

# **RUGGED SUMMIT**

**By**

**Tom W. Nichols**

## DEDICATION

To my many friends, with whom I have been classmate, teacher, and fellow-teacher for more than forty years—ex-students of the Southwest Texas State College, whose lives and desire for learning have made possible the institution over which the subject of this book presided for thirty-one years, RUGGED SUMMIT is respectfully and affectionately dedicated.

Tom W. Nichols

## PREFACE

This is the story of a man, of his colleagues and co-workers, and of an era in the history of education in Texas. The core of this story is the biography of Cecil Eugene Evans, but it was impossible to present the life of this man with a true and accurate perspective apart from the whole stage, the cast of actors, and the drama in which he so effectively played his part.

President Evans smoothed the path for his biographer in several ways, the greatest single feature being the little Redbook into which he wrote the minute details of the happenings of his daily life, his thoughts, and his philosophy. Moreover, he kept in well-organized files his "official" correspondence which contained all the ingredients with which to create a history of the epoch in which he played such a leading role.

I am indebted to many persons for help, encouragement, and sympathy, a few of whom are listed herewith.

To the late President John G. Flowers, I am grateful for his generosity in making available records of his office and for his helpful suggestions in the writing of the chapter on the Laboratory School. To Dr. Alvin Musgrave goes my appreciation for his willingness to relieve me of many routine duties and thus increase the time I could devote to this study. Also, my thanks to Vice-President Leland E. Derrick for relieving me of committee duties during this my last year so that I could devote all my spare time to the completion of this task.

To Jesse C. Kellam, ex-student and close friend of the subject of this book, my gratitude for his permission to use his eloquent eulogy delivered at the memorial service for C. E. Evans.

To Dr. Joseph A. Hill, President Emeritus of the West Texas State University, the sole survivor of that valiant band whose struggle preserved and brought to maturity the system of colleges in Texas known as the former State Teachers Colleges, I owe special thanks for his encouragement, his suggestions, and for the use of material of which he is the author.

And, finally, my sincere thanks to Mrs. Bernice Soyars, the only child of President Evans, for her thoughtful and generous help, without which this story could not have been written.

San Marcos, Texas  
May, 1967

Tom W. Nichols

## CONTENTS

I. APPOINTMENT .....	1
II. THE LITTLE REDBOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA .....	19
<i>What It Is</i> .....	19
<i>Multitude of Details</i> .....	20
<i>Proprieties and Improproprieties</i> .....	27
<i>Humor in the Redbook</i> .....	28
<i>The Redbook on Financial Matters</i> .....	33
<i>Redbook Record of the Great Depression</i> .....	37
<i>Redbook List of Faithful Employees</i> .....	44
<i>The Farmer</i> .....	46
<i>Faithful Rotarian and Churchman</i> .....	49
<i>Prohibitionist</i> .....	50
III. FIGHT FOR EXISTENCE .....	51
<i>Beginning of the Conflict</i> .....	51
<i>Church Schools Attack</i> .....	53
<i>Skirmishing Between State Colleges</i> .....	59
<i>Hard Times for Educational Paupers</i> .....	69
<i>Evans Leads the Defense</i> .....	74
<i>Alma Mater Lives On!</i> .....	78
<i>The "Shooting War" Ends</i> .....	83
IV. NUMBERS AND DESTINY .....	90
<i>Foreword</i> .....	90
<i>Claim to Territory</i> .....	94
<i>Counting Noses</i> .....	96
<i>The Problem of Advertising</i> .....	98
<i>Talks and Recruiting</i> .....	104
<i>The Double Value of Extension Work</i> .....	106
V. NURSELINGS OF THE STATE TREASURY .....	109
<i>The Brood Was Too Large</i> .....	109
<i>The Ferguson Rule</i> .....	112
<i>Local Funds</i> .....	120
<i>Funds a la Politics</i> .....	126
<i>Funds for the Summer School</i> .....	135
VI. MONUMENT TO A COLLEGE PRESIDENT .....	142
<i>We Ought to Have a Prayer Meeting!</i> .....	142
<i>Land Hungry</i> .....	145
<i>A Deal With The Governor</i> .....	146

<i>More and Bigger Buildings Needed</i> .....	150
<i>Help From a Regent</i> .....	153
<i>A Break in the Clouds</i> .....	154
<i>Boarding Houses Fade Away</i> .....	156
<i>Paeon of Joy</i> .....	158
VII. THE LABORATORY SCHOOL.....	159
<i>"The Very Heart" of Teacher Training</i> .....	159
<i>The Evans Dream</i> .....	161
<i>Obstacles</i> .....	167
<i>Campaign for a School House</i> .....	169
<i>The Evans Plan Worked</i> .....	172
<i>Ideas—New Versus Old</i> .....	174
VIII. THE FIGHT FOR RECOGNITION.....	176
<i>A College is Known by its President</i> .....	176
<i>With the State Department of Education</i> .....	184
<i>Victory in the Associations</i> .....	187
<i>Also the News Media</i> .....	196
<i>With High School Officials</i> .....	198
<i>And Then the Regents</i> .....	199
<i>Next the Legislature</i> .....	203
<i>Even the Political Leaders of Texas</i> .....	208
<i>At Last, Their Own Faculty</i> .....	209
IX. BRING BACK THE WAYWARD.....	211
<i>First the Preview</i> .....	211
<i>Student Publications</i> .....	213
<i>The College and the Town</i> .....	219
<i>The "Bobcat"</i> .....	222
<i>Other Worries</i> .....	223
<i>Summer was a Tough Time</i> .....	225
<i>When a Regent Takes Notes</i> .....	225
<i>Estill to the Rescue</i> .....	227
<i>That Bad Year, 1925</i> .....	229
<i>The Ominous Beginning</i> .....	229
<i>Dean Brogdon and the Boarding House</i> .....	230
<i>The Summer Rebellion</i> .....	234
<i>The Aftermath</i> .....	239
<i>Lone-Wolf Troublemakers</i> .....	246
<i>The Devil Woman</i> .....	247
<i>The Bear Man</i> .....	250

	<i>Discipline Never Fades Away</i> .....	251
X. REGENTS GOOD AND BAD.....		253
	<i>Briefly, a Foreword</i> .....	253
	<i>Evolution of the Board</i> .....	253
	<i>How Regents Were Selected</i> .....	254
	<i>The Work Regents Do</i> .....	264
	<i>Not All was Harmony and Good Will</i> .....	276
	<i>In a Matter of Discipline</i> .....	282
	<i>Odd Numbers</i> .....	284
	<i>Political Windbreak</i> .....	292
	<i>Finis</i> .....	293
XI. PROBLEMS AND PILLARS.....		293
	<i>Overview</i> .....	293
	<i>The Blake Case</i> .....	296
	<i>The Harry Trouble</i> .....	300
	<i>The Case With the Happy Ending</i> .....	304
	<i>Gates Thomas, The Rebel</i> .....	310
	<i>Others</i> .....	316
	<i>Retirement</i> .....	318
XII. THE SEVENTEEN-YEAR WAR WITH THE DALLAS NEWS.....		320
	<i>Hostilities Open</i> .....	320
	<i>Early Chance for Peace</i> .....	322
	<i>Allies for the Enemy</i> .....	324
	<i>Cease-Fire and Truce</i> .....	328
	<i>Depression and Renewed Conflict</i> .....	333
	<i>More Enemy Reinforcements</i> .....	336
	<i>The News Displays Reason</i> .....	338
	<i>War Weary But No Peace</i> .....	340
	<i>Conclusion</i> .....	346
XIII. WITH POLITICAL FLAVOR.....		347
	<i>Evans' Interest</i> .....	347
	<i>Candidates and Trouble</i> .....	349
	<i>"The Situation in Austin"</i> .....	362
	<i>At The College Door</i> .....	369
	<i>In State Politics To Stay</i> .....	372
XIV. AT CHAPEL.....		374
	<i>Purpose</i> .....	374
	<i>Prayer and Exhortation</i> .....	376

<i>Directions</i> .....	379
<i>Evans Speaks His Message</i> .....	381
<i>Better Speech</i> .....	381
<i>Cigaretts and Liquor</i> .....	382
<i>Excellence</i> .....	383
<i>How to Succeed</i> .....	384
<i>Inspiration and the Bright Future</i> .....	385
<i>War, Patriotism, and Peace</i> .....	390
XV. EVANS AT FACULTY MEETING .....	393
<i>The Presidential Duty</i> .....	393
<i>Be Good and Be Strict With Students</i> .....	394
<i>Work Week</i> .....	396
<i>The Shepherd</i> .....	400
<i>Sermons and Reports</i> .....	402
<i>Recruiting Students</i> .....	405
<i>The Dismal Outlook</i> .....	407
<i>The Sounding Board</i> .....	410
XVI. THE LEADER .....	411
<i>The Setting</i> .....	411
<i>Guide and Critic</i> .....	412
<i>Head of the Council</i> .....	413
<i>Through the Gloom</i> .....	425
<i>Agent and Adviser</i> .....	430
XVII. PRESIDENT EVANS AND THE FUTURE PRESIDENT .....	435
<i>Lyndon on the Campus</i> .....	435
<i>Johnson's Career</i> .....	440
<i>Help With the Laboratory School</i> .....	447
<i>"Bird" Johnson Takes Over</i> .....	448
XVIII. PERSONAL GLIMPSES .....	450
<i>Family Man</i> .....	450
<i>Achievements</i> .....	454
<i>Champion of Student Activities</i> .....	456
<i>Student of Jurisprudence</i> .....	458
<i>Random Snapshots</i> .....	459
<i>Joy and Gloom</i> .....	463
<i>The Evans Creed</i> .....	467
<i>The New Year Greetings</i> .....	470
<i>The Late Years</i> .....	474
<i>Eulogy</i> .....	475



# I APPOINTMENT

On March 24, 1911, Cecil Eugene Evans was appointed "principal" of the Southwest Texas State Normal School at San Marcos. At the head of the school was Thomas G. Harris, a serious, dogmatic, and zealous man, who had been notified in September that he would be replaced at the close of the school year. Harris had held office since the opening of the school in 1903. During the campaign for governor of Texas in 1910, Harris, a very active member of the Anti-Saloon League,<sup>1</sup> had vigorously opposed O. B. Colquitt the "wet" candidate. To Harris, Colquitt represented two of the most undesirable qualities a politician could possess at that time: first, he was an anti-prohibitionist or a "wet"; and, second, in Harris' opinion, he was not a friend to the public schools of Texas.

As a state senator fifteen years previously, Colquitt had voted against a school tax proposal; and Harris, who was then editor of the *Texas School Journal*, severely criticized Colquitt editorially for his stand. John Marvin Smith, who interviewed T. G. Harris in 1930, relates the following:

The history of the controversy between them is somewhat as follows: While Mr. Harris was living in Dallas [where he was Superintendent of the Dallas City Schools, 1891-1893] he assumed the editorship of the *Texas School Journal*, and when he moved to Houston and later to Austin, [at both places as Superintendent of City Schools] he moved the magazine with him. This magazine was an outstanding school publication and made a continuous fight seeking to increase school revenues and to improve teachers' salaries. In connection with a measure looking toward an increase in salaries for teachers Mr. Colquitt declared upon the floor of the Senate, of which body he was at that time a member, that "school teachers are not tax-payers but tax-eaters." In his magazine Mr. Harris took Mr. Colquitt to task, and this

---

<sup>1</sup>See S. S. McKay, *Texas Politics 1906-1944*, (1948) Tech Press, p. 32. McKay explains that the burning issue of the campaign was that of submission of the liquor question to the voters, which had been defeated by extremely small margins in the House and Senate in 1908.

and subsequent articles were responsible for the ill feeling that resulted in the removal of Mr. Harris as principal of the Southwest Texas State Normal School.<sup>2</sup>

In the campaign before the July primaries in 1910, Harris had certainly made no secret of his opposition to Colquitt, and there is evidence that he wrote and talked much and frequently to influence others to vote against this candidate.

Colquitt's friends in San Marcos apparently were not slow in informing him of the stand being taken by this head of a state-supported institution. Therefore, after winning the general election and being duly inaugurated governor, Colquitt notified Harris—by what means is not known—of his dismissal.<sup>3</sup>

The governor then tendered the appointment to F. M. Bralley, state superintendent of public instruction and secretary of the State Board of Education, a man of wide reputation as all educator. However, Bralley, no doubt sensing the opposition which was certain to accrue as a result of the political dismissal of Harris and the equally political appointment of his successor, declined the offer. There is little doubt that Bralley recommended Evans to the governor. Evans had enjoyed for three years the opportunity to make a name for himself throughout Texas as the general agent for The Conference for Education in Texas, an organization well-supported financially and dedicated to the upbuilding of the public schools of the state. The Conference had attracted nation-wide attention because of the successful campaigns which Evans conducted for three school amendments to the state constitution.<sup>4</sup> Bralley, who had formerly been president of the State School for Blind, and was now a very active officer of The Conference for Education, had been in close contact with Evans and his work as general agent, a position Bralley had also held.

Moreover, Evans had been superintendent of the public schools of Anson in Jones County and of Merkel in Taylor County, followed by a very successful period as head of the Abilene Public Schools. Also, Evans had been elected to an

---

<sup>2</sup>Smith, John Marvin, "The History and Growth of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College!" Unpublished thesis, Graduate School, the University of Texas, Austin, August, 1930, pp. 31-32.

<sup>3</sup>See letter of eulogy of Evans written by Colquitt on April 18, 1936, on the 25th anniversary of Evans' administration. The letter is quoted in full in the last chapter of this study.

<sup>4</sup>For a fuller account of this work, see Chapter XVIII of this study.

influential position as president of the Texas Association of Superintendents and Principals, and had been twice appointed as a member of the State Summer Normal Board of Examiners. In fact, he was at one time a member of the permanent board of examiners and had conducted six summer normals that ranked among the largest and best in the state. In addition, he held what was regarded at that time as the rather high scholastic degree of master of arts from the University of Texas.

A few days earlier Evans had boldly requested some prominent men in state affairs to dispatch recommendations in his behalf to the governor. A number of these people sent to Evans copies of their letters to Colquitt. A group of citizens of Abilene signed a petition composed by E. V. White, county superintendent of Taylor County, requesting the appointment of Evans, and mailed it by special delivery to Austin. B. L. Russell, former county judge, a businessman and president of the First National Bank of Baird, wrote Governor Colquitt as follows:

. . . Mr. Evans is in the very prime of life. He is a graduate of the State University, and has had remarkable success as a teacher and superintendent of schools. He is a man of lofty ideals, clean personality, and profound scholarship. As a youth, he chose teaching as his life's work and Texas as a field of his labor, and has given all the energy of his young manhood to the acquisition of a broad and exhaustive study of educational conditions . . . For the past three years he has served in the capacity of General Agent for The Conference for Education in Texas, and in the discharge of his duties in this office has gone all over the state visiting schools, addressing teachers institutes and conventions and making a minute and thorough study of the conditions of our rural schools.

No man in Texas, in my opinion, has a broader acquaintance with the teachers of the state, or has a more intimate knowledge of the condition and needs of our country schools than he. His training in this respect, it seems to me, peculiarly fits him for the duties of a normal principalship; and it is from our normal schools that must come the great body of our rural teachers, and upon the intelligence and refinement of our rural population the strength and perpetuity of our state depends. Mr. Evans' friends and your friends in this part of the state would rejoice at his appointment.

The foregoing very eloquent letter is included here as an example of the recognition which Evans had been accorded in that section of the state.

The governor agreed to place Evans at the head of the San Marcos school, and the latter was notified as already indicated. Evans accepted on March twenty-seventh. It probably was not the salary alone which attracted him, because the actual cash payment to him was only \$2,500 for twelve months. A home was furnished which, according to rental values of that day, amounted to less than \$500 a year in value.

From the correspondence which passed between the friends of Evans, and from newspaper stories and editorials published at the time, it is not difficult to see that there were many school men in Texas who had held out hope that no one would accept appointment to a position which had been made vacant by the manifestation and taint of political spoils. After a brief period, however, those who knew C. E. Evans most intimately showered him with congratulations. Prominent people throughout the state—such as Clarence Ousley, editor of the Fort Worth *Record*; Mrs. Percy V. Pennybacker, author of Pennybacker's *Texas History*; J. D. Sandefer, president of Simmons College; County Superintendent of Taylor County, E. V. White, later dean of the College of Industrial Arts; Joseph W. Bailey, United States Senator from Texas; Walter R. Chapman, attorney, at Anson, Texas; L. T. Cunningham, county superintendent of Jones County, Anson, Texas; and S. M. Sewell, a well-known official of the Texas State Teachers Association—were among those who sent their congratulations.

Mingled with the words of praise and professed pleasure were also expressions of regret that T. G. Harris had been made the victim of the displeasure of an incoming governor. However, there were a few who took the tacit and cautious view that Harris had brought his dismissal upon himself for his dabbling in state politics. There was also a shred of bitterness by one of two school men who also had their eyes on the position. Among these was Oscar H. Cooper, a prominent member of The Conference for Education, who had been president of Simmons College at Abilene—a man with experience in college administration.

One of the elements which contributed to the discomfort of Evans was the defense which Harris undertook almost immediately after being notified of his dismissal. Using the letterhead of the Southwest Texas State Normal School, and dating the missive March 1, 1911, Harris mailed a duplicated

letter appealing to his friends to come to his rescue. But he described the governor's action not as particularly directed toward him but at the school itself. His message follows:

Dear Sir: Governor Colquitt's evident intention at present is to remove me from the principalship of this school at the end of the current session. Inasmuch as no incoming governor has ever disturbed the organization of the normal schools in Texas, it seems to me to be a matter of great importance to our public school system that these institutions should not now be listed among the spoils that belong to the victor in politics. People who know me I think understand quite well that I have never formed the habit of "begging quarter" of an enemy. I do not now feel impelled either by inclination or from necessity to form such habit. I have always felt that, with the assistance of my friends, I could take care of myself and my family. That same feeling is still right vigorous. Hence I do not regard this as a personal matter. It is not an issue that involves my fate alone. The question, it appears to me, is this: Has the man who happens to become governor the right to lay the hand of personal spite and political prejudice upon one of the normal schools? And on that question I am ready to fight.

About three hundred of the best men in this community have voluntarily sent to the State Board of Education as strong an indorsement of my work here for eight years as can be expressed in terms of the English language. Putting aside all questions of egotism and all questions of modesty, I boldly challenge the Board to settle the question by the result of the most searching investigation. No investigation is at present contemplated. On what ground, then, is my removal based? On one or two or all of these: (1) Some fifteen years ago I criticized Mr. Colquitt editorially in the Texas State Journal for his opposition to a school tax measure in the senate; (2) not being in sympathy with Mr. Colquitt, I voted against him last July. That is all, positively all, so far as I know.

Has a school man, has the editor of a school journal, the right to criticize a state senator for opposition to a school tax? Has a school teacher a right to be a prohibitionist? Has a school teacher a right to vote against a man whose political doctrines he cannot indorse? If you think a teacher ought to be protected in these rights and that no governor has a right to try to make teachers afraid to exercise these rights, then I trust you will be ready to do what you can to influence the State Board of Education to see that it would be a crime against public education to drag these schools into this kind of politics.

I suggest that you send your letter to Hon. F. M.

Bralley, secretary of the State Board of Education. If you feel inclined to try to influence others to join you in this movement, I think you will thereby render the cause of education a service.

I think I do not need to tell you that this is in no sense a circular letter, intended for the public. I am sending it to only a few people, all of whom I regard as genuine friends of public education and all of whom are people of prudence and discretion.'

**The** copy of the Harris appeal which reached Evans had been received and forwarded to him by Rev. Cullom H. Booth, pastor of the Methodist Church in San Marcos. On the back of the letter Rev. Booth wrote :

Dear Sir: I trust that you will give this matter your thoughtful attention. It would be fatal to the interests of education in Texas to allow a precedent of this kind to be established. It is time for good men everywhere to speak out. Sincerely,

**This** communication, received in Austin by Evans, without doubt made him realize the magnitude of the storm of hostile public opinion being generated. However, at that time, he had no real prospect of becoming a candidate for the position. The fact that Rev. Booth had been pastor of Evans' church in Austin just prior to his transfer to San Marcos accounts for his selection of Evans to receive the Harris message rather than the chairman of the State Board of Education. The letter shows Evans' concern in attempting to weaken the wave of protest which might be a detriment to his long-time friend, E. M. Bralley, who had been offered the position at San Marcos. At the same time, Evans knew that there was some hesitancy on the part of Bralley to brave the inevitable public criticism which would attend his stepping down from his position in Austin to take the position at San Marcos under the circumstances and in view of the protests he had already received. Therefore, there could have possibly been a glimmer of hope that he, Evans, might yet become the appointee.

Evans' reply to Rev. Booth reads:

Dear Brother Booth: Your letter reached me one day after the Governor announced the election of Superintendent Bralley to the presidency of the Southwest Texas State Normal School. In the event that Professor Bralley does not accept the position tendered him, which is yet problematic, I wish to say frankly that in my judgment it is not

possible for any school man in Texas to do anything to prevent a change. The present State Administration has already passed upon the matter of retention of Professor Harris and is determined to make the change.

Professor Bralley was not an applicant for the position and gave no assurance of accepting the same. I do not believe that any school man in Texas has been so lacking in professional ethics as to work for the removal of Professor Harris in order to secure the place. A number of Professor Harris' friends in various sections of the State saw the Governor early in the year, but their efforts availed nothing. It seems, therefore, that nothing whatever can be done to assist Professor Harris, since his removal has already been agreed upon.

I trust you are having a pleasant and satisfactory year in San Marcos. Yours sincerely.

As is indicated later in this chapter, Evans boasted to a very close friend, E. V. White, that the governor passed over some outstanding men to select him. At least, it is evident that Evans was able to amass and present considerable support for himself to Governor Colquitt. Some of the correspondence which reached the governor is included here to help justify Colquitt in his choice of Evans.

Clarence Ousley, president of The Conference for Education in Texas and, in a sense, therefore, Evans' employer, after writing to the governor on March 21, wrote Evans as follows:

My dear Evans: I take great pleasure in writing to the governor today. While I should regret to see you leave the Conference at this time, I recognize the opportunity that is now, at least, a possibility, and knowing how much it means to you, I am glad to do what I can in your behalf. Yours very truly.

As has been already noted, among those whose assistance Evans had requested in communicating with Governor Colquitt, was his close friend, E. V. White at Abilene, county superintendent of Taylor County. As soon as White received Evans' letter he secured the names of four city superintendents of the area, including the principal of the Abilene High School; three county superintendents; the president of Simmons College, J. D. Sandefer; the president of Britton's Training School at Cisco—a total of ten names—and sent a request in Evans' behalf to the governor. The letter dated March 22 follows:

We have learned from press reports that State Super-

intendent F. M. Bralley has declined the appointment of the principalship of the San Marcos Normal School. Being under the impression that the State Board of Education will consider at an early date the selection of another, we are writing to recommend the appointment of Professor C. E. Evans, who is at present General Agent of the Conference for Education.

First, Professor Evans is a gentleman in every respect, enjoying the confidence of his friends and associates as a man entirely dependable, thoroughly conscientious, and fearless in the performance of duty.

Second, for fifteen years Professor Evans was connected with the schools of West Texas, where he rendered conspicuous service as a superintendent of mature scholarship, strong personality, and unusual executive ability. From personal knowledge, we know him to be a man of administrative capacity, thoroughly capable of coping with delicate and difficult situations. While he is a person of diplomatic turn, he is never lacking in backbone and cannot be swerved from his conception of right. We point with pride to the fact that he has never held a position in any of the schools of West Texas that he did not leave voluntarily and over the protests of his constituency.

Third, Professor Evans' scholarship is a factor that cannot be questioned, and one that commends him to special consideration. In addition to holding a masters degree from the University of Texas, his scholarship has been perfected by the result of many years of diligent study. In this respect, he has the profound admiration of every teacher and pupil with whom he is associated.

Fourth, two years ago Professor Evans was appointed General Agent of the Conference for Education, a position which he has filled with eminent ability and conspicuous service. This position has carried him into all section of the state and has given him the opportunity to study the most pressing needs of our entire educational system—the needs which can be met successfully only through proper training of our public school teachers. The teachers of Texas will most assuredly approve his appointment.

In his letter requesting the assistance of White, Evans confided to his good friend his misgivings about the propriety of his seeking the position. White replied: "As to whether you have made a mistake, I am not prepared to say. I can only say that your friends are prepared to take care of you in this part of



creation and that if your interests suffer because of your present action, it will not be in West Texas." Undoubtedly this was the reassurance much needed by Evans at the moment.

Senator Joe Bailey wrote Governor Colquitt: "Mr. Evans is qualified by character, attainments, and experience to render the state valuable service as the head of any of its educational institutions."

L. T. Cunningham, county superintendent of Jones County, who was well acquainted not only with Evans, but with Mrs. Evans' family, the Maxwells, wrote Evans on March 22:

Through Mr. White by 'phone, I have just learned that you might accept the presidency of the Southwest Texas State Normal College if appointed. Your friends in this section, as well as, I am sure, in other parts of the state, feel that we need you in this position. If we can do anything whatever to make this thing sure, we desire to act at once.

Cunningham mentioned Mr. Maxwell, the aging father of Mrs. Evans, and said: "Mr. Maxwell seems to be jolly, having just left my office after relating to me about his great trip to Toledo. He seems to be in good health again."

After his acceptance of the position there appeared to be a period during which Evans may have entertained some doubt of the wisdom of his action. With certain of his friends he seemed to overdo the effort to justify himself. Shortly after his acceptance he wrote Superintendent White:

The State Board of Education tendered me the position of principal of the Southwest Texas Normal College and after advising with my friends I decided to accept the same. There is no question whatever of propriety in so doing, and no friend has even suggested such a thing, but some have thought that perhaps a little unpleasantness may grow out of the local situation in San Marcos and that no reason can arise for this unpleasantness giving me any trouble; yet a few bitter partisans may for a short time carry some feeling against me. I am not directly, indirectly, or in any other way responsible for the removal of Mr. Harris; my friends did what they could to secure his retention, and it is a significant fact that the men with whom I advised as to whether I should take this position are the same men with whom Mr. Harris advised when seeking assistance to retain his position.

I trust that you and other friends of mine will make known the true situation that no intelligent man in the West may criticize my action. This position was wide open and

would have been filled at once by appointment of some other man, since the State Board had formally decided not to reelect Mr. Harris. I was not a supporter of Governor Colquitt, and in tendering the position to me he passed by some strong teachers in Texas who were personal friends of his. I had been thrown in contact with Governor Colquitt since January, and he had been uniformly courteous to me and I believe he had arrived at the conclusion that I was a good school mail; at least, he advised with friends of his and decided to tender me the place as a result of what he personally knew and what his friends told him.

In a great many places there was sounded an undertone of doubt and dissatisfaction at the whole occurrence. In certain instances resolutions of congratulation and support for Evans were closely followed by expressions of such dissatisfaction as "While we deplore the removal of President Harris . . ." etc.

S. M. Sewell, who later was appointed to the faculty of the College, wrote Evans on April 5. Sewell told of his trip to Stamford, Texas, the previous week to attend a teachers meeting, and reported the attendance of about 180 teachers at the convention. The letter follows: "I was royally received and entertained. I found the teachers favorable to the work of the Conference, and in love with the present leader." Sewell related part of the address of P. W. Horn, a prominent public school superintendent and later president respectively of Southwestern University and Technological College. In referring to the San Marcos situation, Horn said: "I think a man who is able to be president of a state normal is as great as the governor—and sometimes greater." Sewell added in parentheses "hearty applause." Then he mentioned a resolution passed by the teachers group. He added:

The committee on resolutions was divided on the first resolution and offered a minority report which left out the first clause of the resolution—deploring the action of the governor in removing Harris. County Superintendent Williams of Haskell, chairman of the association, appeared before the committee and tried to get them to leave that clause out, but they would not. However, they embodied another resolution commending your appointment.

In a postscript Sewell acknowledged receipt of a letter from Evans and commented:

I am inclined to think that Mr. Horn had but little, if anything, to do with the resolution. There was no discussion upon the matter; I think if there had been, the resolution

would not have been adopted. No, you cannot afford to be drawn into a controversy; neither can you afford to pay any attention to the comments that may be made in regard to either the removal or the appointment. Simply do your duty and let that be the end of it.

Evans found at San Marcos a stalwart supporter and friend in Rev. Cullum H. Booth. As already noted, Reverend Booth was Evans' pastor at Austin before his coming to San Marcos. On April 3 he wrote Evans enclosing a clipping of an article which he had written for the San Marcos weekly newspaper, the Hays County *Times*. The letter follows:

Dear Professor Evans: I was greatly interested in learning from the papers some days ago that you had accepted the principalship of the Southwest Texas State Normal. I have been away from home holding a meeting, and this is my first opportunity to congratulate you and assure you of my personal pleasure in the prospect of having you in San Marcos.

Of course, you are aware of the strong feeling aroused here against Governor Colquitt by reason of Professor Harris' removal. While our feelings toward the Governor in that matter remain unchanged, yet we wish you to understand that we are all ready to accord you a most hearty welcome and to cooperate with you in every way possible to make your administration here a great success.

I can say this to you, not only on my account but also on behalf of the Methodist Church (numbering nearly 800 members), on behalf of the Pastors Association and on behalf of the Normal College faculty. Professor Pritchett, in conversation with me yesterday, told me that I might assure you of the hearty sympathy and support of the entire faculty. I presume that you will be coming over soon to look things over, and I wish to extend to you a most cordial invitation to stop with us at the parsonage. We have an abundance of room, and will be glad to see you at any time.

With kindest regards to Mrs. Evans, I remain,  
Sincerely your friend.

The clipping from the San Marcos newspaper carried the heading, "Concerning Prof. C. E. Evans" by Cullom H. Booth, Pastor of the Methodist Church. It follows:

While I have condemned and do continue to condemn the removal of Professor Harris by Governor Colquitt as entirely indefensible and unjustifiable, yet I wish to most heartily commend to you, the good people of San Marcos, Professor Harris' successor, Professor C. E. Evans. Profes-

sor Evans is a Christian gentleman of the highest type and is already recognized as one of the strongest educators in Texas. Professor Evans was born and reared in Alabama. He is a consistent and active member of the Methodist Church. For three years I was his pastor in Austin and also counted him as a close friend. At present Professor Evans is secretary [sic] of the Conference for Education in Texas. Before coming to Austin he was superintendent of schools at Abilene.

However, although Professor Evans is my personal friend, it does not alter my opinion that Governor Colquitt, in the matter of Professor Harris' removal, without assigning any sufficient reason, has committed a great wrong against the public school system of Texas and that this should be made an issue in the next campaign against him. Still, as good citizens of San Marcos and Texas, we must all stand squarely by Professor Evans and the Southwest Texas Normal that no hurt may come to this great school in which we are all so deeply interested.

CULLOM H. BOOTH.

By way of footnote, it might be well to mention at this point that T. G. Harris was made president of the San Marcos Academy in 1911. In 1912 he used his position, writing on the letter-heads of the Academy, indicating that the message was coming from the president's office of that school, to communicate with county superintendents and others advocating Ramsey, the announced opponent of Colquitt. Superintendent E. V. White of Taylor County, sent a copy of the circular letter to President Evans.

With one possible exception, no evidence is available that any faculty member of the Southwest Texas State Normal School was opposed to Evans. He retained in his private files until his death a few letters written by faculty members expressing pleasure at his coming.

Professor A. W. Birdwell, with whom Evans had been associated a year or two earlier in the work of The Conference For Education in Texas, and who later became dean of the faculty, wrote on March 31 to say:

Dear Mr. Evans: I have just seen notice of your election to and acceptance of the principalship of this Normal.

Of course, I was sorry that a vacancy had to occur, but since it did occur, nothing could give me more pleasure than your election.

I believe you will find the faculty loyal and anxious to,

cooperate with you in making this the greatest school of the kind in the state.

Very truly yours.

No doubt this letter helped to establish firmly between Evans and Birdwell a friendship that lasted the rest of their lives. Reference to their cordial relationship is made in a later chapter of this story.<sup>5</sup>

Evans' answer to Birdwell illustrates his characteristic abrupt, laconic style of expression and his well-nigh irresistible tendency on occasion to boast. He wrote:

Dear Sir: I appreciate very much your kind letter in which you assure me that the faculty of the Southwest Texas State Normal School will be thoroughly loyal. My scholarship, experience in school work, services to the cause of education, and character are sufficient guaranty to progressive citizens in San Marcos that my administration of the affairs of the Southwest Texas State Normal School will be characterized by conservatism, good judgment, and sound professional ideals.

With sincere good wishes, I am

Yours sincerely.

As early as June, 1911, Evans was in touch with certain faculty members concerning the work for the fall term. A letter from P. T. Miller, teacher of physics and chemistry, expressed Miller's willingness to do the work of the registrar and clerk "If the Board will pay me for the work." The work contemplated by Miller would be in addition to his regular duties as instructor. Miller mentioned the desirability of the additional salary to him as he was "anxious to get far enough ahead in the matter of a living to permit me to do some summer work in the North as soon as possible."

Evans' brief contacts with Harris must have been awkward and painful, even though there was every outward show of courtesy and consideration on the part of both men. Evans wrote Harris on March 31:

Dear Sir: It is my purpose to come to San Marcos at an early date and confer with you. Please inform me if you can meet me at such time and place in San Marcos as may be agreed upon later to discuss matters of common interest. Our personal and professional relations during the seventeen years I have been identified with the public schools of

---

<sup>5</sup>See Chapter XVIII.

Texas justify the positive belief that we can discuss all questions pertaining to the welfare of the Southwest Texas State Normal School with perfect freedom, absolute fairness, and friendly feeling. Your prompt reply will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

Only indirect evidence is available of their meeting, and the extreme formality of their correspondence would indicate the embarrassment which each no doubt felt in the presence of the other. At least, there was some sort of communication between them during the interval of March 31 to May 5. The following letter from Harris, dated May 5, 1911, is self-explanatory:

Dear Sir: Referring to the enclosed letter which you recently forwarded to me, I have to say this:

We had a similar letter from this lady sometime ago. We replied by sending her our catalog, and telling her that we were not advised as to the future policy of this school on the question at issue and advised her to write to you on the subject.

When I received this letter from you I expected to see you here yesterday and therefore deferred answering, preferring to discuss the matter with you in person. As you did not come to San Marcos, I am returning the letter to you for your disposition. I think you will agree with me in the opinion that I could not properly outline the future plans or policies of this school.

I am sending you by this mail a copy of our latest catalog.

As previously indicated to you, I shall be ready soon after the close of this session to furnish such material for the next catalog as may pertain to this year's work. Then the matter of a new announcement for next year, setting forth the organization of the school, formulating its future plans etc. will naturally be left to you.

Yours truly,

It may logically be presumed that contacts between the outgoing and incoming presidents of the Southwest Texas State Normal School were kept to the minimum which the politeness of the two courtly gentlemen would allow.

Generally, the businessmen of San Marcos held aloof from the affairs of the College. The only communication of which there is a record during the interval before Evans assumed office was a letter from the president of the First National Bank,

dated March 29, combining congratulations and solicitation for the new college president to do his banking business with that financial institution. Whether this letter pleased or displeased Evans cannot, of course, be established, but from numerous private statements which he made in later years concerning the breach of certain proprieties it is not surprising that he did his banking business with the rival State Bank and Trust Company.

Evans received a cordial welcome by the Alumni Association of the Normal School on the occasion of the meeting of that organization May 13, 1911. It is still of interest to the many hundreds of students who have gone through the College to learn that at that early day the student body was attracted from such wide areas of the state. The following list of officers and their addresses is included here to illustrate this fact:

President, H. A. Nelson, San Marcos.  
First Vice-President, J. L. Hall, Robert Lee.  
Second Vice-President, Mrs. O. T. Kirksey, Manchaca.  
Recording Secretary, Miss Adeline White, Matado .  
Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. W. C. Vernon, San Marcos.  
Sergeant-at-Arms, Miss Aileen Hague, El Paso.

A news story in the *Star*, the student newspaper, declared the occasion a happy one with the largest number in attendance in the history of the organization, every class from 1903 to 1911 being represented. A resolution was adopted by the group as follows:

WHEREAS, the man who has so efficiently guided the interests of the Southwest Texas State Normal School since its organization will no longer be directly connected with this institution, and

WHEREAS, his successor is a man eminently qualified to conduct the work so efficiently begun,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that we, the members of the Alumni Association, express our sincere appreciation for the services rendered this school by our beloved Principal, Mr. Thomas G. Harris, and, further be it

RESOLVED that we pledge our heartiest support, and extend our good wishes to Mr. C. E. Evans, and hope for him the same success that has attended our retiring principal.

r

There appear to be no reasons whatever to suspect that Governor Colquitt ever regretted his action in placing Evans in the head position at the San Marcos Normal School. Through

the years occasional correspondence passed between the former governor and President Evans. In November of 1911 Colquitt wrote Evans the following letter:

Mr. C. E. Evans, Superintendent,  
Southwest Texas State Normal,  
San Marcos, Texas.

Dear Sir:

I expect at an early date to announce the members of the board of regents for the normal examiners [sic] under the new law. It is my intention to appoint no one from the town where one of these institutions is located. I want, as far as possible, to delocalize these institutions.

I wish you would submit me four or five names from among those in adjoining counties to yours whom [sic] you think will take an interest in the management of these institutions, from which I may select one man for one member of this board.

Of course, I do not, by this letter mean to convey the impression that I will select anyone recommended by you, but will be glad to have recommendations from you. Kindly let me hear from you without delay.

Yours truly

O. B. Colquitt, Governor

There is no record of the recommendation of Evans, if any, but the fact that the governor called upon him for this assistance showed, at least that his confidence in Evans' judgment was not entirely lacking.

One year later Governor Colquitt appointed President Evans to serve on the Textbook Board. On August 15, 1912, the governor wrote:

I hereby tender you an appointment as a member of the Textbook Board provided by an act passed by the special session of the Thirty-Second Legislature. I invite your special attention to the terms of said law, and ask you for your cooperation in every respect in complying with that statute.

I ask you to keep this appointment confidential until it is announced by me. I sincerely solicit your assistance in adopting a high-class set of textbooks, and I feel sure that you will cooperate in every particular in giving the State of Texas a clean adoption of books, free from just criticism. Please advise me if you will accept on these terms.



Evans accepted this appointment gratefully and served on the Board until its abolition by statute in 1928.<sup>6</sup>

Some of the letters written to the former governor by President Evans seemed to be for the purpose of keeping Colquitt informed of the progress of the College under Evans' administration. Uniformly these letters to the former governor referred to the "appointment" of Evans by Governor Colquitt, rather than to his "election" by the Board of Education. Always, too, the messages in these letters stated or implied unmistakably that the confidence of Colquitt in the new head of the San Marcos school had not been misplaced.

In 1917 when the Board of Regents of the State Normal Schools acted to transfer President Evans from San Marcos to the presidency of the proposed new college at Alpine, a letter concerning the contemplated move was immediately sent to Colquitt. On September 1, 1917, Evans wrote:

Dear Governor Colquitt: March 2, 1911, you tendered me the position of President of the Southwest Texas State Normal School, and at that time I stated to you that whenever in the future I gave up the position, I would be able to submit to you a record of results of which you could be rightfully proud. As I am soon to transfer from the Southwest Texas State Normal School to the Sul Ross Normal College at Alpine, I am briefly making mention of some things, as a matter of history as well as a matter of interest to you.

When I came to San Marcos in 1911, conditions were exceedingly difficult and unfavorable. I found all around me a critical disposition, and this attitude even went to the length on the part of many in expressing doubt as to my ability to stay in San Marcos more than one year. Public sentiment was not disposed to be cooperative and helpful. The situation changed very much the second and third years and at the end of the sixth year antagonism has entirely disappeared, and I find all factions of people in San Marcos decidedly friendly, and nobody thinks that a mistake was made in my appointment to the presidency of the Southwest Texas State Normal School.

Evans also mentioned the fact that the enrollment had more than doubled during the six years, and that there was a unanimous expression of regret that the board of regents had trans-

---

<sup>6</sup>For a full history of the work of the Texas State Textbook Commission, see Evans, C. E., *The Story of Texas Schools*, The Steck Company, Austin, 1966, pp. 394 ff.

ferred him to Alpine. He concluded with the statement: "I do not believe that it would be at all egotistical to say that the Southwest Texas State Normal School commands the confidence of school men of the State to a very high degree." He further expressed his appreciation for the many favors shown him during the years.

Colquitt replied promptly:

My clear Sir: I appreciate your letter of the first very much. I was satisfied you would make good and be able to overcome all the luridness of the opposition by the friends of Mr. Harris.

I am very sorry, though, that they have transferred you. I understand the Legislature may repeal the laws creating the new normals altogether, or at least suspend the appropriation for them. I wish they had let you remain at San Marcos, though it may be your wish to go to the new institution.

With all good wishes, I am

Yours truly.

It seems appropriate at this point to take notice of the fact that the order of the regents was countermanded in view of the probability that the rising tide of war made appropriations for any new colleges highly unlikely. In a later chapter reference will be made to the problem created for Evans by the prospect of his transfer to Alpine.<sup>7</sup> For the present chapter, however, the writing of the letter to O. B. Colquitt and the latter's reply seem to be a fitting close to the most important event, perhaps, in the life of C. E. Evans, his appointment to the presidency of the College.

---

<sup>7</sup>See Chapter X.

## II THE LITTLE REDBOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA

### What It Is

In many photographs of C. E. Evans he is shown holding in his hand a small, vest-pocket-size book, with a red leatherette cover. Thousands of Evans' acquaintances throughout the years came to associate him with the handy little memorandum book, always within easy reach in the inside pocket of his coat. The uses to which he put the little Redbook<sup>1</sup> were so numerous that it would be impossible to list all of them. The memoranda collected in the book served him well. Gifted with a remarkable memory, he supported it with a store of usable facts that became part of the secret of his success in life. The book was a guide to his everyday activity—a sort of chart and compass that steered him around the blunders of forgetfulness that plague the average person. Important ideas were rarely lost in the press and strain of his many-sided life, for he captured them as they came with a quick note in the Redbook and later polished and perfected them, at times with many revisions.

He noted in the Redbook any disturbances of whatever nature which occurred in connection with the management and control of the College or in his private affairs. If a faculty member failed to perform his duty, a note went into the Redbook; and if the same faculty member showed signs of dissatisfaction or was guilty of questionable conduct, the evidence against the teacher was carefully accumulated, dated, and documented.

If Evans anticipated trouble, a memorandum kept him alert for it. If he planned to call in a troublesome student or employee, or if an irate parent requested a hearing, the subject matter of these interviews was written in the Redbook, and the details were rehearsed so that he would be able to act with the support of complete information.

Probably the strangest feature of the *Little Redbook Encyclopedia*

---

<sup>1</sup>To anticipate any question which may occur to any reader, the name Redbook was not given the vest-pocket notebook by this writer, and it has no connection with *The Little Red Book* copyrighted in 1957 by the Coll-Webb Company and published for the very excellent program of Alcoholics Anonymous.

*clopedia* was its preservation through a period of more than half a century. In the collection there are **143** of the little books, each carefully dated and indexed, and there is not a single gap from the beginning to the end. The first books are dated during the time of his first experience as a public school superintendent, and average slightly more than three a year; some years, being heavy with matters Evans thought it necessary to record, required as many as six books. In other years as few as two books were sufficient. And the time of creating and keeping these records extended to the end of his life.

The average size of the books was less than that of a three-by-five card. There seemed to be times when he was unable to obtain the exact size he preferred, some being about six inches in length and about two and one-half inches in width. A few had black or green covers, but red prevailed overwhelmingly, and hence the designation by his friends all over the state of "Little Redbook."

Jokes were made by his friends, outside of college and on the faculty, by students—and more often by the alumni—about Evans' reference to the book. He could carry on a conversation at the same time he was searching for a detail in the book. Students in the early days pretended to believe that if one's name ever got into the Little Redbook it meant doom.

The Redbook forms a very good diary of President Evans. From it alone one could piece together a history of the College during his administration. In addition, one may find thousands of events in his personal and business life, his political beliefs, a thorough treatise on the conduct of college students and faculty, and numerous suggestions of the way to be an efficient college president. As an example of the latter, he listed in the Redbook in 1930 the following note: "Pitfalls for a President: (1) Attempting too much. (2) Outrunning public sentiment. (3) Mixing in local jealousies, etc. (4) Dodging essential problems. (5) Failing to learn from his enemies."

### Multitude of Details

How any man could possibly attend to the innumerable details involved in his duties as president of the College can be explained by the systematic, day-to-day recording of the items

to which he gave his attention, Given here are a comparatively few samples, and this record will not go back before 1911 when he became president.

Among the first entries in the book of 1911 there is indication of Evans' worry about attendance at chapel, which, at that time, was held every day and was compulsory for all students and faculty. He assumed the duty of providing a suitable program for the thirty-minute service. Moreover, he assumed the sole authority to grant excuses from chapel. The Redbook contains the names of students who were excused, the dates, and the specific problems connected with each. The following notation made in December illustrates one case: "Amanda Dean working at Mrs. Rabe's. 'Phone Mrs. Rabe about letting her off in time for chapel."

Two days after Christmas, on December 27, 1911, under the heading "Normal Problems," he showed that his mind was leaping ahead to the return of students and to chapel attendance. He listed the following: "(1) Chapel—order of exercises—checking absences. (2) Pupils excused (announcement of names) during day, by whom excused, for what excused. (3) Reports at end of term. Absence of teachers. (4) Payment of substitute teacher—by whom?"

There were unbelievably petty details such as, "Stamps and stationery needed"; "See Miller about lights in library." "Stove in girls' rest room." "Blackboard for Mr. Brown." "Mrs. Ward —~~m~~ observance of study hours."

The last note was crossed out. Mrs. Ward was the house mother at a girls' boarding house. He had always entertained a dread of facing boarding house keepers—especially women—if there were any kind of controversy.

"More coal needed," began the memoranda, and there followed a list of names, presumably dealers. "Plumbing—see Talmadge Hardware." "Inventory of property." At this point he interrupted the details with a special note underscored: "Superintendent Spencer of Lockhart wants a teacher for four months. Salary \$50 per month. See Nelson."

It appears that he had a secretary, Miss Allred, and that one of his worries was finding work to keep her busy. Under a heading in the Redbook dated January, 1912, Miss Allred was to check absentees and tardies and have all call at the office before

leaving school. Apparently he dealt personally with students who were absent or tardy.

He even listed his own duties. For example, under the heading "Program of Work," he listed the class which he taught — "History of Education, Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, 11:05 to 11:45." "Supervision of janitors and general oversight of buildings, daily." Then followed, "See to widening of walk." "Accounts, bills, receipts and orders, monthly payroll." "Conferences with teachers. Conferences with students." "Supplies needed."

At times there would be listed a matter requiring attention, which he never found time to attend to. In a few weeks, he would pick up the notation and move it up to current memoranda. Actually, in spite of his attempts to budget time, he preferred to let his impulses and the needs of the moment govern his activities. He found it difficult to follow a schedule. Sometimes after making a memorandum he would apparently forget it.

Faculty members through the years have laughed at being requested to come to the president's office, arriving only to find him gone, perhaps checking on a construction project or planning a new one. At other times he would forget the reason for sending for the person, would ad-lib for a while and then dismiss him.

On February 19, 1912, he made a note that Miss Hines was to have a bookcase. On the 24th under the heading "Unfinished Business," he again wrote, "Bookcase for Miss Hines," mentioning also that janitor service in a certain building was to be inspected, and adding still another memorandum simply reading, "Architects."

His visits to out-of-state teachers colleges were recorded first in 1913. He formed close friendships with presidents of some of these colleges, one in particular, President T. W. Butcher of Emporia, Kansas. At that time Emporia had what Evans regarded as a large faculty of 80; three men and four women in the department of physical education alone. Another was President John R. Kirk of Kirksville, Missouri, where the faculty numbered 60. The faculty at San Marcos then numbered 26. All these facts were recorded in the little book.

The first mention of an automobile was made in 1913.

Part of the Christmas holidays of 1913 were spent by President Evans in supervising the work of one man on the

campus. Beginning on December 24, the man, W. J. Moore, with a team of mules worked on the grounds, and Evans was the timekeeper, this information being recorded in the Redbook. The pay was \$4 a day for man and team.

On January 20, 1914, he took notice of umbrellas in the halls and in corners, and to this he objected. The next day he mentioned his objection in chapel.

On July 21, 1914, there appeared a memorandum that a "resort for bathing" was under consideration—no doubt the beginnings of the famous Riverside area on the San Marcos River.

No detail of daily happenings was left unnoticed; two lines revealed that "Grace Moore lost \$1.35. Boy confessed." The very next note showed additions to his problems: "Toilet in old house to be moved on porch. Rooms need papering. Roof leaks."

All pages in this book being filled, there was written on the inside of the back cover one word, espionage, with no comment or even the definition. At that time the word probably was in far less common use than it is today or has been in connection with historical events of recent years.

In 1915 and in many other years there were pages of cost records for the operation of the library, for repairs and improvements to the various buildings about the campus, for summer school, and for salaries of persons employed and also by entire departments. State funds and local funds were carefully kept separate, and a month-by-month budget was kept so that the amount available for any certain purpose would not be overdrawn and also that no money would lapse to the state treasury because it was not used.

In 1915 Evans began taking an interest in athletics. One notation was to the effect that:

(1) Athletics promote physical strength, agility, dexterity and swiftness.

(2) Athletics develop intellectual qualities such as quickness, alertness, and ability to take care of self in a crisis.

(3) Athletics develop moral qualities of self-control, self-reliance, courage.

(4) Develop social qualities of cooperation—team work.

(5) Powerful agency for promotion of school spirit.

Dangers:

(1) Undue emphasis upon winning.

(2) Sacrifice of scholarship, may lead to professionalism.

(3) Normal standard--conduct and class record must be satisfactory.

In the fall of that year, he made a note to see Smith about a football team.<sup>2</sup> The note continued: "Players must maintain scholastic standing." He also added, "Basketball team of boys without clothes." On November 17 he made another note: "See Smith about Martindale game." No other record has been found of a Bobcat team playing against Martindale, a village some five miles from San Marcos.

In 1915 Evans was his own head janitor. On October 10 of that year he listed directions as follows:

(1) Sweep rooms each day if possible and dust desks, chairs etc.

(2) Toilets.

(3) Blackboards.

(4) Window panes.

(5) Lost articles turned over to Y. W. C. A. or Normal Exchange.

(6) Umbrellas, hats, books, etc. found in corners of halls or on fire hose will be removed by janitors each day.

About this time he wrote a long list of "do's and don'ts" for students, the most significant of which suggested "Tiptoeing in halls."

A note at Christmas time, 1915, revealed the bigness of the Evans heart and his compassion for unfortunate students. A few students—a very few, indeed—had no home to go back to when the Christmas holidays arrived. He requested all of these students to leave their names with the dean of women, and he usually talked to each one and learned about the situation which each faced. One case which illustrates the attitude of Evans toward these students, is typical of events which occurred several times during the years.

A young man out of an orphan's home turned his name over to the dean of women, giving as his reason for remaining on the campus, "I have no other place to go." The student was already on the payroll as a part-time house painter. Evans provided full-time work for him during the holidays, and invited the boy to his home for Christmas dinner.

---

<sup>2</sup>Evans was referring to Spurgeon Smith, well-remembered professor of biology,



The electric bell system in the College was always something of a headache, and still is. On August 4, 1916, a little over fifty years ago from the date of this writing, Evans made a note in the Redbook: "Bell rings in Science Building five minutes easy." At that time, the College was using storage batteries for electric power. Besides lights, there were few other appliances operated by electricity.

In 1919, next to a note to request "Lynton Garrett to clean out from under training school building," there was this note, which probably had no connection with the one before it: "If brains stop work, the world does not stop but goes backward. Brain labor must get more than hand labor."

The condition of Evans' personal finances is revealed by a continuing record in the Redbooks of 1923. This record was of a series of small loans made to the president of the College by the business manager, the money apparently coming from petty cash. The series, in part, runs as follows: "1/31 \$6.00 — 2/8 \$10.00 — 2/13 \$7.00 — 2/14 \$5.00 — 2/19 \$6.00 — ~~2/20~~ 2/20 \$4.00 — 2/27 \$6.00 — 3/5 \$10.00 — 3/11 \$32 — 3/23 \$5.00 — 4J2 \$30.00 — Total \$121.00." The most likely explanation seems to be that these sums were taken as advances, in effect, on his salary. The writer has heard the business manager, C. E. Chamberlin, comment on the fact that President Evans never made an error in his records nor failed to pay back these advances.

In 1923, the Redbook shows that Evans was considerably alarmed by a crack appearing in the wall of the Main Building, and he wanted to remember to tell Miss Fisher, his secretary, to send word to Boucher and Clayton.<sup>3</sup> Incidentally, too, he added a note to tell Miss Fisher to be careful about the kind of paper used for copies of correspondence mailed.

On January 1, 1924, he made notes as follows:

- (1) See whether the hospital has fire protection apparatus.
- (2) Fix hole in ceiling of garage room apartment.
- (3) Return Donalson's team.
- (4) Check on gambling in boarding houses.
- (5) Telephone connection for Wimberley and Williams.<sup>4</sup>
- (6) Bolton<sup>5</sup> to build hogpen.

---

<sup>3</sup>Boucher was the professor of industrial arts and Clayton was the college mechanic.

<sup>4</sup>Two of his most trusted maintenance employees.

<sup>5</sup>Foreman of buildings and grounds crew.

- (7) See Wade<sup>6</sup> ask about Hughson's<sup>7</sup> note.
- (8) Send cut of Miss Brogdon's<sup>8</sup> picture to newspapers.
- (9) Meet the church committee.
- (10) Wimberley, wash windows and ventilators in auditorium, also radiators in offices and library.
- (11) Student nightwatchman
  - (a) No substituting except with knowledge of Chamberlin or President.
  - (b) Notify office when key or lock is broken and door open.

The memoranda for another day, December 12, 1926, revealed that Evans wanted to:

Tell Tom Nichols :

- (1) Faculty meeting 4:00 P. M. Tuesday.
- (2) Antonio<sup>9</sup> to clean house Monday.
- (3) Bolton to report number of loads of dirt or rock moved and time of hands. Start setting out trees.

In 1927 the Redbook was penciled with an interesting discovery for Evans. He had run across an establishment named New England Cafeteria that served peach cobbler, butter beans, baked Irish potatoes, banana and orange salad, cornbread—two pieces—and tea. All for 39 cents.<sup>10</sup>

Just below the foregoing was the following quotation: "No fellow in the wrong can stand up against a fellow in the right who looks him in the eye and keeps on a-cornin'." —Bill McDonald.

The Redbook for the first part of 1929 indicates that Evans was called upon constantly to recommend ex-students and others with whom he had taught or worked. There are many names and addresses and notations concerning recommendations that were to be written. This writer was well aware of these many requests, for he had learned to watch for the Redbook when Evans started dictation of a letter. If the book came out, he knew to get the name and address with all numerals and spellings correct, for that would be his only chance to check on the correctness of these items.

---

<sup>6</sup>Cashier of State Bank and Trust Company.

<sup>7</sup>Tenant on Evans' farm.

<sup>8</sup>The incoming dean of women.

<sup>9</sup>One of the faithful handymen about the campus.

<sup>10</sup>Evans was a light eater and was never burdened with overweight. Former Dean of the Faculty Alfred H. Nolle tells with a smile the story of a trip to a distant city. While President Marquis of Denton dined at a most fashionable hotel, President Evans took his meals at a little out-of-the-way "Greasy Spoon" resturant.

At times the Redbook was used in the place of check stubs. Instead of recording the check on a regular stub, Evans would list it in the Redbook. There were never very many of these in any one book, and it is doubtful whether they were complete in showing Evans' outstanding checks.

