

The Texas Observer

FEB. 3, 1967

A Journal of Free Voices

A Window to The South

25c

HEMISFAIR '68 AND LEGISLATURE '67

Austin

HemisFair's backers aren't pleased about the fact, but somehow their plans have, in varying degrees, become an issue in almost everything the legislature is trying to do these days. Officials of the fair need \$5.5 million from the state government, and quickly, if HemisFair is to be ready for its scheduled opening in April, 1968. Gov. John Connally has declared the appropriation an emergency and the House overwhelmingly gave its OK. The Senate probably will follow suit, perhaps by the time this is read, but not before some menacing oratory and the extraction of a few promises from legislative backers of the fair concerning future votes on other matters.

There has been much grouching — some *sotto voce*, some not so *sotto* — about HemisFair on the part of legislators from beyond Bexar County and vicinity who feel that they have emergencies of their own. The governor, however, is a man of considerable influence; the fair is not likely to be refused.

The process of responding to the request has revealed some of the nature of the 60th legislature. The HemisFair bill is the first that has encouraged the lawmakers to doff their ceremonial robes and dispense with the amenities that characterize the opening of a session. The word "HemisFair" has popped up in discussions that are, basically, related to the struggle between the House and the Senate and between the two houses' leaders, Lt. Gov. Preston Smith and Speaker Ben Barnes. HemisFair has not escaped notice during the consideration of an emergency pay raise for state employees, an issue that was a significant surprise attack in the House-Senate feud. In fact, the fair is thought by many to be partly responsible for the sudden choice, by the Senate, of the pay bill as a stratagem to use against the House. This will be discussed in a moment.

Nor have the backers of HemisFair been comforted by two recent non-legislative incidents which are much on the minds of the lawmakers in Austin. First there was the voting down, in Bexar County, of a tax increase to finance operation of a teaching hospital. The vote has jeopardized plans of the last legislature to establish a South Texas Medical School at San Antonio. Another woe for HemisFair is the involvement of a San Antonio legislator in the delays surrounding acquisition

of land for the LBJ State Park. Rep. Roy Garwood was retained by a couple who are fighting condemnation of their 54-acre property which is being sought for the park. Garwood has acknowledged that one reason he was retained was that such a move will delay the condemnation proceedings until after the legislature adjourns. Garwoods accepting a role in the case has irritated some legislators.

LET US BEGIN now to weave the stories of HemisFair '68 and Legislature '67 in more detail. The complicated tale began with a hearing before the House Appropriations Committee last week. HemisFair's leaders were prepared. Several speakers were on hand, slide projectors at the ready. There were mimeographed handouts, a wall display outlining the fair's research to date into Texas history, and a large model of part of the fairgrounds.

Leading the presentation was Frank Hildebrand, director of the Texas Tourist Development Agency. Just as he began to speak a West Texas representative, Delwin Jones of Lubbock, whipped out a handkerchief and rather loudly blew his nose. No one, and certainly not Hildebrand, seemed to notice. After 50 minutes of smooth talk, color slides, and straight-from-the-shoulder earnestness, committee chairman Bill Heatly of Paducah called a halt. Not many of the committeemen were paying much attention anyway.

George Hinson of Mineola, saying that he favored the appropriation, asked how much San Antonio and Bexar County intended to put into the fair. H. B. Zachry, HemisFair's board chairman, said that "San Antonio's expenditures are \$75 million and I expect it to reach \$100 million." Hinson moved that the committee report the appropriation to the House floor favorably. There were no dissenting votes. Just as Heatly was preparing to adjourn the meeting Rep. Jones of Lubbock said, "Mr. Chairman, if they come back looking for more money in the future, I'm going to be like that tomat that had an affair with a skunk — I'll have enjoyed about all of this I can stand." Heatly urged that the committee members support the bill on the floor. After adjournment several members were heard complaining about the appropriation.

Before the measure came to a vote on the House floor, Speaker Barnes said he believed that the two-thirds majority

needed to pass the emergency appropriation existed in the lower house. There was some opposition, Barnes said, among some members who "are using the medical school thing, justly or unjustly, to work against HemisFair." Some legislators were questioning why the fair's appropriation should be passed when Bexar County voters had, a few days before, turned down a tax increase as their part of establishing the South Texas Medical School in San Antonio. The tax increase needed was to finance operation of a teaching hospital near the medical school. An earlier vote in San Antonio had authorized bonds to build the hospital; construction began several months ago on both the hospital and the medical school. If funds aren't provided to operate the hospital the entire medical school project could be in jeopardy. San Antonio leaders have been given a deadline, later this month, to come up with a plan for funding operation of the hospital; meanwhile, many legislators are angry and embarrassed about the situation.

On the floor of the House Rep. Heatly lead the HemisFair bill to passage. After some 30 minutes of a foredoomed and thus largely bantering floor revolt, lead by Reps. Carl Parker of Port Arthur and Clyde Haynes of Vidor, the vote was 121-23. Heatly, smiling, told a colleague, "I ought to go to San Antonio and run for mayor."

In the Senate the HemisFair bill was to be considered this week by the Finance Committee before going to the floor of the upper house. Committee chairman Sen. A. M. Aikin of Paris said he didn't intend to bottle up the measure. Sen. Joe Bernal of San Antonio, probable floor leader of the bill, said that 16 Senators favored it, five were doubtful, and one, Sen. George Parkhouse of Dallas, was opposed. A two-thirds majority of the Senate is required to pass the emergency measure. There are 31 Senators.

IN THE MEANTIME, the day before the HemisFair bill passed the House, the Senate mounted its first offensive in the struggle between the legislature's two chambers. Basically, the battle is between Lt. Gov. Smith and Speaker Barnes (Obs., Jan. 20), who both want to be governor. On the third legislative day the House had fired the opening shot in the 1967 phase of the war. At Barnes' urg-

(Continued on Page 3)

Another Good Speech for the Well-To-Do

Speeches like Gov. John Connally's to the 60th legislature are really fine and progressive-sounding talks — if you earn more than five or six thousand dollars a year, aren't mentally ill or retarded, live in a pollution-free area where traffic congestion isn't a problem, and don't have youngsters who keep saying they want to attend college. Otherwise, you might have a few suggestions to offer the governor.

Texas leads the nation in poverty and is not a state that brags much about its social enlightenment. Our state government's leaders in their public statements seem to assume that everyone wears coats and ties all the time, has two late-model cars in a garage that's attached to a fashionable house, and is making it just fine on pay day. Certainly such folks as those the governor and other state leaders have in mind are the economic strength of our state. But there are two million of our ten and one-half million people who do not live this way, who need some consideration in the acts of our state government.

What of a state minimum wage? Could not some consideration be given this reasonable measure? Would paying \$1.25 an hour really drive one farmer or one shopkeeper to bankruptcy?

What of pollution? The governor did propose a Houston-Galveston Bay Authority to control the quality of that body of water. But are we doing enough to protect — yes, and to rehabilitate — the state's other water resources. And what of the air? Not a word on that.

What of the War on Poverty? Shall Texas crack down on criminals, as the governor urged in ringing terms, without considering some of the causes of the upsurge in crime which the governor says is "frightening"? Can not the War on Poverty be implemented rather than stalled in Texas? President Johnson's home state can scarcely be called a showcase of the poverty fight.

And what of the cities? Is it enough to pass a local option city sales tax? The legislature seems to be balking on this and properly so. Let the state government do more to serve the centers wherein reside the majority of Texans.

THE GOVERNOR has been delaying telling us how we shall raise the needed additional revenues for the coming biennium. It is reported that the business lobby requires some more convincing, some more hand-patting, before the prospect of some taxes on business are announced. The governor deserves credit for his proposal to put some of the new financial burden on business, rather than socking individuals with the total bill. Certainly business can not be said to be overtaxed in Texas—undertaxed is more accurate—but acknowledge the fact, the governor is moving slightly in the right

direction on this matter. Free voter registration may have its benefits.

The governor's plan for having the federal government turn back income tax money to the states is not a good idea. There has been much talk during the past few weeks, in Austin, of state's responsibilities. Why, then, pass on to Washington the political burden of levying taxes for Texas? What's wrong with setting up a state income tax, if it's needed? Texas does require more revenue to become a modern state. We must pay the way, but with a progressive tax. A state income tax should be passed — and the sales tax repealed! The governor's federal tax rebate proposal is a clever idea for Texas. The rebates would be based on population, the governor suggests, not on taxes paid to Washington. Texas is fourth in population; eighth in federal income taxes.

PRAISE IS DUE the governor for his call for a "strong industrial safety program" with "adequate authority to prescribe safety standards" (let there be no failure in providing adequate authority); for calling for (slightly) increased unemployment compensation benefits; for advocating a Public Utilities Board to regulate Texas utilities; for urging an eavesdropping ban in Texas; for asking that Medicaid be implemented in Texas; for calling for increased state employees' salaries; for urging money for the Institute of Texan Culture, which can be an important institution.

Much is before the legislature; the governor has made some good suggestions, he has stood mute on some needed measures. The governor proposes, the legislature disposes.

What's Up

What's gotten into the Star-Telegram, anyway? The Fort Worth paper has been behaving most peculiarly for a Texas metropolitan daily these past few months.

First there was the bald-faced suggestion that perhaps the deadline for voter registration ought to be extended to within a month or so of general election day. Any red-blooded Texan worth his depletion allowance knows that such a practice would only permit the rabble, stirred up by the election campaign, to get in on determining who shall govern in our democracy. What nonsense.

Then the Star-Telegram had the temerity to question, albeit gently, our governor's proposal for having the federal government turn over some of its loot to the states. The newspaper, in an editorial, suggests that to do such a thing without adequate controls would possibly be an abdication of the U.S. government's obligations to the nation. Now what kind of carpetbaggin' notion is that, anyway?

Be warned, Star Telegram, you are being watched. Your Establishment credentials are in jeopardy. □

THE TEXAS OBSERVER

© Texas Observer Co., Ltd. 1967

A Journal of Free Voices

60th YEAR — ESTABLISHED 1906

A Window to the South

Vol. 58, No. 26



February 3, 1967

Incorporating the State Observer and the East Texas Democrat, which in turn incorporated the State Week and Austin Forum-Advocate.

We will serve no group or party but will hew hard to the truth as we find it and the right as we see it. We are dedicated to the whole truth, to human values above all interests, to the rights of man as the foundation of democracy; we will take orders from none but our own conscience, and never will we overlook or misrepresent the truth to serve the interests of the powerful or cater to the ignoble in the human spirit.

Editor and General Manager, Ronnie Dugger. Partner, Mrs. R. D. Randolph.

Associate Editor, Greg Olds.

Business Manager, Sarah Payne.

Associate Manager, C. R. Olofson.

Contributing Photographer, Russell Lee.

The editor has exclusive control over the editorial policies and contents of the Observer. None of the other people who are associated with the enterprise shares this responsibility with him. Writers are responsible for their own work, but not for anything they have not themselves written, and in publishing them the editor does not necessarily imply that he agrees with them, because this is a journal of free voices.

Subscription Representatives: Arlington, George N. Green, 300 E. South College St., CR 7-0080; Austin, Mrs. Helen C. Spear, 2615 Pecos, HO 5-1805; Corpus Christi, Penny Dudley, 1224½ Second St., TU 4-1460; Dallas, Mrs. Cordye Hall, 5835 Ellsworth, TA 1-1205; Denton, Fred Lusk, Box 8134 NTS, 387-3119; Ft. Worth, Dolores Jacobsen, 3025 Greene Ave., WA 4-9655; Houston, Mrs. Shirley Jay, 10306 Cliffwood Dr., PA 3-8682; Lubbock, Doris Blaisdell, 2515 24th St., Midland, Eva Dennis, 4306 Douglas, OX 4-2825; Snyder, Enid Turner, 1706 Glenwood, EM 6-2269; San Antonio, Mrs. Mae B. Tuggle, 531 Elmhurst, TA 6-3583; Cambridge, Mass., Victor Emanuel, Adams House C112.

