



ISSUE NUMBER XXXIX FEBRUARY 15, 1987

Among Friends of LBJ

NEWSLETTER OF THE FRIENDS OF THE LBJ LIBRARY

SPEAKERS ENLIVEN AUTUMN AT THE LIBRARY

A distinguished array of speakers from the worlds of politics, education and history provided a lively series of evenings at the Library during the final quarter of the year. They included:

- Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who served as assistant secretary of labor during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and later as assistant to President Richard Nixon, as U.S. ambassador to India and as America's voice in the United Nations.
 - Charles Robb, former governor of Virginia, son-in-law of President and Mrs. Johnson, and chairman of the Democratic Leadership Council.
 - David and Julie Nixon Eisenhower, husband and wife representing important strands of the nation's political history, who have both recently written books about their famous relatives.
 - Historian David McCullough, whose previous books have been about Theodore Roosevelt, the Panama Canal and the Brooklyn Bridge, and whose current subject is President Harry S. Truman.
 - Larry E. Temple, once special counsel to President Johnson, now an Austin attorney and for the last year and a half chairman of a select committee appointed by the Governor of Texas to look into the subject of higher education.
- The pages that follow offer a sampling of their presentations.



Senator Moynihan



Governor Robb



David and Julie Eisenhower, with moderator Lewis Gould

Excerpts From Moynihan:

A FAR-RANGING LOOK AT RECENT HISTORY



... A political era ends when a person in a prominent place forcefully asserts that it is time the nation adopt a policy which is precisely the policy those in office have proclaimed to be securely in place. And the end of the Reagan era came on December 4, 1986, on the op-ed page of the *New York Times*, when a respected editor of a foreign policy magazine declared, "It is high time for America to demonstrate awareness of its strength in the world today and act like a great power and not a supplicant." End of Reagan era. The specific event that ended the era was the appearance of American emissaries, chocolate cake in one hand and the Bible in the other, in the farthest anteroom of the Ayatollah — who, of course, sent eunuchs to receive the tribute and dismiss the emissaries without even a souvenir of worry beads, far less an audience in [his] chamber.

The most important thing a great power can do is be understood and the most dangerous thing is to be misunderstood. And when we say we stand for some things we must never be seen to have done the opposite. And people associated with that have to leave. It doesn't matter which party.

As an ambassador you use back-channel communications occasionally to get to the secretary without going by the assistant secretary. But the absolute explicit understanding is that you report to the secretary of state. You're appointed by the President to serve the secretary of state. Anyone who does not, has to be dismissed. It cannot be allowed.

In the 1960s we saw North Vietnam as the point of a lance firmly held by the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Communists pointed down the perimeter of Asia heading off into Indonesia, up the Bay of Bengal to India, and everybody knew that Lenin had said the road to Paris is through Calcutta ...

People who came into Washington with Kennedy had read all the books and knew all the doctrines. They were the first people who ever came into the White House who would know that Lenin said the road to Paris is through Calcutta. And the result [was] Vietnam ... Lyndon Johnson inherited it and was suspicious of it, but he couldn't persuade himself that he knew more about the subject than the people whose good fortune it was to know more about such things than the likes of him. A senior official of the Johnson administration, someone in his White House, said to me recently that by the time Johnson came to office his predecessors had created such a myth of invincible communism that Johnson and his advisers could not break out of that conception.

Apart only from decolonialization, the single most important fact of the third quarter of the 20th century was the collapse of Marxist-Leninist ideology. A fighting creed which at one point came near to dominating the intellectual life of the metropolitan centers of the world simply collapsed. In part this was so because it failed in its promises when put in place in the Soviet Union, but also because it was simply argued into general disbelief ... That simple essential fact has deprived Moscow of half the effective power it had in the world ... The Soviet Union has extraordinary economic problems. The country cannot feed itself. It has grown militarily stronger, and that is a great phenomenon, but partly its military strength is the cause of its economic weakness and a response to it.