Evans was not a scientist, but he was very much interested in the achievements of scientists. As a matter of fact, any successful effort which brought fame and recognition was praised by Evans and noted to his staff in the spirit of "Go thou and do likewise."

The Redbook served as notes for many of his speeches. Evans was always interested in the Texas State Teachers Association, having been a public school teacher himself and being mindful of the needs of the public schools. On November 25, 1937, he was called upon to introduce one of the candidates for the presidency of the TSTA. Notes found in the Redbook indicate what he said:

The man who aspires to the highest honor of TSTA should be a man who came up through the ranks of public school teachers and who knows Texas schools and their needs. He should be an outstanding teacher whose merit, service, and ability will add prestige and influence and honor to the Association. He should be not only a good classroom teacher but an outstanding leader whose record in the public schools of Texas should be his platform and his eulogy. Such a man is R. H. Brister of Waco!

To other details found in the Redbook should be added the long list of book titles published through the years, titles which attracted Evans' attention. Many of these were ordered for the College library and many others were added to Evans' private library.

For at least ten years, 1931 to 1941,<sup>11</sup> there appeared regularly in each book the address of Lyndon B. Johnson. Evans took a great interest in the first campaign of Johnson for the seat of the late Congressman Buchanan in 1941. The campaign was opened in the College auditorium.

### **Proprieties and Improprieties**

During the first year of President Evans' work at the College, the Redbook reflected his troubled mind over the pe-

---

<sup>11</sup>See Chapter XVII of this study.

rennial problem of the conduct of college students. His notes are, essentially, snapshots of what he observed all about him. On November 30, 1911, he listed several observations including the problem involved along with each. He listed the following:

1. The town-goers and their control.
2. How to keep up with girl in town.
3. The postoffice; meeting relatives at train; out-of-town trips; holidays; buggy riding.
4. Stealing of books.
5. Three young men standing on corner waiting for normal girls to pass; and then young men following.
6. The number of wives in San Marcos who came to Normal School but stayed to be wives and mothers of local men.

With the last note, Evans seemed to imply that possibly some of the inky clouds he was seeing could have linings of a brighter hue.

At the same time, the Redbook passed adverse judgment upon the local motion picture shows because the management would not cooperate in enforcing proper conduct of young couples. It also placed "off limits" Rio Vista Park and the fish hatchery. But, strange to say, he showed no opposition to dancing. He realized that the time had not arrived when dancing would be approved by a majority of parents, but the little book hints that with proper supervision dancing might become a permissible entertainment for students.

Evidently even at that early date he was already longing for the time when most of these problems could be placed in the laps of the deans.

On a few occasions Evans would call the men students together for the purpose of delivering them a man-to-man talk. On March 27, 1912, he made notes in preparation for such a talk as follows:

Boys—

1. Responsibility for girls—protection to girls.
2. Outhouse.
3. Drinking.
4. Pool hall—questionable places.

### Humor in **the Redbook**

Evans had what a friend of his described as a "limited but unique sense of humor." The cartoonist Bill Mauldin wrote that he got considerable amusement from the reaction of people to

his cartoons. At some, which he thought were downright funny, no one else even smiled; and others which he intended to be serious were, for some people, uproariously funny. Evans' choice of jokes which he copied into his little books probably would meet a reception not unlike Mauldin's cartoons. Some of these jokes Evans copied into each new book, year after year. He seldom bothered to select a joke with which to illustrate an idea. To him, if the joke was funny, it didn't matter in what connection it was told.

Some of Evans' most-used jokes are presented here in the belief that no picture of a man is quite complete until one learns the character of his jokes. Let it be said emphatically that the term "smut" could never be applied to the jokes Evans enjoyed. The subject matter of them is too widely diffused to suggest where he may have picked them up. Indeed, some date back to antiquity. Here are fifty of them in chronological order as they appeared in the little books, with no attempt to classify them as to subject matter. The numbers given these entries have no significance other than as convenient reference.

1. A lady presented her husband of one year with a book, "A Perfect Gentleman." A few years later, with a book, "Wild Animals I Have Known."

2. A drunk meets an apparition whom he recognizes as the devil. "Shake, old boy," he said, "I'm your brother-in-law. I married your sister."

3. "When I got through speaking, there were no people to hear me except a deaf man and a blind man, and the blind man was trying to lead the deaf man away."

4. Teacher's question: "If 15 sheep are in a pasture and six jump the fence, how many are left?" Farm boy's answer: "None. All the others would follow the first six over the fence."

5. Pat and Mike, eating horseradish, with tears in their eyes: "And what are you crying about?" asked Pat. "I'm crying 'cause my mother in Ireland died many years ago. And what are you crying about?"

.. 'Cause it's such a pity you didn't die when you mother did!"

6. Somebody crossed mosquitoes with fish and guaranteed a bite every second.

7. Country teacher cashing monthly voucher when the cashier apologized for soiled bills and added: "I hope you are not afraid of microbes."

"No. I'm sure no microbe could live on my salary."

8. A fisherman in Colorado: "Any trout out there?"  
"Thousands."

"Will they bite easily?"

"They're absolutely vicious. A man must hide behind a tree to bait a hook."

9. Etiquette is saying "No thanks" when you want to holler "Gimme!"

10. "An awful predicament," said the man. "I came home and wife asked me the time. When I said "twelve," that cuckoo clock sang out three times, and I had to stand there and cuckoo nine more times."

11. It's so dry in Arizona that bullfrogs five years old have never learned to swim.

12. Professor in chemistry class to a student in ministry who was taking chemistry as a required course: ("What would you do for a patient who has swallowed oxalic acid?"  
"Administer the sacrament."

13. There was once a pious young priest  
Who lived almost wholly on yeast.  
"For," he said, "it is plain  
That we must all rise again,  
And I want to get started, at least!"

14. Train robber, ordering all to throw up their hands, announced: "I expect to rob all the men and kiss all the women." One man stood up and vigorously objected, when a homely old maid spoke up and said, "Sit down. He's robbing this train!"

15. Sambo agrees to stay all night in a haunted house for two dollars. There follows a three-day search for Sambo, but he cannot be found. On the fourth day Sambo enters the village.

Everybody: "Where you been these four days?"

"Ah been comin' back."

16. "Your honor," said the bailiff, "your bull pup chewed up the court Bible."

"Well, have the witness kiss the pup. We can't adjourn court just to get a new Bible."

17. Preacher, stung by a bee: "Be calm, brothers. I have the word of God in my mouth and the love of God in my heart, but I've got hellfire in my britches!"

18. A country preacher in Mississippi was interrupted in his sermon by the braying of a mule which had stuck its head in the church window. The preacher asked if anyone in the congregation knew how to stop the mule from braying. The answer came back: "Tie a stone to his tail."

The preacher then said solemnly: "Let him who is without sin tie the first stone."

19. A Republican and a Democrat met in Florida. The

Democrat said his father was a Democrat and his grandfather was a Democrat.

The Republican said, "If your grandfather was a fool and your father was a fool, what does that make you?"

"A Republican."

20. Two old codgers quarreling. One said, "I'll law you to the district court."

The other said, "I'm willin'."

The first then said, "I'll law you to the supreme court."

"Go ahead, I'll be there."

The first one said, "I'll law you to hell."

The other said, "All right, my attorney will be there."

21. Poor teacher: "I was poor for many years, but finally I became wealthy through industry, economy, conscientious effort, indomitable persistence, and the death of a rich uncle who left me \$74,950."

22. A doctor took in a young partner, and the partner cured a ten-year patient of a chronic illness. The older doctor said: "I intended to put my son through college on that patient's illness."

23. Jellybean—a boy who buys his girl a five-cent drink and then tries to squeeze it out of her.

24. Judgment Day. Man sitting at the head of his own tomb reading epitaph: "Either the person who wrote this didn't know me, or I came out of the wrong hole."

25. A man asked for the loan of a donkey but was told that the donkey was not in the stable. The man said: "But I hear a donkey braying in the stable."

The other replied, "What! Do you take the donkey's word before mine?"

26. "My wife must have tea for breakfast, and I must have coffee."

Then you have both coffee and tea?"

"No. We compromise; we have tea."

27. The prize for ugliest face was given to old Zeke, and Zeke said he wasn't even in the contest.

28. Little Boy's story: "A man who owned some bears lived in a cave. Some boys threw stones at the man, and he told them if they kept on throwing stones he would turn the bears out and they would eat the boys. They did, he did, and the bears did,"

29. After many years, a man decides to take his wife some flowers. She meets him at the door and bursts out crying: "The children came home sick, the electricity is cut off, the cook quit, and now you come home drunk!"

30. A man charged with deserting his wife: "No, Judge, I ain't no deserter; I'm a refugee."

31. A salesman tried to sell an instrument to detect truth. "I've got one," said Mose; "I been livin' with her a long time."

32. Intelligence is that inherited quality which allows a fellow to get along without an education. Education, on the other hand, is what is given to some of us so that we can get along without intelligence.

33. A youngster took his girl by taxi to the picture show, took her to dinner after the show, and called the taxi and took her home. "Did you kiss her goodnight?"

"No. I thought I had done enough for her."

34. The assistant to the manager wrote a collection letter to a customer who owed \$20. The boss looked the letter over and said: "This is a nice letter all right except that the word "dirty" has only one R in it, and "cur" begins with a K"

35. The man's thinking is so crooked that if a nail were driven through his brain it would come out in the shape of a corkscrew.

36. If your wife laughs at your joke, you have a good joke or a good wife.

37. Ozark salesman: "This spring water has been scandalized by the bestest phrenologists—seven per cent exit acid, eleven per cent carbonic acid, ten per cent nitrogeeseation, and the rest pure hydrophobia."

38. A cow man and a goat man traveling together decided to make camp at an abandoned house. The cow man went in the house but came out promptly. "(There's a skunk in there," he said. The dog went in, but in a moment he came out. Then the goat man went in, and the skunk came out.

39. Angry woman to a man smoking a vile cigar: "If you were my husband I mould poison you."

Man: "If you mere my wife I would poison myself."

40. Mark Twain referred to a certain lawyer as a strange man. When asked why, he said, "It's peculiar for a lawyer to have his hand in his own pocket."

41. An administrator asked a man whether he wanted his mother-in-law embalmed, buried, or cremated. The answer: "All three. Take no chances!"

42. Mark Twain said: "Be honest; it pleases some people and astonishes the rest."

43. Typographical error: "Wanted, a maid to hell with house work."

44. Protect the birds. The dove brings peace and the stork brings tax exemptions.

46. Preacher—One who talks in *other* people's sleep.

46. Dentist—The only man who can tell a woman to shut her mouth.



47. Politician—One who will find an excuse to get out of anything except office.

48. A man who had not spoken to his wife in five years said, "I didn't want to interrupt her."

49. A visitor to Thomas Edison remarked that the front gate needed repair; it was hard to open. "No," said Edison, "everyone who comes through the gate pumps two buckets of water into the tank on the roof."

50. Methuselah ate what he found on his plate

And never, as people do now,  
Did he note the amount of the calorie count.

He ate it because it was chow.

He wasn't disturbed as at dinner he sat

Destroying a roast or a pie

To think it was lacking in granular fat

Or a couple of vitamins shy.

He cheerfully chewed every species of food,

Untroubled by worries or fears,

Lest his health might be hurt by some fancy dessert,

And he lived over nine hundred years!

—Redbook, 1937

### **The Redbook on Financial Matters**

A lurking fear which constantly hung over President Evans was that some trusted employee might, with wrongful intent or through neglect, misappropriate College funds for which the president of the College would be held liable. He could never reconcile himself to dependence upon the College business manager for knowledge of the condition of the accounts. As a consequence of this fear, he kept a duplicate set of financial records of the College in his office where he could consult these records as any time without the aid of any employee.<sup>12</sup>

The complete financial records required far more space than that in the little Redbooks. However, many notations were made in these books so that they became a valuable part of the Evans financial records as well as his diary.

The first example of these records kept in the Redbook was in explanation of the collection from students of funds called "The Student Activities Fee." Some of these fees were voted by the students upon themselves. It should not be unfair to say that

---

<sup>12</sup>It was fortunate that he did this because of events which happened after his retirement. Most of the old, inactive files of the business office were lost when water got into the storage place in the basement of the Main Building and ruined them. It happened that the Evans records were untouched.

at times the suggestion for the need of such fees was planted by President Evans in the minds of a few student leaders. Students voted in 1926 to tax themselves one dollar per term for the improvement of the practice field across the street from the fish hatchery on the north side. At that time the area was the only football field available to college teams. Student funds built the old wooden gymnasium destroyed by fire in the fall of 1930. And there were a number of other projects developed with funds from this source.

The following passage from the Redbook of 1926 states accurately Evans' policy as to the handling of the student activities fee voted by the students. It is also a defense against critics who argued at that time that the College was violating the provisions of the law relating to exemption of ex-service men from certain fees.

We are not charging ex-service men a student activities fee. The total incidental fee of the College is \$12 per term, which includes the activities fee. We now look upon the incidental fee as a unit and the students activities disbursements as an appropriation from that unit for a special purpose. For administration, this is better.

However, until we consolidated, we did collect the student activities fee from all students alike, including ex-service men until recently, and in my judgment, it was in strict agreement with the provisions of the law and in no sense a failure to respect its terms.

The student activities fee was voted by the students at a regular election by ballot, the amount being fixed by the students themselves. We acted only as a collecting agency for the students. The students had held these elections, at each of which, by large majority, they fixed a larger tax, and this manner of fixing the tax compelled me to believe and accept it as a student tax, the College being responsible for its proper handling and for preventing any abuses of it. The chapter and section which exempts ex-service men from fees and charges is directed to college authorities who **fix** and collect, and in the true sense we did not fix or collect this fee.

A student body within limits, approved by the board of regents and faculty, should pool its efforts by a tax for student enterprises.

When we reached the conclusion that it would be a better policy to lump the several fees for collection and administration, exemption from the full matriculation fee would follow.

Evans examined the practice of other colleges in the matter of collections from students in the form of fees. In 1937 he put in the Redbook examples of what was being done by other institutions:

1. Student union building at University of Oklahoma, costing \$400,000, financed by student fee of \$2.50 per semester.

2. The University of Minnesota used dormitory rentals and current rentals and surplus earnings of university press.

3. The University of Montana, with a fee of \$1 per quarter, increased the fee to \$5 per year. This financed a building costing \$240,000.

4. The University of Georgia erected buildings costing \$2,817,000 and paid the cost from net income from buildings and designated fees.

Evans cited court cases in which colleges were upheld in the collection of fees from students and also in the use of revenues from buildings to pay off bonds issued against these fees and revenues, this practice being almost unknown among the state-supported colleges at that time. In this connection, he made note of part of a loan agreement brought to court as evidence of the right of a college or university to make the collections. He quoted the following:

Borrower shall furnish adequate heat, light, power, and water service without charge against the project or deduction from gross revenues therefrom so long as the bonds are outstanding. Such contingent liability is held not sufficient to create an indebtedness within the meaning of the constitutional provision under consideration.

With the entries in the Red book just mentioned, Evans must have felt well armed to enter into any discussion of the subject of the collection of fees and other charges from students.

Evans was much concerned with comparative per capita costs among the several institutions of higher learning in Texas, including the University. The following table of comparison was compiled in 1930:<sup>13</sup>

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Enrollment</i>	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Per Capita</i>
1. University of Texas	6,500	\$4,317,000	\$600
2. A. and M., CIA and two junior colleges	7,100	6,011,730	846
3. Seven teachers colleges	7,500	4,187,891	568

<sup>13</sup>Three years later, statistics such as these were used to good advantage in the fight of the teachers colleges for existence. See Chapter III.

The following note in the Redbook made also in 1930 showed what had happened to the request of the College for appropriations the previous biennium:

1. Regents' recommendations .....	\$1,403,310
Included: Library building .....	\$225,000
Women's dormitoy .....	250,000
2. Board of Control recommended .....	788,350
Included: Library building and equipment .....	175,000
3. House voted .....	727,150
Senate voted .....	859,150
Included: (House) Library bldg.	150,000
(Senate) Library bldg.	225,000
4. Free conference .....	717,950
Included: Library building .....	175,000
5. Governor vetoes building .....	175,000
<hr/>	
Appropriation .....	\$ 542,950

In this instance, the figures in the Redbook show that the recommendations of the regents were reduced by the sum of \$860,360 before the governor was willing to sign the appropriation into law.

President Evans was not content merely to learn what the appropriations and per capita cost to the state were for his own college, but he carefully collected in the Redbook for ready reference the same data for the other teachers colleges. For the purpose of comparison, in 1930, he compiled a table of appropriations and per capita cost for all the teachers colleges. This table covered a five-year period, 1927 to 1932. At that time San Marcos was the third largest of the teachers colleges in enrollment, next to Commerce, Denton always having been first. Evans listed the San Marcos enrollment as 1,232 for the regular session of 1931-32 and 2,160 as the enrollment for the summer session of 1930. The per capita cost for the Southwest Texas State Teachers College for the regular session of 1931-52 was \$155. The lowest per capita cost was at Commerce, with \$104—the latter school having an enrollment of 1,830, with an appropriation \$200 less than that of San Marcos. The highest per capita cost was Alpine, with \$250.<sup>14</sup> Canyon, with an enrollment of 870,

<sup>14</sup>See Evans' prediction concerning Alpine before the school was established, Chapter X.

had a per capita cost of \$209. Denton, with the highest enrollment of 1,963, had a per capita cost of \$144.

Evans recorded in the Redbook the appropriations made for the College by biennia from the beginning of the College for the biennium of 1903-05 to the date of his record. The table showing this information first appeared about 1923 and was repeated in almost every Redbook thereafter and brought up to date. For many of these years he made notations of which buildings on the campus were constructed from funds included in that appropriation; he noted also vetoes of certain items and the amounts lost by veto.

In one of these notes he recorded the fact that an ex-student of the College who was then a representative in the legislature from Hays County, in 1935, made a fight and succeeded in cutting drastically the salary of H. E. Speck, Dean of Men. This revenge taken against Dean Speck made it necessary for President Evans to secure approval of the board of regents to restore the salary cut out of local funds.<sup>15</sup>

The last of the notes on finances was a comparison of the costs of auditing the books of the several teachers colleges, that of San Marcos being considerably higher than the cost of any other school, and the comment was added that there was a \$200 penalty put on San Marcos because the accounts of the College were not ready for the auditors.

### Redbook Record of the Great Depression

Raymond Brooks, well-known Texas newspaperman, wrote in his Memoirs that all recollections of the depression focus on individual human hunger, dread and suffering. He declared that there was frustration and rage, and even the government itself was pinched into a helpless condition as the legislature struggled in its sessions during the depression period and public officialdom groped for answers.

At the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, President Evans and his faculty faced the situation with calmness and courage. Suddenly all ideas of a growing enrollment and an expanding college plant had to be abandoned, for it was recog-

---

<sup>15</sup>This act of Representative Thomas Dunlap created an enormous amount of ill will against him. He was defeated after only one term in the legislature.

nized early in the depression that the legislature could not provide for expanding education.

At the College the decline in enrollment, however, was far less than was feared and predicted. The following table gives the numbers enrolled during the six-year period from the summer of 1929, just before the crash, to the spring of 1935.<sup>16</sup>

Regular Session Year	College Alone	College Plus Extension	Summer School	Year
1929-30	1,207	1,412	2,065	1929
1930-31	1,223	1,267	2,318	1930
1931-32	1,198	1,245	2,146	1931
1932-33	1,174	1,392	1,653	1932
1933-34	1,019	1,286	2,274	1933
1934-35	1,170	1,277	2,111	1934

President Evans explained the large enrollment in spite of the depression by pointing out that the population was increasing and that when there was no jobs available for young people out of high school, the only logical thing left was to spend the time in college. He made the comment that people find a way somehow to do what must be done.

In an address before the weekly general assembly (into which the old daily chapel had evolved) on March 2, 1931, Evans used the topic "Hard Times." He sketched the history of depressions, mentioning first the periods or cycles of depressions of 1893, 1907, and 1921. These, he said attract students to college and also keep students away from college. He referred to the "colossal" losses in values to society. Prices of farm products "toboggan." Not long ago, he declared, three bales of cotton would send a student to college for a year. Now it would take six to eight bales.

"What should college students do about it?" he asked. He urged students not to embarrass those who were having to struggle to stay in college, and complimented the spirit of the boys and girls who were fighting poverty. He advised the students to face debts honestly and courageously. "Consult with and satisfy creditors. You can't run away from accounts or from student loans," he declared. "These," he said, "are honor debts." And he mentioned the huge demand for student loans and the

<sup>16</sup>See the College catalogs 1930 to 1936.

help some faculty members were giving students by loans from their private funds and by signing as sureties for students obtaining loans from loan funds of the College.

He urged the students to make any reasonable sacrifice to stay in college, and suggested that if a student was wealthy enough to own a car, such student should not ask for a loan. As an example, he mentioned a mature man, a student in college, owner of "a new car costing \$1,000," asking for a job to work his way.

He told the students that "a good record on your part will reward the sacrifice of parents and friends. There are loan funds available to invest in good records." He advised graduating students to register with the teacher-placement committee. And he added:

Our interest as well as your interest is to locate you in the best possible position. Get acquainted with the College officials and the members of the faculty before you leave the College. Give us a chance to help you when you are in need. Tell your friends about the College and its service to students.

In a speech to the Alumni Association on May 23, 1931, Evans mentioned the public, nation-wide reaction against higher education. This, he said, was a real danger to state-supported colleges because there had been hasty ill-advised expansion in the number and cost of institutions of higher learning. The grand totals of cost for these schools was larger than people were willing to put up. Evans felt that there would be a swing back so far as to constitute peril to education for a quarter of a century. He predicted that alumni organizations were in for "political bulldozing"; for campaigns ahead of meetings of legislatures. He urged that the members of the Alumni Association do whatever personal work they could do to counteract the trend against colleges. "Don't over-discount the future," he pleaded. He reminded his listeners that there were other depressions of a century ago and told them of the great losses caused by the depressions of 1837, 1841, 1857, 1873, 1907, 1921, and finally the panic of October 29, 1929. He closed by telling his hearers that he would like to leave with them the theme of an optimist, "The ultimate triumph of the best."

On May 21, 1931, the Austin *American* carried in an editorial a quotation from William C. Berger's *Public Management*,

"All Dressed Up and No Place to Go." Evans copied in the Red-book the following from the editorial :

From 1920 to 1928, a period during which the population of the country increased less than 16 per cent, the number of men and women emerging annually with degrees from higher institutions doubled. It may be safely assumed that today a larger proportion than ever before of the youth of the land who are seeking employment for the first time are college graduates. Almost equally safe is the assumption in the present business depression that an unusually large number of the graduates find themselves educationally dressed and no place to go.

This quotation inspired President Evans to make its theme the subject of his commencement address to the graduating class of the summer session of 1931. It was one of Evans' best intellectual efforts. He introduced the subject with the quotation referred to above and continued with the following remarks:

... When young men and young women of fine integrity, splendid native ability, cultural and vocational training, representative of the best all-round possibilities of present-day life, are to find no opportunity to render service or even to earn a competent livelihood, the social, political, and economic consequences will stagger thoughtful people to believe. Let us face the situation confronting the college graduate of today and find the explanation and remedy so far as practicable. Will there be, on a large scale, no place for the college graduate to go? What everyday conditions limit or forbid the employment of the college graduate? Are the colleges turning out a product that meets the practical conditions of life? With the discussion of these problems, we will submit some remedies, tentative, or suggestive, at most.

On every hand, evidences of the acuteness of unemployment multiply. "Row Over Unemployment," "World of Workless," "Fight Between Jobless and Police," "Rent Eviction Riot," "Red Mischief for Idle Hands," "No Jobs and Empty Pockets," and other similar headlines are to be seen in dailies. The more conservative monthly magazines have carried stories of the tramps of jobless persons whose discussions have the earmarks of worthy, educated persons, forced out of jobs by adverse conditions, and honestly searching for new employment. Technological unemployment resulting from displacement of men and women through labor-saving machines and the immobility of workers, does not find an immediate solution. Independent of technical removals of workers, the regular transfer of labor from occupation to occupation costs employees in time lost far



more than the total losses from strikes and lockouts. Congress and legislatures, alike, attack the general and specific problems of unemployment, but with few tangible results. The army of unemployed probably outnumbers the combined armies of soldiers on all fronts during the World War. Out of the total number of workers, one in six in America and one in five in England and Germany are safe estimates of the unemployed. The more recent studies of the situation by capable business authorities do not show any significant improvement, and promise only meager gains in the near future.

Directly and indirectly, the unsettled conditions extend evil effects to schools and colleges. The same considerations that reduce expenses in business cut budgets in education and abolish long-standing positions. Cutting salaries and eliminating jobs are so widespread an occurrence as to be counted among present routine duties of educational boards.

The college graduate enters a world, at its best, articulated poorly with college ideals, ideals, and objectives. Life's work is not so much a continuation of college studies in graduate or practical fields as an adventure where academic training has new and unexpected applications. . . . Quoting from Rugg's *Culture and Education in America*, "From the early days of colonization, American life has been dynamic; with each succeeding generation, the rhythm has accelerated. The dominant theme is change, movement. The American mind, like its industry, displays itself in movement, buildings, exploitation. But in a hundred years, the public school has never caught up with the momentum of industry, business, community life, or politics. Only rarely has it succeeded in dealing with contemporary issues and conditions. Never has it anticipated social needs."

. . . There can not, at any time, be an over-production of trained men and trained women. Higher education is good for all comers that can get it, although the benefits are relatively small in the case of misfits who will not apply it in fields where they may profit most. There may be any year, and there is at the present time, a surplus of college graduates for positions open in the professions under present conditions. As no coordination of forces makes practicable the preparation of only the probable or estimated number of professional workers demanded, we need not be surprised to learn that we have over-produced lawyers, physicians, teachers, dentists, and engineers. . . . Employment committees of colleges and universities have fewer vacancies and a larger number of teachers seeking employment than for years. Dentists are so crowded that it is difficult to make a comfortable living. Increase of lawyers led representatives

of the American Bar Association to say, "Commercialism is likely to crush out the professional character of the calling." New York City, alone, had 800 architectural draftsmen out of employment.

. . . The disease of unemployment is deep seated, constitutional rather than local. The proper remedy is not merely to provide jobs, but to prevent recurrence of unemployment. State and federal employment offices and registration bureaus for compilation of unemployment statistics are among essential agencies for fighting unemployment. Unemployment insurance, at the least, is worth the thoughtful consideration of legislators. Certainly, large business organizations can do something to stabilize the incomes of workers through the development of emergency funds, voluntary and corporate, set aside in prosperous years for periods of depression. The program of education should include re-education of the adult for a new job. The once-for-all preparation for life does not answer the crisis of today.

. . . Writers do not indicate any widespread cooperative effort between the colleges and the employing world to make it practicable that the product of the college fit better into life's situations. The American manufacturer determines his products by industrial needs and conditions, constantly adjusting and readjusting to meet the changing needs. Ford closed plants for the transformation from Model T to the new car. Colleges may be said to be manufacturers of human material into the finished product of doers and thinkers, and must, therefore, adjust their procedure and their goals to the shifting conditions of a machine age.

. . . There is not a surplus, today, of capable men and women for the professions if the proper professional standards were enforced. . . . The elevation of standards in the professions mould, in a few years, cut out the incompetent, the mediocre, and the unfit. As part of a program for recognition of technically and professionally trained persons, government service of all kinds should determine its selection under the principles of civil service regulations, where merit takes the place of partisan rotation in office. Any kind of appointment system involving consideration on basis of equipment would make large gains for the college graduate in the public service.

In conclusion, the threatening unemployment of college graduates in large numbers is temporary; with general unemployment gradually relieved and employment on a more permanent basis as a result of the sad lessons of depression, with adjustment of colleges to the practicable demands of business and industry and a better understanding between

these two forces, and with the professions adequately protected against the competition of the untrained and unfit, the college graduate will find himself better dressed educationally, and there will be abundant places for him to go.

So much of this address is quoted here because it is felt that Evans was speaking not only to that graduating class at "Riverside" on a sweltering summer night, but across the thirty-five years of history to the graduating classes of today and to the educational world of the future.

The depression grew worse, and in November Evans recorded in the Redbook that the "Austin banks are overloaded on state treasury warrants and carry only warrants of local depositors." He added the comment, "We expect our local banks to help us."<sup>17</sup>

The following note made in the Redbook in 1932 reveals what was happening in this the third year of the depression:

A land overflowing with produce from the farms, but not enough food. A land of mighty industries, but not enough coats. A land of scientific marvels, but not enough jobs. A land with a great history, but with a depression every few years.

Evans told the student body in assembly on March 3, 1932:

You have enrolled during difficult and hard times. I know the sacrifices many of you are making to stay in college. Pay the price in creditable conduct and effort. There are fewer and poorer positions open than in ten years. Elevation of standards helps some, but you must still compete with teachers certificated on a much lower level of scholarship; and the school boards are cutting salaries.

Again he reminded the students of the service of the college "Committee on Placement of Teachers," urging them to enroll, and giving them advice on how to apply for positions as teachers. Among other instructions, he warned the students not to make a "political drive" for a position, that is, using prominent citizens to get their merits before the school authorities. "There is dynamite in local politics," he said. He urged applicants to apply early for vacant positions and said, "In May, a position in hand is worth two in prospect."

In a faculty meeting on August 22, 1933, President Evans thanked the faculty for responding favorably to his request that

---

<sup>17</sup>At that time the state treasury was months behind in the payment of warrants.

some take part- or half-time off to assist other worthy faculty members whose positions had been discontinued. He said that two or three volunteers were yet needed, because a reduction in the teaching force must be made. He notified the faculty that a change in any faculty member's assignment might be made to meet the circumstances.

Even as late as 1938, the effects of the depression were still the subject of many public comments. The Redbook carried the following quotation from the *Dallas News* of February 17 of that year:

Franklin D. Roosevelt says: "We are agreed that the real and lasting progress of the people of farm and city alike will come not from the old familiar cycle of glut and scarcity, not from the succession of boom and collapse, but from the steady and sustained increase in production and fair exchange of things that human beings need."

And for a remedy for depression, Evans picked up a quotation from Roger W. Babson written in 1921: "We must make thrift, industry, and honesty a part of our religion, and religion a part of our business. Then and not till then will we have good times."

### **The Redbook List of Faithful Employees**

The mention of only two will illustrate Evans' close friendship with his faithful employees about the campus. There were many others.

There was Rufus Wimberley, engineer. Evans depended upon Wimberley for almost every repair job on the grounds and about the buildings, the athletic field, and "Riverside," now Sewell Park. He valued highly the practical ideas which Wimberley used in his work. He indicated that for dependability under all circumstances Wimberley could not be excelled. Evans kept in mind each biennium the fact that the salary for his engineer was low, and regularly asked for a reasonable raise. This, of course, was not always forthcoming. On one occasion, after a particularly strenuous summer's work, during which Wimberley worked many hours overtime without expectation of extra pay, Evans requested of the board of regents permission to pay this faithful employee \$200 in a lump sum, in addition to the regular monthly salary.

In November, 1917, a note appeared in the Redbook: "Rufus

to clean up Riverside resort." This, perhaps, was the start of the commendable work of Wimberley in the making of Riverside. He constructed his own attachment to a tractor with which he pulled a scraper on a steel cable, and with this instrument kept the river bed dredged clean. Riverside swimming pool, almost a thousand feet long, became known far and wide as one of the best in the country—largely because of one man's skill and devotion to his job.

There was also J. A. Clayton, mechanic and instructor, an extraordinary man in many respects. He was talented in mechanical art, and monuments to his inventive genius are still visible on the campus. One outstanding example was the concrete retaining walls along the river banks at Sewell Park, which were built by pouring the concrete into forms laid flat on the ground. Reinforced with steel, the ends of these rods were left protruding and were bent into rings and hooks so that each section of the wall, after hardening, could be slid into place and secured. This eliminated the necessity for building forms under water and meant the saving of hundreds of dollars.

When a request for a dumb waiter came from the College cafeteria, Clayton built one operated by water pressure in the pipes already in use in the cafeteria, and the cost was a mere fraction of that for an electric elevator which would have served the same purpose. He also invented an electric scoreboard for the gymnasium. Both these inventions were used by the College for years.

The great number of orders in the Redbook under the names Clayton and Wimberley remain as evidence of their usefulness. For example, on one day, June 12, 1924, there were listed the following:

1. Screen the athletic field house door.
2. Tennis court for Miss Hines.
3. Drag Riverside pool and complete wall.
4. Electric fans.
5. Lockers.
6. Complete sewer line at H. E. Cottage.

At Evans' suggestion, Clayton began attending college classes part time and earned the bachelors degree in 1930. He was then made an instructor on the regular faculty in industrial arts, serving until his untimely death in an automobile accident

in 1937. The Redbook records the notes on the brief but beautiful and heart-touching eulogy which Evans delivered at Clayton's funeral on November 14, 1937. Evans said in part:

J. A. Clayton was a man of character. For any undertaking, he asked only, "Is it right? Is it square? Is it honorable?" His ideals were high. He had inborn faith in his fellowman and God. He was a man of service. He sought and found opportunities to serve others. He really lived "In a house by the side of the road" and was a friend to every man. He was a man of ability; he had talent and versatility. He could, in mechanical lines, do more things well than any other man I have ever employed. For example, he knew the Diesel engine so well that he could have built one. . . . It may be said of him that he "watered a desert; he tunnelled a hill."

#### The Farmer

President Evans had a meager background of rural living to equip him for the business of farming. Nevertheless, he was not different from great numbers of other professional men in the desire to own a place out in the country away from the city. The first land he purchased lay along and astride the Blanco River some six miles north of San Marcos. The land was rough and timbered with the usual scrubby liveoak and cedar found in Hays County. The soil was rocky and shallow, and there were only patches of it in cultivation. Later he sold this farm and bought another about two miles closer to the city. There is little evidence that he made any substantial profits in money, but, having accompanied him to the farm many times and watched his interest in this agricultural sideline, the writer is convinced that the dividends were abundant in rest, relaxation, and release from the burdens of administering the College.

The Redbook served him as a record for the transactions relating to the farm. The purchase and sale of livestock, equipment, and supplies, as well as records of the yield from the land and the share due the tenant, were all carefully posted on the tiny pages. Agreements between him and the tenant were written in the book and signed by both the parties. For legal documents, some of these agreements were masterpieces of brevity, which attorneys might well emulate.

A note in the Redbook of 1918 included a formula for an ant killer using sodium or potassium cyanide to be "mixed three parts of sand or road dust and sprinkled on ant hill. Caution:

Do not handle with bare hands." A little later there was a recipe for an antidote for tapeworms written in a feminine hand. This consisted of pomegranate bark, pumpkin seed, and other ingredients. Presumably this was to be used as a veterinary remedy and not for human consumption. There was one note recording the dosage of Epsom salts recommended for constipation of hogs. No doubt this information was for farm use, although it could have been also for the benefit of the one-man department of agriculture of the College.

By 1921 Evans was showing an increasing interest in farming operations. There were also copies of advertisements of land and livestock for sale; he was especially interested in Duroc Jersey hogs. Considerable space was used in plans for repairs and improvements on the farm. Detailed measurements were taken and recorded in the Redbook, and prices of the materials accompanied the lists. Evans must have tried to manage his farm according to the same principles of good business practice which he employed for the College. The Redbook has many entries showing the cost of feeding mules and other livestock. In one entry he noted that a mule required twelve pounds of corn and ten pounds of hay on a working day. If the mule were idle, five pounds of corn would suffice if the hay was increased to fifteen pounds. A mule would consume in one year **57** bushels of corn and two tons of hay.

In a note dated September 29, 1928, he recorded an agreement with tenant Claude Harris to rent the land on halves; all the cattle, goats, and sheep on halves, and all land to be cultivated. Harris was to have use of Evans' teams, but would have his own chickens and turkeys. Harris would plant oats for grazing his own cows and Evans' teams. Evans then made a note that the income from the farm for that year was less than **\$75**. But in spite of this setback he spent many hours and considerable money in trying to make a profitable farm out of the rocky land.

Five years after Evans sold the first farm on the Blanco River, he received notice from the holder of the vendor's lien note which had been assumed by the buyer that Evans would be held responsible for payment of the loan, this on the grounds that he was an indorser of, and therefore a secondary party to, the note. Evans composed his reply first in the Redbook. He said :

Your loan all along had for its sole security the land.  
It is purely an afterthought on the part of an attorney to

attempt to hold me for the payment of this land loan more than five years after it passed from my hands. My losses on this farm were more than a thousand dollars annually for four years and the same amount in deflation of values. The place has never been worth the loan and is now run down and worth; at best, five to six thousand dollars. There is neither moral nor legal responsibility upon me.

No suit was brought in court to force Evans to pay.

An inventory of livestock dated April 1, 1934, was recorded as follows: "Cows, 51; calves, 16; small calves, 9; goats, 88; kids, 21; hogs, **13**; sheep, 6; mules, 5; horses, 1." He noted that 59 head of hogs had been sold the year before, 16 of which being sold to Bryan Wildenthal, personal—not as business manager of the College.

Among other farming enterprises, Evans considered burning charcoal from the cedar timber on his land. He put the following table in the Redbook:

8 cords of cedar @ \$1.50 .....	\$ 12.00
Hauling .....	2.00
Burning in kiln .....	17.00
100 sacks @ 5¢ .....	5.00
Total costs .....	\$ 37.00 [sic]
3,500 lbs. of charcoal at \$3 per cwt. ....	\$105.00
Profit .....	\$ 68.00

Apparently he did not take the trouble to recheck and discover the error of one dollar too much in the calculation of the costs for this project. There is no record, however, that he ever undertook this enterprise.

Not all was seriousness and worry about the Evans farm. He thoroughly enjoyed looking after things about the place. He took his losses good-naturedly and could never be as stern and hard with his tenants as he sometimes was with employees of the College. Practically all of his tenants were distressingly poor and constantly in need. His attitude toward them seemed to be one of sympathetic understanding. A bit of levity crept into the pages of the Redbook on occasion. Next to a note on the use of fertilizer he wrote the joke about the little girl named Fertilizer.: "Yes," said the mother, "that's her name. She was named for both her parents—his name is Ferdinand and my name is Liza." At another place he mentioned "A turkey stuffed with sage—and a sage stuffed with turkey." In still another he wrote the story of the bicycle salesman who tells the farmer: "But the bicycle



will not eat as the cow does and you can ride it. "You would look silly riding a cow." The farmer replies, "No sillier than trying to milk a bicycle." In connection with the cost of feeding mules, he joked: "Plowing should continue not later than eleven o'clock at night. It gets the mules accustomed to late hours and unduly exposes the plow."

### Faithful Rotarian and Churchman

Evans enjoyed one of the best attendance records at Rotary in the entire nation. He believed thoroughly in the Rotary code of ethics and the fellowship of its members. His Rotary nickname was "Shep." One story goes that this name was acquired during his boyhood at a time when he, as was said of Robert F. Kennedy, "desperately needed a haircut." With his flaming red hair down to his collar, Evans was likened by some wag to the family shepherd dog that followed any member of the Evans family who left the house. The dog's name was Shep, and the joker maintained that it was difficult to tell the boy and the dog apart.

Through the years Evans was the goodwill ambassador from the College to the town through his membership in the Rotary Club. He was called upon to address the club on numerous occasions, and never lost an opportunity to bring before the group the relationship between the city and its schools. On January 5, 1937, according to the notes in the Redbook, he told his fellow-Rotarians that the value of the College and other schools to San Marcos was great. He reminded them that San Marcos is an outstanding school center. It attracts and holds high class citizens. The schools promote the increase of per capita wealth and bring money for investments. He thought the loss of Coronal Institute, which had been in San Marcos for many years, meant a hundred-thousand-dollar loss to the city. Because of the good schools and the educational atmosphere, he declared that culture and refinement were disseminated. "The city is an altogether worthy and wholesome environment for families," he said.

This was an example of the messages he had presented to the club on many occasions. On August 23, 1939, he made his last notes in the Redbook concerning the Rotary Club. The notes from which he spoke were as follows:

- (1) Twenty-eight years ago this week, I traveled from

Austin to San Marcos, carrying with me a copy of the College catalog of 1911-12 that had just come off the press.

(2) San Marcos contributes to the College. Splendid moral environment. Willingness to send your children to your college and ask your friends. Sympathy for College and its problems. Fine residence city. Ministers and churches furnish religious leadership and inspiration.

Evans served his church in several capacities. Evidently, he went about the church business very much in the same fashion in which he handled school business. A table in the Redbook in 1927 speaks for itself:

Church	Members	Salary of Pastor	Amount Per Member
University Church	800	\$5,000	\$31.50
Corpus Christi	580	4,800	38.40
Gonzales	410	3,000	16.90
Lockhart	570	3,600	20.30
San Marcos	800	3,600	15.80

#### Prohibitionist

Evans was a "dry" who sought information on the subject of the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor and read all reports obtainable. He kept a list of all the "dry" states and counted as being dry those states that had "local option." The following is a typical report he copied into the Redbook:

In spite of the continued activity of the constables, "blind tigers" and clubs for the sale of liquors flourished in the towns with the support of local option. A foreign observer reported the general standard of enforcement as low and told of "saloon keepers who called themselves druggists and sell liquors to all comers for medical purposes."

Other insertions in the Redbook showed medical reports on the harmful effects of the use of alcoholic beverages, the low moral standards in localities where liquor is sold without restraint, and the incidence of crime in relation to the use of alcoholic beverages.

Evans' chapel talks were full of exhortation against liquor, and the rules of conduct on the campus absolutely banned alcohol in any form. He talked to this writer many times on the evils of drinking beer and wine. He said very heatedly on one occasion: "You have probably heard that beer will not make you drunk. Don't believe it! Just because it takes more of it to produce intoxication does not mean that you are not just as drunk!"

### III FIGHT FOR EXISTENCE

#### **Beginning of the Conflict**

During the first ten years of his administration President Evans may have been beset with many and varied administrative problems, but there were a few clouds on the horizon even after the sixth year to forecast the later serious struggle for the very existence of the College, a conflict that was to last approximately twenty years.

The attack upon the College came from four quarters : Other rival state-supported colleges ; church schools and denominational colleges; economy-minded members of the Legislature of Texas, aided by would-be reformers of the state system of higher education; and the news media of all classes. The first three sources will be generally dealt with in this chapter. In all fairness, however, it must be said that the Southwest Texas State Teachers College never stood alone in the fight, even though its proximity to the University of Texas frequently was the cause of its being singled out for opposition.

Apparently the first sign of the growing opposition manifested itself in the spring of 1917 when a serious attempt was made by the state normal schools to raise their status from two-year to four-year colleges. In a letter written April 18, 1917, President Bruce of the North Texas State Normal School suggested that President Evans look into the matter of opposition coming from President Vinson of the University of Texas. Bruce expressed the hope that Dr. Vinson would not attempt to manage any institution except the University. He asked Evans to ascertain whether Vinson had made his objections in his talk to the State Board of Education Committee. He said the rumor had come from R. B. Cousins, then president of the West Texas State Normal School at Canyon. Bruce said that Cousins had suggested that the four state normal presidents should write a joint letter of protest to President Vinson.

When Evans was elected president of the Council of Presidents of the State Normal Colleges to succeed retiring President Bruce, he immediately assumed leadership in the defense of these

colleges, and his lieutenants at Canyon, Denton, and Huntsville, and later at Kingsville, Commerce, Nacogdoches, and Alpine kept him informed of the happenings on the firing line.

On September 29, 1923, President R. L. Marquis, successor to President Bruce, wrote:

I am now convinced that the powers that be in the University of Texas propose to throw every obstacle possible in the way of Normal College growth in this state. Two years from now, unless conditions change, the University of Texas will be in greater need of friends than during the biennium just passed. I do not object to using such situations for what they are worth, since our claims are just. So far as I know, the University is the only institution in Texas which objects to seeing the Normal Colleges fulfill the purpose for which they were created.

I wish to be understood as meaning by "the University" that part of the institution which is now in the saddle. I know that there is a large part of the institution which does not have this feeling toward the Normal Colleges, but shall, as always, be friendly in their relations with us.

On October 19, 1923, President H. F. Estill of the Sam Houston State Normal Institute wrote a letter to the other presidents of the normal colleges as follows:

I heartily endorse every word of President Evans' letter of October 14 in regard to the leading editorials in the Dallas News and Galveston News of October 9th. This is a question on which the normal colleges must "hang together" or else they will hang separately, and President Vinson will be the executioner. Let us recognize the issue, put our friends on guard and be prepared for a fight to the finish.

In several other ways Evans and his fellow normal-college presidents clashed with the interests of the University of Texas, and a certain amount of the bitterness thus generated lasted for years. The presidents of the Texas teachers colleges were slow in being convinced that the graduates of the University of Texas would make satisfactory instructors in these colleges. In reply to a letter of inquiry from President Estill written on April 7, 1925, President Evans said:

I think you can take Miss Anderson and make her an efficient teacher for the Sam Houston State Teachers College. She is capable, worthy, and adaptable. In common with the usual University graduate, she needs to give a little more attention, to professional and institutional problems.

## Church Schools Attack

When the great depression of the early thirties began to pinch hard at the sustenance of the denominational colleges, some of them joined the foes of the teachers colleges. President Estill of Huntsville on April 13, 1932, reported to President Evans a speech made by President King Vivion of Southwestern University delivered in Houston in one of the Methodist churches.

After declaring that Southwestern was a non-professional school with no purpose to turn out technicians nor professional men and women, he stated: "Every profession is overcrowded today. The state schools are turning out graduates in the professions so rapidly that there is a great surplus of professional people, especially teachers." Dr. Vivion warned that too many teachers are being trained in Texas. He pointed out that there were at that time only 45,000 teaching positions in Texas, and that within the last biennium (1930-31) certificates had been granted to 28,000 teachers in the state. There is small chance, he declared, of many of these finding employment. There are too many teachers colleges in Texas, he continued. Offering free tuition, these colleges are gathering in a great number of students and training them for a profession that is more overcrowded, perhaps, than any other. He said that the situation had changed from ten years ago when there was a shortage of teachers; but that this fact certainly was not true today.

In March, 1932, a conference was held in Dallas between the presidents of the state institutions of higher learning. Growing out of this conference, President J. C. Hardy of the then Baylor College for Women at Belton wrote an article entitled "A Restudy of the Principles of Tax-Support of Education." This article was submitted to every president of a state-supported college with the request for comment, analysis, etc., and was submitted for publication in several newspapers. The article maintained the thesis that state-supported education through the elementary and high schools was the unquestioned duty of the State. But after high school when the student then is pursuing his learning for his own benefit—and not for the benefit of the State—the student should pay a "larger" share of the cost of his education. This would be fair to the "overburdened" taxpayer and, as a matter of fact, Hardy maintained that it would be beneficial to the student by forcing him to pay

for his gain rather than have this value presented to him as a "dole" by the taxpayers. He asserted that a policy of increased tuition fees in the state colleges was necessary to preserve both the denominational colleges which could not exist unless they could get more students; and the state colleges which could not carry the extra load of instruction which would fall upon them in case the denominational colleges should cease to exist.

A. W. Birdwell, former dean of the faculty at the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, and then president of the Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College, Nacogdoches, was first to write a reply to Dr. Hardy's article. Birdwell mailed a draft of his reply to President Evans. In his letter of transmittal Birdwell said:

I am sending you herewith my proposed reply to Dr. Hardy's article. It represents only first impressions. I am not sure whether I am getting at the matter from the right angle. Please read it. If there are any fallacies in it, I would like to know it. If not, I would like to restudy it and substantiate every statement by facts and figures if necessary.

As Birdwell's reply expresses so clearly and convincingly the principles of government and philosophy of education in our society as observed and believed by those men who contributed so much to the building of our present system of colleges in Texas, excerpts from it are included here:

No one, so far as my studies go, has defined the State's responsibility for the education of her people. I doubt whether this responsibility can be defined in any but empirical terms. During the past 100 years, we have advanced from the position that the State had no responsibilities in the education of the people to the present situation. I think that we shall "go around in circles" unless we undertake to define the State's responsibility in terms of end-results of the educative process.

In 1819, Thomas Jefferson, in a report prepared by him for the Commission appointed by the governor of Virginia under an act of the General Assembly and which met in 1818 at Rockfish Gap in the Blue Ridge Mountains, defined the objectives of elementary education as follows:

"1. To give to every citizen the information he needs for the transaction of his own business.

"2. To enable him to calculate for himself, and to express and preserve his ideas, his contracts and accounts in writing..

"3. To improve, by reading, his morals and faculties.

"4. To understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either.

"5. To know his rights; then exercise with order and justice those he retains; to choose with discretion the fiduciary of those he delegates ; and to notice their conduct with diligence. with candor and judgment.

"6. And in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social obligations under which he shall be placed."

This statement of the objectives of elementary education has never been improved. . . . Perhaps the elementary school, as Jefferson conceived it, furnished the necessary training; but today we have a very different situation. . . . It is quite easy, I think, to conclude that the educational program which was thought to be essential in Jefferson's day would be totally inadequate for the present day, *if the end results expressed in his report are to be attained.*<sup>1</sup>

The objectives of education have been constantly changing and must continue to change, and, therefore, the responsibility of the State constantly changes; and so long as progress is being made, will constantly assume larger and larger proportions. I think, therefore, your conclusion that the State's responsibility ends with the high school is arrived at *a priori*. I am not concerned with whether the State is doing too much or too little, but I think a conclusion of this sort should be reached in the light of the history and development of our educational agencies. . . . The private academies insisted that the elementary school was the end-point of the State's responsibility. . . . The secondary school, as we know it today, came in opposition to the wishes of many very great school men. . . . We must think in terms of the intellectual needs of the people in order to arrive at anything like a safe conclusion as to the State's responsibility in the matter.

I agree that the elementary school and the high school should receive first consideration. But if the State needs, in order to preserve the integrity of its institutions or to promote the general welfare of its people, a more extended type of education, then I think the State in its sovereign capacity is the sole judge of both the extent and the nature of the training that shall be offered to its people. Your effort to distinguish between that training that promotes the welfare of the individual and that that promotes the welfare of the state is interesting. Many eminent educators agree with you. It seems to me, however, that if this principle is applied

---

<sup>1</sup>The italics are Birdwell's.

literally, we shall get lost in a wilderness of uncertainties. . . . The conclusion is easy that what benefits the individual will benefit society. It is very difficult to make a distinction between them. Certainly if one wishes to follow out this principle to its logical end, it would reach into the curriculum of both the elementary and high school. All of our vocational work would have to be decided against, and our schools maintained at public expense would be reduced to a study of the institutions which have arisen among us and the duties and obligations which the citizen owes the State. This may be right, but certainly, if this principle were applied rigidly, it would destroy the modern conception of both the elementary school and the high school, to say nothing of the state's endeavor in higher education.

Of course, your whole argument in regard to this matter is the basis for the argument in favor of raising fees in the tax-supported colleges. . . . I do not think that fees in any type of school . . . have ever been based . . . on any . . . principle. I think it has been a matter of expediency, and has been determined by the annual available funds of the institutions involved. For example, Rice Institute for several years did not charge any tuition. The returns from their endowment made it possible for them to render this service without a tuition charge. So far as I know, there was no criticism from any other college in the state. Perhaps the fact that Rice undertook to limit the number of students to be accepted is the explanation of the lack of criticism. The newspapers, a day or two ago, carried the information that Baylor University, Waco, was greatly reducing the price of living of their students. I think this was prompted, not as a mere advertising scheme, but because Baylor University felt that she was able to do this. Similarly, I think the fees in the state schools have been based on the ability of the state to pay the bill. Whether the state has that ability or not is, of course, a debatable question. . . . The patrons of the junior colleges think that it is cheaper and better to pay a fee of \$125 and have their children at home than to send them away to school. It is an economic problem rather than an educational principle . . .

It is inevitable that a college which undertakes to render the greatest possible service to its constituency should offer a broad and liberal course of study. . . . I do not think that the supposed needs of the private and denominational schools should be allowed to determine the state's policy in the field of higher education. I do think, however, that frank and friendly discussion of all these matters might result in relieving to some extent the feeling that seems widespread among the private and denominational colleges that the low



fees charged in the state-supported colleges are tending to reduce attendance at the denominational colleges, and are, therefore, the source of all their troubles.

. . . You recognize the responsibility of the State for the elementary schools and for high schools. I think this responsibility extends to furnishing well-trained teachers for every school in the land. In order to do this, it becomes necessary for the State to establish and to maintain institutions to which this function was given. . . . For the past 25 years . . . the teachers colleges have been growing in the direction of respectable academic institutions, and have assumed leadership in the training of teachers. As a result, every college in the land has entered the field. Practically all of them maintain strong departments of Education, and either through the school system or privately-maintained practice schools, undertake to meet the requirements of the certificate laws, and, therefore, have all become teacher-training institutions. I am not quarreling with this, but I do wish to say that adding new functions to any institution inevitably increases the cost of maintaining that institution. In other words, much of our trouble in both the denominational colleges and state-supported colleges has come because we have tried to "keep up with the Joneses." . . . Teachers presently do not receive the greatest benefits of their training. Their salaries are fixed arbitrarily, and they cannot charge "what the traffic will bear." Certainly they are rendering a distinct public service, without which the State's efforts at public education would be very defective. I wonder if you would agree that the State should furnish, at comparatively low individual costs, facilities for training the teachers of the State. . . . Almost my entire life has been given to the business of trying to train teachers for the public schools of this state. I have been a humble instrument in trying to make the teachers college respectable, both academically and professionally. I have experienced the patronizing attitude of other institutions of learning. I now find myself under rather great suspicion, because it is possible for students to come to the teachers colleges and receive the benefit of sound training, both academically and professionally, at somewhat lower costs than can be found in other institutions.

About this time President J. A. Hill of the West Texas State Teachers College wrote a circular letter to the other presidents in which he expressed the firm conviction "that the State Board of Control is being adversely influenced by denominational colleges, at least so far as the teachers colleges are concerned." Hill

also replied by letter to Dr. Hardy's article. On December 31, 1932, he wrote:

You refer to the training of soldiers at public expense because of their protective value to society. Let me remind you that "Education is the cheap defense of nations," and that "Education is a better safeguard of liberty than a standing army." It would seem, therefore, that the State's obligation to train its teachers is no less important than the nation's responsibility to train soldiers. Not only that, but if a teacher is worthy of his high calling, he is distinctly a public—and not a private servant. As you well know, his compensation has always been entirely inadequate for the responsibility that he carries. This being the case, to charge a high tuition in our state teachers colleges would amount to the State's putting a tax upon the teacher for the support of education. The sum of such fees which any teacher might spend in preparation for the public service would have to be charged against his already meager salary. This would be unjust not only to the teachers but also to the children and to society, because eventually it would mean that only the less fit would be attracted to the profession of teaching—a condition which already obtains in too great degree.

Society, acting in its own interest, should set up such conditions around the profession of teaching as would enable it to enjoy the services of its most talented citizens. This is true, or education is not what the fathers of this country have taught us.

. . . The teachers colleges have abiding and perpetual interest in the elementary and secondary schools of the state, and are perhaps closer to them in spirit and function than any other institution or individual. Moreover, we shall go farther to support the so-called common schools and give them every kind of assistance than will any other institution in our country.

You must remember that colleges existed before the common schools and have brought into existence the public school system of the State. They are necessary to furnish leadership.

. . . Very few of our students would go to a denominational college, or to any other college, that would charge from \$150 to \$200 tuition per year. For the most part the effect would be of two kinds: (1) Many who are now getting a college education would never darken a college door; (2) in my section of the State a large number would go to college in adjoining states. . . .

