying the rural areas. In the 1972 senatorial election this situation was altered to some degree. The Republican incumbent, Senator Tower, carried many rural counties. This could be attributed to the strength of Senator Tower himself, to the fact he is an incumbent, to the Nixon landslide, or possibly to other factors, but probably it has to be assumed that the Republican party is gaining at least some strength in rural Texas — although it has a long way to go.

The same situation is true in the governor's races of 1970 and 1972. The Democratic candidate ran away with rural Texas in 1970, but this year it was closer. Without a fairly strong rural vote, however, the Democratic candidate could not have won the election.

The foregoing discussion of Democrat versus Republican, leads to a couple of conclusions which can be drawn from the most recent election:

1. The South, from the Potomac to the Pedernales, has become solid Republican country in presidential politics. It would take the nomination of a conservative Democrat like John Connally or George Wallace to reverse this, and it is difficult to imagine that the present leadership of the national Democratic party would stand still for that.

2. Despite the Nixon landslide in Texas, Texas should yet be called a two-party state. The moderate-to-conservative Democrat still runs better statewide, in election after election, than either the liberal Democrat or the conservative Republican. In addition, the Republicans still are having a hard time attracting voters to their primary by fielding a balanced ticket in state and local elections.

The most significant change in Texas politics in recent years is the rise of the independent voter — the man or woman who ignores all pleas to "vote it straight." Texas is caught up in a national trend of independent voting. Party labels and party discipline simply do not mean as much as they did in the past. In earlier times people tended to bunch up for social reasons or religious reasons or ethnic reasons. It was much easier to exert party discipline under those circumstances. Those days are apparently gone forever — and good riddance. People are much more mobile, much better educated, and much more resentful of being thought of as bloc voters. To put it

another way, people these days are too sophisticated to vote blindly for a party label and ignore the character, record and program of each candidate for office.

The so-called independent voter is the fastest growing segment of the electorate in Texas. Public opinion surveys reflect that the decline of the brass-collar Democrat has not necessarily swollen the rolls of the Republican party. Most voters who once called themselves Democrats now consider themselves to be independents — not Republicans. They have not swapped one party discipline for another.

The pattern in Texas, and in a number of other states throughout the South, is for most of these people to vote in the Democratic primaries and, in November, to vote for the Democratic candidates for state office but for the Republican candidates for national offices. For instance, Utah this year gave its Democratic governor 70 per cent of the vote and the Republican presidential candidate 70 per cent of the vote. Switch-voting, therefore, is a national affair, not peculiar to Texas.

Some liberals have been advocating that these switch voters get out of the Democratic party and stop voting in Democratic primaries. They contend that a voter's party affiliation is best determined by how he votes in the presidential election — not by how he votes in local and state elections. The question, however, is subject to debate, since a good many persons prefer to be Democrats even though they sometimes support Republican candidates. If every Democrat who voted against George McGovern were banned from the Democratic party, then the Democratic party would be a shell of its former self. It is impossible to understand the reasoning of some otherwise intelligent and thoughtful individuals who are more interested in purging people from a political party than they are in recruiting people for the party.

Perhaps this is a good time to decide what political parties should be. Should a party be simply an ideology, as some believe? Or should it be a means of assuring continuity in government — a method by which free people conduct a political system which seems to work better than any other system?

I believe in the idea of continuity. In my opinion, a political party is only the means of achieving an end — and that is the selection of leaders to govern *all* of the people and not merely to adopt the beliefs of *some* of the people and impose them on everyone else.

In conclusion, I would say that Texans today are tending to vote against radical change, perhaps because we have undergone so much

change in recent years. An analysis of the 1972 elections would indicate that the people are growing weary of high taxes, suspicious of high-sounding schemes to spend their money, wary of easy solutions to difficult problems, and considerably turned off by the permissive society in general. In other words, we are in a period of slowing down, getting our breath, and taking stock of the future. I do not think this means we are satisfied with the status quo. It simply means that most of us believe we have had too much government. We are ready to try to get by with a little less.

Dickson: The issue of corruption in state government arising from the Sharpstown scandal and other irregularities in Austin has resulted in political changes in Texas. Texas voters were offended by the conduct of some officials and voted against them on moral grounds. Whether or not these changes in office holders result in long range political change is another question. These same moral considerations did not gain the same importance on a national level. The national issues, especially in foreign affairs, seemed so complicated to the average voter that it was difficult to make a moral judgment, possibly because the national issues involved theological and religious considerations.

The major issue on a world basis, which directly affects foreign affairs, is the ideological confrontation between Communism and Christianity. The major issue on a national level, which directly affects domestic politics, is the religious confrontation between the advocates of the Social Gospel and the evangelical Christian Fundamentalist. This confrontation between the major factions of the entire religious community was dramatically played out in this year's presidential campaign. Senator George McGovern represented the ideals and program of the Social Gospel, although his father had been a Methodist fundamentalist, and President Nixon represented a Quaker idealism that was powerfully influenced by evangelical Christianity. Each candidate made a self-conscious attempt to call upon the moral and spiritual sources of the nation. No mention was made, however, by either candidate that he was advocating a particular religious doctrine. The politicians prefer the less descriptive terms, conservative and liberal. The mention of religion is taboo in political contests in this country because of the freedom of religion provision in the First Amendment and the fear of the charge of religious bigotry. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that "the First Amendment mandates government neutrality between religion and non-religion." But, regardless of this constitutional restraint, which Thomas Jefferson said "erected a wall of separation between

Church and State," the State continues to follow political policies based on the religious beliefs of a majority of the voters.

In foreign policy, for example, since the era of Senator Joe McCarthy in the early 1950's, this nation has had a hysteria about Communism. There is a reason for this traumatic reaction. Communism is a Christian heresy. It is an anti-Christ philosophy. The churches used to send missionaries to Asia to convert the heathen, but with the rise of Communism, the federal government has taken over the job of foreign missions. That was the justification for the Vietnam involvement. The Russians, of course, were Christians before the Bolshevik Revolution. The Eastern Orthodox Church, the church of the tsars, was the second largest Christian community. But in 1917 when Russia threw out Christianity, along with the government of the tsars, the United States refused to recognize Russia as a nation for 16 years. When China went communist in 1949 she was rejected as a nation and has not yet been recognized by the United States even though President Nixon in 1972 paid an unofficial visit of friendship to Chairman Mao and Premier Chou En-lai. Whether or not the arms industry has exploited anti-communism as a means of transferring taxpayers' money into the coffers of the industry, as some have charged, the fact is that Christian fundamentalists have been in the forefront of the Cold War. Pope Pius XI, Pope Pius XII, Francis Cardinal Spellman, Generals Maxwell Taylor and William C. Westmoreland, Ambassadors Henry Cabot Lodge and Ellsworth Bunder, Secretaries of State John Foster Dulles and Dean Rusk were "true believers" in the anti-Communism of the Christian fundamentalists.

"Fervent in his beliefs and relentless in their execution, admitting of neither doubt nor dissention, and devoid of compassion and humor, the 'true believer' makes war in the name of peace and commits murder in the name of human happiness, and does so with a pristine conscience, a conscience made pure by fervent conviction" (Senator J. Wm. Fulbright, 1965).

On May 2, 1965, President Johnson broadcast from the White House a statement of the purposes of the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic. In that speech he said, "The American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere . . . This is and this will be the common action and the common purpose of the democratic forces of the hemisphere. For the danger is also a common danger and the principles are common principles." That declaration was hailed as the "Johnson Doctrine."

The other side, as Secretary Rusk was fond of saying, also had its "true believers." After the Russian intervention in Czechoslovakia in August, 1968, Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary of the Soviet Communist party, published an article in *Pravda* in which he set out the Communist doctrine which led to the invasion. It was hailed as the "Brezhnev Doctrine." It proclaims that Communist ruled states enjoy neither genuine sovereignty nor genuine rights of territorial integrity, that the Soviet Union can at any time send troops into any such states to preserve the Communist rule. In the words of the *Pravda* article, "This means that each Communist party is responsible not only to its own people, but also to all Socialist countries, the entire Communist movement."

Placing these two documents side by side, makes it clear that both leaders, though using different terminology, were talking about their own ideologies or religions. They were not talking about war in the traditional sense as armed conflicts between nations or a people. One was a believer in Marxists-Leninism and the other in the Bible. Christianity and Communism are both evangelistic. In earlier times such confrontation would have been called a religious war.

In 1919 Harry Emerson Fosdick delivered a sermon at First Presbyterian Church in New York in which he attacked five absolutes of the Fundamentalists: (1) the substitutionary theory of the atonement — Christ died for our sins. (2) resurrection of the Body, (3) the Virgin Birth, (4) inerrancy of the Scriptures — the Bible is literally the word of God, and (5) the Second Coming of Christ.

A copy of this sermon was mailed by Ivy Lee, head of a national publicity firm and an admirer of Dr. Fosdick, to every minister in the United States. Dr. Fosdick challenged the Fundamentalist view that all Christians must accept these beliefs or else be kicked out of the Church. Dr. Fosdick's view was that *deed* as well as *belief* constitutes Christianity. This interpretation of the Bible came to be known as the Modern Scholarship of the Bible and emphasized the Social Gospel. By 1940, it had been accepted by the majority of Protestant Seminaries in this country.