Communist-induced convulsions are not likely to be the most important. The most important will be ethnic in character, deriving from differences and rivalries of race and religion and language, and will affect much larger entities and are much more dangerous, as we see in Southern Africa, in the Middle East and in the Gulf.

The press is doing its job. You know, there's a pretty good rule as you travel around the world. If you're in a place and you're not quite sure what kind of place it is, get hold of the newspapers. If the newspapers are filled with good news, you can be pretty sure the jails are filled with good men.

In 1976 and 1980 and 1984 the principal proposition of the campaign was that the government of Washington is not our government. It is *their* government — whoever "they" are. "They" are our adversaries. That is a corrupting idea. You can say what you will about Lyndon Johnson — and people have — there was not a day that he didn't respect in every inch of him the government of the United States. He didn't think it perfect, and he didn't think it perfectible — but he thought it could be made better, and he thought it did do good. And he was right.

The Eisenhowers: Famous Family Reminiscences



David Eisenhower, grandson of Dwight D. Eisenhower, discussed his work, *Eisenhower at War*, an account of his grandfather's command of the allied expeditionary forces in England in World War II.

What I originally conceived of was a book that would have begun with my grandfather's second term . . . [But] as I got into the story I found that I had an end but I did not have a beginning. So I kept being led backwards . . . to that moment where this book starts.

In November of 1943, for the first time, the American president and the Soviet premier, sat down [together]. This was one of the great political events of the century, and the real issue for us was . . . were we really prepared to [launch a second front?]. When the Commander vested with responsibility for the execution of the operation was named, it was Dwight Eisenhower. [That] situated my subject in the middle of something important which continued right on through his presidency and which continues on up to this day — this strange relationship between the Americans and Russians.

I think that the secret of his success as a coalition commander is that he was absolutely dedicated to the purposes of the coalition and he assumed that everybody else was despite outward differences. I believe that the outcome vindicated his judgment.

I think what [the issue of] Berlin comes down to is that there is this [period] — let's say about four or five weeks in the spring of 1945 — when the Germans have given up on the Western front. [Some] British writers insist that the American leadership — Marshall and Eisenhower primarily — should have used that [period] to gain control of Germany — Berlin and Germany — which would have given the allies decisive say concerning the occupation sectors in Germany and — this is the theory — we could have [bargained] for free elections in Poland, Czechoslovakia and so on.

What I try to show is that Berlin would have been a deviation by the allies that would have utterly destroyed any chances of a settlement in Europe at all.

We could not walk into Berlin with the Germans acquiescing, without telling them that they could wait for us to arrive everywhere else. That would have bucked up German resistance against the Russians in Czechoslovakia. It would have meant a long stand in Norway, it would have meant a stand in Denmark. My grandfather, by avoiding the Berlin invitation, was saying, in effect [to the Germans], "We will not truck with you, and we will accept nothing except unconditional surrender to the Americans, British and Russians." That was the basic decision at the outset of World War II, and the basis of the future settlement which was given a chance by his decision to halt the 9th Army on the Elbe, and to concentrate on his military objective.

The settlement has served a great purpose. It has endured for 41 or 42 years, and it would not have lasted a year if Eisenhower had directed troops into Berlin in April of 1945, in my opinion.



Julie Eisenhower, daughter of former President and Mrs. Richard Nixon, talked about *Pat Nixon: The Untold Story*, her poignant memoir of her mother.

I think her particular contribution — one that she will probably be most remembered for — was the role of goodwill ambassador, because she did travel to 78 nations around the world representing the United States [beginning] during the Eisenhower administration.

My mother did not feel comfortable getting involved in policy issues. She viewed her role as meeting people, talking to people, being the eyes and ears. She loved campaigning, but she didn't feel qualified nor did she feel that it was her role to advise on strategic issues or even nitty-gritty political issues. But she did feel strongly in 1971 — the women's movement was just beginning — that it would give such a boost to the dignity of women if a woman could be named to the Supreme Court.