On January 31, 1933, President Estill wrote a letter to the other presidents which indicated that he had discovered another

area of hostility on the part of the church schools. He mentioned in the letter two "broadsides," as he called them, entitled "How the Government of Texas Spends Its Money for Education." Among other recommendations, one of these asked that the tuition in the state colleges be raised to \$150, as this would "go a long way toward solving the problem in a just way for all concerned." The other contended that the public schools would get more nearly their share of the state's money if \$150 were charged each student in the state colleges. Estill closed with these words:

I presume that most, if not all, of you have seen this mimeographed material. The wayfaring man though a fool can see the cloven hoof of our church-school friends. In their effort to save themselves they are striving to array elementary education against higher education, all under the guise of unselfish devotion to the interests of the public schools.

### **Skirmishing Between State Colleges**

A certain measure of ill feeling was created from time to time between a teachers college and another state-supported college other than the University of Texas. These clashes usually took the form of mild protests when the president of one college would discover what he considered an encroachment upon the academic preserves of the other. Between some there was suspicion and enmity growing out of their proximity to each other and the overlapping of the territory from which each institution drew students. Such natural clashes occurred between the West Texas State Teachers College at Canyon and the Texas Technological College at Lubbock; between the A. and M. College on the outskirts of Bryan and the Sam Houston Teachers College at Huntsville; between the North Texas Teachers College and the College of Industrial Arts, both located in the city of Denton; and between the Southwest Texas Teachers College and the University of Texas, located a distance of about 30 miles apart.

Occasionally enmity not far beneath the surface would show when the president of a teachers college would become interested in a teacher at another teachers college and would cautiously inquire into the possibility of obtaining that teacher's service without incurring the wrath of the employer-president. These minor events were usually handled with little outward show of anger. But there were other events which resulted in verbal

slugging matches. President Evans was usually kept informed by both sides of the controversy. And on more than one occasion Evans himself was a party to the conflict.

A bitter exchange took place in 1922 between President W. B. Bizzell of the A. and M. College and President H. F. Estill of the Sam Houston Teachers College when Bizzell took President Estill to task for allegedly announcing in the newspapers that the Sam Houston Teachers College would teach vocational agriculture under the Smith-Hughes program. President Bizzell informed Estill that it would be wasteful duplication of the state's money and would injure both institutions if the legislature should become aware that another A. and M. College was being operated within 50 miles of College Station. After reminding Estill of the adequate facilities, including 50 laboratories, at College Station designed especially for the training of teachers of vocational agriculture, he expressed the confident belief that Sam Houston Teachers College had no such facilities. And, finally, Bizzell declared that the atmosphere at a scientific and military institution was more favorable to this phase of teacher training.

People who knew H. F. Estill have frequently expressed the opinion that he had few equals as a debater, and he certainly lived up to his reputation in his reply to Bizzell. He wrote as follows:

You view with alarm this expansion of one of our long-established departments of teacher training as meaning the transformation of the Sam Houston Normal into an agricultural college! rivaling the institution over which you preside . . . .

The collegiate functions of the Agricultural and Mechanical College and the Sam Houston Normal are not matters of opinion by the administrative heads of these institutions but are clearly set forth in the constitution and statutes of Texas. The constitution designates the A. and M. College as an institution "for instruction in agriculture, the mechanical arts, and the natural sciences connected therewith." . . . The statutes of Texas will be searched in vain for a provision changing the field of service of your institution or authorizing it to assume any of the functions of a Teachers College. The functions of the Sam Houston Normal as specifically stated in the act of the legislature creating the institution is "to train teachers for the public schools of Texas." No subsequent legislative enactment has changed or limited this definite field of service.

Later President Estill wrote and printed a small bulletin defending Sam Houston Normal as the proper school in which teacher training in agriculture should be authorized. The following passages from that bulletin show how the battle of words was carried to the president of the A. and M. College:

Sam Houston State Teachers College made no protest when the A. and M. College a few years ago departed from the definite functions prescribed for it by the State constitution and laws, and invaded the field of teachers colleges by establishing courses in teacher training. Devoting all its energies to fulfilling the great mission for which it was established and is maintained by the State, the Sam Houston Teachers College has been too busily engaged in preparing teachers for the public schools to entertain institutional jealousies, or to engage in institutional controversies. However, when the A. and M. College, not content with breaking into the field of the teachers colleges, proceeds, through its president, to recommend to the Survey Staff<sup>2</sup> the curtailment of the definite and statutory functions of the Sam Houston State Teachers College in order to build up its own newly-created and struggling department of Education, "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind," as well as consideration of the educational interests of Texas, calls for emphatic protest and for a dispassionate statement of facts.

. . . . When . . . the A. and M. College establishes a department of Education and enters the field of teacher training it departs from its constitutional functions as clearly as it would do by establishing a department of law and engaging in the training of lawyers. The Survey report admits . . . that "no institutional provision nor legislative mandate exists for expanding the functions of A. and M. College beyond instruction in agriculture and mechanical arts."

On the other hand, the statute creating the Sam Houston Normal Institute clearly indicates its function to be the preparation of teachers for the public schools. The training of teachers of any subject taught in the public schools of Texas is the definite and statutory function of the teachers college. It is not the function of the Sam Houston Teachers College to establish a department of scientific agriculture or to train farmers, horticulturists, or veterinarians. The teachers college has made no attempt to enter any such alien fields. In the light of these facts the

---

<sup>2</sup>See full account of the creation of the Committee on Survey of Institutions of Education, Evans, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-228.

impartial reader can readily see which institution has broken away from its constitutional and statutory functions. . . .

For more than 25 years the Sam Houston Teachers College has been offering teacher-training courses in agriculture as part of the equipment of rural teachers. The mastery of these courses has proved an important factor in the recognized success of hundreds of young men and women who have gone out from the institution to teach in the rural schools of Texas. On the other hand, the A. and M. College ventured into its new field of teacher training only a few years ago.

Strange to say, absolutely no inspection of the agriculture department at Sam Houston was made by any representative of the Survey Staff. The educational surveyor who was sent to Huntsville distinctly stated that inspection of the agriculture department was not part of his responsibility. Any conclusion of the Survey report as to the adequacy of the facilities or the efficiency of the instruction of the agriculture department at Sam Houston Teachers College is based on second-hand information or ex parte statements.

. . . During the past three years there has been an average annual enrollment of 107 students in the department of teacher training in vocational agriculture at Sam Houston Teachers College, 51 of whom attended the long sessions and 56 the summer sessions. The last catalog of the A. and M. College gives 25 as the number of regular students enrolled in the Education department. The summer enrollment will hardly equal this total. It is evident that Texas teachers recognize the fact that a teachers college rather than a technical, scientific college is the best place to learn to teach any subject taught in the public schools.

. . . The Survey report . . . gives per-capita costs to the State of students at the various institutions. This statement shows per-capita cost of students at A. and M. to be  $2\frac{3}{4}$  times as great as at Sam Houston Teachers College. In other words, it costs the State  $2\frac{3}{4}$  times as much to train a student to be a teacher of vocational agriculture when the training is given at A. and M. College as when given at Sam Houston Teachers College.

Disputes and differences of opinion between the teachers colleges themselves were not unknown in their fight for a share of the students of Texas and for Federal aid and privilege of teaching under the Smith-Hughes vocational instruction law. Such a clash occurred between President Evans and President Estill in 1923. This friction was started by a statement made

by Estill that a strict interpretation of the assignment of certain instruction under the Smith-Hughes authority did not make sense when it deprived students in the avowed territory of one teachers college from taking advanced courses in the subject in which that student desired to major. Moreover, Estill stated that it was the intention of the administration at Huntsville to offer advanced courses in home economics, which subject had been assigned to San Marcos. He invited other teachers colleges to offer advanced courses in agriculture under the same circumstances.

Following this statement, Estill wrote the following letter, dated February 10, 1923:

The question of whether a state normal college should offer advanced courses in any subject should depend upon the actual demand for such courses on the part of students in the section of the State which the institution chiefly serves. The Sam Houston Normal College has no objection to any of its sister institutions offering advanced courses in agriculture whenever the interests of the students of the institution demand it. . . . We advise our students who plan to qualify as home economics teachers in Smith-Hughes schools that they should take their advanced work at the Southwest Texas Normal. Otherwise they may take such special advanced courses as we feel justified in offering.

Girls constitute two-thirds to three-fourths of the students in attendance upon normal colleges. The demand for home economics courses is proportionately greater, therefore, than for either agriculture or industries, which are men's courses. Would it not be manifestly unjust to the prospective teacher of Texas to prohibit the senior normal college from offering advanced courses in home economics solely on the ground that the normal college as San Marcos has been designated as a teacher-training institution in vocational home economics under the Federal law?

In a state as great in area and population as Texas to provide similar advanced courses at several of its institutions in accordance with local conditions and needs, is neither wasteful nor expensive.

I am sending copies of this letter to the other normal presidents.

The letter aroused the ire of President Evans as few other communications ever did. He knew some of his weaknesses, one of which was to hurl invectives at the object of his displeasure. Thus he formed a policy when he wrote a letter of criticism of

allowing the missive to "cool" for a while, after which he sometimes destroyed the message or softened its tone. After a cooling period, however, in the case of the reply to Estill, he let the original message go into the mail. His reference to his letter of February 2, 1923, indicated that he had previously cautioned Estill against duplication of efforts in the teaching of the subjects designated by the board of regents under the Smith-Hughes law and had stated that failure to observe the rules would be "wasteful and expensive." This direct rebuttal to Evans' warning did its part to stir his wrath. Also, the fact that Estill had sent copies to the other presidents, thus by implication calling these other gentlemen to witness the justness of his argument, was the final stress that broke the dam of Evans' choler. His reply of February 15 follows:

In my letter of February 2, I called your attention to the action of the board of normal regents some years ago, in designating the Sam Houston Normal Institute for teacher-training work in vocational agriculture, and the Southwest Texas State Normal College for teacher-training work in vocational home economics. By discontinuing plans for extension teaching in agriculture, we did our part in making it possible for you to get more liberal appropriations in equipping a standard department in that subject. Indeed, if in the summer of 1920 all normal colleges in Texas had asked for large amounts in vocational agriculture, and put forward similar plans for enlargement, no normal college would have received one cent, or else the normal colleges would have received inadequate sums. The Board of Control and legislative committees could readily see the wisdom of fully equipping one normal college for vocational agriculture. The number of students in this subject in no wise justifies all the normal colleges in an ambitious plan for expansion. Your apparent generosity in inviting us to expand in agriculture becomes, therefore, a clever bluff or a huge joke, in view of the fact that there are not sufficient numbers of students in vocational agriculture to justify such a policy, and yet we could have as many agricultural students as you have in home economics. You suggest to us an absurd action on our part.

You have profited by the action of the board of regents in concentrating vocational agriculture, and the other normal colleges have cooperated with you in your policy of expanding such work. You now refuse to approve a similar policy for the Southwest Texas State Normal College, thereby indicating a desire to gain at the expense of



this institution and give nothing in return. There is not a sufficient number of students in vocational home economics to justify all normal colleges in offering senior college work in such subject. You have fewer than ten students in home economics in your junior and senior years. All normal colleges combined have fewer than 75 students in these classes. . . . This situation is still further accentuated by the fact that already there are more teachers of home economics than there are places to fill. You can find degree women in vocational home economics teaching in other subjects and even in the grades. In the face of all this you propose, with a very small number of students in the subject, to expand into a four-year course leading to a bachelor's degree in vocational home economics. At the same time, you are profiting by the fact that we are not expanding in vocational agriculture. You cordially endorse a sound attitude in cooperating with you, while you, on the other hand, are deliberately adopting an unsound policy affecting us. You evidently are delighted with our attitude in not duplicating your vocational work, although you go right on and just as positively duplicate our vocational work.

. . . We cannot afford to cooperate with you in vocational agriculture unless you cooperate with us in vocational home economics; it is preposterous to ask us to do so. We have advised students for more than two years to take advanced work in vocational agriculture with you, but one-sided cooperation is now at an end. In an educational situation where cooperation is essential to success, you have chosen to take rather than to give and take; we, therefore, refuse to give.

Neither this letter nor the other letter was mailed to the other presidents. I am endeavoring to bring about equitable division by agreement with you. I have not the slightest doubt that the State of Texas will refuse, when the facts are presented, to sustain a senseless and suicidal policy in this matter.

I say all these things in the best of feeling; but the time has come for frankness. Sincerely yours.

In his reply to this blast from Evans, Estill protested such strong language and declared it was uncalled for; moreover, he said, it certainly would appear that two friends could adjust their differences without resort to such an aggressive display of emotion.

On February 21, Evans wrote Estill what could scarcely be termed an apology. He said:

My letter was a mere frank statement of honest differ-

ence of opinion. . . . While I may have appeared to be more aggressive in facts put forward than you have done, I am sure you would have been just as strong in your view. The letter does not contain the slightest suggestion that it is intended to be unkind; it is merely plain spoken. However, I regret the use of any language that would be construed to be discourteous to you.

With kind personal regards,

Later the same year Evans again took issue with Estill, who had given information to newspapers in a manner which made it appear to Evans that Estill was assuming the authority of speaking for all the other teachers colleges. As the president of the Council of Teachers College Presidents, Evans resented this action. He wrote Estill:

I do not exactly like the idea of one teachers college assuming to be a central bureau to give out authoritative information for all the other teachers colleges. I am going to be rather slow about giving information when it is to be used in that way. Already Texas has been broadcast with an article sent out from Canyon two years ago in which we were reported as a much smaller college than even Commerce, although, at that time, our enrollment was rather heavy. This was due to the omission of our summer enrollment. . . .

No record was found of a direct reply by President Estill to this criticism. The records do show, however, that the absence of a reply was not due to timidity on Estill's part. Copies of his letters show that he spoke frankly and disputatiously to any other president with whom he disagreed. For example, in 1925 President R. B. Cousins of the teachers college at Kingsville inquired of Estill what his attitude would be toward the employment by Cousins of the head of the agriculture department at Sam Houston. Estill replied to Cousins as follows:

. . . The present head of my department of agriculture is rendering satisfactory service. I may state that if he should desire to go elsewhere I would not for a moment offer objection, much as I value his services. At the same time, to be perfectly frank with you, I do not believe that the spirit of cooperation and amity among the state teachers colleges will be promoted by encouraging the transfer from one of these institutions to another of a head of a department who is recognized as a valuable man and who is entirely in harmony with his environment, and where the proposed change involves no promotion. I say this aside from

the fact that the vocational agriculture work is under fire. I believe we have won the fight. However, there is no promotion in the transfer of a man from the headship of the agriculture department in an institution which has Federal and state recognition of this work to another institution of equal rank in which the department has no such recognition. I have no reason to believe that our department head desires a change of location. In fact, he has actually given me voluntary assurances to the contrary. However, as his friend I shall not object to any decision he may reach in this matter.

I have written this in the spirit of candor and friendship.

Very sincerely yours,

Despite their internal differences the presidents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges were a unit when faced by a common opponent. Under the leadership of President Evans, these men were an ordained and consecrated team exerting every possible effort to further the cause of teacher training and to increase the prestige of the system of teachers colleges of the state. Nevertheless, occasional bickering among themselves continued. Each watched the others to see that nothing was gained by one while the others were discriminated against. Like a crew of brothers enjoying the fellowship of cooperative effort in moving toward a common goal, their tempers were frequently just beneath the surface ready to explode in sudden jealous anger.

On February 26, 1925, President Estill wrote President Evans as follows:

My attention was attracted to the fact (in the Senate journal of Saturday, February 21) that the West Texas State Teachers College has a deficiency item for fuel, light, and power, \$16,000; also repairs and improvements, \$600. The North Texas State Teachers College has a deficiency item for repairs and improvements and up keep of buildings and grounds, \$5,636.31. The bill states that these deficiencies have been duly authorized by the Governor. I am wondering how Hill got his fuel deficiency since last September, and I am reminded that you and I are in urgent need of a fuel deficiency appropriation for the same period for which Hill seems to have already received his. Please let me know the status of my two emergency items which you have been kindly looking after for me, namely, fuel, light, and power, \$3,625 and paving \$4,100. . . .

Because of his proximity to Austin, Evans frequently acted

as the representative in legislative matters of the presidents in more remote parts of the state.

Perhaps the matter of enrollment caused more friction between the presidents of the teachers colleges than any other single factor. Before Evans assumed the presidency of the Council of Presidents he wrote a letter to all of these men in an effort to define the territory which rightfully might be claimed by each of the colleges and into which another teachers college must not go to solicit students. On May 24, 1919, he wrote:

Not only from the standpoint of economy, but also from the standpoint of good feeling, should we do the maximum part of advertising in the territory adjacent to each of the normal schools. No good whatever can come from the Southwest Texas State Normal College circularizing Collin County, Rockwall County, Potter County, or Montgomery County with a view of attracting students from these counties to San Marcos. Students in Collin County should attend the North Texas State Normal College; students in Rockwall County should attend the East Texas State Normal College; students in Potter County should attend the West Texas State Normal College; students in Caldwell County should attend the Southwest Texas State Normal; students in Montgomery County should attend the Sam Houston Normal Institute. Occasionally, for climatic reasons, a student from one of these counties may go across the state to enter a normal school, but neither good sense nor professional courtesy would insist upon students doing so. If the State Normal Colleges of Texas insist upon adopting a policy of partisan competition for students but an hour's ride from other schools, we can stand it just as well as any other Normal school can. Such a policy, however, is neither necessary nor advisable, and in my judgment, is indefensible.

Ten years later, apparently through error, advertising matter from the Southwest Texas Teachers College was sent to a student at White Deer, sixty miles northwest of Canyon in the far-away Panhandle of Texas. News of this was not long in reaching the president of the teachers college at Canyon, and he promptly wrote President Evans reminding him that there had been an agreement among the colleges not to encroach upon the other's territory. President Evans sent an immediate apology, blaming the mistake on the registrar's office which failed to learn the location of the town in question. He promised President Hill to correct the situation and keep all agreements in the future.

## Hard Times for Educational Paupers

A short time after the great depression began in the fall of 1929, school men, not unlike all other citizens, became so uneasy at the prospects of the future of our economy that thoughts of cutting expenses in whatever area possible dominated most private conversations and public utterances. As the gloom of hard times settled everywhere, there is little wonder that public attention was soon directed to government expenses as well as all other kinds. It is also no wonder at all that the Texas Legislature meeting in 1931 started the session with the almost unanimous determination to cut state spending.

This attitude on the part of the majority of the legislators presented the opportunity which many enemies of the state teachers colleges had long been seeking. Fortunately, however, for the public schools and colleges, calm determination on the part of the governor and legislative leaders prevailed, and a faint spark of hope continued to glow that the depression might ease up. Thus the appropriations were cut but nominally in the 1931 session, and the teachers colleges won a two-year reprieve.

But the ailing economy grew steadily worse. State revenue dropped alarmingly, and before the end of 1932 there were proposals from practically every source of communication for the abolition of this or that state function, with concentration upon the teachers colleges. The State Board of Education in the fall of 1932 recommended severe cuts in the funds of the state colleges, but did not propose the abolition of any one of them. By this time the voices of extremists were loud in the plea to destroy the "unneeded" colleges and thus undo the mistakes made by the legislature in establishing too many state colleges in the years past.

Under the urgent advice of President Evans and President Birdwell of Nacogdoches, the teachers college presidents gave their support to the program of the State Board of Education. These men expressed to newly-elected representatives and senators their willingness to undertake to operate the colleges as economically as possible and pledged themselves to accept a reasonable reduction in their appropriations.

On January 3, 1933, President Birdwell wrote to the other teachers college presidents as follows:

There are many people saying that the teachers col-

leges are educational menaces. Of course, this idea is old and has been explored a thousand times. It is queer that any man who claims to be abreast with educational thought should very seriously undertake to defend this thesis. I think the report of the Committee on Reorganization and Efficiency<sup>3</sup> abounds in misstatements of facts, in professional insults, and in invidious comparisons.

Arguments, of which the following summary is typical, appeared in the editorial columns of several Texas newspapers:

*"Six Reasons Why The State Teachers Colleges and particularly The Southwest Texas State Teachers College Should Be Abolished Outright Or Reduced In Rank To Junior Colleges"*

1. *No need.* Technical colleges do a better job of training teachers.

2. *Poor locations,* political rather than educational considerations being the determining factor for the mislocations. Complete abandonment or re-location is suggested.

3. Because of cooperative relationships with the public schools, the industrial colleges are in many respects offering better teacher-training work than the teachers colleges.

4. The Southwest Texas State Teachers College is located 35 miles from the University of Texas and has no territory to serve which could not be better served by the University of Texas. The University can train teachers better through its better qualified instructional staff and better practice-teaching facilities.

5. The Southwest Texas State Teachers College is now 70 per cent a junior college which carries a number of senior college courses for a few students. In view of the fact that slightly more than 300 upper level students at the Southwest Texas State Teachers College can readily be absorbed in the upper level classes at the University of Texas with very little if any additional cost, it would seem advisable to discontinue upper level offerings at the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

6. Multiplied departments with many class units of one to five students and many more with six to ten students, all of which is unnecessary and expensive.

Although there were a few signs in 1933 that the cause of the teachers colleges would not be entirely lost by action of the

---

<sup>3</sup>See Evans, *op. cit.*, pp. 231 ff. for the history of this controversial committee created by the Forty-Second Legislature in 1931. Also J. A. Hill's spirited account which he described as a time when "all hell broke loose in Texas." *More Than Brick and Mortar*, West Texas State College, 1959, pp. 117, ff.

legislature that year, the fight continued for half a dozen years, the attacks coming from the public utterances of prominent people of the state or from statements in newspapers and magazines. One example was a speech made by Mrs. Noyes Darling Smith, chief speaker at the March, 1934, meeting of the A. A. U. W. in Austin, as reported in the *Daily Texan*, student newspaper of the University. Mrs. Smith's speech consisted in a large part of the findings of the State Board of Education. Said she: "The Board in its survey was forced to concentrate on one point: whether the system by which a small class taking a certain subject, repeated in each of the fifteen state institutions of higher learning, was not too expensive."

As a result of the investigation, Mrs. Smith said, the Board recommended that no freshman or sophomore class be organized with less than ten pupils, and no junior or senior class with less than six. This plan, if followed, would mean that only three or four out of the fifteen colleges would be four-year schools, Mrs. Smith explained. The Board also recommended that no graduate work be attempted by any school but the University.

In a letter concerning Mrs. Smith's speech, President Estill of Huntsville maintained that if only four institutions were allowed four years of college work these would be (1) the University of Texas, (2) the A. and M. College, (3) Texas Tech, and (4) The College of Industrial Arts. If only three—the first three above. Thus the whole system of teachers colleges in Texas would be reduced to junior-college level.

The fear of this "threatened emasculation of the teachers colleges," as President Evans frequently referred to it, pushed some of the friends of the teachers colleges to the brink of panic. In a letter dated December 12, 1933, President Hill of Canyon urged immediate, forceful action:

We should contact all candidates for governor and lieutenant governor and commit them to the continuance of the Texas State Teachers Colleges on something like the present basis. I do believe, however, we should let these candidates know that, in turn, we are willing to make adjustments, consolidations, and retrenchments along constructive lines. On the other hand, we are not willing to enter the field of political cheese paring.

Three months later on March 10, 1934, in a letter addressed

to President Morelock of Alpine, with copies to all the presidents, Hill also said:

I note your statement that the country as a whole is getting the impression that we have too many teachers and will take but little notice of the quality. I agree with your statement. It is up to the teachers colleges to emphasize facts: (1) There is no surplus of qualified teachers. . . . (2) The alleged surplus is due not to there being an oversupply on the part of the teachers colleges but to the fact that every other type of educational institution is permitted to rush into the field of teacher-training, in addition to their justifiable functions.

In January, 1933, the report of the Legislative Committee on Efficiency and Economy, aided by the report of the State Board of Education, which, as J. Q. Guleke of Amarillo, member of the Board, said, offers a "deadly parallel," was causing worry in every area where an interest in the welfare of a teachers college could be found. In a letter to President A. B. Mayhew of the Board of Regents of the State Teachers Colleges in January, 1933, President Hill mentioned the pressure on him to speak in behalf of the colleges, but he hesitated to oppose Guleke. The well-known ability of Hill as a public speaker, however, put him in an embarrassing position because of the great and growing demand for his appearance.

At last he agreed to speak and, as he wrote Mayhew, "Some are insisting that it be broadcast." He told Mayhew that he would try to confer with John E. Hill, member of the board, in the next day or two and then expressed the wish that he might have the counsel of each member of the board of regents. He promised to speak with restraint and good feeling, so far as it was possible for him to do so, and said that a typewritten or stenographic report of the "essay" would be made. He declared, "Mr. Guleke did not present a single fact which I fear to face, and I shall proceed to riddle them one by one. Any and all suggestions will be appreciated."

President Evans remained surprisingly calm, even though his college appeared to stand in the greatest danger of "emasculatation" or total abolition. On March 24, 1933, he wrote the other presidents:

It seems to me an unwise policy to continue running risks in times of crisis. Both the Efficiency-Economy Committee and the State Board of Education have recommended



drastic policies of reduction, consolidation, or destruction. To say that these recommendations have not been carefully considered by many thoughtful people in the Legislature and in Texas is to run counter to facts.

If I interpret your sentiment and the common sentiment correctly, you are in favor of defeating the present radical movement by direct frontal attack, making no substantial concessions. The adverse recommendations of these organizations are to be set aside as dangerous "in toto." My own judgment is that you are wrong.

As it is now, no state college will lose its life *this* year, but we will have the agencies organized and active to continue the fight for our destruction two years later. Whatever opinion we may have concerning the Anderson-Hughes-Metcalf Bill,<sup>1</sup> this bill will be put on the skids forever under the power now lodged in the present State Board of Education. I have it from what I regard as inside authority that the State Board of Education has never expected to destroy the Teachers Colleges this year, but expects to accomplish its complete plan within two to four years. Our friends in the Senate and in the House are evidently not intending to reduce the power of the State Board of Education. We, therefore, carry over a war-time organization with enhanced administrative powers and with considerably exaggerated importance to fight for our destruction within the next few years. We are deliberately rejecting the opportunity to get rid of the destructive power of the State Board of Education over us. The sword hanging over our heads for two years does not look good to me. I make no further comment. I have not been in Austin since Tuesday.

When President Evans made certain contacts in Austin with what he himself called "inside authority" and divulged information of this implied confidential nature, not one of his comrades in this struggle failed to take sharp and respectful notice. Moreover, the proposed strategy of Evans to abandon the counter-attack and seek peaceful negotiations may well have been a deciding factor in averting the destruction of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

President Hill, almost by return mail from Canyon, was the first to respond to Evans' letter. On March 27, Hill wrote as follows:

I have read and pondered over your letter of March 24. I think it has in it much food for thought. In fact, I had

---

<sup>1</sup>A bill offered in the House during the regular session of 1933, designed to reorganize the Texas colleges rather than destroy any of them.

thought of most of the things you mention, and I am willing to follow your leadership in this matter.

My suggestion would be if we are going to accept the one-board idea, that the bill provide for not more than two members from any vocation (the present board is loaded down with lawyers), that not more than two members may be alumni of any one college or the University, that no member may be a resident of a county in which an institution is located, and that (I am not sure of this) two or three of the members should be educators. It may be that the State Superintendent should have an exofficio position on this board.

### Evans Leads the Defense

In spite of Evans' conciliatory leaning, he was too much of a fighter to keep entirely out of the fray. On January 22 he had made a sharp and almost desperate reply to a communication from J. O. Guleke, member of the State Board of Education from Amarillo. He said at that time:

A copy of the biennial report of the State Board of Education reached me at Austin, and on return to San Marcos I find a copy sent me through the mails. I desire to thank you for the extra copy.

Some weeks ago, a member of our faculty and I, working together, made a careful study of this report. Under the report of the State Board of Education, what remains of the present system of state teachers colleges will be mere scraps or wrecks of a former splendid system, if this institution is left at all. No further comment is necessary.

When the report and recommendations of the Efficiency-Economy Committee appeared late in 1932, President Evans at once launched a campaign to produce testimony countering the findings of the Committee and in favor of the system of teachers colleges. He prepared facts and figures to refute the Committee's statement that the Southwest Texas State Teachers College was a local college drawing its enrollment from a narrow territory; and to make this evidence stronger and more effective he took his statistics from the report of the State Board of Education itself for 1932-33. The accompanying table not only tends to prove that the Southwest Texas State Teachers College was not a strictly "local" college by the definition of the Efficiency-Economy Committee, but that all the other teachers colleges are in reality "state" institutions, drawing their enrollments from a large area. In addition, Evans found information which would

most likely look favorable to an efficiency-minded legislature, that of cost to the state of instruction in the teachers colleges, and particularly the fact that the institution at San Marcos had next to the lowest cost per hour of credit in instruction of students.

In February, 1933, Evans also prepared a report from 33 counties showing the college or university at which the teachers in these counties had received their training. This report, compiled from the records of the State Department of Education, was sent to every member of the legislature and to the members of the State Board of Education.

Table 1  
*Recent Report of State Board of Education 1932-33*

	Students 50 Mile Radius (Per Cent)	Students 100 Mile Radius (Per Cent)	Credit Hours Cost, 12 Months
A. and M. ....	12.1	32.1	\$14.09
C.I.A. . . . .	40.5	50.5	11.37
C. A. I. . . . .	66.8	80.6	8.03
U. of Texas ....	26.5	40.7	9.11
Texas Tech ....	45.5	56.7	7.64
Denton .....	56.4	76.4	6.39
Commerce .....	67.8	95.3	5.24
Huntsville .....	55.9	85.7	8.93
San Marcos ....	44.5	74.9	5.73
Canyon .....	44.3	76.9	8.07
Alpine .....	31.8	38.8	9.48
Nacogdoches ..	84.8	95.7	7.79

An examination of this report will serve to show its probable worth in the defense of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

Starting with the teachers of Travis County, the report showed that out of 411 teachers in that county, 194 were trained at the University of Texas; 108 at other colleges; 70 at San Marcos; and 39 at other Texas State Teachers Colleges. In Caldwell County, which adjoins Travis, out of 151 teachers, 110 were trained at San Marcos; 7 at the University; 20 at other colleges; and 4 at other Texas State Teachers Colleges. In Bastrop County, which also adjoins Travis, out of 82 teachers, 20 were trained at San Marcos; 20 at the University; 28 at other colleges; and 4 at other Texas State Teachers Colleges. In Williamson County, just north of Travis, out of 264 teachers,

90 were trained at San Marcos; 29 at the University; 122 at other colleges; and 23 at other Texas State Teachers Colleges. In Hays County, the home of Southwest Texas, out of 77 teachers, 67 were trained at San Marcos; 6 at the University; 3 at other colleges; and 1 at other Texas State Teachers Colleges. Of the teachers in all of the 33 counties reported upon, out of a total of 4,594, 1,688 were trained at San Marcos; 581 at the University; 1,681 at other colleges; and 644 at other Texas State Teachers Colleges.

With the information of this report, it would appear indeed difficult for anyone to reach the conclusion that the Southwest Texas State Teachers College was not performing the service for which it had been established.

Other telling evidence was presented by Evans in articles written for educational journals published in Texas and sent to newspapers, where they were not always published. One of his favorite illustrations was to show how many of the students at Southwest Texas had to travel through Austin "and pass by the University of Texas" to get to San Marcos. For example, students coming from the counties north of Austin—Williamson, Milam and the heavily populated counties of Bell and McLennan would pass through Austin. A small bulletin which served as a stuffer in the regular small, business-size envelope was printed in February, 1933, as an answer to the report of the Efficiency-Economy Committee. Below are some paragraphs from this bulletin:

Enrollment since 1903 has totaled 65,750 students, one-third of whom have spent an average of more than three years in this college. The increase in attendance, in both regular and summer sessions, from 1921 to 1931 has been approximately 300 per cent. The average attendance for the past five years has been: Regular Session, 1,237; Summer Session, 2,126.

An average of 79 bachelors degrees was conferred by each of the 140 teachers colleges of the United States in 1930. In the same year Southwest Texas State Teachers College conferred 162 such degrees.

The first degree class (1919) had two members; the latest class had 182 members. Degrees have been conferred upon 1,221 graduates, 75 per cent of whom are in the teaching profession; 13 per cent are home makers; and only 10 per cent are unemployed, unknown, or engaged in other occupations.

The average tenure of high school teachers with

degrees from all state schools other than teachers colleges is 6.9 years—the average tenure of such teachers graduating from this college is 8 years.

Of the teachers employed in the thirteen counties surrounding San Marcos, 35.9 per cent of all elementary teachers and 23.8 per cent of all high school teachers were trained in this college,

Among the sixteen state educational institutions, for the twelve months of 1930-31, this college ranked second in low per capita cost to the state and fifth in its large percentage of students coming from a distance of more than fifty miles.

The per capita cost is also low to the individual student. An average monthly expense per student for the fall quarter of 1932 was \$26.

According to the Texas Educational Survey of 1925, the proportion of students in state educational institutions representing agricultural homes was as follows: state teachers colleges, 59 per cent; other state colleges, 27 per cent.

In further answer to the criticism of the Committee that the territory served by the Southwest Texas State Teachers College could be better served and at little extra cost by the University of Texas, which is only 30 miles distant, the bulletin presented the following:

*Proximity in Other States of Teachers Colleges  
to the State University*

Teachers College at Ypsilanti, within 7 miles of the University of Michigan.

Teachers College at San Francisco, within 10 miles of the University of California.

Teachers College at Lewiston, within 30 miles of the University of Idaho.

Teachers College at Edmond, within 30 miles of the University of Oklahoma.

Teachers College at Lafayette, within 50 miles of the University of Louisiana.

Teachers College at Greeley, within 50 miles of the University of Colorado.

And finally, to show that in spite of the Committee's recommendation that the Southwest Texas State Teachers College be discontinued or reduced to a junior college, the bulletin declared that the report of the Committee itself was a rebuttal of the

reasons given for the recommendation. The bulletin presented excerpts from the report of the Committee, adding page numbers for documentation :

"The state does need better trained teachers."—p. 10.

"The data of Table II show that the institution (SWTTC) serves a broad area of the state."—p. 176.

"Students will not attend an institution having a reputation for low standards and scholarship."—p. 14.

"More than 58 per cent of the regular session students and more than 67 per cent of the summer session come from homes at a greater distance than 50 miles. This is unusual for a teacher-training institution. Even in liberal arts colleges more than 50 per cent usually come from homes within a radius of 50 miles from the institution."—p. 176.

"Distribution of trained teachers from the Southwest Texas State Teachers College is probably broader than the distribution of the homes from which they come as students."—p. 176.

"Table III shows this institution to rank third in class size among the seven teacher-training institutions of the state."—p. 179.

"No criticism for the instructional part of the organization is offered."—p. 186.

"So far as could be observed from an inspection of library records, files, location of books, and the college library, library work is being efficiently performed."—p. 191.

A miniature map of the middle section of Texas was added to the bulletin showing the enrollment by counties for the past five years (prior to January, 1933) for 80 counties stretching from the Rio Grande and the southern gulf coast northward to Navarro on the east side of the territory and to Runnels on the west side, and with an appended statement that 126 other counties not shown on the map contributed 2,000 additional students.

The bulletin was sent to every member of the legislature, to the members of the board of regents of the state teachers colleges, and to thousands of other people throughout the state. The Alumni Association, acting on the information presented in the bulletin and in circular letters, petitioned the lawmakers to oppose any attempt to destroy or hamper the great work which the College was doing.

Alma Mater Lives On!

The records do not indicate any serious effects of all the publicity and unrest concerning the future of the College upon

the enrollment. Odd as it may seem, the depression which brought on all this trouble did not seriously reduce the enrollment of the College. Nor was the statement by the Efficiency-Economy Committee that the San Marcos institution was essentially a junior college substantiated by the facts. The following table represents the enrollment for the years 1927 to 1932 inclusive of the regular sessions and summer sessions, with the percentage of upper classmen for each year:

Table 2

Year	Regular Session	% Upper Classes	Summer Session	Date	% Upper Classes
1927-28	1,244	27	1,944	1928	28
1928-29	1,196	27	2,025	1929	31
1929-30	1,207	28	—	1930	—*
1930-31	1,212	26	2,262	1931	40
1931-32	1,172	31	2,070	1932	39

\*See college catalogs for these dates. The catalog for 1930-31 omitted the enrollment for the summer session of 1930.

The attack upon the College was first officially noticed by President Evans in a faculty meeting, December 8, 1932. He displayed the Austin headline of a newspaper relating the recommendation that all the teachers colleges except Sam Houston at Huntsville be closed. He told the faculty that opposition to the cost of higher education was not strange in a time of widespread economic depression. He recited statistics to show how the burden of educational costs had increased in a little more than 15 years. He pointed out the fact that the total cost of higher education in Texas for the biennium of 1915-17 was only \$4,496,016 as compared with 1931-33 of \$15,986,773 appropriated by the legislature, but with more than two million dollars of that being vetoed by the governor. The following table was presented to the faculty to show the growth in the number of state-supported colleges:

Table 3

Growth in Number of State-Supported Colleges

1915	Colleges in Texas	1931
7	all	15
3	senior	12
4	junior	3
1	A. and M.	6
1	C. I. A.	1
1	University	1

Thus with multiplied colleges came, as a matter of course, multiplied costs. The relative importance of the system of state teachers colleges was shown by Evans in a comparison of the enrollment in the state colleges as follows:

University of Texas, .....	6,348 <sup>5</sup>
A. and M., Texas Tech., and C.I.A. ....	6,473
Seven Teachers Colleges .....	7,979

He used the following illustration :

Start 100 students to college in Texas—30 go to the University, 31 to the group of colleges named second above, and about 40 go to the teachers colleges. Start 17 students to college in Texas, and one will go to San Marcos. But for the summer sessions, out of 100 students enrolled in the Texas colleges, about 50 will attend the teachers colleges and about 50 will attend the other state colleges.

On the matter of costs, he said the teachers colleges are 25 per cent less expensive to the state, on the average, than are the other state colleges.

He read from the report of the legislative Efficiency and Economy Committee which recommended that the college at San Marcos be abandoned on account of its location near the University, the lack of any need for the work which the school was doing, and the fact that whatever service to the state the school might be rendering could be rendered better by the University. The report stated firmly that the teachers colleges were not essential because their work could be done better by the colleges of arts and sciences. If continued at all, the report recommended that these colleges be reduced to junior college rank.

Evans made the gloomy prediction that a cut in salaries and perhaps the elimination of some positions were inevitable.

Later that month Evans told the Kiwanis Club of San Marcos that there was no real reason for a crisis. He said much blame for the upheaval was due to "politics and pork," growing out of the multiplied costs of government, large deficiencies in state funds, and the continued depression. He noted that almost 8,000 students in the teachers colleges other than at Huntsville were threatened. The main target, however, was San Marcos, the existence of which, it was argued, could not be justified

---

<sup>5</sup>It may come as a surprise to many Exes to learn that the enrollment of the College for the fall semester of 1966 was larger than that of the University of Texas only 34 years earlier.



either as a senior or as a junior college. The others seriously threatened were Canyon, Commerce, Alpine, and Nacogdoches. Evans referred to the proposed cut as "emasculatation or destruction of the teachers colleges." He declared, "We must justify the San Marcos College as a college for state purpose under state plan." He stated that the Committee could not justify the San Marcos College and the University at Austin, 30 miles apart with overlapping territory unless they were cooperating institutions or colleges each with a distinct and definite purpose. He compared the situation with that of the College of Industrial Arts and the North Texas State Teachers College, both at Denton.

He told the Kiwanians, "We can't justify the San Marcos College unless it meets the real college needs of a sufficiently large body of students to make an efficient economic unit." He again denied that there was a surplus of qualified teachers. He said that had not the depression occurred, driving back into the teaching profession hundreds of poorly qualified teachers who would otherwise be in other work, there would not have been a surplus of teachers, and he predicted that with the return of normal economic conditions this so-called surplus would melt away. He reminded his listeners that during the depression there was also a surplus of engineers, lawyers, doctors, etc. He emphasized the fact that Southwest Texas State Teachers College was a state college—not a local college—doing the definite work of training teachers for service in the public schools. It was a specialized state institution, he declared, which was not duplicating the work of the University. He quoted from Cubberley's *State School Administration*, pp. 594-5:

That such development (general college training and special training for teachers) will be favorable for teacher training, and that it will draw into the teaching profession many able students, men and women who do not now contemplate the work because it requires advance decision as to career and attendance at a specialized state institution before they have had a chance to learn what education is about or what teaching means, there can be little question.

Evans said that expenditures for education are meaningless unless expressed in the superior quality and skill of the teacher. The efficient school presupposes the efficient teacher, he added.

He pointed out that the teachers college is a peculiarly

American institution, only five states being without teachers colleges—Delaware, Florida, Nevada, Rhode Island, and New York. In a comparison with eight other states, Evans showed that whereas in Texas, with seven teachers colleges, there are 137 students in teachers colleges to every 100,000 population, the other eight states range from 126 students per 100,000 population in Virginia to 288 per 100,000 in Oklahoma. In Wisconsin, a state with a fraction more than half the population of Texas, nine teachers colleges are supported with enrollment per 100,000 population of 208 students.

Evans then declared that the San Marcos State Teachers College was already a state college with a sufficient enrollment for an efficient economic unit. Including all 563 colleges in the United States, San Marcos ranked in the upper fourth. Excluding A. and M. College and the University, San Marcos ranked in the upper sixth. In the regular session San Marcos ranked sixth in enrollment among the twelve state colleges of Texas, and for the summer session it ranked fifth of the twelve colleges.

At this point, as a sort of footnote, it may be recorded that the townspeople of San Marcos came as nearly being solidly in support of the College administration as at any other time since the College was established. The San Marcos Record opened its editorial and news columns to win public opinion against abolition of the College. An event occurred just at this time which well illustrated the favor in which the citizens of San Marcos held the College.

Many people here may still remember the afternoon in late November, 1932, when the Main Building caught fire. In those days, when the firebell sounded in San Marcos, anyone could learn the location of the fire merely by lifting the telephone receiver and listening as "Central" announced over and over the site of the fire. Thus attracted by the fire, hundreds flocked to the campus, this time not merely as spectators, but in a desire to help put out the flames. Fortunately, the fire was discovered early enough to bring it under control with very little effort.

In ordinary times little or no attention would have been given to the event, but with the threat of extinction already hanging over the College, a serious fire would have almost certainly sealed its fate. A bit of humor lightened the gravity of the occasion, however, when someone volunteered the informa-

tion that the fire originated in President Evans' private "toilet." And this was true. Never a man to provide himself with luxury at state expense, Evans for the 21 years of his tenure had made use of the men's rooms without thought of inconvenience. At last, however, he had called on Rufus Wimberley and Ab Clayton, his right-hand men and jack-of-all-trades, to install the necessary fixtures and provide a lounge opening into the president's office!

For insulation, Wimberley and Clayton packed the walls for sound proofing with cotton seed hulls. In some way the hulls may have absorbed a modicum of moisture which caused the material to heat and possibly create combustion. By breaking into the hollow of the walls, the fire was easily extinguished. Needless to say, Evans ordered the insulation material removed. The embarrassing plumbing noises would just have to be endured!

### **The "Shooting War" Ends**

In 1933, whether because of the quality of the defense organized by the teachers colleges, or because of a sober second thought, the legislature of Texas seemed content to allow the colleges to live, but all state appropriations were cut twenty-five per cent. The recommendation of a legislative committee and of a board appointed especially to reduce state spending were rejected. Just as President Evans had predicted, the sword hanging over the heads of the teachers colleges did not fall. But the war was not quite over, and the sniping continued sporadically for five or six years. During 1934 certain representatives of the State Department of Education in public speeches allegedly charged most of the troubles of Texas education to the teachers colleges, but no official action was taken. A letter received in March 1934 from an alumnus of another college informed President Evans of the appearance of a representative of the State Department of Education who spoke to a group of county teachers and members of boards of trustees about the new rural aid law. The correspondent related:

Suddenly, in the course of his talk he introduced the state teachers colleges, charging them, as I recall, with flooding the state with teachers and burdening the citizens with taxes. He called particular attention to the duplication of costs in supporting two institutions at Denton, declaring that one of them—the teachers college—should be abolished. At the close of this irrelevant attack, he stated that he was

expressing his own views and not those of any other member of the State Department of Education.

I have never attended a teachers college or held a position in one, and consequently could not reasonably have felt responsible for any errors held up to us. What struck me was the impropriety of these "personal" remarks. Why does not a public servant traveling at public expense confine himself to the subject the public is asking to hear?

Other correspondence on the subject indicated the emotional intensity which had been generated over the discussions. However, there were good signs that the foes of the teachers colleges were weakening. A year earlier the tone of letters from members of the State Board of Education was uniformly firm in the determination to rid Texas of the burden foisted upon the state by the generosity of legislatures in the past. But now, in the late spring of 1934, away from the legislative turmoil in Austin, there was an unmistakable softening in the attitude toward the subject.

In September, 1934, President Evans received a letter from Tom Garrard, member of the State Board of Education from Tahoka, with a very conciliatory tone. It read:

Dear Sir: The State Board of Education, as you know, made a report to the Legislature two years ago affecting your school and is making a follow-up study with the view of making other recommendations, I presume. If there were any mistakes touching your school in the other report, I would like to know about them, and if there are any suggestions that you may have for the betterment of your school that might be incorporated in this report, I would like to have these suggestions. Please give me this information at once, if you can, as the Board meets to take up this matter on the week of the 8th of October.

Then added in the handwriting of Mr. Garrard was the following: "P. S. Please give me all reasons you can for the continued existence of your school under its present setup."

The Board postponed the date of its meeting, and for some reason Evans did not reply directly to Garrard, but addressed a form letter to the entire Board in which he referred to the tables on costs and enrollment already presented in this chapter. The letter, dated October 27, 1934, follows:

Ladies and Gentlemen: We are submitting herewith statistical data requested by your Board, to which we take

the liberty of adding the following additional information and observations.

The grand total of classes taught in the Southwest Texas State Teachers College in the current semester is only 170. Our catalog does not list this year Latin, library science, or religion, but upon request we are teaching one class in library science which has 22 students. We did not schedule French, which, though offered, we propose to teach only occasionally on demand. Of the total of 170 classes, we have five classes with one to five students and 21 classes with one to ten students, making 12 per cent of all classes containing one to ten students. For 1933-1934, we organized nine classes with one to five students and 63 classes with one to ten students, the grand total being 371 classes, making 17 per cent of all classes containing one to ten students. For 1932-33, with a grand total of 609 classes, we organized nine classes with one to five students and 129 classes with one to ten students, making 21 per cent of all classes containing one to ten students. The average of classes of one to five and classes of one to ten for all colleges of Texas exceeds somewhat the average for the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. We insist that this college has met the issue of small classes fairly and squarely, and that no legitimate criticism should come to us.

Reference to official reports of the State Board of Education for 1932-33 shows a cost of \$8.42 per semester hour for the regular session and \$2.95 per semester hour for the summer session, or an average of \$6.79 per semester hour for twelve months. For 1933-1934 these official reports show a cost of \$7.15 per hour for the regular session and \$2.69 per semester hour for the summer session, or an average of \$5.05 per semester hour for twelve months. In maintenance cost as in internal organization the Southwest Texas State Teachers College reports an efficient and economical program. . . .

We take pleasure in submitting also a study made a year ago attesting to the extensive service this college is rendering over a large area of Texas. A reference to the findings tabulated in the study will indicate that in 1932-1933 in Bexar County alone 247 teachers had received most of their training in the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, and that in some counties, notably Caldwell, Lavaca, and Hays, the percentage of those who received their training in San Marcos is surprisingly high, for the three counties instanced being 72, 75, and 87 per cent respectively. Respectfully submitted

On the 12th of November Ghent Sanderford, board member from Austin, wrote President Evans as follows:

Please send be a catalog of your college for 1934-35.

The Board of Education meets in Fort Worth the 24th of this month. I would appreciate a letter from you making such argument and statements in behalf of your college as you desire. I want to be fully prepared to help write a proper report and any suggestions you have to make will be appreciated. Yours very truly.

To this letter Evans replied directly:

Dear Mr. Sanderford: Under separate cover a catalog of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College is forwarded you. I note the date of the Fort Worth meeting of the State Board of Education and am submitting some statements for your information.

1. The Texas teachers colleges are the State's regularly designated agents for the training of a professional force for the public schools. Only through the professional school teacher does the tax dollar reach the child. The university teacher is extravagant in cost to the State through failure to train the young people for good citizenship. Set apart for the sole function of teacher-training, the Texas state teachers colleges are on the job the year round. With teachers colleges, teacher-training is not a sideline, an adjunct, or a let-live department; it is the paramount consideration and is given just recognition and proper emphasis in both academic and professional classes. It follows that the product of a teachers college should make better teachers than the product of arts colleges where teacher-training has a secondary place and poor laboratories.

2. The Texas state teachers colleges must be four-year colleges if they properly serve the public school system; as junior colleges, or as emasculated senior colleges, they would have a very small field of usefulness with doubtful continuance as state institutions. Any standard senior college must offer at least eight majors in order to give students the chance for a good program of academic studies suited to individual talent and special needs. Given an opportunity through liberal academic offerings, Texas state teachers colleges may fully meet the demands of the public schools for efficient teachers.

3. The Texas state teachers colleges are rendering service to the schools of Texas on a sound administrative basis and at reasonable cost. Reference to findings of a special study indicates that in 1932-33 a very large per cent of the teachers of Bexar, Caldwell, Lavaca, Fayette, Gonzales, Wilson, and other counties in the radius of Southwest

Texas State Teachers College received their training in this college. In the number of small classes, cost per semester hour, and soundness of program offered, the Texas state teachers colleges have a record surprisingly creditable. We insist that the Texas state teachers colleges are doing the State's designated work well, are directing reasonable and efficient courses of academic and professional studies, and constitute one of the State's best investments in education. Sincerely

With the prospect confronting him of losing the institution over which he had presided for 23 years, Evans' eloquent defense was linked to that of the other teachers colleges in the belief that these colleges would stand or fall together. The precise effect of Evans communications, of course, cannot be evaluated; but at least, coupled with the other efforts of the other teachers college presidents, Evans' arguments must have had their share of influence upon the Board, for no action was taken at the November meeting.

As early as April, 1933, President Evans was optimistic enough to write the following "message" for the College *Star*:

The College believes the worst days have already passed and that its life is no longer in any danger whatever. We look to the future with the utmost confidence. We are expecting a big summer school for 1933 and a big attendance for the session of 1933-34. Let each student in college be responsible for bringing another student to the College for next fall session.

We appreciate the confidence and cooperation of students through the hours of trial. Many letters are on file from former students showing unlimited enthusiasm and loyalty. Through the record and services of its trained product, the College will continue to live, expanding in usefulness and power.

A report by Dean A. H. Nolle at the close of the regular session in May, 1933, indicated that he then felt victory was imminent if not already accomplished. After pointing out that there was only a slight decrease in college enrollment in the session of 1932-33 compared with 1931-32, but an increase in the size of the graduating class, Dean Nolle made these comments:

These facts bear testimony to the gratifying manner in which the College emerged from the trying ordeal resulting from the adverse recommendations of the legislative

Efficiency and Economy Committee. The campaign of enlightenment waged to save the College served to entrench this institution even more strongly in the sentiment of the student body and the citizens of Southwest Texas. I especially desire to call attention to the high sense of loyalty displayed by members of the faculty during these trying months.

At a faculty meeting February 28, 1936, President Evans announced that the State Board of Education had made a favorable report on the College and that members of that board were now friendly. There had been no more adverse reports, he said. The policy for the future must be one of concentration on quality rather than quantity and superficiality. Small appropriations were predicted by Evans, which meant low salaries for the faculty for a while. Efforts would be increased to recruit students, he said. Also, a study would be launched of the enrollment by counties to see where it might be built up. He suggested that any requests for judges of scholastic events be accepted, for all these events gave the College an opportunity to render service and build good will. There would be no hardship on a few, he said, if all would cooperate.

Until about 1939 there were still occasional rumblings in the press, their nature being a mere repetition of the old refrain that Texas had too many colleges and that a number should be reduced to junior colleges, consolidated, or abandoned, and offerings beyond the sophomore year should be confined to the "major institutions." Some of these outbursts took the form of a plea for more funds for the University of Texas which could easily be supplied by the destruction of other existing state colleges.

After the appearance of a particularly vindictive article, President Evans, on September 29, 1939, wrote the following observations to the other presidents of the teachers colleges:

It is my judgment that this type of propaganda can still injure us in a number of ways. It can weaken the confidence of the public in our permanence and reduce our attendance. It may even shake the faith of the Federal Government in our permanence to the extent that we would have difficulty in securing additional grants and additional loans. At all events, the results are antagonistic and injurious.

The fight for existence of the College and of her sister institutions in the system of Texas state teachers colleges made



an important chapter in the history of education in Texas, and it accomplished much. No longer would there be apologies for the existence of these schools, and no longer would there be a biennial fight to secure funds from a hostile legislature for the barest necessities of the growing colleges.

The names of the small group of men upon whose shoulders fell the brunt of the struggle are engraved deep in the annals of Texas education. Paraphrasing the words of Winston Churchill, seldom have so few done so much to provide a sound and sure foundation for the education of the masses of their fellow citizens.

## IV NUMBERS AND DESTINY

### Foreword

When Ethie Lee, from Munday, Knox County, Texas, stood at the head of the line that September morning in 1903 and put her name first on the roster of students at Southwest Texas State Normal School, perhaps she little dreamed of the thousands who were to follow through the halls and classrooms of the College. Miss Lee's home was nearer to two-thirds of the major colleges and universities in Texas than to the fledgling institution at San Marcos ; but, as many thousands have done since, she passed by the University of Texas to get to Southwest Texas.

As a matter of fact, five other students whose homes were in Austin enrolled in that first class. Only thirty-four were from San Marcos and twelve others were from Hays County. Three were from Georgetown, home of the old established Southwestern University; three from Waco, home of Baylor University ; three from Belton, home of Baylor College; and three from San Antonio, home of several institutions of higher learning. Ninety-nine counties were represented, dotting the map of Texas from one side to the other — from El Paso to Port Lavaca, from Dallas to Cotulla, from Alpine to Houston. Eleven states besides Texas were represented, and two foreign countries. Of the 303 students, 140 came from farms and ranches; six were the children of physicians, six of lawyers, and seven listed their fathers' occupation as minister. Thus an excellent cross-section of the student population of Texas found its way to San Marcos for the opening of the school. And from that day it could never be said that Southwest Texas State College was a "local" institution, for its students have always represented practically the entire state.

When C. E. Evans took office in September, 1911, the enrollment of the previous regular session had been 506 students, representing 114 counties. But the enrollment increased the very first year of Evans' administration to 619, with 127 counties represented. Ten years later, 1921-22, however, the enrollment of students of college rank was only 596, with the so-called

normal school and training school students bringing the grand total to 1,167.<sup>1</sup>

Encouraged by the increase in enrollment during the first year of his administration, President Evans never ceased efforts to attract students to the college. This quest for more and more students was a matter of life or death for the College. The settled method of legislators for calculating the amount to be appropriated for the state teachers colleges was a fixed sum per capita. In short, to get more funds a school must have more students.'

Students were easy to find, but finding those financially able to attend college was another matter. Recurring depressions and droughts over large areas regularly intensified the difficulty. Therefore, President Evans devoted himself to the financial help of students with the same energy and determination with which he tackled all other problems. He looked around at the full-time employees of the College. How many of these could be replaced with needy students? Under a few full-time supervisors, he gave students part-time work at nearly all the jobs usually found about a college. Discovering that I had learned shorthand and typewriting during my first two years in sub-college and college, he took me from my part-time job as janitor in the fall of 1923 when his secretary resigned to get married, and put me in his office as part-time stenographer. My case was typical of many others through the years.

