

AMONG FRIENDS *of LBJ*

Issue Number XLIV December 15, 1988

Symposium Probes Urban Problems

During the Johnson Administration, three presidential commissions—known as the (Nicholas) Katzenbach, (Robert) Kerner and (Milton) Eisenhower Commissions—threw a glaring spotlight on the crisis that was festering in American cities. In October, a symposium at the Library, composed of scholars, educators, public officials and others working in urban affairs, looked at the urban condition today, two decades later.

Out of those landmark reports of the 60s came this stark warning from the Kerner Commission: "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white, separate and unequal."

Today the problem is seen in broader terms than the black-white language of that report. And when Blacks are joined by other minority groups—notably Hispanics, and in some areas Asians—the situation ap-

pears even more compelling. "What we are witnessing and what we are about to experience," said San Antonio Mayor Henry Cisneros, one of the symposium keynoters, "is a massive demographic change that may indeed be the biggest story in America in the next century." He pointed out that minority groups under the sixth grade in Houston schools and under the fourth grade in the Dallas school system already heavily out-number those from the traditional majority. And he cited a recent finding in California that several of that state's largest counties will soon be predominantly minority, and the state itself will be fully 48% Hispanic by the year 2000. "Those demographics," he said, "will sweep across the whole of the country, across all dimensions of American life."

But even as those trends inex-

orably change the face of the nation, the move toward separateness foreseen two decades ago has been accelerated rather than reversed: this was the sobering note sounded at the conference. Professor Barbara Jordan of the LBJ School, another keynoter, quoted from a recent report issued by the American Council on Education: "America is moving backward, not forward, in its efforts to achieve the full participation of minority citizens in the life and prosperity of the nation." Katzenbach, who was Attorney General of the U.S. when he chaired the commission bearing his name, and whose address opened the conference, forcefully made the same point: "The problems are worse today than they

Below: Henry Cisneros greets LBJ School Dean Max Sherman after delivering keynote address



Cities Symposium (cont.)



Katzenbach

were 20 years ago." The progress that flowed from the civil rights laws of the 1960s, "enabling the middle class black population to grow and prosper," has had scant effect on "the inhabitants of segregated ghettos. We have indeed moved further toward those two societies . . . separate and unequal."

Exacerbating the problem are other kinds of changes, described by Cisneros, which erode urban vitality. One is "the transformation of our economy from manufacturing to service;" over the past 30 years "we have lost hundreds of thousands of jobs paying 13 and 14 and 15 dollars

an hour and replaced them with jobs paying five and six and seven dollars an hour," producing further "polarization along income lines," with "the top 20% of the population [earning] 43% of the national income, and the bottom 20% [earning] 4.75%."

Another dynamic is the growth in population of older citizens, at the same time the numbers of minority—and poor—youth are expanding. The result, as Cisneros painted it, is "a very explosive picture: a picture of older persons who say, 'No more social spending, no more bond increases; let's hold up on tax

increases; this thing has gotten out of hand; it's threatening [me] and I can't afford it,' juxtaposed against populations that are saying, 'No, our best days are yet ahead. We need more schools and more social spending'."

That unhappy confrontation describes one of the cruel dilemmas of the time. People in the twilight of their lives have "legitimate concerns" about their income security, Cisneros said. And yet, as speaker after speaker affirmed, the hope and health of our national future depend on our ability to open the doors of education and opportunity to all American youth. The alternative, Barbara Jordan warned, "consigns us to becoming a nation of permanent unrest, permanent instability." And at stake, there was general agreement, is nothing less than our position in the world. "As our economy moves further and further into high tech services," Katzenbach said, "we need an educated citizenry. If we cannot achieve it . . . then we will either fill those jobs with immigrants or we will export the jobs to other countries . . . If this country doesn't face up to its urban and race problems by genuinely integrating this society, we will, in the not too distant future, lose our leadership in the world."

Cisneros reminded the audience that the Prime Minister of Japan was roundly criticized recently for saying that America would not be able to compete with the Japanese or the other northern industrial nations in the next century, "because as a polyglot nation, America has too many Hispanics and Blacks." But, Cisneros continued, "he could have changed his statement only slightly and been correct: America will *not* be able to compete if it decides to leave its large population of Blacks and Hispanics undereducated, underproductive and operating and living at the margin of society . . . How we deal with this question of an underclass is no longer an issue of civil rights [or] Christian compassion [or] constitutional ideals. It is a question of national survival."

Cities Symposium (cont.)

One of the conference sponsors—the Inter-University Program/Social Science Research Council for Public Policy Research on Contemporary Hispanic Issues*—is preparing recommendations for action in the areas of education, employment, human services, and economic and community development, based on papers presented at the symposium and the discussion they stimulated. Inevitably, those recommendations will call for some federal support. But there was an awareness that any request for scarce federal funds would be subject to intense competition.

One of the participants, Brookings Institution economist Robert Reischauer, reminded his colleagues that “we are not the only group meeting and coming up with lists of new initiatives . . . People are meeting all over the country, doing the same kind of thing . . . the environmentalists, the energy folks . . . the [ones] who have had their share but are hungry for more: health research, drugs . . . space.”