After his service as a bomber pilot in World War II, George McGovern attended Dakota Wesleyan, a Methodist College in South Dakota. Even before the war, McGovern began to doubt the Fundamentalist doctrines of his father's religion. At Garrett Seminary and at Northwestern University, he encountered the sermons and writings of Dr. Fosdick and the works of Walter Rauschenbusch, a turn-of-the-century Baptist theologian who had become the leading exponent of the so-called "Social Gospel." Rauschenbusch taught that

the chief responsibility of Christians was to apply the ethic of the New Testament to contemporary social problems and to advance the ideals of Jesus by working within the political system. He saw an affinity between socialist politics and the "New Testament vision of the Kingdom of God," according to an article in the September 29 issue of *Commonweal*, by Charles P. Henderson, Jr., entitled, "The (Social) Gospel according to (1) Richard Nixon (2) George McGovern." According to Henderson, "there is a clear line of descent from Christianity and the Social Crisis (written by Rauschenbusch in 1907) to the Senator's proposals for tax reform and redistribution of wealth . . . The charges that McGovern is too radical to be elected President become less credible when one considers that his most radical ideas come not from the Communist Manifesto, but from a home-grown variety of Methodist religion." That was written before November 7, 1972.

President Nixon on the other hand is a Fundamentalist. He is the first President to have religious services every Sunday in the White House. In 1970 the President was selected "Churchman of the Year" by Religious Heritage of America, Inc. He has made Billy Graham, the leading Christian Fundamentalist, his spiritual adviser. He has ignored the leaders of the National Council of Churches made up of thirty-four main line denominations. The political views of the two candidates, McGovern vs. Nixon, flow logically from their religious views. On *amnesty*, McGovern thinks the war in Vietnam is wrong and places the blame on the nation. President Nixon places responsibility on the individual for not fighting. "Since we have no direct self-interest in the Asian subcontinent, this is the most selfless, the most moral war in our history," said the President. On *Drugs*, Nixon blames the individual — McGovern looks for social forces that contribute to drug abuse. On *Patriotism*, Henderson wrote, "for Nixon, patriotism is very closely related to piety. He places devotion to country so high on his list of virtues that it seems to have moral, even theological, significance. He seems to believe that this nation is the chief manifestation of God's will for mankind." The same writer quoted Senator McGovern as saying "God rules over all nations without any special favor to any."

Prior to the election, President Nixon gave Garnett D. Horner of the Washington Star-News an exclusive interview on condition that it not be published until after November 7. In that interview, President Nixon endorsed the Puritan work ethic in these words, "The average American is just like the child in the family. You give him some responsibility and he is going to amount to something. If, on

the other hand, you make him completely dependent and pamper him and cater to him too much, you are going to make him soft, spoiled and eventually a very weak individual." Henderson contrasted the two men with the comment that, "Where Nixon places the moral responsibility upon the individual to find a job, regardless of circumstances, McGovern places the moral responsibility upon government to guarantee a living income to every citizen, regardless of merit."

The answer to Dr. Fosdick's question, "Shall the Fundamentalist Win?" would seem to have been supplied by the November 7 election. The answer to the larger question, "Shall the Communists Win?" is still unresolved. There is a bit of irony in the fact that President Nixon, who based his entire political life up to now on anti-Communism, has taken the lead in the reapproachment with Russia and China. Based on their religious beliefs, this should have been the role of George McGovern.

Frantz: As many of you know, the Texas State Historical Association published a two-volume *Handbook of Texas* at the beginning of the 1950's. Recently the Association has been completing a supplementary volume updating and correcting the earlier two. A necessary major revision has been a complete, restructuring of earlier articles with 20th century political content. Simply extending and adding was insufficient.

Take, for example, the account of the Republican Party in Texas. Its 20th century story to 1950 was that of His Majesty's loyal opposition, useful for dispensing local patronage when Harding or Hoover was in the White House: noticeable in the 1928 aberration when rural, white, dry, fundamentalist Texas rejected urban (if not exactly urbane), immigrant-tinged, wet Catholic Al Smith; and unique in places full of unreconstructed Germans, like San Antonio, who insisted on sending Harry Wurzbach to the Texas Legislature just as though he was a first-class citizen, otherwise identified as a Democrat. The G.O.P. in Texas was a private club, exclusive but generally worthless in the biennial political donnybrooks. But a viable party? Hardly.

But look at the Republicans now. They have carried Texas for the national ticket three times out of the past six, and narrowly missed on two of the three occasions when they lost. They have sent a Republican Senator to his third term. His election may have been a bit fluke at first, but he is a solid choice now, a fact of continuing political life. Republican Congressmen, state legislators, a near-miss

at the state treasurer level and a nearer one for a gubernatorial candidate who was not even supported with enthusiasm by the G.O.P. hierarchy.

Democratic governors — Shivers, Daniel, and Connally — have supported Republicans with little damage to their political stature. The situation indicates that Texas may have finally quit confusing politics with religion, and gone honest — or at least clearly-eyed.

There have been three parties in Texas — the Republicans, and the Democrats, regular and rump. Finally, however, the state may have reached that maturity in which Republican-minded persons masquerading as Democrats can close out their charade — and be what their instincts show them really to be — Republicans in name as well as in spirit, and not clinging to some brass-collar, yellow-dog syndrome whose rejection was akin to denunciation of church and parentage. A century after Reconstruction the Republican party has returned to Texas.

The 1950 accounts of towns — Houston, Dallas, and the others — is another example. There is now less of towns and cities, and more of metropolitan districts — nineteen of them by official designation. The change in designation carries portents — in education, in welfare programs, in every kind of social service. Dallas cannot consider in terms of Dallas — but in terms of Dallas *plus* Plano and Grand Prairie and Irving (are you listening, Cowboys?) and Arlington (how about you, Rangers?) and — yes, even you, Fort Worth (and you, Greater Southwest International Airport?). No city is, to paraphrase, an island, complete in itself — and nowadays its managers know it — and its citizenry is learning it.

Finally, to be brief rather than complete, how about the politics of minorities? The earlier *Handbook* carried nothing, because there was nothing to carry, or Lulacs, G.I. Forum, La Raza Unida, et cetera, et cetera. After all, it has hardly been a decade since Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson and the Mexican screenstar Cantinflas spent a long, long day on the flat bed of a truck convincing San Antonians that their world would not end if a man with a Spanish surname, Henry Gonzales, were sent to represent their myriad of brown skins and brown eyes in Washington. And now? Hardly anyone looks up when another Mexican-American is elected to office, or Dallas places blacks in local posts and in Austin, or when Houston sends to Congress one Barbara Jordan, who is not only black but — oh Heavenly Saints — belongs to the female fragment (which though hardly a minority group, has certainly been second-class in its political privileges).

What this means is that no longer does Texas have a political Establishment that is secure, stationary, or stable, as Dallas CCA knows. Texans are giving a hard look to see whether politics serves its purposes of making policy for the people — and though you and I may not always agree that the decision is judicious, we do agree that it is hard-eyed and tough-minded, and that more than ever the party and candidate had better justify their promises with performance instead of slogans and contacts. The electorate is stirred and disturbed. And as seldom before, such an electorate, with its ever broadened base, is going to force changes and enforce standards hitherto ignored.

McCall: Since the War Between the States, Texas generally has been a one-party state, and the Democratic party has been that one party. The Republicans usually have nominated candidates only for national offices and a few state offices such as governor, lieutenant governor and attorney general. In most counties in Texas no Republican candidates for local office have been nominated. To be other than a Democrat was to be disenfranchised in most local and state offices. This has discouraged all but a small percentage of the voters, except in Dallas, from formally becoming Republicans and voting in the Republican primary elections.

Nevertheless in races for state offices Texas has during this past century had the characteristics of a two party state. The division, however, has been between the conservative and liberal wings of the Democratic Party. While the division was not formal and was not always clearly defined as to particular candidates, there were always enough candidates for national and state offices who definitely styled themselves conservative or liberal to make the division a reality and to give Texas voters a choice. This division grew more definite after 1936, when Franklin D. Roosevelt during his first term repudiated the conservative Democratic platform on which he had been elected and followed a most liberal program. Local candidates were seldom affected by this division. They did not run as liberals or conservatives, but legislators and major state offices usually took their positions with the liberals or conservatives. Generally the conservative Democrats have won the election though at times liberals such as Governor James Allred or Senator Ralph Yarborough have been elected.

The national Democratic party has continued to shift to the left since 1936 while the majority of the Texas Democrats have remained conservative. In 1940, 1944 and 1948 the Texas Dixiecrats or States Righters tried to prevent the Texas Democratic Party from

supporting Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, the Democratic candidates for President, but were not successful. Many voted for the Republican candidates in 1940, 1944 and 1948 or candidates of the States Rights Party in 1948. In 1952 Governor Allan Shivers broke with Adlai Stevenson over the Tidelands issue and led Texas to support Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower. In the absence of a special state issue, such as the Tidelands, and with the aid of Senator Lyndon Johnson the national Democratic ticket of Kennedy and Johnson barely carried Texas in 1960. Johnson, the Texan, won rather easily over Goldwater in 1964, but Humphrey barely carried Texas in 1968. Nixon in 1972 even with no special Texas issue such as the Tidelands soundly defeated McGovern, the national Democrat. At the same time the conservative state Democrats generally won all state and local races in spite of the state political scandals.

A continuation and an acceleration of the present political trends in Texas can be expected in the next decade. There will probably be an increasing percentage of Texas voters who will not blindly vote the Democratic ticket. Many will call themselves "independents," but most of them will continue to vote in the Democratic primaries and then vote split tickets in the general elections. The ticket splitting will increase particularly on the state level, but until the Republicans produce serious candidates for all the local and state offices they will attract only a small percentage of the voters in the primary elections.

The exposure on television of the candidates for federal offices and for the major states offices will contribute further to the trend toward independent voting. Television exposure allows every voter to feel that he knows the candidates and thus is able to make up his own mind regardless of political endorsements.