She and Curator Clem Conger worked very closely together, and over 500 pieces of American art and antique furniture were added to the White House collection, which is the largest amount that had ever been added. One of the great discoveries made during those years was Dolley Madison's portrait. You know the famous story of the fire when the British burned the White House in 1814, and you've read that President Washington's portrait was split apart and rolled up because they didn't have time to unfasten it from the wall and wanted to save the portrait, and Dolley Madison wrote to her sister to say that the British were coming and she was saving this portrait. Well, what was not known is that she also saved her own portrait from the White House; and this turned up at the Pennsylvania Academy of Art. So now it is in the White House again, hanging in the Red Room where it should be.

Because my parent's political lives are so completely entwined, I do try to express how they each viewed pivotal moments. In the "fund crisis" of 1952, my father's reaction was to go on the offensive — to look at his emergence from the Checkers speech as a triumph; the people responded to him, they had telegraphed Eisenhower, they had telegraphed the National Committee. So he looked at that as a triumph. But for my mother, a completely opposite reaction. She looked at it as such a painful incident that when I interviewed her for the book she couldn't even bear to bring herself to talk about it.

I should hope that the letters that my parents wrote to each other during their courtship and the early years would be available some day. I think that the presidential library system is such an important one in bringing access, and I hope that there will be a Nixon Library some day.

Unfortunately, my mother did not keep a White House diary . . . so there are not extensive papers. But what papers there are, I would like — if they are willing to me — to open them to historians.

McCULLOUGH: IN SEARCH OF HARRY TRUMAN

I work in a presidential library in Independence, Missouri much of my time. I believe very strongly not only in presidential libraries — they really transformed our ability, our opportunity to understand the presidency — but I strongly support the idea that presidential libraries be located where the president came from. There is, as I am sure many of you know, a feeling among some historians and some people in Washington that all the presidential papers should be in Washington under one umbrella of the National Archives and I, for one, would argue endlessly against that. Our presidential libraries are a great national resource and all of us who are interested in them, all of us who support them, must continue to do so because every gesture of support that we can give is well worth it.

... Harry Truman was an unreconstructed 19th century man. He hated the telephone, among other things, so thank goodness he wrote letters to his mother, to his sister, to his wife, to his daughter, to friends. And he wrote private memoranda to himself and he kept a diary, a journal.

Harry Truman, furthermore, never went to Washington as a senator until he was 50 years old. So for 50 long years it never occurred to him that he was a character in history. Therefore he felt perfectly free to be himself on paper. So the letters and diaries at the Truman Library number in the hundreds, in the thousands. Now many have been published, but many more have not been published. He is probably the last president we are ever going to have for whom it is possible to go below the surface to get inside his life to know what he was really thinking and feeling to the extent that we can with Harry.

... It is hard to imagine any president of the United States with more dropped upon him suddenly than was the case with Harry Truman in April 1945 when FDR died. He suddenly found himself the commander-in-chief of the greatest war of all time. He was to a large extent unknown by the country. He had Roosevelt's very high powered cabinet to reassure, to guarantee that he would continue the policies of the great man. He was informed within a very short time of the atomic bomb, the existence of this terrible new weapon about which he'd been

told virtually nothing. He had to decide whether we would proceed with the United Nations. He was in the spotlight as never before in his life, for which, really, he was unprepared.

When you're working in a library like this, the tendency is to go to the great collections, the Acheson papers, say, in addition to the Truman papers. But I had a wonderful time looking at the papers that are very seldom looked at. And among those are the papers of Mr. Truman's sister, Mary Jane. In all the time that Mr. Truman was dealing with these crushing issues, with the fate of the world, Mary Jane was writing to him from Grandview, Missouri where she and Mama Truman, as everybody called her, lived. The theme running through [her] letters is that it is a tremendous disservice that her brother Harry has put upon all of them by becoming President.

Mr. Truman's answer [invariably was to the effect]: "You both have done fine under this terrible blow."