Whatever the degree of federal involvement, the real key to solving the problems of the cities, Katzenbach and Cisneros agreed, will be local action. “Federal standards alone,” Katzenbach said, “are not going to work. Solution of the nitty-gritty problems will depend on local leadership, both public and private.” Cisneros described the specific needs as “local initiative, local tax capability, and local fiscal innovation. The old language that said, ‘We’ll do just fine because we have cheap jobs and cheap labor and cheap water and cheap electricity’ is no longer good enough. There is a whole new language in American cities: investment of industrial and research parks . . . specialized strategies in purchasing and development, venture capital and working with banks, convention centers, downtown revitalization, his-

***Other sponsors, along with the Library, were the LBJ School of Public Affairs and the Joint Center for Political Studies.**



Jordan

toric preservation . . . marketing and projecting and creating an identity for the city.” Then, speaking out of the experience which has earned him the reputation of one of the nation’s most successful and innovative mayors, he defined the two “fundamental principles” which he considers essential “for lifting people in the city out of poverty.” The first is general economic growth—“an essential precondition for creating minority upward mobility.”

“In San Antonio,” he said, [our position is] “we are going to build economic prosperity, whatever it takes. We will go anywhere, talk to anyone, do anything, consider any-

thing that is prudent and won’t put us in jail, to create jobs. We will be the best at what it takes—licenses, permits, fees, zoning, traffic, security, personnel matters, new sites, tax abatements, you name it.”

Along with this goes what he called the second essential: “create the conditions in which jobs can reach those who have been outside the economic mainstream. That means we have to locate some of those plants in central city areas . . . train people in skills . . . leverage business to support central city housing and literacy programs and every other kind of city-building and human resource development strategy.”

Conference in Houston Explores World of Texas Politics

"The World of Texas Politics," said Lynn Ashby, editor of *The Houston Post*, "is filled with some of the most offensive, slimy, repugnant and least respected villains in our state's history. But we shall get to the journalists later. Let us begin with the politicians . . ."

His statement appeared in the program of a symposium on "The World of Texas Politics" which the LBJ Library, the LBJ School, the *Houston Post* and Rice University jointly sponsored at Rice September 29-30.

Four panels explored various areas of that world.

In the first panel, moderated by State Senator Chet Brooks, the thorny matter of political financing was addressed by three experts who have had considerable experience with it—Tom Leonard, Karl Rove and George Shipley.

Shipley stated the issue succinctly: "The core problem is to drive the money out of the system and to fund [campaigns] with minimal strings attached, and also to encourage small giving, and giving for good-government reasons as opposed to the expectation of what we euphemistically call access."

What gave urgency to the problem for all three panelists is the "explosion in campaign costs," as Leonard put it. "I for one," Rove affirmed, "am horrified, absolutely horrified, by the large sums of money that are raised and spent in political

campaigns."

"Unless a meaningful way can be found to control campaign expenditures," Leonard warned, "we will be unable to attract or retain in public office people of the same quality that we've had in the past." He saw another danger as well: "The fund-raising role played by individuals will be replaced by funds raised by major interests—political action committees, trade associations, and others with vested interests in government operations."

One reform needed, Rove suggested, is "fuller disclosure . . . especially as to the source of money [and] the principal occupation [of the donor]. Shipley agreed: "We need to require meaningful disclosure." Leonard worried that disclosure laws already on the books could result in a "loss of privacy" which is "bound to [produce] reluctance on the part of individuals to give to the candidate of their choice." But Rove argued that there are adequate safeguards: "It is illegal to copy those lists."

Shipley proposed another remedy: "I think the time has come to limit campaign contributions." Rove concurred, with this demurrer: don't follow federal limits. "I think the federal limits are too low. There has to be a balance struck between limits which are so low as to force a candidate to spend all of his or her time on the telephone or begging for money and, on the other hand, giving the

people at least the confidence that a campaign is not being unduly influenced . . ."

Should there be limitations on spending as well? Only Rove expressed himself on this question, and to him the answer is no. "As much as I'm horrified by the huge sums of money we have to raise, to limit the amount [to be spent] arbitrarily would be, in my opinion, to benefit the incumbent or the majority party in each and every instance."

What about public financing? "I think the experiment with public financing of presidential elections has by and large worked successfully," Shipley said, "and we have enough historical basis now with the financing of presidential primaries to show that on a matching basis the system works, and that candidates who can organize these things can have a shot."

"I disagree," said Rove. "I don't think the system has worked particularly well on the presidential level . . . I really think it creates more problems than opportunities." He acknowledged, however, that public financing "ultimately may have to be the answer. We may find no other way to limit the influence of these large contributions."

Below: Tom Leonard, Moderator Chet Brooks, Karl Rove, George Shipley



World of Texas Politics: The Writers

"Texas is still the big story," said Liz Carpenter, kicking off the discussion on a panel devoted to "Writing about Texas Politics." "I suspect we always will be: size, sinew. We still, even with the electronic trap-pings and our new urbaneness, are gutsier than any other state."

But hers was the only optimistic voice on the panel. The others saw the Texas story today in gloomier terms.