The Observer is published by Texas Observer Co., Ltd., biweekly from Austin, Texas. Entered as second-class matter April 26, 1937, at the Post Office at Austin, Texas, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Second class postage paid at Austin, Texas. Delivered postage prepaid \$6.00 a year; two years, \$11.00; three years, \$15.00. Foreign rates on request. Single copies 25c; prices for ten or more for students, or bulk orders, on request.

Editorial and Business Offices: The Texas Observer, 504 West 24th St., Austin, Texas 78705. Telephone GR 7-0746.

Change of Address: Please give old and new address and allow three weeks.

(Continued from Page 1)

ing representatives had approved, 145-0, a set of joint rules that, in part, would limit the discretion of conference committees in adjusting bills of a similar nature passed by both houses. This initiative embarrassed the Senators, many, if not most, of whom aren't interested in any such limitations, particularly when it comes time to combine the House and Senate appropriations bills. Probably the House leadership isn't really interested in reducing the power of conference committees, either, but this is war. The House's proposed rules were, in effect, saying to the Senators: "let's be more democratic than we have been in the past." It's difficult to take a public stand against the democratic process, so, clearly, the House had put it to the Senate; Barnes had scored first on Smith.

The Senate's and Smith's answering volley was fired during the upper house's first bill introducing period. Sen. Charles Herring of Austin told reporters beforehand that a "major story" was coming. When Herring's SB32 was introduced it was announced as an emergency salary increase for 38,000 state employees, for March 1 to Sept. 1 of this year. It soon became clear that SB 32 would, if passed by the Senate, put pressure on the House

and on Gov. Connally as well. (Smith is also at odds with the governor since Barnes is clearly Connally's preference as a successor.) The threat lay in the House rule that, until after passage of the general appropriations bill, the Representatives can't consider money bills unless requested to do so by the governor. So Connally's and Barnes' choice would lie in going along with the Senate's move (for which the Senate — and Smith — would get most of the credit), or they could refuse and risk the displeasure of the workers who would be affected and perhaps seem cold-hearted to a segment (who knows how large?) of the voters. Connally and Barnes have been urging a state employees' pay increase for a year or more; now, however, their stand was being both taken from them and used against them. Both men were displeased about the emergency bill; Connally was described as outraged. The administration's plan called for the pay increase to be voted this session to begin at the start of the 1967-69 biennium, next Sept. 1.

Who conceived the Senate's thrust is not known. Some say Smith; others, Herring. The Austin Senator denies vigorously that his bill is a power play, as has been charged. Regardless, the move was imaginative, given the Smith-Barnes rivalry.

THE BARNES FUND

The Houston Chronicle, in a Sunday supplement feature on Texas House Speaker Ben Barnes, disclosed, far down in the story, that a Ben Barnes Club was formed, more than a year ago, in the four counties of Barnes' home district. The club's 160 members chip in \$10 monthly to support the Speaker in activities that are related to his duties.

Barnes has said since that he has no control over the funds, which are kept in banks in his district. "More than a year ago the people in my four counties [Brown, Runnels, Coleman, and Comanche] started asking my best supporters if they would give \$10 a month to help me," Barnes said. "The money stays there and when I think I need anything, I telephone them. . . . I have never written a check on the fund myself," Barnes said. He uses the money for such things as travel expenses and postage for Christmas cards, he explains, and does not receive a regular income from the fund. "This is no personal money of mine, it's for political purposes," Barnes said. "I never receive any money directly and none of these bills involve my personal expenses. We are very careful about that."

A reporter asked Lt. Gov. Preston Smith if he has such a fund. Smith, like Barnes, gets \$4,800 yearly as his state salary. Smith said he has no such private fund to help pay his political expenses. The lieutenant governor said he has income from personal business interests, primarily movie theaters in Lubbock. Barnes, the Chronicle reported, has income from a farm, a construction business, and the operation of

two Holiday Inn motels (in Bryan and Del Rio) with two other motels planned for Marshall and Plainview.

Asked if he thought his fund was similar to the Nixon fund once maintained for former Vice President Richard Nixon, Barnes said he thought not. "My fund is raised through voluntary \$10-a-month contributions from voters who live within my district. The Nixon fund involved far larger amounts. There is a vast difference between a \$10 monthly contribution and a contribution of \$1,000 or more."

At a press conference Barnes was asked if he would identify the supporters who started the fund. Barnes said he would rather not. "I'm sure they would have no objection," he said, "but I might leave out somebody. The contributors include ranchers, businessmen, merchants, and professional men." How about reporting the money for tax purposes? Barnes said the Internal Revenue Service requires that such a fund be used to pay "legitimate expenses incidental to the speaker's office."

Barnes said he favors a code of ethics requiring legislators and other elected state officials to disclose their sources of income.

The most outspoken critic of the Barnes fund has been Rep. Don Gladden of Fort Worth, who said "It is most unfortunate that a person in his position must depend on private charity to perform the functions of his office. I was unaware that the money voted by the legislature for operations of the speaker's office were insufficient." □

HERRING ROSE IN the Senate to speak briefly in favor of his bill. It was referred to the Finance Committee, whose chairman, Senator Aikin, immediately asked unanimous consent of the Senate to stand at ease while the committee considered "this unusual bill." There were no objections to this rare procedure.

Twenty of the 21 committee members filed into an adjoining meeting room. Absent was Sen. Ralph Hall of Rockwall. A notable presence among those who crowded into the room was Smith, who seldom attends committee meetings. He spoke first, supporting the pay raise bill and urging, at the same time, economy in government.

Herring said there are cases of "college graduates being asked to work for the state of Texas for less than they can earn as janitor with the federal government. . . . Many state employees are now waiting to see if the leaders of Texas mean what they say [about a pay raise] and if we don't we'll lose them." The minimum salary would be increased to \$3,216, from the present \$2,388. The percentages of increase provided would range from 34% for the lower pay brackets to 12.5% for those in the higher ranges.

The only opposition among those on the Finance Committee was voiced by the Senate's only Republican, Henry Grover of Houston, and a liberal, Joe Bernal of San Antonio. Neither questioned the need for the pay raise, only the emergency procedure. Grover said "Why can't we wait a week? . . . We could end up with an appropriations bill that no one ever thought of."

"We're ten years behind. We've got to move," Herring replied. "Let's pass it out, pass it out," Sen. Parkhouse chanted.

Bernal said, "I'm afraid we're opening a door. Why not appropriate money for Medicaid, junior colleges, and senior colleges on this [emergency] basis, or a teacher pay raise?" Herring answered that the state employees have been waiting too long to wait further.

Sen. Bruce Reagan of Corpus Christi, said it was a disgrace that hundreds of state jobs were unfilled. "I'm not a spender," he said, but this is an emergency. Reagan moved approval of the bill. Tom Creighton of Mineral Wells seconded the motion.

"Is there any more discussion?" Aikin inquired.

"No, we've heard too much already," growled Parkhouse.

Bernal, before the vote, said "I'm not opposed to a state employees' raise, but is this really an emergency?"

"Do you think HemisFair's an emergency?" Reagan asked.

"We've got a deadline," Bernal said of the fair.

"Yes, and you've got \$20 million from the federal government, too" Parkhouse rumbled.

In the voice vote Bernal and Grover were the only dissenters.

The committee meeting required 20 minutes. Newsmen returning to their table in the Senate chamber found an unsigned release there, evidently prepared before the day's session, which read: "More than 38,000 state employees stand an excellent chance of getting a belated Christmas present today if the Texas Senate and House pass the emergency pay raise bill worth several millions of general fund dollars voted out of the powerful Senate Finance Committee today."

Another news release was passed out to reporters, this one from Smith, announcing his "full approval" of the bill. "Of all emergency measures we consider, the needs of the people should come first. This means the pay raise takes precedence over all other emergency measures." This was obviously a reference to the Connally- and Barnes-backed HemisFair emergency appropriation bill. "Our employees can count on raises beginning March 1, 1967," Smith said in his release.

THE NEXT DAY it was clear that the Senate leadership wanted to pass the bill on the spot. Herring asked that the rules be suspended so that the emergency bill could be passed; this would require the approval of four-fifths of the Senate membership and would be necessary since, under the constitution, only the governor can submit emergency matters to the legislature. Sen. Grady Hazlewood of Amarillo protested; he is regarded as more of an ally of Connally's than of Smith's.

"When you do something like this," Hazlewood said, "the state budget has gone to the wind. What is there about this bill that makes it such an emergency?"

Herring heatedly answered that the state employees have been waiting years for a pay raise.

Hazlewood asked why the House members didn't know of Herring's intentions, adding "I've been in the Senate 27 years and I never saw anything happen like it did in that [committee] room yesterday."

After some debate between Herring and Hazlewood the vote was taken. The count was 24-6 in favor; Herring needed 25 ayes. Voting no were the governor's brother, Wayne Connally of Floresville, H. J. Blanchard of Lubbock, Hazlewood, Don Kennard of Fort Worth, Jack Strong of Longview, and Jim Wade of Dallas.

Why did Grover and Bernal vote yes? The Observer asked. The senators answered that they had made their point in the committee meeting the day before and there was some danger of being misunderstood back home as opposing the pay raise when the emergency procedure was what they objected to. Bernal voiced some concern about HemisFair's fate in the Senate, had he voted the other way, naming three Senators who had solicited his support since the day before. Hall, the only Senator absent, was reported as favoring Herring's move; if so, his presence would have meant that the Senate action would have succeeded.

Smith, afterwards, was asked by a San Antonio reporter about the chances of

HemisFair's appropriation, which the House had just approved, getting through the Senate. The lieutenant governor said he believed that the bill would pass but said there might be some trouble if the emergency pay raise bill doesn't make it. "This has absolutely nothing to do with the HemisFair bill," Smith said, "but if forces block [the pay bill], there might be consequences."

The next day, after some behind-the-scenes activity, Herring said that he had planned to ask another vote but "overnight several members have had a change of heart," so he wouldn't ask for another record vote. Herring said he had heard some stories "about the governor being displeased" about SB 32. "I'm sorry about that," Herring said, "I didn't know I was supposed to check bills with him. . . . My sole purpose is to try to help some poor people that are in trouble financially." He said he would try again with his bill sometime.

It turned out that the next effort was one day later. The vote was 23-7 this time. Hall was present; he voted aye, with Herring. Blanchard switched his no vote to an aye; but Oscar Mauzy of Dallas and A. R. Schwartz of Galveston changed their votes to no this time. W. T. Moore of Bryan walked off the floor just before the roll call vote began and did not answer when his name was called.

Sen. Creighton then moved that the governor declare the salary increase an emergency measure and submit it to the legislature. This motion passed 25-6 (voting no were Sens. Strong, Wayne Connally, Hall, Hazlewood, Kennard, and Wilson) and was sent to the House. Barnes said he would make no effort to stop the resolution the House — or help it either. "It's going to be up to the House what it wants to do," Barnes said. The House, Monday, gave its unanimous approval. The next move is the governor's. G. O.

Political Intelligence

New Groupings In the Texas Senate

✓ Texas Senate watchers have a more complicated situation than usual to deal with this session. Normally the groupings are along the customary liberal-conservative lines; this year there are three blocs — Connally people who won't take anything off Lt. Gov. Preston Smith; Smith's senators who won't take anything off Connally; and independents, including the liberals, who can go either way.

✓ The lone Republican, Sen. Henry Grover of Houston, appears to be in the Smith grouping at this point. Smith gave Grover eight committee assignments, which is more than some veterans got (A. R. Schwartz of Galveston, for example); and Grover is vice-chairman of the banking committee.

✓ Schwartz, noting the three-way split in the Senate, believes that this session the cause that is right and fair will be able to prevail in the upper house, but that any cause that is unfairly handled, whether it is right or not, will not prevail there.

✓ Schwartz was exuberant as the third week of the session ended that he had been able, without half trying, to obtain eleven co-signatures from Senators to his announcement, in advance of an executive session on appointments, that he was going to vote aye on them. Except for Sen. Wayne Connally, Floresville, the twelve who signed were liberals and moderates. Sen. Charles Wilson, Lufkin, asked Schwartz, "Have you got any conservatives?" and Schwartz, who had not yet got Wayne Connally's signature, said no, whereupon Wilson signed the statement,

"Charles Wilson, conservative."

