

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

PROCEEDINGS

*1976*

---

*The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

AT SAN ANTONIO

DECEMBER 10 and 11, 1976

XL

---

AUSTIN  
THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS  
1977

---

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 COLLINS-WORTH, 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.*

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

---

# *The Philosophical Society of Texas*

---

MOST APPROPRIATELY, THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS marked both the 139th anniversary of its own founding and the American Revolution Bicentennial by holding its meeting on December 10 and 11, 1976, in San Antonio de Bexar, one of Texas' most historic cities. Members and guests were registered at the St. Anthony Hotel.

On Friday evening members and guests enjoyed a cocktail buffet at the Institute of Texan Cultures. Special tours of the Institute were followed by the dome show "What is a Texan?" and "The Texans." President Thomas H. Law then introduced the following new members of the Society:

Kenneth H. Ashworth, Austin  
Edward N. Brandt, Austin  
James Dick, Round Top  
Tom C. Frost, Jr., San Antonio  
John L. Hill, Jr., Austin  
John H. Jenkins, Austin  
Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson, Stonewall  
Dan E. Kilgore, Corpus Christi  
Jack Maguire, San Antonio  
Robert C. McGinnis, Austin  
Louis Charles Page, Austin  
Jenny Lind Porter, Austin  
Emil C. Rassman, Midland  
Robert S. Sparkman, Dallas  
David Warren, Houston  
Sam P. Worden, Houston  
Mrs. Lyndall Finley Wortham, Houston

On Saturday morning a discussion was held entitled, "The Effect of Politics on Higher Education." Two panels looked at the issues on "The Effect of Politics on the Direction of Higher Education"

and "The Effect of Politics on the Quality of Higher Education." An afternoon panel examined "The Effect of Politics on Research."

Saturday evening began with a cocktail party followed by dinner and a speech by last year's Philosophical Society President, Edward Clark.

The 1976 attendance was large, and members and guests had great praise for local arrangements chairman, Peter Flawn, and program chairmen Frank Harrison and Logan Wilson, and their respective committees. Those in attendance can look back with fond memories of the meeting in St. Anthony's town.

#### *Attendance at 1976 Annual Meeting*

Members attending included: Misses Carrington, Cullinan, Friend, Hargrave, Porter; Mesdames Dudley, Johnson, Jones, Knepper, Freeman, Moore, Northen, Randall, Symonds, Wortham; Messrs. Anderson, Andrews, Ashworth, Baker, Banks, Bean, Bennet, Blocker, Brandt, Caldwell, Carmack, Clark, Coke, Crook, Daniel, Davis, Denius, Doty, Dougherty, Flawn, Fleming, Frantz, Frost, Gambrell, Garrett, Gordon, Hackerman, Hall, Harbach, Harrison, Hart, Harte, George Hill, John Hill, Hoffman, Holtzman, Hunt, Jeffers, Jenkins, Jordan, Josey, Kelsey, Kempner, Dan Kilgore, William Kilgore, Kirkland, Kusch, Law, LeMaistre, Levin, Lindsey, Lord, Lovett, Maguire, McCullough, McGinnis, Minter, Moore, Moseley, O'Quinn, Page, Pate, Pool, Ragan, Rassman, Richardson, Schachtel, Sears, Sharp, Shuffler, Smith, Sparkman, Sprague, Sutton, Tate, Topazio, Tower, Vandiver, Warren, Watkins, Whitcomb, Wiggins, Wilson, Winfrey, Winn, Winters, Worden, Wray, Wright.

Guests included: Mrs. Thomas D. Anderson, Mrs. Mark Edwin Andrews, Mrs. Kenneth H. Ashworth, Mrs. Rex G. Baker, Mr. and Mrs. Joe Ballard, Mrs. C. Stanley Banks, Mrs. William B. Bean, Mrs. J. M. Bennet, Mrs. T. G. Blocker, Jr., Mrs. Edward N. Brandt, Jr., Mrs. John C. Caldwell, Mrs. George Carmack, Mrs. Edward Clark, Mrs. Nan Clausel, Mrs. Henry C. Coke, Jr., Mrs. J. R. Cravens, Mrs. William H. Crook, Mrs. Price Daniel, Mr. and Mrs. Richard T. David, Mrs. Morgan J. Davis, Mrs. Franklin Denius, Mrs. E. W. Doty, Mrs. J. Chrys Dougherty, Mrs. Peter Flawn, Mrs. Durwood Fleming, Mrs. Joe B. Frantz, Mrs. Tom C. Frost, Jr., Mrs. Jenkins Garrett, Mrs. Wm. E. Gordon, Mrs. Walter G. Hall, Mrs. Richardson Hamilton, Mr. and Mrs. David Hannah, Mrs. Frank Harrison, Mrs. James P. Hart, Mrs. Edward H. Harte, Mr. and Mrs. Frank

Head, Mrs. Freedeem Herring, Mrs. J. W. Hershey, Mrs. George Hill, Mrs. John L. Hill, Jr., Mrs. Philip G. Hoffman, Mrs. Wayne H. Holtzman, Mrs. Wilmer B. Hunt, Mrs. Leroy Jeffers, Mrs. John H. Jenkins, Mrs. Jack S. Josey, Mrs. Mavis Kelsey, Mrs. Harris L. Kempner, Mrs. Dan E. Kilgore, Ms. Nancy Kilgore, Mrs. William J. Kilgore, Mrs. W. A. Kirkland, Mrs. Thomas H. Law, Mrs. Charles A. LeMaistre, Dr. and Mrs. Ralph Letteer, Mrs. William C. Levin, Mr. and Mrs. William M. Lewis, Mrs. John H. Lindsey, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Porter Little, Mrs. Grogan Lord, Mrs. Malcolm Lovett, Mrs. Jack R. Maguire, Mrs. J. W. McCullough, Ms. Jessie Brewer McGaw, Mrs. Robert C. McGinnis, Mrs. Merton Minter, Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Montgomery, Mrs. John D. Moseley, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Oppenheimer, Dr. Raul Ortiz, Mrs. Louis C. Page, Dr. and Mrs. Pete Palosota, Mrs. A. M. Pate, Jr., Mrs. Cooper K. Ragan, Mrs. Emil C. Rassman, Mrs. Margaret Scarbrough, Mrs. Hyman Judah Schachtel, Mrs. William G. Sears, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Sethness, Mrs. Dudley C. Sharp, Mrs. R. H. Shuffler, Mrs. Ralph H. Shuffler, II, Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Smith, Sr., Mrs. Frank C. Smith, Jr., Mrs. Robert S. Sparkman, Mrs. Charles C. Sprague, Miss Lois Stoneham, Mrs. John F. Sutton, Jr., Mrs. Willis M. Tate, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Thomas, Mrs. Virgil W. Topazio, Mrs. Frank E. Vandiver, Mrs. George Vaughan, Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Walker, Mrs. David Warren, Mrs. Edward T. Watkins, Mrs. Walter Prescott Webb, Mrs. James L. Whitcomb, Mrs. Platt K. Wiggins, Mrs. Logan Wilson, Mrs. Dorman H. Winfrey, Mrs. James B. Winn, Jr., Mrs. J. Sam Winters, Mrs. Sam P. Worden, Mrs. Andrew Jackson Wray, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Wright, Mrs. James S. Wright.

Since the last Annual Meeting the following Society members have died:

Harry Hunt Ransom  
French Martel Robertson  
Robert Lee Sutherland  
Charles Rudolph Tips  
Radoslav Andrea Tsanoff  
Gus Sessions Wortham

## SYMPOSIUMS

## THE EFFECT OF POLITICS ON HIGHER EDUCATION

*President Law:* This morning you will have the first of three panels on the very provocative and I think also extremely general topic of "The Effect of Politics on Higher Education." Each of the panels will have a chairman, as your programs indicate. The chairman for the discussion this morning, "The Effect of Politics on the Direction of Higher Education," is one of the extremely able administrators in education in the state of Texas. If you have not seen the beautiful campus of the University of Texas at San Antonio and if you do not know something about the very significant programs that are now in progress in that institution, I hope you will have an opportunity in the near future to do so. The president of the University of Texas at San Antonio will be the chairman of our panel this morning, Peter T. Flawn.

## I. THE EFFECT OF POLITICS ON THE DIRECTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

*Chairman:* PETER T. FLAWN, *San Antonio.* President, University of Texas at San Antonio.

*Panelists:* PHILIP G. HOFFMAN, Houston. President, University of Houston.  
JOHN D. MOSELEY, Sherman. President, Austin College.

FRANK E. VANDIVER, Houston. Vice-President and Provost of Rice University.

*Peter T. Flawn:* Mr. President, members of the Society, and guests, with me on the panel on "Directions" are three educators and so as to avoid any problem of evaluation of their distinction, I will introduce them alphabetically. Philip G. Hoffman, President of the University of Houston, is a historian, administrator, internationalist; John D. Moseley, President of Austin College, is trained in law and public administration. He has an extraordinary twenty-three year tenure as president of an institution of higher education and it makes him very well qualified to speak to us on the changes higher education has experienced in these last twenty-three years. Frank Vandiver, Vice-President and Provost of Rice University, is a historian, writer and administrator. All of these panelists are fully aware of the effect on higher education of recent political developments. As chairman, I shall make an opening presentation. My colleagues on the panel will respond or make a statement or introduce an argument and the subject will then be open for general discussion.

This presentation examines the effect of modern political trends on the direction of higher education in the United States. It is becoming increasingly difficult to use the term "politics" in other than a perjorative sense, but I shall apply it without prejudice to those procedures and structures through which society is organized and through which it carries out public policy. We are, of course, talking about the effect of laws, policies, procedures, guidelines, and decisions promulgated by government and quasi-governmental agencies, together with a group of non-governmental external bureaucracies (that are taking on a governmental cast) on the operation of colleges and universities and on their programs.

It is difficult to separate direction from quality in higher education, and research in higher education, (the subjects of the succeeding panel presentations) because politically initiated changes in program quality and in research programs constitute changes in direction, but I shall attempt to stay in my area to avoid those issues as much as possible, concentrating on changes in program direction and operational procedures in colleges and universities induced by actions of external governmental and quasi-governmental bodies.

Direction is part of a vector, a term that embodies action or movement as contrasted to stasis. If we are to consider direction, we must begin somewhere in order to have a reference point to assess change. I do not propose, as seems popular in discussions of higher education, to begin with the medieval university and develop a full history of the institution and its relationship to governments. I shall assume that we all know a great deal about colleges and universities and that what we are all concerned about is the effect of recent political trends and developments on the university's function and operation. I am talking about the last thirty years.

The university has been, until recently, a relatively free institution. It has not been autonomous as the faculty would have it, but it has been relatively free. Of course, both public and private institutions reflect general economic conditions and prevailing social attitudes to varying degrees. Public institutions operate within a constitutional and statutory framework and come to legislative bodies for operating funds; private institutions compete for private funds for endowment and operations and operate within the broad policies of Boards of Trustees. But, compared to the institutions of 1976, the institutions, public and private, of 1946 were relatively free as compared to other institutions created by society to carry out a social purpose.



Now, in our bicentennial year, the university, and particularly, but not only, the public university — its function and operation — its direction for better or for worse — is coming under more control by government action and of government agency, and of external bureaucracies known as accrediting agencies.

Control is exerted and exercised at the federal level by (1) general economic policy and social legislation, and (2) by bureaucratic and judicial interpretation of legislation. At the state level, control comes (1) through the appropriation process, (2) through general and specific legislation, (3) through central education agencies or coordinating agencies, and (4) through bureaucratic and judicial interpretation. By way of introduction I shall now consider political trends that have provided the basic impetus for the control mechanisms.

In the wake of the Second World War, the United States in the strength of its abundance and with the power of its extraordinary economy, still idealistic and with the principles of its Constitution impressed on every school child, and still supremely self-confident, set out to build a better society and a better world.

We wanted to eliminate ethnic and economic discrimination and come to a true social equality. We wanted a more open democratic society with full participation by the electorate. We wanted a more thoughtful and deliberate policy of growth and development — a policy that would take into account both consequences and alternatives.

In thirty years we have made considerable progress toward those social and political objectives. Only those over fifty years of age can appreciate how much. And, as with all fundamental social changes throughout history, the impact of the change — of the progress — on society's institutions and the way it conducts its affairs has been profound, and not entirely anticipated. Educational institutions, particularly public educational institutions, have been profoundly affected.

In the 1950's and early 1960's, society made its investment in postsecondary education. The money was available, and it was a very large investment. The system opened up and diversified. The junior and community colleges offered unique educational services and a down-to-earth educational environment that brought into postsecondary education thousands of individuals for whom education was not a family tradition. Access to education, and through education, to new vocational and professional careers was much improved.

Financial aid for students was greatly increased. But, other things were happening as well.

A vast federal and state educational bureaucracy was growing; accrediting agencies were growing. These agencies, backed by statute, and the power of the purse began to intrude upon the individual institutions through guidelines, rules, and regulations. To comply, institutions were required to divert dollars and manpower from educational programs to compliance, accounting and reporting through a wide range of institutional functions. We have come to the point where we must strike a balance between accountability and freedom to function.

Representative government has a built-in bias toward inflation. Social programs are popular. They are expensive. Candidates promise their way to election and spend their way to reelection — responding to the “Let’s have it now” demands of the electorate. The only control of truly representative government is through a limiting document that is superior to the representative process, that is a constitution or a charter that can be amended only with considerable time and effort. Although in Texas there is a constitutional limit on debt, there is no such limit in the federal Constitution. Higher education has been both the beneficiary of federal spending in support of higher education, and the victim of the inflation resulting from federal economic and social policy. Higher education is particularly vulnerable to inflation. Income has not kept pace with rising operating expenses. The university cannot raise the price of its products because it does not sell them and there is great resistance to increases in tuition and fees — political resistance for the public institutions and market resistance for the private institutions. Measurement of productivity in the industrial sense is difficult and the possibility of “increasing productivity” with no increase in resources, while it has received great attention, seems to defy realization if quality of education is to be preserved. The more open and democratic society that we have built is a spending society that puts its institutions under great financial pressures through deficit spending to achieve short-term social goals that are popular with the electorate but which prejudice the long-term welfare of the very institutions that made it all possible.

Our representative government has approved legislation that permits minorities (issue-oriented, cause-oriented, ideological, and ethnic) to intervene in majority decisions through the judicial process

so as to short-circuit representative government in the traditional sense. The result is a litigious society where the decision-making process is delayed, obstructed, and in some cases paralyzed. In our thrust toward a more open system, we must not lose the capacity to make good decisions and to act. Educational institutions are increasingly the victims of frivolous litigation wherein a few individuals who are not hired, or who do not perform and are terminated, pervert the intent of laws designed to protect the individual against discrimination. We must strike a balance between the administrator's responsibility to use public funds wisely to insure an able and competent faculty and staff, and the individual's right to protection against arbitrary and capricious administration. In our desire to create a society wherein no one can abuse authority, we should not create one wherein no one can exercise any without challenge and "second-guessing." In universities, authority has been divided among so many "constituencies" that opportunity for constructive administration is greatly diminished.

The emergence of the referendum to make complex public policy and resource allocation decisions threatens the quality of decision-making and thus the survival of our institutions and our society in a competitive world where good decisions are essential for survival.

Educators have been in the forefront of the drive toward equal educational opportunity. They have been strong in support of egalitarianism in its finest sense — the belief that all individuals are equal in intrinsic worth and are entitled to equal access to the rights and privileges of their society. But, equal worth does not translate to equal ability, an equal access does not equate to equal achievement. The business of the college and university is to assist the individual to develop his or her full potential. To fully develop human potential, an institution must recognize and reward merit and performance; it must stress and stretch its students; it must, inevitably, also recognize failure.

If it is true, as many historians and philosophers insist, that through time a relatively small percentage of the human race with the capacity for superior intellectual performance has been responsible for invention, innovation and the development of civilizations, then it follows that failure to fully develop human potential is prejudicial to the long-term welfare of mankind. Put another way, the society that applies its resources to develop the individual to the limit of his or her potential is a wise society that is thereby insuring the wel-

fare of all of its citizens. I am sure that to those who are committed to the extreme dimension of the egalitarian ideology this is an unacceptable elitist view. The basic problem that the extremist egalitarian must contend with is that it is in the free society that he pretends to support wherein differences in individual capability and performance are most visible.

It is indeed a bitter irony that the university or college charged with developing society's human talent is now under siege by those of little vision who see recognition of merit, diligence, superior performance, and hard work as somehow a threat to a democratic society — whereas in such recognition lies its only salvation. It has been said that a man with little knowledge can yet be wise, and that is true — although knowledge certainly helps. But, at no time in 3,000 years of history has any society suffered fools and survived. There are fools — and there are wise men and women. We all know that; it has always been so. One individual's opinion is not as good as another's. It is up to us to maximize society's human resources.

The higher education that has cultivated excellence of mind and professional and occupational skill to produce the nation's leaders must now struggle to protect its standards of merit and performance in a society that appears bent on destroying merit in order to prevent discrimination. We cannot allow that to happen. It is not necessary. There is no conflict between an antidiscrimination policy and a pro-merit policy. They are perfectly compatible. Indeed, they are complementary. More than that — we will not achieve true equality of opportunity unless we vigorously pursue both policies simultaneously.

The Civil Rights laws were enacted because able and capable individuals of the ethnic minorities and able and capable women were denied equal opportunity. But, unless we cultivate and reward performance, there will be no opportunity. We will be in a society wherein there is no place to go.

I have wandered into the theme of the next panel — the effects of politics on the quality of higher education — but, it is necessary, I think, to establish the political thrust that has affected function and operation.

In the final part of this presentation I shall deal with four topics (1) financial control of institutions through the appropriations, grant and contract processes, (2) control through civil rights and other social legislation, (3) control through establishment of central bu-

reaucracies, and (4) control by accrediting agencies and licensing boards.

(1) *Financial Control:*

This sophisticated audience is, I am sure, generally familiar with the appropriation process wherein public institutions carry forward their legislative requests for operating funds and private institutions carry forward requests for public support through tuition-equalization grants and contracts. In Texas, the large part of the public institution's budget is allocated on the basis of formulae tied to semester credit hours generated by the institution. This system has both advantages and disadvantages, but they must remain a subject for another day. In Texas, funds for capital improvements come to public institutions through bonding capacities of constitutionally protected endowment funds, statutorily authorized revenue bonds serviced by tuition and fees, and general revenue appropriations.

Political forces in the Legislature have from time to time attempted to diminish the managerial authority of the institutional governing boards by various appropriation bill riders, for example mandating teaching loads or budget policies, or by statutes to change operating procedures, diminish fiscal authority, or change the composition of the governing boards, but these attempts have been largely overcome by reason and by counter force.

What is relatively new is the successful attempt to vest by statute more authority in the central agency — in Texas, the Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System — with resulting increased compliance and reporting responsibilities for institutions. In plain words, control over university curricula is now vested in a central agency to the extent that any change requires approval. This agency also has authority over use of all but constitutional construction funds.

Currently, there is political interest in two additional control mechanisms that are viewed by institutions with great alarm.

One would require all private gift and endowment funds to be deposited in the state treasury. Such a legislative thrust with its accompanying bureaucratic rules and regulations would inevitably diminish private philanthropy for public institutions in Texas.

Another contemplates a mechanism to take funds away from programs that in the view of a central bureaucracy are producing too many graduates for particular job markets.

Curiously, many of the staunchist advocates of free enterprise are the most critical of universities that produce "too many teachers," or "too many physicists." Apparently, they see the whole purpose of the university as production of professionals and technicians to fill immediate social needs and oppose expenditure of public funds for higher education not directly related to the job market. They seem not to recognize the alternative to our free system — manpower planning — as the policy of the socialist state that they so vigorously oppose.