Joe B. Frantz, an historian who has written about Texas and the Southwest for four decades, presented it this way:

"Texans like to think that they are bright and street-smart and politically wise, but in many aspects of politics they attained their zenith between about 1890 and the onset of the First World War, 70 to 100 years ago. Then industrial interests took over, Texas turned careful and quit thinking, and has lazed along like a barely-felt zephyr, hardly noticeable as a political breeze. Right now, when its days of easy inheritance, virtually free cotton land, untended cattle waiting to be branded and headed north on government grass, and oil in undreamed-of quantities—when those things have begun to pass, when contemporary Texas needs to think and care in terms of people and their utilization for their own interests as well as for the state's interests, they want those shifting winds to blow somewhere else. Texans are like old crap-shooters who enjoy an unbelievable run of winning dice, but who, when the dice grow cold, refuse to acknowledge that sometimes you have to get into a more constructive business."

A younger writer, Larry Wright, had much the same pessimistic outlook: "It seems to me that writers in Texas, and I include myself in this, have fallen for the old temptation of writing about Texas politics as a comedy or a farce. The truth, and I think we all know it, is that Texas politics is properly understood as a tragedy. That didn't matter so much when Texas was less consequential, but in the modern age the failure of Texas to assume the real responsi-



Liz Carpenter and Chandler Davidson

bilities of political leadership has had devastating consequences for its citizens, and will have important effects on the lives of people everywhere.

"We have more power than we know how to use, or at least to use wisely. Look at how we spent our wealth and power in the last boom. Going into the 1970s Texas already had profound problems in education, prisons and mental health care, to name only three of the many social problems in this state. In the 1970s we had the money to address to those problems. Now we're headed into the 1990s, broke, with some reforms in education but otherwise those problems are underfunded, unresolved and still almost entirely ignored.

"Where is the legacy of that boom? Where are the cultural institutions, the schools, the public

art? You can find the legacy in the vacant skyscrapers in our cities, which are now owned by the foreign banks that have bought our own corrupt financial institutions. You can find the legacy in the blight of cruddy strip-shopping centers and garish beach communities and the ugly sprawl of car lots and franchise chicken joints and prefab warehouses that issue out of the heart of every city in our state and crawl along our highways like a poison vine. Look at Texas in the wake of the boom and you see the broken remains of a state built on greed and impermanence, a civilization that is here to take and not to give.

"It's odd, because we Texans are always talking about how much we love Texas, and yet when I look at the state I wonder, 'Where is the evidence of that love?'"



Joe Frantz and Larry Wright

World of Texas Politics: The Insiders

Chandler Davidson, chairman of the Department of Sociology at Rice, recalled an earlier writer about Texas, the late V. O. Key, whose book of a generation ago, *Southern Politics in State and Nation*, has "had an enduring influence among political scientists and among several decades worth of college students." Key, he said, foresaw the growth of a "robust" two-party system in Texas.

On one point, at least, Davidson pointed out, Key was "right on target: realignment in a very significant way has come to Texas." But on others, "he was quite off the mark." To wit:

- "Racial politics have not disappeared."

- "I think in all fairness we have to say that the two parties in Texas as they now exist are not very robust." As evidence, he cited the fact that only 23% of the voting age population turned out for the Super-Tuesday primaries.

- "The have-nots have not come into the electorate despite major changes in election and registration laws . . . While the wealthy folks have continued to vote as a percentage of the voting age population at about the same rate they did 20, 30 years ago—two-thirds of them voted in the November election—the percentage of the less affluent has actually decreased [from] about a third in 1960 [to] some 22%" in 1980. "In other words, the affluent have more clout than ever in the policy realm . . . And the public officials they have elected to office dance with those who bring them."

Liz had the last word: "I'm not discouraged about the quality of people who are out there." And anyway, things are changing. "There are young people all over the place. The emergence of women and blacks has given us a great deal more input on problems. And so, I'm an optimist about the future . . ."

For a panel titled "An Insider's View of Texas Politics" there was assembled a group of insiders of various stripes—practitioners of politics who have operated from different positions. They included George Christian (moderator), who has served two governors (as well as a president of the United States) and been adviser and consultant to a host of other political leaders; Rodney Ellis, the youngest member of the Houston City Council, who once was legislative assistant to Lt. Gov. Bill Hobby and administrative assistant to Congressman Mickey Leland; Kay Bailey Hutchison, business woman, lawyer, one-time professor and a former member of the U.S. House of Representatives; Dan Morales, state representative from San Antonio who has been cited as one of the "seven best" and "most powerful" members of the legislature, and Julian Read, who began as a sports reporter and emerged as one of the most influential public relations consultants in the state.

Following is some insiders' information elicited from the panel discussion.

GEORGE CHRISTIAN: When I began covering the Texas legislature in the 1940s as a reporter, the legislature was a stereotyped Texas political group if ever there was one. . . . But things have changed. . . . Who is our typical Texas politician today? Is it Mr. Geniality, Bill Clements? Is it loquacious, back-slapping Bill Hobby? Is it that peace-loving, quiet, genteel Jim Maddox? How about the epitome of the red-neck—Good Ole Boy Lloyd Bentsen? Or how about America's Sweetheart, Ma Richards? Who is the typical Texas politician?