✓ Sen. Don Kennard of Fort Worth drew some complaints when, after signing on as a co-sponsor of Sen. Charles Herring's SB32, the emergency pay raise measure for state employees, he failed in two record votes to support suspending the rules to permit its consideration. After the first vote Kennard said he was concerned about the omission of hourly employees from the bill, some of whom make \$1.15 hourly. After being assured that the hourly workers would be given raises, Kennard said he was ready to vote for the bill. But the next day the vote was taken a second time and Kennard voted no again.

This week Sen. Murray Watson of Waco asked the Senate's permission to add Kennard's name as a co-sponsor to three bills sought by the Texas State Teachers Assn. "You sure he'll vote for them?" Lt. Gov. Smith asked dryly.

✓ Veteran Sen. Dorsey Hardeman of San Angelo rose on the Senate floor to memorialize Gen. Robert E. Lee on the anniversary of the Southern general's birth. Hardeman, impressive in a black suit, vest, and pince-nez glasses that were attached by a black ribbon, quoted, largely from memory, the eulogy that was spoken at Lee's funeral. Hardeman's colleagues applauded his offering and voted to include the remarks in the Senate Journal.

In the House

✓ Some House liberals, including several who are first termers, complain

that they have no floor leadership. Gone is the savvy of Bob Eckhardt, of Houston, who is now a Congressman. The 141-0 and 145-0 votes in the House have resulted, in some cases, because some of the liberals are inexperienced in the ways of the House; they would oppose the Ben Barnes machine were there an opportunity — and if they were sure they would not be too much in the minority. Some say that they feel they must be careful in going against the powers that be — at least until they see the way things are.

✓ A case in point was the unanimously passed resolution in support of Gov. Connally and opposing the William Manchester book's version of some aspects of President Kennedy's trip to Texas. The resolution was passed in the House by a swiftly-called voice vote.

✓ As if in retribution, one first term liberal House member, Glenn Vickery of Houston, introduced a resolution praising U.S. Sen. Ralph Yarborough for his bill that will seek a Big Thicket National Park in Texas. The resolution received the same treatment as the Connally-Manchester measure — a fast voice vote. It is believed that Speaker Ben Barnes, who has further political ambitions, let Vickery's resolution go on unimpeded rather than stall it and risk raising the ire of Yarborough supporters. It is thought that Barnes probably didn't think the matter important enough to make an issue of it. The 139 House members who voted for the resolution signed their names to it and a copy was sent to the Senator in Washington. Yarborough was delighted.

✓ Rep. Don Gladden, Fort Worth, has come forward with a bill to repeal the state's right-to-work law. He says that organized labor, concerned this session with workmen's and unemployment compensation law changes and the minimum wage, "has responded rather coolly" to his bill against right-to-work, but that he campaigned on a platform of repeal and he's going forward with it. With a grin, Gladden said, "I told Hank Brown I was going to bring the labor movement kicking and screaming into the twentieth century." (Texas labor president Brown has similarly threatened the Texas Establishment.)

✓ Rep. Jake Johnson of San Antonio said his poll of his House colleagues on his liquor-by-the-drink bill showed 67 for it, 41 against it, and 21 neutral. He thought his 67 supporters might be scaled down to 50 when the time came to step up to the bar on the issue, but, he said, "We're gonna get a vote." Johnson was full of irritation with the citizens' committee that has formed to support liquor-by-the-drink in Texas. He says that so far the citizens have not stimulated support from major cities other than San Antonio. Asked if he thought this might be because they've had too much liquor by the drink, he did not respond with the sense of humor sometimes characteristic of him.

✓ If Ben Barnes doesn't seek an unprecedented third term in 1969, as House Speaker (some suggest that he might), Reps. Gus Mutscher of Brenham

and Gene Fondren of Taylor seem to be the leading contenders for the post. Mutscher claims, privately, the support of more than 90 of the 150 present House members.

✓ Rep. Rex Braun of Houston has filed a report on his sources of income. The statement, which Braun says is a complete one, lists assets totalling some \$380,000. Braun, a first term liberal, said he filed the statement with the secretary of state to indicate support of a new code of ethics bill proposed by Rep. Jim Nugent of Kerrville. Nugent's bill would require disclosure of potential conflicts of interest.

✓ Close followers of banking, small loan, and savings and loan legislation profess astonishment in the legislature at the makeup of the House banking committee. Rep. Grant Jones, Abilene, is represented to be the most nearly liberal member thereof, the others as friends of one segment or the other of the industries the committee is concerned with. (By comparison the Senate banking committee is less closely tied in with the financial community.)

✓ A rundown on the more significant bills introduced in the House and Senate will be listed in the next issue of the Observer.

Texans in D.C.

✓ Texas has five chairmen of House committees with four others no lower than third in seniority. George Mahon of Lubbock leads the Appropriations Committee; Wright Patman of Texarkana, Banking and Currency; Omar Burleson of Anson, Administration; and Olin Teague of College Station, Veterans' Affairs. Burleson would have won membership on the Ways and Means Committee, it is believed, were it not for several Alabama Democrats attending the inauguration of Mrs. Lurleen Wallace as governor. Burleson, in a Democratic caucus, lost the seat by two votes to a New Yorker.

✓ Cong. Richard White of El Paso seeks to exempt his hometown from Central Standard Time. El Paso has been on Mountain Standard Time for 84 years. A federal law passed last year will go into effect on April 1, requiring that each state be completely within a single time zone.

✓ Cong. Joe Pool of Dallas said he "might have broken even" after a Washington party he held to reduce the \$25,000 in debts he said he owed after his 1966 campaign. Seth Kantor writes in the El Paso Herald-Post that a number of lobbyists attended at \$25 a head; Kantor described the party as a "whiskey-flowing reception." About 90 Texans, members of the "Congressman Pool Club," flew to the capital for the event. Each of them put up \$247.50 for the chartered prop-jet flight, food, lodging, and admission to the party. A testimonial dinner may be next, Pool has indicated.

✓ Cong. J. J. Pickle of Austin said he will support new taxes for the Vietnam war, but the War on Poverty should be financed conditionally, depending on the nation's "ability to pay under present conditions. We spend only about 1% of our budget on the poverty program," Pickle says. "To tie it in to the national defense is a grossly unfair question."

✓ Former Cong. Lindley Beckworth of Gladewater has been nominated by the President for a position on the U.S. Customs Court.

✓ The Observer article "He Is Handicapped If We Take Away His Language" has been published in the Congressional Record at U.S. Sen. Ralph Yarborough's instance. It was written by Ramon Garces, a Laredo newsman, and discusses a bilingual teaching project in the elementary grades.

More on 1968

✓ Speculation that U.S. Sen. Ralph Yarborough might run against Gov. John Connally in 1968 persists in news reports. Bo Byers of the Houston Chronicle quotes Yarborough as saying in Dallas a couple of weeks ago: "My fight for my home state cannot be based alone in Washington because the greatest danger is here [in Texas], and that danger is lying in the very air of this state. It is time that this smog of misinformation be cleared away. It is time for Texas to take its place in the sun, and I am enlisting in the fight to see that this is done — within our lifetimes." Yarborough's Senate term runs through 1970, so he could run for governor without resigning.

The senator threw another log on the fires of speculation when he said, also in mid-January, that he "would definitely run for the Texas governorship if I were not a U.S. Senator — because Texas needs a governor. I haven't decided, though, whether I will toss my hat into the ring, and one of the main factors which will determine that decision is my ten years seniority in the Senate."

Yarborough, commenting on new Texas Atty. Gen. Crawford Martin's objections to a federal wage and hour law that would govern certain state-operated institutions, told the Observer that Martin "is following in the footsteps of Waggoner Carr and is a true follower of the Connally-Carr machine in fighting against a living wage for the working people of Texas."

Yarborough said the resolution of praise (see above) passed by the Texas House of Representatives shows, the Senator said to the Observer, the "weakening of Connally's hold" on events in Austin.

✓ And what of John Connally? Dick West of the Dallas News reports that the governor is now an even bet among "the most knowledgeable sources" to run for an unprecedented fourth term as governor in 1968. West says that, three months ago, the chance of Connally doing

this was only one in ten. The governor "would rather ranch than run," West says, but he is determined that liberals and Republicans will not capture the statehouse. West discusses potential challengers to the Establishment's hold on the governor's chair, listing Republican George Bush and liberals Franklin Spears and Ralph (but not Don) Yarborough.

Another factor, of course, in a Conqally fourth term try, would be President Johnson's plans in 1968 and the necessity for a Texas Democratic Party controlled by LBJ partisans. Byers in his Chronicle article quotes some Texas conservatives, "including at least one high state official," as being convinced that U.S. Sen. Robert Kennedy will vie with President Johnson for the '68 nomination unless LBJ's popularity improves.

Gonzalez Complains

✓ Sen. Yarborough and Cong. Henry B. Gonzalez of San Antonio are at odds over Yarborough's newly-introduced \$107 million education and job training bills to aid the Spanish-speaking in the Southwest. The bill would authorize \$100 million for programs of education, training, health, leadership, citizenship, and others, emphasizing self-help and individual responsibility. The other \$7 million would finance bilingual education, teaching English as a second language to Spanish-speaking students.

Gonzalez says the bills create "a racial distinction and exclusion of other groups." The Congressman says that "by referring to some of the people in this [Southwest Texas] area as hyphenated Americans, the Senator is relegating them to a second class status."

✓ Texas Democrats are having a bit of trouble filling several positions on their State Executive Committee. Four of eight Harris County positions were offered to liberals at last year's state convention but were refused as the liberals believed that they should control all eight. Attempting to fill two of the four vacancies, the S.D.E.C. named Jesse Strickland of Pasadena and Mrs. Marguerite West of La Porte, both said to be liberals. But a couple of days later Mrs. West said she would be unable to accept.

✓ Bill Thomas, University of Texas professor and a leader of Texas Liberal Democrats, is joining Franklin Spears' political staff, becoming at least the third full-time worker for Spears' political future.

✓ Spears was honored last week near Houston at an appreciation dinner that was attended by a variety of Democratic office holders. Cong. Bob Eckhardt of Houston spoke. Other Congressmen scheduled to be on hand were Jack Brooks, Henry Gonzalez, and Jim Wright.

✓ Waggoner Carr changed his mind; he will practice law in Austin, not in Lubbock as previously announced. . . . Thirty of 56 pending slant wells cases were settled shortly before Carr left the attorney general's post; the \$400,000 worth of cases were disposed of shortly after new AG Crawford Martin had announced that he would be tougher on such matters. . . . Edinburg editor Jim Mathis, in a front page column, writes: "If Martin gets statewide enforcement with the new head of his Enforcement Division, ex-Hidalgo [County] DA Bob Lattimore, like Lattimore provided this county, the state will be in a sorry shape two years from now."

✓ U.S. Sen. John Tower is receiving more and more mail from several sections of the nation urging that he seek the Republican Presidential nomination in 1968. Tower, in Austin for a state GOP powwow, said that President Johnson placed "a couple of phone calls from Manila" to Texas labor leaders in November, but failed to sway them to support Carr. The senator is back in Vietnam this week.

Waggoner Carr would have needed an 88.2% turnout, or 2.7 million voters, to have beaten Tower, a GOP computer found. About 1.5 million voted in the race.

✓ George Bush of Houston, a bright new face among Republicans in Congress, was given a prompt dose of national exposure. He was on a TV panel of Republicans who discussed the President's State of the Union message. Bush was given a coveted seat on the House Ways and Means Committee, a move calculated to embarrass Texas Democrats, who failed to win a Demo vacancy for the state on the important committee.

✓ A Republican, Carl McIntosh, lead a field of seven in a special election for a vacated seat in the legislature. McIntosh and liberal Democrat Tom Moore, Jr., are in the runoff Feb. 4 for the McLennan County (Waco) seat.