I predict that no central bureaucracy, state or federal, will be successful at forecasting five years into the future with any degree of accuracy on how many nurses, geologists, accountants, chemists, or welders will be needed. Technological, economic, and social currents in our society flow too fast and too unpredictably. Manpower planning data should be used advisedly but within an educational system that permits the student to react quickly to opportunities and provides the kind of basic intellectual development that permits the individual to adapt to change. I will not launch a defense of the social value of a broad ranging university education except to assert that the opportunity offered by our institutions for a combined or either/or humanistic and professional education has been an enormously successful social policy.

### *(2) Control through Civil Rights and Other Social Legislation:*

Last year it cost the new, fledgling University of Texas at San Antonio about \$240,000 to comply with federal reporting requirements and to answer inquiries and charges. Like all other universities, we have had thrust upon us very burdensome procedures in hiring, promoting, terminating, in evaluation of performance, in public disclosure, and in serving the student as a "consumer."

Funds and managerial effort are diverted away from the main purpose of the institution. Because of legal liability and open records, honest evaluations of employees, faculty, and students are enormously complicated. No one will put anything on paper. Frank discussion about unsatisfactory performance or weaknesses may become grounds for legal action.

We are now preparing an Affirmative Action Plan for the Handicapped, but we are handicapped because Washington is not sure what a handicapped person is.

Ironically, the legislation to open up the system is closing it down — making it less direct and honest. We do not give reasons

when an individual on probational annual appointment is not re-appointed because of litigation liability.

(3) *The Central Bureaucracies in Texas are the Coordinating Board and the Texas Education Agency* — although the State Auditor, the Board of Control, Legislative Budget Board, and the Governor's Office, and various interim legislative committees also require institutional attention and compliance with directives. The Texas Education Agency must approve Teacher Certification Programs. Some years ago the Texas Education Agency attempted to expand its authority to instruct universities on how to prepare teachers. The Attorney General stopped that, but TEA continues to push a legislative program that would confer on that bureaucracy more authority to control university curricula.

The Coordinating Board has basic program and facilities authority. The Board is now studying the Role and Scope of each institution in Texas before it is prepared to consider new program requests.

I do not say that we should not have such agencies, or that they should not carry out the functions assigned to them by representative government working through statute. I am reporting on how they affect the operating university whose business is to assist individuals to develop themselves and thereby carry out a positive, productive role in our society.

(4) *COPA is the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation:*

It recognizes (1) the nine postsecondary commissions of the six regional associations, (2) four national associations for specialized institutions, and (3) thirty-three national professional commissions. Another twenty specialized accrediting organizations have indicated a desire to be recognized.

Accreditation is a mixed blessing. On balance it has put at least a floor under program quality. If a program is not accredited, it really cannot compete successfully for funds. The accrediting team tells the institution what kind of faculty to hire and how many in order to achieve accreditation. Of course, to a bureaucracy, the worst case involves the "client" who proposes to do something different or who asks "why."

Increasingly, the federal government is turning to non-governmental accrediting agencies in an attempt to hand off the decision on funding eligibility. There are also attempts by special interest groups to use the accrediting process to enhance their own status. We

are now facing a move by licensed psychologists to require a professor to be licensed by the state board before he or she can teach psychology. If they are successful, the next step is to require curriculum approval by that state board.

Some years ago, with the help of the Attorney General, higher education escaped from legislation that would have made it illegal for any faculty member to teach a course with "engineering" in its title unless he or she was a registered professional engineer in Texas.

To summarize, "politics" has:

- (1) made higher education more accessible and substantially increased its funding and financial aid to students
- (2) rendered the operation of universities more costly and less efficient
- (3) made universities less "free" and less independent
- (4) made universities more profession and job-related and less humanistic
- (5) encouraged faddism and discouraged basic intellectual development
- (6) eliminated instruction in ethics and morality
- (7) worked to homogenize higher education, reduce peaks of excellence, and lower quality; but
- (8) for the public institutions, politics has done one great and magnificent thing — *it has built them.*

*Philip G. Hoffman:* I wish to share with this audience the enthusiasm which is obviously felt for the very fine paper which Peter Flawn gave us and to indicate that I agree with most of what he said. Now for the president of one university to say that about the efforts of another is something which I think indicates the warm ecumenical relationship which we have in higher education in Texas.

As Peter Flawn was speaking I was reminded of a story I haven't thought about for many years of the black minister in South Alabama who each Sunday closed his sermons to his flock by saying, "Brethren, we must do something to remedy the *status quo.*" The problem was that very few if any members of his flock knew what the *status quo* meant. So finally they formed a committee and waited for the minister and in effect told him that he had to explain this or they'd get another minister. So the next Sunday he concluded his sermon by saying, "Brethren, I hear tell you want to know the mean-



ing of the *status quo*. The *status quo* is the Latin for the mess we're in."

I have been solemnly abjured that my remarks should be within the confines of somewhere between five and ten minutes and I guarantee to respect this restriction. I would also agree with Peter Flawn that the directions and the quality aspects of political influence are not entirely separable but I will also along with him try not to transgress too much in terms of the subject of the subsequent panel.

It is obvious, as has been pointed out, that politics does have a very substantial impact on the direction of higher education. It's really not surprising at all that it should because virtually all other institutions of our society are affected in one way or another by politics. We've known its impact on churches in various ways as recently as a white frame Baptist church in Plains, Georgia. We have of course through the years noted the impact of politics on our courts whether it be in the appointment and confirmation process or in many cases in the actual election process of judges itself and the various other influences attendant upon these forces. We know that business and industry are tremendously influenced by politics in various ways. In fact, local government itself is influenced by federal politics so we're not being singled out all by ourselves but we, as is apparent in the subject of this particular panel this morning, are especially concerned about the impact of politics on the direction of higher education.

I think that we should not assume that these impacts are always negative. As has been pointed out, frequently they assume positive aspects. Historically, we know that there have been many times when there has been a vibrant interaction between the higher education community and the social, political, and economic forces of the day. For example, the land grant college development and expansion throughout the years. The impact of politics and economics on the development of graduate research universities in this country has been tremendous. We need only look back to the early 1960's and the middle 1960's to see the tremendous impact, which had truly been developing before but which became emphasized especially in the early days and the continuing days of John Connally when he took strong positions on behalf of higher education which caused higher education to make great gains in the state of Texas. This was very important for the state and for higher education. And I might add that it was also good politics for John Connally because at that time

higher education was a very popular objective and much of this momentum has continued to the great benefit of Texas culturally and economically during the intervening years.

However, I regret along with many of my colleagues, and I think many persons in this room, recent expressions of concern which seem almost to wish to dissociate from these tremendous gains of recent years.

On the contrary, and I would like to digress personally for just a moment to say that I came to the state of Texas some twenty years ago from another state, and from having travelled in many states and from being part of systems of higher education in three or four states. At the time I came to Texas, Texas higher education, speaking primarily of the public sector, was not well recognized nationally. That is not true today. As I travel around this nation today, I sense the very keen difference in the attitude toward Texas higher education today as compared to twenty years ago. I also submit to you that much of the prosperity and economic development and cultural progress of this state is closely related to the gains which I have just alluded to which had some of their beginnings at an earlier time and when we today hear comments which tend to suggest that in the forthcoming session of the legislature, there may be an effort to make higher education somewhat of a whipping boy in this state, it alarms me and I know it alarms many people.

On the contrary, I think the progress of higher education over the past fifteen years especially in this state should be a cause of great rejoicing and pride on the part of all public leaders, on the part of its citizens rather than the suggestions we receive now and then that perhaps there is even a desire to dissociate somewhat from this progress.

I will also point out that in spite of the rather dramatic assertions which have been made about the unreasonable escalation of higher education costs in this state, when we consider the public senior state colleges and universities, comparing the biennium of 1966-67 with the biennium 1976-77, there is practically the same percent of the total state budget devoted to public higher education now as ten years ago. The actual increase is only .6 percent. I would suggest again that we have great cause for rejoicing in this state in terms of progress which has been influenced in the past by very affirmative political directions, something which we should not dismiss lightly. I concur with Peter Flawn's concern about the volume and expense

of regulations, particularly in the compliance machinery. There are twelve major pieces of legislation governing in this area that relate to the areas of equal opportunity, occupational safety, and health and environmental protection. Peter McGaffe, who is president of the University of Minnesota, has estimated that the compliance with federally mandated regulations and programs on the part of American higher educational institutions will cost these institutions of higher education approximately \$2 billion this year. Now if this is true, and I can't check it. This was published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. But if it is true, this is equivalent to the amount of voluntary contributions which colleges and universities, both public and private, will attract during this same period. Let's assume it's only half true, that it's only \$1 billion, and how ridiculous to say only \$1 billion in this context, but let's assume that it's only half true and I am sure that the margin of error is less than that, this is an appalling figure and one which causes great concern and I would suggest to you that the cost of this compliance mechanism or the satisfaction of it is ten to twenty times today more than it was ten years ago.

The President of the University of Rhode Island, Frank Noonan, made this comment some time ago. He said, "Can we find the organizational methods to preserve the autonomy, flexibility, and differentiation in higher education?" Federal and state regulations, unions and systemwide personnel practices, teaching load requirements and cost per full-time-equivalent student, affirmative action and grievance procedures, lawyers and courts, budget reviews and systems to standardize terminology, accounting practices and rank and serial numbers, simply drive us out of the education business and into the bureaucracy business. If we are not careful, much of the life of the mind and the pursuit of truth will disappear. They will disappear not because of political repression, against which academic defenses are always on the alert, but rather they will be smothered to death, bit by bit, while we are looking the other way." We should recognize as the previous speaker did that many of these requirements are based on excellent intentions, many of them are valid, but it does appear that they have become excessive and unreasonable and as one writer put it, "The colleges and universities and Washington need to sign a peace treaty."

There are those who profess very serious constitutional concerns in this area too. President Dallin Oaks of Brigham Young University

argues that the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the press could — if pressed in the courts — be extended to protect schools, colleges, and universities against excessive government interference. He states federal agencies should be just as cautious in dealing with educational institutions as they are with the newspapers, radio, and TV.

And in conclusion, I would like to give you a quotation from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, who is well known to many in this room, David Matthews, the former President of the University of Alabama, who made this statement probably before he knew he was going to return to the University of Alabama and made it from the vantage point of the secretaryship of Health, Education and Welfare. David said, "I have come to the conclusion that no amount of accounting, no refinement of statistics, no system of accountability will ever save or preserve or perpetuate higher education. If in the process of trying to account for what we do in such a detailed way we make universities places that are more hospitable for people who are more facile with forms than they are with ideas, we will have corrected the character of universities in such a way that they have little way of doing what society asked them to do in the first place."

Thank you.

*John D. Moseley:* Politics is a word that connotes many different things to different people in different situations. The dictionary says it is the science, or conduct of government — political affairs, methods or principles. Others have defined politics as the art of the possible. Many use the word to connote something questionable, fraudulent, misuse of power, or self-serving. Politics in our democratic society is the process that the people use to determine policy or directions as to how we shall live together — of what is important and should receive priority. Thus, it is appropriate for us to seek an understanding of "politics" as that process which determines at various levels and ways the directions of higher education.

I should like for you to think with me about "The Effect of Politics on the Direction of Higher Education" in three ways, or at three levels of concern.

The first is the basic public policy of betting our American system of government on an informed and educated citizenry, and yet nowhere in the federal Constitution is there direct reference to edu-

cation. Many of our early statesmen were committed to education and its necessity, and you are familiar with their quotes, especially in this Bicentennial Year. Yet, it was the church that provided the education and established and operated the colleges during our early history.

If one traces the history of public policy in higher education, one could characterize it as reaction to social needs — the early needs were for basic education and for the preparation of leadership in the ministry, medicine, and law. In the latter part of the last century the needs of the rising middle class brought the reaction of establishing land grant colleges and universities that would move from the classical curriculum to the mechanical arts and applied sciences. Yet even at the turn of the century in 1900 we had only 250,000 students in all of higher education. After two World Wars, with the Depression in between, and the G.I. educational program, we had fifty years later ten times the students — 2,500,000 in 1950.

Again, we were compelled to react, and react we did to Sputnik and we established new directions of scientific emphasis and research. We invested in a major upgrading of higher education and research, and higher education, government, and private industry joined forces to put a man on the moon. About the same time we reacted also to another social phenomenon, the post-war baby boom, and we expanded the base of our educational system as it was now clear that upward social and economic mobility could be accomplished through education. Also, great expectations for the solution of problems of an increasingly complex and technological society would have to be solved through higher education and the leaders it produced. And at the same time some envisioned social goals of non-discrimination regarding race and sex, as well as economic opportunities could also be accomplished through the providing of equal opportunities for all to secure postsecondary education to meet their needs and capacity. The reaction policy was a concept of "universal postsecondary education." Access to higher education, non-discrimination, and equal opportunity were facilitated by civil rights laws, federal and state programs of student aid, and the rapid expansion programs of building colleges and universities.

We have made a major public policy change of direction in access and have accomplished much. We have in 1976 more than 11,000,000 students in traditional type educational institutions, and another 10,000,000 or more in vocational, technical, and proprietary

types of establishments now considered a part of, and eligible for program aid within the universal postsecondary educational concept. We have expanded the base and have made higher education available within reasonable travel distance for the rich and poor, old and young, male and female, and able and not so able. These reaction policies set in motion forces that we do not yet fully understand in terms of ultimate costs and ultimate benefits for the economy and society. Indeed, they have changed fundamental goals and tasks for much of higher education, and we the people have created great expectations for higher education to solve many of our personal and societal problems.

If one looks carefully at the results of this approach of politics to reacting to social needs and problems, one finds a myriad of programs and costs related to higher education throughout the whole national government; and it becomes readily apparent that the concerns, rules, regulations, and financial policies lack a consistency of focus, direction, and balance. Maybe it is impossible, even undesirable, but it does present major problems in resolving conflicting sub-goals and meeting meritorious expectations.

The second public policy area, or level, I would call to your attention as resulting from the political processes is the "system" or grand design of higher education, or as it is now expanded to be known as "postsecondary education" of which traditional higher education is but a part.

There are two attitudes, or expectations, that present increasing problems as we continue to expand the base and strive to meet our new social goals. One of these attitudes that "higher education" is all alike, for example, one degree is like another. We know technically that this is not true since one degree requires some courses that another does not. But basically the attitude that a college degree is a college degree is broadly held and refers to a level of education. The other attitude is related — that is, the degree is a "credential" that says you are qualified to do something, or to perform in a certain field of activity — as a teacher, doctor, lawyer, beautician, mechanic, etc. However, we are moving more and more away from the degree as the basic credential and requiring additional "certification" — exams and experience which are raising more questions about the basic degree and differences in educational programs and their goals and operations. Recent examples can be given of con-

flicts between certification boards and college faculties as to what and how one should be taught in a given field.

These attitudes and problems are used here to merely point to the different goals and purposes of education that we now have brought into the system, whereas we had earlier an almost singular classical attitude and approach to a "college education." We still have the problems of attitudes and expectations on the part of the public of "to get a college education solves the job problem, the status problem, and the meaningful personal life problem." People expect education to produce all of these results immediately, at little or no cost. Undoubtedly educators in their enthusiasm of the expansion heydays may have oversold what education could do, but economic security, to be president of the United States, and to enjoy personal happiness were not in the guarantee warranty. We didn't promise a rose garden without thorns.

It seems to me this presents a current major political problem — a problem of clarification of public policy as to the type of system of universal postsecondary education we need to meet the aspirations and new demands of our society. This means all postsecondary education is not alike, or equal: it does not require the same amount of time, nor cost, and it does not produce the same kind of results. It involves some of the essentials of our free society, particularly the matter of individual choice regarding the kind and amount of education the individual wants, needs, and can properly benefit from. It also provides a new broader base of the informed and productive citizen. This means that we should clarify the different functions and roles each part of the system should play, and not allow every part to try to do everything.

This problem of the postsecondary system focuses primarily at the state level of politics and government, although many federal policies and programs need to be taken into account because they are integrated into the state systems. When we speak of politics and policies of the state regarding higher education, or postsecondary, we must make the distinction between policy making for the whole higher educational system and that for only the programs and operations of the state-owned colleges and universities. It is increasingly necessary for the policymakers to take the broad view and understand the importance and relationship of each sector in the total state system, even though outside of the state operated sectors. Thus, politics, in consideration of higher education, must

deal with the total postsecondary needs and the implications for our society, and we must more precisely design a system capable of accommodating the different needs, levels, and kinds of education.

Because the system has just grown up in its various parts and because each part has gone through tremendous adjustments during the expansion period, there is great need for each sector to reappraise its unique role, strength, and capacity. There is even greater need for an understanding of the various sectors of the system. Policy-makers and the public should know the unique role and scope of each sector, its constituency, its financial base, and its place in the balance of the overall system of postsecondary education.

This means that we must have a better understanding of the educational function and services of the community college sector as the broad local base of the system with its unique program and financing. Likewise the state college and university sector has its special characteristics and diversity, with basically undergraduate institutions, and with upper division and graduate institutions, regional universities, professional and research institutions. We must better understand the roles and scope of these public institutions and provide better and specifically related financing. The independent sector must be taken into account if the fundamental advantage of choice and of the dual system is to be preserved, as well as the economic advantage to the state to have these independent resources being used to carry the educational load. The vocational, technical, and proprietary sector is new and raises many new policy and educational questions as well as new training resources to meet employment needs.

There are two main problems of politics at this level — one is for a design and understanding of the system and its very diversity and balance to meet the present and future needs of the citizens. The other is for the educators and the politicians to quit fighting one another over the bigger roles and budgets and to accept each other's unique contribution. Those of us in education should stop trying to be everything to everybody and to do our own thing with quality and integrity in a balanced system where everyone wins. One current notable effort in this direction among educators is the Association of Texas Colleges and Universities' new statement "Higher Education Affirmations — 1976."

The third area of politics and its effect on higher education is probably the most important and, many would say, the most vicious.



This is true in part because it is closest to home and it affects one's daily life and profession. It is the politics of local campuses. This is not a simple adversary relationship, although it sometimes seems so among administration, faculty, and students. It is far more complicated by academic concepts of what college and higher education are all about. There seems to be a basic conflict between those who view educational excellence in terms of ability and performance and those more concerned with open admissions and job relatedness. This conflict does not exist simply between educational institutions but often within the ranks of a given institution. Depending on one's perspective, it makes a difference in the career investment of a professor. It also makes a difference in the expectations of students, and these expectations change from one student generation to the next. The basic conflict affects the operation of the institution and its internal constituency and sets in motion a continuing political process.

Let me use just one central issue as an example of what I mean and you can translate that into the politics of faculty meetings, curriculum committees, faculty senates, dean's council, budget committees, tenure decisions, etc. — indeed, all of the political structures and their operations used to arrive at an institutional decision.

My example is related to instruction and is a quote from Dr. Patricia Cross, an outstanding researcher and educator. She says in an article in a book on current issues in higher education of 1976:

I predict that once we have reached our goal of education for all, we will turn our attention to providing education for each. Such a goal is infinitely more complex and more demanding than our present goal of providing access for all. We are going to have to be much more thoughtful in the years ahead. The expansionist era of higher education, for all of its virtues, has not been especially thoughtful. It has been largely a matter of education by formula — identify a new constituency, find out what it wants and needs, and expand the system to include it.

. . . But the expansionist years have had relatively little effect on the practice of the average faculty member. Most teachers wait patiently for the machinery to move each new wave of students into their relatively unchanging classrooms. As a recent Carnegie report notes, college instruction remains pretty much as it was 300 years ago. Unless learning experiences are redesigned to meet the needs of the new clientele and the changing times, access to college is a hollow victory. The impetus for change in the remaining years of this century will come from a recognition that

higher education does not offer all of its constituency equally good learning experience . . . instructional change is on the way.

If we understand broad public policy and changes in the system of postsecondary education that this country has undertaken in granting access and opportunities for all . . .

If we understand how the system must utilize each sector to provide its own function in the system and to have balance and accomplish the educational needs for rapidly changing society . . .

If we understand how each institution and program can make very special contributions with quality and integrity — not the same as others — and that these differences are important and necessary to enable the whole system to serve the needs of our state and nation . . .