RODNEY ELLIS: I basically learned about politics from the grass-roots level, from carrying Bill

Hobby's dress bag to going around the halls of Congress with Mickey Leland. I learned the significance of coalition building, particularly from the vantage point of someone who happens to be Black and interested in Texas politics. I learned that coalition was very important.

KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON: My first introduction into Texas politics was when I was 29 years old and running for the Texas legislature from Houston. I had assembled my campaign team and I was off to my first meeting with a Republican group in my district. A man sitting in the back said, "Young lady, what do you think about the indictment of Congressman John Dowdy over in East Texas for mail fraud?" I gave him the classic Civics 102 answer and said, "I think it is terrible when a public servant misuses the public trust in such a way." He said, "Young lady, don't you know that it's all a part of the communist plot to take over America from the inside?" I went home and I called my campaign manager and I said, "You know, I'm really not cut out for public service. I just don't think I can do this." And he said, "Oh, gosh, I guess I should have told you some of the pockets you would reach in the district before you went out your first time."

DAN MORALES: There are essentially only four major obligations and responsibilities of state government: education, transportation, human services and corrections. And that's it. . . . And if you'll look at the current operations of these areas, I think there is some cause for significant concern. [The courts have challenged the state's activities in all but transportation] . . . So in three of the four major areas of state obligation and responsibility, we are operating today in a crisis fashion. And I think that raises a very legiti-

The Insiders (cont.)

mate question for us citizens: Is that the way state government ought to operate? Ought it to be the case that the only time state government takes any meaningful and significant action is when we have a federal judge banging us over the head with [a] gavel, or when we are responding to some other immediate crisis or emergency?

JULIAN READ: The thing that strikes me is the enormous change that has taken place in Texas politics. [Back in the early 50s] focus groups were somebody that adjusted the camera lens and a poll was something you tacked signs up on. We didn't keep a whole lot of records back in those days. And I guess the best memory of cash that I have is

that it was very respectable. . . . Today TV is an absolute necessity. You must have television. [And] those costs have gone up, up, up, up. So that's where the campaign money is going. . . . It's not that there's some sinister hole you're putting that money into. It's being used to communicate with American people.



Ellis, Hutchison, Christian, Morales, Read

Final Panel: The Scandals

Introducing the final panel, "Texas-Size Scandals," Lynn Ashby said, "Texas without corruption would simply be Oklahoma without football." Later in the discussion, **LEWIS GOULD**, professor of history at the University of Texas, gave this a broader historical perspective: "When you read accounts of Texas state government in the early 20th century, the national press would say how honest the state government was, say, compared to Pennsylvania,

where it was said that the Standard Oil Company did everything but refine the legislature. So these things may go in cycles, but I think the infusion of money and economic progress into the 20th century had something to do with giving people the wherewithal to buy legislators and other [excesses]. . . . We might want to ask how honest a government [the people] want, which is another question that American society has always faced."

Gould traced the case of James E. Ferguson, elected governor in 1914. A complicated skein of events, beginning with his vendetta against the University of Texas (in 1917 he vetoed the entire university appropriation) led to his impeachment and a trial before the legislature where he was convicted of corruption. "The long-term significance of the Ferguson scandals," said Gould, "has to do with the relationship of the state to higher education." Charges that he made in his campaign against the university "were charges that stuck. He said the university had faculty members who were proving in the laboratory that you can't grow wool on the back of an armadillo. And this kind of allegation is one that has remained powerful in state politics. Universities have always been on trial and under the charge that they were somehow impractical and devoted to things the citizenry really didn't [need]. This tension between higher education and the state has never abated. And that, in my judgment, is the most lasting legacy of Jim Ferguson."

The Scandals (cont.)

KEN TOWERY, publisher of three weekly newspapers in Texas, won the Pulitzer Prize in 1955 for a series of stories he wrote on the Texas Veterans land scandals. It involved a fund called the Veterans Land Fund, created by the legislature after World War II, from which veterans were allowed to borrow at low interest. Some politicians and developers found a way to use it for fraudulent purposes. The ultimate effect, Towery said, was to "help speed the development of Texas as a two-party state. . . . It's sad that we had to go that route to get there."

SAM KINCH, JR., veteran reporter, columnist, editor of the state's largest political newsletter, covered the Sharpstown stock fraud scandal of the early 1970s and then wrote a best-selling book about it. It was, as Kinch described it, "a scandal of biblical proportions. It involved conning the Catholic Church and some of its educational enterprises . . . robbing a bank through bad loans . . . buying off some state political figures in order to pass some hokey legislation that would have let state-chartered banks avoid federal regulation." But "what happened in the wake of Sharpstown is the story. . . . At the very next opportunity they had, the voters elected a legislature committed to reform. We got, as a result, reforms . . . which have been institutionalized in the subsequent 15 years. And I figure that for a single political scandal, that wasn't a bad trade-off."