For example, the pay for a full-time janitor would keep three students in college, so students were employed. Likewise, the repair and clean-up crews on the grounds were composed largely of students. Three students, working in shifts, took over the job of night watchman, and President Evans lent the use of his personal revolver for the protection of these young and scared boys patrolling the dark campus. In the other administrative offices and in the library student help took the places of nearly all of the lower-paid employees.

For almost two decades President Evans personally interviewed and employed every student who was put on the payroll.

---

<sup>1</sup>See College catalogs for the years mentioned.

<sup>2</sup>To make it even harder on a slow-growing but aspiring college attempting to uphold standards of instruction, the legislature fixed the appropriation on a per credit-hour basis. Thus for a student taking 18 hours of work instead of the usual 15 hours, the appropriation might be increased 20 per cent. Certainly, the temptation was present to let as many students as possible carry 18 hours.

Moreover, he kept the employment records in his own handwriting, listing the salary per month promised each student and posting the disbursement entry each month as the students were given checks.

He helped many students in another way by the establishment of cooperative houses. The College catalog of **1936-37** describes these houses as follows:

In addition to its dormitories the College also offers cooperative homes for students who desire to reduce their housekeeping expenses to a minimum. Oakwood Hall furnishes housekeeping accommodations for married couples. Cliffside, Southside, and Hines Halls are cooperative homes for girls. Lowman Cottage will provide housekeeping rooms for thirty boys, and a cooperative Athletic House will be available in time for the fall training camp.

To students in distress he lent money from his own pocket, some of which he never got back. He helped families who had moved to San Marcos in order to educate their children. He always gave employment preference to any man who was the father of college-age children, and many of the "house mothers" in the boarding houses, and later the dormitories, were mothers of students enrolled in the College,

Even the weather was a factor considered by President Evans in his attempts to make a college education possible for poverty-stricken boys and girls. He kept up with the rainfall reports and was always aware of drought or flood conditions in the area which he claimed for the College. He knew that a severe drought would keep many boys and girls who lived on farms and ranches from coming to college, and if applications for work came from one of these areas, he made a special effort to find work for the applicants. If students lived in or near San Marcos, he considered them able to manage somehow without assistance by staying at home and commuting to the campus. Students' problems were frequently discussed at faculty meetings, and he would ask the teachers to give information about needy students and render whatever help possible.

Helped by a growing prosperity and a rapidly increasing population in the state, but greatly handicapped by a provision in all appropriation bills prohibiting "the use of any part of these funds for advertising," he nevertheless found a way to reach prospective students. He assumed that the authority to

write letters had not been removed from him by the language of the appropriation statute, and he poured a veritable snow-storm of letters over an area comprising more than one-third of the state. The recipients of these were high school seniors. President Evans composed these missives with the precision of a skilled debater presenting facts. At the same time, he filled the messages with eloquent portrayal of campus life, opportunity to pursue subjects of one's choice; and, last but not least---and this part appealed strongly to parents — a college where expenses were low.

A note in the Redbook in 1916 carried a list of faculty members who had been asked to fold letters to be mailed. Later, when President Evans secured from the post office a permit to send bulletins by second-class mail "for the purpose of dispensing information concerning the College," he acquired a medium almost equal in effectiveness to the first-class letters and one which could be sent out for a fraction of the cost. He was careful to explain this new mailing permit to the president of the board of regents and secure the approval of the board as insurance against any accusation of violating the ban on advertising. In the composition of these bulletins Evans frequently enlisted the aid of certain teachers of English, and occasionally asked faculty members to aid in addressing the many thousands of these by hand.

Another very effective help to students was in the loan funds created. Small in resources, these funds were operated under the supervision of a faculty member for making loans to students. When the loan funds were exhausted, some of the more affluent faculty members helped students with unsecured personal loans; some faculty members carried several students at one time. Others found jobs for students at their homes and also aided them by recommending their services to the townspeople. Still other students were given help by the various organizations set up by the Federal Government—the Works Progress Administration, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Civil Works Administration, and the Public Works Administration.

President Evans recognized very early the value of extension work as a recruiting device. But here, again, the state positively refused to appropriate money for this purpose to the state teachers colleges. An act passed by the Forty Second Legislature at the regular session was as follows:

All appropriations for extension services provided in

this bill are hereby stricken out except for the University of Texas, the Agricultural and Mechanical College, and the College of Industrial Arts, and no funds of any of the institutions named in this bill except the University of Texas, the Agricultural and Mechanical College and the College of Industrial Arts shall hereafter be used for or in behalf of extension service."

In spite of this fact, however, the College administration discovered that extension teaching could be made self-supporting. By asking faculty members to take an extension class one night each week with no increase in salary but with all expenses paid, the College started the work with no expenditure of state money, and the work was carried on with the fees collected from extension students,

### Claim to Territory

In a letter dated March 5, 1923, to Royal L. Watkins, a friend in Dallas, President Evans wrote:

Our students come from all sections of Texas but very largely from the area included in the radius of 100 miles from San Marcos. Some of our difficulties in maintaining a good enrollment will be appreciated when we state that one-third of our student body must pass through Austin and by the University of Texas, and the remaining two-thirds must come from South Texas, where there is a large Mexican population. Very few Mexican students ever get high enough in the grades to reach us.

The so-called "territory" of the College, as can be easily understood from the foregoing letter, overlapped that of a number of other institutions of higher learning. In the case of all schools other than the teachers colleges there was no agreement whatever regarding solicitation of students in any area. With each of the teachers colleges, however, there was an "understanding" that no advertising matter or any other form of recruiting effort would be undertaken in counties adjacent to the county in which the college was located. Sometimes infractions of this agreement were made inadvertently because of failure to check closely the map of Texas. When this occurred, the offending college was certain to hear from the one whose territory had been encroached upon.

This rivalry for territory extended to all matters of competi-

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 2, p. 631, *General Laws of Texas*.

tion with other colleges. For example, at any time President Evans received information that another teachers college had admitted without any qualification or condition students from high schools lacking in accreditation from the State Department of Education, he would very promptly challenge this as an apparent effort of the offending college to gain an unfair advantage in enrollment. Likewise, in the granting of scholarships to the valedictorians of high schools, a strict checkup was made of the areas involved. A letter from President Estill of Huntsville dated May 30, 1930, complains of Texas Tech's violation of the agreement among the members of the Association of Texas Colleges to grant scholarships only to high schools which have fifteen affiliated credits. In this instance the Lubbock college had granted a scholarship to a high school with only twelve affiliated credits, and, moreover, the high school was within twenty-five miles of Huntsville,

Estill addressed his complaint to Evans, and in his reply Evans promised to take the matter up with the Association of Texas Colleges. At that time it appeared that the main objection to the practice was that it attracted students from the "territory" of the complaining college.

The fact that the legislature took the enrollment count as a principal basis for appropriations encouraged competition among the teachers colleges, and suspicion arose at times that the reporting of student numbers was not accurate. The following letter of President Evans, dated October 1, 1931, to President Hill shows an awareness of such inaccuracies.

I note your statement that the tabulation of enrollment for the colleges of the state should include only strictly college students that thereby there may be a "real equal basis for comparison." This cannot be done unless enrollment statistics exclude sub-college students, the duplication of extension students of all kinds, and any other duplication of names during the regular session of nine months. The fourth paragraph of Section 2 of the regular appropriation bill, striking out all appropriations for extension services, originated on account of the resentment of members of the House through the action of colleges in counting extension students with regular campus students to increase enrollment.

## Counting Noses

President Evans not only kept detailed record of the enrollment of all divisions of the Colleges, but compiled for comparison the enrollment in every state-supported college in Texas. He was, of course, more keenly interested in the enrollment in the other teachers colleges, as in this information he had an accurate basis upon which to judge the growth of his own institution. The Redbook carried these data from 1912 through the thirty-year period of Evans' administration. Enrollment figures for the College were published in each of the College catalogs in summary form, and the names of the members of the previous year's graduating class were published in an appendix to each College catalog.

Evans called upon the registrar's office to furnish him with enrollment figures showing the number of students by counties. From these statistics he could create a map of the state for instant reference to learn how many students had enrolled, and these maps were kept to reveal the enrollment from each county for a period of years. By keeping this information in his Redbook, he could at any time determine the "value" of any county in terms of "support" of the College. His method of obtaining this information and perhaps his purpose was the same as that of a candidate for public office who keeps track of the areas where he is "strong" or "weak." The area distribution of the four college classes was also compiled so that he could at all times calculate the size of the upcoming senior class for any of the next four years.

In the Redbook for 1926 Evans constructed the accompanying table, which is self-explanatory. It is typical of many others he set up through the years for his own information:

Table 4  
Comparison of Enrollment of the Teachers Colleges  
Regular Session 1925-1926

	Fr.	Soph.	Jr.	Sr.	Total	Rank
North Texas	745	390	168	93	1,396	1
Southwest Texas	557	331	123	82	1,074	2
West Texas	401	186	63	51	701	3
Sam Houston	316	225	81	51	673	4
East Texas	410	135	56	35	636	5

In the very midst of this hectic struggle for numbers, President Evans revealed his awareness of the danger of enrolling students without regard for scholarship and for proper facilities



for their instruction. In an address before the 1926 meeting of the Texas Association of Colleges,<sup>4</sup> he spoke on the subject, "Everyday College Problems." Part of this address is quoted herewith:

The regular increase of annual college enrollment is no longer classified as a temporary phenomenon. From 1903 to 1913, American colleges advanced at the rate of 6.9 per cent a year; we note the growth in 1923 to 1925 to be almost the same rate. The advance of 1925-26 over 1924-25 in 159 institutions was reported to be 7.0 per cent. The combined enrollment of the Sam Houston State Teachers College, the North Texas State Teachers College, the Southwest Texas State Teachers College increased from 1,474 in 1915-16 to 3,846 in 1924-25. The grand total for all the colleges in America is estimated at 650,000 students. While Germany educates 22 per cent of its population of college age in institutions of higher learning, France, 21 per cent; England, 8 per cent; the United States educates 58 per cent; and our college enrollment is almost treble that of the three countries named. This large increase in the number of young men and young women seeking college training may be properly considered a "fair index of social progress in America"; certainly, the colleges of the country owe it to these students to give them efficient and satisfactory preparation for a worthy life career.

It is easy to see that the best interests of a student body may be endangered through the mania for bigness; mere numbers may mean the cheapening of college opportunity and inefficient college instruction. Under ordinary college conditions, an increase of enrollment exceeding  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent will represent a liability rather than an asset to the permanent interests of the college. It never helps an institution of higher learning to care inadequately for a student body in crowded classes and limited program, and to send students away with the knowledge that they have been neglected. When a careful stock of faculty, equipment, buildings, institutional purpose and urgent territorial needs is taken, the desire of a college for continuous growth to the limit of such probable facilities is indeed to be commended. The present entrance requirements serve a purpose in the limitation of numbers to those who will probably profit by attendance. A modification of these requirements in the direction of supplemental intelligence tests, together with

---

<sup>4</sup>For this statement the writer is relying on a note written in President Evans' handwriting on the margin of the original cards upon which the address was typed in the usual form he used for the reading of his speeches.

a careful investigation of the high school record of students before entrance would probably serve an equally useful purpose.

In the fall of 1931, Evans wrote a letter of sympathy to President Whitley of the East Texas State Teachers College at Commerce concerning the problem of the phenomenal increase in enrollment at that college without increased funds for faculty or facilities for taking care of this increase. On October 24, President Whitley replied as follows:

. . . I note what you say concerning enrollment at this institution. You are entirely correct; we have a real problem. The pity of the whole situation is that we have secured only three legislative teaching positions in a period of six years, and it will be two years before we have a chance to get relief. In the meantime our student body has increased in a most wonderful manner. I am not responsible for this increase; I can't help it, but it is here, and the Board of Control and the Legislature will, I am sure, give us relief just as soon as financial conditions will warrant such actions. You remember I got several new positions through the Legislature this time only to have them vetoed by the Governor. . . .

In the years to come the experience at Commerce was to be repeated in most of the other colleges. But there could not be a cessation of effort to attract larger enrollments as long as they meant increased appropriations. The hope was always present, however, that sooner or later the legislature would realize the imperative necessity of providing adequately for the needs of the College and that the intense competition between the colleges for state funds would some day be unnecessary.

Therefore, President Evans continued to do everything in his power to make a great school of the institution he so dearly loved; for by this time the College had become his very reason for existence, the budding fruit of his tremendous efforts to build a school for the training of teachers so badly needed in the public schools of Texas. There was yet, in the year 1931, only a faint glimpse of victory ahead.

### **The Problem of Advertising**

The legislative ban on advertising was never effective in preventing the teachers colleges from occasionally contracting for space in newspapers and professional magazines such as the

*Texas School Journal* and the *Texas Outlook*, the organ of the Texas State Teachers Association. If there was a breach of the law, the act usually brought only criticism, rarely severe, from a few lawmakers. A letter from President Binnion of the East Texas State Teachers College, dated September 27, 1921, presented the problem as it appeared to him:

... We are being criticized severely by certain members of the Senate for advertising in the papers of the state. I move you that we discontinue at once all ads of any character whatever including that in the *Texas Outlook*. I think this should be done at once and if possible we should pay for such ads as are now outstanding out of last year's local funds so that we may face the Senate Finance Committee next year and tell those gentlemen that we have not used one penny of State funds or of institutional funds for any type of advertising since September 1, 1921.

A few days later, on October 7, 1921, President Binnion sent another letter to the presidents expressing increased uneasiness over the subject of advertising. He wrote:

... With respect to advertising, you are advised that we are forbidden by the appropriation bill to use any of our State funds for advertising. I am willing to go ahead with the ad in the *Outlook*, but we shall certainly not use State money or local fund for the payment of the ad. I am going to be in position to say to the senators when we meet them again that not one penny of state money or local funds has been used for advertising since the enactment of the Legislature took effect.

Although there seemed to be a fear of advertising in the periodicals, there was no stopping the presidents from the use of direct-mail matter. February 2, 1923, President Evans wrote M. O. Flowers of the Board of Regents as follows:

We have found bulletins similar to the enclosed to be very valuable for purposes of advertising the institution. As indicated on the bulletin, we mail this on second-class mail rates, thereby saving quite a nice sum during the year. You will receive regularly copies of these bulletins.

In spite of the fact that President Evans himself advised the other presidents on July 2, 1923, that "The Appropriation Bill of 1921 specifically cuts out advertising, and we should obey the letter and the spirit of the law," a bulletin such as the one indicated in his letter to Flowers did not fall under the definition of "advertising" as he understood it. So it appeared that any

class of direct communication was never affected by the legislative ban. It was only "advertising" as a message printed in a newspaper or magazine that was banned. October 10, 1927, President Whitley, successor to President Binnion, wrote:

I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. M. M. Florer of the *Dallas News*, asking the East Texas State Teachers College to take some space in the next edition of the *Texas Almanac*. It has occurred to me that it will be well for all eight colleges to take a little space in the *Almanac* if we can see our way to pay for same. Mr. Florer says that the rate will be \$15 per inch. He furthermore says that an inch will run 50 ordinary words. I shall be glad indeed if you can take this space, but the only way I know to pay for it is out of local.<sup>5</sup>

July 30, 1929, less than one year after the *Dallas News* had been very generous with its front-page space in a fourteen-day series of articles about the teachers colleges,<sup>6</sup> a representative of that newspaper asked President Evans to approve, as head of the Council of Teachers College Presidents, a joint advertisement for the Educational Issue of the *News*. Evans declined to make a contract for the other colleges, but agreed to take the matter up with the other presidents, which he did immediately. August 1, President Whitley replied:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 30 in which you are suggesting that we take a joint space in the Educational Issue of the *Dallas News* which will come out on August 11th. I shall be glad to edit the material if sent me, but I want to say in this connection that I am "agin" the proposition. As long as the Texas Legislature refuses to give us money for advertising, and as long as it quarrels with us about money for advertising. I am not willing to take space in the *Dallas News*. If we take space in the *Dallas News*, I do not see how we can avoid taking space in the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, in the San Antonio *Express*, and in the papers of Houston, Galveston, Beaumont, Texarkana, Paris, Amarillo, El Paso, and dozens of other papers in Texas. Please understand that I will do whatever the group votes to do, but I am of the opinion that it will be unwise for us to get into this matter.

---

<sup>5</sup> The "local fund" created from student fees was not considered at that time by the presidents as being a "state" fund, because control over this fund had been given to the board of regents. Later all funds were required to be deposited in the state treasury.

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter XII of this study: "The Seventeen-Year War with the *Dallas News*."

This objection on the part of Whitley is somewhat perplexing when less than two years before he was very much in favor of a joint advertisement in the Texas Almanac, published by the A. H. Belo Corporation, owner of the Dallas Morning News.<sup>7</sup> But consistency did not appear to be a virtue of any of the teachers college presidents in their contemplation of the subject of advertising.

Be that as it may, Evans mailed his copy for the advertisement to President Whitley on August 1; but as soon as Whitley's letter was received Evans telegraphed him: "Agreement of Presidents lacking. Cut out the proposed advertisement in Dallas News." August 5 President Evans followed up the telegram with a letter to President Whitley and sent copies to the other presidents:

Tuesday, July 30, I addressed letters and telegrams to the Presidents suggesting a joint advertisement in the Educational Number of the Dallas News. I declined to make a contract that day with Mr. Oliphant of the News, preferring to submit the proposed advertisement to the Presidents for action. In contracts for joint advertisements unanimous consent is essential. Just as soon as one President had written or wired his objection I sent a telegram to you requesting you to discontinue any further efforts, since we had until Tuesday only to complete the agreement. Not having a contract of any kind with Mr. Oliphant, there is no possibility of a misunderstanding.

My own personal opinion was that in view of the expense the Dallas News management incurred last fall in its staff correspondence for teachers colleges, it would be a generous thing, and at the same time, a splendid investment to use a page in the News for the year 1929 only. No change of policy of advertising nor question of authority can properly be raised; the Texas Press Association early in this year was given a contract for two pages of advertising in one of its publications. I do not favor any kind of joint advertisement in any publication until it receives the unanimous vote of the group. I am, therefore, entirely satisfied.

Almost a year later, May 14, 1930, President Marquis sent to President Evans a copy of his letter to the editor of the Texas Federation News, which read:

... In 1921 the Legislature placed a rider on our appropriation bills prohibiting the use of any funds for advertis-

---

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*

ing, and this prohibition was placed upon all the institutions of higher learning. When the appropriation bill for the next biennium was prepared, the rider referred to was omitted upon a gentleman's agreement that these institutions would not use the appropriations for advertising. Since that time the colleges have scrupulously conformed to this understanding. While I should like very much to have this college take the space offered, I do not feel that I would be justified in disregarding the policy.

This letter touched off a somewhat indignant exchange of letters between Evans and Marquis on the subject. May 17, President Evans replied to Marquis' communication as follows:

I am thoroughly in sympathy with the policy mentioned in your letter to Miss Ollie Koon. The situation so far as advertising is concerned is just like we want it; it is not advisable to make an opening for solicitations from multitudinous sources for advertising in publications of any kind.

Incidentally, though believing that we are fully bound by the spirit of the rider of 1921, I question the accuracy of any gentleman's agreement in 1923. I believe you or any other President will have difficulty in pointing to a conference among the Presidents ratifying such an understanding. I have heard this alleged gentleman's agreement mentioned on other occasions, but think it to be a delightful piece of fiction, so far as any general understanding among us was concerned. If it really happened, we violated this gentleman's agreement a year or two years ago, when we took space with the Texas Press Association.

In any event, I wish to reiterate that I am in sympathy with the spirit of this alleged gentleman's agreement. I think it advisable to conform strictly to this policy, and hereafter we should not make "fish of one and flesh of another." We will be on safe ground when we refuse to advertise in the Federated News, if, at the same time, we refuse to take space in the publications of the Texas Press Association.

President Marquis felt the full lash of Evans' words of advice and correction, but he replied in fairly good humor, ending with a genuine chuckle:

You should not smart at the use of the phrase of "gentleman's agreement," because I can assure you, my dear friend, the rider would have been written on the Senate Bill which ~~was~~ prepared for that biennium. I did not mean to say, nor did I say, that the said agreement was entered into by any group of presidents. I do mean to say, however, that

some of us, and I would not undertake to name those present, did succeed in having this rider eliminated by the Senate Committee, with the distinct understanding and definite promise that, if it were left off, the colleges would make no such expenditures.

I accept your castigation relative to my conduct in the break-over with the Texas Press Association. I was in favor of it at the time, but I would be against a similar action now. I greatly appreciate your enthusiastic rebukes because I find, for the most part, they are well deserved, and after proper confessional observances, I feel unusually clean and moral.

This bit of correspondence reveals a trait of Evans' personality; he couldn't bear to lose an argument. If, however, his opponent took offense at strong language used, Evans was quick to apologize for the undesirable language, but he still could never concede that he was wrong on the issues. On May 23, he replied to Marquis:

I regret very much that my letter of May 17 has been construed to mean "castigation." No such construction was intended, nor was I aware of any language used that implied severe criticism. I still think you are mistaken about the alleged gentleman's agreement, but do not question your sincerity. Nothing whatever was said about such an agreement until long after the appropriation bill of 1923 was passed and in full effect. Practically all the people of North Carolina still believe that there was a Mecklenberg Declaration of Independence, although no accurate scholar of American history can find an original source justifying such a belief. There is nothing new about good folks having a difference of opinion regarding something that occurred.

Beginning with the fall of 1922, including 1923 and all the years following, I have regularly told representatives of daily papers that on account of the legislative acts of 1921 I doubt the advisability of advertising. The agreement was also supposed to include an exception in the case of the *Texas Outlook*, but we had no hesitation in including the *Texas School Journal* so long as Dr. Musselman<sup>8</sup> was on our board. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the policy of staying out of the daily, weekly, and monthly publications with advertising of the Texas State Teachers Colleges. It is my judgment that the action of the Legislature in the summer of 1921 was eminently wise. You do not, however, need any "proper confessional observances."

---

<sup>8</sup>H. T. Musselman of Dallas, who was appointed in 1925. He was publisher of the *Texas School Journal*.

I have the utmost confidence in your sincerity of purpose and nobility of conduct. As a matter of fact, I feel under many obligations to you for courtesies, kindnesses and favors.

Evans was never averse to securing free advertising for the College in the guise of a news story. Copies are available of an article written by him and sent to "all county papers in our area" under the date of January 10, 1933. To show the nature of this communication, a part is quoted:

. . . The College has students from 160 counties with 60 per cent coming from the 50-mile radius of San Marcos. One hundred and sixty-three students from Caldwell County, 133 students from Gonzales County, and 109 students from Lavaca County . . . while Williamson County sent 105, Bell County 109 students, and Milam County 103 students.

The boy or girl coming from a poor family with limited means can attend the College, feel at home on its campus, and earn a diploma or degree at a cost within the means of the family. For instance, seven girls from a small town in this section, through light housekeeping, are continuing in the College.

The College has been economically administered. A recent report of the State Board of Education of fifteen state colleges places the Southwest Texas State Teachers College among three colleges with the lowest per capita cost. The College recognizes the necessity for reducing the costs of government, and is cooperating in requesting a reduced budget.

There is no available evidence that the item was used by any weekly newspaper.

### **Talks and Recruiting**

President Evans never lost an opportunity to call on his listeners for help in directing students to the College. The Red-book shows that as early as 1916 he was telling the student body that standards of the College were being raised; that the old first grade teachers certificate did not signify so much as formerly. "Do you know friends that expect to attend institutions of higher learning another year? Give their names to the registrar." This request was repeated hundreds of times in general assembly talks. Invariably, in an assembly held close to the holidays of Thanksgiving or Christmas Evans would urge students, "When you go home be a good advertisement for the



College. 'Sell' your family and community the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. You carry with you our good will and best wishes."

On May 24, 1936, he told the student body in assembly:

Cooperate in sending students to college. Advise your friends to come to this college. Believe in your college, . . . rejoice in its program. Don't listen to the voice of any person who would turn you against your college. Put all ex-students back of the College on and off the campus. Support the College program. Plan to do your graduate work with us. Consult the Graduate Council under the advice of Dean Nolle."

On December 18, 1941, under the influence of war spirit, the student body at assembly was entertained with a program of patriotic music, and then was addressed by President Evans, Dean H. E. Speck, and Don Streeter, instructor in speech. The occasion was used to urge students to remain in college as one of the best ways of serving their country. President Evans requested students to ask at least one prospective student to attend the College for the second semester. He mentioned special "war-time" courses to be offered.

In May 1942, at a faculty meeting Evans called the decrease in enrollment for the spring semester a "collapse of enrollment," and predicted a thirty per cent reduction in the faculty for the fall semester of that year. He encouraged the granting of leaves of absence for war work.

As a prominent Rotarian, Evans was invited to address the local club on numerous occasions and, at times, other clubs in San Antonio, Uvalde, and a few other places. To these he always carried the message of the College. He would thank the members for the interest in the College shown by the citizens of that community, and he could tell them the exact number of students from this community who had attended the College during recent years and also mention teachers in the local public schools who were graduates of the College. At the San Marcos Rotary Club he would praise his fellow members for the Rotary Loan Fund and would promise preference to San Marcos students who needed financial help. Moreover, he would also confide to the local club some of his worries about the future of the College. For example, in 1925 when the college at Kingsville opened its doors, he praised the Kingsville institution — its faculty and plant

and equipment—but warned that the new college might attract students who had been attending school in San Marcos.

At other times he would compare the lack of dormitories at the College with the splendid accommodations for students only thirty miles away at the University of Texas, and would hint that the citizens of San Marcos might use their influence to obtain more favorable legislation for the College. He would also ask for the help of members who, as business men and citizens of San Marcos, could exert a great influence in safeguarding the welfare of girls and boys "so that wholesomeness of student life and the uplifting influence of your association with them may send our boys and girls back to their parents worthy citizens."

### **The Double Value of Extension Work**

Extension teaching was a device with two purposes—the usual purpose of serving teachers in the field and that of attracting students to the College campus. President Evans probably considered the latter to be the greater value because this was the only available means of carrying the College to the people. As it had done with advertising, the legislature forbade the use of state funds for extension work, making the restriction apply particularly to the teachers colleges, as was noted earlier in this chapter. This ban on extension work came after most of the state colleges had been engaged in keen competition with each other for several years, at times there being courses offered in the same community at the same time by two different colleges. All college administrators were of the firm belief that the work was an excellent means of "holding" the territory in question.

Perhaps the clearest and most concise statement of the reasons for extension teaching was presented by President H. F. Estill of Huntsville in a letter dated September 5, 1931, addressed to the board of regents. He put his argument in this form:

I. Adult education is one of the notable phases of the work. Adult wage earners may prepare themselves for better positions.

II. Extension teaching tends to increase residence enrollment. A student who takes extension work will want to continue residence at the same college. Thus it widens the influence and service of the college offering the work.

III. There is no sacrifice of efficiency by the faculty since the amount of extension work taught is limited.

IV. The work is done at no cost to the state as the appropriation bill carried a prohibitive clause—which was aimed primarily, according to information of the writer, at the college at Kingsville. Other state colleges [not teachers colleges]<sup>8</sup> are permitted to use state funds for this purpose.

V. To discontinue this service would work a hardship on several hundred teachers in the area who are demanding this service.

VI. No worthwhile purpose would be served by limiting extension teaching since it costs the state nothing; helps the cause of education in Texas.

Estill's letter closes with a request to the board of regents to authorize the setting up of a fund exclusively for extension work. Then Estill continued:

. . . However, when there is an open question as to the interpretation of a certain section of the law the teachers should follow the course that best promotes the interest of teacher training in Texas and the cause of education until specifically forbidden to do so.

While there was hardly any let-up in the service of extension teaching, nevertheless criticism remained alive, especially when it was revealed that classes were being held at distances exceeding a hundred miles from the College campus. On August 23, 1935, President Evans wrote Colonel T. H. (Tom) Ball, member of the board of regents from Houston; purporting to give Ball information concerning the distances from the College at which extension units may be taught. Evans mentions the fact that units may be as far away as 125 miles. But he gave the assurance that all the teachers colleges followed the same policy as far as distance was concerned. The value of the units, in the opinion of President Evans, was that, "Students in our extension classes frequently enroll in college later." He mentioned the uniform policy, also, for the payment of salaries to teachers of these units—extra pay over their regular salaries. He also mentioned agreement between all state-supported colleges for regulation of extension classes and for the maintenance of standards. He said further:

We organized an extension unit in Wharton County. It is my judgment that it was necessary and wise. We have a

---

<sup>8</sup>The brackets are 'the writer's'.

strong claim on Wharton since our students are all over the county. Official reports show 62 Wharton County teachers from San Marcos, 58 from all other teachers colleges, 55 from other state colleges, and 15 from the University of Texas. The defeated candidate and the successful candidate for county superintendent enrolled in our extension class, one of them withdrawing on account of personal objection to the other. If we discontinue extension classes in Wharton County, the territory will be taken over by Kingsville or Houston colleges in a short time.

In a letter addressed to A. B. Mayhew, president of the board of regents, dated September 5, 1931, President Marquis of Denton expressed the opinion that:

The chief objection to withdrawing from the field lies in the fact that private institutions, even the junior colleges, will rush in and do the work; and they certainly will not be able to do it in a manner that would be acceptable to the teachers colleges of this state. I favor our devising a way to proceed with the extension work in so far as it is devoted to the training of teachers for the public schools of Texas.

## V NURSELINGS OF THE STATE TREASURY

### The Brood Was Too Large

The state institutions of higher learning, along with all other state-supported departments, must suckle at the enormous udder of the State Treasury; and whether the flow is abundant or meagre, it remains their only sustenance. Too often these offspring of the state legislature have had to starve through biennium after biennium when the funds of the treasury were scarce or when the flux of political fortune deprived these institutions of adequate support.

In the early days of this century more often than otherwise the head of a state institution or department was shouldered with the great responsibility of securing enough funds to keep that unit functioning, and the process by which such funds were obtained was at once a combination of petition, importunity, political pressure, and compromise. Like the mother whose young are too numerous to be fed until all are satisfied, the law-making body yielded many times to the loudest wail and the strongest pull.

President Evans — unlike some others who shrank from the begging and wheedling, the questioning and at times ridicule of legislative committees — always appeared eager to get into the struggle for his share of appropriations. This struggle was without end for C. E. Evans, and what he obtained for the College must have been done, on many occasions, by swallowing his pride and experiencing inner retching at the whole distasteful task. Without a doubt, greatest credit is due him and others in similar positions for their devotion to the cause of building a greater system of education in Texas and for making the way easier for their successors.

As an example of what they sometimes had to endure, President Hill of Canyon relates an incident which occurred during the regular session in 1921. He and President Evans were seated on the floor of the House, listening to the proceedings at the time when the Appropriations Committee brought its report before the House. President Hill wrote:

At that time the "economy bloc" went into action.

Presently an old retrencher arose and loudly and dramatically expressed opposition to salary increases. He accused the presidents of the "normals" of unbecoming, even illegal lobbying for their respective budgets. At the height of his denunciation he faced the two presidents and in stentorian tones, with finger pointed at the *culprits*, he said, "Yonder sets two of the buzzards now." Right there Evans and Hill staged the fastest footrace ever held on the floor of the House. Had the Capitol been on fire, they could not have gotten out faster.<sup>1</sup>

President Hill says in another place:

In spite of the fact that the school's budget had been cut nearly 50 per cent, the President came away rejoicing. After one has been kicked around for a year (indeed in this case for several years) like Champ Clark's hound dog, he is happy to get out with his life.<sup>2</sup>

Four years earlier, in 1917, President Bruce of Denton wrote a letter to the other presidents, which throws light on the predicament of the presidents in their efforts to increase salaries, particularly their own. In the requests for appropriations at the 1917 session the following words were included: "Adjustment of Salaries," which phrase was explained to the appropriations committee by President Goeth<sup>3</sup> of the board of regents, as necessary because it might not be possible to obtain teachers unless more money could be offered than allowed in the itemized appropriation bill. According to this provision, the presidents had planned to raise their own salaries \$600. President Bruce wrote:

Ordinarily I would not say anything concerning my own salary. I have never asked for a raise in my life, but now the number of working years are not so many as they were twenty years ago, and having spent all my savings up to now on trying to fit my children for life, I must within the next few years make some preparation for the time when I will work no more.

Besides, I have, in consequence of this anticipation of this raise in salary, already spent money for this year that I mould not have done so lavishly otherwise. I have invested several hundred dollars in Liberty Bonds, subscribed liberally to the Red Cross fund and Y. M. C. A. fund and agreed to donate \$500 to the building of a church in Denton. And,

---

1 Hill, J. A., *More Than Brick and Mortar*, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 93.

3 A. C. Goeth of Austin.

therefore, the loss of \$600 this year would work a genuine hardship on me, and I am sure it would on the other presidents of the normal schools.

A bit of strategy was suggested by President Evans in the handling of the very delicate matter of asking for an increase in their own salaries. April 15, 1918, he wrote to the other presidents:

I am in hearty accord with the idea relative to placing the salaries of presidents for the next two years near the middle of the itemized list. Our present plan of placing the largest salary at the beginning prejudices the average member of the Legislature against us. . . .

Even after the funds were appropriated, it was a common event for state warrants to be issued on a deficiency basis. These warrants read, "To be paid out of funds when available." This created a hardship of immeasurable proportions upon employees of the state and resulted frequently in the enrichment of banks that cashed the warrants with discounts at rates as high as ten per cent. An eight per cent charge was more common. Although in some localities the banks voiced hesitancy or even refused to cash state warrants, most banks found them a source of desirable revenue.

In June, 1926, President Evans wrote to M. O. Flowers, president of the Teachers College Board of Regents, concerning the matter of discounting state warrants and asked permission to borrow money from a local bank in lieu of discounting two deficiency warrants granted by the governor in the amounts of \$5,000 and \$15,000 respectively. Evans informed Flowers that it appeared very difficult to discount these warrants at any reasonable rate, saying that 15 per cent had been the most favorable figure offered by any bank in San Marcos or Austin. The rate of discount named by one Austin bank was 20 per cent.

The situation regarding deficiency state warrants at that time was not new. Years earlier, in a letter to President Estill, dated May 27, 1913, Evans had said:

Our teachers have been able to make arrangements to borrow money on the warrant as collateral and thereby secure a rate of 8 per cent. This is the best we have been able to do.

The inconvenience of discounting state warrants or borrowing money on them (which was far less frequent) prevailed year

after year to the middle thirties. This became a major source of worry to President Evans when certain out-of-town banks began competing with local banks to obtain the warrants from teachers. A. C. Parr, a student working his way through college by part-time service in Evans' office as secretary and assistant, became the agent of a bank located some 100 miles from San Marcos. The discount offered by this bank was appreciably lower than that required by the San Marcos banks, and soon many of the employees of the College were doing business with the out-of-town bank through this agent. The business was furnishing a comfortable income at one per cent commission to Parr.

After some months of this arrangement, representatives of the local banks called upon Evans with a near-ultimatum that he must stop using his office to give business to their competitor. Evans reluctantly informed Parr what the situation was, because he had little liking for the treatment which college employees had received from the San Marcos banks. However, the agency was shifted, in name, from A. C. Parr to his brother Bob, who was also working to stay in college, and this gesture preserved the local peace. Moreover, the local banks were ultimately forced to lower their discount to meet the competition.

### **The Ferguson Rule**

During the administration of Governor James E. Ferguson in 1915, all state institutions were called upon to itemize requests for appropriations, thus eliminating lump-sum grants and giving the legislature and governor tighter control over the spending of state money. This disturbed the presidents of the teachers colleges, as it restricted the freedom which heretofore had permitted a flexible use of funds and an easier shifting of money to items most needed at the moment. The effect of the change in the policy of the lawmakers was revealed in part by a letter written on April 14, 1915, to President Bruce of Denton, in which Evans said:

Senator S. R. Cowell, Chairman of the Finance Committee, and Captain W. E. Craddock, personal representative of Governor Ferguson, spent two or three hours with me Thursday afternoon and discussed very thoroughly the needs of the Southwest Texas State Normal School..

He then mentioned the desire of these men to have the requests itemized.



President Bruce replied as follows:

I write to say that this kind of plan is what we have all agreed not to present. It is my opinion that if we presented an itemized statement, this committee will seize upon it, and our appropriation bill will be made to read just as the items are stated, in which case our hands, and those of our Board, would be absolutely tied, and the salary of everyone be fixed.

It might be that in securing a person for one of the positions one of us might not be able to get a man worth \$1,800, but we would be forced to pay him that amount. On the other hand, it might be that the one we want would be worth \$1,800, but because we have itemized the amount of \$1,500, it might be impossible to secure the person we wanted.

It is my opinion that no more dangerous thing could occur to us than for the salary of each teacher, janitor, fireman and other employee to be designated in the appropriation bill.

. . . The itemization of the amounts should be left to our board of regents. The law gives them the right to fix the salaries of teachers, and other employees, and there has been, several times, a tendency of the legislature and governor to fix the salary of each employee in the state institutions.

. . . The first year I was president of this school I had great difficulty in steering around the danger of having every item absolutely fixed, and I hope that we will not run upon that rock again soon.

I know from conversation with Governor Ferguson that his idea is that every item should be mentioned in detail just as in the paper which I received from you today. Let me ask you not to urge this matter upon the committee, for I assure you that if you do all of us will have cause to regret your action.

Bruce, as president of the Council of Normal School Presidents, and as one with longer tenure and experience than Evans, felt entitled to advise the latter on this problem. The college at Denton had been established in 1901, two years prior to the establishment of Southwest Texas, and Bruce became president in 1906, at age 50. Therefore, he was Evans' senior both in age and in terms of service.

Money with which to pay faculty salaries always looms as the number-one problem of a college administration. College presidents generally recognize that the reputation and growth

of a college depend to a large extent upon the quality of the faculty members who can be recruited. And there has always been, even in times of economic depression, a strong competition for desirable teachers whose presence would lend luster in academic circles and thus attract better students, bigger gifts from individuals, Federal Government grants and loans, and membership in national accrediting associations.

For the teachers colleges, lack of adequate salaries doomed them to third-rate institutions for a quarter of a century. In 1919 President Bruce wrote a form letter to the members of the Texas Legislature and sent it also to the other presidents of the state normal schools. The theme of the letter was expressed in these words:

Because of low salaries in this college and better opportunities elsewhere we have lost several teachers and other employees during the past 12 months. I know that still others contemplate a similar move unless conditions improve. I hope you will believe me absolutely sincere and unqualifiedly loyal to the best interests of the children of Texas, whom the students of this college are being fitted and trained to teach, when I declare to you that the present situation demands the increase in salaries herein recommended by the board of regents for those who have labored with me so faithfully during the past years to make this college first class, efficient, and inspiring.

President Binnion of Commerce, in a letter dated January 10, 1920, wrote President Evans saying, "I shall lose a number of my best teachers next year unless I am able to raise their salaries." Binnion expressed the fervent hope that the legislature would act favorably on the matter. He declared that the teachers colleges would be demoralized "unless our respective institutions **are able** to pay at least as good salaries as the better grade high **schools** in the state."

Again, in April of that year, President Binnion wrote:

. . . A number of my teachers have been offered raises in salaries elsewhere. One has been offered a raise of \$750, another a raise of \$700, and another a raise of \$600. The Legislature will have to give us \$25,000 to \$30,000 for increased teachers salaries or our school will go to smash. There is no use in being mealy-mouthed in the matter of asking for adequate salaries for our teachers. If the normal schools are to maintain their prestige and be worthy of the

name of senior colleges we must pay our teachers decent salaries.

On May 1, 1920, President Evans said in a letter to Binnion: "The maximum amount now paid the head of a department is \$3,000, which is a really inadequate salary. Some of the best men in our faculty should receive \$3,600 and quite a number of others should be paid \$3,000."

In April, 1921, there was no assurance to the college presidents of Texas of the level of salaries which would be appropriated by the legislature. By this time in the spring it is late for filling vacancies on the faculty for the regular session beginning in September. In the face of the uncertainty, President Evans was called upon to ask the advice of A. C. Goeth of Austin, president of the board of regents. By that time recommendations had been made by the House Committee on Appropriations, but nothing definite had been done. Goeth advised that tentative engagements with faculty members be made on that basis, and Evans promptly wrote all the other teachers college presidents conveying that information.

In a few days President Estill of Huntsville sent a circular letter to the other presidents in which he commented as follows:

If the salaries recommended by this committee are the same as those recommended by the Board of Control, a very difficult situation confronts us. It will be impossible to secure first-class talent with this 9-month salary schedule as a basis. The whole situation in regard to salaries is so indefinite at this time that I cannot see how the normal school presidents can take steps to fill vacancies.

Biennia came and went 'without improvement in the situation. In late 1924, for example, when there was an attempt to prepare a budget of state finances for consideration at the forthcoming session of the legislature, the recommendations of the Board of Control were downright confusing. A letter from President Marquis of Denton, who had succeeded President Bruce, reveals the situation in part, and is given here along with a bit of Marquis' philosophy concerning the future of teachers colleges in general:

Concerning the recommendations of the Board of Control, it appears that the salary scale has been modified to such an extent that we can scarcely recognize just what it is. This school has been materially reduced in some of its

departments, and the cuts have gone below the salary now paid.

I am sure that the same conditions exist in regard to the budgets of the other schools. The building program is not altogether discouraging, and it can, in my opinion, be materially helped in the committees. I am ready to join hands in a plan to organize our forces for the purpose of urging our needs, beginning with our local representatives and senators and continuing to the floors of the House and Senate, and to the private office of the Governor. I have been convinced through the years that the teachers colleges have been too modest and have played the role of Alphonse and Gaston to their great embarrassment. I fear that our past performances have not carried our real convictions and our real estimates of the functions of the schools we represent. As I see it, we are having much the same battle to wage that the high school division of the public school system is now engaged in. In fact, I am convinced that the evolution of the Teachers College into a real professional school is tied on to and is part of the development of the high school in this country. The modern high school alone has been the principal factor in calling attention to the necessity of having a teachers college. The high school will now move forward with increasing momentum. The teachers college, being a part of the movement, will do the same thing inevitably. We are, therefore, a part of a great movement, which may be checked at intervals, but can in no wise be stopped. I am not the least bit discouraged; I am convinced that we are at this moment thrown upon our resources and are challenged at this particular step. We shall meet the challenge and undertake to dissolve the force which would slow us up. . .

The feeling was very prevalent among the presidents of the teachers colleges that these institutions were the victims of discrimination in Austin as between them and the other state-supported colleges. On July 3, 1926, President Evans wrote to the presidents of the teachers colleges and sent copies also to the members of the board of regents. In the letter Evans tells of his presence at the hearing given the Texas Technological College for appropriations. This hearing was set by the Board of Control. He relates that he has information that the Texas Technological College is asking for salaries equal to those at the University of Texas and also asking for the privilege of doing graduate work. Evans laments the discrimination against the teachers colleges in the matter of salaries and other items,

showing that equal pay should be given for equal work in state colleges. He says: "We have permitted this discrimination in salaries to go on as long as we can and maintain the prestige of our teachers colleges and our own sense of self-respect." He then expressed the opinion that it would be dangerous for Tech to offer graduate work. The state could afford only one school for this, he then thought.

At this time the board of regents seemed to be solidly in support of the presidents. On July 7, 1926, M. O. Flowers, president of the board, said in a letter to Evans:

At our meeting next week it seems to me that the most important thing is to first make the board of control agree to treat the teachers colleges right in the matter of salaries, and I think you should select someone or two to present the subjects as they occur to you. We should have no trouble in making them admit that we cannot maintain the same standards with C. I. A. and A. and M. and Tech and let them have a salary scale that will rob us of our best teachers. I think we should first make them admit that we have attained as high standards as any other senior college, and then we should make them agree that we should either quit or be given the same rights in the matters of salaries and equipment.

It may be best for us not to fight Tech too hard, but there is not a reason why Mr. Hill should not present his case and make every comparison that is necessary. When Tech presented its budget before the board of control it emphasized the fact that it had an enrollment of 1,043 students. In talking with one of their professors this week, I told him that I did not believe their daily attendance ever reached more than 500 students, and he only smiled at me, and I am sure he felt the same way about it. That was Dr. Ray who was taken away from Nacogdoches and given a much higher salary and a lower rank.

. . . . My position is that the teachers colleges must quit being too modest and must demand equal treatment with other schools of the same kind.

There was little if any improvement in the situation during the next biennium. The continued increase in enrollment in the summer schools, instead of bringing an increase in appropriations, brought reductions. The lack of funds appropriated for the summer schools during the session of the legislature in 1927, and with no prospect whatever of relief by the governor through his authority to grant deficiency warrants, became so grave a

situation that the presidents of the teachers colleges decided to ask their faculties to serve two weeks without immediate pay with the understanding that the legislature would be asked for an emergency appropriation to provide pay for the amount owed them. There was considerable warning given that this would probably not be successful, and the warning proved valid.

It is a mere matter of history that in the year 1929 the economy of the state was prospering, and the outlook had seldom been brighter for revenue income to the treasury. But in the fall after the legislature had committed the state to what was then regarded as "heavy state spending," the economic crash occurred. Thus the teachers colleges found themselves not only unable to provide higher salaries to assure higher class instruction but, as noted in another chapter,<sup>4</sup> under the necessity to fight for their very existence. And for the next ten years, summer school salaries were reduced from the amounts paid during the regular session.

If the charge of being too modest in their requests for funds for teachers salaries was accurate, the teachers college presidents were ultra modest when it came to requesting raises in their own salaries. The first discussion of the salaries for the presidents brought forth from President Evans a warning against raising their salaries and paying for the raise out of the so-called local fund or contingent fund, over which the presidents had almost unrestricted control. About that time, too, the attorney general ruled that such action would be illegal. Organized opposition to requests of the presidents for increased salaries occurred for the first time in 1919. On the 23rd day of July, President Evans wrote President Hill on the subject as follows:

The threatened fight against an increase in salaries of normal school presidents came last Saturday morning, but the cause was saved by the close margin of 50 to 47. Monday morning a reconsideration was offered, and our opponents carried the day by approximately a majority of 15. Later Monday the speaker ruled the reconsideration out of order on the ground that the motion to table reconsideration had carried Saturday afternoon. Our salaries, therefore, remain at \$4,000. There is, however, considerable feeling on the part of some members of the House, but so far as I know there is no inclination on the part of senators to condemn us. It may be interesting for you to know that the repre-

---

<sup>4</sup>Chapter III.

sentatives from Plainview, Greenville, and three of the four Fort Worth representatives were against us in this fight. We had confidently expected the cordial support of representatives from districts in which the State Normal Schools were located, and, in addition thereto, had hoped for the cooperation of members from counties adjacent to normal school locations.

As a result of their losing fight for increased salaries in 1919, some of the presidents were apprehensive that enough ill feeling had been generated against the group to damage permanently their future chances, not only for their own salaries, but perhaps for securing adequate funds for any other needs of the teachers colleges. On July 30, 1919, President Hill suggested that the presidents "do not use the full four thousand dollars and in this way try to regain our lost favor." He did suggest, however, an increase in benefits, that fuel for the heating of the president's home be added to the list of things furnished by the state.

Hill's suggestion to refrain from using the full salary of the president met with near unanimous opposition by the other presidents. The trend of the argument against the suggestion seemed to be that if any money appropriated for the salary of a president were returned to the treasury, this would be a good enough reason for a cut by later legislatures, in the belief that this was an admission by the presidents that such a high salary was not needed. On August 7, Hill wrote that he had been convinced that there would be "a great deal of diminution of opposition" if a strong contention were made for higher salaries for the normal school presidents in the future.

So far as the records show, there was never again a separation made of the requests for increased salaries for the presidents from the list of salaries for other college employees. In 1929, however, the salaries of the presidents were recommended by the Board of Control at a level below that of the deans. This, of course, created embarrassment to the executives, even though a raise for the presidents had been approved by the Board to the amount of \$6,000 per annum, Evans, for a while, appeared willing to accept the situation temporarily, as it certainly could be used in the following biennium to boost the presidential salaries. As a policy after that, he recommended, "First get the salaries of the presidents raised so as to be out of the way of

raises for other college officials and faculty members." But the usual last-minute slashes left the salaries of the presidents at \$5,000.

As a sort of follow-up to this situation, a study made by President Hill in the spring of 1930 revealed that the salaries of the presidents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges were lowest of those in any state, including Arkansas, Louisiana, and other southern states. The lowest salary paid to a teachers college president outside Texas was at that time \$6,000 per year as compared with the salaries of the Texas group, which were \$1,000 lower. This study was made of 80 teachers colleges in the United States. The range of salaries in other states was from \$6,000 to \$12,000, The largest group was that of 25 colleges, all paying \$6,000. Twelve colleges paid \$7,000; three paid \$9,000, etc.

### Local Funds

In the early days the term "local funds" had great significance for the presidents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges, During those years—before the legislature had thought of a state auditor—the local funds were for all practical purposes under the absolute control of the presidents. The lawmakers were not concerned as long as "state" funds were not being disbursed, There were several sources of local funds, the main source being the fees paid by students. The amount of these fees which could be collected from each student was rigidly fixed by law, but so long as the funds were spent in the interest of the collecting college, the president had almost unhampered freedom in their disbursement.

For example, if the legislature did not appropriate the amount requested for a particular item—and this applied to salaries as well as general maintenance, travel expense for the president, entertainment at school functions, etc.—the president would authorize the expenditure, the business manager would vouch the invoice or statement, and the item was included in a list of others sent to the office of the secretary of the board of regents in Austin. The secretary was, in turn, given great freedom in approving the voucher and signifying by rubber stamp the name of the president of the board. It was very seldom that the secretary was required to send a voucher for the personal inspection of a member of the board.



It is easy to understand, therefore, why there was bitter opposition to any suggestion that all local funds be deposited in the state treasury and state warrants drawn against these funds, as was required by the Fairchild Bill.<sup>5</sup> That very rule of law was finally passed by the legislature, but fortunately for the development of the teachers colleges it came after the formation of a fairly well-established policy of at least reasonable state support for every state institution.

This somewhat lengthy definition is given here in order that the frequent references to local funds hereafter may be properly understood. For a time the local fund was also called "the local contingent fund," but this designation was soon dropped. Prior to 1930, there was also a fund appropriated by the legislature called "contingent fund," but any warrants issued against this fund had to be approved by the comptroller of Texas.

The argument that local funds were, in fact, state funds was never directly disputed by the presidents; but they contended strongly that the board of regents of the teachers colleges had been given control of the local funds and that there was never any intention of the legislature to make mandatory the deposit of these funds in the state treasury.

In 1931 the Texas Attorney General ruled that local funds must be deposited in the state treasury. Immediately the heads of all state-supported colleges joined in opposition to the ruling, even going so far as to employ four attorneys known all over the state to present arguments to the attorney general against the ruling. On October 8, 1931, President Evans wrote to A. B. Mayhew, president of the board of regents, as follows:

It was agreed for these attorneys and representatives of the colleges to meet at an Austin hotel at 2:00 p.m., October 28. The attorneys seemed to have the utmost confidence in their ability to win the case for the colleges. Some years ago the Missouri Supreme Court had a case involving the same legal questions, and decided in favor of the Missouri college.

Evans also notified the other teachers college presidents of the action planned. October 14 President Estill of Huntsville replied:

I acknowledge your letter of October 12 addressed to the teachers college presidents advising us of the steps that

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Acts of Texas Legislature, 1927.*

have been taken to avert the threatened ruling of the Attorney General's Department in regard to depositing local funds in the state treasury. In accordance with your suggestion, I have written to the persons named by you, giving them the statement desired in regard to this college. If I can cooperate further in any way please let me know.

There was some doubt in the minds of a few presidents as to just what money collected by a college should be defined as "local funds." Matriculation fees were, without question, local funds. But whether the student activity fees paid by students for their football tickets, their subscription to student publications, et cetera, mere to be collected and deposited in the state treasury was open to question. On August 16, 1932, President Estill raised this very question in a letter to President Evans. Evans replied that he did not consider the funds mentioned as "college" funds, and therefore he believed they were outside the attorney general's ruling.

In October President Estill appointed one of his staff members to make a study of the state constitution to see whether the deposit of local funds in the state treasury was required by the constitution. The investigator reported that there appeared to be a conflict, or at least a difference in interpretation of the meaning of the provision of the constitution, Article IV, Sec. 24, which states, "the Governor may also inspect their managers of state institutions books, accounts, vouchers, and public funds," and the statutory provision which created the boards of regents, stating that the "board shall have authority to fix the rate of incidental fees to be paid by students attending such schools and to make rules for the collection of such fees and for the disbursement of such funds."

It should be remembered that the Pollard Fee Bill took away the authority of the governing board to fix the amount of the mat iculation fee, but it did not change the board's authority to disburse these funds.

The Huntsville staff member came to the conclusion that the state constitution impliedly gave authority of the regents to retain and disburse local funds.<sup>6</sup>

The legislature took no definite action in the session of **1933**, but the question remained alive as a continued threat hang-

---

<sup>6</sup>A copy of this report is in the Evans files.

ing over the presidents. The minutes of the Council of Teachers College Presidents, meeting at the Blackstone Hotel, Fort Worth, on November 7, 1933, included the following paragraph:

The group discussed the rumors coming from various sources that an effort would be made to have the colleges deposit all their local funds, from whatever source the funds may be derived, in the state treasury to be paid out on regular vouchers through that office. It was the consensus of opinion that this would cause unnecessary bookkeeping and would tend to work a hardship on the institutions involved, but the group seemed to favor the filing of annual audits with the Comptroller of Public Accounts to become a part of his records. The meaning of this is that the colleges desire to handle their local funds through their regular depositories, but that the expenditure of these local funds should be a matter of record in the Comptroller's biennial report.

As an illustration of the use made of local funds and the freedom with which such use was exercised, a letter from President Birdwell of Nacogdoches, dated March 23, 1927, reads:

I am assuming that the Governor will sign the emergency appropriation bill. I have had to employ extra teachers to take care of the near 200 new students who have entered this term. If anything goes wrong with the bill I shall pay the salaries out of local funds. It seems to me that it is altogether wise to teach all who come to us, even though we do have to spend local funds.

As already reported, the summer school of 1928 was left almost without support. The presidents were forced to draw heavily on local funds to carry on the work of the summer session. Then there was an attempt to secure an appropriation from the legislature in 1929 to reimburse the colleges for their expenditures from local funds for summer school support which had heretofore been supplied by state appropriations or by deficiency warrants issued by the governor. At this time, however, Governor Moody refused to issue a deficiency warrant for the purpose stated.

In the following letter, dated February 8, 1929, President Evans undertook to instruct President Whitley of Commerce how he could salvage part of what had been lost by East Texas State Teachers College because of the necessity of using local funds in the summer of 1928:

The Free Conference Committee may reject all items involving the refund to our local funds. Your friends would like to do something for your school, but if they follow the Moody program of making no refund to local funds, you will lose \$18,000. I confidently believe you stand a chance to hold \$8,000 to \$10,000 of this amount by increasing the request for your summer school of 1929 by \$5,000 and by substituting an item of \$4,000 to \$5,000 for salaries for the spring term of 1929. Or, instead of salaries for the spring term, however, it could even be departmental maintenance for the same amount. Wire your senator your wishes in the matter; but if you can possibly do so, make the totals for the two items which you include \$9,000 to \$10,000.

This letter also reveals the very necessary tactics of "juggling" requests for funds in order to sidestep probable objections and carry on the work of keeping the institutions operative. Ten days later, President Whitley jubilantly wired Evans as follows: "Free Conference Committee voted today to allow unpaid salaries of last summer. All other items allowed as previously agreed on."

Another instance of tactics employed to accomplish what was deemed to be something for the good of the schools is illustrated by a letter from President Hill of Canyon, dated April 20, 1929:

... In case the legislature does its worst in the matter of appropriations, why not ask our board of regents to raise the salaries of certain strategic positions from our local funds. These would include heads of departments, administrative officers (including the president and such other places as circumstances may justify). Other institutions are doing this same thing and getting by with it. I see no reason why we should continue to punish ourselves.