The northern, northeastern, and far western elements of both the Democratic and Republican parties are more liberal than the majority of Texas voters. When the candidates for President and Vice President of the national parties reflect the prevailing views of the northern, northeastern and far western elements of the two major parties, one can expect substantial numbers of conservative Texas voters to vote for the presidential candidate of more conservative third parties such as George Wallace's American Party. Paradoxically this probably will aid the more liberal Democratic party candidate by taking votes which would otherwise go Republican, unless he is so liberal, e.g., George McGovern, that the third party candidate will get a plurality as George Wallace did in several Southern States in 1968. On the other hand if the national parties and par-

ticularly the Democratic party do not choose liberal candidates, then the liberal third parties of the Mexican-Americans and Black Americans will attract more Democratic votes and paradoxically aid the more conservative Republicans as did the Raza Unida Party in 1972.

Some indications appear that members of Congress and other national officials are beginning to doubt that they can solve all the problems of the nation. They now are starting programs, such as revenue sharing, to leave the solution of local and state problems to the local and state governments. With the increased seriousness of local problems such as housing, crime, pollution, poverty and school integration, the importance of school, city, county and state offices and officials will increase. Ideological differences should result in different political groupings such as now exist in city and school elections in Dallas and elsewhere. It is a possibility that the Republican party, representing the more conservative political philosophy, will present an increasing number of local and state candidates. This trend could lead to Texas eventually becoming a genuine two party state.

N E C R O L O G Y

GIBB GILCHRIST

1888-1972

THE DEATH OF GIBB GILCHRIST, ON MAY 12, 1972, MARKED THE end of one of the most respected careers of public service Texas ever saw. Actually, in his 84 years, he had two such careers, separate and distinct, each distinguished and successful. In both he made contributions of lasting value to all Texans.

Either would have been gratifying for most men. As state highway engineer he built the Texas Highway Department from a low point of inefficiency and public distrust to a position of eminence and respect which lasts even to the present. As an educator he took the A. and M. College of Texas from the status of a back-country cow college, and put it well on the road to becoming the effective and respected technical University and statewide service organization it is today.

Throughout his 34 years of public service, he never once wavered from the path of unswerving integrity he set for himself and those who worked with him. Never once did he avoid a fight where a matter of principle was at stake. He had no patience with those who weighed expediency against principle and no respect for those who were uncertain in the face of opposition. He was a stubborn, hard-driving man, who demanded much of himself and of those around him. Both his prejudices and his loyalties were strong.

Born at Wills Point, he grew up in East Texas. He was educated at Southwestern University at Georgetown and the University of Texas at Austin. When he first became state highway engineer, in 1924, the Texas Highway Department was in its infancy. A few months later Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson was elected Governor and Gilchrist resigned. He returned to the job in 1928 to rebuild an organization wrecked by political intrigue and chicanery. In the next nine years he developed it into an institution which earned the wholesome respect, not only of Texas, but of the nation.

"Gibb Gilchrist is the man who instilled in the employees of the Highway Department the elements of honesty, integrity and hard work, and put us on the track we are today." This was the comment of Highway Commission Chairman DeWitt Greer, who had been Gilchrist's successor as state highway engineer.

At the peak of his career, nationally and internationally honored as a leader in highway engineering, Gilchrist resigned to become

Dean of Engineering at Texas A. and M. College. Seven years later, in a time of disruption and uncertainty, he was named president of the institution.

The years of Gibb Gilchrist's presidency were anything but peaceful. Heads rolled and rumors rumbled across the campus as he cut out accumulated deadwood and streamlined the organization. When the complex of colleges and services which had grown up around the central institution were organized into the State's first system of higher education, Gilchrist was architect for the plan and first Chancellor of the System. He served as head of the statewide Texas A. and M. College System until mandatory retirement at age 65, in 1953.

As Chancellor Emeritus, Gilchrist lived out his days in his home on the edge of the campus. He maintained an office and spent much of his time as a consultant to Texas engineering firms. His leisure was given over to watching his favorite sports and browsing his fine personal library of Texana. Death came on May 12, 1972, in a Bryan hospital, after a long illness.

A man of many contradictions, he was at once a dreamer and a hard-driving doer. A stubbornly practical engineer, he created the roadside parks along Texas' highways, fought to preserve trees and other natural beauties along the rights-of-way, and initiated the planting and protection of wildflowers along the roadways. A stern administrator, he was enthusiastically innovative, developing new programs and combining old ones to meet new needs. He was the driving force behind the creation of the Texas Petroleum Research Committee, the Texas Water Research Committee and the Texas Transportation Institute, among others.

A distinguished Engineering Graduate of the University of Texas, he was also an honorary member of the Sul Ross class at A. and M. He is the only individual in the history of the two rival institutions to have a "profile" article appear simultaneously in the University's *Alcalde* and the *Texas Aggie*.

Survivors include his widow, Vesta, of College Station, a son, Henry Gilchrist, of Dallas, and two grandchildren.

—R.H.S.

LOUIS HERMAN HUBBARD

1882-1973

LOUIS HERMAN HUBBARD, SOMETIMES CALLED THE TEACHER WHO refused to retire, died in Georgetown July 15, 1973. His career, spanning 91 years, was unique not only in its longevity but in its variety and contributions to all levels of Texas education. Son of a New England father and a Spanish mother, he was born in the U. S. Consulate in Puerto Rico, but grew up in Texas and spent his life in and for Texas. A product of the University at Austin (B.A., 1903, M.A., 1918, Ph.D., 1930), he began teaching in the elementary school at Sulphur Springs, moved to Belton as high school teacher, principal and finally superintendent (1902-24), taught English summers in Southwestern and Baylor, and was briefly high school principal at San Angelo. He returned to his alma mater to teach English and education and serve as the pioneer dean of students until 1926, when he became president of Texas State College for Women (then College of Industrial Arts, later Texas Women's University). His leadership in administration was signalized by his presidency of the Association of Texas Colleges (1930) and of the Southern Association of Colleges for Women (1932). Relieved of administrative responsibilities by promotion to president emeritus in 1950, he returned to his first love, teaching English in various colleges, including Texas Wesleyan at Fort Worth. He spent his last years in Georgetown, near the campus of Southwestern University.

A member of this Society for forty-four years, he was its President in 1946 and presided over the memorable Annual Meeting when Fleet Admiral Nimitz made his first public address after returning from the Pacific.

He was a man of many talents, a teacher who never ceased to be a student, a person whose reserved manner sometimes concealed his native wit and appreciation of humor. (When he met Admiral Nimitz, for example, he charged him with having said the Pacific Ocean was larger than Texas and reported that the Admiral cannily replied: "I was misquoted. Someone asked that and I told him that if anything was larger than Texas, maybe it was the Pacific.")

He was a devout Episcopalian, a responsible citizen concerned with civic movements unrelated to his profession — a man whose contributions to this region are real and lasting. His *Recollections of a Texas Educator* (1964) is the saga of a youngster who learned to speak English when he was five, knew the seamy side of life

in wide-open El Paso, wanted to be a physician but dedicated himself irrevocably to the improvement of the teaching processes, living through and helping mold education at all levels for about half a century. He tells his story honestly, without false modesty and convincingly.

—H.G.

JOHN SAYERS REDDITT

1899-1973

JOHN SAYERS REDDITT WAS BORN IN CENTER, APRIL 4, 1899, THE eighth child and fourth son of his parents. His middle name of "Sayers" was given to him by his mother in honor of his great uncle, Joseph D. Sayers, Governor of Texas, 1899-1903. He died April 13, 1973, at Lufkin a few days after his 74th birthday. He spent his childhood and was educated in Center and received his LL.B. from the University of Texas in 1921. Licensed to practice law that same year, he formed a partnership in Lufkin with then State Senator I. D. Fairchild, and continued the practice until his death, over fifty years.

His participation in civic and public affairs was lifelong and few made greater contribution to them. He was a State Senator, 1933-1941; President, Texas Good Roads Association, 1945; Chairman, Texas Highway Commission, 1945-1949; on the Texas Commission of Higher Education, 1955-1961; and Regent of the University of Texas, 1961-1965. In 1971 he received the Distinguished Alumnus Award of his alma mater.

In Lufkin, his home city, he served on the School Board, was president of the Angeline County Chamber of Commerce and a director for many years. He was one of the founders and a trustee of the Memorial Hospital, and was influential in establishing the library. He received in 1957 the Silver Beaver Award of the Boy Scouts of America.

Other affiliations were numerous and varied: life member of the Ex-Students Association of the University of Texas; a steward in the First Methodist Church; an organizer of the Texas Methodist Foundation (chairman until 1965); a 32nd degree Scottish Rite Mason and a Rotarian. In addition to membership in the State and American Bar Associations, he was a charter member of the State Bar of Texas Foundation. He was an Army veteran of World War II.

He was a loyal, generous and enthusiastic member of The Philosophical Society of Texas. For years and years he was Chairman of the Committee on Officers and regular attendant at the annual meetings which were an important event in his life.

He was married to Hazel Lee Spears, December 27, 1924, who survived him along with their two daughters, Mrs. John Henderson, Lufkin, and Mrs. R. J. Moroney, Jr., Austin.

He passed away after a lingering illness of some months. He loved life and fought valiantly to live. Yet he had no fear of death and approached it with calmness and courage.

Shortly after his death, a grandson, David Redditt Henderson, a student in the Lufkin High School, as the subject for a term paper, wrote a memorial for his grandfather. He quoted this: The privilege of being reared in a Christian family is the greatest single asset any child can possess. A congenial, loyal and happy family contributes much to good character moulding and good citizenship. My own sisters, brothers and their lineal descendants have a great obligation and debt of gratitude to our father and mother, who believed, in theory and in practice, that the love of God and your fellow man constituted the basic precepts of a Christian life.

And he adds: "John Sayers Redditt not only wrote the above statement, but based his life by it as well."

That appraisal is shared by all who knew this truly remarkable Texan.

—C.S.B.