MOLLY IVINS, political columnist for the *Dallas Times Herald*, who in the course of her award-winning career has worked for the *Minneapolis Tribune*, the *Texas Observer* and the *New York Times*, covered the recent revelation of payments to football players at SMU that became known as "Ponygate." "After all the revelations had come out," Ms. Ivins said, "when the board of regents met in an emergency session to consider what finally they had to do about it, the students—hundreds of them—

gathered around outside chanting, 'No more cheating! No more lying!' . . . [A] meticulous, ethical report made by five bishops of the Methodist Church in the wake of Ponygate served a very useful and cleansing purpose for SMU as an institution. I think its faculty, its student body, its new president are all dedicated to the proposition that that kind of thing shall not go on again."

"What," a member of the audience asked, "will be our next great

scandal in Texas politics?"

There was agreement on the panel that if one is to come, it will be in the area of campaign financing.

What might keep the issue from becoming "truly a scandal," Kinch said, would be "a pre-emptive strike, if you will, to change the law. . . . I suspect that if the scandal does not precede the reform, [some] wise legislator will take that up as his or her next crusade."



Kinch and Towery



Ivins and Gould

Connally Reviews His Political Career



John Connally, who has been a power in Texas politics both as a Democrat and Republican, ended the symposium with a luncheon reflection on issues which he has found significant in his long career. Here are some of his observations:

Demands on a Governor

Part of the problem you have in trying to occupy an office like [governor] is to try to achieve something that's worthwhile under the pressures of all the demands that are put on you. Most of the demands are not unreasonable, it's just the accumulation of demands of a big state. You're importuned by all your friends in every city and every county, in every locality, to come and speak and participate in this event, whether it's the watermelon jubilee or the Turkey Trot in Cuero, or something else. The demands on your time are unbelievable, particularly when the legislature is in session. I think this is probably the only time that I've ever made this confession: The reason I didn't run for a fourth term as governor was basically because I didn't want to deal with the legislature any more. Indi-

vidually they're all great. . . . But as soon as the legislature convenes [and] they all come to Austin, they immediately are surrounded by the lobbyists and the seekers of whatever stripe and variety, and are constantly being told how important they are and how strong they are and how valuable their service is. I suppose anybody in public office has to have more than their share of vanity, but you haven't seen anything until you've seen the combined pride and arrogance and vanity of the legislature. . . . There were a number of members of the legislature who were expert at extortion. They were committee chairmen who knew how to extort everything possible out of a governor that could possibly be squeezed out of him in order to get any kind of legislation passed. And they traded and they swapped, and I finally got tired of that. I'm not trying to sound noble—I just felt that every now and then people ought to do what they should do in the public interest without demanding something in return, or without demanding some building in their district or some school in their district or some department appointment.

Attitude on Service

I went into [office] basically with the assumption that I was not going to have a long political career. Most people view me as a fellow who's consumed by political ambition, and that's not true. In 1948, when [Lyndon] Johnson was elected to the Senate, he left vacant the seat in the Tenth Congressional District of Texas. I think I could have been elected to Congress. Homer Thornberry, who was elected, called me and said, "If you're going to run, I'm not going to run." I said, "Homer, I'm not going to run. I don't want to go to Congress." [So] I passed up a chance when I was 31 years old to go to Congress. When I was governor, I think I had a fair chance to be elected to the Senate, but I didn't want to go to the Senate; I didn't want to devote the rest of my life to politics.

So when I went in the governor's office, I like to think that I was in a position to do some things that I thought needed doing. That's why I made education [a priority].

Money

Today there is a great deal of talk about all the money that's raised and the corruption arising from all this money. I saw none of that. I saw in the first place that money was hard to come by in 1962, terribly difficult. We scrounged; we begged, we pled for money, and we found everybody to be quite tight-fisted. We just had unshirted hell trying to raise money. [But] we didn't make any commitments to anybody. . . .

So far as money is concerned, it played no part in the affairs of the governor's office while I was there. We got money from a lot of different sources; we got some large contributions. In those days \$5,000 was a large contribution; most of it was much smaller contributions. But I don't recall one instance where people who contributed to us tried to take advantage of that contribution, not one.

Connally (cont.)

Changes in the System

The system's changed, and I don't think it's nearly as much fun as it used to be. We used to have rallies. In 1938 W. Lee O'Daniel turned out 25,000 people. When I was running in my race for governor in 1962, in the first primary we had a barbecue at my mother and dad's place in Floresville; we had 10,000 people show up. The president of the United States can't get 10,000 people today. Nobody goes to a rally any more. Politics has turned into direct mail and phone banks and professional aides. You look at candidates today [and] you wonder whose words are being spoken, really, because of all the professional help, and you wonder what your candidates think.

You get a feeling today that all of the candidates are manufactured candidates. So I get a rather empty feeling that the average person today is being divorced from a real feeling of participation in and an emotional involvement in a political campaign. How are you going to get emotionally involved over all this direct mail that comes, just raising money and talking about the opposition, how terrible they are? That leaves you pretty empty, really.

But that's the system we have, and I'm not sure that it's a very good system. But maybe one day we'll get

back to a different system where everybody can feel, as we used to feel, that you had something to do with the choice of your candidates.