Around the State

✓ Bexar County officials are agonizing over what to do about rescuing a state-supported medical school project that is in dire jeopardy. Voters opposed, by a 3-to-2 vote in a surprisingly heavy turnout, a tax hike that would fund operation of a teaching hospital near the South Texas Medical School. Such a hospital is required by statute if the school is to be opened. Both the hospital and the school are under construction. University of Texas Board of Regents chairman Frank C. Erwin, Jr., has urged that county officials devise some proposal in the next few weeks.

✓ Houston Mayor Louie Welch is evidently trying to smooth down some feathers ruffled by Harris County pollution warrior Dr. W. A. Quebedeaux. In a pointedly-worded statement Welch said

that Houston has enjoyed "a high degree of cooperation" from industry in the pollution battle and that a full report upcoming on the city's efforts will show the value of aiming for "results instead of making noise." Welch adds that he is hesitant to spend much city money on fighting pollution since "the state may put the cities out of the pollution control business. Counties may be assigned the job by the state," he said. Welch pointed out that the city won an award from the state and federal governments for its pollution fighting efforts.

The Houston Post, unimpressed, has announced that it will begin running a pollution forecast as part of its weather reports, explaining that some kinds of weather hold pollution, others tend to dispel it. Reports will be based on a pollution intensity scale of 1 to 100.

Quebedeaux, meanwhile, has been relocated by his county court employers, set up in a Pasadena office that had (or has) a leaky roof and, for a few days, no telephone. Quebedeaux had been located in downtown Houston.

LBJ Park Opens

✓ The first portion of the LBJ State Park has been opened — 25 acres equipped with picnic tables, some garbage cans, four longhorn cattle, and a buffalo. It will take between \$750,000 and \$1 million to develop the rest of the site, according to Mark Gosdin of the State Parks and Wildlife Dept.

John Ben Shepperd, recently named to handle the project, has named a 44-member citizens committee to help him solicit donations and support. The committee has decided to seek state and federal money. Shepperd says the committee will receive a list of donors, as, probably, will newsmen. But the reporters' lists won't show the amounts of individual contributions, only the overall total.

Most of the land still to be acquired is a 54-acre tract owned by Mr. and Mrs. Earl W. Sweeney. A condemnation commission ruled that the Sweeneys should get \$62,500 for the land. They are appealing the award and have retained Roy Garwood. Since Garwood is a state representative, the appeal can't be heard until after the legislature adjourns. Shepperd is hoping the delay can be avoided; he has paid the \$62,500 to the Gillespie county court, saying that this will entitle the land to be conveyed for "immediate possession" of the Parks and Wildlife Dept. The same weekend in which he wrote the check Shepperd had said that the park fund had about \$58,000; evidently no one has asked him where the additional \$4,500 came from.

✓ Denison should establish a bi-racial committee to work out "certain features we feel must be adjusted" in regard to job opportunities and housing," that city's council was told by a Negro delegation. □

Fulbright and Schlesinger Versus Rusk and Taylor

An Address by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, to the Texas legislature, Jan. 26, 1967, and

Responsibility and Response, by General Maxwell D. Taylor, Harper & Row, 1967, \$3.50,

Versus

The Arrogance of Power, by Senator J. William Fulbright, Random House, 1967, \$4.95, and

The Bitter Heritage, Vietnam and American Democracy, 1941-1966, by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1967, \$3.95.

Austin

There was something of the quality of a dream about this scene, Governor John Connally, the former sidekick of oilman Sid Richardson, and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the son of a Georgia tenant farmer, striding into the chamber of the Texas House of Representatives, followed by the man the Reader's Digest once called the Texas legislature's most powerful lobbyist, Ed Clark, now the Ambassador to Australia; striding, in company too with the current leaders of the legislature, to the podium, there for Rusk to defend the war in Vietnam and refute the senator from Arkansas. The speech fell upon the legislature like snow upon a countryside, silently, and lay close on the unresisting sod. Rusk was warmly greeted and warmly applauded when he finished, but seldom did the legislators think to interrupt what he was saying, and circulating among them afterward, one heard talk about liquor by the drink, the new state tax program, and what's new in Tyler, but nothing about what he had said. Yet in the prints of the land the debate is raging, pro and con, about the war, and Rusk had come to this Texas place to carry on the war of words — the war of ideas and values — that strangely underlies the bloody war ten thousand miles away.

Introducing Rusk, Connally said he was a man "who understands the mission of the United States in trying to preserve an atmosphere in this world in which free men might live and prosper and hope." And the Secretary's defense of our Vietnam policy occurred, more than in any single sentence, in the values the phrases he used conveyed. The President, Rusk said, sits in his Oval Room, "thinking hard about how best to protect liberty." The central purpose of our foreign policy, Rusk said, can be taken from the preamble of the Constitution, to "secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity." We must, he said, "preserve our nation and our way of life," and we cannot do so by confining ourselves to "the North Atlantic basin." The main job of stopping aggression has been "accom-

plished by the defensive alliance of the Free World."

General Taylor, in his just-released book, conveys, in military equivalents, this same idea of liberty arrayed all over the world against communism. "I suggest," he writes, "that for purposes of this discussion we divide the countries of the world into three categories: the troublemakers, the victims, and the bystanders." In "these communist-inspired conflicts" called "wars of liberation," he says, the common denominator is subversive aggression to overthrow "a non-communist state." Thus, Taylor says, the Viet Cong have "their masters" in Hanoi and Peking is "behind" Hanoi. Even as Theodore

"American policy," says Senator Fulbright in his book, *The Arrogance of Power*, "has been weakened by a seeming inability to believe in the tractability of communism or the abatement of its fanaticism." We have adopted, Fulbright says, "a view of communism as the fulcrum of a revolutionary process that will not be satiated until it dominates the world. . . . If we assume that there is no legitimacy about the aims of communists, that there is no element of decency or humanity in communist societies, then any compromise must be regarded as a pact with the devil and our declared policy of 'building bridges' to the communist world must be regarded as a moral sellout."

But in fact, writes the senator whose economics is conservative enough for Arkansas, "communism, for all its distortions in practice and for all the crimes committed in its name, is a doctrine of social justice and a product of Western civilization, philosophically rooted in humanitarian protest against the injustices of nineteenth century capitalism." The fervor of communists abates; some countries are probably better off under communist rule than they were before; the U.S. has more to gain from competing nationalism than from the destruction of communism — all these things, Fulbright here plainly says.

After the McCarthy era, Arthur Schlesinger writes, the doctrine was firmly lodged in American policy that "the threat of communism was indivisible," and the fact of the Sino-Soviet split, as well as the divided tendencies among other communist nations, divisions based in their different nationalisms, has not shaken our policy loose from this simple, pervasive idea. The Domino Theory, invoked in variant forms by Rusk and Taylor, simply ignores the fact, Schlesinger points out, that the biggest Asian domino of all, China, fell some time ago, without the others falling. Underlying the American intervention in Vietnam, says Fulbright, "is the old and discredited idea of a centrally directed communist monolith."

"We are fighting in Vietnam," Rusk said in Austin, "because also we have not forgotten the lesson of the tragic Nineteen Thirties . . . the lesson that one aggression leads to another . . . Once again we are hearing it said that if you let the aggressor have one more bite, maybe he will be satisfied." And the Secretary quoted a Methodist Bishop that we must "avoid appeasement on one side and total war on the other."

Here, however, Rusk loses General Taylor, President Kennedy's and now Presi-

Group Therapy

"I am proud to be President Johnson's Secretary of State. And I believe that the American people — and all men everywhere who love freedom — are very fortunate to have as President of the United States a man of his courage, fortitude, and seasoned judgment."

—Dean Rusk
to the Texas Legislature

"Dr. [Jerome] Frank points out that one of the principal values of group therapy is that the individual patient cannot easily break off communication and is thus encouraged to persevere in his treatment. I wish that Dr. Frank and his colleagues could be engaged to conduct group therapy for the leaders of China and the United States."

—Senator Fulbright
in *The Arrogance of Power*

Draper demonstrates brilliantly, in the current *Commentary*, that in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Vietnam, our foreign policy failed politically, we tried economic pressure that in turn failed, and then we reverted to brute force, Taylor explicitly upholds our "use of military force to gain political ends."

The backbone of world peace, Rusk told the legislature, is our commitment to assist in the defense of "more than 40 nations" and our power to do so. General Taylor, like Rusk, is concerned that we oppose not only aggression, but also *subversive* aggression, and while Taylor grants that this may present a problem of evidence, he is confident that we can discharge what he calls our "mission in an evolving world of multipolar power."

dent Johnson's military adviser, for while Taylor upholds past decisions in Vietnam, he says that we have learned how very *costly* such a war as Vietnam can be, in men and money — by implication, in criticism and loss of credit abroad, too. We must exercise, says General Taylor, "selectivity" in which of the wars of liberation to oppose, taking care that the governments we defend won't crumble under our help. And Taylor admits the social reforms on which Eisenhower insisted in Vietnam have failed to materialize. Lightly, in passing, Taylor acknowledges the problem of "how to distinguish the patriotic revolutionary from the subversive insurgent." Yet if we select, picking and choosing, which "subversive aggression" to resist, won't this be appeasement? — letting "the enemy" have one more bite? The difficulty of the neat argument is that reality isn't neat.

"The good old Munich analogy," Arthur Schlesinger calls the argument against appeasement from the 1930's. A pluralistic—what even Taylor calls a multipolar—world of nations is not comparable, Schlesinger points out, to the militant Hitlerian juggernaut in Europe.

The question most deeply is, are we free to think, or are we not? "Certain words must never be uttered except in derision," writes Senator Fulbright; "the word 'appeasement,' for example, comes as near as any word can do to summarizing everything that is regarded by American policymakers as stupid, wicked, and disastrous. . . . In a free and healthy political atmosphere [the idea of 'appeasement'] would elicit neither horror nor enthusiasm but only interest in what precisely its proponent had in mind. As Winston Churchill once said: 'Appeasement in itself may be good or bad according to the circumstances. . . . Appeasement from strength is magnanimous and noble and might be the surest and perhaps the only path to world peace.'"

We want no territory, no surrender, Rusk told the legislature; all we ask is that the North Vietnamese "stop shooting at their neighbors." This, said Rusk, is being called a demand for unconditional surrender, and that, the Secretary submitted, is "an abuse of the English language."

Rusk also told the legislature, however: "The military conquest of South Vietnam will not occur. But there remains the hard job of rooting out what Ho Chi Minh has called 'the guerrilla infrastructure.'" Schlesinger writes, "should we attempt to root out the guerrillas in every village and cave, it would require almost a million American soldiers and a war of many years. Such an effort would hopelessly Americanize the war. . . . If we continue the pursuit of total military victory, we will leave the tragic country gutted and devastated by bombs, burned by napalm, turned into a wasteland by chemical defoliation. . . . Our method, in other words, defeats our goal."

Rusk used the title of Fulbright's book in his speech to the legislature. "It has

been asserted," Rusk said, "that the United States is suffering, or is in danger of suffering, from the 'arrogance of power.' That recalls Lord Acton's dictum that power tends to corrupt and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. I don't believe that the American people have been corrupted by power. . . . We have sought nothing for ourselves except what we seek for all other peoples on this planet: the right to live in freedom and peace."

"Gradually but unmistakably," Senator Fulbright charges, "America is showing signs of that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened, and in some cases destroyed great nations in the past. . . . We are still left with two essential reasons for our involvement in Vietnam: the view of communism as an evil philosophy and

the view of ourselves as God's avenging angels, whose sacred duty it is to combat evil philosophies. . . . Power has a way of undermining judgment, of planting delusions of grandeur in the minds of otherwise sensible people and otherwise sensible nations."

"The war began," says Arthur Schlesinger, "as a struggle for the soul of Vietnam: will it end as a struggle for the soul of America?"

Closing, Rusk referred to another recent book title, speaking of "the exercise of power, not to conquer, not to destroy, but to build a durable peace."

Speaker of the House Ben Barnes then took the rostrum and said, "Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, for those words of wisdom, encouragement, and inspiration." R.D.

'COOL IT, GEORGE!'