Then — maybe — we can begin to understand that the politics — the power of the people — of our country has undertaken what no other nation in history has ever done — at one and the same time to have an elitist and educational approach based on competence and performance and an egalitarian educational approach based on non-discriminatory access and opportunity.

To accomplish these policy goals which are already underway, will test not only the new system of postsecondary education, but also the political system that set it in motion.

To succeed may produce a society and an economy the like of which can hardly be dreamed of.

To fail to meet the new expectations may be so drastic as to bring down the whole system and produce unthinkable consequences.

Maybe Fred Hechinger, the former educational editor of the *New York Times* has best put this issue. He says, "In this Bicentennial Year, no other objective seems more urgent than helping the American people regain their faith in education. The incentive to do so is elemental: to prevent the decline and fall of American democracy."

That may suggest another and more fundamental way of stating our topic — "The Effect of Higher Education on the Direction of Politics."

*Frank E. Vandiver:* One great thing about being last on any program is that everybody else has already covered your subject, so now I can simply copy my predecessors. I would like to start out as you would expect any historian to start out by talking about

history. That might take days but I'll try to boil it down and emphasize again some of the things that have already been indicated here this morning.

The direction of education, particularly the curricular direction of education, it seems to me, usually is set and has been set certainly in the last twenty years by a series of crises. That is to say that education has been reacting to external stimuli—wars, as you pointed out John, Sputnik certainly — it's also reacted to the evolution of society and has a tendency to do its best to get right with civil rights. It's reacted to faddism and fads are just as prevalent in the educational world as they are in any other kind of human activity. It's reacted to faddism in government. It's reacted to bureaucracy. It's reacted to government bureaus. It's reacted.

Education has also found itself in the position of pandering to the marketplace. Increasingly has this been the case I think on all campuses, particularly since we have at last encountered what I think you might call the job-oriented generation. The era of unrest of the 1960's which made the American campus a battleground, and for service on that battleground, neither the faculty nor the administration got combat pay and I still resent that. We have passed from that generation into a job-oriented generation and this by all indicators must be good. Bunk! Job orientation has brought about I think a serious skewing of the educational purpose everywhere. Peter Flawn mentioned that we now live in not only a regulated educational environment but a litigious society, and job orientation is one facet of a litigious society. It produces, as a matter of fact, one area of jobs, lawyers. I don't have anything against lawyers, but I've got too much to do with them.

This society is also a society of technological progress. We are in the age of technical man as well as job oriented man, and technical man is primed for job orientation because technical jobs require special education. We are in a business oriented society too and businesses require job orientation.

The current generation of American students, a lot of them I think, come to the role of student with the question, "What kind of education do I need to get a job?" That makes them wonder what kinds of jobs are available and then they begin to match curriculum to job necessity. Engineers, lawyers, bio-scientists, political scientists — you know, they're a kind of appendage to the

law too. Maybe it goes the other way; I don't mean to denigrate either side of that argument. Even social scientists, God forbid. There's a new area of job interest, the energy crisis and the ecology crisis have brought a whole new genre of jobs to us. And I think the combination of job orientation and the increasing complexity of social interaction, has really produced a kind of anti-liberal atmosphere in education. I mean anti-liberal education, the old idea of a liberal learning concept has suffered serious buffeting in the last twenty-five years. What has happened, for instance, to the old classics? I don't mean just the tripos, but what about classical science? Physics had a great heyday in the first nervous reaction to Sputnik, but like Sputnik physics went up and fizzled out. Chemistry has had a great emphasis in the last few years and now the question is beginning to be whether chemistry can answer all the questions it poses for itself. Geology (comment from audience) I know, I know . . . I won't say anything more about geology — just that it's a fairly rocky subject these days. Botany, who's ever heard of that in the last twenty years? All of these, if I may use the term, classical sciences are in trouble along with the humanities. I think a practical society, and that's really what I've been talking about, has resulted within the last twenty-five years in the new anti-intellectualism which perhaps we don't really recognize and probably deny when confronted by it. It's an anti-intellectualism of practicality, and that means it's against the old-fashioned conception of learning which was obviously time-wasting, money-wasting, and absolutely useless in the present context. It's an anti-intellectualism being forced by the new scarcity of money. The 1970's, as has already been said this morning, has seen a quenching of the expansionist, educational atmosphere of the 60's. And we now have an atmosphere on the American campus so heavily directed toward the university meeting the problems of the job requirements of the students that libraries are becoming condemned as being terrible consumers of money and producers of zilch. Equipment on the campuses is costing too much, that is, scientific research equipment; and the only way we can finance it is to get the money from the government which is a type of skewing of its own. And time has become increasingly difficult to find on the American campus. Just plain, old-fashioned contemplating time. When can you sit down and think about what you've been reading? I don't really want to think about what I've been hearing most every day on the campus, but when do you get any contemplating time? Do you know any

administrator who has any time to be anything but a putter-out of fires? That's true of faculty members. They're so busy filling out forms, worrying about the psyche of their students and wondering if they're interfering with anybody's civil rights that they haven't got time to be plain, old-fashioned scholars. And if that isn't the ultimate skewing of the university, I'll eat it.

Now there have been some trends in government funding that we've all hoped would offset this dismal picture. The National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities are bold democratic reactions to the crisis of learning. Every government throughout history has had some way of trying to sponsor learning and research, whether it be Prince Estherházy and music or the NSF. And the idea behind these is perfectly sound. The problem is the process, and I'm serious about that. Process becomes the end result of a bureaucratic system. It's far more important than what comes out the other end except to the consumer of learning. But the process becomes so difficult that when you get through making an application for a grant that you think, "My goodness, I've earned it just filling out the form!" The trouble with the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation is that they are bureaucratic organizations. They react to the fads of their staffs. And I'm serious about that. Faddism in government staff agencies is a serious problem. I've watched it close up on various panels. The panels themselves, the peer review which is the best system we can get, are still filled with problems. Panels will sit there and seriously ponder whether or not the *certain or little* interests in education have been met by this gigantic agency. No they haven't, so suddenly \$6 million is dumped on a tiny little project because some panel thought it was a great idea or some staff person put it into the heads of the panel. Innovation is either so thoroughly stimulated that it becomes a disaster or it's thoroughly stifled and nothing is done. Now I'm all for government money to back research. I just resent the fact that the NEH has less than the NSF, and Norman Hackerman and I argue about that every day. He thinks NSF ought to have all the rest of the money too, but that's another problem. The competition of agencies becomes involved in public funding.

Then there's the problem of congressional reaction to the public funding agencies. As Norm well knows, Congress gets very upset

about titles of applications like the sex life of the tsetse fly. Don't laugh. You didn't laugh. You could have laughed. It's a serious project. If you can figure out how to prevent the sex life of the tsetse fly, you can prevent the tsetse fly. But that created a terrific problem with the NSF and its congressional relations. The NEH had a serious problem of a similar kind with the social history of the comic book. That was an application title. It brought us more disaster than anything in the world. It was a serious, sociological study but Congress kept dangling this title, you know, the social history of the comic book, \$75,000, so congressional reaction — the whims of congressmen and senators — creates reaction in these educational agencies of the government. They become very tender to the sentiments of congressmen of all kinds and then that forces a conformity sometimes of a very distorted sort.

What are the alternatives for these dismal pictures that I've been talking about? Should education continue to react to the marketplace? Should it continue to react to crises, to faddisms, to government whims and regulations, or because of politics, can it do otherwise?

Thank you.

## II. THE EFFECT OF POLITICS ON THE QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

*Chairman:* NORMAN HACKERMAN, Houston. President of Rice University.

*Panelists:* JACK MAGUIRE, San Antonio. Executive Director of the Institute of Texan Cultures, University of Texas at San Antonio.

EDWARD H. HARTE, Corpus Christi. Publisher, Corpus Christi *Caller*.

KENNETH H. ASHWORTH, Austin. Commissioner of Higher Education, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System.

*Norman Hackerman:* One of the things that occurred to me as I was listening to the panel this morning was that all of us were talking to the wrong people. We ought to be talking to the Gulf Corporation people down the hall or to some of the teachers who are in the building. All of us in this meeting pretty much agree on the major premise. Our differences are just minor differences of opinion. It is a shame to keep talking to each other and not to anybody else. This is stated with a certain amount of fervor because in the past six months I have had direct contact with groups of the public via some regional public forums of the National Science Board. These were not involved with higher education like most of you, but were "true" public from the regions around Atlanta and Seattle. There were people there from all varieties of backgrounds — citizens off the street, League of Women Voters, members of the Sierra Club, and so on in addition to a few Board members and NSF staff members. One thing is clear. It is quite different trying to convince some of the people outside the realm of education of the importance of basic research or basic education than it is to convince you. You don't need much convincing. So it might be more productive to leave here and re-gather down the hall to the other meeting and see what kind of response we get there.

Well, Peter Flawn and his panelists this morning told you that they were just going to touch on politics but they actually excavated the mine. Nonetheless, my co-panelists and I are going to try to get on with our assigned task and I would like to introduce them. Jack Maguire will look first at the assigned topic in terms of the recent past; then Ed Harte will look at it in terms of current activity; and finally, Ken Ashworth will look at it in terms of the future.

First though, a few things about it beforehand. "Politics" in one dictionary is defined as "the art or science of government." The art or science. Now the fact is that politics is predominantly a means by which all of us learn to live with each other with a minimum of

nastiness. To do that requires a certain amount of organization. If any one of us lived alone out in the middle of the desert, we probably could do almost anything we wanted, within our physical capability. But as soon as we come closer to each other, we have some problems. So the mean distance between us is what is important and to repeat, as we get closer together, we have to get more organized.

I am going to use as my definition of higher education not all of postsecondary education, but that collegial activity that goes on in the four-year college or university. That is, higher education in the sense in which most people in this room are interested. Note this does not refer to importance but to interest. Further, the purpose of the four-year college or university is learning as contrasted to training. It is learning, which as you know is an individual process. Only you, yourself, can learn for yourself. Certainly, the setting helps. Peer learning is very valuable, preceptor learning is useful and formal — instructional learning is all right, but is really the least important part of the process. Now the question becomes quite different. What is the effect of organization on a truly individual process? Obviously it has to be restrictive. That is the problem, it *has* to be restrictive. And it should be.

The policy of mass higher education came into being implicitly after the war of the Forties. The explicit statement of that policy came in the middle of the Sixties. Now let us look at what that mass higher education policy meant. It meant the massive infusion of additional people into the system. Until about 190 years ago in this country all of higher education was in independent institutions, that is, non-governmental institutions. Up to 25 years ago, half of the students who were in colleges and universities in this country were in independent institutions, that is, private institutions that perform a public function. In 1976, 20 percent of the college students in this country were in independent institutions. Now, the funny thing about this is that it sounds as if there has been diminution in this sector of higher education, but in fact total enrollment in these institutions has gone up regularly, not with a very big slope, but regularly. Where then are these additional students that you hear about? They are in the public institutions. So the public institutions which started in about 1786 began to exfoliate following the war of the 1940's. They followed a birth-rate curve which while not exponential, was close to it. Certainly, the linear slope of enroll-



ment with time in public institutions was much greater than the linear slope for the independent institutions. (There is continued exchange between the two sectors.) Therefore, the mass higher education movement was indeed a governmentally supported system. Now that is a fairly important proposition. If the increase was predominantly in the publicly supported institutions, then we should look primarily at those colleges and universities in regard to the topic of this panel. This by the way does not set the two segments off against each other. Indeed, it may actually point up the complementarity.

So it had to be state-supported schools which carried the load increase and there had to be government funds to do it. Now government funds normally lead to some government involvement. This is a truism, and a proper one.

As an aside, and relative to the panel discussion this afternoon, during the high growth rate these public universities grew not just as instructional institutions, but also as research centers. The research center growth in itself has been beneficial to society. Yet, it had in it the seed of a serious problem. This has led to a divergence of interest within the individual faculty members and within the university relative to the two valuable things that occur on campus, namely research and instruction. It has turned out that in the research center institution, it has become almost impossible to be a dual purpose individual, such as faculty had been. Thus, the research center growth has some influence on what we are talking about in the quality of education. As I told you, I do not think teaching is all that important. Interest is the important factor and it is interest that has been lost, not the ability to lecture or demonstrate or even advise.

Now, a question: Should cost effectiveness, accountability, systemization, centralization, be condemned? My answer is no. And I did not need the conversation toward the end of the earlier panel to get to my answer. It is needed. Still, higher education is a pure faith system, not a whole lot different from religion. It is faith that says given the exposure to education, people will be better people and that if people get better then society gets better. But even a pure faith system which has a large number of people in it has to have oversight. There are almost eleven million students plus a half million faculty plus three or four million staff — about fourteen million people.

It does not matter how good the intentions are; the results of those good intentions are sure to include some failures. And you

have to remember that with such a large number of people, not all will have good intentions. There are inevitably selfish people amongst them. At any rate, the fact is that the system leads to oversight. Nonetheless, that oversight impedes the individual learning process, especially for the two ends of the intellectual spectrum. It is the two ends of the intellectual spectrum that give the greatest difficulty.

There is another measure of effectiveness which some may well say is simplistic. The Office of Education puts out gross figures for the operating costs for all United States four-year colleges and universities each year. The data are for the preceding year, ten years before that, and an estimate for ten years into the future. Thus, there will be one for 1964, 1974, 1984. In 1964, the operational cost was \$12.9 billion to educate 4.95 million students. Simple arithmetic says that this came to \$2,620 per student operating cost, no capital cost included. In 1974, it cost \$40.2 billion to educate 9.053 million students for a cost per student of \$4,450. Using an appropriate deflator, you find that it cost about \$2900 per student in 1974 using 1964 dollars or more per student the more students there are. That is sort of the reverse of the usual cost effective argument. Why? Perhaps because the larger the system gets, the more you have to put into the system which is not directly related to its primary function. Administrative services increase, counseling services increase, and services increase generally. And there are fewer faculty. These numbers provide a simple, but not simplistic calculation. You heard earlier about multi-media systems. These might simply increase costs without improving learning. That is like saying "he's small, but he's slow."

The question that the four of us have to respond to depends on the existence of certain critical issues and problems. There is a sizeable catalog of these, but I am going to go briefly through two issues and one problem.

Issue one: Purpose. What is the purpose of higher education? You had some very good conversation on that this morning. It is essentially the career versus the liberal education confrontation as exemplified by the Paris demonstrations this past April. These were not riots such as those in Paris in 1968 which stopped the government for a while. The students reacted because the government had imposed requirements on all national institutions which removed some of the liberal education possibilities and emphasized career orientation. Also, in the recent Democratic party platform a plank

on higher education expressed interest in career activities in education. And we have heard a good deal about that same topic in Texas this year. To firm up the point, there is a story about a man who awoke one morning to find water dripping. He called a plumber who came and fixed it in about 3 minutes and presented his bill — \$75.00 for labor. The man said, “You know, I’m a lawyer and I don’t charge fees like this.” The plumber said, “When I was a lawyer, I didn’t either.” At any rate, that is part of the problem and part of the solution. It is a great idea for those who wish to do one kind of thing to do it, and for those who wish to do another kind of thing to do that.

The purpose of the university in my opinion is to sharpen some general skills, to expose the mind to some explored and unexplored areas of human understanding, to start a fairly deep furrow, and over-all to produce a tough and flexible mind. Toughness so that you are not taken in by what anybody tells you authoritatively (as I may be doing now) and at the same time with flexibility to listen to other people’s arguments. A very difficult thing to do. It is awfully easy to have your ears open but your mind closed. So if you can produce flexible, tough minds to any degree, then certainly the process has been worthwhile. But the problem is how does that fit into an accounting system.

A second issue is cost-benefit. Who gets something out of the process and who pays for it? If indeed society is better because of larger numbers of highly educated persons, then society gets something out of it. Obviously if a person feels better, and can become gainfully employed, he or she gets something out of it. So who pays for it? What sort of a separation can you make in these two areas? The cost-benefit issue literally surrounds the first issue, the purpose, and they cannot really be fully separated.

The third item is a problem. The problem is that the reservoir of people in the 18-22 year age range is diminishing. This is the cadre which has inhabited the campuses up to now. Perhaps this is the only time they are consistently and constantly broadened. In this country for the four years from 1955-1959 there were 4.3 million live births. In 1960, there were 4.2. Those people will show up on college campuses next year. In 1975, there were 3.2 million, 25 percent less. Now, lifelong education and continuing education are fine, but I believe that the period of tremendous strides in learning is before the beginning of the mental maturing process. That is why

it is not certain that we can change our college campuses so that the 18-22 year old predominant composition will disappear. At any rate, if that is the case, that is a problem. No matter what the enrollment figures are for this year or last year, unless there is massive teenage immigration into the country, the numbers of college students have to come down. You might rely on the proposition that a greater percentage of 18 year olds are going to college. But the history of the last five years says that the percentage going on to four-year colleges is diminishing. This human reservoir problem is related to the cost-benefit problem which is related to the purpose of the college and university, all inextricably wound together. And that is inextricably wound into the future quality of education.

Thank you.

Now I would like to ask my panelists to say what they want to say and not be bound by the fact that we have assigned past, present, and future topic headings. Jack Maguire will start off.

*Jack R. Maguire:* Education and politics, both so necessary to a free society, too often are cast in the roles of antagonists rather than allies. Détente between the two is practiced, but only rarely does the conference table seem to resolve differences in a peace pact satisfying to both. Communication too often is by criticism and innuendo instead of reasoned dialogue. As a result too many educators have developed an incurable phobia of politicians and politicians an innate distrust of the academy.

This has not always been the case to be sure. Madison, Jefferson and Adams, as well as a few other politicians since, recognized quality education as a condition of successful self-government. They saw the academy for what it should be ideally and which it almost became before the regulators took over — a system of education for the whole man that would lead to his personal, economic, moral and social fulfillment. They believed, as a handful of intelligent politicians still do, that scholarly institutions should be run by those most qualified to do so — the scholars. The only legitimate early function of government in education was to provide some general guidelines and broad financial support without the imposition of a political bureaucracy on the system.

For a century and a half, education enjoyed the freedom of being this kind of elitist institution functioning with little direction and even less interference by government. In the aftermath of World War II, however, the nation embraced a philosophy of education for

all and opened the floodgates of federal, state and local treasuries to provide it. Educators, hungry for riches the likes of which they had never anticipated even in their wildest dreams, reacted as might be expected. Once the right to an education from the cradle to the grave became the inalienable right of every American, the academy willingly became an assembly line for the mass production of education.

Learning for all, and learning for a lifetime, is a noble concept. For education, however, it could only have the effect of lowering quality, at least until the system could acclimate itself to new procedures. In the first place, educating the masses was a sharp departure from the education of the few to which the academy had so long been accustomed. In the rush to put up ever more buildings, double facilities and triple enrollments, many of the old standards had to be ignored and even discarded.

While the huge sums of money for this expansion were readily available from a benevolent body politic, educational administrators either forgot or chose to ignore the very practical golden rule of business which is: "He who has the gold rules." Most of the new money needed by the expanding educational plant came from the taxpayer. And the taxpayer, in turn, began to demand through his elected representatives the right to tell the scholars how to do their jobs. Thus the political arena and the ivory tower became unwilling partners in progress — unwilling, at least, on the part of the academy.

It is a tenuous partnership which isn't likely to change, and it is one which both education and politics must recognize, understand and adapt to as best they can. Education, finally becoming accustomed to bigness at the expense of some of the quality of its old elitism, has to accept the fact that it now is a part of big government and can survive only with the largesse of that government. Politicians, acutely aware that education is an important issue on which elections are won and lost, must recognize this new constituency for the power bloc that it has become and serve it accordingly.

To coexist, and to insure that the quality of education will be diluted no more than it already has been, both educators and politicians must establish a much clearer dialogue than has existed to this point in time. Educators must accept the fact that their budgets, no less than those of highways or welfare or environmental protection, must be subject to closer scrutiny and tighter regulation by those who control the purse, be they boards of regents, legislators,

government bureaus or accreditation agencies. They must also accept the unpalatable (to many) fact that politics is going to be a way of life for education for all time to come.