JAMES WOOTEN McCLENDON

1873-1972

ONE OF GEORGIA'S MORE NOTABLE GIFTS TO TEXAS, AND ONE MORE extended than most in point of time and variety of values, was this soft-spoken, slender, gray-eyed, fair-complexioned jurist, born in the former state on November 1, 1873, of a gentle, educated and religious family and migrating with his widowed mother to Texas about 1889, where, beginning a short time thereafter, he resided in Austin until his death on January 9, 1972, following the death in 1964 of his wife of some sixty years, Anne Hale Watt McCleendon, an attractive Central Texan of distinguished family.

Judge McCleendon joined the Philosophical Society in 1939 and served as a vice president during 1942. His characteristically in-

tellectual bent would doubtless have made him a more active participant than he was but for the fact that so much of his interest had already vested in other and more specialized affiliations, curricular and extra-curricular, accumulated over the preceding decades. While the latter covered a wide field — intellectual, spiritual and practical — he will, of course, be best remembered for those incident to his life profession of the law.

His distinguished legal career and attainments are most recently reviewed in the memorial resolution drawn by sometime Supreme Court Justice and University Chancellor, James P. Hart, adopted by the Travis County Bar Association on April 27, 1973, and presented on May 2, 1973, at a memorial ceremony held by the Austin Court of Civil Appeals. Various other tributes include two published by the statutory Texas Civil Judicial Council in its official reports for the years 1949 and 1971 respectively. The final *Who's Who in America* chronology of his professional (and personal) life appears in the 1972-73 edition of that publication. A commendably elaborate obituary, including what is evidently his last photograph, is published in the official *Texas Bar Journal* of April 22, 1972, and one somewhat more brief on the first page of the *Austin American Statesman* of January 10, 1972.

Following an A.B. degree at The University of Texas (1895) and an LL.B. with the first graduating class of its College of Law (1897) he practiced law until 1918 with the then prominent Austin firms of Fiset and Miller and its successor, Fiset, McClendon and Shelly, serving meanwhile (1912-13) as president of the Travis County Bar Association. One of the early beneficiaries of his services with Fiset and Miller was none other than Elizabeth Ney — the original claim of Texas and Austin to artistic fame.

His judicial story begins with his service from 1918 until 1923 as a member, and eventually Presiding Judge, of Section B of the then Supreme Court Commission of Appeals, an appointive body consisting of two groups or "sections" of three judges each created to assist an overworked Supreme Court which was itself composed of only three members. In late 1923, while still on the Commission, he accepted appointment as Chief Justice of the Austin Court of Civil Appeals — one of the state's more important intermediate appellate courts — to which office he was thereafter elected and re-elected until his retirement on January 1, 1949. As has been the case with most Texas appellate judges, his work was restricted to the field of civil law, as distinguished from criminal. In 1934, while retaining his then office, he sought elective promotion to the

Supreme Court but was defeated in a three-cornered primary race.

Judge McClendon's proficiency in the law practice was, not unnaturally, duplicated on the bench, where the hundreds of decisions and opinions written or participated in by him during an era of accelerated economic and social evolution gave him a reputation outstanding even among the unusually large corps of appellate judges which has long typified the State's judicial system. Under a more appropriate methods of judicial selection he would probably have reached full membership on the Supreme Court at some point well before retirement.

Conspicuously constructive, too, were what might be called his extra-curricular professional activities, which, with but few possible exceptions, contributed more than any other jurist of his time to the modernization of the Texas system of civil justice, and this notwithstanding the then comparatively relaxed attitude of both bar and public toward the subject matter. These contributions were made mostly through the Texas Civil Judicial Council above mentioned, of which he is justly considered to have been the principal founder as well as its most valuable member during its 40-odd year history to date, but also in significant degree through the organized Bar of the state and nation.

Doubtless equal to his interest in legal "reform" must have been his devotion to the Masonic Order, evidenced both by the number of Masonic bodies to which he belonged as well as by the high offices he held therein, including that of Grand Master of the Masons of Texas. These latter obviously involved much individual responsibility on his part for the various Masonic enterprises of a philanthropic nature. Paralleling these fraternal affiliations, the Judge maintained throughout his life faithful membership in the Methodist Church, of which his mother had been a dedicated executive.

His undoubted enthusiasm for the fine arts probably began, or began to blossom, with his above-mentioned early acquaintance with Elizabet Ney, which, in turn, conceivably fostered his concurrent interest in Texas history, both artistic and general. In any case, the State and its capital city are both indebted to him for his vital part in the creation of the Texas Fine Arts Association, of which he was the first (and most frequent) president, and for the establishment in recent years of The Elizabet Ney Texas Fine Arts Association McClendon Foundation, to which latter he was the principal contributor financially and otherwise.

His loyalty to his Texas alma mater was both strong and enduring, although in his University days, as Judge Hart has pointed out,

he was not altogether immune to student enthusiasms involving dispute with the "Establishment," however innocent these adventures now seem in the light of today's collegiate libertarianism. Perhaps due to the same instincts that later led him into Masonry, as well as to a natural disposition toward selectivity in his friendships, he was (in the unegalitarian terminology of the past) a "frat-man" (S.A.E.) as distinguished from a "barb." Both then and later he also held regular and "honoris causa" membership in sundry academic honor societies.

One of the evidently favorite diversions of his maturer years was regular attendance at the fortnightly meetings of the Town and Gown Club of Austin at which everything from (and including) the Creation has long been learnedly (and sometimes acidly) discussed from both the academic and less academic viewpoints by, among others, the late and much lamented triumvirate of Frank Dobie, Walter Prescott Webb and Roy Bedichek. There, even at age 97, sitting with his cane in one hand and an un-Methodist appetizer in the other, the Judge would be heard to prophesy his own survival to or beyond the century mark.

In politics he was (not surprisingly) a Democrat, as, over a century after our first American Civil War, all but one or two out of our hundreds of Texas district and appellate judges still are. At the same time, it is safe to say that, whatever his strictly political talents, the latter contributed far less than his merits to the lengthy success of his public career.

In the area of individual character and personality, his ethics were quite as high as the corresponding standards of his professional life — while his obvious dignity, refinement and sophistication — extending even to external appearance — were yet little more characteristic of him than his often humorous and witty geniality, as well as his consideration for every fellow-human. He was a Southern gentleman in the best sense of that term.

Members of his family surviving at his death include his daughters, Mrs. Frank Knight and Miss Mary Anne McClendon, both of Austin, two grandchildren, three great-grandchildren, a brother, Dr. Jesse F. McClendon of Norristown, Pa., and a sister, Mrs. John Marshall of Hubbard Woods, Ill.

W. ST. J. G.

EDWARD BLOUNT TUCKER

1905-1972

EDWARD BLOUNT TUCKER, A NATIVE AND LIFE-LONG RESIDENT OF Nacogdoches, was born May 23, 1905, and died there June 11, 1972. Mr. Tucker attended the University of the South, and graduated cum laude from the University of Virginia. After brief employment with Texas Power & Light Company in Waco and Cooper, he returned to Nacogdoches to guide and manage his family estate of farm and timberlands, and commercial properties.

He was co-founder and President of the Nacogdoches County Lumber Company, which from its beginning in 1939 as a small semi-portable operation grew into a major lumber enterprise.

Despite the demands of his business interests, Mr. Tucker gave generously of his time and talents to his community, his church, and to Texas. He was a long-time member and president of the Board of Trustees of the Nacogdoches Independent School District. He was appointed to the Board of Regents of the University of Texas by Governor Coke Stevenson in 1945 at a critical and trying time in the University's history. Amid sharp controversy and bitter criticism, he was unswerving in his determination to preserve it as a "University of the first class." He was a champion and leader of the University's association with the M. D. Anderson Foundation and the Houston Medical Center, and from their inception had firm faith in their destiny.

Mr. Tucker was a director of the Sabine-Neches Water Conservation District which originated plans for Rayburn, Toledo Bend, and other East Texas lakes. He was a director of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce and senior warden of Christ Episcopal Church of Nacogdoches.

Mr. Tucker was as straight, strong, and stalwart as the towering East Texas pines, the symbol of the land which he loved. He loved people and was happiest when surrounded by his family and his friends. He was a charming bon vivant, a hunting and fishing companion par excellence. He scorned sham, hypocrisy and snobbery. The poorest sawmill laborer was his friend as well as Texas' most exalted personages. His social credo was simple but difficult one, "Princes and lords are but the breath of kings, and man's the noblest work of God."

He is survived by his wife, the former Mamie Ethel Blount, a sister Miss Elizabeth Tucker, a daughter-in-law Mrs. Edward

Blount Tucker, Jr., and three grandchildren: Susan, Ann, and Edward Blount Tucker III, all of Nacogdoches.

He became a member of this Society in 1960.

—W.E.D.

WILLIAM MARVIN WHYBURN

1901-1971

ONE OF THE BRILLIANT MATHEMATICIANS PRODUCED IN TEXAS, WHO achieved national recognition not only in his specialty but as an academic administrator, William Marvin Whyburn died in his seventieth year at his home in North Carolina. Born in Lewisville, his formal education was received at North Texas State and the University of Texas (B.A. 1922, Ph.D. 1927) and continued at Harvard as a National Research fellow. He began teaching in public schools, Texas A & M and Texas Tech, before moving to UCLA where he was chairman of the mathematics department when he was called to the presidency of Texas Technological College in 1944. Four years later he became Keenan Professor at the University of North Carolina and later Provost. After his retirement he held an endowed professorship in Southern Methodist University.

He came from a family of mathematicians, and was himself the first of the distinguished candidates shepherded by H. J. Ettliger toward the doctorate.

A member of this Society since 1946, he frequently attended Annual Meetings even when resident in California or Carolina, and took an active interest in its affairs, and served as an officer for many years.

—H.G.