Austin

American involvement in Vietnam was protested by some 40 young adults, most of them of college age, when U.S. Secy. of State Dean Rusk addressed the Texas legislature. Shortly after Rusk arrived and began speaking one of the protestors, George Vizard, 23, of San Antonio, a former student at the University of Texas, entered the Capitol. He evidently intended to pass out mimeographed handbills attacking U.S. policy. Officers told Vizard that he could not bring the literature in. An Observer reporter was a few feet away when Vizard and a capitol security guard then became involved in a mild scuffle. Another guard ran up to help; the two officers pushed the young man back through the Capitol's main entrance with their nightsticks, one of which was across Vizard's throat. To resist being pushed outside, he dropped to the floor, limp, and covered his head with his hands. The officers stood looking down at Vizard, uncertain what to do.

They then turned their attention to ejecting three of Vizard's companions, including his wife, who were standing behind him in the doorway. Vizard got up and asked of another officer, "What is the name of that man who stuck his night stick in my throat?" Getting no answer, he demanded, "Am I under arrest?" The officer, in a low voice, said something that evidently indicated that no arrest was intended. Vizard then reached back, took a bundle of handbills from his wife, and made as though to continue on inside.

More shoving ensued. An officer grabbed Vizard, who had again dropped to the floor, and dragged him out the door by one ankle. He jumped up and charged another officer. Someone, perhaps Mrs. Vizard, yelled "Cool it, George!" Vizard, being held off by the officer's night stick, dropped his arms and said "I'm not hitting him, he's hitting me."

At this point three Dept. of Public

Safety officers and an Austin policeman came up and grabbed Vizard. Holding him by each of his arms and legs, they carried him out the door face down, and put him down on the lawn outside. Asked if the young man was under arrest, an officer said, "He's been disturbing the peace, yes, sir."

Vizard is active in the University of Texas community; he is associated with the Students for a Democratic Society and the Rag, an off-campus weekly publication that is, generally, New Left oriented. A friend of Vizard's, Tom Mantle, a University of Texas junior, says that many of the protestors represented only themselves, though many were members of the S.D.S., Young Democrats, and Austin groups which oppose the Vietnam war.

After Vizard's arrest some 40 pickets took up positions on the steps of the Capitol's main entrance, bearing signs that read: "Super Rusk Is a Drag," "Dean Rusk, Official Cover-Up Man for Genocide," "Not with My Life You Don't," "Support Our Boys in Vietnam — Bring Them Home," and "Rusk Lies, Children Die." Some leaflets were passed out on the steps, while the pickets began singing, evidently waiting for Rusk to come out after finishing his speech.

Rusk's motorcade, however, was lined up on the north side of the Capitol, awaiting him on the other side of the building from the protestors. Word of this must have reached the pickets, a bit later they came around the side of the building to stand by the limousine that was to drive Rusk away. About ten officers stood between the protestors and the car.

After about 12 minutes more the motorcade's cars suddenly started their engines and pulled around to the west side of the Capitol. If the intent was to get the cars out of the crowd's way the tactic failed; the protestors and dozens of spectators followed. Eight minutes later Rusk emerged with Gov. John Connally, House Speaker Ben Barnes, and assorted legis-

lators and state officials. The secretary was smiling his familiar, serene smile, seemingly unaware of the pickets who were chanting "Hey, hey, what do ya say;

how many kids have you killed today?" Others were shouting "Fascist! Fascist!" Swelling applause from Capitol workers and other spectators, including some stu-

dents, drowned out, for several seconds, the derisive cries.

Thus the secretary departed the Texas Capitol. G. O.

Vietnam: 'A Dance in a Cemetery'

Rabbi Levi Olan of Temple Emanu-El Brotherhood in Dallas, and a regent at the University of Texas, continues to speak in Dallas on the Vietnam war in accents not often heard in the churches of the state. Here are excerpts from another of his sermons on the subject:

"A Jew now living in Israel recalls his childhood with his parents who were living under the Nazis in a cemetery. They were spared their lives so that they could perform the grave digging detail for those whom Hitler was killing in the millions. He saw, as a child, deportations, death from disease, starvation, and the daily regular killings. He remembers that he managed to play in the midst of these macabre happenings. In fact, he played a game called deportations. He now says: 'I became accustomed to my environment.' We are in a frightful danger of becoming accustomed to living with war as a normal way of life.

"The last half-century has been one of unrelenting destruction and terror. When I was in High School, it was the First World War. Then with the failure of all hopes for Peace, came Hitler and the Second World War. This was followed by Korea, and now Viet Nam. I have watched coffins returning to our land and hidden away. Visits, however, to the Veteran's Hospitals, and dealing with war widows are somber reminders that death and destruction has been the way of life for fifty years. We live, it seems, in a cemetery and play our childish games. Viewers of television, we watch Mystery and Wild Western drama and also a picture of a little child in Vietnam blown to pieces. . . . Like that child under the Nazis, we have become accustomed to life in a cemetery. . . .

"Our nation at this hour is playing the role of God while armed with terrifying power. There is a passion growing here to move in and destroy all competing Gods. We do not hesitate to use bombs that shatter, napalm that sears and burns on enemy and on friend. Our mood is one of passionate devotion to the God we have set up, the State whose actions it is becoming heresy to question. In ancient times men brought their children as a sacrifice to the God Moloch because he was God. The danger today is that the nation becomes our Moloch.

"The events in Vietnam are distressing to all of us. It is a tragic place of destruction, disease, and death. For a thousand years the Vietnamese were ruled by China and then for eighty years as a colony of France. When they rebelled against the harsh rule of their French masters some ten years before the Second World War,

the rebellion was led by the Viet Minh. They declared their purpose in their rebellion. It read like this: 'All men are created equal. They are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' They fought hard against the colonialism of France, sacrificing much blood. America then gave the French over 2½ billion dollars to stamp out the rebellion. Former President Eisenhower in explaining the success of the Viet Minh said: '. . . (they) had much popular, sympathy and many civilians aided them by providing both shelter and information.' When that rebellion was concluded by the Geneva Agreement of 1954, which provided for elections within two years, President Eisenhower again said: '80% of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh as their leader.'

"We have declared a holy war against communism and justify the death and terror of this hour by the devotion to our God. We equate our battle now with the struggle against Hitler and the Nazis, forgetting that there is a vital difference. Hitler used force to give the Aryan race dominion over all. The communists are not racists. They have a social and economic theory which they propagate by a subtle mixture of open and hidden propaganda and even subversion. They are a people with an idea appealing to those living in grinding poverty with no hope but a revolution. Instead of matching our own ideas against that of the communist world as an answer to poverty and frustration, we have resorted to force. Will we never learn that you do not destroy an idea with bombs? Almost half the world is caught up with this idea and we cannot police the world against it. The fact is that the history of the Twentieth Century records the expulsion of Western powers from Asia and Africa — Britain from Palestine and India; France from Southeast Asia and Algeria; Holland from the South Pacific; and Belgium from Africa. None of these were communist inspired.

MEETINGS

THE THURSDAY CLUB of Dallas meets each Thursday noon for lunch (cafeteria style) at the Downtown YMCA, 605 No. Ervay St., Dallas. Good discussion. You're welcome. Informal, no dues.

The **TRAVIS COUNTY LIBERAL DEMOCRATS** meet at Spanish Village at 8 p.m. on the first Thursday. You're invited.

ITEMS for this feature cost, for the first entry, 7c a word, and for each subsequent entry, 5c a word. We must receive them one week before the date of the issue in which they are to be published.

"The pity of it is that America has powerful ideas with which to win against communism in the struggle of the people for bread, shelter, and freedom. We, of all people, ought to understand the revolution of our age since we were born in a revolution against tyranny. But we seem to support the status quo, in China, in Cuba, and in Vietnam. We have a wonderful answer to oppression, poverty, ignorance, and fear but the use of bombs and Napalm is not it.

"We had better not get accustomed to our role, to war as the way to defeat false gods.

"We are carrying on a dance in a cemetery." □

February 3, 1967

9

BUMPERSTRIPS:

Draft KENNEDY '68

Fluorescent, genuine peel-off bumperstrip stock.

1 for 25c — 6 for \$1

100 for \$10 — 1,000 for \$65

Pass the Torch in '68 Committee

P. O. Box 3395 Austin, Texas 78704

"THE PIPE HOUSE OF AUSTIN"

Will D. Miller & Son

Magazines — Daily Newspapers
High Grade Cigars and Tobaccos
Pipes and Accessories

122 West 6th St. Austin, Texas

Sen. J. William Fulbright's

ARROGANCE OF POWER

\$4.95

Arthur Schlesinger's

BITTER HERITAGE

\$3.95

2116 Guadalupe, Austin, Texas, 78705

Mail order requests promptly filled

MANCHESTER: Part Two

Austin

One wonders, reading Look Magazine's second installment from William Manchester's *The Death of a President*, why Manchester gives a long flash-back from 1960, when Jack Kennedy went deer hunting at the LBJ Ranch. As Manchester relates the episode, Kennedy shot a deer because Lyndon Johnson wanted him to, but Kennedy did not like to kill anything and fired the killing shot with severe distaste. Later, Manchester says, Johnson presented Kennedy the mounted deer head and badgered him about displaying it until, again with distaste, Kennedy did. Why did Manchester, in a book about the assassination, reach back three years to tell about this episode?

One answer may be implied in an AP dispatch from New York quoting a source close to the Kennedy family as saying, "The whole first chapter [of the original Manchester manuscript] was a deer-hunting scene in Texas. It showed Johnson as a man of violence who loved to kill deer and would force others to do the same. It seemed to set symbolic overtones which were unjust and inaccurate. It seemed an attempt to make this the symbolic framework for the whole book, which was unjust and disastrous."

The AP source said the chapter was tossed out at the insistence of Kennedy advisers. A version of it, however, found its way into the second installment in Look.

Meanwhile, William S. White, the columnist who is a close friend of Johnson's, pointed out that the first installment referred to Johnson being surrounded by "members of his tong," about which White remarks: "A tong, of course, is a Chinese gang and, in common usage, a criminal gang as well."

It has also emerged that Manchester at one point wrote Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, "Though I tried desperately to suppress my bias against a certain eminent statesman who always reminded me of someone in a grade D movie on the late show, the prejudice showed through. This was cheap of me, but I suppose there is a little meanness in all of us." Manchester said that the unfair references to which this letter referred, qualified as ones "that might conceivably have rubbed off on the Kennedy family," were cut from the book.

The Kennedy lawsuit against the book's publication by Harper and Row having been settled, Manchester publicly criticized the Kennedys, saying their motivations in much of their attempted editing were political. Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak quoted Johnson as confiding to intimates that "the ultimate record will be clear." They added that "verbatim transcripts of telephone and other conversations between the President and others in the post-assassination pe-

riod have been carefully filed for future use." In Austin, Governor John Connally is understood to be conceiving of his statement on the subject as a book; he has been approached by publishers. Breasting the waves of the Manchester controversy long enough to take a draught of air, the possibility can be seen that a book by Connally could become the Johnson group's answer to the Manchester book.

MANCHESTER'S second installment leaves no doubt that Kennedy, awakening the morning of Nov. 22 and seeing the splashes in the press about the refusals of Sen. Ralph Yarborough to ride with Johnson the day before, told his aides to get Yarborough in the car with Johnson. Evidently Manchester (and perhaps also Kennedy) did not know that Yarborough had ridden with Johnson the night before. Yarborough has stated that he did so without Kennedy having asked him to. Presumably this refers to the episode of the night before. On Nov. 22, Manchester says, Yarborough acceded to a Kennedy aide's urgent request that Yarborough ride with Johnson (Manchester does not quote the aide as invoking Kennedy's request directly, however). According to Manchester, at one point the aide blocked Yarborough as the senator started to get out of the vice-presidential car to make room for Mrs. Nellie Connally. Manchester says Kennedy told the aide to make it clear to Yarborough that either he rode with Johnson or walked.