Politics has a responsibility, too. Politicians, must understand that education is not a business and can never be run as one; that educators are teachers, not lobbyists, and that the art of political quid pro quo is something that is repugnant to the best of them and an enigma to almost all of them.

Somewhere in the no man's land that now exists between the two, education and politics must find a common ground for frank discussion, mutual trust and, perhaps, even eventual understanding. Only then will education become, as John Adams envisioned it, an institution that will "countenance and inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty and punctuality, sincerity, good humor and all social affections and generous sentiments among the people."

By that standard, at least, the educated man is not an endangered species today. He simply doesn't exist. But then maybe he never did.

*Hackerman:* Now we'll hear from Ed Harte.

*Edward H. Harte:* I represent one of the consumers of education, the marketplace to which some of the educators pander, as we were told earlier this morning. And I thought I'd give you a brief report of how some of us consumers feel about the product that we're getting. I speak, of course, from a very parochial point of view because I am a newspaperman and the only way I really know the products of Texas colleges and universities is through applicants for jobs in the newspaper or the broadcasting business. And I thought I would share with you some of the very good news that I feel there is to tell about it and a little bit of the bad. When it comes to pandering to a marketplace, I must say that the colleges and universities in Texas are exceedingly responsive. If anything, they're probably over-responsive. And I don't mean that facetiously. It is just a problem. Ten years ago, we had a tremendous shortage of journalists in this state, so much so that the Harte-Hanks newspapers, of which mine was a part, had to mount a special training program at great expense to train reporters. Today there are 3,000 students in the University of Texas School of Communications. The industry of the state cannot accept the output of even that one university, much less that of the other schools around the state teaching journalism.

Now, Dr. Flawn has explained to us that this is a problem for which there is no solution because you cannot plan successfully. But I merely point out that there are an awful lot of disappointed students when they discover they are prepared for jobs for which there is no room. Apparently in my field, journalism, some of the schools in the smaller colleges should actually just be shut down. And it does seem to me that while you can't plan successfully, perhaps Peter, you can react to counsel and steer kids out of professions for which there is no particular need.

The students that we get are in many ways superior to the student that I was thirty years ago and that you all once were. Inevitably, they are far more sophisticated. They have been exposed to a range of experience that my generation simply didn't have. In my business, journalism, this is a tremendous plus. Another tremendous plus in my business is the sensitivity of students of today which we did not have. They are sensitive to all issues of social justice. It is a very genuine sensitivity. It leads to a commitment on their part to do something about the world that I find very refreshing and much better than things were in my time. I also find their self-reliance, to a degree, better than that of my generation. J. Evetts Haley is a historian up on the Plains and a rather dyspeptic individual, who was a good friend of mine until he wrote about me unfavorably in that book he did about LBJ. Haley used to have a theory that education in his time — and he was about as original as they came — educated the originality out of you. And certainly that was true in my time. We learned to a great extent that everything had been tried before and innovation was probably not what would work. And as a result, I feel members of my group were excessively awed by age and experience when we got out into the world. Today's youngsters are not awed by age, experience, or much else. And this is a plus in my view. It leads them to innovate. It leads them also to be willing to take the responsibility for the things they undertake. As I say, they are innovative; and if that doesn't work, they're the first to admit it.

There is in my view one outstanding minus in today's educational product and that is that he, she, and it cannot spell. They do not use our language with any precision whatsoever. They do not say what they mean to say. Now in my business, this is not only a disadvantage; it is a liability. It can get you in the courthouse. We are a litigious society, and newspaper publishers are more and more aware of the

fact that their reporters simply are not saying what they mean to say. Now I don't say this is the fault of the colleges. The colleges can say, with some justice I am sure, that it is the fault of the high schools, and the high schools naturally say that it's the fault of the elementary schools, and the elementary schools say it's the fault of the family, and the family says the fault is television. But meanwhile, we are developing a generation in which we do not use our language. And this has very serious implications, not only for me in the newspaper business, but I think for society as a whole.

The scenario that drives everyone in the newspaper business crazy is this one, and I think it should drive philosophers crazy. Reading and writing are acquired skills. You acquire those skills for which you feel a need. If there is no need to read or to write beyond the level of following rote directions and filling out an application blank, then will people bother to acquire those skills? And I think this is something we have to come to terms with as a philosophical society and as citizens. If you cannot write and read and use language effectively, if you cannot articulate even to yourself abstract or complicated ideas, and if we are raising in this country a growing generation, larger and larger numbers of people who cannot have that complicated or abstract idea, are we not getting loose with our own future as a self-governing people?

I would like to close with a quote from George Orwell. Orwell seems to me to look better and better as we get closer to 1984. He said if people cannot write well, they cannot think well. And if they cannot think well, other people will think for them.

Thank you.

*Hackerman:* Ed, I don't think there are any philosophers in this group who philosophize. Few of them would consider themselves philosophers. Philosophers are people who make bright thoughts murky.

Now you've heard from four assassins from the campus earlier and then a fifth one, myself, and then somebody who was sort of in the middle of campus activity and had a good view of it, Jack, and then a user. And now you're going to hear from a guy who catches all the fuss. He sits right on the scene and I pity him, Ken Ashworth.

*Kenneth H. Ashworth:* I am glad that Norm Hackerman gave me the shortest of the three topics, future issues of quality in higher education.



With such short time, the first question is who is going to control my content. We've all been interviewed on TV. And I'll bet you are like me afterwards. You find you assumed that the interviewer knew what he was going to do with the topic and when it was over you found you'd covered a lot of trivia and totally missed the main points you wanted a chance to make. As a consequence, I now tend to ignore the questions and give the answers I brought along. Or as one Texas scholar said, "I dance with the girl who brung me."

All of this is to say neither the large topic nor Frank Harrison or Norm Hackerman will control me today despite their overpowering efforts to do so. I am master of these few minutes.

When I was an undergraduate, I overheard two Ivy League professors talking about the field of scholarship. They said that scholarship was like medicine; an early commitment is absolutely essential. They said that if a person hasn't made a commitment and become deeply immersed in academic studies by sixteen there is too much loss of time, too much to learn, too much catching up for anyone who starts later. Imagine how I felt hearing that at twenty-three, having just come back to school after four years as a white hat in the intellectual ferment of the U. S. Navy.

I think the issues on quality in higher education in the future will be very much the same as those we face now. When we talk about quality in education, we need to distinguish three different qualities: the quality of the mind, the quality of the commitment, and the quality of the process. Most of us when we talk about the quality of education are talking about the quality of the educational *process*. And that *is* important. High quality minds and high quality commitments have been lost through lousy quality of the educational process. So process must be addressed in order to protect the other two essential qualities of mind and commitment.

Our process of education has been increasingly influenced by egalitarianism. And that is desirable, within reasonable limits. But we have to maintain as part of our process enough diversity *within* and *among* our educational institutions to preserve the other two qualities, that of the mind and that of the commitment. A society dedicated to averaging its intelligence will pass first through a phase where no one is listening to anything said or thought above the average. In the next phase no one will be saying or thinking anything above the average. Beyond that no one will care about the

average and at that point perhaps the society will find it possible to start over again.

In order to preserve what we have it is essential that within our educational processes of educating the masses we find compartments and pathways to maximize the development of high quality minds and commitment to intellectual pursuits. This is the challenge of the future in protecting quality.

Most of us here are doers and thinkers, in that order. We grab at bits of intellectual ideas as we ride hell-bent through each day. Cicero was called an intellectual garbage can. When you lead an active life there's little time for most of us to do anything other than collect and ruminate on the ideas of others. There's nothing wrong with that; it depends on the quality of the garbage you pick over.

Oliver Wendell Holmes has given us advice on both thinking and doing. At one point he said: "Only when you have worked alone — you have felt around you a black gulf of solitude more isolating than that which surrounds the dying man, and in hope and in despair have trusted to your own unshaken will — then only will you have achieved. Thus only can you gain the secret isolated joy of the thinker."

However, on doing, Holmes has said: "It is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived."

So let me sum up my few minutes on these weighty thoughts. But first, if you've been impressed, don't forget the observation made about one scholar: On the surface he is very profound but down deep he's really very shallow.

I don't think there is any age limit on when a person can become interested in ideas. I believe it's possible to begin after the age of sixteen. I believe we need an educational process that maximizes throughout life the quality of the mind and the quality of the commitment. And that process should even trigger *dormant* minds and *late* commitments so that those dedicated earlier to *doing* things can also come in time to find the excitement of ideas.

### III. THE EFFECT OF POLITICS ON RESEARCH

*Chairman:* CHARLES C. SPRAGUE, Dallas. President of the Health Science Center of the University of Texas in Dallas.

*Panelists:* POLYKARP KUSCH, Dallas. Professor of Physics, University of Texas at Dallas.

WAYNE H. HOLTZMAN, Austin. President, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, University of Texas at Austin.

JACK S. JOSEY, San Antonio. President of the Welch Foundation, Former Member of the Board of Regents of The University of Texas System.

*Charles C. Sprague:* Mr. President, members of the Society and guests, before embarking on the topic assigned us this afternoon, I would like to take advantage of the podium to make a few remarks about the session this morning. First I thought it interesting that of the various institutions represented by the admirable speakers we had this morning, none of them had a medical school. Two comments in that regard. How could they be so lucky? And if they had, I would dare say, their discussions would be even more enlivened than they were. And I say that in all seriousness because at the present time, federal intervention is directed I think disproportionately to the health professional institutions in terms of the restrictions, constraints, and intrusions into the academic portion of our institutions. I think the medical schools in particular are a forerunner of what is apt to come in other parts of the university in the future. And unless something is done to head this off I dare say we will be in serious trouble. And I say that in all sincerity. And I also say that many university presidents have not taken up this challenge to the degree I would hope that they might. Of late Derek Bock and Kingman Brewster at Yale have been very vocal in expressing our concerns about the intrusion of the federal government into the medical schools particularly and hopefully we will see more of that in the future. I know there are at least two universities in Texas, members of the American Association of Universities, the elite group in this country as you know, that took a very active part and Dr. LeMaistre specifically was involved very much in working and trying to improve on the health manpower legislation that was just enacted in this last session of Congress.

Lastly before proceeding, I would like to say that while agreeing with everything that was said this morning, I think we ought to look at the other side of the coin, not only to how does politics affect higher education but how are we responding to these pressures. While I would like to think that all the institutional heads and their boards have the tough, flexible mind that Dr. Hackerman referred

to, I'm afraid that's not always the case and often I think we succumb too easily to some of these pressures and indeed on occasion I feel that we use these for rationalizing some of our actions or use them as excuses for some of the actions of the institutions.

Having been given the title "The Effect of Politics on Research" for our panel discussion, the first question I asked of our leader, Dr. Frank Harrison, was "What is your definition of politics?" With the recent report of the Carnegie Council on policy studies on higher education entitled, "Progress and Problems in Medical and Dental Education — Federal Support Versus Federal Control," I thought perhaps our chairman had in mind the effect of federal and state government politics as opposed to a more global definition. Dr. Harrison has assured me that we should use the broadest possible definition in our comments today. This is appropriate because to an increasing degree quasi-governmental groups and the public at large are exercising increasing pressures on our institutions, both directly and indirectly.

My first task (a pleasant one I should add) shall be to introduce our distinguished panel. We have been most fortunate in recruiting this outstanding group of individuals. Not only is each particularly well qualified to speak on this subject, but their backgrounds and areas of interest are quite varied and each views the research problem from a somewhat different perspective.

First, may I introduce Dr. Wayne H. Holtzman. Dr. Holtzman received his bachelor's and master's degrees from Northwestern University, and his Ph.D. from Stanford University in the area of psychology and statistics. Since 1949 he has been a member of the faculty in the Department of Psychology at the University of Texas at Austin. Currently, he is the Hogg Professor of Psychology and Education and President of the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health. He served as Dean of the College of Education from 1964 to 1970. Among the many learned societies of which he is a member, Dr. Holtzman served as President of the Inter-American Society of Psychology, of the American Psychological Association, the Division of Evaluation and Measurement of the Southwestern Psychological Association; and the Texas Psychological Association. He is Secretary General of the International Union of Psychological Science and serves on the Board of Directors and as past President of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. He serves on the Board of Directors of Science Research Associates, a subsidiary

of IBM; on the Board of Directors of the Foundation's Fund for Research and Psychiatry; and as Chairman of the Board of Visitors for the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Holtzman will address our topic today from the standpoint of the Behavioral and Social Sciences and the Humanities.

Our next panelist is Mr. Jack S. Josey. Mr. Josey is a 1939 graduate of the University of Texas at Austin, receiving his degree in Petroleum Engineering. He has served the University of Texas at Austin in many capacities, as a past President of the Dad's Club; as a past Vice Chairman of the Board of Regents and as Chairman of the Medical Affairs Committee of the Board; he serves as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Hermann Hospital Estate; a past member of the Executive Board of the Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges; a past member of the National Advisory General Medical Sciences Council of the National Institutes of Health; and as a past member of the Board of Governors of Rice University. He presently serves as the President of the Welch Foundation. Although not an academician himself, Mr. Josey has had wide experience with research at all levels within the University, and within the N. I. H. and now he has had still another vantage point from which to view research since assuming the presidency of the Welch Foundation. Mr. Josey will present his views from the standpoint of that of a member of the private sector.

Our fourth panelist is Dr. Polykarp Kusch, who occupies the Eugene McDermott Chair at the University of Texas at Dallas. Dr. Kusch received his Bachelor of Science degree in Physics from the Case Institute of Technology; his Master's and Ph.D. degrees in Physics from the University of Illinois. He has had a most distinguished research and teaching career, principally at the Columbia University in New York. Prior to his joining the faculty at the University of Texas at Dallas in 1972 as Professor of Physics, he was Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at Columbia University. Dr. Kusch is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; the American Philosophical Society; The National Academy of Sciences; Phi Beta Kappa; and Sigma Xi. He received the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1955; he has numerous honorary degrees from the institutions of which he is an alumnus — both the Case Institute of Technology and the University of Illinois, as well as Ohio State University; Colby College; Gustavus Adolphus

College; and Yeshiva University. During his tenure at Columbia University he received the Great Teacher Award: The Alexander Hamilton Medal. He is consultant to numerous foundations and frequently serves as visiting professor at universities around the world. We are particularly fortunate to have Dr. Kusch join us in our panel discussion today. In a sense he will speak for the physical sciences although I am sure his comments will have a much broader application.

As you might expect, my comments will stem from a background in biomedical research as well as from administrative experience at a biomedical institution. I say this, because one's view of the effect of politics on research may be quite different, depending on the result of political priorities in one's particular area of research. By and large, biomedical research has been in a favored position both with the public and the government since World War II. The agency through which the bulk of funds are channeled, namely the National Institutes of Health, may well be the most effective and efficient agency of our federal government. My comments will therefore be influenced by these favorable circumstances. That is not to say, however, that biomedical research has been, or is, free of problems stemming from politics, both from within and outside the government.

Before addressing the more narrowly restricted field of biomedical research I would like to make a few general comments that apply to all areas of research to a greater or lesser degree.

One of the greatest threats to the future of our society is the increasing tendency to demand quick and easy solutions to any problem, given enough money. The public, despite all we have learned from past experience, continues to have difficulty in comprehending the essentiality of basic research as the ultimate solution to most of society's problems. Unfortunately, this nation's favorable experience with the development of the atomic bomb and the successful space exploration by NASA has led the public to believe that any scientific problem lends itself to that kind of solution, namely plenty of money and plenty of people. That is why there is already being expressed disenchantment with our nation's "Conquest of Cancer" program. We simply did not have and do not yet have the basic fundamental knowledge essential to the solution of the kind of complex problem posed by cancer. I am sure that most of you are familiar with one of H. L. Mencken's favorite quotations, "for every problem, there is a solution, which is simple, direct and

wrong." One of our highest priorities as a nation should be that it is agreed that some percentage of the gross national product should be set aside for research, and that a stable federal policy of research support is vital to the continued progress of our nation, and, indeed, society as a whole.

Sound research is almost always an arduous task. It is an enterprise that depends far more on disciplined imagination and hard work than it does upon creative strokes of genius or serendipity.

The above-mentioned economic problem of adequate funding of basic research and the apparent lack of societal, philosophical commitment to such research, have received wide public attention, and undoubtedly will be addressed to some extent by our other panelists today. Therefore, I shall not elaborate on these at this time, but rather I would like to address a problem that is much less publicized, but yet is proving to be an increasingly difficult barrier to the successful pursuit of many kinds of research —biomedical and otherwise. This problem relates to the increasing and legitimate concern of society regarding the impact of research upon the rights of the individual.

It will be interesting to note a century from now how historians will have recorded this present period. Almost certainly they will note that there was a perceptible shift in the frame of reference by which human values were assessed. In a society noted for the most sophisticated technology and one which was rapidly changing many of its social norms, a variety of reactions were occurring to previously privileged institutions and professions. Threats to individual privacy, and dignity, began to be perceived very differently and what man was doing to man in the name of scientific advancement began to receive vastly increased attention. They will no doubt record that there was an ethical movement that viewed some of the processes as well as some of the products of biomedical research as creating social choices which the biomedical experts alone were no longer capable of answering. Hopefully, we are passing through a transitional period of turmoil that will terminate with some rational, broad-based method for monitoring biomedical research that will protect the rights and dignity of the individual, but at the same time will not create so many constraints and restrictions that biomedical research in many areas would be brought to a grinding halt. The impact of such public concern in research is not restricted to the biomedical arena; the on-going battle between the

conservationists and those who propose nuclear power or the companies who cannot comply with new regulations regarding environmental pollution without staggering price increases in their products—are similar sources for public debate.

May I make my position clear — I do not see the situation as black or white — in virtually every instance there is right on both sides. Having been involved personally in research where human beings were the experimental subjects, I can assure you that the investigator feels severely constrained. The welfare of the subject is always paramount, and his (the patient's) interest may not be displaced for the good of society, or allowed to be confused with the ambitions or curiosity of the investigator. I am pleased and happy to say that I have not known a clinical investigator personally who has not shared these views.

At the moment, we are in the midst of a phase of rapidly mounting regulatory legislation, national commissions, regulatory agencies with a rapidly expanding bureaucracy, and consumer groups taking extreme positions in order to gain half a loaf. This often results in the research community, be it academic or industrial, taking an equally extreme position. While there have been rare obvious abuses by research scientists in the field of clinical investigation, we must not throw the baby out with the bathwater. Unfortunately few if any politicians can take a long-range view; their future is their term of office and their actions are dictated by what is politically right to insure or make more likely their re-election rather than what they may feel is, in fact, the best long-term solution.

Despite the problems confronting biomedical research efforts from a variety of political influences and pressures, the advances over the past thirty years have been astounding. To be honest, these advances have been due, in very large part, to the commitment of our federal government to basic biomedical research. We have been exceedingly fortunate in this country to have had a mix of public and private support for biomedical research that has not only made the United States the envy of the world, but has provided a true "golden age" for biomedical science. Again, historians a hundred years from now may well state that this was our country's greatest contribution to civilization for this particular period.

It is paradoxical that politics has been both the greatest benefactor of basic research and at the same time poses one of the greatest threats to it.



*Polykarp Kusch:* If you were to allow me 65 minutes, I would comment at length about provocative remarks with which I agree and especially provocative remarks with which I disagree this morning. Unfortunately, I have not more than ten minutes, preferably seven.

The style of a civilization is, to a large degree, determined by the level of knowledge that is a part of the civilization. When we think of Greece in its golden age and of the Renaissance, we think of flourishing knowledge. The driving force that led men in those epochs to seek knowledge was not primarily utilitarian or economic but rather a restless need to know and to understand. Of course, new knowledge did become useful to man in the sense in which it eased the often harsh circumstances under which mankind lived. Still, as examples, the great intellectual achievement of discovering the place of our planet in the universe and the discovery of man's place in the hierarchy of all life has changed man's thought and awareness to such a degree that it has altered the style of our civilization.