One of the great benefits of a presidential library is the picture collection. You can learn an enormous amount by looking at pictures. And one of the most interesting of my recent discoveries at the Truman Library are pictures of Mary Jane Truman — this sister — who has always been described as an "old maid" a kind of picturesque Missouri lady, who never married and who took care of Harry's mother until her death. And then I found some pictures of Mary Jane taken on the Truman farm during the first World War. Harry went off to the war and Mary Jane stayed home and ran the farm. She was a beautiful young woman, really striking looking. And suddenly it becomes a different story and you begin to wonder: why didn't she marry? To what extent was she left with Mama so that Harry could go to war? And of course, Harry never went back to the farm because when he returned from the war he married Bess Wallace who lived in an entirely different world in Independence...

And by the way, he went to war when he didn't need to because he was over age, his eyes were bad, and maybe more important than either — he was a farmer, and President Wilson was urging all farmers to stay home: their services on the land were more important than a uniform. So maybe Mary Jane is a much more important character in Harry Truman's life than we've been led to believe. I'm sure she is a very interesting person. The tendency with a biography very often is to concentrate on the main character — too much so in my view because each of us is a part, has something in us of the people that have mattered most to us and vice versa. So it seems to me that in order to understand Harry Truman, I've really got to understand his wife, his mother, his sister, his daughter — all the people that really counted to him...

I was listening one night to one of his Secret Service men who was telling stories about Stalin and Eisenhower and Mr. Truman and I said, "Well you've been very kind to let me spend all this time with you because I'm sure you're tired of telling these stories." And he said, "Mr. McCullough, I've never been asked to tell any of these stories." And that's a great loss, because when those people are gone, that history will be gone. So the kind of work that is done by libraries such as this with oral history is of vital importance.



FORMER GOV. ROBB HOLDS DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY REVIVAL

By Dave McNeely

(Reprinted from the *Austin American-Statesman*, 12/31/86)

The Iran affair demonstrates that Republican President Reagan's foreign policy is "in complete disarray," according to former Virginia Gov. Charles Robb.

But Robb cautioned that "the biggest mistake we [Democrats] could make is to view the Iran affair as a free pass to the White House."

Robb, son-in-law of the late President Lyndon B. Johnson, is mentioned as a potential White House occupant himself — though he's personally pushing U.S. Sen. Sam Nunn, D-Ga. Robb said he agrees with Nunn that Democrats, as an alternative to the Republicans, must shape a foreign policy based on readiness and strength, but tempered with fairness.

"Democrats today, quite rightly, reject a Republican foreign policy that has too often been characterized by military bluster and swaggering rhetoric," Robb told a joint meeting of the Austin Council of Foreign Affairs and the Friends of the LBJ Library Monday night. "Such a policy, built mainly on armaments and superpower arrogance, offers no clear moral alternative to the cynical power politics of the Soviet Union."

"And it provides no answer at all to the questions of poverty and injustice around the globe. Instead, it allows our adversaries to pose as the champions of hope and progress in the third world."

Robb charged the Reagan foreign policy is "marked by incoherence" in the Middle East, and said Democrats don't find much to recommend it elsewhere.

"We reject a policy that temporizes with the evil of apartheid in South Africa, that shrugs off human rights abuses in non-communist countries, that fawns over friendly autocrats, that pursues a wildly erratic, all-or-nothing course on arms control, that reaches too quickly for military options and too reluctantly for diplomatic openings, and that too often insists on interpreting all tension and conflict in the context of the East-West rivalry."

Democrats can't afford to succumb to isolationist tendencies, but instead should be a positive force in the world, said Robb, who recently took a two-week trip around the world that included stops in several foreign capitals.

Robb is trying to rekindle the Democratic spirit for foreign policy of the style practiced by Harry Truman, John Kennedy and, until the Vietnam swamp, by Lyndon Johnson. The United States should pursue democratic ideals abroad, but must have the military might necessary to enforce its position.