RAMSEY YELVINGTON

1913-1973

RAMSEY YELVINGTON, PLAYWRIGHT IN RESIDENCE AND PROFESSOR of speech and drama at Southwest Texas State University, was born in West Point, Fayette County, February 5, 1913. Except for three years in the army during World War II he never resided outside his native state. Son of a Baptist minister, he attended schools of Smithville and San Antonio, and San Marcos Academy; later Howard

Payne College, Baylor University, and the Dallas Theatre Center. He was married to the former Louise Durham of Waco, had two daughters, Margaret Steubing and Harriet Smith, and three grandchildren. His home was full of the mementos of his experiences in the theatre.

At Baylor Mr. Yelvington began a close association with Paul Baker, who later produced many of his plays. Real recognition came to him with *A Cloud of Witnesses* which Baker first produced at Baylor and then at San Antonio, where as "The Story of the Alamo" it was an annual summer feature at San Jose Mission. It was the second part of the well-known Texian Trilogy that begins with *Women and Oxen*, (premiered at Hardin-Simmons University, directed by Harry Thompson.) and concludes with *Shadow of an Eagle*, the story of Sam Houston and San Jacinto, (first shown at the Dallas Theatre Center.) In 1968 all three were produced at the outdoor Glade Theatre in San Marcos, directed by James Barton.

The Governors, a quasi-historical play was featured at the opening of the new theatre at Southwest Texas State where his latest play, *The Folklorist* was being directed by his daughter Harriet at the time of his death. Besides pageants produced in various cities of Texas and in Chicago, his play *The Long Gallery* was produced off-Broadway by Stella Holt.

His major interests were play writing and raising cattle. Mr. Yelvington spoke extensively on the theatre and Southwest writing, was an accomplished actor and frequently performed as a singer. He played tennis, rode horses, herded cattle, and kept bird dogs. He wore big hats and "stayed out of cities as much as possible."

Ramsey Yelvington's work as playwright, folklorist, and historian was recognized by his membership in the Texas Folklore Society, Texas State Historical Association, the Texas Institute of Letters, and the Philosophical Society. He had recently organized a group of talented young writers, actors, and directors to form the Texas Playwright's Company. His complete works (eighteen full length plays and six one acts) will be published next year.

—J.B.W.JR.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

For the Year 1973

President

DILLON ANDERSON

Vice-Presidents

LOGAN WILSON

JOHN ERIK JONSSON

THOMAS HART LAW

FREDERICA GROSS DUDLEY

PHILIP GUTHRIE HOFFMAN

Secretaries

MARY JOE CARROLL

VIRGINIA LEDDY GAMBRELL

Treasurer

W. DEWEY PRESLEY

Librarian

SAMUEL WOOD GEISER

Directors

DILLION ANDERSON

WILLIS McDONALD TATE

HARRIS LEON KEMPNER

HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL

RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING

WILLIAM ALEXANDER KIRKLAND

RUPERT NORVAL RICHARDSON

HARRY HUNTT RANSOM

GEORGE CREWS MCGHEE

W. ST. JOHN GARWOOD

PAST PRESIDENTS

* Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar	1837-59
* Ira Kendrick Stephens	1936
* Charles Shirley Potts	1937
* Edgar Odell Lovett	1938
* George Bannerman Dealey	1939
* George Waverley Briggs	1940
* William James Battle	1941
* George Alfred Hill Jr.	1942
* Edward Henry Cary	1943
* Edward Randall	1944
* Umphrey Lee	1944
* Eugene Perry Locke	1945
* Louis Herman Hubbard	1946
* Pat Ireland Nixon	1947
Ima Hogg	1948
Albert Perley Brogan	1949
* William Lockhart Clayton	1950
* A. Frank Smith	1951
* Ernest Lynn Kurth	1952
* Dudley Kezer Woodward Jr.	1953
* Burke Baker	1954
* Jesse Andrews	1955
James Pinckney Hart	1956
Robert Gerald Storey	1957
* Lewis Randolph Bryan Jr.	1958
W. St. John Garwood	1959
George Crews McGhee	1960
Harry Hunt Ransom	1961
* Eugene Benjamin Germany	1962
Rupert Norval Richardson	1963
* Mrs. George Alfred Hill, Jr.	1964
* Edward Randall, Jr.	1965
* McGruder Ellis Sadler	1966
William Alexander Kirkland	1967
* Richard Tudor Fleming	1968
Herbert Pickens Gambrell	1969
Harris Leon Kempner	1970
* Carey Croneis	1971
Willis McDonald Tate	1972

*Deceased

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

- ALBRITTON, CLAUDE CAROL JR., dean, graduate school of humanities and sciences, professor of geology, Southern Methodist University . . . *Dallas*
- ALBRITTON, JOE LEWIS, lawyer; board chairman, Pierce National Life Ins. Co.; president Houston Citizens Bank and Trust Company; director Southwest Public Service Company; trustee Baylor University, Baylor Medical College . . . *Houston*
- ALLEN, HERBERT, president, Cameron Iron Works; trustee, Rice University; former director, Texas Technological College; trustee, St. Stephens Episcopal School . . . *Houston*
- ALLEN, WINNIE, retired archivist, University of Texas Library . . . *Hutchins*
- ANDERSON, DILLON, lawyer; former Special Assistant to the President of the United States for National Security Affairs . . . *Houston*
- ANDERSON, ROBERT BERNARD, partner, Carl M. Loeb Rhoades and Company; former Secretary of the Treasury; former Tax Commissioner, Texas . . . *New York*
- ANDREWS, MARK EDWIN, president, Ancon Oil and Gas Company; former Assistant Secretary of the Navy . . . *Houston*
- ARMSTRONG, THOMAS REEVES, Armstrong Ranch; former president, Santa Gertrudis Breeders Association . . . *Armstrong*
- ASTON, JAMES WILLIAM, board chairman, Republic National Bank; treasurer, City of Dallas; trustee Texas Research Foundation, Wadley Institute, Southwestern Legal Foundation, bd gov's SMU; Colonel USAAF WWII (DSM, Legion of Merit), City Manager, Dallas 35-41 . . . *Dallas*
- BANKS, STANLEY, lawyer; chairman, Texas Library and Historical Commission . . . *San Antonio*
- BATES, WILLIAM BARTHOLOMEW, lawyer; chairman of the board, Bank of the Southwest and of the University of Houston; trustee, M. D. Anderson Foundation and Clayton Foundation for Research Texas Medical Center . . . *Houston*
- BEAN, ALAN L., Captain, United States Navy astronaut; fourth man to walk on lunar surface . . . *Houston*
- BENNETT JOHN MIRZA, JR., chairman, National Bank of Commerce and City Public Service Board; director, Texas and Southwestern Cattlemen's Association; Major General, USAFR . . . *San Antonio*
- BLOCKER, TRUMAN G. JR., surgeon; president, Medical Branch University of Texas; consultant to the Surgeon General . . . *Galveston*
- BONER, CHARLES PAUL, professor emeritus of physics, University of Texas . . . *Austin*
- BRISTWATER, LEO, United States District Judge, Northern District of Texas . . . *Fort Worth*
- *BROGAN, ALBERT PERLEY, professor emeritus of philosophy, University of Texas; past president, western division, American Philosophical Association . . . *Austin*
- BROWN, GEORGE RUFUS, president, Brown and Root; trustee, former chairman, Rice University . . . *Houston*
- BRYAN, JAMES PERRY, lawyer; former regent, University of Texas . . . *Lake Jackson*
- BUTLER, GEORGE A., lawyer; board chairman, Bank of Texas; trustee, George Washington University, Grand Central Art Galleries, Washington-on-the-Brazos Association . . . *Houston*
- CALDWELL, (JOHN) CLIFTON, rancher, chairman Shackelford County Historical Survey Committee, director Texas Historical Foundation . . . *Albany*
- CARMACK, GEORGE, former editor *Houston Press* and *The Albuquerque Tribune* . . . *Albuquerque*
- CARRINGTON, EVELYN, child psychologist, staff of Children's Development Center, Shady Brook Schools, Children's Medical Center . . . *Dallas*

*Life Member

- CARRINGTON, PAUL, lawyer; past president, Dallas Chamber of Commerce; past president, State Bar of Texas *Dallas*
- CARROLL, MARY JOE DURNING (MRS. H. BAILEY), lawyer; board member, *Texas Law Review*; ed. staff, *Handbook of Texas* (1952); former Parliamentarian, Texas Senate; Governor's Committee, 1969 Codification of Texas School Laws *Austin*
- CLARK, EDWARD, lawyer; former Secretary of State of Texas; former United States Ambassador to Australia *Austin*
- CLARK, RANDOLPH LEE, president, University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute; professor of surgery, University of Texas at Houston *Houston*
- CLARK, TOM C., retired Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States *Dallas and Washington*
- COKE, HENRY CORNICK JR., senior partner Coke and Coke, director First National Bank; president Dallas Historical Society; past president, Dallas Symphony Society *Dallas*
- COLLIE, MARVIN KEY, lawyer *Houston*
- CONNALLY, JOHN BOWDEN, former Secretary of the Treasury, Governor of Texas and Secretary of the Navy *Floresville and Washington*
- COTTAM, CLARENCE, director Welder Wildlife Foundation; former research chief, Department of the Interior, and dean, Brigham Young University; past president, National Parks Association *Sinton*
- CULLUM, ROBERT B., board chairman, the Cullum Companies; president State Fair of Texas; trustee SMU and other institutions, foundation, civic enterprises *Dallas*
- DANIEL, PRICE, associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas, former United States Senator, attorney general and governor of Texas; author *Liberty and Austin*
- DARDEN, WILLIAM E., president, William E. Darden Lumber Company; former regent, University of Texas *Waco*
- DAVIS, MORGAN JONES, president, Humble Oil and Refining Co.; past president, American Association of Petroleum Geologists *Houston*
- DEBAKEY, MICHAEL L., surgeon; president, Baylor College of Medicine *Houston*
- DENIUS, FRANKLIN W., lawyer; past president, University of Texas Ex-Students Association; member Constitutional Revision Committee *Austin*
- DEWITT, ROSCOE PLIMPTON, architect; in practice Dallas 1919- *Dallas*
- DICKSON, FAGAN, lawyer, former assistant Attorney General of Texas; vice president Dickson Properties, Colorado River Development; member Council on Foreign Relations *Austin*
- DOTY, EZRA WILLIAM, emeritus professor of Music and dean of the College of Fine Arts, University of Texas *Austin*
- DOUGHERTY, J. CHRYS, attorney; member national panel, American Arbitration Association, advisory board Submerged Lands Board, trustee National Pollution Control Foundation, Advanced Religion Study Foundation *Austin*
- DOYLE, GERRY, typographer; director of publications, San Jacinto Museum of History *Beaumont*
- DUDLEY, FREDERICA GROSS (Mrs. Ray L.), chairman trustees University of Houston Foundation; vice president Houston Symphony; member Governor's Committee on Higher Education *Houston*
- DUGGER, RONNIE E., journalist; with Texas Observer since 1954 (owner); contributor to national and regional journals *Austin*
- ELKINS, JAMES A. JR., president, First City National Bank, chairman Federal Reserve Bank of Houston; regent, University of Houston *Houston*
- ELLIOTT, EDWIN ALEXANDER, former Regional Director, National Labor Relations Board; former professor of economics, Texas Christian University *Fort Worth*
- ESTES, JOE EWING, United States District Judge, Northern District of Texas *Dallas*