It is the nature of the political process to serve the immediate purposes of the members of the society or of groups within the society. The greatest research support is now given to those activities that are perceived to be useful to man where the word *useful* is not well defined. What is thought by one portion of society to be useful is thought by another portion of society to be of small value. The definition of utility thus becomes a political compromise with the marked quality of short-sightedness. Publicly financed research is expected to solve immediate and urgent problems and problems that loom far larger than the Biblical "cloud out of the sea, as small as a man's hand." The contemplative spirit that marked the development of much of science and which was, in fact, extremely productive cannot thrive when delimited and immediate goals are prescribed.

I do not, of course, deny the value of attacking immediate problems, provided that we do not become blinded to the totality of problems, all of which are closely intertwined. It is not good enough to solve problems in isolation from all other problems. The nature of a problem demands no less thought than does the solution of the problem.

At the end of America's bicentennial year one wonders about the survival of America as a liberal and humane society through the

next two centuries. Indeed, speculation about that question leads to thought about the prospect of the survival of civilized man for the next two centuries. We are, of course, troubled by the energy problem. That problem is not independent of the food problem, the population problem, the problem of the destruction of cities, foci for the creative spirit, the problem of rapidly diminishing resources and the problem of the deterioration of our environment. To these familiar problems I might add less obvious problems — the growth of anomie, the alienation of many from the mainstream of modern society, the lack of strong moral authority, an articulate spokesman for the thesis that there *are* moral questions that transcend economics or national interest. It seems to me that the activity described as problem-solving research does not really meet our needs. It is doubtful that the purported solution of a single and isolated problem will give insight into the overall predicament in which we find ourselves.

We need a compelling vision of what the experience of being part of mankind could be. We need thought, reflection and imagination not channeled by anything other than the limitations of the collective and individual human mind. We need fresh insights and not merely an ingenious, clever and useful application of old insights. If we manage to work our way out of our present predicament, it will, I think, be the consequence of fresh ideas rather than the result of variations of old ideas.

It is the historic mission of the university to cultivate learning and knowledge as an intrinsic good. It is an historic fact that new learning, acquired without immediate utilitarian goals, has, in fact, transformed the world several times over. This could happen again if, as I say to my students, we think rather than solve problems.

*Wayne H. Holtzman:* Less than a hundred years ago, we had the beginning of ideas about the federal government in research. In 1880 a report from the National Academy of Sciences proposed that there be a Department of Science or some kind of science advisory committee in the federal government. If we go back to 1934, the time of the Great Depression, we find some rather radical ideas being discussed by a group of scientists in a meeting in Pittsburgh. "Suppose we got heavy government funding for the support of science?" "Oh no, that will bring with it political control. All kinds of problems would come with support from the federal government." The majority felt it shouldn't be done; and yet Karl Compton, the

noted physicist, drafted a plan at that time putting science to work for society. President Roosevelt bought two fundamental ideas in that report: first, that government's concern for science goes beyond its own establishment, its own departments or programs within government, and includes science in the nation as a whole; and second, that somehow you could develop a partnership between government and science for the good of the society to solve national problems and to serve national progress.

During World War II, America moved into high gear with the birth of big science. A certain portion of the newer social and behavioral sciences, as well as the natural sciences though not much of the humanities, developed rapidly under government support. For the first two decades after the war, research and development grew very rapidly as an enterprise in federal government, approaching its peak in 1968. During the 1960's, 90 percent of the federal dollar for research and development went into hardware, defense, aerospace, and atomic energy. By 1976, this percentage dropped to 76 percent.

The problems today are different than they were in the 1960's. About 25 percent of that federal dollar going into research and development is now concentrated upon our environment, social problems, and behavior concerning energy, much of it policy related. Most natural scientists have gotten over their initial fears of political control, or at least they have learned to live with it, in order to develop large-scale research programs that are essential not only for the advancement of understanding in the sciences but for the solution of certain problems.

The behavioral and social sciences were a little slower in their development. One of the reasons for this lag is the fact that the sciences which deal with man's behavior are value-laden areas. We're all human beings who have directly experienced nearly anything that some scholar or scientist is going to say about human beings or human behavior. Reacting intuitively, we are just a little distrustful of someone who specializes as a behavioral scientist, skeptical that he can be sufficiently objective to be scientific. The important issues of the social and behavioral sciences are value-laden in every respect. Within the humanities such as literature and philosophy, the question of values is even more self-evident. And the humanities don't have the trappings of scientific methods and

procedures behind which the social and natural sciences can hide when attacked.

Currently we see a kind of steady progression where the behavioral and social sciences are catching up with the physical sciences and getting into many of the same troubles with respect to the effect of politics on research. The humanities are now also entering the political arena, often teetering on the brink of catastrophe at some Congressional hearing. Six major conflicts or issues crop up again and again whether you're talking of the natural sciences, the social and behavioral sciences, or the humanities. When political decisions tip too far one way or the other on any of these issues and a healthy tension and balance is lost between the poles of the controversies, trouble arises.

The first issue is big research versus little research. Big research is where you place lots of money in a big organization and move forward with a major enterprise. It may cost millions of dollars a year or it may just be several hundred thousand dollars a year, but it's pretty big. A big research project may even run a hundred million dollars in some areas. Little research is where the scientist or scholar is personally in control of what he's doing. If he can't maintain control of his research and do it within a modest increase over his existing resources, it's already well on the way to becoming big research. The effects of politics on little research is less apparent as long as the research is recognized as legitimate. Most of the specific effects of politics are on the big research programs that require a bureaucracy to carry them out. If we had only big research, we'd lose many of the new ideas and the individual creativity which characterizes the lone scholar. If we had only little research, many of the scientific and technical advances we seek would not be feasible.

The second issue, and this comes up again and again in any discussion, is that of the academic versus the practical. The politician is interested in the quick fix and the immediate solution in order to point to the results for the investment that's been made. At the other extreme, the scholar or scientist is often concerned that he have complete freedom of inquiry to do what he wants with no external controls or accountability. Both extremes should be avoided. The politician's search for a quick solution to a complex problem is doomed to failure, and the academician must be accountable to society for his work.

The third issue is how to evaluate research. You could evaluate it in terms of the input, the qualifications of the individual, what he says he's going to do, what his institution has in the way of a reputation. All these are input factors to consider. Or you could evaluate it in terms of the output; the hardware product that comes off the line or the significance of his research as judged by his academic peers. A problem arises because very little of what we call scientific or scholarly research can be evaluated in terms of output or product until many years later. Therefore, we evaluate it in terms of its input characteristics or the scientist's past reputation rather than its output. But the general public and politicians representing the general public are demanding output evaluations. What is the end product of the investment? As you move from the physical sciences on over into the humanities, the output becomes increasingly difficult to define.

The fourth issue is that of research versus development versus dissemination. Basic research is very different from the development of existing scientific knowledge to produce new technologies. Dissemination involves publicizing what is already known and putting it into practice. People get these three concepts or research, development, and dissemination confused, partly because they're frequently lumped together. Research and development is almost one word in government circles. You can't really tell whether 95 percent of a given federal budget is going into development and only five percent into research or just the reverse. As far as federal dollars go, the current trend in the United States is to invest more and more into development and less into research, a practice that is using up our seed capital in basic science. We are now falling behind other nations in our proportionate support of basic research in many areas. A better balance between research, development, and dissemination must be achieved.

The fifth issue concerns the role of politics in the support of research into value-laden areas, especially the behavioral and social sciences and the humanities. The more value-laden the area, the more vulnerable to political pressure is the researcher. The more controversial the area, the more there is serious question as to whether or not the researcher is doing a good job and should be supported. The more human-oriented the research topic, the more the general public feels they can judge the worthiness of the proposed research. Thus the most vulnerable areas concerning the

effects of politics on research are the humanities, followed closely by the behavioral and social sciences. A balance between academic and lay authority concerning such research is difficult to achieve and tenuous at best. Yet such a balance is essential to long range success.

The sixth issue concerns the role of politics in the distribution of resources. If you were dealing only with little research, it wouldn't matter. There's nothing much to distribute. But when you get into big research, you are talking about billions of dollars, and where are those billions of dollars going? How should support be distributed across different fields of research? Should atomic physics receive more than molecular biology? Should the money go to the thirty or forty universities and research institutes in the country that have already achieved peaks of excellence? Or should that money be spread more equally throughout the country to hundreds of institutions so that more people gain immediate benefits? A look at the recent Congressional hearings for the National Endowment for the Humanities is revealing of this dilemma. Senator Claiborne Pell, in an illuminating dialogue with Ronald Berman, the head of the National Endowment, turned down Berman's reappointment as director of the Endowment because he was supporting meritorious projects in major universities and not developing hundreds of little projects that would affect thousands of communities. Unlike the Endowment for the Humanities, its sister agency, the National Endowment for the Arts, has reached out to all communities across the United States, providing a revival of public interest in the arts. The issue of distribution of resources remains a political dilemma with an uneasy tension between the several points of view.

Any researcher is misguided if he thinks he has complete freedom to spend money and go where he wants without being accountable for his actions, simply because he has a grant and a personal commitment to an idea. With freedom of inquiry goes social and fiscal accountability for the scientist's actions. At the same time, it is just as misguided for a politician to feel that he can control the development of research for his own political ends, whatever they may be.

The role of the politician is to represent the public interest, including my interests as a scientist. The politician and the citizenry set the broad policies and debate and develop the categorical finding in line with those policies. The scientist or scholar applies his special knowledge in developing the projects, recommending the most

meritorious among many proposals, and alerting the public to implications of public policy. As long as these two roles are kept clear, as long as there is then some stability of funding so that the researcher can plan ahead, and as long as there is a multiplicity of sponsors so that even within the federal government there are several options for the scientist seeking support, the effect of politics upon research will be reasonably well balanced.

*Jack S. Josey:* In the middle ages, and earlier, men of learning, now commonly called philosophers or scientists, depended for support on kings, noblemen or their own estates. The great discoveries in the minds and in the laboratories that arose from these people brought mankind from a primitive existence to our modern society. This situation prevailed until recent times when the private sector and the government provided the necessary funds for such intellectual activities. The role of the government became very important after the end of World War II, especially with respect to science. In 1973, 16 percent of all foundation giving was to science. This amounted to \$387 million, by the way. The federal government gave 50 times that amount but most of this was given to industry in scientific research. Foundations gave two-thirds of the \$387 million to universities and colleges; the federal government gave only 13 percent of its total support of science research to colleges.

As the end of the twentieth century is approaching, we have lived in an era where the world population is accelerating, we have material prosperity that was undreamed of 100 years ago. Science has made possible increasing food, longer life, and freedom from many diseases. The lot of the average citizen is far better today than at any other time in our history. The population explosion and environmental problems that now exist cannot be wholly controlled and corrected by the development of our present technology. We need new ideas and new ideas are the result of basic research. The trend in government agencies and in large segments of the private sector is to support applied and developmental work. It is getting harder and harder to secure funds not restricted to some immediate goal. We need more basic research, more new ideas. The government should support basic research and should encourage the private sector to support basic research. I hope this is not an idle dream because therein lies our future.

*Address*

## HE WHO PAYS THE PIPER

Edward Clark

Coming before this august group of scholars and intellectuals tonight to deliver a speech on politics and higher education is not the easiest assignment I have ever had. In fact, I feel a little like the boy who brought the stink bomb into church: I know I'll get the attention of the congregation, but not necessarily the kind that I would want.

To say that it is a delicate subject is to put it mildly.

However, I did not choose the subject, and therefore I do not intend to deal delicately with it. It is a matter to which I have given a great deal of thought and about which I have some very definite ideas.

So, as the friendly airline captain would say, "fasten your seat belts as we prepare for takeoff."

And I think that an appropriate takeoff point would be the title of an article I saw a few years ago in one of our learned journals. It read:

"UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS: ON THE WAY UP —  
BUT POLITICS STILL INTRUDE"

I find that title hopelessly naive.

It is naive in its implied *assumption* that there is something evil and sinister about politics; it is naive in its implied *contention* that a public institution of higher education can ever be entirely divorced from politics — or *ought* to be.

I have been involved in politics, in one form or another, all of my adult life. I do not apologize for it. I am not ashamed of it. I am proud of it, in fact I am proud to have played a role in helping to make our system of government work. Because that's what politics is really all about. It is not a dirty, demeaning business, practiced only by those who are motivated strictly by self-interest. It is the very engine of democracy.

It is — no more and no less — participation in the day-to-day affairs of our government. Is that so horrible?

When you vote, you are practicing politics. Is that dirty and demeaning?



When you go to a PTA meeting, you are practicing politics. Is that dirty and demeaning?

When you write to your congressman, urging him to vote a certain way — or when you contribute to his political campaign — you are practicing politics. Is that dirty and demeaning?

It is a constant source of amazement to me that when students and faculty members participate in *campus* politics, it is considered an ennobling experience. But when a person dedicates his life to politics, all too often he or she is considered engaged in a “shoddy profession.”

This sort of selective reasoning simply baffles me. It reminds me of the man who said: “*My* plan is a ‘strategy’; *your* plan is a ‘scheme’; *his* plan is a ‘dodge’.”

Now I do not mean to single out any one group as an example of this attitude. I fully recognize that such blanket condemnation of our politicians and our political institutions is widespread throughout our society — and as old as our republic. But scholars, of all people, ought to know better.

They ought to know that politics is mankind’s *highest* form of social behavior, not its *lowest*.

They ought to know that the practice of politics is the best guarantor of freedom that we have ever had — and that those who are unwilling to participate in democracy are those who are unable to protect it.

They ought to remember that the greatest individuals this nation has produced were engaged in politics: Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, the two Roosevelts. We called them statesmen after they died, but they were politicians long before that.

Someone once remarked that mothers may still want their favorite sons to grow up to be President, but they don’t want them to become politicians in the process. Well, heaven help us when we stop turning out politicians. When that happens, we’ll be left with nothing but bureaucrats.

Frankly, it troubles me to hear people refer to politics as a “necessary evil” of our society. They just don’t know what our system is all about.

But it troubles me even more to hear some people insist that our academic institutions ought to be completely isolated from politics in any form — that the “intrusion of politics” is somehow a threat to academic freedom.

Let's define what we are talking about here.

I agree that our universities should never become political footballs in the rough and tumble of partisan politics.

I agree that we should never "politicize" our universities either through appointment or promotion.

I agree that we should resist any outside attempt to control the day-to-day operation of our universities through the heavy-handed use — or misuse — of power.

If that's all they were talking about, they would get no argument from me — or anyone else.

But when people start telling me that any public institution in this nation is "above politics," I want to tell them that that institution is headed for trouble.

There is a certain attitude here that disturbs me. It says, in effect, "the politicians don't understand the first thing about higher education, and therefore they ought to leave it alone."

Worse yet, a lot of the same people honestly think that they're *better* than the politicians — and a whole lot smarter. I want to tell you, that's not only a short-sighted attitude to take, it's a dangerous one, as well.

Beyond that, some people do not seem to grasp the central fact that a public university does not exist in a vacuum. As much as we might *like* to say, "hands off, politicians. What we do is our business" — it just doesn't work. What we do is the public's business, as well — and therefore the business of the elected officials of this state.

In case anyone has forgotten, it's called "accountability."

Too many of us, I am afraid, would like our universities to run under the principle of "philosophic mechanism." That eighteenth century view of life, you will recall, concluded that God originally set the universe in motion but, after that, it ran on its own. He wound it up, so to speak, and let it go.

That's the way some people think a university should operate. Once it was created, it should be left to its own devices with no outside interference — a sort of perpetual motion educational machine.

The problem with this attitude is twofold.

First, here in Texas, the Constitution gives to the legislature the duty and authority "to provide for the maintenance, support, and direction" of the university — and the legislature has delegated this duty and authority to the board of regents which is appointed by

the governor. Now that's politics, pure and simple. But it's also a fact of life.

The second problem is that the Constitution requires our public institutions to come back to the legislature every two years for their appropriations. And there is an old expression which says, "he who pays the piper calls the tune."

That may be hard for the piper to accept, but that, too, is a fact of life.

Am I overstating the case?

Am I dealing in the obvious?

Surely every person in this state recognizes the legislature's authority over our public institutions of higher education.

Yes, everyone recognizes it, but not everyone accepts it.

Let me be specific.

There is, in this state of ours today, a nagging feeling that something is wrong with our universities. There is a feeling that, in many cases, they are not doing their job.

Freshmen come home with stories of administrative errors and official indifference. "I couldn't get the courses I wanted and no one seemed to care," they say.

Sophomores come home and say that college is a depersonalizing experience. "I'm nothing more than a hole punched in a computer card," they say.

Juniors sometimes come home and say that after two-and-a-half years, they've never had a course under a full professor. "I'm being educated by teaching assistants," they say.

The seniors come home to report that they finally signed up under a full professor. "But he's never in his office," they often say.

The taxpayers of this state are concerned about what's happening in higher education and we owe them — and their elected representatives — an accounting.

We cannot hide behind the shield of "academic freedom" if we're not doing our jobs.

We're all accountable to the public — and to their elected representatives.

Every member of the board of regents is accountable.

Every university official is accountable — from the president on down.

Every department chairman is accountable.

Every professor is accountable.

Frankly, I think we are doing a far better job in our universities than the press, the public and the legislature give us credit for doing. I think our faults are magnified and our accomplishments are largely overlooked. But that's not the point.

We may be wrong — we may be right — but in any event, we can never say, "it's none of their business."

And if we *are* right, we had better learn to tell our side of the story — and tell it well. We had better learn to communicate.

The days of the smug ivy-tower philosophy are over, my friends. And so are the days of legislative *carte blanche* for higher education. In this era of expanding government services and tight budgets, those agencies are going to be funded which can justify their existence in the political arena.

Those which cannot — or will not — prove their worth are going to be cut back.

It is a harsh world — and academic freedom will never protect us from its realities.

It's a fact of life that he who pays the piper *still* calls the tune — and we had better learn to play some sweet music.

---

# N E C R O L O G Y

## HARRY HUNTT RANSOM

1908-1976

HARRY HUNTT RANSOM, PRESIDENT OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF TEXAS in 1961, died in Austin on April 19, 1976. The following University of Texas Faculty Memorial Resolution was prepared by Professors C. L. Cline (chairman), Joe B. Frantz, and Wayne H. Holtzman.

Harry Hunt Ransom, son of Harry Hunt and Marion Goodwin Ransom, was born in Galveston, Texas, on November 22, 1908. (In later years he dropped the use of the middle name and initial and always signed himself simply "Harry Ransom.") He received his higher education at the University of the South (A.B., Phi Beta Kappa, 1928), Harvard (student, 1929-30), and Yale (A.M., 1930, Ph.D., 1938). In addition he was later awarded numerous honorary degrees: University of the South (Litt.D., 1958), Baylor University (LL.D., 1958), Trinity University (LL.D., 1963), Texas Christian University (LL.D., 1963), Austin College (L.H.D., 1966), University of North Dakota (Litt.D., 1970), University of Dallas (Litt.D., 1971), Southern Methodist University (L.H.D., 1972), and Colorado School of Mines (D. Eng., 1972).

Upon completion of his Master's degree, Harry Ransom began his teaching career as an Instructor in English and Journalism at State Teachers' College, Valley City, North Dakota (1930-32, 1933-34), and then moved on to an Instructorship in English and History at Colorado State College (1934-35). From the outset, however, it is evident that he was eager to return to his native state and to obtain a position at The University of Texas, one of its attractions being a library that would enable him to carry on researches already begun. So eager was he, in fact, that he gave up a more remunerative position in 1935 to accept a three-fourth's time Instructorship in English at The University. This position became a full-time one, and he held it until 1938, when, after taking his Ph.D. degree from Yale, he advanced to the rank of Assistant Professor, which he held until the outbreak of World War II. Enlisting as a second lieutenant in the Air Corps in 1942, he served until 1946, when he was mustered out as a major. In 1947 he was awarded the Legion of Merit by the War Department for his direction of the Air Force Editorial Office from 1944 to 1946. Upon returning to The Univer-

sity he was promoted to the rank of Associate Professor and to Professor in the following year.