Regrets

I must say that one of the great disappointments I have is that we didn't do more. You wind up with a sense of frustration. You're confronted with things sometimes over which you have no control; you get involved in all kinds of difficulties that you never heard of, that you have to try to extricate yourself from. You're constantly living in fear of something happening beyond your control. You worry about the legislature, the demands that are put on you. . . .

Believe me, you can only fight so many battles at one time. But even so, when you look at the magnitude of the problems, when you have a vision or an idea of where this state should be and where you should be going, you have an empty feeling that you didn't do enough, that you could have done more and that you should have done more, and that there's something wrong with a system that doesn't permit you to do more.

The Switch in Parties

I don't have any reservations about it, none at all. This is not to

say that everybody who supports the Democratic party is wrong and I'm right, it's just that I'm more at ease now. I had more personal friends, and still do, in the Democratic Party than I do in the Republican Party, and I maintain those friendships. I don't fall out with people over politics. I never did; I didn't when I was in public office. Everybody has a right to think what they want to think. They have a right to advocate what they believe in. So do I, so that's why I changed. But I don't believe everything these hard-line Republicans believe, either. I just happen to agree more, I guess, with more of what they believe.

The Bankruptcy

We've had our trials and our tribulations, and a lot of it is self-induced.

But we suffered the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, and we had no choice but to go into bankruptcy. We took it as best we knew how. But that's a passing thing in our life. We've had misfortunes before; we've had tragedies before. This is not the worst thing that's ever happened to us. It sure isn't the best. But you know, we'll start over. Life isn't over.



Another conference in which the Library, along with the LBJ School, participated was held in Washington, D.C. in conjunction with the Commission on Infant Mortality. It assembled

many former Secretaries of Health and Human Services (and its predecessor Health Education and Welfare) to consider issues relating to children's health. Attending were: Arthur Fleming,

Robert Finch, Elliot Richardson, Joseph Califano, Richard Schweiker, Margaret Heckler, David Mathews and the current secretary Otis Bowen.

Reflections of a Kennedy-Johnson Loyalist



by Walt Rostow

(excerpted from an article in the Los Angeles Times—Ed)

There is in our country a little noted tribal rite. On the birthday of each former president no longer alive a wreath is delivered in the name of the incumbent and placed on the former president's grave. . . . Such a quiet ceremony was held on August 27 at the LBJ Ranch.

Driving back to Austin, I thought of the reported recent remark of Richard Goodwin that he did not expect "Johnson loyalists" to like his forthcoming book. I asked myself: What does being a Johnson Loyalist mean? For I certainly belonged in that category.

In my case, it does not mean that I agreed with LBJ on every occasion or found him without flaw. . . . But Johnson commanded—and his memory still commands—the loyalty of most of those who served with him because of his total commitment to the resolution of the dual crisis he confronted and to his large aspirations for America and the human community.

There was, however, more to it than that. No business was conducted by Johnson without a strand of humor—usually the lovingly told and relevant anecdote. . . . And then there was—only occasionally expressed—a capacity for deeply felt understanding and affection.

I knew John Kennedy well before I knew Johnson. . . . I concluded he would make a great president and committed myself to his support which continued without a breakdown to November 1963. Like many others, I found him an extraordinary mixture of maturity and humor; high spirits and a sense of the possibility of tragedy and the closeness of death; compassion and toughness; short term political skill and far-seeing statesmanship. His friendship, once granted, was steady and reliable and generated an answering intense loyalty.

. . . With respect to Southeast Asia and civil rights, education and medicine, Latin America, India, NATO and arms control there was virtually complete continuity between the policies of Kennedy and Johnson. Some argue, of course, that Kennedy would have taken a different course in Southeast Asia if re-elected in 1964. We shall never know. What we do know is that Johnson built his policy on the foundation Eisenhower and the nation laid in the Southeast Asia Treaty which Kennedy supported. . . .

Kennedy once expressed what he fundamentally shared with Johnson. We had breakfast early on the morning of August 8, 1958. . . . Kennedy reviewed with sympathy, shrewdness and humor his competitors for the Democratic nomination; that Johnson wanted the same things for the country that he (Ken-

Philip Bobbitt, nephew of LBJ, spoke at the President's grave site on August 27. (Another such ceremony was held at the LBJ Grove in Washington, where Horace Busby spoke.)

nedy) did; but that it was "too close to Appomattox" for Johnson to be nominated and elected. He, therefore, felt free to run. . . .

Looking back now . . . I would guess that there is no way the story of America in the 1960s can be told except in terms of the Kennedy-Johnson years of responsibility. Their lives and policies became inextricably intertwined. . . . Between them, they moved the nation radically toward equality of citizenship and opportunity, long as the road ahead remains. And the basic social legislation they sponsored is likely to remain fundamental to our society—having survived successive counter-attacks—so long as we manage to sustain a sufficiently productive economy to support those commitments.

Their place in history is still to be decided; but it was a privileged and moving experience to serve from the first Kennedy to the last Johnson day in their administration. And, whether standing in that country burial ground in Stonewall or looking up at the slope of Arlington Cemetery on the way into Washington from National Airport, I'm glad I knew them.