- ETTLINGER, HYMAN JOSEPH, professor of mathematics,
University of Texas *Austin*
- EVANS, STERLING C., former president, Bank of the Cooperatives and Federal
Land Bank; member of the board, Texas A & M University System;
trustee, Wortham Foundation *Houston*
- EWING, WILLIAM MAURICE, Wiggins professor of geology and director, La-
mont-Doherty Geological Observatory, Columbia University; past presi-
dent, Seismological Society of America, and American Geophysical Union
. *Palisades, New York*
- FLAWN, PETER T., president, University of Texas at San Antonio . *San Antonio*
- FERGUSON, CHARLES W., editor-at-large, *Reader's Digest*; former cultural rela-
tions officer, American Embassy, London *New York, New York*
- FINCH, WILLIAM CARRINGTON, retired dean, Vanderbilt Divinity School;
former president, Southwestern University *Nashville, Tennessee*
- FLEMING, DURWOOD, president, Southwestern University; president Texas
Assn. Church-Related Colleges, mem. World Meth. Council . *Georgetown*
- FRANTZ, JOE B., professor of history, The University of Texas, director, Texas
State Historical Association; editor, *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*;
president, Texas Institute of Letters *Austin*
- FRIEND, LLERENA BEAUFORT, professor emeritus of history, University of
Texas *Austin*
- GALVIN, CHARLES O'NEILL, dean, School of Law, Southern Methodist Univer-
sity; began practice, Dallas, 1947, Lt. Comdr. USNR WWII; member Am.
Judicature Soc., Intl. Inst. CPAs *Dallas*
- *GAMBRELL, HERBERT PICKENS, professor emeritus, Southern Methodist Uni-
versity; past president, Texas Historical Association, research director,
Dallas Historical Society; past president, Texas Institute of Letters; mem-
ber, Texas State Historical Survey Committee *Dallas*
- GAMBRELL, VIRGINIA LEDDY (Mrs. Herbert), director of the museum, Dallas
Historical Society; former chairman, Texas Library and Historical
Commission *Dallas*
- GARRETT, JENKINS, lawyer; member Governor's Committee on Education Be-
yond High School; newspaper publisher *Fort Worth*
- GARWOOD, WILMER ST. JOHN, former professor of law, University of Texas
and Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas; president, Texas Civil
Judicial Council *Austin*
- *GEISER, SAMUEL WOOD, professor emeritus of biology, Southern
Methodist University *Dallas*
- GLASS, H. BENTLEY, president, Stoney Brook Center, State University of New
York; president, United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa; former professor of
biology, Goucher College and Johns Hopkins University
. *Stoney Brook, L. I., N. Y.*
- GREEN, LEON, professor of law, University of Texas; former dean of the
School of Law, Northwestern University *Austin*
- GREENHILL, JOE R., Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . *Austin*
- GRESHAM, NEWTON, lawyer; former president, State Bar; chairman regents,
State Teachers Colleges; trustee, St. Luke's Hospital *Houston*
- GUION, DAVID, musicologist, pianist, composer *Dallas*
- HACKERMAN, NORMAN, president, Rice University; former president and chan-
cellor, University of Texas *Houston*
- HALL, WALTER GARDNER, president Citizens State Bank, Dickinson; past presi-
dent Mainland Chamber of Commerce; former director San Jacinto River
Authority; trustee, Rosenberg Library *League City*
- HARBACH, FRANKLIN ISRAEL, director, Neighborhood Centers Association; past
director, National Federation of Settlements *Houston*
- HARGRAVE, HELEN, retired associate professor of law and law librarian, The
University of Texas; member State Bar of Texas *Austin*

*Life Member

- HARRINGTON, MARION THOMAS, president emeritus, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University System *College Station*
- HARRISON, FRANK, physician, president University of Texas at Arlington; former professor Southwestern Medical School *Arlington*
- HARRISON, GUY BRYAN, JR., professor of history, Baylor University *Waco*
- HART, JAMES PINCKNEY, former chancellor, The University of Texas; former Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas *Austin*
- HARTE, EDWARD HOLMEAD, publisher *Corpus Christi Caller*; vice president, Texas Daily Newspaper Association; director, Texas Research League; member, Texas State Historical Survey Committee *Corpus Christi*
- HEATH, WILLIAM WOMACK, lawyer; chairman regents, University of Texas; former chairman, Board for Hospitals and Special Schools *Austin*
- HERSHEY, JACOB W., board chairman, American Commercial Lines; chairman advisory committee, Transportation Center, Northwestern University *Houston*
- HERTZOG, CARL, book designer and publisher, The University of Texas at El Paso *El Paso*
- HILL, GEORGE ALFRED, III, lawyer; president, San Jacinto Museum of History Association *Houston*
- HILL, GEORGE W., president, Southern Heritage Foundation; former executive director, Texas State Historical Survey Committee *Austin*
- HILL, JOSEPH MACGLASHAN, physician; director, Wadley Research Institute; past president, International Society of Hematology *Dallas*
- HINES, JOHN ELBRIDGE, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church; trustee, Episcopal Seminary of the Southwest; former member State Board of Hospitals and Special Schools *Houston and New York*
- HOBBY, OVETA CULP, president, *The Houston Post*; former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare *Houston*
- HOBBY, WILLIAM PETTUS, JR., executive editor, *Houston Post*; president, Child Guidance Center; chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations *Houston*
- HOFFMAN, PHILIP GUTHRIE, president, University of Houston *Houston*
- HOGG, IMA *Houston*
- HOLLOWAY, JAMES LEMUEL JR., Admiral (retired), United States Navy, former Superintendent, United States Naval Academy *Washington*
- HORGAN, PAUL, director, Center for Advanced Studies, Wesleyan University; president, American Catholic Historical Association; member, National Institute of Arts and Letters *Roswell, New Mexico and Middletown, Connecticut*
- HUNT, WILMER BRADY, judge 133d Dist. Court 47-70, now retired, serving as special judge; longtime chm. judicial section, State Bar of Texas *Austin and Houston*
- JAWORSKI, LEON, lawyer; president, American Bar Association; past president, Texas Civil Judicial Council and State Bar of Texas *Houston*
- JEFFERS, LEROY, lawyer; regent, University of Texas *Houston*
- *JONES, CLIFFORD BARTLETT, president emeritus, Texas Technological College; honorary chairman, Lubbock National Bank *Lubbock*
- JONES, ERIN BAIN (MRS. JOHN LEDDY), legal research scholar; member World Peace through Law (Washington and Geneva); author; benefactor of educational and educational institutions *Dallas*
- JONES, EVERETT HOLLAND, Bishop of West Texas, Protestant Episcopal Church (retired) *San Antonio*
- JONES, HOWARD MUMFORD, professor of English, Harvard University; past president, American Academy of Arts and Letters *Cambridge, Massachusetts*
- JONES, JOHN TILFORD, JR., president, *Houston Chronicle* *Houston*
- JONES, MARVIN, retired Chief Judge, United States Court of Claims *Amarillo and Washington*
- JONES, RUTH LEGGETT (Mrs. Percy), director Dodge Jones Foundation, Conference of Southwestern Foundations *Abilene*