Dr. Ransom's enthusiasm for his subject matter, his devotion to his students, and his ability to inspire them to stretch themselves to the utmost of their ability soon marked him as a gifted teacher and attracted a large and loyal following. It was in the classroom that he developed a firm conviction, from which he never wavered, that the foremost purpose of a university is to educate the youth of America — in the words of Matthew Arnold to expose them "to the best that has been thought and said." In the course of time he received many honors as educator and was named to important national committees, commissions, and boards, thus extending his influence beyond the confines of his native state. Concurrently his various publications on copyright established him as a foremost authority on the subject. He was never a narrow specialist, however: from 1938-1941 he was Associate Editor of the publications of the Texas Folklore Society, and in 1958 he founded and edited the *Texas Quarterly*, which was to concern itself with the entire range of human interests. Throughout its history until his death at the time of the nineteenth volume, the *Quarterly* consistently enjoyed the kind of world-wide interest and acclaim which he envisaged.

Not long after his return to The University of Texas from the Air Force Dr. Ransom's personal and professional qualities not unnaturally attracted the attention of administrators. In 1951 he was appointed Assistant Dean of the Graduate School and in 1953 Associate Dean. From that time his climb up the greasy pole, as Disraeli described the Prime Ministry of Great Britain, was rapid: in 1954 Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; in 1957 Vice President and Provost; in 1960 President of The University of Texas; in 1961 Chancellor of The University of Texas System. When he retired from the Chancellorship in 1971, he was named Chancellor Emeritus by the Board of Regents to concentrate on library collections and advise the Board. In 1973, the Regents commissioned him to write the history of The University up to the time when he became President. He was engaged upon this project at the time of his unexpected death from a massive heart attack on April 19, 1976.

Once in high office Dr. Ransom moved swiftly. From the beginning the library was one of his foremost interests. By the late nineteen

fifties the library possessed approximately a million and a half books, but the use of it was often a mystery to the ordinary undergraduate. No doubt the Board of Regents was taken by surprise when Dr. Ransom, as Vice President and Provost, recommended giving first priority to the building and stocking of a second library, with open stacks where undergraduates could easily find the books they needed. This project received Regental approval in September 1958. Later, after it was built, students in gratitude for many years called it "Harry's Place," and today throngs of students attest to its usefulness.

With the Undergraduate Library assured, Dr. Ransom next persuaded the Board of Regents to appropriate a budget surplus of a million dollars for the acquisition of books and manuscripts which eventually became the Humanities Research Center. In succeeding years similar and even greater sums were appropriated for this purpose. The formation of the Humanities Research Center was carried out with great acumen. (The name itself was appropriate only in a broad sense inasmuch as the collection included materials in the history of sciences and social sciences, in the Gernsheim Photography Collection, in the Hoblitzelle Theatre Collection, in the history of aviation, and in the Michener Art Collection, among others.) Realizing that The University had come too late upon the scene to be able to acquire early printed books — although an occasional rarity such as the Brudenelle manuscript of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* was acquired — he concentrated upon the periods in which materials were available — that is, the modern and contemporary. The library was already fairly strong in English and American books of the eighteenth and nineteenth century, and gaps were filled in in these periods whenever possible. But it was primarily in the twentieth century where concentration was possible, and here most of the acquisitions were made. Sometimes whole libraries were acquired, such as the Alexander Pope collection of Professor R. H. Griffith, the Parsons library, the T. E. Hanley library, and once the entire stock of a bookstore going out of business. Gifts came in larger number — the Alfred and Blanche Knopf Library, the manuscripts of such writers as Lillian Hellman and Tennessee Williams, for example — because the donors realized that The University of Texas was a place where literary and other materials of scholarly interest were most cherished and better cared for than elsewhere. So rich indeed are the collections that Bertram Rota, the English book-

dealer, remarked some years ago that The University of Texas is the greatest library in the world for books printed in English since 1900, and Dr. Ransom became known throughout the book world as the greatest builder of libraries in modern times. In 1970 The University of Texas Library was included in Anthony Hobson's *Great Libraries*. It was therefore fitting that in 1974 the Board of Regents renamed the building completed in 1972 for these collections the Harry Ransom Center.

Dr. Ransom has been called a man of vision and a dreamer of dreams rather than a man with his eye merely fixed upon the day-to-day operations of The University. Essentially those dreams coalesced into a great plan to make The University a university of the first class, as charged by the framers of the State Constitution. He realized that such a plan could not become actuality without an eminent faculty, fully equipped laboratories, and libraries as tools for students in the humanities and social sciences; and toward fulfilling these objectives he bent all of his energies. Among the new faculty recruited upon his recommendation were some who became known as "Harry's boys." During Dr. Ransom's career at the helm The University was an exciting place to be, and many of those who survive him will remember "the Ransom years" as the halcyon years of The University.

When the history of The University through the year 1971 comes to be written, no one within its pages will be found to have held so many positions of importance or to have left so great an imprint upon The University. Academically, if he did not originate the Plan II degree program, he contributed to the upgrading and shaping of it to permit thousands of qualified students to pursue a broad and varied interdisciplinary course of study. He conceived and instituted a Provisional Admissions Program for culturally or economically deprived students and initiated the establishment of the 24-hour counseling and information service. Further, he instituted formal recognition of students' scholarly attainments and solicited funds for the awarding of undergraduate scholarships and scholastic recognition. Although no man could accomplish all of these things single-handed, his was the inspiration and his the guiding hand. When all else may be forgotten, the Academic Center and the Harry Ransom Center will stand as monuments to his genius and his foresight.

In the death of Dr. Ransom The University of Texas and all who knew and loved him have suffered a grievous loss. Only one con-



solution remains: because of his life and work The University has come much closer to realizing its potential to become a university of the first class.

Dr. Ransom is survived by his devoted wife, Hazel Ransom, whom he married in 1951.

---

## FRENCH MARTEL ROBERTSON

### 1901-1976

BORN ON A RANCH IN STONEWALL COUNTY, JULY 4, 1901, THE son of John E. and Eula (Hudson) Robertson, French Martel Robertson attended the public schools of the area, the University of Oklahoma and Baylor University. He was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Laws by the University of Texas in 1927. He served two terms as county attorney of Haskell County and did some additional law practice. Meanwhile he had married Mary Louise Lowe. Their daughters are Mrs. William Braymer and Mrs. G. Gus Vletas.

He established the Robertson Oil Company in 1936. Thereafter his own business appropriated the greater part of his time, and he soon discontinued the practice of law. Even in the early years of his career, however, public affairs appealed to him, his associates recognized his capacity for leadership and he became chairman of the State Convention of Young Democrats.

He entered the Air Force as captain in 1942, and before his discharge as lieutenant-colonel nearly three years later he had won the Legion of Merit award for outstanding service in the training of Chinese air and ground students.

In 1944 the Robertsons moved to Abilene, and thereafter this city was their home. Robertson's talent in leadership and his willingness to serve soon involved him in the affairs of the community and of the state. Through three decades he worked diligently for the Red Cross, the Community Chest, the Boy Scouts, and the Abilene Community Theater. He had a substantial share in the securing of Dyess Air Force Base. He served the Abilene Chamber of Commerce in many ways, was its president one year, and in 1956 was named Abilene's Outstanding Citizen.

His own business grew. Besides the Robertson Oil Company,

he dealt in real estate and promoted a cable television system for Abilene.

As the years passed, calls upon him became heavier and he gave more and more time to public service. It was said of him that he built up more years on the Democratic State Executive Committee than any other person in the history of the state. During his last three decades he shared his time generously with the State of Texas, giving an aggregate of nineteen years to major state boards. He was on the Texas Prison Board, later the Board of Corrections, 1947-1957, chairman the last four years. Thereafter he was on the Board of State Hospitals and Special Schools, later Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation for six years, chairman a part of this time; and he was a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas, 1961-1963.

To Robertson these appointments were not mere sinecures. He gave himself to these institutions heart and soul, spent time with them, lobbied for them, and worked ceaselessly to improve them. He took special pride in his accomplishment with the prison system, which he found in a woefully run-down condition after World War II. He led in bringing about reforms and securing relatively large appropriations that made the Texas prison establishment one of the best in the nation.

Death claimed French Robertson on February 28, 1976.

—R.N.R.

---

## ROBERT LEE SUTHERLAND

1903-1976

ROBERT LEE SUTHERLAND WAS BORN ON FEBRUARY 11, 1903, in Clarinda, Iowa, to Donald Grant Sutherland and the former Charlotte Cleveland. His father was a lawyer and the family moved to Seattle, Washington, when Robert was two. By the age of 15, he and his family moved back to the midwest, settling in Galesburg, Illinois, where he saved enough money raising purebred livestock while in high school to finance his expenses at Knox College. Before receiving his A.B. degree in 1925, he was editor of the college annual, winner of the Bancroft Oratorical Contest, and member of Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Sigma Rho, and Sigma Delta Chi. Little did he know that he would be returning to Knox College 15 years later to receive the Alumni Award and in 1958 to be awarded an honorary

Doctor of Laws degree. After a year of graduate work at Oberlin, he married Marjorie Lewis of Knoxville, Illinois, and accepted his first teaching position as Professor of Public Speaking at Huron College, South Dakota. Their only child, Elizabeth, was born in 1931. His M.A. degree in 1927 led to further advanced studies at the University of Chicago and a Ph.D. degree in social ethics and sociology in 1930.

His first post-doctoral appointment in 1930 as Professor of Sociology at Bucknell University lasted ten years during which he served as chairman of the social science division (1934-36) and as dean of men (1938-40). In 1935 he took a semester's leave of absence to complete an introductory textbook co-authored with Julian Woodward of Cornell University. Shortly after publication in 1937, his *Introductory Sociology* became the leading text in the field, going through six editions in the next 25 years. Another leave of absence in 1936 involved him in an experimental public forum project in Portland, Oregon, under the U.S. Office of Education. In 1938 he was appointed Associate Director of the American Youth Commission where he directed a staff of 40 persons for two years in a series of studies of minority groups. His summary volume, *Color, Class, and Personality*, was highly acclaimed when published by the American Council on Education in 1942, firmly establishing his reputation as a leading sociologist.

In 1939, a nationwide search was begun for a director to head the newly organized Hogg Foundation for Mental Hygiene at the University of Texas. Homer P. Rainey, president of the University, had been deeply impressed by the administrative, academic, and personal qualities of Robert Sutherland in their earlier association at Bucknell and at the American Council on Education. Miss Ima Hogg and a national panel of mental health consultants agreed, leading to the appointment of Dr. Sutherland as Professor of Sociology and Director of the Hogg Foundation, positions he held for the remainder of his career.

As operation of the foundation began, he traveled throughout Texas, laying the groundwork for close cooperation with agencies, organizations, and individuals. No region of the state, however small and isolated, was left untouched. His influence was greatly extended through many other specialists who were called upon frequently as consultants and speakers. By the close of World War II, Robert Sutherland and his consultants had worked in 152 communities with 2,000 groups and more than 400,000 people. Mental

health was not well understood as a concept. The idea of positive mental health, of actualizing human potential, nourishing the individuality of each person through social intervention, education, and community programs, was a relatively new concept which captured the imagination of thousands of Texans under Dr. Sutherland's enthusiastic leadership. In spite of limited staff and resources in these early years of the foundation, no request for help went unanswered. His unique personal touch, friendly manner, quick but thoughtful response, and open style of relating to people of all kinds established indelibly the fundamental character of the Hogg Foundation in these formative years.

By the early 1950's, the income of the foundation increased greatly as both the University and the state moved into a new era of development. The professional staff of the foundation tripled with the appointments of Bernice M. Moore, Bert K. Smith, and Wayne H. Holtzman to assist Robert Sutherland in expanding his program through grants to others for mental health training, research, education, and service, while augmenting his own personalized style of public education. His skillful leadership inspired others to exert their utmost efforts on behalf of statewide reforms for mental health and against mental illness. All of the major advances in state legislation and statewide reorganization of mental health programs during the 30 years of his tenure as head of the Hogg Foundation can be attributed in large part to his pervasive influence and rare ability to draw people together in a common cause, regardless of background and political persuasion.

While his primary responsibility was to direct the Hogg Foundation, first with the title of Director and then as President, Dr. Sutherland was also active as a sociologist and professor throughout his career. He frequently contributed to advanced courses and seminars, continued his own research and scholarly writing, and served on numerous university committees. In the summer of 1954 he taught American Studies at Cambridge University. In 1957-60, he was principal investigator of a National Institute of Mental Health project, "Bridging the Experience from Hospital to Community." In the summer of 1961 he joined a small delegation of distinguished sociologists invited to tour West German universities by the government of the Federal Republic of Germany. He served as consulting sociologist at the M. D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute and as Lecturer at the UT Medical Branch in Galveston. At various times within The University of Texas he was chairman of the liaison

committee between the University and the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, chairman of the advisory council for the establishment of the Institute of Urban Studies at UT Arlington, member of the advisory council to the School of Social Work Foundation, and member of the advisory committee for the Winedale Stagecoach Inn. Under his chairmanship, a special committee made an exhaustive study of counseling of university students in 1966. Many innovations in the student personnel programs of the UT System continue to flow from his report. In 1964 he was appointed to an endowed chair as the first Hogg Professor of Sociology, a post he held until his academic retirement in 1974. He continued his active involvement in foundation and university affairs as President Emeritus and Hogg Professor Emeritus of Sociology until his death on November 19, 1976.

Robert Sutherland's services were much in demand at the national and international levels as well as in Texas. He was an active member of the board of trustees for the Woman's Foundation (1946-50), Stephens College (1943-52), Knox College (1958-65), the Foundation Library Center (1958-64), and the Council on Foundations (1967-73). He organized and served as lifetime board member of the Conference of Southwest Foundations, the oldest organization of foundations in America. His knowledge of foundations and skill in drawing them together in a common enterprise were without peer anywhere. Widely recognized as a foundation leader, he was a member of the Foundations' Executives Group, an influential organization of a dozen presidents drawn mainly from the large eastern foundations.

Among his many other assignments were the Panel on Research, Southern Regional Education Board (1954-57), the National Advisory Council on Dental Research (1960-63), the Technical Review Panel for the HEW Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (1962-67), and the Citizens Advisory Council to the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (1964-67). He also served as treasurer of the World Federation for Mental Health's United States Committee (1959) and as a member of the Professional Advisory Committee of the National Association for Mental Health (1959).

The honors accorded him were many. He was elected to Phi Kappa Phi and to the Philosophical Society of Texas. He was listed in *Who's Who in America*, and was recognized as an honorary member of the Titus Harris Society and the Texas Society on Child

Psychiatry. Among the numerous organizations that honored him with special citations were the Dallas Health Museum (for outstanding contributions to public health in Texas, 1948), the U. S. Air Force (for leadership in directing a series of seminars for chaplains at the Hogg Foundation, 1956-67), the Texas Society on Aging and the Governor's Committee on Aging (1963), the Texas Social Welfare Association (1967), the UT Austin Graduate School of Social Work (1970), the Council on Foundations (1976), and the Texas Senate which passed a memorial resolution shortly after his death, noting his many contributions to the state and the nation.

The extent and depth of the humanistic concerns of Robert Sutherland are difficult to describe. He believed and acted on the premise that even the slightest tree could be of some shade to the weary traveler and that small amounts of aid, given with full heart, at the appropriate time, could be enormously helpful to the recipients. His genius lay in the involvement of people to help people and his faith that there was nothing more productive than the creative abilities of human beings. He emphasized effective, realistic coping with problems, all the while respecting and understanding the values of individuals and the paramount need to avoid doing anything that would humiliate persons or impair their dignity. Even during his terminal illness, he was always concerned for the welfare of others. He interviewed the hospital staff, praising them for their work, and pointing out the crucial role of attendants, nurses, and "just plain folks" in healing the sick. Compassion, empathy, and modesty were paramount in his personality, made delightful because of eccentricities distinctly his own. Thousands of his friends carry within their own personalities a little bit of Bob Sutherland. He will live on within all who knew him.

—W.H.H.

---

## CHARLES RUDOLPH TIPS

1892-1976

CHARLES RUDOLPH TIPS OF DALLAS WAS BORN AT SEGUIN, TEXAS, on June 5, 1892. He died on March 11, 1976, at 83 years of age, bringing to a close a life of great activity and achievement in which he was the recipient of many distinguished honors and much recognition. In every area of life to which he set his hand, he was an unusual man, one with a record of things accomplished.

He was a graduate of the University of Texas where he was a Phi Gamma Delta and the last elected president of "The Final Ball" and a life member of the Ex-Students Association. To him goes the credit for the founding of the city of Three Rivers in Live Oak County, Texas, and the development and colonization of the surrounding territory. He became the owner of the Ambassador Hotel in Dallas and remained such owner to the time of his death. Prior to moving to Dallas, he resided for some years in San Antonio where he was a member of the Order of the Alamo and where he reigned as King Antonio VIII in the annual Fiesta Week Celebration of that city.

He was proud of his Texas heritage, being a descendant of pioneer families and to him Texas history was of absorbing interest: he loved his state and its history. In that area of his life his activities were numerous. He served as President of the Sons of the Republic of Texas, Commander of the Knights of San Jacinto, President of the Texas Historical Survey Committee and of the Texas Historical Foundation.

His military record was outstanding. A veteran of World Wars I and II, he served as a Colonel of Infantry and during World War II he was the Commander of Camp Wallace between Houston and Galveston. Later in that war he served in the China-Burma-India Theater of Operations and was awarded the Bronze Medal in 1944 by General Claire Lee Chennault. At the time of his death he was President of the Founders of the American Legion and Past Commander of the Dallas Chapter of Military Order of World Wars.

In fraternal life, he was a 33rd degree Scottish Rite Mason, Knight Templar and a member of the Shrine. His religious affiliation was with the Episcopal Church of the Incarnation in Dallas where he was a past vestryman and past Senior Warden, and it was from this church that his funeral services were held prior to interment at Mission Burial Park in San Antonio.

He married Hazel Woodward of San Antonio and they were the parents of four children, a son and three daughters, all of whom survived him, along with twelve grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. The Philosophical Society, of which he was a devoted member, records his passing with sorrow and with a deep appreciation for his enduring contributions to the Society and his native state.

—C.S.B.

---

## RADOSLAV ANDREA TSANOFF

1887-1976

A LONG-TIME MEMBER AND SUPPORTER OF THE TEXAS PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, Radoslav Andrea Tsanoff brought wit and wisdom to the Texas cultural scene. His death on May 29, 1976, ended a distinguished career in thought and teaching.

Tsanoff enjoyed a happy blend of personality and perception. The quality of his thought can be measured partly by his numerous articles and his books (*The Problems of Immortality*, 1924; *The Nature of Evil*, 1931; *Religious Crossroads*, 1942; *The Moral Ideals of Our Civilization*, 1942, 1947; *Ethics*, 1947, revised 1955; *The Ways of Genius*, 1949; *The Great Philosophers*, 1953, revised 1964; *Worlds to Know*, 1962; *Autobiographies of Ten Religious Leaders*, 1968; *Civilization and Progress*, 1971) and partly by his classroom performance and his learned conversation. For Tsanoff was the truest of teachers — a man who gave his learning in all he said and did. His learning was vast but not flaunted; his wisdom deep but not precious; his wit ready but not barbed. His charm enhanced his impact.

There was something of the ancient Athenian sense of citizenship in Radoslav Tsanoff's lifestyle. He felt an obligation to share his mental and material competence, as well as an obligation to share the trials of his society. He was, consequently, intensely a part of the Houston community. As a member of the Houston Symphony Society's board during difficult formative years, he lent strength and stability, as he did to the board of the Houston Museum of Fine Arts. His lasting support of the Texas Philosophical Society reflected his devotion to the life of the mind.