Varied Programs Enliven Library Activities

Lee White, (right) who was counsel to President Johnson during passage of the landmark civil rights bills, spoke to the International Association of Official Human Rights Agencies at the Library for its 40th annual conference. He illustrated LBJ's ability to "know how to take every resource and turn it toward the goal to be achieved."

"Five or six Civil Rights leaders came in to see the President, very unhappy about something. President Johnson said to me, 'Get hold of Larry O'Brien and tell him to come down with his talley sheet on the Education Bill.' So O'Brien brings down his talley sheet with all the members of the House of Representatives who were voting or leaning toward us, and those who were against us, and those in the middle. The President goes down the list and after about 45 minutes, each of those Civil Rights leaders who came in to raise cain walked out with an assignment to talk to 10 or 15 congressmen to get them to vote the right way. The President said to them, 'This bill is going to be of more significance to the people you represent than whatever you've got to complain about to me, and you can always come back and complain, but that bill is going to be voted on tomorrow.' And guess what? [The congressmen] voted the right way and the bill passed. "That was the way he marshalled his resources to do what had to be done."

Columnist Mark Shields, former President Gerald Ford, comedian Pat Paulsen and imitator Jim Morris discussed "Is Politics a Laughing Matter?" with Liz Carpenter and then came to the Library for a post-performance party.



U.T. historian Michael Hall discussed his recently published biography *Increase Mather, The Last American Puritan*. He recounted his first meeting with Liz Carpenter who, learning of his special interest, said, "Tell me something funny about Puritans." "I have been on the lookout for the last 12 years," he said, "but I still have not found much funny about [them] But . . . I take them and their pretensions a good deal more lightly now than I did then."



George Christian delivered the fifth Frank Erwin lecture at the Library on the eve of the presidential election. His remarks transcended that specific event and reflected on the political conditions of the nation. Some excerpts:

There are some basic, lingering questions about our economic and social viability . . . questions such as an education system that gets more expensive but doesn't produce the right results for an industrial democracy . . . such as long-term care for the elderly when it's clear that our population is growing older and people are living longer . . . such as the perpetuation of an underclass, much of it molded along racial and cultural lines, which saps our resources and breeds social injustice.

Reducing the underclass strengthens the nation in every respect. A competent work force is good for business. People with wages in their pockets are good for the economy and spread the tax burden around. Educated children with ambition for a family and a home and a good job are a lot less expensive to society than prisons full of semi-literate and illiterate convicts.

We have the right to expect our leaders to call for national action when the country is in peril. We are in peril from a lack of national unity and purpose in perfecting our democracy, and only a president can issue that call to arms.

The greatest challenge of our two political parties is to make a difference in the lives of our people—all of our people. Thoughtful political leaders have dealt with this challenge all through our history, while timid politicians have avoided it.

Any president who fails to act on this fundamental issue will preside over an extremely transitory majority.



The presidential election was also the subject of a presentation by Life magazine editor Todd Brewster and Life reporter Peter Meyer, who recounted the highlights of the campaign as they had covered it. They spoke at the Library on the night of the second presidential debate.



An Evening With Lady Bird Johnson

A packed auditorium heard Mrs. Johnson reflect on the experiences which led her to co-author *Wildflowers Across America* with Carlton Lees. Some reminiscences:

My mother died when I was five years old, and I grew up rather alone in a rural area near Karnack, Texas. . . . But I loved being outdoors and ran unhampered down the sandy roads and hedge rows finding dewberries and blackberries and pink climbing roses, and explored the piney woods near my house. The song in the wind in the upper branches of the pine trees is the most evocative symphony I've ever heard.

When I was very young my mother read to me constantly—fairy tales, Aesop's Fables, and the Greek, Roman and Teutonic myths. I fell in love with their heroes and relied increasingly on books for my enjoyment. Sometime soon after Mother's death I must have appeared sad to my father. I remember one night he asked if I would like for him to read to me . . . I had never seen him sit down with a book to read. My eyes widened in amazement to learn he knew how! I thought that anyone who possessed the magic

power to read must certainly want to do it all the time. My daddy's taste ran to Zane Grey and Oliver Curwood, so adventures of the American West and the Northern wilderness of Canada became part of my imaginings.

At the University of Texas, I found my love of books and nature a constant thread. Learning opened the doors of the world for me, and outside I began a romance with the roadsides and virgin fields of the Texas hill country. It was a land of open meadows, with chalky stream banks and picturesque live oaks. Bluebonnets covered the earth in the early spring, and as spring deepened into summer, a heavenly carpet of Indian Blanket and Paintbrush and Coreopsis would appear.

When fate thrust us into the White House . . . I took advantage of the public stage it provided to enlist citizens and communities in "beautification." Although it sounds purely cosmetic—and, alas, we never did think of a better word—it spread to cover not only public plantings but the wider range of clean air, clean water and protection of our parklands and seashores.