A Democratic foreign policy should recognize that the East-West nuclear terror is but a symptom of "fundamentally opposed political values," Robb said. He said that the United States should re-establish its role as a "beacon of hope to oppressed peoples everywhere," while not losing its capacity to enforce peace through deterrence.

He said that President Reagan almost bargained away this country's nuclear missiles at the recent summit meeting at Reykjavik, Iceland, despite the Soviet Union's superiority in conventional forces. To do so would amount to unilateral disarmament, Robb said.

The United States, with help from European allies, instead should achieve equality with the Soviets in conventional arms before it bargains away its nuclear aces, Robb said.

The normally cautious Robb was rather direct in criticizing President Reagan for the sale of arms to Iran and apparent use of some of the proceeds to fund the anti-Sandinista forces fighting in Nicaragua.



But he said that this country should not make dumb foreign policy decisions in reaction to dumb actions in the White House.

"First, we must learn the truth and hold those responsible accountable under the law," Robb said. "Second, we must restore the capacity of the government and President of the United States to conduct an effective foreign policy."

"We must understand what the current crisis is, and what it is not. It is a failure of decision-making, accountability, and ultimately, of presidential leadership. It is not a sound basis for determining future policy towards Central America."

Robb said the United States should continue to back the Contra forces against "a sophisticated police state apparatus" set up by the Sandinista government with Soviet help, that has produced a military foothold for the Soviets 250 miles from the Panama Canal.

But Robb said the United States also should be consistent in stepping into situations to help democracy, instead of sitting on the sidelines or sticking with authoritarian forces.

"We can learn from past mistakes in Central America," Robb said. "Today, in nations undergoing political struggles, such as the Philippines, South Korea, South Africa, Haiti and Chile, we must place America's moral, economic and political support firmly on the side of democratic forces before it's too late, instead of waiting until their politics polarize, the democratic center is eroded, and we face, once again, only difficult choices instead of opportunities."

He said there is a middle ground between the fervid anti-communist efforts of the Reagan White House in Nicaragua and elsewhere, and the hands-off attitude of some Democrats. The first step is outlining what this country endorses, instead of just what it opposes.

"We must fashion a larger pro-democracy policy for Central and Latin America, instead of merely reacting to the dangers posed by a communist takeover," he said.

This country also should help restructure debts of countries in Central and South America, and to help them revive their economies with U.S. aid sent through conduits different from "the same old inefficient and inequitable structures — and in some cases the same old corrupt elites," Robb said.

Also, military aid to the Contras should be conditioned on civilian control over military forces, and clear commitment to democratic self-determination and human rights, Robb said.

But whatever it does, Robb said, the United States cannot afford to sit by waiting to find out how developments in Central American countries affect our security. "By the time we know precisely," he said, "it will be too late to act."

Whether Robb will be the eventual messenger, the foreign policy message that he is putting forth may be what it takes to get the Democrats back in the White House.

Larry Temple:

Some Provocative Thoughts On Education



Temple was the Frank C. Erwin lecturer at the Library in November. (The lecture series is endowed in honor of the former chairman of The University of Texas Board of Regents and LBJ Foundation Board.) His address was an important statement on education generally. "Texas," he said, "is just a microcosm of the nation as a whole." Excerpts:

I want to identify what I have come to believe are the most fundamental issues underlying everything else that we consider about higher education.

So there will be no mistake about the point from which I start, I want to state my basic thesis or belief of what higher education is about.

The *business* of higher education is education. It is *not* job training. It is *not* economic development. It is *not* building campuses. It is *not* many other things that people ascribe to it.

Certainly, a quality and well supported higher education system is the best vehicle we have to devise a sound and diversified economy. Bright minds originate new ideas which lead to new industries. It's obvious that economic benefits flow from a quality and accessible higher education system. But that is a *benefit* of higher education, not the purpose. The purpose or business of higher education is education. I believe we have lost sight of that fact in recent years.