A believer in reason and enlightenment, Tsanoff lived by these principles. Generations of friends and students heard great ideas of the Western World cast through the clarity of Tsanoff's mind. A true philosopher, Tsanoff was also a true humanist. He leaves us all richer and wiser and glad for his life.

—F.E.V.



## GUS SESSIONS WORTHAM

1891-1976

GUS SESSIONS WORTHAM DIED IN HOUSTON IN THE EARLY HOURS of Wednesday, September 1, 1976, at the age of 85.

Mr. Wortham was born in Mexia, Texas, on February 18, 1891, the son of John L. and Fanny Carter Sessions Wortham, was educated in the public schools of Huntsville, Texas, and attended Tarleton State College at Stephenville, and The University of Texas at Austin.

After a tour of duty with the insurance department of the State of Texas, at Austin, he came to Houston, where on July 1, 1915, Gus S. Wortham and his father, acting as a partnership, founded the Houston insurance agency then and now known as the John L. Wortham & Son. John L. Wortham, the father, had many business interests and left the management of the insurance firm to his son from its first day. With time out to become commanding officer of the 800th Aerial Squadron during World War I, young Gus built the agency from modest beginnings to high position and great substance.

When John L. Wortham & Son had been in business for some ten years, and had enjoyed exceptional success for so young an enterprise, Gus Wortham and his partners began to consider the possibility of forming an insurance company. They reasoned that their firm could allocate to such a company a modest portion of the large volume of excellent fire and casualty business which the agency was by then producing. Thus it was that American General Insurance Company was born, on May 8, 1926.

The infant company was owned in considerable part by members of the John L. Wortham firm, was managed by the firm, and for a number of years received substantially all of its business from the firm. Quite naturally, therefore, Gus Wortham, as senior partner of the firm and largest owner of the company, was named chairman and president of the new organization.

Under his sure hand, his talented leadership, his rare business acumen, the company grew and prospered. Within the span of one man's management, American General grew from \$300,000 of paid-in capital and surplus to \$4.5 billion of assets and \$742 million of capital and surplus at the time of his death. Within the span of the founder's lifetime, the company grew from a tiny fire and casualty writer licensed only in its home state and doing business virtually

only in its home city, to a diversified financial services corporation doing business in all fifty states, all provinces of Canada, and elsewhere in the free world.

And when he retired from his duties as chairman and chief executive officer of the company on November 3, 1972, he had served continuously as the chief executive officer of American General and its predecessor organization for 57 years, 4 months, and 3 days. That record, we believe, may well be unequalled in modern business history in America, for it seems probable that there are few instances, if any, of equal longevity as chief executive of a large, publicly owned corporation.

But Mr. Wortham's interests and achievements were many and varied, and by no means limited to the world of business. He was long a civic leader and builder of his community; a noted success as a rancher and cattle breeder; a patron of the arts; a supporter of education; and a financial leader of note. For many years, too, he had a keen and active interest in matters political and governmental, at local, state, and federal levels, and enjoyed close association with legislators and governors, Congressmen and Senators, a Vice President, and a President.

He served as director or trustee of Texas Research League, Texas Children's Hospital, National Space Hall of Fame Foundation, Texas Safety Association, the Society for the Performing Arts, the Houston Livestock Show and Rodeo, the Houston Museum of Fine Arts, North Texas State University, the DeBakey Medical Foundation, United Fund of Houston and Harris County, Texas Commerce Bank (for 45 years) — and, in particular, William Marsh Rice University and the Houston Symphony Society, each of which he served for many years as chairman of the finance committee.

Still other organizations which he has served as director or trustee include The Newcomen Society in North America, The Philosophical Society of Texas, the Mid-Coast Santa Gertrudis Association, the Delta Santa Gertrudis Association, Santa Gertrudis Breeders International, the Texas Insurance Advisory Association, and Missouri Pacific Railroad.

He was named Key Houstonian of 1968 by the Houston Board of Realtors, was recipient of the Insurance Man of the Year Award by the Federation of Insurance Counsel of 1958, was recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus award from The University of Texas in 1962, of the Coronat Medal from St. Edward's University in 1963, and of the first Distinguished Alumni Award from Tarleton State

College in 1966. He was director of the Houston Chamber of Commerce for many years, served two terms as its president, more recently served as a director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and was for two terms chairman of its Policy Committee.

Gus S. Wortham was one of those very few who may truly be called a noble spirit. He was, above all, a man of exceptional character, absolute integrity, and unblemished reputation. He was a great builder — a builder of Houston, of Texas, and of the company he founded and headed for more than 57 years. Even more, he was a builder of men. As such, he was a strong and decisive leader and an inspirational personal example to all who worked with him or for him, in whatever capacity, at whatever level.

He was a man of unforgettable warmth and friendliness toward all who knew him, and of great understanding and compassion toward those around him. He was as gentle and kindly as any man I have ever known. And he was notably considerate of those of lowly station or menial occupation, which surely is one of the marks of true nobility.

He profoundly influenced the lives of those around him, and of many whom he scarcely knew, but who were touched, even at a great distance, by his genius, or his warmth, or his example.

He will be remembered with admiration and friendship and appreciation by those who knew him, as long as any one of them shall live.

—B.N.W.

---

## OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

*For the Year 1977*

*President*

TRUMAN G. BLOCKER, JR.

*Vice-Presidents*

CLIFTON CALDWELL

GEORGE CARMACK

JOE B. FRANTZ

MRS. PERCY JONES

FRANK VANDIVER

*Secretary*

DORMAN HAYWARD WINFREY

*Treasurer*

MARY JOE CARROLL

*Librarian*

SAMUEL WOOD GEISER

*Directors*

TRUMAN G. BLOCKER, JR.

THOMAS HART LAW

EDWARD CLARK

LOGAN WILSON

WILLIS McDONALD TATE

HARRIS LEON KEMPNER

HERBERT PICKENS GAMBRELL

WILLIAM ALEXANDER KIRKLAND

RUPERT NORVAL RICHARDSON

GEORGE CREWS MCGHEE

## PAST PRESIDENTS

* Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar . . . . .	1837-59
* Ira Kendrick Stephens . . . . .	1936
* Charles Shirley Potts . . . . .	1937
* Edgar Odell Lovett . . . . .	1938
* George Bannerman Dealey . . . . .	1939
* George Waverley Briggs . . . . .	1940
* William James Battle . . . . .	1941
* George Alfred Hill, Jr. . . . .	1942
* Edward Henry Cary . . . . .	1943
* Edward Randall . . . . .	1944
* Umphrey Lee . . . . .	1944
* Eugene Perry Locke . . . . .	1945
* Louis Herman Hubbard . . . . .	1946
* Pat Ireland Nixon . . . . .	1947
* Ima Hogg . . . . .	1948
Albert Perley Brogan . . . . .	1949
* William Lockhart Clayton . . . . .	1950
* A. Frank Smith . . . . .	1951
* Ernest Lynn Kurth . . . . .	1952
* Dudley Kezer Woodward, Jr. . . . .	1953
* Burke Baker . . . . .	1954
* Jesse Andrews . . . . .	1955
James Pinckney Hart . . . . .	1956
Robert Gerald Storey . . . . .	1957
* Lewis Randolph Bryan, Jr. . . . .	1958
W. St. John Garwood . . . . .	1959
George Crews McGhee . . . . .	1960
* Harry Hunt Ransom . . . . .	1961
* Eugene Benjamin Germany . . . . .	1962
Rupert Norval Richardson . . . . .	1963
* Mrs. George Alfred Hill, Jr. . . . .	1964
* Edward Randall, Jr. . . . .	1965
* McGruder Ellis Sadler . . . . .	1966
William Alexander Kirkland . . . . .	1967
* Richard Tudor Fleming . . . . .	1968
Herbert Pickens Gambrell . . . . .	1969
Harris Leon Kempner . . . . .	1970
* Carey Croneis . . . . .	1971
Willis McDonald Tate . . . . .	1972
* Dillon Anderson . . . . .	1973
Logan Wilson . . . . .	1974
Edward Clark . . . . .	1975
Thomas Hart Law . . . . .	1976

\*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, WINNIE, retired archivist, University of Texas Library . *Hutchins*
- ANDERSON, ROBERT BERNARD, partner, Carl M. Loeb Rhoades and Company; former secretary of the treasury; former tax commissioner, Texas . *New York*
- ANDERSON, THOMAS D., lawyer . *Houston*
- ANDREWS, MARK EDWIN, president, Ancon Oil and Gas Company; former assistant secretary of the navy . *Houston*
- ARMSTRONG, ANNE LEGENDRE (MRS. TOBIN), former U. S. ambassador to Great Britain . *Armstrong*
- ARMSTRONG, THOMAS REEVES, Armstrong Ranch; former president, Santa Gertrudis Breeders Association . *Armstrong*
- ASHWORTH, KENNETH H., commissioner of higher education, Texas College and University System; former executive vice president of the University of Texas in San Antonio and vice chancellor for academic affairs of the University of Texas System . *Austin*
- BAKER, REX G. JR., lawyer . *Houston*
- BANKS, STANLEY, lawyer; former chairman, Texas Library and Historical Commission . *San Antonio*
- BEAN, ALAN L., captain, United States Navy, astronaut; fourth man to walk on lunar surface . *Houston*
- BEAN, WILLIAM BENNETT, director, Institute for Humanities in Medicine and Harris Kempner Professor of Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch . *Galveston*
- BENNETT, JOHN MIRZA, JR., chairman, National Bank of Commerce and City Public Service Board; director, Texas and Southwestern Cattleman's Association; Major General, USAFR . *San Antonio*
- BETO, GEORGE JOHN, professor of criminology, Sam Houston State University; former director, Texas Department of Corrections; former president, Concordia College . *Huntsville*
- BLOCKER, TRUMAN G., JR., surgeon; acting president, University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston; consultant to the Surgeon General . *Houston*
- BOLTON, FRANK C., JR., lawyer, former head of legal department of Mobil Oil Company . *Houston*
- BONER, CHARLES PAUL, professor emeritus of physics, University of Texas . *Austin*
- BRANDT, EDWARD N., JR., physician — medical educator, associate deputy chancellor for health affairs, the University of Texas System . *Austin*
- BREWSTER, LEO, United States district judge, Northern District of Texas . *Fort Worth*
- \*BROGAN, ALBERT PERLEY, professor emeritus of philosophy, University of Texas; former president, western division, American Philosophical Association . *Austin*
- BROWN, GEORGE RUFUS, president, Brown and Root; trustee, former chairman, Rice University . *Houston*
- BROWN, JOHN R., senior judge, Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals . *Houston*
- BUSH, GEORGE, former director, Central Intelligence Agency; former ambassador to United Nations; former congressman . *Houston*

\*Life Member

- BUTLER, GEORGE A., lawyer; board chairman, Bank of Texas; trustee, George Washington University, Grand Central Art Galleries, Washington-on-the-Brazos Association . . . . . *Houston*
- BUTLER, JACK, editor, Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- CALDWELL, (JOHN) CLIFTON, rancher, chairman Shackelford County Historical Survey Committee, director Texas Historical Foundation . *Albany*
- CARMACK, GEORGE, associate editor, San Antonio *Express-News* . . . . . *San Antonio*
- CARRINGTON, EVELYN M., retired child psychologist, staff of Children's Development Center, Shady Brook Schools, Children's Medical Center . . . . . *Dallas and Austin*
- 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*
- CLEMENTS, WILLIAM P., JR., former deputy secretary of defense; former chairman, SEDCO, Inc., and chairman of trustees, Southern Methodist University . . . . . *Dallas*
- COKE, HENRY CORNICK, JR., lawyer . . . . . *Dallas*
- COLLIE, MARVIN KEY, lawyer . . . . . *Houston*
- CROOK, WILLIAM HERBERT, former U. S. ambassador to Australia; former president San Marcos Academy; commissioner U. S.-Mexican Border Development . . . . . *San Marcos*
- CULLINAN, NINA . . . . . *Houston*
- CULLUM, ROBERT B., board chairman, the Cullum Companies; president State Fair of Texas; trustee SMU and other institutions, foundations, 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, petroleum consultant, retired chairman Exxon Company, U. S. A. . . . . *Houston*
- DEBAKEY, MICHAEL L., surgeon; president, Baylor College of Medicine . . . . . *Houston*
- DENIUS, FRANKLIN W., lawyer; former president, University of Texas Ex-Students Association; member Constitutional Revision Committee . . . . . *Austin*
- DICK, JAMES, founder-director of the International Festival-Institute at Round Top, concert pianist and teacher . . . . . *Round Top*
- DOTY, EZRA WILLIAM, 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 . . . . . *San Antonio*
- 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 emeritus of mathematics, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- EVANS, STERLING C.**, former president, Bank of the Cooperatives and Federal Land Bank; member of the board, Texas A & M University System; trustee, Wortham Foundation . . . . . *Houston*
- FINCH, WILLIAM CARRINGTON**, retired dean, Vanderbilt Divinity School; former president, Southwestern University . . . . . *Nashville, Tennessee*
- FLAWN, PETER T.**, president, University of Texas at San Antonio . *San Antonio*
- FLEMING, DURWOOD**, president, Southwestern University; president Texas Assn. Church-Related Colleges, mem. World Meth. Council . *Georgetown*
- FRANTZ, JOE B.**, professor of history, University of Texas; director, Texas State Historical Association; editor, *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*; former president, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Austin*
- FRIEND, LLERENA BEAUFORT**, professor emeritus of history, University of Texas . . . . . *Wichita Falls*
- FROST, TOM C., JR.**, chairman of the board, Frost National Bank . *San Antonio*
- GALVIN, CHARLES O'NEILL**, dean, School of Law, Southern Methodist University; began practice, Dallas, 1947; Lt. Comdr. USNR WWII; member Am. Judicature Soc., Intl. Inst. CPAs . . . . . *Dallas*
- \*GAMBRELL, HERBERT PICKENS**, professor emeritus, Southern Methodist University; former president, Texas State Historical Association; former director, Dallas Historical Society; former president, Texas Institute of Letters; member, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . . . . . *Dallas*
- GAMBRELL, VIRGINIA LEDDY (Mrs. Herbert)**, former director of the museum, Dallas Historical Society; former chairman, Texas Library and Historical Commission . . . . . *Dallas*
- GARRETT, JENKINS**, lawyer; member Governor's Committee on Education Beyond High School; newspaper publisher . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- GARWOOD, WILLIAM L.**, lawyer . . . . . *Austin*
- 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 . . . . . *New Hartford, N. Y.*
- 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.*
- GONZALEZ, RICHARD JOSEPH**, economic adviser, Humble Oil and Refining Company; former professor, Universities of Texas and New Mexico; director, Houston Symphony and Grand Opera Associations . . . . . *Houston*

---

**\*Life Member**



- GORDON, WILLIAM EDWIN, dean of Science and Engineering and professor of electrical engineering and space physics and astronomy, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- GRAY, JOHN ELLIS, former president, Lamar University . . . . . *Beaumont*
- 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 chancellor, University of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- HALL, WALTER GARDNER, president Citizens State Bank, Dickinson; past president Mainland Chamber of Commerce; former director San Jacinto River Authority; trustee, Rosenberg Library . . . . . *League City*
- HARBACH, FRANKLIN ISRAEL, consultant; Ripley Foundation, Houston Foundation . . . . . *Houston*
- HARGRAVE, HELEN, professor emeritus of law and law librarian, University of Texas; former president, American Association of Law Libraries; member State Bar of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- HARRINGTON, MARION THOMAS, president emeritus, Texas A&M University . . . . . *Bryan*
- HARRISON, FRANK, physician, president University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; former president, University of Texas at Arlington . . . . . *San Antonio*
- HARRISON, GUY BRYAN, JR., professor of history, Baylor University . . . . . *Waco*
- HART, JAMES PINCKNEY, lawyer, former chancellor, 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*
- HAY, STEPHEN J., former president, Great National Life Insurance Company . . . . . *Dallas*
- HEINEN, ERWIN, certified public accountant; former president, Southern States Conferences of Certified Public Accountants, member Houston Grand Opera Association . . . . . *Houston*
- HERSHEY, JACOB W., board chairman, American Commercial Lines; chairman advisory committee, Transportation Center, Northwestern University . . . . . *Houston*
- HERTZOG, CARL, book designer and publisher, University of Texas at El Paso . . . . . *El Paso*
- HILL, GEORGE W., president, Southern Heritage Foundation; former executive director, Texas State Historical Survey Committee . . . . . *Austin*
- HILL, JOHN L., attorney general of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- HILL, JOSEPH MACGLASHAN, physician; director, Wadley Research Institute; past president, International Society of Hematology . . . . . *Dallas*
- HINES, JOHN ELBRIDGE, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church; trustee, Episcopal Seminary of the Southwest; former member State Board of Hospitals and Special Schools . . . . . *Houston and New York*
- HOBBY, OVETA CULP, president, *Houston Post*; former Secretary of Health Education and Welfare . . . . . *Houston*
- HOBBY, WILLIAM PETTUS, JR., lieutenant governor; executive editor, *Houston Post*; president, Child Guidance Center; chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations . . . . . *Houston*
- HOFFMAN, PHILIP GUTHRIE, president, University of Houston . . . . . *Houston*

- HOLLOWAY, JAMES LEMUEL JR., Admiral (retired), United States Navy, former Superintendent, United States Naval Academy . . . . . *Washington*
- HOLTZMAN, WAYNE H., professor of psychology and education; president, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- 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*
- HYER, JUNE, vice chancellor and provost, University of Houston at Clear Lake City; former parliamentarian, Texas Senate . . . . . *Houston and Clear Lake*
- 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*
- JENKINS, JOHN H., author; publisher, the Pemberton Press; owner, Jenkins Rare Book Company . . . . . *Austin*
- JOHNSON, CLAUDIA TAYLOR (Mrs. LYNDON B.) . . . . . *Stonewall*
- 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, Mrs. PERCY, director, Dodge Jones Foundation, Conference of Southwestern Foundations . . . . . *Abilene*
- JONSSON, JOHN ERIK, chairman, Texas Instruments; chairman, Graduate Research Center of the Southwest; trustee many institutions; former mayor of Dallas . . . . . *Dallas*
- JORDAN, BRYCE, president, University of Texas at Dallas . . . . . *Richardson*
- JOSEY, JACK S., president, Josey Oil Company; member board of governors, Rice University; former regent, University of Texas . . . . . *Houston*
- KEETON, PAGE, former dean of the school of law, University of Texas . *Austin*
- KELSEY, MAVIS PARROTT, physician; clinical professor, University of Texas Graduate School of Biomedical Science; founder, Kelsey-Seybold Clinic . . . . . *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, DANIEL E., certified public accountant, former president, Texas State Historical Association . . . . . *Corpus Christi*
- 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*