Also I should like for the summer school that we shorten the term to eight or nine weeks and reduce summer salaries. If we can get the salaries for the regular session to a reasonable point, I believe a reduction of the summer scale would be advisable.

I have just returned from a trip through the Middle West, looking over some prospective teachers, and I find myself up against the salary proposition good and hard. I do not see how I am to meet the rising standards of the times unless we can get a few more \$3,600 salaries.

President Hill's report to the regents on October 3, 1929, for the quarter ending December 31, 1929, also reveals the financial predicament in which the teachers colleges found themselves

even in a year that was by popular opinion regarded as a "good year" in the financial affairs of Texas. The report follows:

Because of decreased appropriations for salaries and inadequate departmental and other maintenance, we shall be compelled to draw too heavily upon our local funds for support of these items. For example, our salary appropriation for the nine months is \$5,000 per year short of that for each year of the last biennium.

The new Education Building necessitated increased expense for janitors, supplies, etc., in the sum of \$2,500 annually. Consequently, we are compelled to ask for \$7,500 as an emergency appropriation or as a deficiency warrant from the Governor. This is \$5,000 less than the contingent salary sum which the Governor vetoed and is absolutely essential to our maintenance.

For our Summer School, if we figure \$45 per capita, less \$10 to be derived from local funds, we must have an additional appropriation of \$23,000 for the summers of 1930 and 1931 respectively.

There was for at least a decade a distinct advantage to the employee of a state institution who was paid from local funds. These funds, of course, were on deposit in banks serving the colleges, and there was no discount or interest charges as in the case of state warrants drawn against the empty state treasury.

With the creation by the legislature of the office of State Auditor, there was renewed argument for requiring local funds to be remitted to the state treasury. In the legislative session of 1931, there was also an outcropping of criticism of the state colleges for the haphazard manner in which certain appropriated funds were spent. The itemization of appropriations made any flexibility in the disbursement of these funds very difficult. In too many cases, however, the expenditures from certain funds for certain purposes was admittedly open to interpretation under the law. As a result of this criticism on the part of the legislators, the state comptroller made an attempt to adjust some of the problems faced and to remedy some of the questionable practices. A letter from the comptroller invited the college presidents or business managers to confer with the comptroller if desired. Evans took advantage of the invitation, after which he sent the following communication, dated October 10, 1931, to A. B. Mayhew of Uvalde, president of the board of regents:

I am enclosing a letter which refers to a conference with the Comptroller in Austin Monday. Twenty years ago,

all accounts passing through the Comptroller's Office were compared very carefully with the terms of the appropriation bill, and all departments and institutions were promptly turned down in case of doubtful classification. Beginning about 12 or 15 years ago the Comptroller's Office became careless, and from that time until very recently, almost any kind of account could be paid under almost any kind of classification. It is my judgment that this careless policy of the comptroller's Department has unloaded upon us criticisms that properly belonged to the Comptroller's Office.

The distinctive, fundamental responsibility of the Comptroller's office is to pass upon the legality of accounts on the basis of vouchers sent in. Legislators have really not been fair in criticizing the state colleges for expenditure of funds under the wrong headings; the Comptroller, in all such cases, had already passed upon these accounts, and had officially approved their legality. Unfortunately, legislators knew, or in any event believed, that the Comptroller's Office was merely going along the line of least resistance, and, therefore, attached no weight to its rulings.

Early in the summer, State Auditor Moore Lynn, said to me in conversation that his own investigation was to the effect that the Comptroller's Office, for a good many years, had not met its responsibilities properly in settling the legality of vouchers as classified. Auditor Lynn asked me to assist him, if I could do so, by telling the Comptroller that when I first came to San Marcos, the auditors employed by the state were strict in the classification of accounts and in disapproving vouchers drawn against the wrong fund. I have never done as I was requested, but I am in sympathy with what the Auditor and the Comptroller are trying to do.

At the next meeting of the board of regents the following minute was recorded: "Without formal motion it was understood that the schools would continue to administer the local funds as at present, because it was the feeling that it was impossible to obey the ruling of the attorney general without working great harm to the institutions."<sup>7</sup>

### Funds a la **Politics**

The spectre haunting every teachers college president was the fear that he might make an error in judging or estimating the political climate in which all had to work. Every contemplated move had to be analyzed in the light of its effect upon

---

<sup>7</sup>See minutes of regents for the November, 1931, meeting.

members of the legislature, the governor, the board of control, the state department of education, or members of the board of regents, not to mention the usual considerations of public policy. In their letters to each other they poured out their apprehension and, at times, their resentment at being fettered to such a system. In the never-ending quest for funds the presidents were faced with the imperative necessity of evaluating every shade and overtone of political expediency.

In January, 1920, President Evans commented to the other presidents as follows:

The legislature refused to give us the increase in salaries called for, and to secure deficiency warrants after such failure would invite friction and trouble with the next legislature. I believe we should plan to use our entire contingent fund, and possibly some local funds in addition thereto, for increasing salaries. Indeed, it is a critical time for us, and we should be ready to meet the difficult times in a manner that will maintain highclass talent in our schools; but we must do this, so far as we can, along safe lines.

While my judgment is as already stated, I will gladly yield to the judgment of the majority of the presidents, if it is found advisable to ask for deficiency warrants.

A few years later President Estill of Huntsville complained that the representatives from that area had no influence in securing funds for his institution. He said in part:

. . . My situation is distressingly acute. Some of you have been able to induce the legislature to increase your salary totals considerably above the amounts allowed by the Board of Control. Sam Houston Teachers College was not so fortunate. It appears that our local representatives in the House and Senate were devoid of influence, and the result is that our salary totals for the present biennium are materially smaller than those of sister institutions with approximately the same enrollment as ours or with smaller enrollment. The number of our college students has quadrupled in recent years. If newspaper reports are correct, we had the largest number of college graduates this summer of any of the teachers colleges except Denton. Please understand that I am not depressing the needs of my brethren; I am merely emphasizing my own.

As to building needs, both the board of regents and the presidents have recognized an emergency situation at Huntsville. The total building appropriations for this institution in 46 years amount to \$270,000. This total is smaller than that of any teachers college except the one at Alpine. Our

building needs have been recognized by the Board of Control for six years ago, four years ago, and two years ago, but each time the legislature failed to make the appropriation recommended or the Governor has vetoed it. We are within 50 miles of the A. and M. College, an institution which, as President Hill says, has by far the best college plant in the Southwest. The A. and M. College has definitely entered upon the field of teacher training. With its department of education and its training school, it is competing with us. These facts speak for themselves.

While, as Estill said, there appeared to be some discrimination, perhaps due to causes he mentioned, yet there was also the fear that if the presidents acted together as a bloc in presenting requests to the legislature, this would meet with legislative disfavor.

Evans was a student of government and well informed on matters of taxation. What always puzzled him somewhat was the great reluctance of the legislators to vote for revenue measures which even the average citizen knew to be necessary. When in 1926, however, a proposal was made that the state enact a millage tax, Evans opposed the suggestion strongly, pointing out that political economists and tax commissions of the country not only opposed such a tax, but uniformly gave it their condemnation. He referred to the use of the millage tax as the oxcart era of state taxation. Evans' opposition, so far as the records show, went no farther than an expression to the presidents and regents of his opposition.

Unlike the University of Texas and Baylor University, the teachers colleges have never had a champion of their cause in the governor's office. Even James E. Ferguson, whose name was placed in the Hall of Remembrance as a "hero of Texas education" by the Texas Heritage Foundation in 1954, was lukewarm toward support of the teachers colleges. He did, of course, cooperate in the establishment of four normal schools.

After a conversation with Governor Dan Moody in 1929, President Birdwell, some months later, wrote President Evans:

You will recall our conversation with the Governor. There is a feeling that the Teachers Colleges are trying to get too much. We must avoid, I think, anything that looks like a "bloc." Personally, I doubt the wisdom of our proposed meeting, but I am entirely willing to go through with it if it is your opinion that it is wise.



It was the belief then, as it has been most of the time since, that if Texas had not expanded the number of state-supported colleges, there might be enough money to support a few much more adequately. President Evans wrote M. O. Flowers on February 20, 1928:

The John Tarleton Agricultural College and the North Texas Junior Agricultural College were established in 1917, and appropriations were made for each college that year. The total appropriations for these two junior colleges from establishment to date are as follows:

John Tarleton College .....\$2,255,060

North Texas Agricultural College .....\$1,705,192

If this amount had been spent by the state in equipping institutions already established in 1917, it would have changed the entire educational history of Texas.

In spite of inflation and widespread prosperity in the spring of 1929, the niggardly attitude of the legislature toward support of the teachers colleges caused some of the presidents to believe that that year would be the hardest ever. President Evans wrote on April 4: "It has not been my habit to be pessimistic at such times, but I must admit that I am convinced that we are facing the hardest biennium we have ever experienced. . . ." In January, 1930, Governor Moody wrote President Birdwell as follows:

. . . Mr. Terrell, the Comptroller, advises that the prospective deficit on September 1, under present appropriations, is \$501,737.45. While I do not question the accuracy of his book figures, still I know that warrants will not be drawn against appropriations and I believe that there will be some balance in the treasury at the end of the fiscal year. Nevertheless, I am forced to admit that the amount of money which this session can appropriate to the total requested appropriations is so small, that it does not look like it ought to be stated.

I have come to the conclusion that the best way to handle this matter is to say to the Legislature that some additional revenues should be provided. Unless this is done I can't see how any considerable part of the requests can be granted. I certainly do not want any more taxes, but it is difficult for me to see how the increased demands of the departments and institutions are to be met when the revenues are not increased in proportion to the demands.

On the copy of the governor's letter, Birdwell pencilled briefly, "We are confronted with a serious situation. Can anything be done about it?"

Often it was not a matter of whether or not adequate funds were appropriated, but rather whether enough funds were available to keep the school in operation at all. There were occasions on which the presidents almost begged the faculty members to take a leave of absence for advanced study if it were at all possible. A letter from President Birdwell in January of 1930 reveals the situation at Nacogdoches:

. . . I hope we shall not forget the very pressing needs for the regular term. You recall that the contingent fund for this school had been very large. When it was vetoed, we were left with five to six thousand dollars less to maintain the faculty than we had the previous biennium. I do not see how we could have met our payrolls even then had not a half-a-dozen or more teachers been away on leave of absence. This has meant additional burdens to an already overworked faculty. I do not see how we can carry on next year without a material reduction of the faculty.

When the session of the legislature convened in 1931, the outlook became, if possible, even more gloomy for the teachers colleges. On March 6, President Evans wrote A. B. Mayhew describing the problem:

The situation for appropriations is, in many respects, critical. Both House and Senate are not inclined to make any increases in items. Opposition to increased salaries is particularly strong. The Summer School appropriation had hard sledding for a few days, but finally passed both houses.

A new fight upon appropriations comes from an unexpected source. A group of influential and wealthy businessmen, through a shrewd representative, is doing some very effective and dangerous work. The general tone of this group is that neither the common schools nor the state schools need money. The only thing to do, therefore, is to make better use of the money available, and thereby cut out the need of increasing support.

I have before me an article written by C. A. Jay, calling attention to the large appropriations for higher education in Texas. According to this article, Texas is second in the United States in appropriations for maintenance of state colleges; fifth in value of property owned by state educational institutions, and fourth in the grand total of money appropriated for education for all purposes. Part of the contention cannot be answered. Texas has already made the colossal mistake of multiplying state teachers colleges and industrial colleges. When this statement is made, we have explanation for the grand total for the support of state

schools. For instance, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and California do not separate A. and M. Colleges, while Texas has six separate and distinct industrial colleges. No state except Texas has made an attempt to establish four A. and M. Colleges of the same rank as the original A. and M.

All this is submitted as worthy of reflection.

In reply to an inquiry of President Mayhew of the regents, Evans reminded him that it would be illegal, as a means of augmenting local funds, to increase fees paid by students, either the matriculation fee, laboratory fees, or other fees. Evans said:

The so-called Pollard Fee Bill limits laboratory charges to \$4 "for any one year from any one student in any one course." This probably means \$1 per term of three months for a student in a single laboratory course. Under the strict requirement of the law, even this small laboratory charge is expected to cover only "actual laboratory materials and supplies used by the student." We cannot, therefore, charge a special fee for the students who take laboratory courses, and even these fees must not exceed the actual cost of laboratory materials and supplies.

Evans noted with growing concern the lack of uniform treatment of the several state colleges at the hands of the legislature. On July 7, 1931, he wrote again to Mayhew:

. . . I find a surprisingly large number of classes in all state colleges with an enrollment of two to five students and a large sprinkling of classes containing one to two students only. Again the support of the several schools in state colleges is in no wise allocated on the basis of attendance. This is not true only within the teachers college group, but strikingly so without this group. The regular state appropriations have, on more than one occasion, given several colleges exactly the same support, although one college had an enrollment of  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent to 50 per cent larger. There does not seem to be any particular ratio between the total number of students for the regular session and the total appropriations for salaries. The mere fact that a college is given a building by one legislature does not create any obligation on the part of the college to get out of the way two years later and let other colleges have a chance for buildings.

I mention these items because I think they are worthy of very careful consideration by all college people . . . .

The fact that the great depression was now in its third year did its part to increase political activity in opposition to state

support of its colleges. Another letter to President Mayhew on December 9, 1931, showed the reliable information obtained by Evans and revealed a surprisingly accurate forecast of the action which would be taken by the legislature in 1933:

A prominent ex-senator from North Texas is a frequent visitor in Austin. Two weeks ago he showed me some statistics regarding costs per student in all the state colleges. This table listed San Marcos as costing the least per capita of any state college. I very frankly stated to him that we do not make such a claim, but that we are in a small list of colleges with a very low per capita cost.

I am making mention of his statistics in order to call attention to the widespread propaganda against the cost of higher education. This friend of mine stated that the citizens of a large number of counties of the state were organized in opposition to taxes, and were centering their fight upon, and would attempt to organize, the next Legislature for an economy program for cutting appropriations for state colleges. He furthermore added that any state college would do well for 1933-35 to secure appropriations on the present level, and that a ten per cent to twenty per cent cut in the grand total of appropriations would probably be made. The daily papers of this week carry reports of anti-tax meetings in Limestone and Cameron Counties; and it is easy, in reading our dailies, to find mention of other meetings in opposition to taxes.

While I do not think we should get excited about this situation, it occurs to me that state colleges should be discussing some kind of program of concentration or cooperation, and thereby indicate a wholesome respect for what is evidently an overwhelming sentiment. If investigations the nation over have proved anything, they have established the folly of competition and the wisdom of cooperation in higher education. We can now look, however, in any direction in Texas and find the sharpest competition in state colleges; on the other hand, suggestions of cooperation are often frowned upon.

The bitter political campaign of 1932, resulting in the return of Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson to the office of Governor, did nothing to quiet the uneasiness of school men in Texas concerning the influence of politics upon state support for education. One of the most able school men of Texas and one probably most likely to get the attention of the incoming governor was President A. W. Birdwell of the Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College at

Nacogdoches. At the invitation of Mrs. Ferguson, he wrote her on December 14, 1932, setting up eight points of advice concerning the reduction in the expenses of the state.

Essentially, he recommended that all departments of the state government, including the schools, be taken together and a decision reached as to what per cent the total expenses of the state must be cut and let each department bear its share of the reduction. He suggested that about the only way to save any considerable amount of money would be by the reduction of salaries. But he urged the retention of all essential services.

In what appeared to be a helpful attitude and in an apparent attempt to discover points of agreement between members of the State Board of Control, President Birdwell made the statement that the Board of Control had made "about as intelligent a distribution of the funds available in the state government as could be expected." This statement evoked a sharp difference of opinion from President Evans, who wrote Birdwell on December 26, 1932, as follows:

I can in no sense agree that the State Board of Control made "an intelligent distribution of the funds available." The Board took ill-proportioned items and totals and made a poor attempt to adjust these inequalities. The Board did not enter into the real merits of the relative appropriation for the state colleges.

Evans then mentioned the "inequalities" in the salary allotments of the various colleges and gave details of the variation in the per capita appropriation—used usually by the legislature as a basis—for which he shows figures that prove this discrepancy through the years from 1926 to 1932, the variation for 1926-27 being "from \$158 to \$220," and continuing in about that differentiation to 1931-32, from \$103 to \$211. He continued:

I do not believe that this wide margin of difference is wise; really, I think it discredits our entire movement, and sooner or later will bring disaster. In any event, its continuance on the basis of a probable 25 per cent cut will wreck Commerce and will put Nacogdoches out of the running in comparison with two other schools with substantially the same or smaller enrollment—Canyon and Huntsville. We should also remember that the University of Texas is offering to teach freshmen and sophomores for \$125 per capita.

A copy of this communication was sent to Mr. Mayhew

Birdwell defended his statement by again declaring that the recommendation by the State Board of Control should be made the basis for trying to determine what proportion of the available funds might be allocated to each one of the teachers colleges. He repeated his statement that "this report represents the most intelligent effort that has been made to rectify the inequalities of which you complain." He then indulged in a lecture, which was not unusual for him:

I still think that statement will stand. Furthermore, you will recall, I am sure, that our own board of regents instructed us last spring to make the report of the State Board of Control the basis of our budgets.

. . . And I still think it was a wise suggestion. Certainly, it will be a simple one and, in my opinion, will prevent many invidious comparisons, I am perfectly aware that if we get into a controversy among ourselves (and I am speaking of all the state-supported colleges) we will be tremendously weakened before the general public and the Legislature. To be sure, there are differences in costs in the various institutions. There will always be differences. I am perfectly sure that they will be remedied by wise administration rather than by controversy before the powers-that-be concerning them.

I do not think we can win a battle unless we agree pretty definitely on the points to be attacked. I am trying to get the people in East Texas to fight for one thing; to wit, "All the teachers colleges in the state must be maintained as senior colleges." If we can hold the lines everywhere for this one proposition, we shall be in a position in the future to correct mistakes and to perfect the educational system of Texas. If we get into controversy about this department or that, about this inequality or that, we shall lose.

. . . I am trying here in East Texas to contact various members of the Legislature, and I am working just as hard to preserve the institutions at San Marcos and Alpine and Canyon and Commerce as I am to preserve the one at Nacogdoches. In other words, I have felt that we must all go up or down together. I mention these particular institutions because the institutions at Denton and Huntsville are not in any great danger. It may be interesting to state that I am getting very hearty response in favor of the idea that the teachers colleges must be maintained as senior colleges. This accomplished, all else may be achieved in the future; this lost, all is lost.

Political influence in determining the support, or even the fate, of state colleges is not a concept to be wholly condemned.

There is also the consoling fact that political influence is modified and, perhaps, at times actually created by public opinion; and if *public opinion*, sufficiently ponderous, can be wielded at the proper time, political influence can be shaped into a benefit. Thus the teachers college presidents, as leaders of their sections of Texas, were not without the one weapon which could save their respective institutions from destruction. The following letter of President Birdwell suggests the action required to accomplish the aims of his collaborators in undertaking to salvage at least a substantial part of the condemned structure:

The House Committee cut in the appropriation bill is rather alarming. The Senate Committee is more liberal, and perhaps something can be saved. The summer school appropriation is in danger. If responsible citizens could write the members of the Finance Committee, it would help, I think. We ought to make a strong effort next week at the hearing to secure some money at least for the summer schools.

### Funds For **The Summer School**

In the early days of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, the Summer School, or summer *session*, was probably the most important term of the year. The enrollment was far larger than that of the regular session, at times, more than doubling that number. Moreover, the type of students differed somewhat, summer students being usually more mature people, many being experienced teachers returning to college to complete the requirements for higher certificates, degrees, or to acquire specialized training in particular areas. The general atmosphere of the summer session was one of serious work. To a large extent, the students attending the summer session represented the results of training which had already been given, and their return for further training implied the approval of teachers in the field of the type of training offered by the College. The situation was similar in most of the other teachers colleges.

Perhaps the financing of the summer term created a more difficult problem than that of the regular session for the reason that there was not the sympathy for, or willingness to support, the summer session that was present in the legislature when funds were requested for the regular session. The legislators were aware that the professional teachers enrolled at this time were salary earners and probably could afford to pay heavier

fees. On the other hand, extra faculty members could be recruited to teach the college classes from the ranks of high school administrators or teachers with advanced degrees from the larger city schools, and these could be employed for less than the salary level paid the college teachers of the regular session, since summer work did not interfere with their regular positions in the high schools. And there was the greater volume of fees paid by summer school students, because of the increased number enrolled, which made state support not so necessary during these three months.

As the years went by, the cuts made by the lawmakers in summer school support became more and more severe, particularly in salaries; and the steep rise in the standards for granting certificates, as well as the mounting uniform requirement for a college degree as qualification for public school teachers, created more and more demand for summer session training. All these put together were productive of a raft of administrative headaches.

The correspondence between the presidents during the twenties and thirties reveals that no subject was of such importance as summer sessions in terms of the service which it was believed the teachers colleges owed to the public school teachers of the state. An example of the struggle for support of the summer session was found in a letter dated December 31, 1924, written to the other presidents by President Hill of Canyon. The message follows:

On my return from San Antonio I stopped in Austin and took a peep at our budgets. What I saw of my own was most depressing. It showed the following features in which I think you will be interested: My summer school appropriation was reduced from \$58,000 requested to \$40,000. This is \$13,000 less than one-third of the salary budget for the regular session and is considerably less than we are now spending on summer work. If passed in this form it will amount to requiring our teachers to do more work in the summer for less pay, or so cutting down the staff in size as to eliminate about half of the work we offer. I cannot accept this recommendation of the Board of Control and continue our summer school even on its present basis of efficiency.

Huntsville and Commerce were given like amounts. Sul Ross was cut from \$22,500 to \$15,000. I did not see the other budgets.

I asked for only three or four new teachers. Every one



was eliminated and even some that I now have were cut out. We have this year a 25 per cent increase in enrollment over that of last year and are getting along with makeshift arrangements until the legislature can give us relief. . . .

Our maintenance requests were divided by about three and a half. This is so ridiculously small for some of the departments that it might as well be eliminated altogether.

My request for an education building was eliminated and my budget was amended to request a science building, which was granted. This to me seems a preposterous act of power on the part of the Board of Control. Expediency may compel me to accept this recommendation, but it is certainly out of line with my wishes, and I can hardly refrain from resenting the action of the Board.

At almost the same time President Whitley of Commerce, in a letter to President Evans, sang the same refrain of inadequate finances for the summer session. He said:

Our summer school budget was cut so badly that the items are hardly recognizable. We asked for approximately \$30,000 each year, and we were recommended by the Board of Control for only \$9,000. In our departmental budget, we have been fasting for two years. If the Board of Control budget goes through, we shall continue to fast for another two years. I heartily concur in your recommendation that a committee of presidents, together with representatives of the Board of Regents, meet to take these matters up with the Board of Control and see what can be done.

These doleful outcries were always followed by successful attempts to "cut corners" and "make ends meet," but never was there enough for a full program visualized by the presidents.

In December, 1926, President Evans wrote a letter to the other presidents, which, except for the date, may well have been in connection with the previous biennium. This letter includes a table showing the appropriations for summer schools and the costs per capita at the several colleges. It was written, apparently, as a suggested effort to secure more equitable appropriations for summer sessions :

This estimate is based, as should all estimates, upon the enrollment of college students, and shows a per capita cost ranging for the summer session of \$30.34 to \$58.82.

The purpose of this letter is merely to suggest the advisability of summer school appropriations for the several institutions being based somewhat more upon the total enrollment of college students in each of the colleges, making

allowance, however, for the increased comparative costs of small enrollments. So far as we are concerned, we have never been able to offer a full program of work during the summer. At no time has a legislature been willing to give the necessary funds, and I have always doubted the advisability of asking for a deficiency warrant covering such needs, when the legislature itself had refused to increase the summer school appropriations.

In 1927 there appeared to be a growing determination in the legislature to shift the burden of financing the summer schools away from the state treasury. In June President Evans wrote the other presidents:

No teachers college has been given a sufficient appropriation with which to maintain a summer school on the basis of 1926. The committees of the House and Senate have been frank in saying that we should meet the situation by the use of local fees. We have been promised repeal of the Pollard Bill so as to make possible the increase of summer school fees to help the situation. With a possible enrollment of 1,800 to 2,000 college students in 1928 it would take an increase of fees, a slight reduction of summer school salaries, and a balance carried over from the regular session to finance a satisfactory summer school quarter.

In August of 1927, President Hill, in a letter to the presidents, gave figures to show that although appropriations for the teachers colleges for salaries for 1926-27 including the summer school were larger than for any previous year, the amount appropriated for summer schools in all of the teachers colleges had been reduced under that for the previous summer. For example, at West Texas State the appropriation for the summer of 1928 was only \$24,000—less than half of what was spent there for the summer of 1926. Said Hill, "In fact, every state school in Texas had its summer school maintenance cut approximately in half, except the University of Texas, which fared a little better." Hill, following Evans' lead in making suggestions, placed three alternatives before the group; supplement the appropriations; cut the length of the summer session; or cut salaries.

President Evans, who acted as the spokesman for the other presidents on many occasions regarding events in Austin, expressed the opinion on December 19, 1927, that the prospects for a deficiency warrant from Governor Moody were rather remote. He then said:

This college needs \$30,000 in order to maintain an efficient summer school for the summer quarter of 1928. But I do not believe there is even a remote chance of getting this sum as a deficiency warrant from the Governor. I do believe it my duty, however, when the Governor is ready for final action, to present its urgent need. . . .

Early in 1928 President Evans alone persuaded Governor Moody to give relief to the summer schools of the teachers colleges. He secured small sums in the form of deficiency warrants for each of the schools. A letter of approbation from President Birdwell, dated March 9, 1928, described the situation at the Nacogdoches institution, which was typical:

You have done well. Your representation to the Governor of the needs of the teachers colleges hit the spot.

I am only hoping that the Governor will act promptly, for I do not know just how to organize my summer school faculty until his decision is made.

Dr. Harrington and Mr. Gaston<sup>r</sup> were here yesterday. They are beginning their investigation of the needs of the Colleges for the next biennium.

The situation in the Board of Control is rather depressing. It is doubtful just how much weight Dr. Harrington will have. However, we are studying our budget material very closely here and will be ready to make our report at the proper time.

A rather naive idea occurred to at least one of the presidents that one way to convince the legislature that funds must be provided would be for the college to "create a deficit"; that is, to incur financial obligations without visible funds with which to meet the indebtedness. He apparently believed that the governor, through deficiency warrants, or the legislature, by appropriations in the future, would settle the debt of the institution making it. He believed, however, that the obligation for which it would be most difficult to get relief would be a deficit in salaries owed to teachers. General maintenance funds could much more easily be obtained if these were involved in a deficit deal.

The following letter dated March 24, 1928, illustrates this type of thinking:

. . . I think we should use all our local funds to pay teachers salaries, using as little local fund money as possible

---

<sup>8</sup>Members of the Board of Control. Dr. Harrington had been criticized severely by the teachers college presidents for his stubborn opposition to the support of the teachers colleges.

for general maintenance. I am not sure whether any of us can meet our expenses in this way. If we cannot do so, then, of course, we will have to make a deficit.

I think we could get an emergency appropriation from the next legislature to cover our needs in general maintenance much easier than we can get funds for deficits deliberately made. I feel that Governor Moody would help us all he can even in the latter situation, and I think it is probable that the deficits would be paid by the legislature.

The suggestion that teachers be asked to forego part of their pay during the summer session on an agreement that these instructors would be paid their back earnings during the regular session out of local funds if the legislature failed to make the necessary emergency appropriation was made, perhaps for the first time, during the spring of 1928. The risk in any such agreement between the college administration and the faculty was readily apparent to President Evans, and he never gave it serious consideration. He seemed to have an abiding faith that, in some way or somehow, in spite of all muddling of the legislature, the work of the College could be carried on. A miracle would happen. When funds were desperately short, he did without many things which he regarded as most desirable. He knew that the teachers would somehow struggle along with the burden of large classes and poor equipment. If class offerings must be cut and only a portion of the regular faculty employed to teach run-over classes, the work would go on. There would be better times, surely, before long.

His faith was rewarded in June of 1928 when a deficiency of \$50,000 was granted the teachers colleges as a group with each college allotted a proportionate part of this sum. The presidents agreed upon the division of this fund without incident.

Evans then found himself facing a small problem due to the fact that the deficiency warrant could not be paid by the state treasury for nine months or more. Banks offered to discount the warrant at six per cent. In order to stretch this money as far as possible, Evans ordered payments from the deficiency warrants to be made by individual treasury warrants against the fund. Thus, the teachers who were paid by this means were forced to accept the discount of their salary warrants, whereas those who were paid from local funds were enjoying the unfair advantage of freedom from discounts.

In spite of all contrary opinion among the presidents as to the wisdom of such action, some of the group committed themselves to attempt to obtain an emergency appropriation to repay cuts in teachers' salaries for the summer school of 1928. And, as predicted by President Evans, all attempts failed. Evans wrote President Marquis on February 2, 1929, as follows:

My analysis of the situation in the House is that the Appropriations Committee is dead set against any appropriations for the summer school of 1928. The objections are the alleged attempt of the colleges to obligate the state without legislative authority, and the error of the colleges in requesting the state to refund salaries already paid or to pay salaries which could have been settled from local funds. Underlying these objections is the current sentiment fostered by our ancient enemy, Dr. Harrington, that the summer school students should support these terms through increased fees.

While I do not consider these objections to be valid or sound, yet the controlling considerations seem to be as stated. It is my judgment that there is little hope for the House to take favorable action, and furthermore, that a fight on the floor of the House is of doubtful expediency. I do believe, however, that the Senate Committee will stand firm, and that we will be practically certain to get part if not all of the summer school appropriation for 1929. . . .

There was rarely a time during the administration of President Evans when the statement, "The College faces a critical situation," was not literally true; but the statement was true more often when related to the summer session than at any other time.

## VI MONUMENT TO A COLLEGE PRESIDENT

### We Ought To Have A Prayer Meeting!

The sentiment expressed in this heading was somewhat facetiously written by President Birdwell of Nacogdoches to show the dark mood into which he had been thrown by news from Austin of the elimination of all buildings from state appropriations in 1931. Although the biennium of 1931-1932 was at the beginning of the great depression, it was no exceptional period so far as appropriations for the building needs of the state teachers colleges was concerned. It is doubtful that the damage done to the growth and prestige of the state teachers colleges by lack of space could ever be accurately calculated. But apparently by a tacit agreement among a majority of legislators, funds for state buildings were withheld session after session; and the pleas for buildings fell on deaf ears.

In 1934 the Federal Government created the Public Works Administration (PWA). During the next five years Federal funds exceeded state funds allocated for building purposes ten times over. In a report dated August 6, 1940, President Evans stated that the total amount for buildings appropriated by the legislature of Texas during the period of twenty years from 1920 to 1940 for the Southwest Texas State Teachers College was only \$150,000, which was for the Science Building. Funds for this building were appropriated in 1925. Up to that time, the total cost of buildings at San Marcos had not reached \$200,000. And during the years 1934 to 1939, referred to above, the Federal Government, by grants or loans, made available to the College a total of \$718,483. With this money the College erected five buildings—a dormitory for girls and one for boys, the first unit of the Library Building, the Girls Gymnasium, the Auditorium-Laboratory School Building—and certain improvements to the Education Building. In addition to this sum of more than \$700,000, the College spent out of local funds \$70,000 only. The total appropriation for buildings during the first thirty years of the existence of the College was not as much as that appropriated initially to establish more than one new institu-

tion; and it was much less than that appropriated at one time for a newer college with a much smaller number of students than was recorded as the enrollment at San Marcos.

The most tangible mark of achievement during the administration of any college president is the increase in the number and size of the buildings erected. This is universally recognized; it is true in business as well as in education. Being able to point out the size of the plant at an educational institution or a business firm when the executive took office and compare this with its size when he retired from that office is sufficient evidence of success in the public view. Such expansion is, therefore, a monument to the executive and creates an incentive that drives him through the years of his administration.

When he came to San Marcos, President Evans found three buildings for class use, these buildings having a combined cost value of less than \$200,000; and he left a plant valued at more than one million dollars in 1942. In contrast, the catalog of the College for 1966-1967 assesses a value of college buildings in excess of seventeen million dollars. The struggle which President Evans had to endure and the background of Texas politics, the economic backwardness of the state, the outdated tax laws, the rivalries of other state institutions, and opposition of commercial interests—all together made up the stage on which Evans had to appear to secure funds for buildings.

The appropriation for a new building was an occasion for great joy on the campus of a teachers college in Texas. The Education Building, for which an appropriation of \$85,000 was made in 1918, brought about such an occasion. However, that building merely relieved the current crowded situation and did not provide for any future expansion. By 1922 the need for more space was again becoming acute. In his report to the regents for the session of 1921-1922, Evans described the situation as follows:

On account of the enlarged curriculum and the increase in number of students, additional buildings are essential to the efficiency of instruction. The Main Building, Science Building, and Library Building are constructed of cheap material, poorly adapted to college work, and provide very limited accommodations. It is difficult to make a schedule of classes when twenty teachers have no regular classroom; it works a decided hardship upon instructors when they must attend to the daily routine of duties, hold conferences

with students, and yet have no offices in which to transact important school business. During the Summer Quarter, with a large enrollment of mature men and women, the Normal College is unable to make convenient and satisfactory assignments of rooms for instructors on account of the limited number of rooms available. Prompt relief through appropriations for new buildings is strongly urged, to the end that the State Normal College may render the quality of service demanded for the training of public school workers.

In this report Evans did not mention the Education Building, the Manual Arts-Home Economics Building (now housing the department of Art), and the power plant building, an addition to which at that time had housed the department of industrial arts for a number of years. These buildings were more modern in appearance and were constructed of better materials than were the other buildings. They were faced with hard, glazed brick, rather than the "soft," old-fashioned brick in earlier buildings mentioned. Moreover, the few persons who might, by the merest chance, read this report and contemporaneously read the College catalog for 1922-23, page 13, would probably be surprised to read of the third floor of the Library Building (now Lueders Hall) "with its large and comfortable rooms, used for the department of English."

A part of Evans' philosophy in asking for buildings was disclosed in his speech to the graduating class at the close of the long session in May, 1922. The subject of his speech was "Big Things." He said in part:

. . . Lofty ideals thrive in such an atmosphere of big things. You can easily rally our people for a big measure when the small thing dies for lack of support. The project on a narrow scale has destroyed many meritorious movements. So long as Normal Colleges in Texas planned their courses on a cheap basis, people rated the Normal College as a cheap and insignificant institution. The narrow curriculum and meager funds for the support of the early Normal Schools cost the teacher-training work dearly in the confidence of the American people. The small school district in Texas will never vitalize our schools; this outgrown district must give place to the larger consolidated unit, which, in turn, becomes an integral part of the county unit of the real school system.

President Evans was very much aware of the contrast



between the appearance of the plant of the College at San Marcos and that at the University of Texas only thirty miles distant. In his communications to the regents he repeatedly used such expressions as the following, which was expressed in a letter, dated August 1, 1924, to M. O. Flowers, president of the board: "Our unfortunate condition as to buildings may operate against us in appeals for ambitious students unless the Legislature gives relief."

### **Land Hungry**

A building must have a site. Independent of any act of the Legislature of Texas, President Evans acquired land by various devices. He was always very careful to secure the approval of the board of regents before he entered into a "land trade." He would negotiate an agreement with the land owner for a desirable location, secure the approval of a majority of the members of the board by special request addressed individually to each member, and then set about to find the funds with which to pay for the land. One of his most-used methods for securing the immediate acquisition of land which he very much desired was to persuade a faculty member who had money to purchase, or join in the purchase of the land in trust and hold it for the College. The following letter dated October 28, 1924, to M. O. Flowers, explains Evans' method:

November 22, 1923, with your approval, we purchased the Hofheinz tract of land. The part of this land, which includes a house and barns for use of the College and a small field used by the athletic teams, has been held in trust by H. A. Nelson, Professor of Agriculture, and myself until this fall, when the College could pay for same out of local funds. At one time it was thought we could wait until the Legislature assembles in January and ask for an emergency appropriation, but the condition of our treasury justifies settlement for this tract now. Sufficient funds will be on hand not later than March 1, 1925, for full settlement of amount due on Hofheinz property.

Neither Mr. Nelson nor myself, directly or indirectly, has the slightest financial or personal interest in the transfer; we held the property as an accommodation for the College until funds were available for such purpose, and in no other way was the purchase practicable.

In order to get the transaction on record, I am asking formal approval for the transfer of this property to the College. When full settlement is made, a report will be

rendered to you for incorporation in the minutes of the Board of Regents. Respectfully submitted

Formal approval was given by the board of regents and proper deed was executed.

### **A Deal With The Governor**

When the session of the legislature opened in 1925, Evans started immediately making contacts with his acquaintances among the members of the lawmaking body. Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson had been elected governor, and her husband, "Farmer Jim" Ferguson, was again in the seat of power in Austin. Part of the Ferguson platform pledge was no new taxes and reduction of spending by the Texas state government. Naturally, there was considerable misgiving among school men as to what attitude the governor's office would take toward the appropriation of money for new buildings. But Evans so carefully prepared his friends for the presentment of his case for a new building that finally in the last week of March, 1925, both houses passed and sent to Governor Ferguson an appropriation of \$150,000 for a new science building for the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. (The word "Normal" had been changed to "College" by legislative action in 1923.)

Almost immediately James E. Ferguson announced that all appropriations for buildings would be vetoed. Evans then started a remarkable campaign to try to save his much-desired building. He communicated with as many of his friends in the legislature as he could reach by letter and telephone and asked that they use their influence to save the building from the governor's veto. He then asked for and was granted an interview with Ferguson. On April 6, Evans wrote to Regent Flowers as follows:

Early last week I learned of Governor Ferguson's decision to veto the science-building item in our appropriation. I had friends to communicate with him, but in spite of their efforts a veto seemed certain. I, therefore, made arrangements for a conference with him Friday afternoon, April 3.

During the afternoon, I had two conferences with Governor Ferguson,<sup>1</sup> one at two o'clock and the second at four o'clock. In the first conference, I suggested to him the transfer of our science building appropriation of \$150,-

000 to the second year of the biennium, thereby relieving the first year's appropriation of this load. I explained to him the ease with which this could be done by postponing the time of the contract to the summer of 1926, and arranging so as to call for no part of this appropriation until after October 31, 1926. At first he thought this would be satisfactory, but upon reflecting for a few minutes, he told me, frankly, that it could not be done. I then explained to him the urgent need of buildings with us and the disastrous effects upon our plans in case we should lose this essential building. He then asked me what we could afford to give up in lieu of the science building, and indicated a willingness to save the building if there could be spared from miscellaneous items an amount ranging from \$50,000 to \$75,000. He very kindly gave me until four o'clock to work over the situation and report.

During this interval, I called you and secured your approval to make the best adjustment possible under the circumstances. Upon returning to Governor Ferguson's office, I again called his attention to the imperative necessity of a building with us, and our determination to make any practicable sacrifice to save the building. After a discussion lasting something like forty-five minutes, we agreed upon the items eliminated, amounting in all to approximately \$63,000, thereby saving the College the net, nice sum of \$87,000. Some of these items eliminated we can manage some way to do without altogether; the urgent needs vetoed we can meet from our Local Funds.

The statement given to the papers is misleading in two respects. In the first place, we are not so badly crippled as the news reports indicate. We have lost only two positions from our salary account, and still have a net salary roll of approximately \$227,000, an increase of almost \$40,000 over the appropriation for the year 1924-25. In the next place, \$18,000 of the amount vetoed is for items that practically represent permanent improvements, and we will a great deal more than get this back in our science building.

There is no intention to convey the idea that all these amounts could be paid from incidental funds, but rather the idea that we would sacrifice in order to do without a great many items, and pay the indispensable part from fees.

As a result of this agreement, the Southwest Texas State Teachers College has an appropriation of approximately \$617,000, an increase of more than twenty-five per

---

1 Evans was referring to James E.—not Miriam A.

cent over the biennium 1923-25. I see no reason to complain; in fact, I think we have come out remarkably well. I am mailing a copy of this letter to each member of the Board of Regents.

Evans, in his elation at receiving a new building--particularly when so few, if any, other state supported schools had been as fortunate--minimized his loss of about \$90,000, which had been in the appropriation bill before his trade with the governor's office. But the elation expressed in his letter to the regents gave way to intense worry on a great many occasions during the biennium 1925-1927. Contract for the science building was let in the summer of 1925 and construction was begun in the fall. The old science building, heretofore mentioned by President Evans in his reports, was dismantled and removed from the site for the new building, creating an almost-impossible shortage of classroom space while the new building was under construction. Science classes were scattered all over the remaining buildings, including the old wooden gymnasium for men. One sum written into the bill was originally for items under the heading, "Departmental Maintenance, Equipment, and Expense." After the veto, no appropriation was left for these items, and only \$14,000 was available in other funds with the possibility of transfer to maintenance. In the second year of the biennium only \$4,000 was available for this purpose.'

President Evans attempted to keep all the multifarious work activities going on the campus, the ground crews moving, the painters, carpenters, plumbers, and electricians busy. Not only must wages of these workers be paid, but materials must be supplied. He soon found that local funds simply could not be stretched to cover needed disbursements. He inaugurated a do-without policy that left only a skeleton work force; he shifted items that would ordinarily be classified as upkeep and maintenance into other accounts; but still the monthly vouchering of bills to be paid brought him agony.

At that time I was doing my senior year's study and was under agreement to work four hours a day in the president's office. He put me on the payroll for "straight time," but very often I had to work in excess of the four hours in order to do

---

<sup>2</sup> See *General Laws* of Texas, 1925, p. 565.

extra work which would have been done, under normal circumstances, in another office. To make matters more difficult, the young business manager, Bryan Wildenthal, chose to take a leave-of-absence in the fall of 1925 to pursue graduate work at the University of Texas. Wildenthal was not completely replaced. Fred S. Gardner, now a long-time resident of Luling and a retired teacher, then a student and part-time worker in the business office, was given the principal burden of routine duties in that office; and Gardner and I, working together, sometimes overtime at night without additional pay, somehow managed to get the payroll out and the vouchers made and sent for approval to the Board of Control in Austin for the regular appropriations and to the secretary of the Board of Teachers College Regents for the local fund. Gardner drew the checks for payment of the local fund and I wrote the remittance letters.

President Evans watched our every move to be sure that we made no error. Once, when we failed to get a formal requisition from the Board of Control for a carload of fuel oil for which there was a state appropriation, we did not discover our error until the voucher was rejected and sent back to us. Evans considered that the omission was Gardner's fault and sternly informed Gardner that now it would be his task to get himself out of the difficulty. The oil had been received and consumed, and there was no possibility of return and a re-order made with proper requisition. Moreover, the seller was pressing for payment. Gardner decided that the telephone would be the best means of communication. He wrote out and rehearsed his oral explanation, and telephoned the office of the Board of Control. Our everlasting good attitude will always be to the official of that office who told Gardner when the latter explained, "We just made a big mistake," "Yes, we all do sometimes," and agreed for the voucher to be sent in without the usual requisition.

Although there were headachies enough to drive even an executive to exhaustion, the experience was not without value to Gardner and me. Evans seldom praised an employee, and it was doubly gratifying to us when he let us know that we had made a place for ourselves in the College. Gardner did not choose to remain at the College, however, after he graduated; he entered teaching, in which work he remained until his retirement.

## More and Bigger Buildings Needed

Like all other successful executives, President Evans never rested on his past achievements. He was constantly irked by the fact that the technical colleges — A. and M., Texas Tech, and C. I. A., not to mention the University of Texas, were receiving favored treatment from the legislature in the matter of securing buildings and almost everything else. He chafed at the fact that he got only \$150,000 for the Science Building, because he believed that any of the colleges referred to would have received at least \$200,000 for such a building.

There was always the underlying fear that the University of Texas would attract and take students away from the College. The expansion of the University in plant and equipment and good salaries caused that institution to stand as a fearful competitor of the little college at nearby San Marcos.

Evans laid the blame for some of the discrimination in this case upon the Board of Control rather than upon the members of the legislature. In a letter to the other presidents on August 21, 1926, he took time to put his complaint in writing:

. . . Our situation is rendered somewhat difficult by virtue of the fact that the Board of Control, two years ago and again this year, failed to see the real building needs of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. Although the entire cost of buildings at San Marcos since the establishment of the institution in 1903 had not reached \$200,000 by 1925, the president of the Board of Control would not recommend to the Legislature a \$200,000 science building for us, thereby leaving us the small appropriation of \$150,000 for a science building. Again, although the total cost of our buildings, including the appropriations of the last Legislature, is still less than that given more than one new institution with a much smaller enrollment, the current recommendation of the Board of Control for a library building is smaller than we can accept. The recommendation of the Board two years ago and the present year in the matter of salaries, repairs and improvements, and buildings amounted to a rather decided discrimination against us. The Legislative Committees of 1925 saw this, and very kindly assisted us in increasing our salary roll almost \$25,000 per annum above what the Board of Control had listed. While I am willing to make even a reasonable and fair concession, yet I cannot see that there is very much along the line of concession coming from us. We have almost quadrupled our enrollment of college students for

the regular session in six years, and we are yet behind in our building program something like eight to ten years.

Another fact is frequently overlooked. We are only thirty miles from the University of Texas, which, in a very few years, will have a magnificent program on account of oil royalties, lease of lands, and interest account. The University is just now inaugurating a so-called "teachers college," which will, to a much larger extent, duplicate our courses. We must have buildings, equipment, and salaries, else our sister institution will take away from us the large number of mature men and women now coming to us for professional training.

The feeling of being discriminated against was enhanced by the knowledge that in certain other states whose resources were more meager than those of Texas considerably larger sums were being appropriated for the support of teachers colleges than were allotted here. An example of the effect of this knowledge upon the thinking of the teachers college presidents in Texas is shown in a letter dated July 12, 1927, from President J. A. Hill of Canyon. Returning from a trip through Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri, he wrote as follows of impressions gained from his visit to colleges in those states:

Two things stood out about these institutions: all of them are getting much better plants than we Texas fellows are, Kansas in particular is wonderfully fortunate in this respect. It is certainly interesting to hear a teachers college president say, "When I get one more building, I think we shall not ask for another for many years." I myself could not see much more to be desired. The other thing is equally interesting: the Texas salary scale is above that of either Missouri or Kansas. I did not get the data on Oklahoma.

On the whole, I feel that we are doing the job about as well as they are; although they are covering a little wider field than we. Each of them has a rather big extension program. Each does group study work and also correspondence work. All are getting lump-sum appropriations for salaries.

The great gap between the amount of money appropriated on a per capita basis for the teachers colleges and that appropriated for the other Texas colleges continued to be a painful thorn in the side of the teachers college presidents. On January 5, 1938, which was after there were prospects that grants and loans from the Federal Government would be available to finance buildings, President Evans addressed a circular letter to the

members of the board of regents in which he expressed "shock" upon discovery from the report of State Auditor Tom C. King which, he said, showed that the total of the combined assets of Texas Tech at Lubbock, the College of Industrial Arts at Denton, and the College of Arts and Industries at Kingsville exceeded the total assets of all seven of the State Teachers Colleges. The enrollment of each institution was listed, the totals showing that the combined enrollment of the teachers colleges exceeded that of the three other schools by 731 students.

A surprising feature of this letter of President Evans, who was very seldom in error, was the fact that he failed to note that the total assets of the teachers colleges, as listed on the sheet submitted with his letter, exceeded the assets of the other schools named by more than \$750,000. There is no evidence that this error was ever brought to his attention.

One of the last urgent requests for new buildings was made by President Evans on July 30, 1928, in a message entitled "Explanatory Statement." In this he made a lengthy and almost pitiful petition to the State Board of Control for additional building space to care for the needs of a rapidly growing college. Just two years previously the new Science Building had been completed. After pointing out that many college classes were conducted in inadequate wooden buildings, he repeated the figures which he had used so often up to that time, showing that from the establishment of the College in 1903 to the time of writing the cost of buildings to the state had been only \$335,000, a smaller amount than the state would now give a new college for the initial plant. He stressed the need for all the room in the new Science Building for science classes, but noted that many of the laboratory rooms must now be used for classes in English, mathematics, history, and Spanish. In this report he also appealed earnestly for a new library building to cost \$225,000.

He described the old Library Building as costing originally only \$15,000 in 1909. In the report he declared further:

It is non-fireproof, and that the building is unsafe is evidenced by vibration of the floor when students assemble around the desk of the librarian on the second floor. As a matter of fact, several years ago the College was compelled to move the bulk of reference books from the second floor



to the first floor to prevent a possible collapse of the second and third floors.

In the same report detailed requests for improvements on other buildings were made.

### **Help From A Regent**

Nothing came of the petition to the Board of Control. Evans and all the other teachers college presidents marshalled as much influence as they could, first, upon the appropriation committees, and then upon their respective representatives and senators, to support the measures as they came to the floors of the House and Senate, and finally upon the governor to try to forestall a veto. On a number of occasions the members of the board of regents joined the presidents in the effort to secure buildings. In the spring of 1931, when there seemed to be the best chance for new buildings that had appeared in almost ten years, the governor announced his intention of vetoing all buildings. Appropriation for three buildings had been passed for teachers colleges. At this time A. B. Mayhew, president of the board of regents, did his utmost to stave off the veto. In a letter to the presidents, dated May 30, he said:

From the newspaper I am led to believe that the three buildings approved by the Legislature are very likely to be blue-pencilled by the Governor.

If you can do so I shall be glad to have you write the Governor directly and have your legislator and senator also urge this matter upon him. I have written him and have suggested that the museum-library at Canyon should be approved because when a citizenship is willing to put up one-half the money on a worthy project the State should cheerfully accept the favor. I also mentioned the fact that the library building for Denton has been before the Legislature for six years and has been, during that time, in one or both bills, and at one time during the Ferguson administration the library project got to the Governor's desk.

But the mark of the governor's blue pencil could not be stopped. President Birdwell of Nacogdoches expressed his reaction and, probably, that of the other presidents, in a letter dated May 8, 1931:

It seems that the axe has fallen and that the state-supported colleges are in for a lean biennium. From this distance, it seems to me that the buildings are irretrievably

lost. I am wondering if we can save something out of the salary cut. It seems to me that the Conference Committee ought to have the courage to at least restore all the salaries. I hate to think of the results if they do not. To be sure, few of our teachers will quit this year, but many of the best ones will receive calls to more remunerative places before the end of the biennium.

. . . The outlook is gloomy to me. My self-respect is going to suffer in taking a salary cut, and my pocketbook will feel the results also. It does seem hard that we should receive this evidence of lack of appreciation. In other words, I have the blues.

I do not know of any reason why I should be writing this letter except that I need someone to talk it out with.

The Lord only knows what will happen to us at Austin. We ought to have a prayer meeting.

For the other teachers college presidents also, the outlook was extremely gloomy at that time. An economic depression had been under way for almost two years, and *Business Week* had been carrying on the cover a "business barometer" that for months had been falling steadily week by week. There was a universal atmosphere of hopelessness, and the state legislature had by no means escaped breathing this atmosphere.

### A Break In The Clouds

However, even at that bleak moment, there had already occurred for the teachers colleges a tiny chink in the overcast. In January of 1927 a bill had been written by Representatives C. N. Shaver of Huntsville and Fred Minor of Denton to authorize the boards of regents to issue bonds for building dormitories at state institutions. President Marquis of Denton had sent out a circular letter to the presidents suggesting that each one write to these representatives giving enthusiastic approval of the proposed bill. Although the bill was not enacted into law, it was the seed of an idea that within the next few years would germinate into a solution of the boarding-house problem; and from that idea, others would follow and expand into a new concept for the financing of buildings generally for all college purposes.

The Federal Public Works Administration (PWA) which had been set up, as is well known, for the purpose essentially of putting idle men to work, partially removed the roadblock

that had been in the way of the College building program for so many years. It had become certain that no Texas legislature would provide adequate buildings for the rapidly growing state-supported colleges. And here was a new opportunity for President Evans, at long last, to realize the fulfillment of his dream.

In the operation of the PWA, red tape was abundant and tightly wound; but Evans, with the aid of Lyndon Johnson in Washington, was soon to see the long-awaited library building under construction, a two-story structure at a projected cost of \$100,000. The Federal Government granted \$45,000 and the College was to furnish \$55,000, or, apparently such sums as would be required, within these limits, at the ratio of 45 to 55. Prices of building materials were down to bedrock, and a contract for the building soon revealed that there would be a surplus of \$15,546 left in the federal grant.

Most assuredly, Evans had no intention of letting this sum escape. He called upon the architects to draw plans for a third story to the library building, and it was estimated that this third story would add about \$35,000 to the building cost. Evans' information was to the effect that in order to secure the use of this surplus money he must be able to show that it could be matched in cash at the ratio already mentioned. In his usual busy-beaver fashion, he set about to find \$19,000 which could be pledged to the completion of the new building. A conference with certain members of the board of regents was the first step. Having secured their approval in writing, he then went to State Comptroller of Public Accounts, George H. Sheppard, and made application for the transfer to the construction of the library building the following amounts from the listed classifications in the appropriation for the College:

Repairs and Improvements .....	\$2,137
Painting and Outside Improvements ....	1,000
General Maintenance .....	5,000
Local Funds .....	10,863
Total .....	<u>\$19,000</u>

Comptroller Sheppard supported the application in a certificate bearing these words: "Warrants will issue in payment of claims drawn for such purposes when properly presented to this department."

Evans then, on January 10, 1936, submitted what he la-

beled an "Amended Application for Addition of Third Floor of Library Building Upon Deposit of \$19,000 of College Funds" and addressed it to Harold L. Ickes, Administrator, Emergency Administration of Public Works, Washington, D. C. He wrote in support of his application:

The two-story Library Building is now under construction under approved plan, \$45,000 being a grant and \$55,000 being College funds. If amended application for College funds of \$19,000 and *original grant balance of* \$15,546 is approved, the third story will be added in time to make a complete three-story building.

However, all of Evans' efforts to hold the surplus federal funds granted were fruitless. He was informed by the PWA that the grant was for the originally-planned structure only, and that if there were surplus funds not required by this project, such funds would not be made available for an enlarged project. There was the implied reminder that if a larger project had been desired, an application for a larger amount should have been requested originally. Thus, the sum of \$15,546 was lost, and this loss hurt Evans to his very bones. But, at the same time, to bring him pride and joy, there was the new Library Building—smaller, to be sure, than he had hoped for, but nevertheless another major addition to the College plant.

During the following years the problem of buildings became for President Evans almost ridiculously easy compared with the problem in earlier years. In 1938, by Federal grant and loan, another and still larger building—the Auditorium-Laboratory School (now the Evans Academic Center)—was constructed at a cost of \$145,454.3

### **Boarding Houses Fade Away**

Shortly after Mary C. Brogdon was appointed dean of women, she suggested to President Evans that if there were in the boarding-house system just one model house which might serve as a pattern to show boarding-house "mothers," it might be truly helpful. Evans put the idea into operation by purchasing and pushing together two large wooden two-story residences, formerly used as boarding houses, and adding

---

<sup>3</sup> See Chapter VII following, "The Laboratory School."

sleeping porches, bathroom facilities, and other conveniences. This structure had a capacity of sixty girls and was opened for occupancy in the fall of 1926. It was located on the corner of Roanoke and Edward Gary Streets where Brogdon Hall now stands. Thus the first college-owned dormitory was put in operation.