In this "high-tech" era we have been emphasizing the need for more science and engineering courses. Yet in today's complex world the most highly trained engineer, technician, or sci-

entist — note that I said *trained* — cannot know what to do under changing social, political, or economic conditions without having at least a rudimentary understanding of history, government, and economics. Too many of our college graduates are simply becoming well trained modern artisans. They do not even know what they are missing because our educational system is failing them.

A college education has got to be more than a work permit.

The United States is the only country in the world where a person can be considered truly educated and not be multi-lingual. I believe proficiency in a second language should be a requirement for college graduation.

It is the responsibility of our universities to lead and cajole and entice and inveigle and trick students into taking more humanities and liberal arts courses. Every student should get a substantial amount of liberal education irrespective of field or degree major. The curriculum should ensure that a graduate with a bachelor's degree will be conversant with the best that has been thought and written about the human condition. We are not doing that today — and the penalty we pay is immense.

The head of one of the largest teachers' organizations in this country told the Select Committee that only 30 percent of those entering teacher education programs in this country ever intend to teach. The rest have picked the education major as the easy route to a college degree. That is a terrible indictment of our colleges of education.

These colleges must be reformed. I believe the best approach is the one suggested by the recent Carnegie Commission: limit colleges of education to master's level work and require all undergraduates to get their degrees in specific subject areas: English, science, and so forth. That will assure the broader education necessary for those who transmit knowledge to the next generation.

While we are at the business of looking at over-specialized fields, there are others that merit close examination. One is the field of journalism. Although it has not been studied as closely as education, I have been told both by educators and journalism graduates that too many technical journalism courses are required for graduation. Reporters become editorial writers and editors. Newscasters become commentators. How can we expect them to analyze and explain the news without a broad general education?

And I fear that our colleges of business have a tendency to become trade schools. In many cases licensing and accrediting agencies — such as in the case of accounting — dictate the curriculum. That is wrong. I just don't believe our business graduates are as liberally educated as they need to be.

Perhaps we need to consider requiring double undergraduate degrees for anyone majoring in an undergraduate professional field. This would not be in any way a move to diminish professional or teacher education. It would just require a degree in a discipline as an academic building block upon which professional skills would be added.

"TEXAS IN TRANSITION" NOW A PUBLICATION

The June 15, 1986 edition of *Among Friends* reported on a symposium that took place at the Library last spring — "Texas in Transition," which probed the state's burning question in its sesquicentennial year: how to rally its sagging economy — brought on largely by the collapse in oil prices — and create a structure for economic development that will prevent similar collapses in the future.

Now the proceedings of the conference, with an added selection of commentaries and published articles written subsequently by forum participants, is available in a publication bearing the same name.

It was edited by Michael Gillette, chief of the Library's Oral History and Acquisition programs, and one of the organizers of the conference.

The book was published by the LBJ School of Public Affairs, co-sponsor with the Library of the symposium. Copies may be purchased for \$9.95 each from the LBJ School's Office of Publications, P.O. Drawer Y, University Station, Austin, Texas 78713-7450.



IN MEMORIAM John Macy

John Macy was head of the Civil Service Commission during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. In addition, he served as chief talent scout for President Johnson.



Kiran Dix

Kiran Dix has been named volunteer coordinator for the Library. Ms. Dix, who has been with the Library since 1981, took over when Annette Sadler retired last December. Mannette Diederich is the new assistant volunteer coordinator.

RESEARCH GRANTS AWARDED TO TWENTY-SIX SCHOLARS

Twenty-six scholars have been selected as the 1986-1987 recipients of grants to study in the LBJ Library. The funds, totaling \$19,750.00 this year, are made available by The Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation by virtue of a grant from the Moody Foundation to help students, teachers, and writers use the Library's resources by providing support for travel and living expenses.