There are new details in Manchester's account of the events surrounding the assassination. For instance, after reading "every word" of the notorious Bernard Weissman ad in the Dallas News for that Nov. 22, Kennedy said they were going into "nut country." As the Dallas motorcade began, Johnson "was so depressed by the continuing feud in the local party that he ordered the car's commercial radio turned on full blast, to drown out the noise of the crowd." At Main and Market, it occurred to Yarborough that anyone could drop a pot of flowers on Kennedy from an upper story, and when Yarborough saw beyond them the green of Dealey Plaza, he thought, "My, that open sky looks good." When the shooting started, not only Secret Service agent Clint Hill, but also Jack Ready, another such agent, started from the back-up car to the presidential car, but according to Manchester, yet another agent, Emory Roberts, "had seen the last shot strike Kennedy's skull [and] was certain the wound was mortal" and therefore shouted to Ready, "Don't go, Jack!" Ready drew back. Roberts then said to Secret Service Agent Bill McIntyre, "They got him. You and Bennett take over Johnson as soon as we stop." As the car carrying Johnson pulled up at Parkland, the commercial radio was still on.

Manchester commits himself personally to a finding that the X-Rays and photographs that were taken of Kennedy's body, but were not turned over to the Warren Commission and are not available for public inspection, show "no entry wound 'below the shoulder'" but rather "clearly reveal that the wound was in the neck." Manchester says he had not seen the material, but interviewed "three people with special qualifications who examined it before it was put under seal." Manchester says "Robert Kennedy has decided that this material is too unsightly to be shown to anyone, including qualified scholars, until 1971."

On the rancorous issue of resentment in the Kennedy group that the Johnson party boarded Air Force One, Manchester quotes Johnson that Kennedy aide Kenneth O'Donnell "twice urged him to board Air Force One" and then quotes O'Donnell that Johnson's version of this is "absolutely, totally, and unequivocally wrong." Manchester seems to reason that Johnson is the one who is wrong on this and says the discrepancy is probably a result of confusion, although, he says, there is "an alternative," which he describes so opaquely, one cannot make any clear sense of it.

THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE voted to back up Connally's reaction to the first Manchester installment — that it contained distortions, rumors, and inconsistencies. On the House side, the resolution was whipped through unanimously and quickly by Speaker Ben Barnes. In the Senate, Sen. Roy Harrington, Port Arthur, said he hadn't read Manchester's book yet and wanted to study the resolution, which he proposed be sent to a committee. His motion failed, 15-6, and the resolution was then adopted by the Senate. The six who voted against its immediate passage were Harrington, Charles Wilson of Lufkin, Oscar Mauzy of Dallas, Barbara Jordan and Chet Brooks of Houston, and Joe Christie of El Paso.

In other eddies of the controversy, a Rice Hotel executive denied he had said Johnson looked "furious" leaving Kennedy's suite the night of Nov. 21; Columnist Les Carpenter went into the question of who slept where in Kennedy's suite the night of Nov. 21; reporter Bob Baskin of the Dallas News denied Manchester's report that after the assassination, Baskin "just left" and went back to his paper's office to see what else was going on in the world — to the contrary, he was ordered back to the office as other reporters fanned out, Baskin said; Cong. Henry Gonzalez of San Antonio added vivid details to the post-assassination scene at Parkland, and the Dallas congressman, Earle Cabell, defended the Dallas role in the removal of Kennedy's body from the city.

R. D.

Pitching Curves to the Plot Finders

Bill Helmer

Austin

An army of critics has been at work on the Warren Report nearly three years now, trying to clear Oswald, or discover a second assassin, or uncover an elaborate conspiracy involving the CIA, FBI, Dallas police, Cuba, Russia, Jack Ruby, the John Birch Society, and (with real luck) Lyndon Johnson. So far no one has come up with anything that refutes the Commission's conclusions. However one or two of the more rational investigators have managed to blow the Report so full of holes as to discredit its claim to thoroughness and make a serious issue of whether or not the investigation should be reopened.

Certainly the government's reluctance to reopen the investigation involves a certain amount of face-saving. To take a new look would implicitly discredit the Warren Report and add to the credibility of even the hairiest theories about Second Oswalds and planted bullets. Yet some of the Report's critics have made cases too strong and too widely publicized to permit acceptance of the Warren Report as anything closely approaching the whole, objective truth.

By way of muddying the issue even further, I would like to make a few observations that I think are relevant, and which seem to have escaped the Report's critics and defenders alike

ON A DRIVE down Elm Street two months after the assassination I discovered the distance from the Texas Schoolbook Depository to the street to be much less than I (and probably most people) had assumed from all the photos I had seen in *Time*, *Life*, and the newspapers. After another look at the pictures I saw why. All had been taken with wide-angle lenses that give a wider view by exaggerating the distance from the camera. From that window to the curved part of the street, even a poor marksman, even without a scope, could hardly have missed putting two or three bullets into a car moving almost directly away from him. To hit two of the six people in it was no great feat, either. For two bullets to have hit John Kennedy could have been good shooting or just cruel luck. The thing is, nobody likes to believe in the possibility of a big luck factor in the murder of a president.

Not all witnesses agreed on the source and number of gunshots. But Dealey Plaza is surrounded by tall buildings, knolls, walls, and a huge concrete overpass, and anyone who does much hunting or shooting knows how hard it is to pinpoint the source of a shot in hilly country or any place where sound can reflect off a large, vertical surface. It's like trying to figure out the direction of an approach-

ing siren when driving through the downtown district of any large city.

Last August 1, Charles Whitman provided Austin with some 90 minutes of coincidences and confusion that seemed plausible enough under those different circumstances. He scored bull's-eyes at fantastic ranges, knocked down a running newsman at nearly 200 yards, shot the man beside me with a ricochet, hit somebody else through some trees. He smiled and greeted and did not shoot (though he had already killed one person) some Tower visitors who left wondering what that fellow was doing up there with a rifle. Once I wanted to dash across an open space. I wanted to wait until the moment he fired so I could make it while he worked the bolt, but I could not tell whether the shots I heard were coming from the Tower or from the police on the ground.

That clean bullet 399, only slightly warped and dented, seems too undamaged to have done the work attributed to it. But it was of the hard, jacketed variety, and I have picked soft, lead bullets out of hard ground and even wood and found them practically undamaged. I don't think that the pristine condition of that bullet, while suspicious, is quite as significant as many people think. To me it even discredits any planted-bullet theories. Any conspirator capable of planning and so successfully pulling off such a wild scheme would certainly have had the sense to plant a bullet that was at least half-ways convincing.

Governor Connally's recollections raise more than reasonable doubts about the Commission's interpretation of the Zapruder film, at least regarding the sequence

February 3, 1967

11

Speaking of Recognition.

LYMAN JONES

MARY JONES

LATANE LAMBERT

and JAKE SORRELLS

... ARE ALL FAMILIAR NAMES TO THE TEXAS LABOR MOVEMENT
(Inquire of those who know.)

... AND WE CAN'T HELP BEING PROUD THEY REPRESENT THE

Union Labor Division

of the

American Income Life Insurance Co.

Executive Offices, P. O. Box 208, Waco, Texas

Our employees are represented by Local 277 of the Office and Professional Employees International Union — and that's something else of which we are proud. Particularly proud, may we say.

Anything else? You bet! Our Disability Income, Hospitalization and Life Insurance policies are specially designed for men and women of Union Labor.

Ask Lyman and Mary and Latane and Jake! They KNOW your problems. They really know. That's why THEY are with American Income!

Bernard Rapaport

President

BATTER UP!

of shots. But if the Commission was wrong about the shot sequence (and critics seem to find it wrong in nearly every other instance), if the first shot missed entirely, then Connally's recollections do not contradict the Report's conclusion that both men were struck by the same bullet. The film shows him to react to his wound at most 1.3 seconds later than Kennedy, and as little as a half-second later. Even at the extreme, such a reaction lag would not be at all impossible. And certainly not as impossible as the notion that a second assassin could have gotten off his own shot to coincide so closely with Oswald's. Only by accepting the Report's conclusion that the first shot hit (which the Report makes far more tentatively than its critics suggest), and then by playing this off against Connally's recollection that it was the second shot that hit him, can the plot-finders work in a second assassin. Such fact-juggling is worse than any done by the Commission. Indeed, it even requires rejecting or ignoring the rest of Connally's recollections, as well as concrete medical evidence, that the shot came from the direction of the Texas Schoolbook Depository.

I don't think anyone disputes that a shot came from the Depository and made a hole in the back of Kennedy's shirt. And if that bullet went through his body, it virtually had to strike the man sitting in front of him. If anyone fired a shot from that knoll, he must have been using blanks.

FOR ANY AMATEUR detective the Warren Report is a gold mine of discrepancies, omissions, and loose ends. With a little digging and a good deal of sorting, one can assemble a lot of questionable facts and gerrymander them into an awkward plot. The existing conspiracy theories, however, are immeasurably worse off than the Report for contradictions and amazing coincidences, so rickety that the slightest slip-up in execution would have foiled the entire plot. The mastermind behind a conspiracy of such magnitude and complexity must have been an absolute genius with a flawless organization that made not a single mistake, or at least managed to cover any of them perfectly with a series of perfect crimes. Note how cleverly they silenced Jack Ruby! (Such omniscience, of course, rules out any participation by the CIA.) I feel fairly certain, too, that such a mastermind, who has so successfully eluded detection even by the Mark Lanes, would not have sent his man out with a battered \$12.95 surplus Italian carbine. □

12

The Texas Observer

Subscriptions for \$4

Subscriptions to the Observer can be bought by groups at a cost of \$4 a year, provided ten or more subscriptions are entered at one time. If you belong to a group that might be interested in this, perhaps you will want to take the matter up with the others.

(Adv.)

Austin

Bill Helmer knows a lot about guns (he really is doing his dissertation on the Tommy-gun, as we noted when publishing his piece on the sniper in the Tower, and, as three or four book publishers subsequently found out when they wrote and asked him about it). Helmer's reflections on the assassination are of interest if only because of their surface plausibility and because they run counter to the tendencies in the national media now.

However, being plausible is not the same thing as being convincing. Unfortunately the autopsy conducted on President Kennedy's body after the assassination is not "concrete medical evidence." *Life*, in its spread on the issue of whether Governor Connally was hit by the same bullet that hit Kennedy or by a second one, also reported, in a very quiet corner of their presentation, new information which means that while the President's body was being examined by doctors, none of the doctors knew that there were bullet holes both in his back and in the front of his neck. Specifically, the Parkland doctors did not know about the back wound; as *Life* reported, the Bethesda doctors, while they had Kennedy's body before them, did not know about the neck wound, which had been obliterated at Parkland by an incision into the windpipe. Only after their examinations were concluded and Kennedy's body had been taken away from them did the Bethesda doctors learn of the wound in front of the neck.

To be certain that *Life* hadn't made this statement in error or speculatively, I wrote and inquired, and I was assured by Associate Editor David Nevin that, while they could not divulge their source, they were journalistically convinced of the fact.

One of the questions the Warren Commission failed to ask was, Why did Commander Humes burn his preliminary autopsy notes? Now we have a basis for a convincing explanation. The notes were at variance with his final, written report, because he *could not* have concluded, during his examination of Kennedy's body, that the back wound went through the front of the neck. He didn't know there was a wound in the front of the neck when he had Kennedy's body there to examine.

This new fact must be compounded: for the two FBI agents' late-found, first-hand report on the Bethesda autopsy quoted the doctors as saying, during the examination, that the back wound was only an inch deep and there was no path for the bullet beyond that. Obviously this, if correct, would have to mean that, whether a first bullet had missed or not, the bullet that caused the back wound *couldn't* have caused Connally's wounds. And in that event, there had to be someone else firing, as the timing of the Zapruder frames almost certainly establishes.

Even thus compounded, this line of

thought does not allow for the severe problems that the conflict in the evidence about the location of the back wound have caused for the official explanation, and will continue to cause until the hidden-away autopsy X-rays and photographs are made available for independent investigators.

According to the *Saturday Evening Post*, the Kennedys had custody of the X-rays and photographs only for a time beginning in 1965. We had been given the impression, had we not, that the Kennedys had this evidence during the time the Warren Commission was doing its work. To the contrary, the government did. The Kennedys, therefore, did not prevent the Warren Commission from seeing it; the Kennedys didn't have it until after the Warren Report was issued. So, at least, says the *Saturday Evening Post*, which got its information from the Treasury Department. The fact that Richard Goodwin and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., associates of the Kennedys, have now called for a new inquiry, considered in light of the fact that the Kennedys had custody of the X-rays and photographs for a time beginning in 1965, does nothing to allay intense interest in this long hidden-away evidence.