Ten years later, when Sayers Hall was opened, the old building was named the Sayers Annex. The Sayers Hall, with a capacity of 80 girls, was built with PWA funds. One year later Harris Hall was also built with PWA money, and had a capacity of 170 men students. The plan for Federal aid, of course, was not an outright gift, as has been explained, but allowed for a long-term amortization of bonds to be made from revenues from the dormitory income. In his report to the regents, meeting in Houston, May 17 and 18, 1940, Evans mentioned seven dormitories, including the two major structures to which reference has just been made. He informed the regents that the Sayers and Harris dormitories were growing in popularity and that practically all rooms were filled. He also mentioned the central dining hall and College laundry which would assure additional revenue for amortization of loans under the PWA program. The College cooperative houses, he said, met the needs of students with limited means,

Of Harris Hall, the College catalog of 1941-42 makes the following statement; and adds information about other dormitories:

Architecturally, it is one of the most attractive units of the entire College plant, and is equipped to furnish modern rooming facilities for 170 men. It also contains spacious recreation rooms and the office for the manager.

In addition to its dormitories, the College has available several cooperative homes where students are able to obtain room and board practically at cost. Cliffside Hall, Pickard Hall, Northside Hall, and Hines Hall provide cooperative board for approximately 150 girls. Lowman Hall, a cooperative athletic house, (sic) is open to members of the athletic squads. It provides board for 30 boys.

In his report to the regents meeting in Austin, May 15 and 16, 1942, Evans listed certain outstanding financial obligations of the College incurred for the purchase of one or two residences and former boarding houses and the land on which they were situated. Among the latter was the Cole House and the Ward

House, both well known to many ex-students. He asked for approval to borrow \$5,000 from a San Marcos bank as a stand-by source of funds in case such were needed for quick purchase of other adjoining real estate. He made the following remark in closing his report: "But for the purchase of this land during the year and the heavy outlay for improvements of the old Library Building, the College could have closed the year with a splendid net balance."

### **Paean Of Joy**

The "Message" of President Evans in the 1938 *Pedagog* is the expression of one who has come safely to the end of a rough and tiring journey:

With a record enrollment, an enlarged program of senior and graduate courses, large-scale plant improvement, rapid expansion in extension work, and the growth of public appreciation of the College as a service institution in its area, the College faces the future with confidence. The quality of our academic opportunity is commendable; the progressive outlook of the College gives joy to its friends, and increases its possibilities of usefulness. We now offer young men and young women a many-sided college training, wholesome and stimulating in its appeal.

On December 1, 1940, in an address at the Federated Ex-Students Association banquet in San Antonio, President Evans revealed his ideas for the future in the matter of financing a continued building program for state colleges. He recommended a building program of five million dollars to be financed by thirty-year bonds, about the same proposal that had been advocated by Representatives Shaver and Minor in a bill presented to the House of Representatives in Austin in 1927. These would involve appropriation for building purposes of only \$300,000 annually. He said, "The Texas State Teachers Colleges must have a dependable building program if real college progress is made."

Evans' dream for the future came true, of course. The College catalog of 1954-55 carried the statement that the value of the College plant as of 1952 was \$5,320,257, and in 1965, it was listed as valued at over seventeen million dollars.

## VII THE LABORATORY SCHOOL

### *"The Very Heart" OF Teacher Training*

During the era of the normal school, and indeed ever since, actual experience in classroom teaching has been recognized as the core of teacher training. In establishing a laboratory for this purpose, the first arrangement was for pupils of public-school age to be recruited and enrolled in the training school. Later the high school division was referred to as the "sub-college."

Among the various inducements offered parents of school-age pupils to send their children to the practice school were the promises of individual attention in small classes and superior instruction under expert supervision. The fact that the pupils were to be taught by students in training was offset by this guidance of supervisors possessing higher college degrees and having had specialized training for the task.

At Southwest Texas State Normal the laboratory school was officially under the direction of the Department of Education, with the head of that department acting as the superintendent of the laboratory school; and this organization was retained after the institution attained college status. The teachers in the various grades were considered as members of the college teaching staff with the rank, at least, of instructors.

As the college enrollment grew, the facilities for practice teaching could no longer accommodate the number of students enrolling for practice teaching in the laboratory school; and the situation grew steadily worse. During the last years of the decade from 1920 to 1930, President Evans devoted much time and effort in search of a solution. For many years he studied the results of attempts at other teachers colleges of Texas and of other states to enter into cooperative agreements with local public schools. Excerpts from his address to the 1929 meeting of the Texas State Teachers Association are given here as revelation of his convictions and philosophy on the use of the laboratory school in teacher training:

Expert opinion favors close co-ordination of the academic departments with the training school. Noble Lee Garrison, in "Status and Work of Training School Super-

visors," advises the co-operation of both the "College teaching staff and the training school in working out a unified teacher-training program" and in putting such program into effect. Linscheid in his study of 1928, "The In-Service Improvement of the State Teachers College Faculty," urges a 'thoroughgoing integration of the work of the training school with that of the college,' and criticizes the "comparative separation" of "two component parts of the same institution" as "hardly consistent with the idea of a unified and an integrated effort to train teachers."

Bagly, in the Louisiana Survey of State Colleges, says, "There is small place in a teachers college for any instructor who, for any reason, does not connect his work with that of the training school. It is as much his business to use the demonstration and practice facilities on the campus as it is for him to use the library."

We submit some suggestions and observations which we believe to be practicable in application to average training school conditions, all of which are the results of special investigations and direct inspection of representative teachers colleges:

1. The training school is not fully understood or fully appreciated even in the teachers college. For so long a time, it was the favored child of the old-time Normal School, an institution with limited equipment, cheap faculty, cheap plant, and, at best, narrow outlook. When the Normal School began to lose its prestige, its decline, at least, added to the load its protege, the training school, had to carry. On the other hand, the enlarged field of the teachers college required a larger faculty with much broader scholarship. A large per cent of these faculty members come from colleges of arts where the training school idea has small consideration, and, to some extent, is handicapped by the antagonistic attitude to normal school projects, in general. It may take some time yet for many academically minded instructors—and they are in many instances highly valuable men and women—to give a proper rating to the possibilities of the training school. These instructors hold views that are staunchly defended in academic circles of all regular colleges of arts. Some of them even insist that scholarship, alone, is prerequisite for efficient teaching. This over-emphasis upon scholarship should be treated with tolerance, that thereby we may learn the contribution it may make to teacher training.

2. Dignify the training school by giving equal recognition in rank and salary to training school teachers and college teachers. This is another way of saying that the discrimination against teachers in the training school



should be removed. The "inferiority complex" of the training school faculty, wherever it exists—and it does sometimes exist—is productive of friction, inefficiency, and failure. Training school teachers should meet the same standards of academic and professional equipment as do regular college instructors. The scholarship of training school teachers must command the respect of the academic departments. This is only emphasizing the spirit of regularly adopted standards of the American Association of Teachers Colleges effective September, 1932. Until the policy of full recognition of training school instruction becomes the rule, teachers colleges can not look with any hope for cordial and satisfactory co-operation between college departments and the training school.

. . . The teachers college, the state's professional school, can give the state a trained product, the quality of which easily surpasses the product of any college of arts with its Department of Education. Nobody contends that medical schools should not prepare our physicians; nobody believes a lawyer can best obtain the essential legal training outside of the law school; nobody thinks the farmer can meet the demands of modern agriculture through cultural study away from schools of agriculture; nobody advises that the ordinary academic courses supply the highly technical knowledge and skill for architects, engineers, or electricians; nobody even expects the ministry to respond worthily to the opportunities of the present-day pulpit, if educated wholly independent of standard theological schools. Elevate teaching to its proper position beside such professions as law, medicine, and engineering, and the problem of co-operation between the two parts of the same professional college automatically disappears.

### **The Evans Dream**

Evans' first tactful and somewhat timid approaches to the school officials of the San Marcos public schools met with no encouragement and little show of interest. He found a more friendly atmosphere, however, among the rural schools in the neighboring communities about San Marcos. These one-, two-, or three-teacher schools were close enough that arrangements were feasible for transportation to and from the College campus. Thus, a student doing practice teaching could make a schedule that would allow a full load of other class work in the regular college classes.

Later President Evans was called upon by the board of

regents to defend the expense of transporting students to the rural schools. He did so in eloquent fashion. He pointed out that a considerable percentage of those who intended to teach would render most excellent service in the rural schools of Texas where good teaching was so desperately needed. Therefore, the extra expense of providing practice teaching in a rural-school environment was an expenditure yielding abundant returns in service to the state. This part of the teacher-training program was abandoned after a few years, however, on account of failure to obtain state appropriations for the purpose.

Obstacles and disappointments did not cause President Evans to lose sight of his purpose to acquire the entire system of public schools in San Marcos as a laboratory school. In his correspondence with the other presidents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges, as they were known then, he undertook to convince his fellow-presidents of the desirability of such an arrangement. In this he met considerable opposition. As one instance, President Estill of Huntsville said in a letter on April 9, 1927:

. . . I find that the legislators are sadly in need of education on the whole program of teacher training. I have in mind particularly the attitude of some of them toward the training school, which is the heart of the teachers college. There is a disposition to regard the training school as a gift of the state to the local community rather than as a laboratory absolutely essential to the efficiency of the college. There is the disposition to have the per capita apportionment of training school pupils transferred from the town to the college, which would carry with it supervision of the training school by local trustees with probable friction and inefficiency.

Under Dr. Joseph Baldwin's presidency of this institution the model school, or training school, was supported by the per capita apportionment and was chiefly under the management of the local trustees. There were conflicts in policy which resulted disastrously, and the practice school was discontinued for a number of years.

President Evans replied with the statement that a cooperative arrangement was possible that would not deprive the public school authorities of their lawful control of the public schools and at the same time would give college officials advisory authority and approval in matters of employment of teachers and formulation of general policies.

Six years later there was little evidence that Evans had convinced the other presidents that the project was worthy of great concern. President Hill of Canyon even hinted that President Evans had been the victim of propaganda. At the same time, however, Hill admitted that it might be worth while to give consideration to the use of the local public schools if there was a need for this use. On March 4, 1933, President Hill wrote:

It is my judgment that each institution ought to be working out some gradual approach to the use of local public schools to the extent that they are needed. For some three years now we have been gradually enlarging our use of the local schools and we hope to continue to do so as they seem to be needed. It is a rather delicate question, however, and one that might give us an endless amount of trouble and no college should be compelled to act precipitantly in this matter.

I am not convinced, however, that the time should come when a teachers college should abandon its campus training school somewhat along the lines of the present set-up. As to these various surveys recommending abolition of campus training schools, I think this is about what would be expected from the various surveyors that have worked at the job here. It would probably be just as easy for us to find surveyors who would commend the present set-up. Texas has never had a modern competent survey of teacher training as a separate function of the system of state education. The surveys we have had have been made from a point of view unsympathetic with the teachers college program. I hope that at some time we shall have a more friendly authority to pass judgment on our services.

On February 27, 1933, President Evans wrote a general letter to the presidents restating the case for the use of the public schools for practice teaching. In this letter he started with a quotation from the Texas School Survey of 1926, pages 90-91, as follows:

In general, the practice teaching facilities in the Texas State Teachers Colleges are wholly inadequate . . . With the number of students scheduled for practice teaching, there should be a minimum of 500 to 700 children in the training school of each college. In most cases, this number represents a majority of all the children of school age in the community. There is practically no cooperation between the teachers colleges and the local schools in the matter of practice teaching and observation. With the possible ex-

ception of Denton, the local schools should be the training schools of the teachers colleges.

Evans also called attention to the report of the Efficiency-Economy Committee of the Texas Legislature which condemned the separate training schools of the Texas teachers colleges and recommended cooperation with the local public schools. This committee report commended the policy of the so-called industrial colleges in securing such cooperation. He noted that the Efficiency-Economy Committee borrowed its idea from the Survey of 1925. He added:

A cooperative relation will provide practice teaching facilities under public school conditions. The class units for practice teaching in the present artificial demonstration schools are, in notable instances, too small to supply efficient units for the best practice teaching. For example, the eighth grade of our demonstration school has seven students, and in rare instances only have other grades enrolled as many as 20 to 25 students. Under a cooperative relation with the City of San Marcos, using both elementary and high schools, we could double the practice teaching facilities and almost halve the cost. Legislation authorizing cooperation is highly advisable, but not absolutely essential. If the other state colleges [other than the teachers colleges]<sup>1</sup> really work at the job in the matter of cooperation with the local schools for practice teaching they can, in a very short time, provide efficient practice school facilities for their student teachers at a cost so low as to prove embarrassing for the Texas State Teachers Colleges.

[Faced] with three official reports condemning the present demonstration school policy on grounds of small class units and excessive costs, will [the Teachers Colleges not find] it the better part of wisdom to reduce our present per capita cost through cooperation with the local schools, in part if not entirely?

A copy of this communication was sent to the members of the board of regents. In addition, in his quarterly report to the regents dated February 13, 1933, President Evans stated:

The College operates a demonstration school entirely independent of the City of San Marcos, at a cost of approximately \$25,000 for a term of nine months. We discontinued cooperative relations with the Westover [rural] Public School on account of failure to secure appropriations

---

<sup>1</sup>The brackets in these quotations are the writer's.

from the Legislature. Our present facilities are inadequate and the shortage is imperfectly met by using the public high school of San Marcos for a few classes.

I recommend that the President be authorized to enter into a contract with the public school board of San Marcos for the transfer of all elementary school pupils and the eighth grade of the high school to the Demonstration School Building, [Education Building] and for the use of all high school classes in the public high school for practice teaching. It will involve the payment of the major part of the salaries by the San Marcos public school board, with the supplementation [sic] of salaries and the payment of a few salaries by the State Teachers College. The total cost to the College, under an efficient plan of operation, will be considerably less than the separate school plan. In my judgment, it will guarantee much more efficient and satisfactory practice teaching. The recommendation is not new. The President of the College has for many years advised with the public school board urging a cooperative arrangement.

Little by little President Evans advanced his campaign to consummate an agreement with the public schools. For six years he offered various inducements to bring about cooperation between the College and the city schools. He offered the school board the use of college buildings, including lighting, heat, and janitor service, at no expense to the public schools. In addition, the College would pay a substantial part of the cost of instruction in the form of teachers' salaries.

In his report of May 30, 1933, President Evans made a final recommendation to the board of regents meeting in Austin, which seemed to show that he believed his long-sought agreement with the San Marcos school board was about to become a reality. And at this meeting the regents at last gave approval to his plan.

On June 12, less than two weeks later, a contract was signed by the president and secretary of the school board and President Evans. The minutes of the San Marcos school board show that approval of the plan had been given by that body on February 3. The contract was drawn by President Evans, and his files show many revisions before the final form was ready to be signed.

The purpose, as stated in the contract, ". . ." is to establish cooperative relations between the public schools of San

Marcos and the Southwest Texas State Teachers College whereby the said public schools become the laboratory school of the said Teachers College." The contract was to be for a two-year period, beginning September, 1933. It provided for administrative control of the public schools to remain in the hands of the city superintendent and board of education. The principal of the campus public school for the first year was to be selected from without both faculties. Both the principal of the campus school and the principal of the senior high school were to be ranked as associate professors in the College. Nomination of all teachers in the public schools was to be made by the superintendent, "after consultation with the president of the College," and all nominations were to be subject to approval or rejection by the board of trustees after conference and discussion with the superintendent. One provision was placed in the contract after the dogged insistence of President Evans: "The assignment of teachers to the College Campus School shall in no way violate the spirit of the state law relating to the employment of two or more members of one family in a state school." In the years to follow, however, in a few instances, he found it expedient to ignore this provision.

The salaries paid in full or in part by the College were subject to approval by the board of regents of the College. Standards for the preparation of future teachers in the new system were provided thus: "No newly-elected teacher shall have less than the bachelor's degree, with the master's degree to be regarded as the desirable standard."

The agreement called for the College to equip and maintain the Education Building for the elementary and junior high school work, including the following services :

1. Upkeep of the building, janitor service, heating and lighting, crayons, erasers, toilet supplies, etc.
2. The College will equip, staff, and operate the library of the elementary and junior high school in the Education Building, this library to operate as a unit of the College library.
3. The College will equip classrooms and laboratories for modern elementary and junior high school work, this equipment now possessed by the College and either of the present city elementary schools.
4. The City to equip similarly the senior high school.
5. The College playgrounds and recreational facilities

to be made available for the children of the public schools when not in use by the College, this to include the athletic fields, gymnasium, and Riverside.'

6. For the service and equipment supplied to the public schools, the College to receive in return the use of the city public schools as a laboratory school for observation and practice teaching.

7. The College and the public schools open and close at the same time. The schedules of classes in the College and in the public schools to be arranged by mutual agreement so that the assignment of practice teachers and observers would be facilitated.

8. The public schools to be responsible for all textbooks.

### Obstacles

This contract, so highly pleasing to President Evans, representing as it did the successful conclusion of vast effort and the realization of a dream, found, however, only tacit and cool approval or perhaps merely tolerance from the College regents. There was also the ever-present question of the legality of the arrangement under which so much state property was to be used for the benefit of the city schools of San Marcos. The president of Southwest Texas State Teachers College found himself obliged to defend the plan often and from several quarters. At length, the laboratory school project became to him something of an obsession. He viewed it as part and parcel of the work of the College, as defined by President H. F. Estill of Huntsville: "the very heart of the program of teacher training."

President Evans' belief in the importance of the demonstration school was supported by action as well as words. He deemed it wise to agree among the Teachers Colleges of Texas that comparable pay mould be advocated for positions equal in rank or in similarity of duties in the several institutions. On the other hand, more than one president held to the belief that the instructors in the demonstration school were teaching at a lower rank than were the teachers of college classes, even those on the freshman college level. But President Evans, wherever practicable, undertook to raise the rank of the demonstration school instructors both in pay and in recognition.

---

The park on the San Marcos River used for swimming and other recreational activities, now known as Sewell Park.

On one occasion he admonished the College teachers at a faculty meeting that the work of teaching in the demonstration school should not be looked upon as being of lower rank than that in college, and he made it emphatically clear that an assignment of a College teacher to classes in the demonstration school would be nothing short of an honor. At an earlier time he had told A. H. Nolle, the only professor in the College who, at that time, held the Ph.D. degree, that it would certainly not be beneath his position and dignity to teach a class in the demonstration school. Apparently, this statement to Dr. Nolle was made to forestall any future difference of opinion, as he already had in mind the promotion of Nolle to the position of dean of the faculty."

About this time, in a letter addressed to the presidents of the other teachers Colleges, he stated his views in these words:

Very few people will accept our statement regarding the value of demonstration school work for teachers in training so long as we minimize its importance by paying the instructors in the demonstration school humiliating salaries. Just so long as an instructor in the demonstration school receives a salary lower than the poorest salary in English, history, or mathematics, we may continue to expect students and teachers to look upon the demonstration school as an inferior department of the college.

During the first five-year period of the agreement with the city schools, the junior high school grades and some of the elementary grades were housed in the Education Building, while the senior high school classes were still conducted in the old high school building on Comanche and Hutchison Streets, four or five blocks from the College. During all these years President Evans requested meeting after meeting with the public school board for the purpose of consolidating all of the San Marcos system of public schools on the College campus.

A minor purpose of these frequent meetings was to clear up certain details of the **1933** agreement; and the renewed contract in 1935, which became effective on June 15, went into considerable detail in order to eliminate the necessity for frequent meetings to decide and agree upon new problems.

---

<sup>3</sup> Dean Nolle, retired at this writing, tells of this incident with a laugh and a **very** good imitation of the manner of speech of President Evans.



## Campaign For A School House

On August 17, 1937, President Evans made a proposal to the public school board to erect a laboratory school building on the East End site, which was originally that of a city elementary school, the land still belonging to the San Marcos public schools." At this meeting a cordial hearing was accorded President Evans; and this cordiality on the part of the board members must have greatly encouraged the college head. He requested another meeting on August 27. At the latter meeting, much to President Evans' disappointment, the attorney for the school board reported that the Attorney General of Texas had ruled that it was impossible for the city schools to use revenues from bonds voted to contract for a public school building in the city limits of San Marcos if the title to the building would be vested in the State of Texas.

Whereupon, President Evans immediately proposed that the site of the building be changed to North Austin Street across from the Education Building, on land already owned by the College, the city to purchase the additional property needed. The school board voted to consider this proposal pending investigation of the legal aspects.

On October 29, President Evans offered a new site on Roanoke Street, a part of which the College owned, but the records of the school board show no action taken by the board until the lapse of almost a year. On November 8, 1938, the building committee of the public school board met with the City Commission; and the attorney for the Commission expressed the opinion that it would be impossible for the City of San Marcos to enter into a building program with the College. His reasons were given as follows: (1) There would not be sufficient time to prepare the legal papers. (2) The trustees would have to abrogate their functions and hence might become personally liable. (3) That the College had a right to contract according to Statute 2E03C of the Civil Code, but this statute did not give the public schools a right to contract. (4) The College does not have the power to contract extending over a period of more than two years. (5) That there is a possibility of entering into a contract and asking the Legislature for validating action. This he did not recommend.

---

(Minutes of the San Marcos school board.

On January 10 and again on January 18, 1939, President Evans made amended proposals in writing, going into minute details which were incorporated in the minutes of the public school board. On January 20, just two days later, he made another proposal. All of these offers were rejected by the school board. However, the minutes of the board for October 18, 1938, show that the board voted to accept a grant by the Federal Government of \$112,209 and a loan of \$71,000 for the construction of a laboratory school building. The board voted to give \$100,000 toward the project if the College would pay into the public school treasury \$3,000 annually for a period of ten years. This, of course, as already noted, was ruled illegal, since the College could not contract beyond a two-year period without approval by the state legislature.

Under date of June 9, 1938, the Attorney General of Texas wrote and mailed to President Evans an opinion that the board of regents of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College had authority to request a Federal grant for the construction of a building:

" . . . if the Southwest Texas State Teachers College enters into a contract with the San Marcos Public School System for the joint construction of a laboratory school building for use of the children of the San Marcos public schools and for laboratory school purposes for the College . . . through and only through funds or loans to be obtained from the Government of the United States or any agency or agencies thereof.

In his report to the regents dated November 23, 1938, Evans announced:

October 19 official notice of allotment of \$250,909 for laboratory school building, P.W.A. 2178, was received. This allotment included a grant of \$112,909, a loan of \$71,000, and \$67,000 in cash which San Marcos City School had agreed to give. November 4, the San Marcos school board gave official notice of its inability to supply the necessary \$67,000, the reason assigned being that there is no legal authority for the use of school bonds for public school buildings in joint construction of a laboratory school. The College immediately filed in Washington a request for reduction of the grant and loan from \$250,909 to \$145,454. The amendatory application for this reduction of loan and grant was filed in both the Fort Worth and Washington offices. The laboratory school building will provide an

auditorium with first-floor capacity of 1,350 seats, a balcony of approximately 400 additional seats, and 25 classrooms. Certainly, it will prove to be one of the most popular and essential buildings we could construct.

This report indicated that President Evans, no longer hopeful of joint action with the city schools in the construction of a laboratory school building, had determined to go it alone. Approval for the location of the Auditorium-Laboratory School Building was given by the San Marcos Committee of the regents on January 13, 1939.

About this time President Evans received the news that the San Marcos public school board had succeeded in obtaining a grant to help construct a high school building. He reported to the regents in February that the present plans of the public school board were to locate the new building on the site of the old high school building at Comanche and Hutchison Streets, and that "The President of the College immediately opened negotiations with the . . . board" to undertake to get the new building constructed nearer the College campus so that there would be no transportation problem for students who were doing practice teaching and taking other courses in college at the same time. His offer to the public school board was very liberal. A building site was offered, on part of which negotiations for purchase had not been completed. At a meeting with the board, President Evans, accompanied by Mrs. Sallie Beretta, a member of the San Marcos Committee of the College regents, proposed to donate outright the land for the proposed high school building. In addition, he proposed to connect the building to the College heating plant, water supply, and electric lines. Moreover, the College would furnish all janitor. service for the use of the new high school building. He stated to the regents in his February report that if the approval of the public school board could be obtained for locating the building on land of the College, it would be "the full equivalent of a campus laboratory school building." He mentioned here that the San Marcos school board had the proposal under consideration and added that the "San Marcos school board is favorable to a long-term contract with the College."

For the time being, all these negotiations were fruitless. Then an event occurred which hastened the climax of President Evans' negotiations with the San Marcos public schools. The

old high school building was declared unsafe by inspectors, and the city school trustees found themselves in a dilemma. At the May 1940 meeting of the regents, Evans' proposal that the Education Building be turned over to the City of San Marcos for use as a high school was approved. At the August 16-17 meeting of the regents in Austin, he concluded his report with:

We announce with pride that cordial cooperative relations with the San Marcos public schools have been worked out, under which both the San Marcos high school and all the elementary grades are now our laboratory school. In this field, we are justified in stating that we have made maximum attainments.

At last the determination of C. E. Evans to have all the public schools of San Marcos for a laboratory school housed on the campus was an accomplished fact.

### The Evans Plan Worked

As evidence of the relationship between the College and the San Marcos public schools, the following excerpts from the College catalogs of 1938-39 and of 1941-42 show the situation as it was before the final consolidation of the public schools on the College campus and as it was after the construction of the Auditorium-Laboratory School Building:

The Public Schools of the city of San Marcos are the Demonstration Schools of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

The white Kindergarten, Elementary and Junior High School pupils of the city of San Marcos are taught in the Education Building of the College. This building, erected in 1918, of reinforced concrete and remodeled in 1929 and in 1938 at a total cost of \$130,000, is modern in all respects and contains an auditorium, a gymnasium, two textbook store rooms, a reference library, ten teachers offices, and twenty-seven classrooms.

This plan supplies the college with a campus demonstration school of twenty-two teachers and approximately 600 pupils in the kindergarten and in grades one to eight inclusive.

Also, by the terms of the cooperative arrangement, the Senior High School of the city of San Marcos, located in the present city high school building, became the Demonstration School for high school teacher-training. The high school is located about four blocks from the college campus

and has twelve teachers and approximately 260 students and consists of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades.

This new arrangement gives the Teachers College ample practice teaching facilities for meeting the requirements of the most exacting accrediting agencies. It has the further and most important advantage of providing practice teaching facilities in their natural setting, that is, under real normal public school conditions, and in a real public school.

In addition to the facilities of the San Marcos Public School system, the College has available also for practice teaching on a less formal basis certain facilities by urban schools in small towns nearby.<sup>5</sup>

And from the catalog of 1941-42:

The Public Schools of San Marcos are utilized as the Laboratory Schools of the College. The kindergarten, elementary, and junior and senior high school pupils of the city of San Marcos are taught in the Auditorium-Laboratory School and the Education Building of the College. The Auditorium-Laboratory School Building was completed in 1939 at a cost of \$145,454, and the Education Building was completed in 1918 and enlarged in 1938 at a total cost of \$130,000.

The enrollment in the elementary grades is upward of 600, that of the junior high school is approximately 250, and that of the high school department is over 325. The public school teachers function as critic teachers as they direct the work of college students in their observation and practice-teaching courses. This arrangement provides the College with the best facilities possible for directed teaching to meet the demands for effective teacher-training and to satisfy the most rigid requirements of accrediting agencies."

It will be noted that the teacher-training facilities are referred to as "demonstration schools" in the earlier catalogs, but as "laboratory schools" in the later bulletins.

Statements made by teachers in the "demonstration school" of 1940 testify to the intense crowding of the Education Building in undertaking to house almost the entire enroll-

---

<sup>5</sup> College Catalog, 1938-39, pp. 36-36. The mention of practice teaching on a "less formal basis," then undertaken as an experiment, resulted in a complete change in the concept of practice teaching in a "natural setting." See comments later in this chapter.

<sup>6</sup> College catalog, 1941-1942, p. 44.

ment of the public schools of the city. This condition was greatly relieved by the construction of the Auditorium-Laboratory School Building.

### **Ideas—New Versus Old**

The triumph of President Evans in gaining the union of the San Marcos public schools with the College was destined to be relatively short lived. Mounting opposition from certain members of the board of regents of the Teachers Colleges of Texas, absence of endorsement and support from other teachers-college presidents, and, last but not least, the growing feeling in San Marcos that the arrangement must be regarded as a tempo ary makeshift until a suitable building program could be launched—all boded only dark prospects for President Evans' project. The separation of the public schools from the control of the San Marcos city officials and the formation of an independent school district may also have elevated local pride and caused public sentiment to press for the withdrawal of the public schools from the College campus.

At his retirement in 1942, President Evans was almost belligerently defending the contractual relationship which he regarded as well-nigh perfect for the training of teachers. Nevertheless, later events proved that he left to his successor, John G. Flowers, the impossible task of preserving the structure which his tenacity and determination had largely erected.

Moreover, in the minds of certain educators, there had evolved a new concept of practice teaching which went beyond the belief heretofore held that the laboratory school offered sufficient opportunities in observation and practice teaching for college students in regular one-hour classes taken along with other subjects.

This new concept visualized a situation which would hold the practice teacher in a real school environment for, perhaps, an entire semester. The student would have the opportunity brought by "a wide range of laboratory experience . . . first-hand experiences with children, youth, and adults in varied school, home, and community situations . . . ." This would change the old-fashioned, typical student-teaching period of the junior or senior year to include direct contacts with situations

"beyond the school and with human growth and development at all levels" of community life.<sup>7</sup>

This new concept by no means involved any antagonism to the laboratory school, on campus or off campus. It simply involved a new principle of "continuous contact" with a school situation for the practice teacher as a means of giving the student the next best thing to actual teaching experience. It was designed to confront the practice teacher with "total" school problems by placing that student in longer continuous contacts with pupils rather than in periods of one hour or less at a time. This situation has also been referred to as "The many opportunities offered the practice teacher with full-time teaching,"<sup>8</sup> where twelve weeks at least are spent with pupils—not only in classroom work, but also out of school. It has been conceived by eminent educators that the practice teacher might be called upon to sponsor clubs, guide extra-curricular activities, meet and confer with parents, and assume leadership in community affairs. The practice teacher is now to be taken into the inner circle of the public school faculty by attendance at faculty meetings and by regular conferences with school administrators and supervisors.

Thus, it is apparent that no on-campus laboratory school in the future can completely meet the needs of students in teacher training.

---

<sup>7</sup> *School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education*, written and compiled by the Committee on Standards and Surveys of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, John G. Flowers, sub-committee chairman, p. 33.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 75.

## VIII THE FIGHT FOR RECOGNITION

### A College Is Known By Its President

It is true, though it may be unfortunately so, that an institution is not much better known or recognized than is its president. An executive, therefore, who stays in his office and never comes in contact with the activities outside of his own environment is likely to come in a very short time to be regarded as a man of very mediocre ability. This is said with the full knowledge of the fact that mere running around does not add to the real worth of a college president. To come in contact with organizations in the field of work in which an institution is identified, and to make some constructive contribution to those organizations is worth while in dollars and cents to the State even if the president of an institution is required to make several trips out of the state in one year in order to render that service.

The statement quoted was made by S. H. Whitley, President of the East Texas State Teachers College, in response to a rule by the Board of Regents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges, passed in 1928, that no president of a teachers college might make more than one out-of-state trip at college expense in any one year.

The quest for status for the College began from the very first year C. E. Evans occupied the position of president of the Southwest Texas State Normal School. This institution, along with some two hundred other normal schools in the United States, had already been relegated by public opinion to a class in which years must pass before it could escape. The normal school was the product of an agricultural era and was generally considered small and unimportant. For the first three or four decades of this century there was still an aura of cheapness about a normal school; in spite of the change of its name to "college," its program of work and its very atmosphere were associated with the country pedagogue of the nineteenth century.

Evans had good preparation for the duties of his post. He had been associated with most of the educational leaders of Texas. He had taught under R. B. Cousins in the public schools at Mexia, and had absorbed much of the philosophy of that great educator as he watched Cousins rise to the high office of



State Superintendent of Public Instruction, later president of two state-supported colleges and superintendent of the city schools of Houston, the largest city in the state. Moreover, Evans had served as superintendent of one of the best, if not the largest, high schools of Texas. Then his service with the Conference for Education in Texas had afforded him a still larger opportunity to see at first hand the need for improvement in the quality of instruction available to the children of the state. Therefore, Evans was completely aware of the purpose of the Southwest Texas State Normal School and that of all her sister institutions in Texas.

No account of his efforts to lift the status of his college would be accurate or complete unless one mentioned at the same time the efforts of his colleagues, the presidents of the other teachers colleges of Texas.

The available records show that the first efforts of this group of devoted men took the form of an attempt to get the public high schools to raise the standards of their instruction so as to better prepare their graduates for entrance into the normal schools. In 1912 Evans' correspondence with President W. H. Bruce of the North Texas State Normal School at Denton showed that there was considerable concern about the evaluation of high schools whose graduates were to be admitted to the normal schools. On June 17, 1912, Bruce wrote Evans as follows:

I am sure it would be disastrous to us in many respects to admit to any class graduates of a school that has merely been approved by either ourselves or any college upon simple application from the principal of such school.

It is my opinion that if we get through these two years of sliding from one system into another safely, there is a much better outlook for the normal schools and normal school instruction in Texas, but we must be careful during this time.<sup>1</sup>

This is only one example of the concern these men displayed and their confirmed belief in the dignity and respectability of teaching, their conviction that the normal schools were valid instruments of public service, capable of assuming

---

<sup>1</sup> Here evidently referred here to the transition from the old normal school course, little if any of which was of college rank, to the status of a junior college.

responsibility for the welfare of the public schools of Texas. These educators were unshakable in their belief that the American system of public education was the best possible agency for the conservation of human resources and the best advocate of democratic ideals.

Prior to 1913 the Texas state normal course of instruction covered a maximum of three years, only the senior year being on the college level. From 1915 to 1918 a second year of college work was added; and from 1918 to 1921 a full four-year course in college work was offered. At this point an earnest, concerted effort was made by these schools to obtain accreditation in the several college associations.<sup>2</sup>

There followed a period of inspection of courses, equipment, Laboratories, library facilities, and faculty scholarship by the faculty of the University of Texas. Whatever dislike which may have been felt for the institution at Austin, because of refusal by the University to recognize credits offered by graduates of the normal schools, for instance, gave way to a recognition of the hard fact that unless and until the University of Texas recognized the state normal schools, no accrediting agency anywhere would give them consideration.

When in 1916 the board of regents of the state normal schools authorized those institutions to expand into senior colleges, considerable opposition arose from outside, and some doubts were entertained within the group. President Bruce wrote Evans on November 7, 1916:

I believe that if the normals pretend to confer a degree it ought to be made absolutely standard and that we ought to guard our entrance requirements, our course of study, and the granting of this degree, so well that there will be no question as to our graduates being admitted to the graduate classes of such universities as Columbia, Chicago, etc."

Evans expressed agreement with Bruce, and at the same time suggested that a uniform policy be adopted by the presidents and that the details of the course of study should not be passed upon by faculty action prior to a meeting and agreement by the presidents.

There is evidence also that controversy on some occasions

---

<sup>2</sup> Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

waxed hot over proposed offerings and policies. Referring to a copy of a request by J. W. Smith of the North Texas State Normal to W. F. Doughty, Superintendent of Public Instruction, requesting a ruling on whether or not a normal school had the authority to issue a teachers certificate to a student who had completed four years of work in a standard college, President Evans wrote:

. . . At each meeting of the Presidents a new proposition or change of any kind seems to arouse violent opposition, and we are constantly reminded that existing conditions should not be disturbed. Personally I see no valid objection to making reasonable changes at any time of the year.

No official action by Mr. Doughty is necessary to bring about the privilege of issuing certificates to students who enter Normal Schools from colleges and universities with the equivalent of four college credits. The Board of Normal Regents can authorize us to do so, and under its authority we can grant the certificate in a manner substantially the same as that adopted by universities and colleges of the first class.<sup>3</sup>

From this letter it appears that Evans at least believed that the normal schools now should enjoy freedom from the supervision of the State Board of Education in Austin.

Intermingled with their keen desire to raise standards was the ever-present rivalry between the normal schools themselves for students. Evans watched closely the actions of the other schools, and he did not hesitate to flail any departure which he believed had been made from standard or agreed procedure. In October 1917 he carried on an argument with President Bruce over the admittance of four students from the Iredell High School since Iredell had lost its evaluation or classification because it failed to meet the standards of the State Department of Education. During this discussion by correspondence, Evans used language which approached a reprimand in nature:

In the case of the four students from Iredell High School assigned to your sophomore class without entrance examinations or conditions, the procedure cannot find defense in either graduation from the Iredell High School of 1917 or completion of the tenth grade of 1916, in neither of which years did this high school have classification of

---

<sup>3</sup>Letter addressed to W. H. Bruce, March 13, 1917.

the lowest rank by the State Department of Education. It occurs to me that the fair thing to do is to follow the latest list published by the State Department of Education, for the reason that all lists are in process of revision. In fact, I understood that we had agreed to follow the latest lists.

Evans severely criticized President Bruce for creating a situation in which one of the normal schools would admit without condition students from a certain high school while the classmates of these students attempting to enter another normal school would be required to take entrance examinations. This could happen even though requirements for entrance from high school to any of the normal schools were by agreement uniform. Evans declared that this situation allowed a student to "play one college against another",—which had probably been done by students from Iredell who had been required to take entrance examinations at the Southwest Texas State Normal School.

An interesting fact is that President Bruce accepted with humility Evans' castigation. He replied immediately:

I have instructed our classification committee hereafter to go very carefully by the rules printed last by the Department of Education, and to adhere strictly to all agreements made by the Presidents and authorized by the Board of Regents.

It became apparent that the normal schools must be fully recognized not only by the University of Texas, but that the respect, at least of other Texas colleges would also be a valuable asset. In 1919 the normal schools secured an agreement with the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College that their work would be accepted by that institution when offered by transfer students. Evans informed the other presidents of the conclusion of this agreement in a letter dated May 24, 1919, as follows:

Any student who completes the normal senior class in a Texas State Normal College leading to the normal diploma and teachers permanent certificate, in any of the seven courses offered by the Normal College, is admitted without conditions to the junior class of the A. and M. College; and upon completion of two years' college work will be granted the degree of Bachelor of Science in Agriculture.

In the same letter Evans objected to the issue of a teachers

certificate upon completion of two-thirds of a year's work and insisted that the other normal colleges adhere to this policy.

Although assenting to the necessity for recognition by the major institutions of higher learning in Texas, some of the teachers college presidents grumbled over the fact that the normal schools must bow humbly before the will of the University of Texas. Evans, however, having become by this time president of the Council of Teachers College Presidents, undertook to restrain his colleagues in their antagonism against the domination of the University. On June 3, 1921, he wrote:

I do not see any reason to get excited about this matter. We know very well that we are not meeting the recognized standards of the Texas Association of Colleges in several respects. Our high school and college work are still lumped together; freshman college courses are not differentiated from junior and senior college courses; heads of departments in many instances do not hold graduate degrees, and in some cases do not even have a bachelor's degree; diluted college courses on a semi-secondary basis are still given in normal colleges in our state. If an inspection by the University of Texas compels us to eliminate these college irregularities, it will do us good and not harm. Just as soon as we have met the equivalent of the objections suggested, we will have full credit for our degrees. Each normal college in Texas should at once take up with the University of Texas the matter of final accrediting.

Again on September 16, 1921, he wrote to the presidents in a similar tone. He said:

Frankly I do not see what normal colleges will gain by continuing the fight for degree recognition so long as they deliberately decline to meet accepted standards. For instance, Texas Woman's College could not get rating as a first-class college until it completely separated its high school and college classes and its high school and college courses. We know very well that Texas State Normal Colleges have not been doing this. We know equally well that we are not meeting acceptable college standards in some other respects which it is unnecessary to take the time and space to discuss.

In order to settle this question, once and for all, the Southwest Texas State Normal College is going right on with the matter of senior recognition of our courses hour by hour, by the University of Texas. Our program committee has just completed the schedule for the fall term's work, and no instructor teaching in high school will be

permitted to taste the beauties of college teaching; on the other hand, no college teacher will be permitted to drop down and teach high school classes. Nor is that all; we propose to go on until we have met all objections raised by the University of Texas, thereby fully earning the desired recognition.

Evans was very much aware of the several refusals by out-of-state colleges to accept normal college graduates because recognition had not been accorded these graduates by the University of Texas. However, his efforts to diminish the hostility toward the University were not altogether successful. President H. F. Estill of Huntsville, one of the more conservative presidents, complained bitterly at an editorial in the *Galveston News* of Sunday, October 9, 1921, in which that newspaper suggested that the University of Texas undertake only the junior and senior years of undergraduate college work and let the first two years of college be taught at the teachers colleges. The editorial suggested further that the teachers colleges become "feeders" of students to the University for advanced study. On October 11 President Estill wrote:

I for one am not prepared to admit that all the state schools of Texas must be feeders to the University or harmful competitors. It appears that this editorial voices a sentiment which we know exists in some quarters, namely that the normal colleges should not be permitted to offer four years of college work, a sentiment which, in my judgment, is contrary to the best interests of the teaching profession and of the cause of education in Texas.

A few days later President R. B. Binnion of Commerce wrote a letter in which he discounted the effect of the efforts of President Vinson of the University and others to "reduce" the normal colleges to junior college level and put them under the authority of the University of Texas. Binnion said in conclusion: "I think he will wind up about as he did last year in his efforts to move the University to Arlington. . . . He couldn't move the University and he can't reduce the normal colleges."

For several years thereafter there were outcroppings of opposition to one or another policy which the University had adopted or publicly favored. Apparently the idea of "feeder" junior colleges for the University was fostered by W. M. W. Splawn, president of the University during the mid twenties,

and this, coupled with the opposition of the normal colleges' becoming senior colleges, created considerable friction. President J. A. Hill, in his history of West Texas State College, refers to a chance meeting with the president of the University during which conversation the head of the University proposed to Hill that if the latter would give up the idea of becoming a recognized senior college, he, the president of the University, would make the college at Canyon a branch of the University. Hill rejected the proposal, but was led later to wonder what change mould have been made in the history of education in Texas if he had accepted.<sup>4</sup>

During later years, after the teachers colleges were firmly established as members of the nation's foremost accrediting organizations, their relations with the University became those of rivals rather than inferiors. An example of this occurred in 1939 when the question of granting a non-thesis degree was being debated in college and university circles. The University of Texas and other universities of the South were opposed to the omission of the thesis while the universities of the North and West were taking the lead in granting such degrees. On August 9, 1939, President Evans wrote to President C. N. Shaver of the Sam Houston Teachers College:

You and I and the other State Teachers Colleges have lost in the scuffle to prevent the adoption of the non-thesis degree. The Universities of America that are giving the non-thesis Masters Degree, in standing, rank, and prestige make the traditional university with the traditional thesis requirement look like the proverbial thirty cents. When the Universities of Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, and California recognize the non-thesis masters degree, it does not do any good to toss up the Universities of Virginia, Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina as exemplars for maintenance of standards. Cornell University, too, has climbed on the bandwagon of the non-thesis Masters Degree.

Nor should we be forced to wait on our traditional faculty members of our own state university. The State Teachers Colleges of Texas began granting degrees in 1919, omitting the foreign language and the mathematics requirements, which the University of Texas continued to enforce. I know personally some outstanding men in Texas

---

<sup>4</sup>See *More Than Brick and Mortar*, p. 77. Hill does not name the president of the University of Texas, but the date he gives was during the administration of R.E. Vinson.

who refuse to go to the University of Texas on account of the foreign language requirement, and I do not think these men were afraid of work or were looking for low standards,

There was a time in my own life when I thought a student who refused to take Latin and preferred to elect industrial arts, home economics, or business administration was a student looking for easy courses and running away from work. In the language of everyday horse-sense, I have learned a good deal through observation and experience and now know that very often the student who takes industrial arts, home economics, or business administration would make a colossal blunder in submitting to a college requirement for Latin. Students who take journalism, business administration, industrial arts, home economics, and agriculture and students who prefer a non-thesis Masters Degree are just as honest and sincere in the demands for standards as are the students who take Latin and Greek and under compulsion write the traditional thesis on a subject that often is hardly worth while. . . .

The low status of the teachers colleges of Texas was nowhere seen more clearly than on occasions when there was to be a representation of all the state-supported colleges present. Invariably the entire group of teachers colleges were allowed only one representative or, perhaps, two at best, while each of the other colleges of the state was accorded the dignity of having its own representative. In 1927 President R. B. Cousins of the South Texas State Teachers College, insisted, when the question of representation on various boards arose, that "we be considered as individuals rather than a litter."

### With **The** State Department Of Education

At intervals in the recent history of Texas, movements have been made in the legislature to vest in the State Department of Education under an elected superintendent of public instruction the power to pass upon the standards of instruction not only in the high schools of the state but also in the institutions of higher learning. The State Superintendent has been made ex-officio chairman of the State Board of Education and, at times, has headed certain committees created for the purpose of exercising authority over the educational affairs of the state.

In the early part of the legislative session of 1921, House Bill No. 304, included a paragraph as follows:



The State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall have charge of the classification and accrediting of all public schools, state colleges, and sectarian and private schools and colleges, according to the standards and provisions adopted by the State Committee on Accredited schools and colleges.

There was little opposition to the bill at first, but the watchful eyes of the teachers college presidents ultimately discovered the paragraph, and some of the presidents became fearful that the teachers colleges were about to be dominated by the central authority in Austin. By this time, however, President Evans was thoroughly convinced that accreditation could be achieved only by yielding to an authority in no way connected with the College. On February 21, 1921, President R. B. Binnion, of the East Texas Normal College, wrote State Superintendent Annie Webb Blanton that he was unwilling to have the entire policy of the state normal colleges "placed at the mercy of the varying contingencies of political campaigns attendant upon the election of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction." Upon receipt of a copy of Binnion's letter, President Evans, in a somewhat lengthy missive, undertook to bring his colleague back into line with the Evans thinking. He wrote:

No institution, normal college, private college, or university, can expect to classify and affiliate itself. This is for exactly the same reason that a man cannot lift himself by his bootstraps. No high school in Texas can classify and expect to affiliate itself. . . .

Some authority outside of the institution itself must inspect and pass upon the standards maintained by an institution of higher learning. **An** institution cannot try its own case. The point involved is only the meeting of the recognized standards of other colleges. If you do not want anybody to pass on the East Texas Normal College, I am not inclined to disturb you in your isolation. So far as I know, the Board of Normal Regents has never asked for the authority to investigate, inspect, and act upon whether the Normal Colleges of Texas are maintaining the same standards as the University of Texas and the A. and M. College maintain. If the Board of Regents should adopt such a policy, the board of trustees of Simmons College could pass upon its own standards. Each institution would become the final arbiter of its own standards, and, therefore, a recognized common standard would be out of the question,

In the summer of 1919, with the approval of President A. C. Goeth, the Normal Colleges in Texas filed with the State Department of Education a request for classification as colleges of the first class. I have not been aware that our Board of Regents lost any authority by the filing of such application. If the Normal Colleges of Texas are to be recognized in the college world so that their students may pass freely to standard colleges and universities without loss of credit, we must be inspected and classified by some outside authority. I have no fear whatever as to the final outcome of such an inspection. Indeed I am going through such an inspection right now by a committee from the University of Texas.

There is no danger whatever of vesting in the State Department of Education the authority of accrediting the colleges of the state, including the Normal Colleges. This would not involve in any wise our fundamental function of training teachers, but merely the question of whether we are meeting the same standards as Baylor University, Southwestern University, and other institutions of higher learning.

Some months later President Binnion took a stand squarely in support of President Evans in the matter of cooperation with the University of Texas and with the State Department of Education. On September 27, 1921, he wrote to President Estill:

. . . As I understand the matter, Presidents Evans and Binnion are simply striving to have their respective institutions meet the requirements for recognition as colleges of the first class. There are two reasons for this:

1. We must secure recognition of the University in order to settle the question of recognition of our work when offered by our students for advanced standing in other institutions of higher learning in America.

2. We must be recognized by the State Department of Education as colleges of the first class in order to secure the right to issue special certificates; as for instance, certificates in the subjects of kindergarten, manual training, and music. Among other things, this requires a complete separation of our preparatory and college classes. We are trying to do this and to secure full recognition of the University in the near future. We are also applying for recognition by the State Department of Education and expect to secure this classification as well.

Both Binnion and Evans had previously requested the Texas

Association of Colleges to appoint a committee, independent of the University, to inspect the work of their schools.

More than a year later, however, President Evans had not yet made application to the State Department of Education for recognition of the Southwest Texas State Normal College as a college of the first class; but on March 28, 1922, in a letter to President Estill, he expressed his intention of doing so shortly. He gave President Estill a brief review of the background to the situation:

. . . At the suggestion of President A. C. Goeth of the Board of Normal Regents in the summer of 1919, we filed such application but were not, at that time, given recognition . . . for the reason that our high school was not separated from the college. To a large extent, this has already been accomplished with us, and we will practically complete the differentiation by September, 1922.

. . . Classification and inspection means merely accrediting the work a Normal College claims to be doing, and telling such Normal College whether its work is up to standards maintained by the Texas Association of Colleges.

. . . From many points of view, I see quite an advantage to the institutions of higher learning for a single central authority to inspect critically, and classify, after inspection, the academic work and the proposed standards of all colleges in the state. Such inspection and classification will be an impetus to progress within any institution of higher learning, and protection to the public against cheapening standards of inferior institutions.

Thus the struggle went to convince state authorities of the worth of the colleges whose main function was the training of teachers. During the twenties great progress was made by this group of institutions in obtaining recognition. And, in the words of J. A. Hill, "the shooting war ended" in the year 1925. However, when the depression of 1929 struck, there was a renewal of a tremendous struggle to save not only the status attained by the teacher-training institutions but to stave off their abolition.<sup>5</sup>

### Victory In The Associations

In 1917, before the normal colleges themselves became active in their quest for recognition, the state legislature became interested in the survey of the colleges of Texas for the purpose of improving the state system of colleges and eliminating

---

<sup>5</sup>See Chapter III of this study.

duplication among them. Positive action by the legislature, however, was not taken until 1921, when at the special session, on August 24, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5 was adopted, authorizing the appointment of a "Committee on Survey of Institutions of Education" by the governor, lieutenant governor, and speaker of the house. This turned out to be mainly a fact-finding body, and the committee reported some information on state tax systems, control boards of education, etc., which was regarded as highly valuable.<sup>6</sup>

In 1923 at the regular session of the legislature, the Texas Educational Survey Commission was created with authority to make a complete and impartial survey of all the schools of the state, with Governor Pat M. Neff as chairman and ten members consisting of prominent citizens from practically all segments of Texas society. The final report of the survey staff was made in 1925, and, as Evans observed, "it is a mine of school values for the study of educational conditions and educational needs at that time. The subject matter chosen for comment is pertinent; the over-all view, the specific observations, and the manner of presentation further enhances the value of the material."<sup>7</sup> However, this report did little to raise the status of the teachers colleges among the other colleges of the state or with the associations of colleges. On the other hand, five of the teachers colleges were admitted to membership in the Association of Texas Colleges with Class A rating in 1923. Those admitted were at San Marcos, Huntsville, Denton, Canyon, and Commerce. This recognition was a signal victory for the teachers colleges and greatly aided them in their attempts to gain recognition by other associations of colleges covering wider territory.

The goal for the teachers colleges was recognition by the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States. Without exception, the presidents of the teachers colleges of Texas were of southern birth, and truly products of the South by education, family tradition, and personal sentiment. In the face of repeated rejection of their applications for membership, the majority of these presidents persisted in their desire for such recognition.

---

<sup>6</sup> Evans, *The Story of Texas Schools*, op. cit., p. 228.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 229.

President Hill referred to the association in these words: "The . . . , organization had itself been rather exclusive in its policy of admission to membership. It had never looked with favor upon state teachers colleges. It had been controlled to a large extent by the classical school of educational thinking and in no small measure by the private and denominational colleges and universities."<sup>8</sup>

The difficulty of meeting the required standards of the Southern Association was clearly portrayed in a letter from R. B. Binnion of the East Texas State Teachers College, dated December 14, 1922. In this letter Binnion mentioned twenty standards set up by the Association. He said:

I have before me a statement of the standards, twenty in number, all of which I think we can make without serious difficulty except Standard No. 5 and Standard No. 12. These standards are as follows:

"5. *Training of Faculty.* The training of the members of the faculty of professorial rank should include at least two years' study in their respective fields of teaching in a fully organized and recognized graduate school. The training of the head of a department should be equivalent to that required for the doctor's degree or should represent a corresponding professional or technical training. A college will be judged in large part by the ratio which the number of persons of professorial rank with sound training, scholarly achievement and successful experience as teachers bears to the total number of the teaching staff. Honorary degrees are not recognized as qualification for teachers.

"12. *Separation of College and Preparatory School.* The college may not maintain a preparatory school as part of its college organization. In case such a school is maintained under the college charter it must be kept rigidly distinct and separate from the college in students, faculty, buildings, and discipline."

We are eliminating the difficulty with respect to Standard No. 12 by the elimination of our sub-college classes. It will be some time, however, before we meet No. 5 in full, as a number of our department heads have masters degrees only with no additional work. Our teachers of French, Latin, history, economics, and mathematics can probably meet Standard No. 5. After this year, the head of our English department can also meet it. . . .

---

<sup>8</sup>Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

President Evans, however, grew weary of the attitude of indifference on the part of the leaders of the Southern Association and put out a few feelers to explore the chances for recognition by the North Central Association. He had urged the other presidents to join with him in an application for membership in that group. Apparently he had been led to believe that an application would be accorded a favorable reception. On September 3, 1923, Evans wrote the following letter, directing it to President Hill, but sending copies to all the other presidents and to the members of the board of regents:

I am writing again regarding the application of the Texas State Teachers Colleges for membership in the North Central Association. The more I think over the matter, the stronger is my belief that we should go on with this fight. If the College of Industrial Arts, the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and even a few other colleges will join us, we can put Texas in the North Central Association. I believe we could get into the Southern Association of Colleges within possibly two years, but the policies of our Southern Association are considerably behind the educational movement in the Central and Western states. We will be much better pleased if we join a more progressive association. I make this statement with sincere regret, as all my connections, sentiments, and traditions are emphatically Southern.

Two years went by without any action by the Southern Association, and this delay brought some support to Evans from the other presidents in his campaign to apply for admission to the North Central Association. R. L. Marquis, president of the largest of the Texas State Teachers Colleges, now took an active and vigorous part in the fight for recognition. He reasoned that at least the likelihood that the teachers colleges would be taken into the North Central Association might shock the leaders of the Southern Association into action. On April 20, 1925, Marquis wrote to Dean H. D. Campbell of Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia, challenging the unwarranted delay of the Southern Association in giving serious consideration to the application of the Texas State Teachers Colleges. His letter follows:

I am convinced that this matter must be settled at the next meeting of the Association or the Texas group will ask the Southern Association to waive territorial jurisdiction over the Teachers Colleges. If the Southern Asso-

ciation would prefer to waive jurisdiction to admitting the Texas State Teachers Colleges, we feel certain that the North Central Association would act at once and admit us to that Association with the group of teachers colleges now on its list. Since Texas and Louisiana are the only states west of the Mississippi River in the Southern Association, some have suggested that territorially these two states might very logically go into the North Central group. At a recent meeting of the presidents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges it was definitely decided to ask the Southern Association to act finally at the coming meeting or to waive territorial jurisdiction. Any assistance you may render us in our attempt to place the Texas institutions on correct educational standards will be greatly appreciated, I assure you.

In Dean Campbell's reply he stated that the committee to which the question of admittance of the teachers colleges was referred praised the academic standards of the Texas institutions, but because of low salaries paid, recommended that action on the application be deferred. He expressed sympathy and promised personally to present the application to the Association at the next meeting.