When we returned home in 1969, I looked with new eyes at my part of the world. . . . The open fields and meadows had disappeared and in their place were shopping malls, suburbs chock-a-block with housing developments and industrial plants and spaghetti networks of highways. . . . The landscape I remembered had been transformed by progress. . . . Gone were the scenes I loved along with much of the habitat for wildflowers and native plants. I wanted to do something to keep alive the beauty I had known. The founding of the [National Wildflower Research Center] almost six years ago was my way of repaying some of the debt for the delight and sustenance nature has given me all my life.

Why should native wildflowers, plants, and trees command our interest and our concern? Well, to my mind, because they are our national heritage just as our mountains and streams, our forests, and the sight of the fading sun playing on our deserts, giving us the experience of regional identity and pride, saying, "This is New York or Texas or California. . . ."

New Papers Illuminate Whistle-Stop Campaign

In the 1964 campaign, Mrs. Johnson made a unique "whistle-stop" trip through the South. When it came time to publish her *White House Diary*, she found that she had scant documentation of that trip, and she wrote of the lack this way: "As I read back over my diary and prepare it for publication, I am increasingly dismayed that I missed recording some very

important days and nights—including the whole [whistle-stop] campaign." Recently, however, a document was found in Liz Carpenter's Subject Files, which contains Mrs. Johnson's thoughts for Liz to use in preparing the whistle-stop speeches. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 had just been passed, and Mrs. Johnson told Liz not to give her the "easy towns." This

document gives a rare and detailed insight into Mrs. Johnson's thinking for this trip, one she wished to make despite the fact that at the outset, conditions did not promise a very favorable reception. Here are Mrs. Johnson's instructions for this "journey of the heart."—Nancy Smith, Archivist

This tape expresses my feelings on why I am going into the South on this whistle-stop trip . . . random thoughts . . . not polished sentences . . . my own feelings, and maybe not always politic or wise ones. Some threads of this, however, will have to bind together whatever I say in these 28 stops or else it won't be natural.

I want to go because I am proud of the South and I am proud that I am part of the South. I am fond of the old ways of keeping up with your kinfolks—all your uncles and aunts and cousins, right down to the fifth cousin—of long Sunday dinners after church—of a special brand of gentility and courtesy—of summertimes filled with watermelon cuttings and swimming in the creek—and hayrides and visiting for weeks. I knew this well because I visited in Alabama from the time I was six years old until I was 21, every summer for about three months. And I am proud of the *new* South—the glistening new skylines like Atlanta's—of a burgeoning spirit of

growth that puts it second in the nation. I think one can speak truly and proudly of the advances in the South of the economy—of the interest in the arts—of our progress in education.

I am proud of what the South has contributed to the fabric of our national life. From before 1775—and there were Southerners who practically launched this nation—on up to 1964.

And yet now in this decade, there is a shearing apart of the South from the national life. And every time the rest of the nation makes one more snide joke about cornpone or red necks, the defenses of the South go up more angrily. The dividing abyss widens and the curtain becomes thicker and murkier. It is partly the South wanting to pull away and partly the rest of the nation misunderstanding—yes, even laughing, in a way. None of this is right or good for the future of our country. I get letters from my friends down South who say, "Nobody pays any attention to us any more. If we come

to Washington we get a cold shoulder or no attention."

If there is such a feeling—what do I think I and my little trip into the South can do about it? Nothing much. Just sort of say whatever [my] feelings are now, and for the years to come: the South, to this Democratic candidate for President, and to his wife, is a respected and valued and beloved part of the country. The last few months have taught us that Civil Rights is not a problem peculiar to the South, but a problem all over the country. It exists as surely in the big cities in the North and the East as it exists in the states in the South in a way that is a great credit to the local leadership—of mayors and ministers and Negro leaders, white merchants and just plain Joe Citizen. . . .

In short, what I think about the South is that this President is proud of it, feels close to it through his ancestors and through me, and believes that its great future will be more vitally served by the Democratic Party. . . .

From the Library's Archives

January 31, 1969

BOX 8900, UNIVERSITY STATION
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

2450 VIRGINIA AVENUE N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

♦ ORAL HISTORY PROJECT ♦

JOE B. FRANTZ, DIRECTOR

Dear George:

Dr. Joe B. Frantz told me of his conversation with you at Andrews Air Force Base as we were departing January 20th, and I am deeply appreciative of your words as he quoted them to me.

Please know that I value your friendship, as I do your father's, and that I am glad you are one of us down here in Texas.

When you are home sometime, come to see us. Meanwhile, I wish you a long and illustrious career in the Congress.

Sincerely,

Honorable George Bush
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

January 23, 1969

President Lyndon B. Johnson
Stonewall, Texas

Dear Mr. President:

When I spotted Congressman George Bush of Houston in the farewell crowd at Andrews, I asked him why a prominent Republican such as he was seeing you off instead of being in the midst of Republican activities in the city. His reply was a nice tribute to you:

"He has been a fine President and invariably courteous and fair to me and my people, and I thought that I belonged here to show in a small way how much I have appreciated him. I wish I could do even more."

Sincerely,

Joe B. Frantz



An exchange of correspondence relating to LBJ and President-Elect George Bush and a photograph of the two men made in March 1969.

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, Jeff McGuire

Staff Assistance: Yolanda Boozer

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