But see William Manchester's remarks on this subject; they are recounted in another story in this issue on page 10.

Studying the assassination has become a highly esoteric business. For instance, investigators are now preparing to dispute the contention that the bullets fired into the presidential limousine from behind had to have come from the Depository. There was another building, there were other windows in it and of course other windows in the Depository itself, in the area from which the bullets could have come.

Nor is the mystery of the President's mortal head wound itself settled. First, the Zapruder films seem to show that the bullet forced the President, not forward, as a bullet from behind would, but back. Second, very little is known about the wound that would tell us much about which direction it came from.

The F.B.I. investigated, on Nov. 22, a suspect in the shooting of Officer Tippit. An article in the Greater Philadelphia Magazine now relates an independent investigator's further inquiries after the doings of this suspect. He was, according to this article, appropriately dressed and armed, and in Dallas, his whereabouts unaccounted for, when Tippit was killed. The suspect, the investigator relates, made a number of statements contrary to what the investigator had found to be the case.

None of this is any more convincing in any definite direction than Helmer's arguments (or, for instance, those in *Newsweek*, with which Helmer in gist agrees). The difficulty is precisely this, that none of the evidence is conclusive in any direction. That is why we need a new investigation. R. D.

Observations

Tower and Bush

Since his election, Sen. John Tower has resumed his hawkishness about the war. However, this need not be taken as evidence on the face of it that Tower will make book with the California nut, Ronald Reagan, on the Republicans' presidential nomination in 1968. The fact that Tower and Reagan have conferred means nothing in itself, either. Reagan will of course keep California's delegates under his own control. Tower may be trying to form a Texas-Southern bloc of his own; in any case Tower can keep the Texas delegates out of a pool with Reagan's if Tower so wishes. Tower is right-wing, but he is a political cynic, too, and he may well understand that to win, the Republicans must be more moderate on the war than Johnson. They cannot be both hawk and dove at once and expect to be listened to.

Meanwhile, what's George Bush going to do? He defeated Frank Briscoe by presenting himself openly as more moderate than the blood-and-guts, right-wing Democrat. As Houston's congressman and as a strong finisher against Senator Yarborough, Bush's status among the Republicans approaches, and under some circumstances could exceed, Tower's. Will Bush induce Tower to moderate his presidential politics? If Tower is putting in with the spoiler, Reagan, will Bush carve out his own course and divide the Texas Republicans? Interesting questions.

Johnson's Prison

As politics, President Johnson's program for a 30% increase in social security benefits is a shrewd maneuver to woo older voters at a time when his Great Society programs suffer from a tax insufficiency and when his and his party's popularity is waning limply toward 1968. As policy, however, the Social Security increase is good in itself.

Why, the President wonders, don't people like him? He has wanted to be liked, to be a great President. But as Lippman says, Johnson cannot blame anyone but himself for the situation he is in. He made the mistakes of deliberate escalation and aerial bombardment in Vietnam; they flowed from his fixations and values. And even if he is really trying to build a Great Society in Asia before we get a good start on the one at home, by forcing his ideas on Asians he is committing what Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., calls "sentimental imperialism."

Johnson's concern for the poor has always wavered between sentimentalism and commitment. He forgets this concern

when his own career and reputation require it; when he can and it helps his own career and reputation, he comes on with it like gangbusters. The social security increase is a case in point.

He proposes to raise the lower limit of taxable income all the way up to incomes of more than \$10,000. This would make the social security system more progressive, base it much more on the principle of ability to pay; and since business must match personal contributions to social security dollar for dollar, the progressive feature is doubled in import. In addition, social security benefits would be increased to offset inflation, which is cruelest of all to older people. An old couple who thriftily socked away \$5 in 1940 now find that it will buy only \$1.85 worth of groceries. This makes sweet and gentle old people bitter and angry.

The disaster of Johnson's presidency is that he has so alienated each major area of the electorate in some vital way, programs that appeal to any given segment do not suffice to restore their confidence in him. Liberals are alienated by the war; by the napalming of human beings in what has clearly become an American colonial enterprise. Conservatives are alienated by the Great Society, war-starved as it is, and of course by such proposals as the social security increase. Individuals of disparate politics are put off by having been told so many lies. Driven by his anti-communist succubus, Johnson not only is missing being a great president, which he could have been. Because of the Dominican Republic and Vietnam, because of the total primacy of foreign policy on any sane scale of values in the nuclear age, he is already, as of now, our worst president of this century—worse than Teddy Roosevelt, worse than Harding, worse than Hoover, worse than Eisenhower. Yet the paradoxes continue. If he could turn the key to his prison of policy—a prison of his own making, the key ring there in his hand—and let himself and the world out of it at once, he might still recoup an honored place in history.

Passing The Day

What do you say about a napalmed child?

Did you see the picture of these children in the current *Ramparts*? And a mother lay on the ground, her bandaged hand held high, suckling her baby.

I wandered, Sunday morning, up and down the University Drag in Austin.

At the University Methodist Church, Dr. William Morgan was sermonizing on the claim on every man. I was not wearing a tie, and did not go in.

At the University Baptist Church, Dr. Blake Smith was sermonizing on His blood cries to me from the ground. You can sit on the red velvet steps at the back of the church, outside the double doors, and hear on the public address system.

Cain slew his brother Abel, and God came and asked Cain, where is your brother? And Cain lied, and asked God, Am I my brother's keeper? And God answered with silence. But God said your brother's blood cries to me from the ground.

No, Dr. Smith said, you are not your brother's keeper; you are your brother's brother.

Take, Dr. Smith said, Vietnam. Whatever, he said, the military and political considerations, we must keep ourselves sensitized to what God told Cain, Your brother's blood cries to me from the ground. In Vietnam, Dr. Smith said, our brother's blood cries to us from the ground.

The other night my wife asked me how napalm works. (Do you know, dear Texas liberal?) I explained that it sticks to the skin, you can't get it off, and it burns your skin off. I said how horrible to do that to a child. She said yes to a child, but also to anyone.

Nat Hentoff has a piece in the current *Evergreen Review* about the internationally ratified principle of Nuremberg, that no one has to obey a criminal order. It was a piece full of despair. What do I do? I do this, I do that. These things continue. What do I do? This is what he kept asking.

Karl Jaspers said, I believe in *The Question of German Guilt*, that he is guilty because, while others were murdered en

February 3, 1967

13

MARTIN ELFANT

Sun Life of Canada

1001 Century Building

Houston, Texas

CA 4-0686

Scholz'

Since 1866

The Place in Austin

GOOD FOOD
GOOD BEER

1607 San Jacinto

GR 7-4171

masse, he survived. I am guilty by still being alive.

Anyone who risks less than himself risks nothing.

In *Novelists on Novelists*, however, Rebecca West says that it's just as sentimental for Tolstoy to manipulate his novel to make us submit to the primitive sense of guilt as it is for Charlotte Bronte to gush around for the high society readers.

The difference between sentiment and sentimentality is the difference between love and lies. This is a difference worth some time.

The other day I cut down the bamboo stand in my back yard. I used a claw-tooth hand saw, down close to the ground, scraping my knuckles on stumps and rocks. I care about the bamboo because it is in my yard.

These thoughts don't fit together, you say? And probably H. Mewhinney will chide me again for not getting the quotations exact. Some Spaniard, I think Unamuno, (but I am not sure of that, Mr. Mewhinney), said one should not always be checking his quotations to get them exact; it's more interesting what a man remembers than what it was exactly in the original.

And how vain, that we expect our thoughts to be reasoned, like arithmetic, and logical, like a vase. The day arrives and casts over its contents, snowy pearl-grey. Here we are.

Thi'll Kill Ya

Bob Bass telephoned the other night at 1 a.m. He had to leave town just after daybreak to go to Canada.

The state representative from DeKalb explained that he is re-introducing his equal shooting rights bill. The Canadian Broadcasting System had telephoned him; they wanted him to fly up to Toronto, at their expense, of course, to tape a half-hour nationwide broadcast about it. It's not every day a boy from DeKalb gets a free trip to Toronto. Bob wanted some stuff we'd run on his bill in 1965, so we got it for him.

The equal shooting rights bill is based on the sound principle that what's fair for you is fair for me. This is a great principle, and anybody who opposes the equal shooting rights bill is opposing, therefore, this great principle.

At Texas law if a husband catches a wife in bed with her lover, or almost in

bed with her lover, or so as it looks like she has just got out of bed with her lover, the husband can kill the lover. Bob thinks this is unfair, and surely we all must agree. To get our moral principles back on a sound basis, Bob's bill makes

it legal for the wife to kill her husband's lover, too.

I am not sure, however, how all this is going to strike the Canadians. They have a lot of Frenchmen up there, and all that.

R. D.

In My Opinion

No, Thank You

Needing about \$100 to clean up some bills, I decided to borrow the money from a loan company with whom I had dealt, in desperation, a year and a half before. I still owed seven payments of \$61 each, \$427, on the old note. I figure I'd extend the loan by two payments, finishing it off in nine months.

Why don't you just make the loan for a year, my smiling loan counselor counseled? That way, he said, the payments will drop to \$50 and, beside, it's so much easier to work out on our charts. Great. It was done.

Not until I was back home did I finally get around to multiplying \$50 by 12 and, coming up with \$600, realize that although I had borrowed only \$85 (the closest I could conveniently come to \$100 on the company's charts) I had added to my indebtedness by \$173.

Back to the loan company. Let's take this again from the top, I suggested. Let me borrow the \$85 as a transaction distinct from my original loan. No, I was told, state law limits a customer to just one account. I gave them back their \$85 check; that kind of help can kill you.

Is there a law that limits a borrower to a single account? Why? In my alienation from Texas financial circles, I nastily suspect that if such a law does exist it is to keep coolies like me in hock through flipped loans. Flipping is the practice of making a customer a new loan when he still owes a balance on an old one. In so doing they don't lop off very much of the interest on the old loan. In my case they somehow worked it out that as of that day my principal outstanding was \$414, \$13 less than I would pay them over the following seven months. I had figured my principal then was around \$355, but like I say, I'm alienated.

OK, then they add the \$85 I asked for and then figure in some more interest on both the \$414 (a sum that, as I calculate, already includes much interest) and the \$85. Interest on top of interest. Nice. Plus four bucks credit life insurance (which they get a piece of), plus another \$20 for disability protection (ditto).

Oh how they must clap each other on the backs when somebody like me walks out the door.

T.C.A. Lives

There already is a Texas Consumers Assn. In the Dec. 30 Observer I had, while

discussing auto insurance, suggested the need for such a group. B. Joe Colwell, a University of Texas economics professor, is its president. The T.S.A. was organized last September.

In view of my grumblings, above, about consumer loans, I am pleased to note that the association shares my concern and has issued a leaflet that urges repeal of a section of the state law that "regulates" loans of less than \$100. It is reported that interest on such loans can range up to 320%. If you are interested in this problem the leaflet is available by writing the T.C.A. at Box 12292, Capitol Station, Austin, 78711.

The association is doing work now on grocery prices, which as you no doubt realize have been getting a bit steep lately. If you are interested in supporting the T.C.A.'s work, memberships are in amounts of \$3, \$10, and \$25 for individuals, \$25, \$50, and \$500 for groups.

More than 350 delegates from across the state attended the organizational meeting last fall. If membership becomes large enough the association could become a significant force in Texas.

Lone Star Psychosis

San Antonio's HemisFair seems to be a tourist trap designed by Chamber of Commerce-type boosters for their own economic and political advantages, to be financed by public (and some private) funds while great human needs are going unmet in that city and throughout Texas. If this is a just analysis, there may nonetheless be one hope, at least, for partial redemption — perhaps justifying spending some of the \$10 million of state tax funds for the fair.