Correspondence shows that one great and compelling reason for the desire for membership in the Southern Association by the teachers colleges was that one of the rules of the Association provided that seventy-five per cent of the teachers in the high schools accredited by the Southern Association must be graduates of colleges also members of the Association. In Texas this discriminated grievously against the teachers colleges. President Bruce R. Payne of Peabody College wrote to Professor Alexander L. Bondurant of the University of Mississippi, October 19, 1925, as follows:<sup>9</sup>

There are, say, 3,000 teachers in high schools in Texas. Only one-fourth of these may come from institutions (and in this case it might be the teacher-training institutions) not approved by the Southern Association. Now really this quota of one-fourth, or 750, is wholly filled up by the old non-qualified teachers whom the board is not willing to drop. Therefore, it practically means that none of the graduates of the teachers colleges in Texas may be allowed to teach in the 150 or more public high schools in Texas which are on the accredited list of the Southern

---

Copy in the Evans file.

Association, unless, perchance, your committee accepts these qualified teachers colleges in some way or other.

Now this is a little too much [power] for any outside organization to exercise very long in Texas. You cannot get away with it.

This is particularly galling to the teachers colleges of Texas, for the agreement which you have with the North Central Association allows those high schools to employ teachers who are graduates of normal schools within the territory of the North Central Association, which normal schools are inferior in many cases to the teachers colleges of Texas.

This assistance from President Payne came, without a doubt, as a result of the solicitation of Marquis. Moreover, the personal campaign Marquis conducted to secure admission to the Association brought rare praise from President Evans, brief as it was.

At the December meeting of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States in Charleston, five of the teachers colleges were admitted—San Marcos, Huntsville, Denton, Canyon, and Commerce. The application of the teachers colleges came before the convention on December 1 and 2. As J. A. Hill expressed it:

Five Texas Teachers Colleges crashed the gate, and the teachers colleges all over the country hailed the achievement. Such a victory had not occurred on any other educational front in many a day. It marked the climax of the struggle for status, and the shooting war came to an end in 1925—that is until years later, when it was on another front.<sup>10</sup>

There was considerable celebration of this event on the campus of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. The prediction made two years before by President Evans that the victory could be won within two years was accurate. At Huntsville there was also typical rejoicing over the event. In a letter to President Hill, dated December 5, 1925, President Estill wrote:

Your telegram from Charleston announcing that five Texas State Teachers Colleges, including Sam Houston, had been admitted to membership in the Southern Association

---

<sup>10</sup>Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 79-80.



caused great rejoicing in "these diggins." President, faculty, and student body had a jolly meeting at chapel.

I feel that the favorable action of the Association at this time was due in no small measure to the personal efforts of our able representatives, yourself, and Messrs. Evans and Marquis. You are entitled to our gratitude.

This action of the Southern Association is a notable event in modern educational history. It is a significant victory for the teachers colleges. It means that these institutions have won at least a place in the sun and that these take rank with the best colleges and universities in the land.

A letter from President Marquis to M. O. Flowers, dated two years later, December 5, 1927, after the return of Marquis from the meeting of the Southern Association gives a few other interesting bits of information relating to the struggle, the active part played by Marquis, and some results of the victory:

I have just returned from a meeting of the Southern Association which was held in Jacksonville, Florida. In many respects, I consider this a very remarkable meeting. When the Teachers Colleges of Texas applied for admission to the Association some five years ago and undertook to secure territorial standardization through that body, we were told by the leaders that the Association was not interested in teacher-training or teacher-training institutions and that it would not undertake to bring into the Association professional schools of any sort. The Teachers Colleges of Texas proceeded to put their house in order and persisted in their request for proper recognition. This was granted at the Charleston meeting in 1925. Five of the Teachers Colleges were given membership, the schools at Huntsville, Commerce, Canyon, San Marcos, and Denton. The school at Nacogdoches was given membership at this meeting in Jacksonville. Not only have the schools been given membership, but gradually recognition of their representatives in their councils has been extended. I had a small place on their program this year. President C. E. Evans was placed on the Nominating Committee, a very important committee, and I was placed on the Commission for Higher Education.

The Texas State Teachers Colleges occupy a very highly respected place as teacher-training institutions, and these schools are looked upon as leaders in the South. Upon our invitation the Association will hold its 1928 meeting in Fort Worth, Texas. This is the first time this Association has ever held its sessions west of the Mississippi River.

As President Hill said, the main fight ended in 1925, and the victory of the Texas State Teachers Colleges had been conceded within a few years by recognition of the presidents of these institutions, even to the election of three of them to the position of the president of the Association.<sup>11</sup> But four years later there was still a small measure of mopping up to be done, and it became the task of President Evans to do the final chores.

Evans had urged at every opportunity that the teachers colleges should receive proper recognition in the official publications wherever there was a directory of recognized American colleges. His determination bore fruit. On May 19, 1928, he wrote to the other presidents as follows:

I am in receipt of a letter from D. A. Robertson, of the American Council on Education, in which he concedes the desirability of giving state teachers colleges greater recognition in the official publications. As stated in my recent letter, neither the American Council on Education nor other publications such as *The World Almanac*, lists state teachers colleges among the recognized colleges of America. This is not so much an oversight as a failure to appreciate the work our type of institution is doing. It is my purpose to keep on with this fight until we get recognition extended to us on the basis of merit.

At the recent meeting of our Council of Presidents, I mentioned the desirability of asking the Southern Association to transfer our group from the Teachers College Section to the General Section of the Association. While I was in hearty accord at the time with the decision to accept the separate section as full recognition, yet I am now of the opinion that we made a mistake. It is not so much what we believe about the action of the Association in placing us in a separate section called "Teachers Colleges," but it is what we are compelled to accept as the estimate of other people. After all, whether we like it or not, the recognition given us is, in the eyes of the general public, a left-handed designation. It is my judgment that we should take up this problem with the Southern Association in the next meeting and ask that we be transferred to the group in which we find other regularly accredited colleges of America. Unless, we do this, we must continue to explain to the world that our recognition is as good as that of the colleges of arts, an explanation which the transfer would save.

---

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 80.

This letter of Evans' renewed in part what had been the subject of heated discussion at some meetings of the Council of Presidents, namely the peculiar function of the Texas State Teachers Colleges to devote themselves exclusively to the training of teachers, and was a forerunner of the concept that these institutions would best serve the state as *general* rather than as professional colleges. Two years previously, President Estill had declared that:

The teachers colleges must do a specific piece of professional work of the highest class, which will differentiate them from other types of colleges and which will gradually compel the recognition on the part of the public generally of the excellence of our work as affording absolutely the best preparation for teaching.

Estill made it perfectly clear that *preparation of teachers* meant for teaching in the primary and secondary public schools of Texas.<sup>12</sup> And less than a year earlier President Hill had written Evans as follows:

. . . With reference to the various suggestions about opening our curriculum to those who do not intend to be teachers, I am greatly divided in mind. If we do this, we lose all the force of the arguments which we have used so long to the effect that a Teachers College is the place to train teachers. President Marquis' argument that brains and character would be added to our student body by such a procedure sounds very much like the argument which I have been hearing lately from the institution to my south. I have been sincere in my belief that a Teachers College is a better place than a technological college to educate teachers. If it is, then we ought to stay with the idea. If it is not, then Texas has made a mistake in establishing an institution for the training of teachers. It is a question on which we ought to think soberly.

On October 5, 1927, President Estill wrote again, showing that there was still division of opinion on this much-debated subject:

It has been our claim that the so-called academic courses—English, mathematics, social science, chemistry, etc.—are not the same in content when taught in the teachers college as when taught in a liberal arts college or in a college of medicine or engineering. The admission to these courses, however, of any considerable number of students

---

<sup>12</sup> Letter in Evans file, dated March 31, 1926.

who have no interest in teaching would tend to change the nature of the courses offered and remove entirely their professional slant, and thereby destroy the distinctive service of the teachers college.

The fact that the teachers college has stood solely for the great mission of educating teachers and has refused to be led off into other fields has been a factor in the elevation of teaching as a profession. For the teachers college now to modify its program and enter other fields would be a confession of professional weakness, as would be the case in a medical college entering another field than that of educating physicians, and would retard the advancement of the teaching profession.

It may be that the force of circumstances will yet drive us into changing our professional standards and lowering the flag which we have held aloft and followed so valiantly in past years. Personally I do not believe that time has yet arrived.

In 1929 the official publication of the Southern Association's "American Colleges and Universities," failed to list the teachers colleges as first-class institutions fully accredited by the Association. This omission caused the United States Department of Interior Bureau of Education in the educational directory of 1929 to omit the colleges; and Brewer's annual "National Directory," a commercial publication, to do the same. Upon discovery of this omission, Evans wrote to the management of the various publications :

I believe that readers of official publications have a right to the facts, and if a teachers college is an institution of the first class, so rated by the territorial associations . . . it should not suffer the embarrassment of being omitted from its membership list by a non-official publication undertaking to give official membership lists.

The several colleges were properly listed in subsequent issues.

### **Also The News Media**

In spite of the fact that the battle for recognition in the educational world had been won after a fashion, certain newspapers in Texas remained hostile to the teachers colleges for years. One newspaper, the *Dallas News*, engaged in an editorial war with these schools of such proportions that a separate ac-

count of it is given in a later chapter.<sup>13</sup> The presidents recognized the powerful influence of newspaper opinion, but, individually or collectively, they could do little to counteract that influence. However, in the group was one individual who never let an opportunity slip by to fire at the newspaper snipers. He was the courageous and able defender of the cause of education in Texas, Joseph A. Hill, president of the West Texas State Teachers College at Canyon. And his defense of the teachers colleges against the attacks published in the news media was by no means futile. One of his most effective replies was in the form of a letter dated April 26, 1928, to the editor of the Fort Worth *Star* Telegram. In this letter President Hill took the editor to task for his editorial of April 15. He told the editor that the editorial was written without information of the facts regarding the function and the standards of the teachers colleges of the state. He stated that the West Texas State Teachers College had at that time 31 honor graduates enrolled from the high schools in its territory. He reminded the editor further that the teachers colleges had been granting standard bachelors degrees for ten years—since 1918, based on four years of standard college training. He declared that 95 per cent of the students were from accredited high schools. He continued:

When, therefore, you speak of duplication which would result if "the status of Teachers Colleges were raised," you only express a fear of crossing a stream which is already behind you. Indeed, well-informed people (and I speak with all respect) who have regard for evident facts will now tell you that all of the institutions of higher learning in Texas have volunteered to help do the work which the law has expressly delegated to and made the duty of the teachers colleges. To use Western lingo, all the cattle of every brand and breed have come into our pasture and are fattening on the grass which rightfully belongs to us. Adding insult to injury, they tell us that we have strayed from our own field and are browsing, as so many contemptible "cutbacks," in the meadows of the thoroughbreds. One of these days, unless things change pretty soon, some old Teachers College Bull will sniff the battle scented atmosphere, curl his tail over his back, and charge the pasture fence. After the battle is over, no one will be able to distinguish the one field from the other. The Teachers College herd will be grazing as contentedly in the pastures of the

---

<sup>13</sup>See Chapter XII.

so-called thoroughbreds as these latter now browse on the legally constituted domain of the "cut-backs" and "dogies." If you want to hasten and pile up duplication, just keep writing such editorials as that of April 15.

If I could rightfully trespass further upon your time I should say many more things.<sup>14</sup>

President Evans, for the most part, considered it the best policy with the news media either to ignore their diatribes or seek a personal conference at which he would undertake to negotiate an "understanding" between the parties. He believed that if the College performed its public service properly, its reputation would be safe in the respect which the graduates held for the College. It was only when he felt that he must defend an action taken by the College administration that he would communicate his opinion to the newspapers. He was ready at all times, however, to write news of events concerning the College or to convey bits of other information which he considered of general interest.

### With High School **Officials**

There were still others with whom the status of the teachers colleges was of paramount importance. Foremost were the authorities of the large high schools of the state. As already indicated, these superior schools were members of the Southern Association and were not, according to the rules of that association, permitted to employ more than 25 per cent of their teachers who had not graduated from a college also a member of that association. In a few instances, for one reason or another, there was an outright prejudice against the teachers colleges, and no graduate of these institutions was ever employed. This was very nearly the case at one time with the schools of Dallas. In 1927 the assistant superintendent, E. B. Cauthorn, according to complaints of applicants for teaching positions under his supervision, was very reluctant to employ any graduate of a teachers college. Cauthorn was a graduate of the University of Missouri and much preferred teachers who had been trained at institutions of that type. The situation came to the attention

---

<sup>14</sup>In this year, 1967, when this is written, the "Teachers College Bull" has completely demolished the pasture fence, and the amazingly accurate prediction of President Hill has come true, with, in the old sense, not a single teachers college left in Texas.

of President Estill of Huntsville, and he wrote to President Whitley of Commerce suggesting that perhaps Whitley could prevail upon Cauthorn to modify his stand on the employment of teachers with teachers college training. President Whitley replied:

I have myself felt this situation very keenly in recent years. I feel that the Dallas City School System has been unfair to the graduates of Teachers Colleges. I have discussed this several times with Assistant Superintendent E. B. Cauthorn, . . . and I think the light is gradually breaking. . . . I shall be glad to take the matter up with him again and try to overcome his prejudice against our teachers colleges.

A little bit of history here will throw a great deal of light upon the situation. Some years ago, I think it was in 1918, Dr. Kimball, who was then superintendent of the Dallas City Schools, undertook to get a bill through the Legislature authorizing him to issue certificates to those Dallas high school graduates who completed some work in Education. The teachers colleges at that time opposed this bill and defeated it in the Legislature. Soon thereafter the Dallas school board passed a regulation saying that no one would be able to teach in the high schools of Dallas who were not graduates of colleges and universities on the Southern list or similar lists. This at once eliminated the teachers colleges because they were not at that time members of the Southern Association. This prejudice against teachers colleges was very strong during Mr. Kimball's administration, and his successor seems to share largely in this same prejudice.

I am perfectly willing, with President Marquis, at an early date to see Superintendent Crozier and Assistant Superintendent Cauthorn for the purpose of discussing this proposition. Meanwhile, I suggest that if any of the presidents know of any incidents like the one mentioned by you I shall be glad to have detailed information with reference thereto. I have something like a dozen teachers from the Dallas City School System working with me here this summer. I am going to discuss the matter frankly with them. I agree with you that something ought to be done to clarify the situation at Dallas.

### **And Then The Regents**

Among all the other problems facing the presidents in their fight for status was that of convincing the members of their own board of regents of the quality of work being done by the

Texas State Teachers Colleges. It was, of course, mandatory that reports be made to the board of regents at stated intervals, but it probably was not absolutely necessary to add with meticulous care explanatory detailed comparison with previous records and the scholastic rating of the institution in question in terms which a layman could understand.

The minutes of the board of regents for the Alpine meeting on November 7, 1921, show, among other actions, the following:

After some discussion of the matter of the State Normal Colleges securing recognition as colleges of the first rank, it was moved and adopted that the presidents of the respective colleges proceed at once to meet the requirements of the University of Texas looking towards an early recognition of their respective schools as colleges of the first rank.

The minutes also show that five of the six regents were present, A. C. Goeth of Austin being president and M. O. Flowers of Lockhart, vice-president. This action, in response to requests for official approval, was enough only to give notice to the regents that the teachers colleges were opening their campaign for recognition.

In his report to the regents for the regular session of 1921-22, President Evans took pains to inform the regents of what the college at San Marcos had already done and was presently accomplishing. He reported as follows:

Upon request of the President of the Normal College, a faculty committee of the University of Texas began in August, 1920, an inspection and investigation of the courses, plant, and equipment of the Normal College. Joint meetings of the Normal College and the University committees were held during the fall and spring terms of the session of 1920-21. The University committee, representing all departments of the State University, visited the Normal College. As a result of the work of these committees, important changes were made in curricula, and high school and college departments of the Normal were completely differentiated so that by the opening of the fall term of 1921 substantially all work offered by the Southwest Texas Normal College was accredited by the University of Texas. Early in the session of 1921-22, the College inspector of the State Department of Education, after thorough examination recommended that the Southwest Texas State Normal College be



placed on the list of accredited first-class colleges. This work of standardization has stimulated Normal College endeavor in every respect.

A year earlier the Evans report to the regents carried an urgent appeal for higher salaries as a means of raising the standards of instruction in the College. Some of his statements are surprising:

High schools may be found in Texas in which there is a better salary schedule than now obtains in the Texas State Normal Colleges. Only the best quality of talent should be employed in a state teachers college, and yet it is practically impossible under the present salary schedule to fill all vacancies with men and women of scholarship and ability demanded. Comparison of the salary schedule of Texas State Normal Colleges with that of other state colleges indicates a lower level of salaries for the teacher-training institutions. A salary schedule commensurate with the dignity and importance of the work is therefore urgently recommended for the State Normal Colleges.<sup>15</sup>

It was the unvarying rule among the presidents that, upon return from an out-of-state trip at state expense a report be made to the president of the board of regents. On March 5, 1923, Evans wrote the following letter to M. O. Flowers of Lockhart, then president of the board:

I have just returned from the Cleveland meeting of the National Education Association. It was one of the most profitable meetings it has ever been my privilege to attend. As you doubtless know, Presidents Hill, Estill, and Marquis were in attendance, and the four Texas Normal College Presidents were together at the hotel.

. . . We got in touch with the best thought along the line of state normal expansion. In all parts of America the normal college seems to be going rapidly to the front. The state teachers college has ceased to be a super high school and has become a real college. This is indeed a very fortunate thing for the cause of education.

The presidents mentioned in this letter took advantage of this trip to visit teachers colleges in other states. They found assistant professors drawing as much as \$4,000 for ten and one-half months' work while at San Marcos a full professor head of a department receives only \$3,000 for nine

---

<sup>15</sup> This report indicates the group consciousness of the teachers college presidents and the feeling that as one of these institutions fared all **would** fare.

months' work and for summer work not always at that high a rate of pay. Department heads in some of these out-of-state colleges were being paid \$400 to \$500 per month. The presidents also saw much better buildings and equipment in other states, notably the State of Michigan.

The reply of Regent Flowers was encouraging. He wrote: "I am convinced from the letters received that the trip to Cleveland was a very profitable one. Just a little more and you presidents will make me see things through your glasses." Flowers also acknowledged the invitation to accompany some of the presidents on an inspection trip to the Mid-West. In this case he was forced to decline the invitation on account of the pressure of business in his law office, as a result of the oil boom then taking place in Caldwell County.

In the annual report to the board of regents dated October 31, 1927, after the teachers colleges had apparently achieved nation-wide recognition, Evans, nevertheless, devoted the last paragraph of his report to standards. He noted with satisfaction that:

. . . the degree graduates of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College enter the University of Texas, Columbia University, the University of Missouri, and other leading universities of America with the usual standing accorded graduates of the best colleges and complete the regular courses for the masters degree in one year.

The College is a member of the Association of Texas Colleges, the American Association of Teachers Colleges, and the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States. The quality of instruction in the College, from a professional standpoint, compares favorably with that in the other accredited institutions of America.

As an indication of the growing consciousness of standards in the minds of the members of the board of regents, the minutes of that body for the Alpine meeting, August 17, 1931, show the following action taken:

After discussion of small classes, it was moved by Crane<sup>16</sup> and seconded by Hayes<sup>17</sup> and carried unanimously that the Board of Regents request the presidents to not organize any classes under five students, except in rare cases. The presidents were told to have a conference to see that further plans may be made to reduce the number

---

<sup>16</sup>W. C. Crane of Franklin.

<sup>17</sup>W. Z. Hayes of Dallas.

of small classes, and they were further requested to make recommendations for the Board of Regents to present to the Board of Education a comprehensive plan tending to reduce the total number of classes and duplication of subjects.

### Next The Legislature

It would be needless repetition to present here the overwhelming evidence of the low estimate of value placed upon the normal schools generally by the lawmakers of Texas. It is probably an equally well-known fact that the unfavorable image of the normal schools never faded from the minds of many legislators even when it was quite obvious that the quality of the work equaled that of any of the other state-supported colleges. At the same time, it is likely that the needs of any one of the teachers colleges were as determinedly presented to the legislature as were the needs of any other college, although the presidents of the teachers colleges had been rebuffed so many times and even insulted on occasion by legislators, that President Hill facetiously likened them to the familiar figure of an old hound dog kicked about until his tail is forever between his legs.

President Hill also looks back upon the fight for status with these observations:

It had been a grueling struggle against great odds—lack of funds with which to improve and expand her program, lack of state-wide political influence, and the active opposition of almost the whole state government plus that of some of the denominational institutions of higher learning.<sup>18</sup>

His account just as aptly applies to the other teachers colleges in their relations with the legislature.

The attitudes of both the state and Federal governments were practically the same. For example, in 1918 when the question of whether vocational training under the Smith-Hughes Law would be delegated to the state normal schools, President Evans wrote the following letter in reply to an inquiry from President Estill:

I gave some attention to securing our share in the Vocational Education Fund until there seemed that every-

---

<sup>18</sup>Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

thing had already been framed against us. I am strongly of the opinion that those directing the vocational work throughout the country are unfriendly to normal schools, and I do not believe we can get what is rightfully coming to us.

A bill was introduced in the State Senate in 1925 to increase the certificate fee of \$2.00 imposed on every student who obtained a certificate to teach. This was promptly opposed by the militant President Marquis of Denton. He estimated that this fee would cost the prospective teachers of the state approximately \$10,000 per annum, and he maintained that this was unfair. He termed it "class legislation and a burden which the teachers should not have imposed upon them."!"

A second bill presented in the Senate at that session would have authorized the State Board of Education to engage in visitation, standardization, and classification of the junior colleges and teachers colleges. Again Marquis voiced opposition. He declared that the teachers colleges objected to being "thrown in a class with junior colleges, either private or state-supported." He maintained that teachers colleges should not be set aside for any particular treatment and given a peculiar place outside of the group of state-supported colleges other than teachers colleges. He said that the law creating the board of regents of the teachers colleges specifically required such board to prescribe a course of study and authorized it to issue such certificates as it may deem necessary. He wrote:

We are vigorously opposed to any legislation which will place us under the administration of any other body than the board of regents. There is no more reason why the Department of Education should exercise administration over the Teachers Colleges than over any other state institution, particularly when all of them participate in the function of training teachers under the same certificate law. To authorize the State Board of Education to exercise any administrative power over the Teachers Colleges would be taking a backward step, as is shown by the fact that the first board of these colleges provided that the State Superintendent should be ex-officio a member and president of the board. This provision was repealed by the next

---

<sup>10</sup>His views were expressed in a letter dated February 14, 1925, to Sen. J. W. Reid of Denton, member of the Senate Finance Committee. Copy in **Evans file**.

succeeding Legislature, and we believe it was a wise action.

In 1926 the Texas Educational Commission was organized through the efforts mainly of the Texas State Teachers Association. An invitation was sent to the teachers colleges to send two representatives to sit on this commission, while every state-supported college other than the teachers colleges had a representative for each college. President Marquis wrote R. T. Ellis, Secretary of the T. S. T. A. protesting this discrimination and undertaking to show that the eight teachers colleges each represented a section of the state where the problems of teacher training were distinct from such problems in other areas. Furthermore, the board of regents of the teachers colleges ordered that each teachers college must have its own representative. The request of Marquis was granted in a few days assuring President Marquis that the teachers colleges would have eight representatives—one for each.<sup>20</sup>

Much effort was directed toward what was sometimes called "the education of the legislature," and this effort went on for years. It was evident that the recognition won by the teachers colleges from state, regional, and national agencies made little impression on many of the members of the Texas lawmaking body. On February 17, 1931, President Estill added a postscript to a letter to President Evans:

I cordially approve the suggestion of President Birdwell that we compile the amount of study done by different members of our faculties to advance their scholarship and professional usefulness together with the approximate cost, this information to be ready to present to the committees [of the legislature]. Also, I shall prepare a list of our faculty people who have resigned positions here in order to accept places elsewhere at advanced salaries.

There was no fear or hesitancy on the part of the teachers college presidents to oppose openly any move proposed by a legislator. In 1932 when the Economy and Efficiency Committee, created by the legislature the year before, recommended the abolition of certain state-supported colleges and the concentration of work in others, one reaction was expressed in a letter from President Birdwell, dated December 6, 1932, addressed to

---

<sup>20</sup>Letter from R. T. Ellis, dated February 8, 1926. copy in Evans file.

Presidents Evans, Whitley, Marquis, and Hill, the heads of the other teachers colleges threatened with destruction. He wrote:

On its face the recommendation is absurd. I do not know whether we need take any concerted action about it or not, but so far as I am concerned I am going to do my best to prevent any such program from becoming a policy of the state.

The psychology of the situation favors the program of great retrenchment, and a good many people will be content to see any institution lopped off. I do not think much harm will come of it, but I am wondering if it would not be a good policy to get behind the report of the State Board of Education and try to make it the policy of this state.

The campaign went on constantly whenever and wherever a teachers college president thought he could do some good for the cause. Given here are but scattered samples presented as typical efforts to accomplish the purpose of convincing the legislature of the worth to the state of these schools.

None of the presidents was more forceful or more eloquent than President Hill of Canyon.

In the early days of the regular session of 1927, legislative finance and appropriation committees set up a classification of the state colleges of Texas into three groups, and these were ranked as follows: (1) the University of Texas; (2) the A. and M. College, the College of Industrial Arts, the Texas Technological College; (3) the teachers colleges of Texas. When news of the action of the committees reached the college presidents, most of them, long accustomed to discriminatory acts against them by the legislature, hesitated to take any action, considering such as most likely a waste of time and effort. But President Estill almost immediately, on April 30, wrote letters addressed to the chairmen of the respective committees and sent copies of his letter to every member of those committees. Among other arguments, he submitted the following:

The teachers college is essentially a technological institution established for the purpose of giving students the necessary knowledge of society and its needs and the required skills of teaching. Real teaching has come to be a highly technical and specialized process. It is the finest of the fine arts. As civilization becomes more complex, it must more and more make of its teachers colleges technological institutions whose product becomes more skilled

as time goes by. The teachers college is as much a technical institution as the A. and M. College, the C. I. A., or Texas Tech.

Estill followed up this letter with another on May 7 addressed to the presidents and carrying this message:

Referring to the classification of the teachers colleges in the third class of state colleges, I may state that a copy of my letter of protest to the chairmen of the two committees was sent to each member of both Senate and House Finance Committees. I do not know that anything was accomplished by this protest, but I believe no righteous cause is ever weakened by a vigorous protest against injustice on the part of either its friends or its enemies.

On April 24, 1935, President Hill wrote Senator Clint Small in Austin:

Below I am giving you some of the things I wanted to say to you while I was in Austin.

(1) The teachers colleges resent the discrimination which the appropriation bill carried two years ago and apparently will carry again this time. To be specific, we ought not to carry the lowest salary scale among the senior colleges of the State. Such classification by the Legislature injures these institutions in the public eye. I don't mind being sorry so much, but I don't like being officially stamped sorry by the Legislature of Texas. Discrimination in salaries does just that thing. You know that Sheffy and Condron and Fronabarger<sup>21</sup> and the rest of my bunch here are just as valuable to Texas as are the professors in similar positions in the other institutions of higher learning. I understand that the house bill will probably carry a higher salary for the president at Kingsville and at El Paso than for the teachers colleges. This, again, is official declaration that the teachers colleges are inferior institutions. Aside from any personal interest in this question, I think that such action is contrary to the State's interest and is utterly inexcusable.

(2) The teachers colleges should not be prohibited by law from doing extension work at state expense. Practically all extension work in Texas, except that of A. and M. College, is done for and with teachers. If there is any set of institutions that ought to have a monopoly on it, it is the teachers colleges; and yet we are asked to stay out

---

<sup>21</sup>Hill refers to three of the outstanding members of his faculty, the first named being L. F. Sheffy, head of the History Department at the West Texas State Teachers College at Canyon.

of the field. Now we do not care to spend state money on this, but the law ought not to single us out and discredit us with the people we are supposed to serve. . . .

It was indeed a fair day in the history of education in Texas when the details of the support for the teachers colleges were removed from the mess of pork-barrel and log-rolling politics always broiling on the floors of the House and Senate and placed in the hands of a central board to be determined on the basis of need and with regard to the rightful place these colleges occupied among the senior colleges of the state.

### Even The Political Leaders Of Texas

The wide-ranging eyes of the teachers college presidents let few items published in Texas escape their critical reading. These presidents were keenly alert for any mention of their schools and, in many cases, the slight of being omitted from mention. They read with special eagerness statements of candidates for public office in order to estimate the degree of friendliness which might be expected from these politicians towards education in general and the teaching profession and the teacher-training institutions in particular.

Singularly adept at the discovery of such information was President Estill. After the Democratic convention in San Antonio in September, 1926, Estill wrote a typical response to the announcement of the party platform. He said :

Evidently the Teachers Colleges had no friend at court in the making of the platform adopted by the State Democratic Convention at San Antonio, or else our friends were "asleep at the switch" when the plank relating to higher education was written. Sufficient proof of this statement is shown in the following quotation from said plank: "In the rapid strides Texas is making for leadership among the states of the Union, it is important that we shall have places of learning for our future statesmen, scientists, men and women of arts, farmers and stockmen in Texas, under her control and jurisdiction, and that the institutions of higher learning should be so sustained that there will be no necessity for the young men and young women of Texas to seek a college education beyond the border of our state."

The writer of the above paragraph evidently had in mind the University of Texas, the College of Industrial Arts, the Texas A. and M. College and its branches, and



the Texas Technological College. These institutions are the "places of learning." . . . The eight Teachers Colleges of Texas with their ten thousand students, the future teachers of Texas children, had no place within the vision of these platform builders. The platform declares that it is important that the state provide a suitable place of learning for her future stockmen—who are to be breeders of cattle, horses, and sheep, but leaves us to infer that it is of no importance that the state provide adequate places of learning for the men and women who are prepared to direct the intellectual and spiritual development of her children in the public schools. I do not believe that the men who wrote the plank on higher education were consciously unfriendly to Teachers Colleges, nor would they probably deny the tremendous importance of the work of these institutions. The unjust discrimination in the platform declaration is merely another evidence of a situation that continually confronts us, a persistence of the old notion of the insignificance of the teacher's calling and ignorance of the modern development of the standards and standing of the profession.

The platform declaration is a challenge to the friends of the public schools. In the words of a distinguished and militant Texan: "On with the battle!"

### **At Last, Their Own Faculty**

One has but to examine the turn-over in the faculties of the teachers colleges during the early years to be convinced that many young instructors accepted positions in these schools merely as an opportunity to gain experience, securing employment elsewhere at the first offer of higher pay. Much of the effort to convince faculty members of the "mission" of the teachers colleges was directed toward these members at faculty meetings. This was particularly true with President Evans. He placed great emphasis on the idea of proper attitude toward the work of the College in training teachers. Unless a faculty member believed in the importance of teacher training, he frequently told faculty members, that instructor should seek another position. Once in a while there was much ado over the event when a young and promising faculty member turned down an offer of employment in an arts college.

An illustration of this appeared at Canyon in 1928. On the 24th of January, President Hill, somewhat jubilantly, reported such an occasion. He made copies of letters that passed

between one of his young teachers, Dr. Albert Barnett, and the dean of the A. and M. College at Stillwater, Oklahoma. The letter from the Oklahoma A. and M. College urged the Canyon professor to come to Stillwater and gave arguments to show the bright future for the young teacher there, compared with his opportunities at a teachers college. The other letter was from Dr. Barnett declining the offer and telling the offeror, among other things, that the teachers colleges represented a "virgin field in higher education that needs mapping." While he deplored the "niggardly appropriations the public gives," he said he knew these schools would grow to maturity and "in doing so they will present a very interesting field of endeavor. I have decided to remain here." This incident was, of course, to the teachers college presidents, a delightful omen for the future.

Among the alumni there have been many protestations of love and admiration for the teachers colleges, but the fact remains that even those who have held degrees from teachers colleges all these years have found themselves unconsciously in an apologetic attitude when they were called upon to name their Alma Mater. When the writer was a graduate student at Louisiana State University, he was offered a position as a regular instructor there. The salary was a little less than that of the position at Southwest Texas from which he was on leave of absence. He wrote to a former schoolmate, a graduate of Southwest Texas, Henry Pochman, also a former associate professor at Louisiana, asking him for advice. Pochman replied that the prestige of a university of liberal arts would make it worth while to accept the position at Louisiana, even at a lower salary, since there would be a better future there than in a teachers college. The advice was difficult for this writer to comprehend after his long service as secretary to President Evans in which he had been steeped in the lore of the teaching profession and in the faith of his great employer in the future of the College.

Perhaps the greatest asset the teachers colleges have, or, for that matter, any institution of higher learning has, is its distinguished alumni throughout the nation. And with this asset, the former teachers colleges are well on their way to achievement of status everywhere.

## IX BRING BACK THE WAYWARD

### First The Preview

When C. E. Evans assumed command at the Southwest Texas State Normal School in September 1911, he inherited from his predecessor an elaborate list of rules and regulations governing the conduct of students. Although he was somewhat amazed at the complexity of the rules and questioned the fairness and feasibility of enforcement of some of them, he thought it the better part of wisdom not to undertake to make any changes for the first year.. The reputation of Principal Harris as a disciplinarian went beyond the confines of the campus at San Marcos.

In October of that year he received an inquiry from R. B. Cousins, president of the West Texas State Normal School at Canyon, and Evans took the time to explain the rules which he had found and to make comments on them. On October 18, he wrote:

The Southwest Texas State Normal seems to have worked out through evolution and authority a system of rules and regulations that, in many respects, are drastic, but in other respects are reasonable. As a whole the system seems to be founded upon "the big stick" and blind obedience, neither of which should have a place in a State Normal School, but both of which, in view of the tremendous responsibility of taking care of 430 girls and 150 boys, I am unwilling to change until I have worked out a proper philosophy for discipline in this school.

So far as social relations of students in the Southwest Texas State Normal are concerned, Normal boys are permitted to call upon Normal girls without any limits unless they attempt to single out certain girls and devote a very large per cent of their spare time to those particular girls. In other words, when a young man loses interest in his work and takes on an absorbing interest in one certain girl, our policy will be to insist that he has forfeited his right to social privileges because he has abused the right.

So far as the young men in town are concerned, they are permitted under certain restrictions to call upon the Normal girls provided in each case they obtain the permission of the Principal. I have also found it advisable to name one day or part of a day during which to give these

permissions; otherwise, I lose a large part of Saturday evening or Sunday evening when I might be resting or studying. It has even been found necessary in San Marcos to refuse permission to certain young men living in the town because these young men did not prove themselves to be the kind of young men that should be in the company of Normal girls.

So far, we have not given permission to any of our students to attend dances, but we have not limited them in attendance upon "parties," provided these parties are held on Saturday evenings.

We do not permit our students to attend carnivals, picture shows, or other such entertainments unless they obtain the proper permission from the faculty. We have little doubt that this is a wise regulation for the San Marcos Normal, in view of the fact that the proprietor of the picture show does not take the proper care in the kind of films exhibited.

I am of the opinion that the correct solution of social matters in a State Normal School is found in the employment of a Dean of Women, and that greater responsibility should be vested in the proprietors of boarding houses, holding them to strict accountability for the proper discharge of their duties. This would mean that all who refuse to cooperate for the protection of Normal students be denied the privilege of keeping Normal boarders. While this appears at first sight to be drastic, it appears to me to be a very satisfactory solution.

I am not at all satisfied with the system that prevails in this school, but I am not inclined to change it until I work out in a concrete way something better. . . .

The foregoing letter seems to delineate rather clearly the problem faced by President Evans at that time and also to present a few of his ideas as to possible solution. At least, it reveals the awful burden of detailed supervision of the social affairs of students weighing upon the shoulders of the principal. In the letter, also, Evans forecast the employment of a dean of women to assume responsibility for the social conduct of the girls, but not yet was there even in the future a plan to lift the task of supervision of the boys from the head of the school.

One cannot help, however, pondering the values accruing to the head of an institution of higher learning from these close personal contacts with that young generation verging on adulthood and mature citizenship. To Evans, this meant personal

acquaintance with almost every student enrolled in the school and meant many lifetime friendships. Moreover, it set a pattern of relationships with his students which the president undertook to keep intact for the rest of his days in office.

The incidents related in these pages and the situations faced by C. E. Evans and his fellow faculty members are intended in no sense to reveal administrative strengths or weaknesses, but to be a factual exposition needed to complete the picture presented.

Most disciplinary measures were taken because of the constant and weighty responsibility which the college administration felt for the boys and girls who had been entrusted, so they felt, by their parents to their care. From the very hour of a student's arrival to the moment of safe departure for home, the student was deemed to be in the care of the College. Even during the interval between the close of final examinations and the award of certificates and diplomas at the end of a term, concern for these young people weighed heavily upon President Evans. On May 3, 1919, he wrote President Estill of Huntsville as follows:

. . . In the event we had final examinations, I should be inclined to require students to return to their homes in all cases where such students are not expecting certificates. I doubt the advisability of holding in the Normal School during commencement when there is a large number of students who are not entitled to certificates or diplomas. It is an invitation to disciplinary troubles. At the same time, it is also true that the closing exercises have an educational value; but I doubt the wisdom of making attendance at these exercises compulsory.

It may be of some interest to recall that in later years Evans adopted the procedure of administering final examinations to graduating seniors ahead of regular schedule and then conducting the commencement exercises before the final examinations for all other students. This plan, of course, permitted all students to attend the graduating exercises and eliminated the idle time for undergraduate students mentioned in his letter to Estill,

#### Student Publications

Entirely outside of the problem of social conduct of students, other occasions for control and disciplinary measures abounded. Among these problems, were those connected with

student publications—The College *Star*, student newspaper, and The Pedagog, the year book. On some of these problems, Evans sought the advice of his friend, senior. in years and experience, President Estill of Huntsville. On October 30, 1918, he asked Estill:

What faculty control do you have over student publications? What do you do to prevent such dangers as "Blunderbuss" and "Cactus" at the University? I am inclined to believe a faculty committee working with a student committee is the probable solution. I will appreciate an opinion from you.

Thus the student-faculty committee was the method adopted by Evans which proved effective throughout the years.

The Pedugog: The main worries caused by the Pedugog were nurtured and produced in the "Catsclaw" section containing the usual jibes, a good many of which went beyond what were considered then the bounds of propriety. In a few instances the faculty sponsor, or, more properly, the censor, was evaded by material, bootlegged to the printer along with approved matter, which found its way into print. Usually the pages on which this objectionable raillery appeared were cut out and removed from the book by order of President Evans before any copy of the annual was mailed out "officially." This was too late, however, to prevent the objectionable matter from reaching the hands of students. Moreover, the files of the library, for some reason, without exception received unexpurgated copies over which later generations of students have chuckled. On occasion this cutting out of pages was an expensive and tedious process which delayed the arrival of the annual to those on the mailing list of the president of the College.

Although probably little worse than other editions of the Pedagog, the 1930 "Catsclaw" section was particularly loathsome to President Evans, and he stopped the distribution of the book to all high school libraries, to the other presidents, and to the members of the board of regents; it was not until November that the copies were "cleaned of the filth," as Evans remarked, and put in the mail. He wrote the following letter to the regents to explain the delay:

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the Pedagog, our student annual of 1930. Through the failure of proper censorship at the right time, the Pedugog con-

tained a number of pages which aroused bitter resentment among our students, and I do not consider fit to be in any college publication mailed. This explains the omission of certain pages and the delay in sending out the annual, which usually reaches you about June 1.

A few days later Evans received an acknowledgement from A. B. Mayhew of the board of regents, as follows:

I have received a copy of the *Pedagog* and find it apparently up to your usual high standard.

Dr. Morelock of Alpine has a member of his faculty who has been putting out a new book which he cannot endorse, and he thinks he has a problem on his hands in deciding whether he should dispense with this man's services or not. He might expurgate the objectionable leaves as you did in this copy of the Annual.

Thus, Evans had the satisfaction of believing that his solution had met with the approval of the president of the board of regents.<sup>1</sup>

*The College Star*: The *Star* gave more trouble than did the college annual, mainly because it appeared more often and was a better means of expressing current student opinion. As in other segments of society, it was the dissatisfied among students who wanted to give voice to their opinions.

No better picture of the niche occupied by the *Star* in the life of the College at that time can be presented than was given by President Evans in a letter dated March 31, 1922, addressed to A. C. Goeth of Austin, president of the board of regents:

I am submitting a report regarding trouble with students in the matter of student publications which I believe will be of interest to the members of the Board of Normal Regents.

For more than ten years, our students, under general faculty oversight, have issued a weekly publication, "The Normal Star." At all times, it has been definitely agreed that the *Star* is a cooperative publication representing not only the students but the school as well, and that, therefore, the editors must not use the columns of the paper to antagonize the policies of the Normal College, or to criti-

---

<sup>1</sup> As a footnote, only, it is recorded here that the 1930 *Pedagog* was dedicated to President Evans as follows: "To an understanding leader in clean, sportsmanlike living—to a character beautiful in genuine simplicity and friendship—to a sympathetic friend of cultural and social influence—and—to a man, President Cecil E. Evans, we lovingly dedicate this—the *Pedagog* of 1930."

cize and condemn faculty action. Written instructions are given annually to cut out all personal thrusts and criticisms and to publish a paper which is thoroughly representative of the best elements of institutional life.

Early in the fall term, the editors of the *Normal Star* became antagonistic to the enforcement of certain school policies. If our Dean of Students corrected a group of boys and girls for improprieties, the *Star*, in its columns, condemned the action of the Dean. The editors of the *Star* even published objectionable matter against the advice of the Dean. When it appeared certain that the management of the *Star* would not publish the kind of student paper that would be constructive and helpful to the institution, the President promptly took the *Normal Star* out of the hands of the editors, vesting direction and control in a responsible faculty member for the censorship of all student communications. Neither now, nor at any other time, do we think the Normal College can permit the continuance of publications of a Bolshevik journal, in which, to use slang, the students and teachers "pull hair," or "wash dirty linen in public," or ape "yellow journalism." We refuse to let obstreperous students "rock the boat." In spite of the efforts of agitators, the best students approve our action and are in sympathy with our policy governing school publications. Our victory for clean school journalism is complete.

A perusal of the *College Star* for the session of 1921-22 does not reveal as bad a situation as Evans portrayed in his letter to Regent Goeth. Ben Baines, the student editor, wrote several editorials on student self-government that were critical of the administration for being slow in agreeing that a system of student government be tried out. He opened the editorial columns to any student or faculty member who desired to express an opinion on the subject. The campaign by Baines had a tinge of defiance of college authority which Evans could not bear at that time. Professor Gates Thomas, head of the English department, was placed in charge of the *Star*, replacing W. I. Woodson, at that time dean of men, and Baines was removed as editor-in-chief. However, Baines was allowed to remain as assistant under the supervision of Professor Thomas.

Two years later on February 29, 1924, Evans wrote President Estill in further explanation of the supervision exercised over the *Star*, as follows:

Our college paper is under general faculty supervision.



The student council and faculty representatives select the staff. We have found it advisable to approve or censor a copy before going to press. There is nothing inadvisable, unwise, or dangerous in the censoring of school papers. Any college adopting any other policy than that of reasonable censorship will come to grief. The editor and business manager receive financial compensation. I think this is a wise thing to do.

The faculty member who was designated by President Evans to assume responsibility for the *Star* frequently had to walk a tight rope between allowing reasonable freedom in the expression of opinion on the part of students and incurring the objections of Evans. This responsibility was passed from one faculty member (always men) to another. In some instances other pressing duties gave the faculty member an excuse for asking for release from the sponsorship of the *Star*. In other instances Evans removed the faculty member for his own reasons, usually after the latter had failed to enforce as rigid censorship as Evans demanded. In the early years the task more or less gravitated to the dean of men. As noted in the letter quoted above to A. C. Goeth, W. I. Woodson, dean of men, also had responsibility for faculty control over the *Star*. Later Woodson's successor, H. E. Speck, carried this responsibility. Also, for a time, Gates Thomas, as an experiment, took over sponsorship of the *Star* as a class project in language and art. Under his supervision, the *Star* became more a literary than a news periodical.

In the early thirties when the "Black Stars" and the "White Stars"<sup>2</sup> had become bitter rivals in campus politics, and "El Toro," the column considered to be the domain of the editor, turned into a diatribe of the strongest kind by whichever party had succeeded in electing an editor, President Evans found the situation getting out of his control, in spite of his many conferences with the faculty sponsor. He then appointed me to supervise the *Star* in order, I think, to give him closer contact with the editing of the paper. I was then part-time secretary and teacher, dividing my time about equally between the two jobs. As secretary, I was more directly bound under the president's orders than would have been a regular faculty member.

---

<sup>2</sup> The organization of the "White Stars" has been credited to Lyndon B. Johnson while he was an undergraduate student.

With this arrangement, President Evans had daily contact with the paper through me and could, without formality or possible embarrassment, obtain information which he desired concerning the activity and thinking of the editor. Moreover, swift correction could be ordered when an error was made.

President Evans became progressively more critical of the type of material produced by student talent for the Star; he disliked criticism in any form, whether of class schedules, dormitory or cafeteria regulations, or of the conduct of other students. One regulation, in particular—the provisions for reporting class absences and penalties for them—which Dean Nolle attempted to enforce, provoked such criticism that it was all I could do to keep the editor out of trouble. Time after time I consulted with the editor and his assistants and persuaded them to change the wording of an editorial from a direct charge that the dean was lying to a question of the purposes of the dean and whether the shortcomings of the system, as the students saw the situation, were the real intention of the dean.

Even this kind of supervision did not please President Evans. Why, he would demand of me, did students wish to make these implied statements of their dissatisfactions? As a matter of fact, if I could have made him understand that while the students were letting off pressure, we were keeping them satisfied in their freedom of expression with no real harm being done, he might have resigned himself to the fact that, as in many other instances, students must be taken as they are.

One of the most popular teachers in the College at that time was L. N. (Deacon) Wright, professor of English, doctor of philosophy, a liberal in thought and conduct, and a participant in numerous student activities. President Evans was not long in recognizing the potential value of a man so close to the students in so many ways. His conferences with Wright became more frequent and cordial. I was sincerely in hope that Evans would transfer to Wright my responsibilities for the Star, but months passed and it did not seem to occur to him to do so. Then one day Evans reprimanded me, mildly, for certain conduct reported to have occurred in the Star office at a time when I was not there. I felt sure at once that Wright had been the president's informant. Thereafter at every opportunity I mentioned Wright to President Evans as one who had

close contact with student affairs; finally I made the outright suggestion that the English professor was in position to do an excellent job as faculty sponsor of the *Star*.

Within a week Wright was appointed to succeed me. I thanked him very cordially for taking over the burden, an expression of gratitude which at that time seemed to puzzle him.

An editor of the *Star* certainly cannot be a lazy person, either mentally or physically. In my opinion, the College has always been fortunate in securing a fine type of student editor. While I was a freshman, I joined the *Star* staff as a free lance writer under the excellent editor Henry Pochmann. Through the years my writings have frequently "seen daylight" in the columns of the *Star*. Thus until recently I became personally acquainted with almost every student who held the position of editor. The College has, fortunately, been spared the distressing controversies between editors and the College administration which are not unknown at the University of Texas.

### **The College And The Town**

Change in customs has eliminated many early-day problems of discipline. For example, in 1919 the question of permitting students to attend dances was a big issue which later disappeared as dancing was approved by parents for their sons and daughters.

At that time, also, there was a widespread distrust of fraternities. On April 17, 1919, President Evans replied to a letter from President Bruce of Denton as follows:

I have your letter of April 15 in regard to the introduction of fraternities in the State Normal Schools of Texas.

If I am correctly informed, the Phi Delta Kappa fraternity does not adhere to the honorary principle, while the Kappa Delta Pi does admit students upon the honorary basis. Before making final judgment, however, I must investigate one other point; does the Kappa Delta Pi society maintain genuine collegiate standards for admission? As soon as I have given this matter thorough consideration, I will write you. Certainly, the introduction of the ordinary fraternity in the State Normal College will invite legitimate criticism and perhaps lead to legislative action. You will remember on two occasions, the Legislature of Texas has almost passed a bill forbidding the continuance of secret fraternities in the University.

When the College had no dormitories and used a system of privately-owned boarding houses, discipline was sometimes a very difficult matter. Moreover, the problem of discipline is always intensified when there are numbers of students living away from the campus in their own homes. In spite of all theories to the contrary, a college or university administration cannot maintain the same control over students when only part of them are living on the campus; and the problem becomes still more difficult when there are numbers of young people of college age who endeavor to establish or maintain social relations with enrolled students. In San Marcos there have always been large numbers of resident students enrolled in the College, and there have been throughout the years many drop-outs who lived in San Marcos or who remained in town after severing their connection with the College. The fast growth of enrollment in the early twenties added to the difficulty of enforcing rules. This situation at the College was described and explained by President Evans in a report to the board of regents dated September 2, 1921:

The Dean of Women regularly visits boarding houses, confers with boarding house keepers and students, and endeavors by sound advice and wise counsel to maintain wholesome conditions in all boarding houses. At the opening of each term, and on other suitable occasions during the year, the girls are assembled in the Normal College auditorium, at which time the Dean of Women explains thoroughly the standards of the institution, and seeks to enlist the interest and cooperation of the students in this way. It is believed that a very large per cent of the students become loyal supporters of the rules and regulations adopted by the Dean of Women and faculty for the protection of the best interests of the young women.

Four years ago, at the suggestion of the President, each class elected a member of the Student Welfare Committee, now known as the Student Council. This council confers freely with the President, Dean of Women, and Dean of Men and other faculty members, regarding those matters affecting the best interests of the young women and young men. During the summer of 1921, the young women of the summer school, upon the advice of our Deans, organized and appointed a committee for the investigation of the situation in the Normal College, or outside of the Normal College, so far as it affects our students. At the same time, the young men, upon the advice

of our Deans, appointed a similar committee to cooperate with the girls' committee. These committees afford a dependable avenue through which to obtain reliable information, and are developing a strong sentiment among our citizens and our students for better safeguarding the interests of all young men and young women.

In this connection we may add that the citizens of San Marcos, early in the summer of 1921, appointed a committee for the purpose of assisting our administrative force in properly and adequately taking care of our students. The Citizens Committee has given us some very helpful information, and, in our judgment, will be very valuable in the future. The Deans confer very freely with the faculty members, student committees, other students, citizens, and the Citizens Committee and boarding house keepers so as to keep informed as to what is going on among students. Faculty members are requested to throw the weight of their influence to assist the Deans in the accomplishment of wholesome results in the lives of students. From experience extending over a number of years, we are inclined to the view that faculty members can assist by example as well as precept in the growth of desirable conditions.

. . . For the summer of 1921, our disciplinary problem was aggravated by the large number of boarding students, some of whom were in homes under crowded conditions. Mrs. W. I. Woodson, acting Dean of Women, devoted her entire time to the work of properly caring for all the girls, and discharging the duties incumbent upon her with courage, fidelity, tact and efficiency. Under all circumstances, I believe we were able to take care of students as satisfactorily and as efficiently as was any other state institution with so large a number of boarding students.

At an early date, President Evans was confronted with the situation in which town boys would seek dates with the College girls. If an infraction of rules occurred, Evans could only discipline the girl, who, he felt in most instances, to be the lesser of the guilty parties. To aggravate the situation, there was, by today's standards, a scarcity of places of entertainment which were satisfactory to the College administration. Lack of supervision available, as indicated in Evans' letter to President Cousins, put the motion picture shows off limits. For the same reasons, Rio Vista Park was disapproved. Riverside Park (now Sewell Park) on the banks of the San Marcos River, under the absolute control of the College and with faculty super-

vision, was publicized to the students, and they were urged to go there; but this recreation could be taken only in suitable weather, for it was entirely in open air. The College personnel managed to string a few dim lights at the park, and it was fairly popular during the warm months and especially during the summer session.

As many of the alumni of the College know well, there was a trouble spot situated directly along the way from the campus to Riverside, and that was the fish hatchery, an area of, perhaps, two or more square blocks. There were concrete walks, and the grounds around the fish ponds were kept attractively mowed. There were no lights at night, and it was by no means a rare occurrence for couples to stray into the grounds instead of going to Riverside. A severe penalty awaited any students who were found guilty of this impropriety. There were a few near-tragedies and numerous cases of discipline growing out of the fish-hatchery temptation. Again, a change of custom eliminated, at least to a large extent, this trouble spot. With the widespread use of automobiles, dark nooks accessible to pedestrians lost a great share of their appeal to college students.

### **The "Bobcat"**

Every college once had an off-campus hangout where students could step outside the jurisdiction of deans. The best known example in Texas is the "Drag" at the University. At Louisiana State University it was "Tiger Town." Such a place was the "Bobcat," located on the west side of North Austin Street (now Lyndon B. Johnson Drive) where the Evans Academic Center now stands. A second, less popular place, "Galbreath's" was located where Laurel Hall now stands. In those days there was no student center or other place on college property where students might obtain refreshments and entertainment. The "Bobcat" was owned and operated by brothers, Leland and John Coers—both students of the College.

Occasionally President Evans would be told that certain events had happened at the "Bobcat"; for example, that students drinking there had been put out of the place by the management. At another time someone informed Evans that missing cafeteria dishes were alleged to have been seen in use there. All

in all, the place was conducted in a very satisfactory manner; but nevertheless, it was a loafing place for idlers, which Evans very much wanted to eliminate.

Several moves were made by Evans to counteract the influence of these off-campus attractions. He authorized the establishment of a student store to be operated by students, the profits of which were to go to student welfare purposes. Here soft drinks were sold and the usual gewgaws which interest young people. But at first no smoking was allowed, and no coffee was served. However, the latter omission was hardly a cause for trouble, as the national habit of a between-meal coffee-break had not, in those early days, taken such a firm hold on the population. This combination textbook library and store, called the College Exchange, lasted to the end of the Evans Administration.

Motion pictures, traveling entertainers, and lecturers were brought to the campus, all offered to students in return for what was called a blanket tax, a fixed sum collected from each student; and this fee entitled the student to a session-long ticket to all attractions on the campus, including football games and all other athletic contests and debates.

### Other Worries

The advent of the automobile multiplied discipline problems for the College administration. President Evans' famous "Redbook," a vest-pocket memorandum always available for reference,<sup>3</sup> had numerous notes which he used at general assembly to warn girls and boys not to sit in cars; and a girl was strictly forbidden to go "car riding" with a boy. The use of cars caused worry also because of the din which was loosed in the early hours of night as the cars, sans mufflers, labored up the steep College Hill and then roared down the hill with cut-outs wide open. Letters from the other presidents revealed the same nuisance at other colleges. The files of the dean of women were stocked with the records of disciplinary measures against those guilty of infraction of the rules against car riding.

Under the authority of President Evans, discipline took on several different forms. Removal of social privileges was the most common for minor misdeeds. In the spring of 1922 the

---

<sup>3</sup> See Chapter II.

College administration found it necessary to cancel scheduled debates with two other colleges, Huntsville and Canyon, as a means of punishment not only of certain debaters, one in particular, but of others who were causing trouble. To understand better the gravity of this act on the part of the administration, one has to recall that debates at the College were at that time, and for more than a decade later, one of the most popular of college contests, ranking in the earlier years ahead of even football. Imagine the effect of the cancellation of a scheduled football game now, and the effect of debate cancellation on the students then can be seen. The situation was explained in letters dated April 1 and April 7, to President Estill of Huntsville. The first of these letters follows:

It is a matter of sincere regret to me to inform you that an internal situation compels us to cancel our engagement with you for intercollegiate debates in April. For a number of reasons, I prefer not to make a full statement in a letter. As a matter of discipline absolutely essential to the maintenance of the integrity of our institution, we are driven to take this step. I am sure you will appreciate the conditions that force us to such a course. As soon as we are together in the Council of Presidents, I can give you a full statement.