*Life Member

- JONSSON, JOHN ERIK, chairman, Texas Instruments; chairman, Graduate Research Center of the Southwest; trustee many institutions; former Mayor of Dallas *Dallas*
- JORDAN, BRYCE, president, University of Texas at Dallas *Dallas*
- JOSEY, JACK S., president, Josey Oil Company; member board of governors, Rice University; former regent, University of Texas *Houston*
- KEETON, PAGE, dean of the school of law, University of Texas *Austin*
- KELSEY, MAVIS PARROTT, physician; clinical professor, University of Texas Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences; associate internist M. D. Anderson and other hospitals; editor Air Surgeon's Bulletin; formerly with Mayo Clinic and Mayo Foundation *Houston*
- KEMPNER, HARRIS LEON, trustee, H. Kempner; chairman, United States National Bank, Schwabach, Kempner & Perutz, and Imperial Sugar Company *Galveston*
- KEMPNER, HARRIS L. JR., trustee, H. Kempner; president of board, Temple Academy; board member, American Jewish Commission *Galveston*
- KILGORE, WILLIAM JACKSON, chairman philosophy department, Baylor University; author *Waco*
- KIRKLAND, WILLIAM ALEXANDER, former chairman of the board, First City National Bank; trustee emeritus, Rice and Princeton Universities; regent, University of the South *Houston*
- KNEPPER, DOROTHY WARDELL (Mrs. David W.), director, San Jacinto Museum of History *Houston*
- KREY, LAURA LETTIE SMITH (Mrs. A. C.), novelist and essayist *Austin*
- *LAMAR, LUCIUS MIRABEAU, retired general counsel, The California Oil Company *New Orleans, Louisiana*
- LAW, THOMAS HART, lawyer; general attorney, Fort Worth and Denver Railway; past president, Texas Junior Bar Association *Fort Worth*
- LEAKE, CHAUNCEY DEPEW, professor of pharmacology, University of California; past president, History of Science Society, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Society for Pharmacology; president, American Association for the History of Medicine *San Francisco*
- LEE, AMY FREEMAN, member advisory council, College of Fine Arts, The University of Texas, and HemisFair; artist, critic and lecturer *San Antonio*
- LIEDTKE, J. HUGH, president, chief executive officer, chairman of board, Penzoil United; trustee, Rice University *Houston*
- LEMAISTRE, CHARLES A., chancellor, University of Texas System; formerly professor, Southwestern Medical School; member Surgeon General's Advisory Committee; chairman, Governor's Committee On Tuberculosis Eradication *Austin*
- LEMMON, MARK, architect *Dallas*
- LINDZEY, GARDNER, vice president for academic affairs, University of Texas; psychologist; author *Austin*
- LONG, WALTER EWING, supervisor, Texas Legislative Service; member, Texas Library and Historical Commission; chairman, Texas Civil War Centennial Commission *Austin*
- LOVETT, HENRY MALCOLM, lawyer; former chairman of the trustees, Rice University *Houston*
- LUCEY, ROBERT EMMET, Archbishop of San Antonio; past president, California Conference on Social Work *San Antonio*
- LYNCH, WILLIAM WRIGHT, former president and general manager, Texas Power and Light Company *Dallas*
- MACGREGOR, GEORGE LESCHER, chairman, Texas Utilities Company *Dallas*
- MALLON, H. NEIL, former president, board chairman, Dresser Industries; past president, Dallas Council on World Affairs; trustee, Southwest Research Institute and Southwestern Legal Foundation *Dallas*
- MANN, GERALD C., president, Diversa, Inc.; former Secretary of State and Attorney General of Texas *Dallas*

*Life Member

- MARCUS, STANLEY, president, Neiman-Marcus *Dallas*
- MCCALL, ABNER VERNON, president, Baylor University; former Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas *Waco*
- MCCOLLUM, LEONARD FRANKLIN, president, Continental Oil Co. . . *Houston*
- MCKILLOP, ALAN DUGALD, professor of English, Rice University . *Houston*
- Sealy and Smith Foundation, trustee Rosenberg Library . . . *Galveston*
- MCGHEE, GEORGE CREWS, former Ambassador to West Germany . . *Dallas*
- MCKILLOP, ALAN DUGALD, professor of English, Rice University . *Houston*
- MCNEESE, AYLMER GREEN JR., chairman of the board, Bank of the South-west; former regent, University of Texas; trustee, Baylor University College of Medicine; director, Texas Medical Center; trustee, M. D. Anderson Foundation *Houston*
- MINTER, MERTON MELROSE, physician, former chairman of regents, University of Texas *San Antonio*
- MOORE, BERNICE MILBURN (MRS. HARRY E.); sociologist; staff, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health; author, lecturer and consultant . . . *Austin*
- MOORE, FRED HOLMSLEY, former director and executive vice president, Mobil Oil Corporation, and former president, North American Division; member, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System; first vice president general, The Sons of the Republic of Texas; director, Texas Historical Foundation *Austin*
- MOORE, MAURICE THOMPSON, lawyer *New York, New York*
- MOSELEY, JOHN DEAN, president, Austin College; former Director, Texas Legislative Council *Sherman*
- MOUDY, JAMES MATTOX, chancellor, Texas Christian University . *Fort Worth*
- MURRAY, GROVER ELMER, president, Texas Tech University . . . *Lubbock*
- MURRAY, WILLIAM OWEN, Chief Justice, Court of Civil Appeals . *San Antonio*
- NELSON, FRED MERRIAM, chairman of the board, Texas Gulf Sulphur Company . . *Houston*
- NORTEN, MARY MOODY, chairman, Moody National Bank and National Hotel Company; trustee, Moody Foundation; director, American National Insurance Company, Medical Research Foundation; member Texas State Historical Survey Committee and Texas Historical Foundation . *Galveston*
- OLAN, LEVI, rabbi emeritus, Temple Emanu-El *Dallas*
- OLSON, STANLEY W., dean, Baylor University College of Medicine; chairman, medical board, Jefferson Davis Hospital *Houston*
- O'QUINN, TRUEMAN, Justice, Court of Civil Appeals *Austin*
- OWENS, WILLIAM A., professor of English, Columbia University, formerly at Texas A&M University and University of Texas; author . . . *New York*
- PARTEN, JUBAL RICHARD, oil and mineral investments; ranching . . *Houston*
- PITZER, KENNETH SANBORN, former president, Stanford and Rice Universities; professor of chemistry and dean, University of California . . *Berkeley*
- PRESLEY, W(ILLIAM) DEWEY, president, First National Bank, trustee, Baylor University Medical Center; past president Cotton Bowl Association; vice president Baptist Foundation of Texas *Dallas*
- POOL, GEORGE FRED, former vice-president, East Texas Chamber of Commerce *Longview*
- PROTHRO, CHARLES N., president, Perkins-Prothro Company, trustee, Southwestern University *Wichita Falls*
- PROVENCE, HARRY, editor-in-chief, Newspapers, Inc., member Coordinating Board, Texas Colleges and Universities *Waco*
- RAGAN, COOPER K., lawyer; vice president, Texas State Historical Association . . *Houston*
- RANDALL, EDWARD III, president, Rotan Mosle-Dallas Union . . . *Houston*
- RANDALL, KATHARINE RISHER (MRS. EDWARD JR.), former member Texas State Historical Survey Committee; regent Gubston Hall . . *Galveston*
- RANSOM, HARRY HUNTT, chancellor emeritus, University of Texas . *Austin*
- RICHARDSON, RUPERT NORVAL, professor of history, Hardin-Simmons University; past president, Southwestern Social Science Association . *Abilene*

- RIPPY, JAMES FRED, professor emeritus of history, University of Chicago
Durham, North Carolina
- ROBERTSON, FRENCH MARTEL, lawyer, oil operator; past president, Texas Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association; former chairman, Texas Prison Board; chairman, State Board for Hospitals and Special Schools; consultant, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization *Abilene*
- SANDLIN, MARLIN ELIJAH, lawyer; chairman of board, Great Northern Oil Company and Pan American Sulphur Company *Houston*
- SCHWETZ, EDWARD MUEGGE, artist *Hunt*
- SEALY, TOM, lawyer, former chairman of regents, University of Texas
Midland
- SHARP, DUDLEY CRAWFORD, vice chairman, Mission Manufacturing Company; former Secretary of the Air Force *Houston*
- SHEPPERD, JOHN BEN, past president, Texas State Historical Survey Committee, former Attorney General of Texas *Odessa*
- SHIVERS, ALLAN, former Governor of Texas; chairman, Austin National Bank; former president, United States Chamber of Commerce *Austin*
- SHUFFLER, RALPH HENDERSON, director Texana Program, University of Texas and director, Institute of Texan Cultures *San Antonio*
- SIMPSON, JOHN DAVID JR., president, Superior Dairies, Inc. *Austin*
- SMILEY, JOSEPH ROYALL, president, University of Texas at El Paso; former president University of Colorado *El Paso*
- SPRAGUE, CHARLES CAMERON; dean, University of Texas Southwestern Medical school; former dean and professor, Tulane *Dallas*
- STEAKLEY, ZOLLIE COFFER, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas
Austin
- STEEN, RALPH WRIGHT, president, Stephen F. Austin State College; past president, Texas State Historical Association *Nacogdoches*
- STOREY, ROBERT GERALD, president, Southwestern Legal Foundation; dean emeritus of the law school, Southern Methodist University; past president, American Bar Association *Dallas*
- SUTHERLAND, ROBERT LEE, president, The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, The University of Texas *Austin*
- TATE, WILLIS McDONALD, chancellor, Southern Methodist University *Dallas*
- THOMASON, ROBERT EWING, United States District Judge, retired, Western District of Texas *El Paso*
- THOMPSON, J. CLEO, attorney; trustee Southwestern Legal Foundation, chairman Hatton Sumners Foundation; longtime member House of Delegates, American Bar Association *Dallas*
- TIMMONS, BASCOM N., Washington correspondent; past president, National Press Club *Washington*
- TINKLE, LON, professor of comparative literature, Southern Methodist University; book critic, *Dallas News*; past president, Texas Institute of Letters *Dallas*
- TIPS, CHARLES RUDOLPH, president, Ambassador Hotel; past president, Sons of the Republic of Texas *Dallas*
- TOBIN, MARGARET BATTIS (Mrs. Edgar), former regent, University of Texas
San Antonio
- TSANOFF, RADOSLAV ANDREA, Trustee Distinguished Professor of Humanities, Rice University *Houston*
- VANDIVER, FRANK EVERSON, professor of history, Rice University; former Harmsworth professor of American History, Oxford *Houston*
- WALKER, AGESILAUS WILSON JR., lawyer *Dallas*
- WALKER, RUEL CARLILE, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas *Austin*
- WARDLAW, FRANK H., director, University of Texas Press; past president, Texas Institute of Letters and American Association of University Presses
Austin
- WHITE, WILLIAM RICHARDSON, president emeritus, Baylor University; former president, Hardin-Simmons University *Waco*