Surviving HemisFair will be the Institute of Texan Culture, whose guiding spirit will be R. Henderson Shuffler, the director of the Texana programs at the University of Texas. If the words that Shuffler spoke last week before a legislative committee are given meaning in reality, the institute will discover and tell the story of the true Texas. Perhaps at long last therapy can be begun to purge that state's psyche of the Lone Star Psychosis that has too long prevailed. Shuffler is an expert in Texas history and has achieved adequate grasp of the full measure of that subject, it seems, to realize that Texana is more than spurs, six-shooters, oil, and cattle. "We have," he said to the legislators, "too long told the Texas story in terms of the Southern

**Texas Society
to Abolish
Capital Punishment
memberships, \$2 up**

P.O. Box 8134, Austin, Texas 78712

Anglo-American, who came [to this state] as a planter, a cowboy, or just looking for a fight. This isn't the whole story of Texas, nor of its people. [There are] many ethnic groups who know something of their contributions, but seldom see them mentioned."

Shuffler points out that evidence has been found that at least 25 ethnic or national groups have contributed to Texas' society and culture. "It is interesting to note," he says, "that there were more natives of England at the Alamo than natives of Virginia; that only two native Texans, one of Mexican ancestry and the other the son of a Corsican, signed our Declaration of Independence. This Capitol Building of ours, designed in the shape of a Greek Cross, was built by a contractor with a German name, working for a syndicate which was financed by the English and Irish. The stone-cutters were imported from Scotland, much of the labor force was Irish and the ornamental scroll-work was designed and cast by Czechs. At least 90% of the statuary on the Capitol grounds was created by a Texan of Italian birth; that in the rotunda by an Austrian of German ancestry. No one knows who created the heroic figure of Liberty atop the dome, but myth attributes it to a Belgian."

Texas has, Shuffler continued, "many towns of true Germanic flavor, many with the Mexican style, and the missions built by Spain are all about us. What fewer people realize is that we also have the oldest Polish settlement in North America, a village where pure Danish is spoken regularly, a cluster of Norse settlements with all the flavor of the old country, and a variety of other spots where the essence of an older culture is visibly preserved within the new. There is even a perfect Russian house in the village of Dubina, and a trio of towns, Moscow, Unalaska, and Sebastopol, on the Trinity, which bear the marks of early Russian immigration in that area."

Shuffler goes on: "We have in Texas today a tremendous interest and a vast ignorance of the truth of our history. This ironic and tragic situation arises from the fact that you can't compete, in an orthodox museum or classroom, or even in a textbook or scholarly journal, with radio, television, the movies and popular magazines, for the interest and attention of the vast majority of the public — and particularly that of our children."

"The result is that most Texans have absorbed the phony myths perpetuated by the popular modern media. They think of early Texans as a bunch of hell-roaring bumpkins in buckskin who came brawling across the frontier, who shoved the Indians and Mexicans out, and settled down to shooting each other at high noon in front of the village saloon. They are apt to picture the typical modern Texan as a loud-mouthed wheeler-dealer in blue-jeans and big hat, who fell into a barrel of oil and came up smelling like a millionaire. These are the popular conceptions of

Texans in too many parts of the globe — and tragically, they are often the conceptions our own children learn and set out to imitate.

"It seems to be about time to tell the truth about Texans, early and late. The truth happens to be just as colorful, just as fascinating, and tremendously more self-respecting than the myth. We need to use the modern means of communication, to tell the truth as effectively as we have the myth."

After HemisFair closes, the institute can become the focal point of existing programs of collecting and studying records of state history, Shuffler says. It could produce films for classrooms and TV, filmstrips and slide shows, historical pamphlets and books; it could collect, catalog, and produce copies of pictures of historic significance that are scattered throughout the state; a central index of Texas documents, letters, newspapers, and relics could be established. Exhibits at the institute's building could be focused on a wide variety of subjects and groups through the years; materials produced could be made available for distribution throughout the state.

"This is the opportunity which our investment at the HemisFair offers," Shuffler says, to broaden the dissemination of the real Texas story, making more and more people aware of the real-life drama. "History, after all," Shuffler believes, "is the product and property of the people. When it is the concern of historians only, it is as wasted as a religion practiced by theologians alone."

The institute is to be operated by the Texas Tourist Development Agency. This could be a mistake; there is danger that the serious work that we Texans need so badly from such an institute could be diluted by considerations of promoting tourism. Let learning about Texas be the central function of the institute, not drawing more tourists into our midst. Why not make it part of the University of Texas system, perhaps as part of Shuffler's Texas programs set-up?

CLASSIFIED

BOOKPLATES

FREE CATALOGUE—Many beautiful designs. Special designing too. Address **BOOKPLATES**, Yellow Springs 24, Ohio.

Wanted to rent, on the lake or secluded somewhere near Austin, shack or house not in use, mid-February to summer, for writer to work in. Write Box A, Texas Observer, 504 West 24th St., Austin.

MEN SHOULD MAKE BABIES NOT KILL THEM

Write for information on draft resistance, tax refusal, pacifism. Send 10c for your copy of "Up Tight With The Draft." Send \$1 for special "draft packet" that includes a copy of Handbook for C. O.'s. Write: War Resisters League, Dept. U, 5 Beekman St., New York City 10038.

BOOKS

William Manchester's **THE DEATH OF A PRESIDENT** will be published in April. The publisher reports that advance orders are running unusually high. To reserve a copy place your order now with Garner & Smith Bookstore, 2116 Guadalupe, Austin, Texas. \$10.00.

On License Plates

Operators of passenger cars will be unwilling advertisers of the San Antonio fair during 1968, when the state will issue license plates adorned with the slogan "HemisFair 1968." A Dallas legislator, John Field, has complained that we haven't advertised the State Fair of Texas on license plates, so why plug the San Antonio fair? There is evidence that some of the lawmakers from Dallas are jealous of HemisFair, but Field has a point.

A more important question, however, is the propriety of forcing Texas motorists to advertise an affair from which only a few will profit. There was no legislative debate about the license plate slogan; the decision was simply made and announced by the Highway Commission. A couple of years back New York put a World's Fair slogan on its plates. A motorist there objected to plugging somebody else's product; he went to court and won a decision that required the state to provide him a set of plates without any advertising.

Hmmm.

G. O.

Social Changes Needed

Editor & Publisher, the national journalistic trade publication, published a feature on the Observer in its Jan. 21 issue. The story reviews the principles and activities of the paper at some length and concludes that the Observer will never be faulted for not trying to make changes in society.

February 3, 1967

15

LATITUDES will have John Howard Griffin, Mark Van Doren, Thomas Merton, Elroy Bode, Ronnie Dugger, fiction, poetry, art, photos, reviews in No. 1 this month. Quarterly at \$3 a year. 6102 Sherwood, Houston 77021.

Editor Robert Bonazzi: "We're independently poor."

PROFESSORS

Your students can receive a semester's subscription to the Texas Observer, if ten or more of them subscribe and the papers can be delivered in one packet to you, for the special classroom price of \$1.50 per student.

As a bonus we will include, for each student subscribing, the double-sized issue on J. Frank Dobie or, as long as the supply lasts, this issue and the December 30th issue on auto insurance.

Send your orders, specifying your bonus choice, to Sarah Payne, Business Manager, Texas Observer, 504 West 24th, Austin, Texas, 78705.

(adv.)

A COMMUNICATION

A funny thing happened to me recently on the way back to Texas. A short two-day trip to Washington, D.C., was winding up, and I found myself in a cab on the way to National Airport. Traffic was light and I arrived with an hour or so to kill. The bar at North Terminal was full, so I had begun walking toward the Main Terminal when I noticed a crowd gathered at one of the gates. There seemed to be about 200 people watching the approach of a plane off in the distance. I went out and blended in. "Who are we waiting for?" I asked someone. "Senator Douglas."

There were numerous placards and a few large, home-made banners welcoming the aging and defeated warrior of the Senate back to Washington. The plane landed, and ordinary mortals began emerging from the front exit. Then applause, and the snowy-haired Senator from Illinois appeared at the rear of the airplane. In the flesh he looked exactly as I had pictured him. He is wise and imposing in appearance; yet he is distinctively human. Recognizably a man, not

Unfinished Crusade

In the New York Times of Dec. 6, Paul Douglas, defeated for re-election as the U.S. Senator from Illinois, said:

"One of the regrets of my life is that I am not going to have the opportunity to carry on a crusade against the tax loopholes. I had hoped to wage war against the gas and oil depletion allowances." □

just a legend. His face showed gratitude and stoicism. He was moved by the demonstration, but he realized that it was because he was making his last official return. He moved slowly into the crowd, shaking hands and exchanging greetings with none of the impatience and feigned solicitude of political campaigning. The crowd included many Negroes, mostly elderly, and the Retail Clerks Union was there in force.

The ebb and flow of the crowd had moved me to within a few feet of him. Again there was a burst of applause from somewhere behind me, in the direction of the lobby. Turning around, I blinked at what I saw: the Vice-President was coming toward me, grinning warmly at Senator Douglas. The two men embraced with emotion. The surges and noises of the crowd prevented my hearing what they said to each other. Humphrey, in contrast with Douglas, was unnatural looking. His face appeared too bronze, his eyes too sharp, his hair too neat. He shook hands as though he was shifting the gears of a car. He gazed with a fixed, glassy smile into the crowd, but at no one in particular, even when he was greeting a particular person. Whereas Douglas looked like a college professor (which he

once was and now will be again), Humphrey was the gleaming image of the modern politician.

I was overcome by this sight—only a few feet away—of these two senators I had respected so much during the Congressional battles of the fifties. What we used to call "people's senators," Humphrey and Douglas were heroes of young idealists a decade ago, but they are not of today's. Both have made their peace with the status quo. Humphrey seems to have gone all the way with LBJ; Douglas this year was finally able to reconcile his reform politics and traditional independence with the full support of the Cook County machine. Both men support the Administration's war in Vietnam. But I noticed that some people were crying. Not sobbing, just tears rolling down cheeks. Senator Douglas was leaving the Senate! I had never seen him before, but there was a lump in my throat, too. I knew that he was one of the great men in the history of the country, one of the most distinguished senators ever to serve. I knew this in one way, from what I had read about his liberal leadership in the Senate and in Illinois, and I knew it in a different way, by being there at the airport when he made his final return.

James Simons,
1606 Palma Plaza,
Austin, Tex.

Dialogue

Let Adults Fight the War

If we adults, who have fattened and prospered on the Cold War and now reap the profits from the Viet Nam War, wish to promote our military economy and continue to thrive on the blood of others, let us take up our arms and go forth to battle those who would deny us further exploitation. Let us not pin the burden on our 18 or 19 year old sons, who had nothing to do with the mess we have made for them; who were raised on Strontium-90 in their formulas and have grown up under the threat of extinction we bought with our taxes. What do they owe us? Contempt?—Mrs. Lee Dresh, 2200 Midway, Mesquite, Tex.

The Mystic Circle

So what happened? We stood on the rosy-pink steps of the state capitol and we looked into the steel-cast eyes of our chromium-plated governor and the fierce daring-stares of the policemen who must have suspected we possessed concealed battering rams or catapults with which to storm the bastion. . . .

And what did the Secretary of State [Dean Rusk] see? A handful of rabble-in-placards. What should he have seen? A

multitude, but they weren't there. What did he hear? A chanted truism: It ain't nice to kill little kids.

Today's [Jan. 26] demonstration was an exercise in futility; but we are all accustomed to that, perhaps a little *too* accustomed to it. Perhaps we have been captivated by the idea of being the valiant minority, the downtrodden, the lonely keepers of the truth. Perhaps we have come to feel that we have failed unless we *are* opposed on every side, attacked, vilified. If this is so, if we consciously court defeat, then we are going nowhere, while the war is headed everywhere and everywhen and every-how and -who. . . .

What I am suggesting is something that many of you won't like and may find entirely too *radical* to swallow. The word, my friends, I'm afraid, is to move out of the mystic circle and into the world where the work is needed, the world where the war is going on. Admit that non-hippies can be a source of power. Teach them; lead them; and use them. "Conversion without alienation," should be the cry, and we should be willing to use every trick available in order to bring it about. That is, of course, if we *really* want the war in Viet Nam to end.

Sara Clark, 502 West 18th, Austin, Tex.