Those receiving grants-in-aid and the titles of their proposed projects are: John Adams, "Competition or Cooperation: The Question of Federal-State Interaction and the Rise of the Lower Colorado River Authority, 1933-39"; Michael K. Brown, "The Segmented Welfare State"; Walter Buenger, "Wright Patman and Big Business"; David L. DiLeo, "George Ball's Vietnam Dissent"; Mathias Dreissig, "The Bracero Program and Labor Relations in the U.S."; Rena Fonseca, "Promise Unfulfilled: Indian-American Relations in the 1960s"; Robert M. Hathaway, "Special Relations: Britain and America in the Postwar World"; George Herring, "LBJ's Conduct of Limited War in Vietnam"; Robert Hilderbrand, "The Johnson Administration and the Vietnam War"; Charles E. Jacob, "Variations in Presidential Styles of Macroeconomic Policy Management"; Lawrence Jacobs, "Institutional Change in the U.S. and Britain: National Health Service Act of 1946 and the Medicare Act of 1965"; Samuel Kernell, "The Politics of the White House Staff"; Yuen Foong

Khong, "From Rotten Apples to Falling Dominos to Munich: The Problem of Reasoning by Analogy about Vietnam"; Peter Kronenberger, "The Decision to Commit US Combat Troops to South Vietnam"; Thomas S. Langston, "The Influence of People of Ideas in Presidential Policymaking: FDR-Reagan"; Dennis Merrill, "Bread and the Ballot: The U.S. and India's Economic Development, 1947-1971"; Franklin D. Mitchell, "President Truman, The South, and Postwar Race Relations, 1945-1953"; Kevin Mulcahy, "Programming, Politics and the Public Interest: An Administrative Biography of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting"; Julie L. Pycior, "Lyndon Johnson and Mexican-Americans in the Great Depression"; James Ralph, "Northern Protest: Martin Luther King, Jr., Chicago, and the Civil Rights Movement"; John Robey, "Transportation Policy During the Johnson Administration"; Michael Schaller, "General Douglas MacArthur and American Policy in Asia, 1935-1951"; Jordan Schwarz, "A Political History of Inflation in 20th Century America"; Jerri-Lynn Scofield, "The Evolution of U.S. Trade Policy from the Kennedy Round Through the Tokyo Round"; Carol A. Weisenberger, "The National Youth Administration in Texas, 1935-1943: A Case Study"; and James R. Williamson, "Business Concentration and Antitrust Policy During the Kennedy-Johnson Years."

COMING EVENTS AT THE LIBRARY

- Feb. 16 An Evening with Brian Urquhart, former under secretary general of the U.N.
- Feb. 19-20 Symposium, "The American Constitution: Retrospect and Prospect"
- Feb. 25 An Evening with Robert Flynn (on literature of the Southwest)
- Feb. 28 Opening of exhibition, "Eleanor Roosevelt: First Person Singular"
- March 5 An Evening with Barry Goldwater
- April 2 Special preview of exhibition "Washington Merry-Go-Round: The World of Drew Pearson." Guest speaker: Jack Anderson



Eleanor Roosevelt



Among the Library's recent distinguished visitors was Texas' junior senator, Phil Gramm, who toured the installation with Director Harry Middleton. Senator Gramm, who once taught at Texas A&M University, was in Austin for the traditional UT-A&M football game on Thanksgiving Day. (A&M won, 16-3.)



Thomas J. Hirschfeld, an expert in arms control and European security issues, is the Distinguished Visiting Tom Slick Professor of World Peace for 1986-87 at the LBJ School of Public Affairs.

The annual conference organized by the Tom Slick professor will be held this year on March 3rd.

(photo courtesy of Charles Steel, UT Photography Services)

AMONG FRIENDS OF LBJ is a publication of the Friends of the LBJ Library

Editor: Lawrence D. Reed

Research Assistance: Charles Corkran, Gary Yarrington

Photography: Frank Wolfe, Paul Chevalier

Staff Assistance: Yolanda Boozer, Shirley James

The LBJ Library is one of eight presidential libraries administered by the National Archives and Records Administration.