- KUSCH, POLYKARP, professor of physics, University of Texas at Dallas, formerly at Universities of Illinois, Minnesota, and Columbia; Nobel Laureate 1955 . . . . . *Dallas*
- \*LAMAR, LUCIUS MIRABEAU, retired general counsel, The California Oil Company . . . . . *New Orleans, Louisiana*
- LAW, THOMAS HART, lawyer; member, Board of Regents, University of Texas System; former president, Fort Worth Area Chamber of Commerce . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- LEAKE, CHAUNCEY DEPEW, professor of pharmacology, University of California; former 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*
- LEAVELL, CHARLES HOLLAND, chairman, C. H. Leavell and Company; director president, United Fund; director Symphony, Museum, Y. M. C. A., etc. . . . . *El Paso*
- LEE, AMY FREEMAN, member advisory council, College of Fine Arts, The University of Texas, and HemisFair; artist, critic and lecturer . . . . . *San Antonio*
- LEVIN, WILLIAM C., physician, president and Warmoth professor of hematology and medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston . . . . . *Galveston*
- LIEDTKE, J. HUGH, president, chief executive officer, chairman of board, Penzoil United; trustee, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- 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*
- LINDSEY, JOHN H., businessman, art collector, civic leader, member, board of directors, Museum of Fine Arts . . . . . *Houston*
- LINDZEY, GARDNER, vice president for academic affairs, University of Texas; psychologist; author . . . . . *Austin*
- LORD, GROGAN, chairman, First Texas Bancorp; member, Texas Securities Board; chairman, Texas Research League; trustee, Southwestern University . . . . . *Georgetown*
- LOVETT, HENRY MALCOLM, lawyer; former chairman of the trustees, Rice University . . . . . *Houston*
- LYNCH, WILLIAM WRIGHT, former president and general manager, Texas Power and Light Company . . . . . *Dallas*
- MACGREGOR, GEORGE LESCHER, chairman, Texas Utilities Company . . . . . *Dallas*
- MAGUIRE, JACK R., executive director, Institute of Texan Cultures, author and syndicated newspaper columnist . . . . . *San Antonio*
- MALLON, H. NEIL, former president, board chairman, Dresser Industries; former president, Dallas Council on World Affairs; trustee, Southwest Research Institute and Southwestern Legal Foundation . . . . . *Dallas*
- MANN, GERALD C., president, Diversa, Inc.; former secretary of state and attorney general of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- MARCUS, STANLEY, executive vice president, Carter Hawley Hale; chairman of the executive committee, Neiman-Marcus . . . . . *Dallas*
- MARGRAVE, JOHN L., professor of chemistry, Rice University; member, American Chemical Society, American Institute of Chemists (fellow); Guggenheim research fellow . . . . . *Houston*
- MCCALL, ABNER VERNON, president, Baylor University; former associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Waco*
- MCCOLLUM, LEONARD FRANKLIN, president, Continental Oil Co. . . . . *Houston*

\*Life Member

- McCORMICK, IRELINE DEWITT (MRS. CHARLES T.) . . . . . *Austin*
- McCULLOUGH, JOHN W., banker, philanthropist; longtime president and director Sealy and Smith Foundation, trustee Rosenberg Library . . . *Galveston*
- MCDERMOTT, MARGARET (Mrs. Eugene), vice president, Dallas Junior College District; board member, Hockaday School, Dallas Symphony Orchestra . . . . . *Dallas*
- MCGHEE, GEORGE CREWS, former U. S. ambassador to West Germany . . . . . *Dallas*
- MCGINNIS, ROBERT C., lawyer . . . . . *Austin*
- MCKNIGHT, JOSEPH WEBB, professor, Southern Methodist School of Law; visiting professor, George Washington and Edinburgh; director Family Code Project, State Bar of Texas; Rhodes scholar . . . . . *Dallas*
- MCNEESE, AYLMEER GREEN JR., chairman of the board, Bank of the Southwest; former regent, University of Texas; trustee, Baylor University College of Medicine; director, Texas Medical Center; trustee, M. D. Anderson Foundation . . . . . *Houston*
- MILLS, BALLINGER, JR., lawyer . . . . . *Galveston*
- 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*
- NORTHEN, MARY MOODY, chairman, Moody National Bank and National Hotel Company; trustee, Moody Foundation; director, American National Insurance Company, Medical Research Foundation; member, Texas Historical Commission and Texas Historical Foundation . . . *Galveston*
- 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 . . *Nyack, N. Y.*
- PAGE, LOUIS C., architect, partner of firm of Page Sutherland Page . *Austin*
- PARTEN, JUBAL RICHARD, oil and mineral investments; ranching . *Houston*
- PATE, A. M., JR., president and chairman, Texas Refinery Corp.; member Texas Historical Commission and Historical Foundation; founder Pate Museum of Transportation; Order of Merit, Luxembourg; student and collector of Texana . . . . . *Fort Worth*
- PITZER, KENNETH SANBORN, professor of chemistry, University of California; formerly president, Stanford and Rice Universities . . . *Berkeley*
- POOL, GEORGE FRED, former editor, *East Texas* magazine; former president, Southern Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives; foreign trade consultant . . . . . *Longview*
- PORTER, JENNY LIND, poet and educator; former poet laureate of Texas . . . . . *Austin*

- PRESLEY, W(ILLIAM) DEWEY, president, First International Bancshares, Inc.; trustee, Baylor University System; past president, Cotton Bowl Council; vice president, Baptist Foundation of Texas . . . . . *Dallas*
- PRESSLER, HERMAN PAUL, lawyer; retired vice-president, Humble Oil & Refining Company; president, Texas Medical Center, Inc.; chairman of the board of trustees, Texas Children's Hospital . . . . . *Houston*
- PROTHRO, CHARLES N., president, Perkins-Prothro Company, trustee, Southwestern University . . . . . *Wichita Falls*
- PROVENCE, HARRY, editor-in-chief, Newspapers, Inc., member Coordinating Board, Texas Colleges and Universities . . . . . *Waco*
- RAGAN, COOPER K., lawyer; former 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*
- RASSMAN, EMIL C., lawyer; former chairman regents, Texas State University System . . . . . *Midland*
- RICHARDSON, RUPERT NORVAL, professor of history, Hardin-Simmons University; past president, Southwestern Social Science Association . . . . . *Abilene*
- SCHACHTEL, HYMAN JUDAH, rabbi, Temple Beth Israel . . . . . *Houston*
- SCHIWETZ, EDWARD MUEEGE, artist . . . . . *Hunt*
- SEALY, TOM, lawyer, former chairman of regents, University of Texas . . . . . *Midland*
- SEARS, WILLIAM G., lawyer, former city attorney, Houston; European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of War, World War II . . . . . *Houston*
- SHARP, DUDLEY CRAWFORD, former vice chairman, Mission Manufacturing Company; former secretary of the air force . . . . . *Houston*
- SHEPPERD, JOHN BEN, past president, Texas State Historical Survey Committee; former attorney general of Texas . . . . . *Odessa*
- SHIVERS, ALLAN, former governor of Texas; chairman, Austin National Bank; former president, United States Chamber of Commerce . . . . . *Austin*
- SHUFFLER, RALPH HENDERSON, II, Episcopal priest-psychotherapist . . . . . *San Antonio*
- SIMPSON, JOHN DAVID, JR., chairman of board, Superior Dairies, Inc.; chairman of board, Texas Rehabilitation Commission . . . . . *Austin*
- SMILEY, JOSEPH ROYALL, former president, University of Texas at El Paso; former president, University of Colorado . . . . . *El Paso*
- SMITH, FRANK C., JR., electrical engineer; specialist in data processing and geosciences . . . . . *Houston*
- SPARKMAN, ROBERT S., M. D., chief, Department of Surgery, Baylor University Medical Center; clinical professor of surgery, University of Texas Southwestern Medical School; former president, Texas Surgical Society . . . . . *Dallas*
- SPRAGUE, CHARLES CAMERON; dean, University of Texas Southwestern Medical school; former dean and professor, Tulane . . . . . *Dallas*
- SPURR, STEPHEN H., former president, University of Texas; formerly at Harvard and Michigan; vice-chairman, Graduate Record Board and Council of Graduate Schools; Fulbright Research fellow; editor (founder) *Forest Science* journal . . . . . *Austin*
- STEAKLEY, ZOLLIE COFFER, associate justice, Supreme Court of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- STEEN, RALPH WRIGHT, former president, Stephen F. Austin State College; former 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*
- SUTTON, JOHN F.**, the William Benjamin Wynne Professor in Law, University of Texas; formerly practicing attorney, San Antonio and San Angelo; chief draftsman, Code of Professional Responsibility, American Bar Association . . . . . *Austin*
- SYMONDS, MARGARET CLOVER**, member, Garden Club of America, Child Welfare League of America; trustee, Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden; Phi Beta Kappa . . . . . *Houston*
- TATE, WILLIS McDONALD**, chancellor, Southern Methodist University . *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*; former president, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Dallas*
- TOBIN, MARGARET BATTS (Mrs. Edgar)**, former regent, University of Texas . . . . . *San Antonio*
- TOPAZIO, VIRGIL W.**, dean, Humanities and Social Sciences, Rice University; writer and editor of numerous books and articles for professional publications . . . . . *Houston*
- TOWER, JOHN**, United States senator . . . . . *Wichita Falls and Washington*
- 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, Texas A&M University Press; former president, Texas Institute of Letters and American Association of University Presses . . . . . *College Station*
- WARREN, DAVID B.**, associate director, The Museum of Fine Arts; senior curator, The Bayou Bend Collection . . . . . *Houston*
- WATKINS, EDWARD T.** . . . . . *Houston*
- WHITCOMB, GAIL**, lawyer; board chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank; former president, American Brahman Breeders Association and Houston Chamber of Commerce . . . . . *Houston*
- WHITCOMB, JAMES LEE**, director, English Speaking Union; trustee, Amigos De Los Americas . . . . . *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*
- WIGGINS, PLATT K.**, retired lawyer . . . . . *Kerrville*
- WILLIAMS, JACK KENNY**, president, Texas A & M University System; former commissioner of higher education . . . . . *College Station*
- WILLIAMS, ROGER JOHN**, distinguished professor of chemistry, University of Texas . . . . . *Austin*
- WILSON, LOGAN**, former chancellor, University of Texas; former president, American Council on Education . . . . . *Austin*
- 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*
- WINTERS, J. SAM**, lawyer; member, American Law Institute . . . *Austin*

- WITTLIFF, WILLIAM DALE, typographer and publisher, president, Encino Press; councillor, Texas Institute of Letters . . . . . *Austin*
- WOLF, STEWART, professor of medicine and physiology, director, Marine Biomedical Institute, University of Texas Medical Branch; formerly with Cornell University, University of Oklahoma; former president, American Gastroenterological Association, American Psychosomatic Society, American Pavlovian Society . . . . . *Galveston*
- WOODSON, BENJAMIN N., chairman and chief executive officer, American General Insurance Company; 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*
- WORDEN, SAM P., inventor . . . . . *Houston*
- WORTHAM, LYNDALL FINLEY (Mrs. GUS S.), author, educator, civic leader, vice president of the Houston Speech and Hearing Society, former regent of the University of Houston . . . . . *Houston*
- WOZENCRAFT, FRANK McREYNOLDS, lawyer; former assistant attorney general of the United States; delegate to United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties . . . . . *Houston*
- WRAY, ANDREW JACKSON, chairman, Marsh and McLennan; former governor, University of Houston; Rice Associates . . . . . *Houston*
- WRIGHT, JAMES S., architect; senior partner of firm of Page Southerland Page . . . . . *Dallas*
- YARBOROUGH, RALPH WEBSTER, lawyer; former United States senator . *Austin*
- YOUNG, SAMUEL DOAK, chairman, El Paso National Bank; director, El Paso Times Corporation, Hilton Hotels Corporation, Texas and Pacific Railway, Telefonos de Mexico . . . . . *El Paso*
- ZACHRY, HENRY B., president, H. B. Zachry Company since 1924; past president, Association of General Contractors of America; director, Texas Research League, Federal Reserve Bank, Southwestern Research Institute; former board chairman, Texas A&M University System . . *San Antonio*

---

## IN MEMORIAM

---

SAM HANNA ACHESON  
NATHAN ADAMS  
JAMES PATTERSON ALEXANDER  
HERBERT ALLEN  
DILLON ANDERSON  
JESSE ANDREWS  
WILLIAM HAWLEY ATWELL  
KENNETH HAZEN AYNESWORTH  
BURKE BAKER  
JAMES ADDISON BAKER  
KARLE WILSON BAKER  
WALTER BROWNE BAKER  
EDWARD CHRISTIAN HENRY BANTEL  
EUGENE CAMPBELL BARKER  
MAGGIE WILKINS BARRY  
WILLIAM BARTHOLOMEW BATES  
WILLIAM JAMES BATTLE  
WARREN SYLVANUS BELLOWS  
HARRY YANDELL BENEDICT  
JOHN HAMILTON BICKETT JR.  
WILLIAM CAMPBELL BINKLEY  
CHARLES MC TYEIRE BISHOP  
WILLIAM BENNETT BIZZELL  
JAMES HARVEY BLACK  
ROBERT LEE BLAFFER  
ROBERT LEE BOBBITT  
MEYER BODANSKY  
HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON  
JOHN GUTZON DE LA MOTHE BORGLUM  
PAUL LEWIS BOYNTON  
GEORGE WAVERLEY BRIGGS  
ANDREW DAVIS BRUCE  
JAMES PERRY BRYAN  
LEWIS RANDOLPH BRYAN JR.  
RICHARD FENNER BURGESS  
WILLIAM HENRY BURGESS  
EMMA KYLE BURLESON  
JOHN HILL BURLESON  
CHARLES PEARRE CABELL  
H. BAILEY CARROLL  
EDWARD HENRY CARY  
CARLOS EDUARDO CASTAÑEDA  
ASA CRAWFORD CHANDLER  
MARION NELSON CHRESTMAN  
JOSEPH LYNN CLARK  
RANDOLPH LEE CLARK  
TOM C. CLARK  
WILLIAM LOCKHART CLAYTON  
THOMAS STONE CLYCE  
CLAUDE CARR CODY JR.  
HENRY COHEN  
TOM CONNALLY  
MILLARD COPE  
MARTIN MC NULTY CRANE  
CLARENCE COTTAM  
CAREY CRONEIS  
JOSEPH STEPHEN CULLINAN  
THOMAS WHITE CURRIE  
GEORGE BANNERMAN DEALY  
JAMES QUAYLE DEALY  
EVERETT LEE DE GOLYER  
ROSCOE PLIMPTON DE WITT  
ADINA DEZAVALA  
FAGAN DICKSON  
CHARLES SANFORD DIEHL  
FRANK CLIFFORD DILLARD  
J. FRANK DOBIE  
HENRY PATRICK DROUGHT  
CLYDE EAGLETON  
ALEXANDER CASWELL ELLIS  
WILLIAM MAURICE EWING  
WILLIAM STAMPS FARISH  
LAMAR FLEMING, JR.  
RICHARD TUDOR FLEMING  
FRED FARRELL FLORENCE  
PAUL JOSEPH FOIK  
CHARLES INGE FRANCIS  
JESSE NEWMAN GALLAGHER  
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 HANSZEN  
THORTON HARDIE  
HENRY WINSTON HARPER

---



---

## IN MEMORIAM

---

HOUSTON HARTE  
FRANK LEE HAWKINS  
WILLIAM WOMACK HEATH  
JOHN EDWARD HICKMAN  
GEORGE ALFRED HILL JR.  
GEORGE ALFRED HILL, III  
MARY VAN DEN BERGE HILL  
ROBERT THOMAS HILL  
WILLIAM PETTUS HOBBY  
ELA HOCKADAY  
WILLIAM RANSOM HOGAN  
IMA HOGG  
THOMAS STEELE HOLDEN  
EUGENE HOLMAN  
EDWARD MANDELL HOUSE  
ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON  
WILLIAM VERMILLION HOUSTON  
WILLIAM EAGER HOWARD  
LOUIS HERMAN HUBBARD  
JOHN AUGUSTUS HULEN  
FRANK GRANGER HUNTRESS  
JULIA BEDFORD IDESON  
WATROUS HENRY IRONS  
HERMAN GERLACH JAMES  
HERBERT SPENCER JENNINGS  
LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON  
WILLIAM PARKS JOHNSON  
CLIFFORD BARTLETT JONES  
ERIN BAIN JONES  
JESSE HOLMAN JONES  
MARVIN JONES  
HERBERT ANTHONY KELLAR  
ROBERT MARVIN KELLY  
LOUIS WILTZ KEMP  
THOMAS MARTIN KENNERLY  
EDWARD KILMAN  
ROBERT JUSTUS KLEBERG, JR.  
ERNEST LYNN KURTH  
FRANCIS MARION LAW  
UMPHREY LEE  
DAVID LEFKOWITZ  
MARK LEMMON  
JEWEL PRESTON LIGHTFOOT  
EUGENE PERRY LOCKE  
JOHN AVERY LOMAX

WALTER EWING LONG  
JOHN TIPTON LONSDALE  
EDGAR ODELL LOVETT  
ROBERT EMMET LUCEY  
LEWIS WINSLOW MAC NAUGHTON  
JAMES WOOTEN MCCLENDON  
CHARLES TILFORD MC CORMICK  
TOM LEE MC CULLOUGH  
EUGENE MCDERMOTT  
JOHN HATHAWAY MC GINNIS  
ALAN DUGALD MC KILLOP  
BUCKNER ABERNATHY MC KINNEY  
JOHN OLIVER MC REYNOLDS  
FRANK BURR MARSH  
MAURY MAVERICK  
BALLINGER MILLS  
JAMES TALIAFERRO MONTGOMERY  
DAN MOODY  
WILLIAM OWEN MURRAY  
FRED MERRIAM NELSON  
CHESTER WILLIAM NIMITZ  
PAT IRELAND NIXON  
JAMES RANKIN NORVELL  
CHARLES FRANCIS O'DONNELL  
JOSEPH GRUNDY O'DONOHUE  
JOHN ELZY OWENS  
ANNA J. HARDWICK PENNYBACKER  
HALLY BRYAN PERRY  
NELSON PHILLIPS  
GEORGE WASHINGTON PIERCE  
CHARLES SHIRLEY POTTS  
CHARLES PURYEAR  
CLINTON SIMON QUIN  
CHARLES WILLIAM RAMSDELL  
EDWARD RANDALL  
EDWARD RANDALL, JR.  
LAURA BALLINGER RANDALL  
HARRY HUNTT RANSOM  
SAM RAYBURN  
JOHN SAYRES REDDITT  
LAWRENCE JOSEPH RHEA  
WILLIAM ALEXANDER RHEA  
SUMMERFIELD G. ROBERTS  
FRENCH MARTEL ROBERTSON  
JOHN ELIJAH ROSSER

---

---

## IN MEMORIAM

---

JAMES EARL RUDDER  
MC GRUDER ELLIS SADLER  
JEFFERSON DAVIS SANDEFER  
MARLIN ELIJAH SANDLIN  
VICTOR HUMBERT SCHOFFELMAYER  
ARTHUR CARROLL SCOTT  
ELMER SCOTT  
JOHN THADDEUS SCOTT  
GEORGE DUBOSE SEARS  
ESTELLE BOUGHTON SHARP  
JAMES LEFTWICH SHEPHERD, JR.  
MORRIS SHEPPARD  
STUART SHERAR  
RALPH HENDERSON SHUFFLER  
ALBERT OLIN SINGLETON  
A. FRANK SMITH  
FRANK CHESLEY SMITH  
THOMAS VERNON SMITH  
HARRIET WINGFIELD SMITHER  
JOHN WILLIAM SPIES  
TOM DOUGLAS SPIES  
ROBERT WELDON STAYTON  
IRA KENDRICK STEPHENS  
HATTON WILLIAM SUMNERS  
ROBERT LEE SUTHERLAND  
GARDINER SYMONDS  
ROBERT EWING THOMASON  
J. CLEO THOMPSON

CHARLES RUDOLPH TIPS  
HENRY TRANTHAM  
GEORGE WASHINGTON TRUETT  
RADOSLAV ANDREA TSANOFF  
EDWARD BLOUNT TUCKER  
WILLIAM BOCKHOUT TUTTLE  
THOMAS WAYLAND VAUGHAN  
ROBERT ERNEST VINSON  
LESLIE WAGGENER  
ALONZO WASSON  
WILLIAM WARD WATKIN  
ROYALL RICHARD WATKINS  
WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB  
HARRY BOYER WEISER  
ELIZABETH HOWARD WEST  
CLARENCE RAY WHARTON  
WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER  
WILLIAM RICHARDSON WHITE  
WILLIAM MARVIN WHYBURN  
HARRY CAROTHERS WIESS  
JAMES RALPH WOOD  
DUDLEY KEZER WOODWARD JR.  
BENJAMIN HARRISON WOOTEN  
GUS SESSIONS WORTHAM  
FRANK WILSON WOZENCRAFT  
WILLIAM EMBRY WRATHER  
RAMSEY YELVINGTON  
HUGH HAMPTON YOUNG

---