- WHITCOMB, GAIL, lawyer; board chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank; past president, American Brahman Breeders Association and Houston Chamber of Commerce *Houston*
- WIGGINS, DOSSIE MARION, president, Citizens National Bank; former president of Texas Technological College and of Texas Western College; trustee, Texas Tech Foundation, Medical Research Foundation of Texas; Hardin-Simmons University *Lubbock*
- WILLIAMS, JACK KENNY, president, Texas A & M University System; former Commissioner of Higher Education *College Station*
- WILLIAMS, ROGER JOHN, Distinguished Professor of chemistry, The University of Texas *Austin*
- WILSON, LOGAN, former chancellor, The University of Texas; past president, American Council on Education *Washington*
- WINFREY, DORMAN HAYWARD, director, Texas State Library; former State Archivist and researcher, Texas State Historical Association *Austin*
- WINN, JAMES BUCHANAN, JR., chairman, Archilithic Company; member, Academy of Applied Science; artist; rancher *Wimberley*
- WOLF, STEWART, professor of medicine and physiology, director, Marine Biomedical Institute, University of Texas Medical Branch; formerly with Cornell University, University of Oklahoma; past president, American Gastroenterological Association, American Psychosomatic Society, American Pavlovian Society *Galveston*
- WOOD, JAMES RALPH, lawyer; chairman, Southwestern Insurance Company; vice-chairman, Texas Research Foundation; trustee, Southwestern Medical Foundation, Southwestern Legal Foundation; director, State Fair of Texas, Dallas Citizens Council *Dallas*
- WOODSON, BENJAMIN N., president, American General Life Insurance Co.; former Special Assistant to the Secretary of War *Houston*
- WOOLRICH, WILLIS RAYMOND, professor emeritus and dean emeritus, College of Engineering, The University of Texas *Austin*
- WORTHAM, GUS SESSIONS, president, American General Insurance Company; vice-chairman of the trustees, Rice University *Houston*
- WOZENCRAFT, FRANK McREYNOLDS, attorney; former Assistant Attorney General of the United States; delegate to United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties *Houston*
- YARBOROUGH, RALPH WEBSTER, former United States Senator *Austin*
- YOUNG, SAMUEL DOAK, chairman, El Paso National Bank; director, El Paso Times Corporation, Hilton Hotels Corporation, Texas and Pacific Railway, Telefonos de Mexico *El Paso*
- ZACHRY, HENRY B., president, H. B. Zachry Company since 1924; past president, Association of General Contractors of America; director, Texas Research League, Federal Reserve Bank, Southwestern Research Institute; former board chairman, Texas A&M University System *San Antonio*

IN MEMORIAM

SAM HANNA ACHESON
NATHAN ADAMS
JAMES PATTERSON ALEXANDER
JESSE ANDREWS
WILLIAM HAWLEY ATWELL
KENNETH HAZEN AYNESWORTH
BURKE BAKER
JAMES ADDISON BAKER
KARLE WILSON BAKER
WALTER BROWNE BAKER
EDWARD CHRISTIAN HENRY BANTEL
EUGENE CAMPBELL BARKER
MAGGIE WILKINS BARRY
WILLIAM JAMES BATTLE
WARREN SYLVANUS BELLOWES
HARRY YANDELL BENEDICT
JOHN HAMILTON BICKETT JR.
WILLIAM CAMPBELL BINKLEY
CHARLES MC TYEIRE BISHOP
WILLIAM BENNETT BIZZELL
JAMES HARVEY BLACK
ROBERT LEE BLAFFER
ROBERT LEE BOBBITT
MEYER BODANSKY
HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON

JOHN GUTZON DE LA MOTHE BORGLUM
PAUL LEWIS BOYNTON
GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS
ANDREW DAVIS BRUCE
LEWIS RANDOLPH BRYAN JR.
RICHARD FENNER BURGESS
WILLIAM HENRY BURGESS
EMMA KYLE BURLESON
JOHN HILL BURLESON
CHARLES PEARRE CABELL
H. BAILEY CARROLL
EDWARD HENRY CARY
CARLOS EDUARDO CASTAÑEDA
ASA CRAWFORD CHANDLER
MARION NELSON CHRESTMAN
JOSEPH LYNN CLARK
WILLIAM LOCKHART CLAYTON
THOMAS STONE CLYCE
CLAUDE CARR CODY JR.
HENRY COHEN
TOM CONNALLY
MILLARD COPE
MARTIN MC NULTY CRANE
CAREY CRONEIS
JOSEPH STEPHEN CULLINAN
THOMAS WHITE CURRIE
GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALEY

JAMES QUAYLE DEALEY
EVERETT LEE DE GOYLER
ADINA DEZAVALA
CHARLES SANFORD DIEHL
FRANK CLIFFORD DILLARD
J. FRANK DOBIE
HENRY PATRICK DROUGHT
CLYDE EAGLETON
ALEXANDER CASWELL ELLIS
WILLIAM STAMPS FARISH
LAMAR FLEMING, JR.
RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING
FRED FARRELL FLORENCE
PAUL JOSEPH FOIK
CHARLES INGE FRANCIS
JESSE NEWMAN GALLAGHER
MARY EDNA GEARING
EUGENE BENJAMIN GERMANY
ROBERT RANDLE GILBERT
GIBB GILCHRIST
JOHN WILLIAM GORMLEY
MALCOLM KINTNER GRAHAM
IRELAND GRAVES
MARVIN LEE GRAVES
CHARLES WILSON HACKETT
HARRY CLAY HANSEN
THORTON HARDIE
HENRY WINSTON HARPER
HOUSTON HARTE
FRANK LEE HAWKINS
JOHN EDWARD HICKMAN
GEORGE ALFRED HILL JR.
MARY VAN DEN BERGE HILL
ROBERT THOMAS HILL
WILLIAM PETTUS HOBBY
ELA HOCKADAY
WILLIAM RANSOM HOGAN
THOMAS STEELE HOLDEN
EUGENE HOLMAN
EDWARD MANDELL HOUSE
ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON
WILLIAM VERMILLION HOUSTON
WILLIAM EAGER HOWARD
LOUIS HERMAN HUBBARD
JOHN AUGUSTUS HULEN
FRANK GRANGER HUNTRESS
JULIA BEDFORD IDESON
WATROUS HENRY IRONS
HERMAN GERLACH JAMES
HERBERT SPENCER JENNINGS
LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON
WILLIAM PARKS JOHNSON

IN MEMORIAM

JESSE HOLMAN JONES
HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR
ROBERT MARVIN KELLY
LOUIS WILTZ KEMP
THOMAS MARTIN KENNERLY
EDWARD KILMAN
ERNEST LYNN KURTH
FRANCIS MARION LAW
UMPHREY LEE
DAVID LEFKOWITZ
JEWEL PRESTON LIGHTFOOT
EUGENE PERRY LOCKE
JOHN AVERY LOMAX
JOHN TIPTON LONSDALE
EDGAR ODELL LOVETT
LEWIS WINSLOW MAC NAUGHTON
JAMES WOOTEN MCCLENDON
CHARLES TILFORD MC CORMICK
TOM LEE MC CULLOUGH
EUGENE MCDERMOTT
JOHN HATHAWAY MC GINNIS
BUCKNER ABERNATHY MC KINNEY
JOHN OLIVER MC REYNOLDS
FRANK BURR MARSH
MAURY MAVERICK
BALLINGER MILLS
JAMES TALIAFERRO MONTGOMERY
DAN MOODY
CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ
PAT IRELAND NIXON
JAMES RANKIN NORVELL
CHARLES FRANCIS O'DONNELL
JOSEPH GRUNDY O'DONOHUE
JOHN ELZY OWENS
ANNA J. HARDWICK PENNYBACKER
HALLY BRYAN PERRY
NELSON PHILLIPS
GEORGE WASHINGTON PIERCE
CHARLES SHIRLEY POTTS
CHARLES PURYEAR
CLINTON SIMON QUIN
CHARLES WILLIAM RAMSDELL
EDWARD RANDALL
EDWARD RANDALL, JR.
LAURA BALLINGER RANDALL
SAM RAYBURN
JOHN SAYRES REDDITT
LAWRENCE JOSEPH RHEA
WILLIAM ALEXANDER RHEA

SUMMERFIELD G. ROBERTS
JOHN ELIJAH ROSSER
JAMES EARL RUDDER
MC GRUDER ELLIS SADLER
JEFFERSON DAVIS SANDEFER
VICTOR HUMBERT SCHOFFELMAYER
ARTHUR CARROLL SCOTT
ELMER SCOTT
JOHN THADDEUS SCOTT
GEORGE DUBOSE SEARS
ESTELLE BOUGHTON SHARP
JAMES LEFTWICH SHEPHERD, JR.
MORRIS SHEPPARD
STUART SHERAR
ALBERT OLIN SINGLETON
A. FRANK SMITH
FRANK CHESLEY SMITH
THOMAS VERNON SMITH
HARRIET WINGFIELD SMITHER
JOHN WILLIAM SPIES
TOM DOUGLAS SPIES
ROBERT WELDON STAYTON
IRA KENDRICK STEPHENS
HATTON WILLIAM SUMNERS
GARDINER SYMONDS
HENRY TRANTHAM
GEORGE WASHINGTON TRUETT
EDWARD BLOUNT TUCKER
WILLIAM BOCKHOUT TUTTLE
THOMAS WAYLAND VAUGHAN
ROBERT ERNEST VINSON
LESLIE WAGGENER
ALONZO WASSON
WILLIAM WARD WATKIN
ROYALL RICHARD WATKINS
WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB
HARRY BOYER WEISER
ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST
CLARENCE RAY WHARTON
WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER
WILLIAM MARVIN WHYBURN
HARRY CAROTHERS WIESS
DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD JR.
BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN
FRANK WILSON WOZENCRAFT
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER
RAMSEY YELVINGTON
HUGH HAMPTON YOUNG