In the second letter, written six days later, Evans had evidently changed his mind about making a "full" statement by mail. This letter was in response to an urgent question from President Estill as to whether the cancellation had been ordered on account of any conduct by representatives of the Sam Houston State Normal College. Evans replied as follows:

The intercollegiate debates have been handled with us through the boys' literary societies. A bolshevik group of students got charge of the societies this year and compelled drastic action on our part. We cancelled debates with you and Canyon for internal disciplinary reasons. There was nothing else for us to do under the circumstances if we were to maintain the integrity and the morals of the Normal College.

There is in no wise any charge or suspicion of unfairness so far as the representatives of other Normal Colleges are concerned. Our action was taken solely on account of a serious situation with us. By taking such action we have protected our institution against radical student leaders in the future.



## Summer Was A Tough Time

The summer session was in many respects the most important session of the year. Suddenly the fairly quiet Hill became a beehive of humanity. The boarding houses were crowded beyond capacity, and desirable places to live were always scarce. Anyone with a spare room for rent during the summer session could fill it with a tenant. Business in town boomed.

In maturity and seriousness of purpose, the average summer school student was superior to the average student of the regular session. But this fact brought worries to the president as it became impossible to control the activities of summer students in the same manner as was done during the regular session. There were among these mature people a lesser number of beginning students just out of high school and away from home for the first time. For these younger ones the administration tried to preserve an environment comparable to that of the regular session; but the attempt to differentiate between these two types of students, all housed together in the same boarding houses, created, at times, a very painful headache for President Evans. Dean of Women Mary C. Brogdon, as determined and devoted an official as could have been found in her position, confessed to me several times that she was always much relieved when the summer session ended.

## When A Regent Takes Notes

During the first week of February 1924, the San Antonio newspapers appeared with headlines to a story of student riot, or serious disturbance, on the campus of Southwest Texas. The apparent immediate cause of the disturbance was an attempt by upper classmen to break up a party put on by the freshman class. However, the stories as carried by the newspapers enlarged upon this incident and related the existence of widespread dissatisfaction with the regulations imposed by the girls' boarding houses. The stories depicted a bad situation all round.

It happened that on February 6, the evening when the fracas took place between the upper classmen and the freshmen, there was a program of classical music presented in the college auditorium in the Main Building, and M. O. Flowers of Lockhart, president of the board of regents, and members of his family had been invited to the affair and were present as sounds of the

disturbance were heard during the program. At the close of the entertainment, the Flowers group witnessed part of the action taking place on the campus.

The next day Flowers wrote Evans as follows:

I am of the opinion that you need to exercise some strict discipline on some of the upper classmen who were guilty of interfering with the freshman entertainment last night. There never will be any way to have strict discipline in a school and guarantee against hazing until it is strictly understood that any body of classmen from freshman up can have their entertainments with perfect freedom from interference by other classmen. I am bitterly opposed to the pranks as played by students against each other, and have ceased to see the joke when I hear of such things and feeling that way about it. I think you should make an effort to put a stop to just such occurrences as happened last night. I am not fully advised as to just what did happen, because all my information came from you and from the glaring headlines of that worthless San Antonio paper. However, that information is sufficient for me to say that, in my opinion, sufficient did happen that severe punishment should be meted out to somebody. I hope that you have not passed the whole matter over just as a student joke.

President Evans made immediate reply to this letter with its implied criticism:

Any act of students, the purpose of which is to disturb another group of students holding a meeting of any kind is objectionable and has possibilities of danger. I sometimes tell a group of students that such conduct is explosive and, therefore extremely hazardous for the College as well as for the students.

Our Deans and Faculty Committee have been working together this week gathering all the facts they can bearing on the affair of Monday evening. We have never passed over these incidents as mere pranks or jokes.

. . . I do not know why the San Antonio papers publish such sensational stories. Very few citizens of San Marcos are in sympathy with the criticism or attacks upon the College. Our best students resent the absurd stories.

After the appearance of the newspaper stories mentioned, a "Petition of Support" for the College was signed by sixteen San Marcos business and professional men supporting and approving "the general policy of the Teachers College in the government of the student body. . . . The recent newspaper attack

on the school and its president is both deplorable and unwarranted." This petition was apparently the product of the local chamber of commerce, as the first two signers were the president and vice-president of that body.

### Estill To **The Rescue**

In the midst of this trouble, Evans received support from an unexpected source. Upon reading the newspaper stories, President Estill of Huntsville, perhaps sensing that the head of the board of regents might be unduly concerned, wrote the following letter to M. O. Flowers and sent a copy to President Evans. This letter is self-evident in showing its purpose to rescue a friend in need; and, at the same time, it clearly stated a policy which was enforced at San Marcos and, without doubt, at every other Texas State Teachers College:

Dear Judge Flowers: A recent issue of the Dallas *News* contains under somewhat sensational headlines an article from San Marcos stating in effect that President Evans and the authorities of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College were being severely censured by local citizens for their policy in forbidding women students to eat at public restaurants. The article further indicated that the matter would be taken up with you as President of the Board of Regents, and that court action might result.

Believing that it may be helpful to you in your consideration of this matter to know the experience of another State Teachers College along this line, I am taking the liberty of writing you. While this institution has no dormitories, it has been the established policy from the founding of the school that the college administration shall have general control over students in their rooming and eating places. Men and women students are not permitted to lodge or to eat at the same place. No students are permitted to lodge or eat at a place that is not approved by the college authorities. This approval is based upon the moral surroundings at the rooming or eating house, its sanitary conditions, its freedom from distractions that would interfere with study, and upon its general adaptability to promote the physical, intellectual and moral welfare of the student. Not infrequently in my own experience as president of this institution students have been informed that they cannot board at some designated place on account of the failure of the place to meet requirements or because of lack of spirit or cooperation on the part of landlord or landlady in up-

holding and enforcing college regulations. We have found this policy to be absolutely essential to the maintenance of proper standards of conduct among young men and young women, and it has been recognized and accepted by the best people of this community.

As to women students eating at restaurants, I may state that before we had a college cafeteria women students were not permitted to board at hotels or to eat at public restaurants except by special permission granted by the Dean of Women in rare cases of mature women who had some special reason for the privilege. Before this regulation was adopted we had found that traveling men and transients at hotels and public eating places were disposed to take advantage of young and inexperienced girls and that imprudent, not to say, scandalous, conduct sometimes resulted. Since the establishment of our cafeteria, we have continued this policy. Women students are not permitted to get their meals at public restaurants. These restaurants are frequented by transients. When college girls are permitted to eat at a public restaurant, the place becomes a resort for irresponsible characters, loafers of the town, and others. Improper associations are formed with possibilities of disastrous results. I repeat that the control of the college authorities over the eating places as well as the sleeping quarters of women students is absolutely essential to the maintenance of proper standards and is necessary for the protection of our young women.

I may add that I have had occasion to remind our local people in past years that this is a state institution and does not belong to the town in which it is located. Neither restaurants nor picture shows nor other local enterprises, however worthy, have any right to exploit the students of this institution. I take it that the Board of Regents expects me and the other presidents of the State Teachers College to adopt and to enforce seasonable regulations for the protection of our young women students. The fathers who send their daughters here have a right to expect this much of us, regardless of the financial interests of local people. Very sincerely yours.

There is no record that M. O. Flowers, after receiving Estill's letter, ever again made the slightest criticism of Evans' management.

As a sort of follow-up of the trouble in February, President Evans made a report to the regents on August 25, 1924. In this report he asked for the formal support of the regents for the

college policy of prohibiting women students from lodging or eating at public hotels or restaurants. The report follows:

During the annual session many problems arise affecting the discipline of young women. The difficulties mainly grow out of troubles in boarding houses. Upon the advice of the President, our Dean of Women, Miss Mary C. Brogdon, has enforced a more advanced policy during the past year, and plans to exercise even more careful supervision and strict control for another year. In boarding houses across town and several blocks from the College, mature women only will be assigned for boarding in mixed boarding houses, where men and women other than college students are boarding, special assignments of students only will be made at the discretion of the Dean of Women; in boarding houses where College regulations are not enforced or where the Dean of Women does not receive cooperation, changes will be made at the discretion of the Dean of Women. So far as practicable preference will be given to boarding houses near the College. The girls will not be assigned to boarding houses at some distance from the College or in a mixed boarding house. In all cases, changes in boarding houses and assignments to boarding houses will be made at the discretion of the Dean of Women. A similar policy will be pursued by H. E. Speck, Dean of Men, in handling situations for boys.

The Board of Normal Regents is requested to give formal approval to these policies.

### **That Bad Year, 1925**

*The Ominous Beginning:* President Evans was very uneasy over what the future held for the College after the bitter political campaign which resulted in the election of Mrs. Miriam A. (Ma) Ferguson as governor. And, indeed, the year had an ominous beginning. In January there was trouble with a "house mother who took sides with a student" in opposition to the dean of women, who had punished the girl for an infraction of one of the many rules enforced in those days. The house mother drummed up sympathy for the girl by visiting a boys' dormitory and relating the story of the dean's alleged cruelty. The woman apparently became inspired in her role as champion of the poor, disciplined students. She called on students under discipline, giving them advice about their supposed rights and suggesting their defense against the College authorities. For a time she basked in the favor of a considerable number of students. She

finally went so far as to call a meeting of dissatisfied students, to give them an opportunity to state their grievances in public against the dean of women. Her dismissal came shortly as a matter of course.

President Evans had a remarkable ability to obtain information about all that was going on in the college community. It has been difficult for this writer to believe that among the College faculty or other employees, or among other students, anyone was ever directly requested to be an informer for the president. But human nature being what it is, there might be a logical conclusion that an executive could easily find sources of information needed to perform the duties of his office. The willingness of subordinates to be of help to a superior, and thus gain favor, seems to be one of those facts which are accepted but need neither be discussed nor advertised. At least it was the case with President Evans; he managed to secure and store away in the Redbook everything he needed to know.

There is no intention here to imply that President Evans created a spy system any more than would be present in the office of the manager of a business enterprise or in, that of any other head of a school. An executive must have knowledge, especially if he is to handle matters of discipline with justice and intelligence.

One trait of Evans' personality was his willingness to listen when employees or students wanted to talk to him. And without a doubt he gained considerable information without the necessity of requesting it. Much of the information which he recorded in his Redbook could have been gained only at second hand. But even in the secure privacy of the pages of the Redbook, Evans never divulged the source of his information.

*Dean Brogdon And The Boarding Houses:* A few weeks after the episode which brought about the dismissal of the house mother, a disturbance of major proportions flared into eruption almost over night. Dean Brogdon was the target of the student protests. She was of the old school of strict disciplinarians who believed that the only way to have order was to enforce rules to the last letter. She had good judgment and tact on most subjects concerning students, but in the matter of boy-girl social relations on the campus she was obdurate. To her the social relations between the sexes were, at best, dangerous, though unavoidable, trouble spots of campus life which demanded the

strictest regulations. Like President Evans, she had means of garnering information. In the absence of dormitories for the majority of her charges, she had to rely upon privately-owned boarding houses, the owners of which agreeing to act as "house mothers" under Miss Brogdon's control.

The system of boarding houses itself, with the investment and financial risk assumed by the owners of these houses, made efficient and just enforcement of rules only a remote possibility. The unfortunate "house mother" was continually torn between the necessity of keeping her rooms full of students and keeping her house on Miss Brogdon's approved list. If the house mothers were too strict, girls would ask permission to transfer; and her income, meager at best, would dwindle. If she were too lenient, Miss Brogdon would take all the girls away and remove the house from the approved roster. It became, therefore, the mode of procedure in dealing with the girls for the house mother to lay the blame for any hated regulation upon Miss Brogdon.

The standard punishment meted out by the dean was to "campus" a girl, which meant the removal of all social privileges and confinement of the girl to the campus. No going to town, no picture shows, no dates—nothing but classes, meals at the College cafeteria, library study, and back to the boarding house.

The ultimate spark that ignited the tinder of rebellion was the camping of several popular girls all at the same time. Naturally, the boys joined in the protest, and a committee of students presented charges against Dean Brogdon to President Evans. The students wrote pages of accusations, among which were those of spying by Miss Brogdon. In every dark corner the students imagined the shadowy form of the dean watching—always with cat-like stealth. They even pictured Miss Brogdon, a sturdy woman who barely managed to keep her weight within desirable bounds, of dressing in men's clothing and disguising herself as a Mexican laborer. The very difficulty of Miss Brogdon's accomplishing this feat did not seem to make this accusation seem absurd to any student.

President Evans, it is true, had been afflicted with some misgivings concerning the dean of women's harsh discipline. He, therefore, made a show of granting hearings to all students who wished to make a statement. Underlying all the testimony Evans could well see that part of the dissatisfaction was due to the lack of courteous treatment by Miss Brogdon; for example, her

charges that a student was lying while being questioned, and her refusal to make any differentiation between upper classmen and freshmen.

When the hearings were all completed, Evans drew up in writing the long list of charges which the students had made and presented them to Miss Brogdon for answers. I had served as stenographer in taking the testimony, and now he assigned me, as one enjoying the confidence of the administration, the job of taking the dictation from Miss Brogdon. She was considerably humiliated by being required to answer every accusation instead of dismissing most of them as too absurd for notice. For the most part, her answer to every charge made by the students was a monotonous denial. Upon the completion of Miss Brogdon's reply to the charges, President Evans, in his usual manner, began to write reports and issue statements.

He took one entire general assembly period to talk to the student body about the matter. He told the assembled students that under the law the pledge, which was printed on each registration card, when signed by the student became a legal contract binding a student to its provisions. From the 1924-25 College catalog, pages 16-17, he read the following:

I hereby subscribe myself a student of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, and, as such, I pledge myself to cheerfully comply, both in letter and in spirit, with the regulations of the College and to help sustain them; to be prompt, decorous, and moral; not to attend any social functions nor engage in any conduct that, in the judgment of the President or the faculty, interferes with my work as a student or is injurious to the reputation of the College; not to leave college without approval of the proper dean or the President; not to leave town without approval.

I agree to resign my position as a student whenever requested to do so by the President or faculty.

He said, further, that the authority of the president of the College is full and complete if he has given impartial and thorough consideration. Then, referring directly to the recent trouble, he stated that no evidence reflecting upon the personal and professional character of any College official had been presented; that the College had never given approval to a system for spying on students. He pledged fair treatment in the future, but admonished the students that each one must support the standards of the College as he had pledged. He assured the



students that prominence or popularity of a student would never have any bearing on the punishment for one who broke the rules of conduct.

Referring to the charge of harsh and unusual punishment meted out by Miss Brogdon, Evans admitted that no two executives would agree every time regarding the extent of punishment. But the cases in which girls were campused, he declared, were not severe or unreasonable — except in the opinion of students who were opposed to all college regulations.

And finally, he said that if the purpose of the agitation and inflamed state of mind of students was intended to reduce or change the punishment of those under discipline, it was a defiance of constituted authority; if the agitation was intended to bring about the abolition of rules and regulations, the methods adopted by the students were wrong and would accomplish fewer changes than could a small committee of cool-headed students through conference with deans and the president; if the purpose of the agitation was to compel the dismissal of Miss Brogdon, it was useless as well as objectionable.

He declared that the president and faculty committee had acted after consultation with students who were dissatisfied and with those who expressed themselves as favoring what the College was trying to do. He said that the College had given an impartial hearing to both sides. "It is our earnest desire to do the best thing for the College," he said. "We are responsible to the board of regents, to your parents and to Texas for the maintenance of standards of propriety worthy of the best ideals of Christian homes."

He then continued almost pleadingly: "What your sentiment is toward my decision in moments of excitement concerns me, but I am even more concerned that in one, five, or ten years, your second thought and sober judgment may commend me for courage and fidelity in the maintenance of proper standards, for faithful and impartial discharge of a trying and difficult responsibility."

President Evans was not unaware that his dean of women had done a remarkable job under the circumstances. Shortly after the trouble seemed to be ended, he wrote A. B. Martin of Plainview, member of the board of regents, as follows:

... It has been a hard fight to protect our girls against the unscrupulous town boy; the present Dean of Women

has very nearly put the tough town boy out of business, so far as slipping our girls out at night is concerned. A few roughnecks are exceedingly bitter, and are willing to adopt almost any kind of measure to square accounts with our Dean of Women. Everything now seems to have quieted down, and good spirit seems to prevail among our students. Regent Mai-tin's reply carried some interesting overtones:

The situation you describe will probably clear up without any trouble, but if it does not you may be sure that I am behind you. If the authorities do not cooperate with you in protecting the girl students against the over-tough, it might be well for some member of the Board to take the matter up with them.

At Canyon I happened to know that a certain individual was selling whiskey to the students. I sent him word by the King Bee bootlegger what was going to happen to him if it was not cut out, and I haven't heard any further complaint. It perhaps would not do for you to participate in this, but we could take the initiative if the situation demands it. If I can be of any service command me.

*The Summer Rebellion:* C. E. Evans came to San Marcos with the reputation of being a skilled disciplinarian. In his experience as a high school teacher and superintendent he won for himself the praise of school boards and patrons alike. He was capable of presenting a stern exterior that could well jar any student wrongdoer out of his complacent attitude. But the writer is convinced that there never was a time when there was not a reserve of sorrow and sympathy for the youngster whom it was Evans' duty to discipline, and that he looked eagerly for signs of repentance so that he could soften the punishment and open the way for possible reinstatement to good standing in the school. No one ever looked more diligently for preventive measures which might forestall the necessity for disciplinary action. He was constantly aware that students might not understand clearly the consequences of forbidden conduct, and he repeated, time after time, the rules which the College and the students were under agreement to follow. That the College was under a duty to furnish the student a wholesome environment in which he could develop mentally and morally was at the very core of Evans' thoughts.

When, as happened a few times, students tried to take matters into their own hands, Evans used no restraint, apparently, in his efforts to crush the rebellion. Victory had been

comparatively easy for him on these occasions; but in the summer of 1925 he found himself facing a serious crisis. The fight was of such a nature that Evans came close to resigning his position. It was, however, the repercussions or aftermath rather than the direct result of the struggle that brought Evans near the point of losing his place.

The affair apparently grew out of a misunderstanding of certain would-be leaders who, in the belief that a three-dollar student activities fee had been included in the fees paid by and collected from summer school students, and after a somewhat superficial investigation, came to the conclusion that the students had paid into the student activities fund much more than they would get out of it during the summer session. They started agitation, demanding an accounting from the College business manager to show for what purpose the money collected from summer school students should be used. They voiced vigorous objection to carrying over into the regular session any fees collected for the entertainment of summer school students. They called for a refund to the students of about two-thirds of the amount which allegedly had been collected.

After a weekend of consultation among themselves, these students succeeded in arousing considerable ill feeling in the student body, and a mass meeting called in the College Auditorium in Old Main, on August 11, found the Auditorium jammed with students, whether as participants or spectators. The first overt act was committed when Dean H. E. Speck undertook to address the gathering. He succeeded in inviting any dissatisfied student to meet with the President's Advisory Council and then ordered the meeting dismissed. Walter Glick, acting as chairman, ignored the dean's order and merely inquired if there were "any other comments." The meeting continued as Dean Speck walked out.

At this meeting a committee was formed to draw up "charges and protests" against the College administration, and the students voted to present these "charges and protests" to the president of the board of regents of the College and if satisfaction were not obtained, to present them to the "Governor of the State."

---

4 Allactions taken by the various student committees, most of which were put in writing, eventually were obtained by President Evans and placed in his personal files, and were not destroyed when he retired.

The news of this student rebellion was headlined immediately in the newspapers of San Antonio and Dallas and, perhaps, elsewhere. In the "charges" the students alleged that errors had been made in bookkeeping credits to the athletic fund, subscription to which were being solicited during the summer session, and laxity in the management of the student annual. No charges of deliberate mismanagement or dishonesty were made. For some reason, the College administration was blamed for the failure of the summer school students to elect a student council, as had been done every term at the regular session. They demanded that the "students be allowed a student council for the next summer, 1926." President Evans said for newspaper publication that "no request ever came to the president during the summer indicating a desire to organize a Council." He declared that members of a student council could have been elected as in former summers. He then made an additional comment, however, to show that even a student council had not the authority assumed by the student leaders in this revolt. He said, "The powers and responsibilities of student councils are everywhere determined by faculty action, never by students wrongfully grasping authority."

Besides Deans Nolle and Speck, Registrar L. H. Kidd of the College, and Superintendent E. O. Wiley of the laboratory school were named by Evans to his Advisory Council for the purpose of dealing with the students.

On Thursday, August 13, only two days after the mass meeting, three of the student leaders were suspended indefinitely, but dates were set in each case for a re-hearing. Several other students were questioned at the same session and action deferred or brief, but definite, suspensions were handed out.

As Evans' secretary, I was ordered to make a stenographic report of the proceedings of dismissal which were held in the president's office. The student leaders, all mature men with experience as teachers in the public schools, were called before the Council one at a time, and after being questioned were dismissed and sent out of the office by another entrance. I well recall a certain amount of drama connected with this action. Each of the men coming into the inner office to meet his judges left his hat on a rack in the outer office. Part of my duty was to bring in the defendants's hat, and this I did by asking which hat belonged to the convicted one and bringing it in before his

departure. On about the third trip into the outer office, those remaining, I found, had the proper hat picked out and waiting for me. Finally the last one questioned, A. J. Briesemeister, later a prominent civic worker and much-loved superintendent of the Seguin public schools, could stand the strain no longer, and when I went for the next-to-the-last hat he very nervously asked me, "Tom, what are they doing to us?" I did not reply but did manage to keep a solemn face.

The three student leaders suspended indefinitely were Walter Glick, James N. Kaderli, and A. J. Briesemeister; the effect of this punishment on the uprising was like throwing gasoline on a fire. Some ex-students not enrolled in the summer school now joined the protesters. According to the newspaper stories, two of these ex-students were very well known, H. H. Pruitt, superintendent of the school at Prairie Lee, and R. H. (Doc) Porter, employee of a commercial firm. Attorneys employed by the loosely organized group were granted an audience by both the governor and M. O. Flowers, president of the board of regents.

It was at this point that Evans undertook to fight back by communication with newspapers and by a detailed report to the board of regents. His "releases" addressed to the newspapers were largely ignored or considerably cut and garbled. A part of a lengthy statement submitted by Evans is quoted here to show the obvious propaganada which he was hoping would be published. This communication was sent out under the following introductory statement with the request that it be published in the Sunday edition of August 30.

President C. E. Evans, for himself and the College Advisory Council consisting of Dean H. E. Speck, Dean A. H. Nolle, Registrar L. H. Kidd, and Superintendent E. O. Wiley, gives the following statement to the press regarding the recent difficulties in the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

The misunderstanding between certain students and the faculty recently voiced in the press grew out of persistent propaganda during the summer by dissatisfied students. The real dissatisfaction centered around an alleged student activities fee of \$3 per student, when, as a matter of fact, only one dollar was collected for the first six weeks, and no student activities fee at all for the last six weeks. Rumors of other grievances further aggravated the situation. The leaders could easily have ascertained the facts

involved by calling at the administrative offices, but no request was made of faculty or other college officials to adjust student grievances. Instead, dissatisfied students determined to seek redress in the wrong way, without consulting the faculty. That for which dissatisfied students refused to seek correction in a direct way through faculty and President, they attempted to accomplish in an indirect way by taking matters into their own hands. Such illegal action was a challenge to the integrity of the College, and could not be ignored. Certainly, these illegal methods reflect opposition to regular college authority. Simple reflection will show the far-reaching consequences of such conduct; the responsibility of the faculty for students would quickly end and real college control by faculty would be a joke. What is the use of Deans, faculty, or President, now, when students can right their own wrongs?

Three single-spaced typewritten pages were devoted by Evans to his defense. A part of the last long paragraph is included here to show an ironic turn of events in that while harmony had been reestablished ~~as~~ between the College administration and the three leaders, the agitation continued. The paragraph stated:

This statement would be incomplete unless it asserted the right of the faculty and President of the College to enforce its discipline free from outside influence or partisan meddling. Five days before knowledge by the College of employment of attorneys to represent aggrieved students, one of the students had reached harmonious agreement with the Council, and settlement definitely made; Friday afternoon, August 21, at a prior meeting with the attorneys of the students, or before the President even knew the name of the attorney, he suggested a date for another conference with the other students. The courts do not permit shouts of partisan spectators to determine rulings on law and evidence; the Southwest Texas State Teachers College has not allowed outside pressure to dictate its policy or control its actions. These cases have taken the regular course, have been settled in the regular way, and the integrity of the College has been upheld through regular channels. . . .

In his report to the regents dated August 29, Evans gave a similar analysis of the cause of the trouble. He said:

Propaganda, by a few designing students, based upon false rumors, was the direct cause of the trouble. Several students evidently worked faithfully at the job during the summer terms. The immediate excuse for trouble was the

expenditure of an alleged Blanket Tax of three dollars, although, as a matter of fact, the tax ~~was~~ only one dollar per student.

He accused the San Antonio *Express* of arousing feeling . . . . . by continually misrepresenting things happening at the College. The following are some of the headlines in daily papers: "Student Meetings Barred," "Students Delve Into College Affairs," "Three Student Leaders Fired," "President Officially Recognizes Suspended Students," "Storm Passes," "Normal War Up to Governor," "Evans Patches Up Row," etc., etc.

Evans told the regents that the agitators and their supporters were in the minority. He reported:

The majority of the students were not interested in this row, and took no part in it. A committee of nine representative young women from several classes made the following significant statement: "The complaints were looked upon as not of sufficient importance for consideration and attention." The petition for reinstatement of students contained the names of about one-third of the students enrolled, and a very carefully estimated number of 100 to 200 of these signed the petition merely upon request, a rather large number of students refusing to sign at all.

He concluded his report with the following paragraph:

It was a desperate effort on the part of a few extremists, together with still more thoughtless but well-meaning students, to involve the school in trouble. We do not believe there is any widespread dissatisfaction, other than as this disturbing element will attempt to keep the ball rolling.

*The Aftermath*: One of President Evans' little-known characteristics was the discomfort he suffered in the knowledge that he had an enemy, that somewhere there was someone who would take pleasure in doing him harm. If he could, in good grace, make peace with the enemy, he would go to great lengths to restore friendly relations. If he believed that the person were obstinately and maliciously plotting his injury, Evans would employ every feasible device to thwart him. It was this characteristic that accounted for the fact that the three leaders of the student revolt were so speedily forgiven and allowed to graduate and receive their diplomas. Two of the three, Glick and Briesemeister, were made to see almost at once that they could gain nothing by continuing the fight. Whereupon, these two apologized,

acknowledged that they were in the wrong, and petitioned for reinstatement to good standing. The other, James Kaderli, was more reluctant to apologize, but in a matter of days, he, too, was reinstated. Ultimately every student who had been suspended was reinstated.

Having made peace with those to whom he had meted out punishment, Evans was chagrined to learn that others were in no mood to make peace and were intent upon ousting him from his position. As has already been mentioned, these malcontents called in person upon both the president of the board of regents and the governor to present their case against Evans and to ask for his dismissal. Newspaper accounts listed the names of the delegation who called upon the governor on August 22, as follows and in this order: R. H. Porter, E. M. Wigginton, Roscoe Hinkle, Judson Wood, R. M. Cowan, and H. H. Pruitt.

Apparently, the delegation was received courteously at the offices of both the governor and the president of the board of regents. But no action was promised them and none was taken. The communication from the governor was satisfactory to Evans as a mere item of information that such a conference had been held but that any action was declined. However, the letter from M. O. Flowers, head of the regents, appeared to Evans to be critical of the handling of the affair. Moreover, the very fact that Flowers had received the delegation and listened to their petition was considered by Evans to be something of an affront.

This hurt Evans deeply, for he felt that he was entitled to the unquestioned support of the regents, as the disturbance had been a clear-cut case of contumacy by students. He brooded over the situation for weeks, and finally made up his mind to seek another position, and if successful, to resign.

He enrolled with an employment agency specializing in the placement of teachers and school executives. He, no doubt, intended to keep his action secret, but the correspondence came into my hands in a routine manner because of Evans' negligence in leaving the correspondence on his desk with other mail which it was my duty to read and if answers were required, call to his attention. He became very angry and upset when I revealed to him that I had handled the correspondence, but when I showed him the circumstances under which it had come into my hands, his anger immediately subsided, and he talked to me about his situation.



From that conversation, one remark he made stands out in my memory: "When a governing board fails to support a school executive, there is little left for him but to resign." As respectfully as I could, I suggested that the communication of Flowers was not so much evidence of lack of his support as it was an expression of his desire that sufficient firmness be asserted in the future as would prevent a recurrence of such trouble. A bit surprisingly, he took no offense at this liberty I assumed in offering a suggestion. I was, indeed, as a matter of self-interest if nothing else, very eager that there be no disruption of the College administration.

Although by this time the storm appeared to have considerably abated, Evans still had to face a small amount of unfavorable publicity. In September, at a meeting of ex-students of the College attending the Southwest Texas Teachers Institute in San Antonio, there was an attempt to have a resolution adopted censuring President Evans, particularly for his action in connection with the uprising in August and generally for his administration of student affairs. As was usual at meetings of ex-students, certain faculty members of the College were also in attendance. President Evans reported to the newspapers that the presence of faculty members was by invitation. In attendance were two popular teachers, W. I. Woodson, former dean of men and now professor of Education, and C. S. Smith, head of the department of biology. Both Woodson and Smith spoke against the proposed resolutions.

According to a news story appearing in the San Antonio *Express* of the next day's date, H. H. Pruitt, superintendent of the Prairie Lea public school, led in the attempt to pass the resolution. He made a statement after the meeting, at which no action was taken by the ex-students. Quoting Pruitt, the story related:

There was no direct action on the resolution because the meeting was dominated and domineered by faculty members of the College and others on the institution's payroll.

Pruitt had been on hand during the August trouble. At that time he, too, was on the payroll of the College as a member of the summer school staff serving as an instructor in the summer "normal," a special session conducted during the summer as a means of enabling teachers to renew expired certificates. Ap-

parently he volunteered to take part in the actions of the students after the close of the summer session. The news story quoted him further as saying:

The meeting was called for the sole purpose of discussing purely student affairs, and the faculty members and those on the payroll of the college had no right to participate.

As a result, the meeting not only failed to pass resolutions censuring President Evans' administration of certain affairs of the College, but it adjourned without adopting those portions that were commendatory to the institution. The feeling is general among ex-students that the internal troubles are not ended, but that they are being aggravated daily by President Evans' vacillating policy and his continued newspaper statements with reference to the controversy of the past few weeks.

Woodson, in appealing to those present Wednesday, admitted that there were vices in "big bundles," but at the same time he opposed movement to thresh the matter out for the general good of the college.

In a letter dated September 10, 1925, addressed to the board of regents, President Evans wrote:

It is not my purpose to pay any further attention to the spiteful work of some ten students who were involved during the summer unpleasantness and led the San Antonio row described in the enclosed clipping. W. I. Woodson was present by invitation, and merely advised students against continuance of the agitation. William Cole of Yorktown and Robert Reed of San Antonio, degree graduates of the College, and Mrs. W. F. Hall of New Braunfels, a freshman college student, fought the resolutions. H. H. Pruitt was on our payroll last summer, and yet he was a busy agitator during the session. Pruitt, being in Caldwell County, did not belong to the San Antonio institute, but rather in the Austin Institute. The resolution started and ended, so I am informed, with laudatory expressions concerning the College, but mixed up the dynamite near the center. The resolution was defeated by a vote of 57 to 14; another motion to appoint a committee to draft a resolution of censure was voted down, only three votes being cast for it.

My own observation is that students who will adopt revolutionary measures on the inside of the College will just as quickly adopt wild, radical measures on the outside.

San Antonio teachers testify that they are overwhelmingly for us on all parts of the ground.

With victory, an ordinary man would have rested on his laurels, but Evans could not tolerate the thought that one who had done him so much wrong, as he considered H. H. Pruitt had done, was at large and possibly working to undermine the College administration. Evans' defense in the newspapers, moreover, had goaded Pruitt into some unsavory correspondence. He wrote a letter to President Evans boasting that he would yet accomplish the task of removing the president from his position. Instead of ignoring such a missive, Evans wrote a letter in which he convicted Pruitt and passed judgment upon him in no uncertain terms, starting with the following declaration: "Your letter is a striking admission of your guilt in plotting to make war on College authorities and your collusion with other plotters."

He charged Pruitt with trying to bring political pressure against the College. Evans chose to take the position that the fight was not against the president of the College alone. He reminded Pruitt of the price he might have to pay for his activity in the rebellion, in these words: "You have given yourself a lot of notoriety but have not changed our policies. Each time you get into the paper you may get the ear of college presidents and superintendents long enough only to be classified as a mature man who was mixed up in a scheme to disrupt a college."

Evans had already reported Pruitt's activity in San Antonio to the board of regents and the other presidents of the teachers colleges.

Then, almost as suddenly as it had begun, the conflict between Evans and Pruitt stopped. After such animosity, it would appear almost impossible ever to restore amicable relations between the persons involved. But it was all in keeping with Evans' character. He simply could not let the matter rest. Through mutual friends he let Pruitt know that the way was open for the reestablishment of their former friendship. This was finally accomplished. The precise manner in which Evans carried out his purpose to turn an enemy into a friend is known, perhaps, only to Mr. Pruitt. Subsequent events bore proof of

their reconciliation; in the summer of 1927 and again in the summer of 1928 Pruitt's name was again on the payroll as instructor at the summer normal conducted by the College.

Next in line for Evans' missiles was Roger Porter, a San Marcos native and degree graduate of the College, 1923, a student always at the top of his class, both in high school and college. A debater of the first rank, he possessed a pleasing personality, a handsome, and altogether distinguished appearance, manner, and speech.

The 1923 *Pedagog* carried the following subscript note with his photograph:

"Doc" is one of these kind (sic) of people who can argue you out of trouble and then argue you in again without even a glimmer of a fallacy. We will have to hand it to him though; it brings in the "A's." While the professors are figuring out one line of talk, he has sprang [sic] some more so fast that they are afraid something valuable has been said that they have missed—so they let it go at that.

Porter had been eminently successful in whatever he undertook, and was an outstanding leader in ex-student affairs. Anything that smacked of politics attracted him, and he was rarely without some office in the organizations to which he tendered his membership. Thus, it was natural that when students of the summer school of 1925 found themselves in the midst of trouble which they had hardly bargained for, they should turn to Porter for counsel. They succeeded in convincing him of the justice of their charges and, to all appearances, he went along with them. But when the facts were finally made public, leaving the rebels with scarcely a cause for which to continue the fight, Porter quietly withdrew from the conflict.

But President Evans was very much alarmed. He feared that such a man as Porter was capable of doing untold harm to the College by discrediting the Evans administration. Evans wrote to some of the other presidents, in whose territory Porter was employed, warning them of the danger which might be lurking. The replies from those presidents showed that they were both surprised and puzzled by Evans' communication. But Evans persisted and wrote again, giving what he considered to be facts on Porter's trouble-making proclivity. In one letter, he

requested President Marquis of Denton to call upon Porter's employer in another city in North Texas and see whether he could persuade the employer to exercise control and prevent Porter from making an attack upon the College. Marquis reported that he had complied with Evans' request, and he tried to reassure Evans by saying that the employer had given his word that Porter would be guilty of no such activity. Evans still was not satisfied; he wrote Marquis again that the employer had been deceived, but that nothing more would be done about the matter for the time being.

Four years later, Porter headed a committee of ex-students to rewrite the constitution of the Alumni Association. When this news reached Evans, all the old fears were revived, but he kept them closely to himself, presumably for the reason that there was a collaborator in the writing of the new constitution, Raymond Cavness, a degree graduate and student leader, a trusted former employee of the College, in whom, I thought, Evans and everyone else had complete confidence. Evans arranged with Registrar L. H. Kidd, himself a member of the Alumni Association, to go to the meeting scheduled to be held in San Antonio during the meeting of the Texas State Teachers Association. Kidd had specific directions from Evans to fight the proposed new constitution to a finish, although neither Evans nor Kidd had seen a copy of the document.

On Wednesday evening before Thanksgiving Day, Evans telephoned me and told me to go to San Antonio to the Alumni meeting, remarking, only, in his curt manner, that he thought I would be needed, but giving no order that I must oppose the move to adopt the new constitution.

At the meeting, when Porter and Cavness joined in presenting the new constitution, under the spell of their respective orations, and in spite of the puzzling opposition of Kidd, who was taking a lone stand against it, the new constitution was adopted by an overwhelming majority. I voted with the majority because I believed that the new constitution was clearly an improvement over the old.

Late in the afternoon when I arrived home from San Antonio, I received a telephone call from Evans to come to the office. His first words gave me considerable shock, as I could

see he was very much upset. "Kidd says you voted for the new constitution!" he said accusingly.

"Why, yes, Sir," I admitted. "I thought it was an improvement—" I got no farther. In the tirade that followed I learned that anything which Roger Porter had advocated was certain to be evil. He also informed me that what I had done was a good reason why employees lose their jobs. He declared that Porter had the awful power to put even Raymond Cavness "in his vest pocket."

I pleaded ignorance, which certainly was not altogether untrue. I put the copy of the new constitution with my copy of the old and laid them on his desk. I knew that his mind was too fair and his heart was too big to harbor injustice for long.

This was the last conflict with Roger Porter, as far as any record shows. But this story must not be finished without relating that somewhere and at some time down through the following quarter century Porter again became solidly established in the good graces of C. E. Evans. I have read with pleasure and some amazement the cordial and friendly correspondence that passed between these two gentlemen during the writing and publication of Evans' *The Story of Texas Schools*, which was piloted to its completion by the kindly guiding hand of "Doc" Porter, who, as editor, represented the publishers, The E. L. Steck Company.

### Lone-Wolf Troublemakers

Some of the most annoying cases of discipline, perhaps, with which any college president is faced are those involving only one student. Usually there is little or no publicity connected with the case; the student is asked to withdraw and complies, feeling fortunate that his misdeed is not more widely known. There are a few students, however, who simply cannot stay away from trouble and are attracted to bad company like flies to molasses. Once with the crowd, these weak-willed youngsters consider the admiration of the tough characters they esteem so highly to be the one essential thing in their lives. And it is this fledgling that is usually caught, while the sophisticate escapes. Then there are run-of-the-mill who are thoughtlessly indiscreet, seldom get into serious trouble, but too often must be extricated from minor difficulties into which they have blindly stumbled.

President Evans had to deal with the usual quota of all these types. The record of only a very few of these cases would be of any interest, but these few are unique in that minor criminal acts were involved or a belligerent attitude on the part of the student caused Evans to fear that the individual might be dangerous. In others there were occasional threats of lawsuits against the College for alleged mistreatment, and always the probability of adverse publicity. On a few occasions Evans found himself facing an irate father accompanied by an attorney, and there was no time to deliberate the case or call in the assistance of a faculty committee. An example of the latter situation grew out of student pranks in connection with hazing. On at least one occasion the victim of hazing left for home and reported in person the whole episode, showing his parents the marks on tender parts of his body. Fortunately for the College, however, it can be said that there was never a death nor a serious injury as a result of hazing on this campus.

By its very nature, this part of Evans story is difficult to report. Little interest would be added here to use names, even though not the slightest stigma remains attached to these occasions for discipline. These cases are somewhat different from those in which masses of students were involved and during which trouble the names of many participants were published in the newspapers.

The *Devil Woman*: Probably the most vexing case ever to plague President Evans appeared in the person of a mature woman who had decided to attend the College after having given trouble for years as the proprietor of a boarding house. From the first day of her enrollment, she seemed determined to even the score for all of the imagined wrongs which had been done her by College personnel. She appeared to spend most of her time thinking up impolite remarks to make to her teachers, protests to the dean of the faculty charging the teachers with discrimination against her, and making up out of thin air wrongdoing by officials of the College and reporting these to President Evans. Then after a courteous hearing by Evans, she would write him a vicious letter accusing him of insulting her and threatening to have her husband settle with him. She **took** books from the library and refused to return them, accusing the librarians of persecution in trying to collect. Then she be-

gan writing letters to the president and the board of regents and to the governor, making complaints against the entire College organization. So far as is known, the president of the board of regents completely ignored these letters. The governor, however, at first sent the letters to President Evans with a question as to whether this student was sane. Later the governor inquired as to why the woman was allowed to continue as a student.

Evans wrote the governor and explained that the student in question was earning very satisfactory marks in her courses. She had so far carefully refrained from any actual violation of a rule that would justify her dismissal. Evans referred to her as an unmitigated nuisance, but nothing more.

On one occasion the woman telephoned President Evans demanding an interview. By that time I was well aware of the troublesome nature of her calls at his office, and this time Evans decided he needed a witness to overhear every word said in the interview. I suggested that I could find duties with the files which were kept in his office. So, while she was present that time I busied myself with the pretense of trying to catch up on the task of filing,

The woman said nothing offensive, but her frequent glances at me showed her dislike of my presence. At last she took leave, and the president smiled his relief. This feeling was premature, however, for in two or three days the usual letter arrived, charging the College head with insulting language. This time President Evans wrote her a short note reminding her that his secretary had been present during the entire interview and would testify that there was no truth in her charge, and that he had not been guilty of the slightest discourtesy. In an amazingly short time the letter was returned by mail to President Evans with the notation in pencil: "Your secretary is just as big a liar as you are!"

Apparently, however, the plan to have me present put a stop to this part of her nefarious scheme to harrass President Evans.

The hope that she would grow tired of college study and drop out was voiced many times by practically every official of the College, but she kept right on with her studies and her unpleasant behavior. She went to great trouble to get hold of every rumor



and bit of gossip; and if she could obtain the names of parents of students under discipline, she would write these parents alarming messages, especially if it were a daughter involved. Fortunately for the College, she made several greivous errors, writing to the wrong parents and confusing the names of their children.

One morning a girl came to the dean of women, confessing that she had been raped by her date of the night before. In closest secrecy Evans and the dean of women got medical aid for the girl and notified officers of the law. In spite of the secrecy, a rumor started, and this was seized upon by the trouble-maker; but she did not get the name of the girl and notified parents of another coed of the tragic occurrence. She also informed the parents that the College authorities were trying to suppress all news of the crime. Of course, this brought a frantic telephone call — and the dean of women's explanation that the message had been the work of a crank.

As the time for the graduation of the woman drew near, President Evans called upon the governor for advice. He asked the governor, "What should we do with such a person? We could not, in good conscience, ever give her our endorsement as a teacher." President Evans reported confidentially that Governor Moody's reply was, "Hell! Graduate her and get rid of her!"

The woman, at last, with her diploma, took leave of the College; and there was a long period of silence. Then she sent one last communication. Ironically, this was in response to an invitation from the College. In preparation for the celebration of Evans' twenty-fifth anniversary of service to the College in April, 1936, bulletins and news stories had carried the general invitation to Exes everywhere to attend. One of the most surprising replies to this open invitation came from the "Devil Woman," as Evans had dubbed her. She wrote under date of April 21, 1936:

Dear Dr. and Mrs. Evans: As it will be impossible for us to attend the exercises commemorating the twenty-fifth year of your most efficient service, as president and co-president (sic) of The Southwest Texas State Teacher's College, we are taking this method to extend to you our hearty congratulations.

And wish for you a most happy and prosperous future, and a long life filled with every success in your great work.

With sincerest regards we remain in the Ex-Students rank and

Yours most truly

*The Bear Man:* Another "character" made his appearance on a registration day in September. He was a huge bear-like man, swarthy, with heavy black eyebrows and bushy hair, which needed both cutting and combing. His rolled sleeves displayed thick, muscular, hairy arms. He squinted furtively through thick lenses. In contrast to his appearance, he had a high-pitched, soft voice and a timid manner. He was a transfer with a satisfactory record and was admitted to junior standing. He applied for work to help pay his way and was given a job at common labor on the campus. He was a steady though slow worker, got along well with his fellows, and managed to do better-than-average classwork.

During his first year he became widely known about the College because of his peculiar manner and appearance and his ability to imitate the call of farm animals and fowls. About December 1 of the second year he applied for an "inside" job. President Evans told him there were no vacancies at that time and promised to keep his application in mind. Then, as Evans started to compliment him on his good record, the man suddenly flew into a rage. He told Evans that he had worked faithfully at common labor while other students had been given "soft" jobs in the offices or the library. He informed the president that he was fed up on the unfair treatment he was getting.

Evans suggested firmly that he leave the office, think over the situation, and come back when he was less upset. From that moment the man became *a* problem. He told everybody who would listen how badly he had been treated by President Evans and of his plan to get even. When he next came to Evans' office, I was instructed to refer him to the dean of men. In the spring term he began making threats to do bodily harm to President Evans as soon as he received his diploma. But he did nothing worse than talk, and another troublemaker was eliminated by graduation.

This case illustrates the never-ending patience of President Evans. He seemed to hold on to the conviction that the student's career must not be marred by dismissal from the College. Years later the man, who had succeeded in a small way, repented and sent the College a message of apology and friendly greeting. Another of the wayward had been brought back, even though Cecil Eugene Evans could not respond from his grave.

There were others, dozens of them. Some were endured, as in the cases just narrated, others suspended but never forgotten, and a large percentage of them became well-known and successful citizens. Evans referred to these seldom, but on occasion he would comment, "They were too valuable to lose."

### **Discipline Never Fades Away**

In a well-established college, disciplinary disturbance of such magnitude that it would endanger the existence of the college can hardly be conceived of. And cases where such disturbance has been great enough to bring about a change in the administration of the college are indeed very rare. It would seem that a well-knit administrative organization, after working as a team through many years in the settlement of disciplinary problems, would become adept at discovering budding trouble and be able to nip it before it ripened into serious proportions. And that, in the writer's opinion, explains why, in the later years of the Evans regime, there were few cases of serious trouble.

Nevertheless, Evans kept a sharp lookout for signs. At intervals he would mention in a faculty meeting the importance of "curing sore spots," of "creating an atmosphere of helpfulness and cooperation" toward students. In two faculty meetings in February and March 1929, he talked on the subject of student "uprisings." He seemed to derive some satisfaction in the knowledge that his college was not the only one in the country to have such problems to solve. In the second meeting he mentioned the historical "Bread-and-Butter Rebellion" at Yale in 1828, in which four obnoxious students were expelled, and a great mass meeting of students followed. As a result of the uprising, forty other students were also expelled. At Williams College, in 1868, he related, the entire student body was expelled by President Hopkins. At the University of Alabama in 1901, where there was a disturbance in protest against military

discipline, the regents, politically motivated, interfered to prevent disciplinary measures being carried out. He also mentioned the affair at S. M. U. in 1925, when the administration found itself dealing with a secret order which no student would identify. He compared the tactics of student members of the secret order at the Dallas school with those of the Ku Klux Klan threats against students declining to join; cases of mal-treatment, etc. He referred to the presence in this situation of a so-called "poison squad" which kept the agitation going, hiding the while under a cloak of secrecy. At the University of Oklahoma there was a rebellion over the use of automobiles; at the A. and M. College of Texas there was an upheaval over faculty grading.

Evans expressed the belief that the nearness of the San Marcos College to the University of Texas had an adverse effect upon matters of discipline here, but he did not elaborate. He affirmed that another contributor to the problem here was the method of handling news of the event which tended to enlarge or exaggerate the disturbance and its significance. At times, he said, indiscreet remarks of faculty members had also complicated the problem and created unwanted and unnecessary carry-over.

At this time, also, President Evans was still searching for the solution to problems that were inherent in the boarding house environment. On February 10, 1929, he called on his good friend President S. H. Whitley, of Commerce, to answer the following five questions concerning policy of the East Texas State Teachers College:

Please write to me indicating what social regulations you have governing the following conduct:

- (1) Girls leaving boarding house and going to town.
- (2) Approval to girls for receiving the company of young men not in college.
- (3) Evenings on which clubs, such as girls' societies and other societies of which girls are members may have meetings.
- (4) Do you have "quiet hour" or hours on Sunday afternoon?
- (5) What evenings with you are considered "off nights" for social engagements?

A reply by return mail will be appreciated.

Evans used the general assembly as a place in which he could talk to and reason with students on matters of discipline. His "messages" to the *Pedagog* and the *Star* were replete with suggestions for a happy and contented college life. The following which appeared in the *Star* on September 17, 1935, is typical:

Make optimism epidemic on the College campus. Look for the best in fellow students and you may expect them to look for the best in you. Look for the best in the faculty and your favorable attitude gives you a chance for the faculty to know you at your best . . . Sell sincerity, good will, honest standards, loyalty, and happy relations everywhere in college life.

Evans used the general assembly as a place in which he could talk to and reason with students on matters of discipline. His "messages" to the *Pedagog* and the *Star* were replete with suggestions for a happy and contented college life. The following which appeared in the *Star* on September 17, 1935, is typical:

Make optimism epidemic on the College campus. Look for the best in fellow students and you may expect them to look for the best in you. Look for the best in the faculty and your favorable attitude gives you a chance for the faculty to know you at your best . . . Sell sincerity, good mill, honest standards, loyalty, and happy relations everywhere in college life.

## X

### REGENTS GOOD AND BAD

#### Briefly, A Foreword

The purpose of this chapter is to present only facts and not to praise or censure the members of the board of regents who served the College and her sister institutions during the administration of President Evans. No human being is all good or all bad, and the events narrated in these pages will, without a doubt, weigh preponderantly on the side of the good for that group of public servants who served without pay and, at times, with considerable inconvenience and even hardship to themselves as regents of the teachers colleges.

#### Evolution Of The Board

In 1911, when C. E. Evans took office, the normal schools were under the administration of local boards of trustees, each board being composed of three citizens of the city in which the school was located. These boards were appointed by the governor. Evans worked under the San Marcos local board for only a short time, and no record was found of any relations whatever that he may have had with the members of this group.

At the special session of the Thirty-Second Legislature in the summer of 1911 a "board of regents of the Texas State Normal Schools" was created, consisting of the state superintendent of public instruction as ex-officio chairman and four members appointed by the governor for terms of two years. In 1913 the legislature put into effect the constitutional amendment adopted in 1912, providing for overlapping terms of six

years for the boards of trustees of eleemosynary, educational, and penal institutions of the state, one-third of the members to be appointed by the governor each biennium. Also in 1913 the legislature increased the membership of the state normal school board of regents to six members, to be appointed by the governor. In 1929 the legislature increased the membership of this board to nine, three to be appointed each biennium. The law clothed them with the customary authority which administrative bodies exercise over colleges.

### **How Regents Were Selected**

Evans had barely enough time to get his bearings on his new job when the governor of Texas was required under the law just passed by the special session of the legislature to appoint four new regents. Having won the favor of Governor Colquitt and secured appointment to the presidency of the San Marcos Normal, Evans took an immediate interest in the appointment of the regents who would administer the affairs of his school. Probably no other school man in the state had better acquaintance with the influential men whose opinion the governor would value. One of these was Clarence Ousley, president of the Fort Worth *Record*, also president of the Conference for Education in Texas, and chairman of the executive board of this Conference, under whom Evans had worked for three years as general agent of the Conference. Evans wrote to Ousley on September 19, 1911, suggesting a few names of men who he thought would be willing to serve as members of the board of regents, and expressing confidence in their qualifications for such service. He requested Mr. Ousley, if he approved of the suggested men, to write Governor Colquitt indorsing them for appointment. In the same letter Evans gave an account of the increased enrollment of the College over the previous year and assured Ousley that the fall term was off to a very fine beginning. Ousley replied immediately on the twenty-first as follows:

My dear Evans: I have yours of the 19th and am today writing the governor as you suggest. I wish I had received your letter earlier as I was in Austin yesterday and could have spoken to the governor in person.

I am rejoicing at the increased attendance upon the Southwest Texas Normal. It demonstrates that the people refuse to carry political prejudices into their educational institutions and shows that your appointment was pleasing to the patrons of the institution. The situation gives you great opportunity and I am sure you are fully equal to it. Yours truly,

On the twenty-sixth Ousley followed with another short letter to Evans saying: "I am in receipt of a letter from the governor cordially approving your views with respect to the board of normal regents. I think you need have no fear at all on the subject." Apparently Evans' first attempt at influencing the appointment of regents was highly successful. The other normal school presidents were, of course, also very much interested. On October 12, 1911, President Estill of Huntsville wrote a letter which he considered so confidential in nature that he penned it in his handwriting. In the matter of securing desirable men to serve on the board of regents, Estill suggested that the presidents work through F. M. Bralley, state superintendent of public instruction and ex-officio chairman of the board of regents. As indicated earlier, Bralley was also a personal friend of Evans'.

Evans' suggestion of names to Clarence Ousley, it appears, was made without the knowledge of President Estill. In Estill's letter to Evans he wrote:

. . . but as yet we here have taken no steps toward suggesting names. The fact that the law calls for four members of the board seems to suggest one member from the section in which each school is located. I fear that the fact the law requires visits to the schools by the board each year besides a meeting at Austin (five meetings, at places widely separated) will tend to prevent some good men from accepting places on the board. Have any names occurred to you that would be available? Have you any information of suggestions along this line?

Those appointed by the governor were: Walter J. Crawford, Beaumont; W. H. Fuqua, Amarillo; A. C. Goeth, Austin; Peter J. Radford, Fort Worth. T. H. Shelby was employed as secretary to the board.<sup>1</sup> The addresses of these men show that President Estill was accurate in his assumption that a regent

---

<sup>1</sup> See College catalog for 1912-13.



would be appointed from the area in which each of the four colleges was located.

Following adoption of the constitutional amendment in 1912, the legislature, in accordance with this amendment, enacted into law a provision for six members of the board of regents and discontinued the ex-officio membership of the superintendent of public instruction. In the place of Superintendent Bralley, Sam Sparks of Austin was appointed and elected to the position of president of the board, and J. S. Kendall of Dallas was added to its roster. This was the first board under the new law with overlapping terms, and the recommendations of C. E. Evans were now an accomplished fact.

Revealing something of the reputation of Evans in school circles of the state, Regent Kendall wrote him on December 6, 1913, requesting information and assistance:

As I have not been told anything regarding what will probably be required of me, I will be very glad if you will, sometime in the near future, write me giving rather fully the matters which will probably have to be passed upon by the board of regents as affecting your school. At the same time, I will be glad to have you give me full statistical information in regard to the school, which would cover its finances, its enrollment, faculty and any other information which I should have.

Always eager to tell the story of his success to any board member, Evans, on December 13, replied:

As you doubtless know, I was appointed by Governor Colquitt March 24, 1911, and assumed the duties of the position in September of that year. I found an unusually delicate and hard situation to handle, one that many friends of education in the state felt could not be handled tactfully. The first year was really the difficult year and since that time I have had comparatively smooth sailing.

Under my administration the course of study has been revised and improved so that definite requirements now obtain, an additional year has been added and satisfactory arrangement for a practice school for senior students have been made. Much progress in the perfection of organization has been accomplished, and the school plant has been improved to a considerable extent. The enrollment of the school has increased approximately twenty-five per cent,

while the general tone and spirit of the school have grown in a like degree.

Kendall served on the board for about five years with apparent satisfaction to the presidents. In the fall of 1918 he announced that he was moving from Dallas to St. Louis. When this announcement reached President Evans, he wrote to President Bruce of Denton as follows:

I understand that our Mr. Kendall is to move to St. Louis, which will mean his resignation from the board of normal regents. Don't you think it highly advisable to take some action for the protection of the interests of all the normal schools in the selection of his successor? As South Texas already has more than its share of regents, this appointment will probably go to North Texas, and will most directly affect you. Doubtless, a strong effort will be made to have a woman appointed on'the board, and if this is to be done, care should be taken to assure a capable and sensible woman who has no grievances, and desires to render genuine service to the normal schools.

. . . What do you think of holding a meeting in Austin Monday, November 11? While there we could confer with Mr. Goeth [board president at that time] and officially call on Governor Hobby.

Evans learned that his prediction that a regent from North Texas would be appointed failed to materialize. He was informed by President Bruce that the most desirable man for the post was A. B. Watkins of Athens, in East Texas. Bruce relied heavily upon Evans' political insight and his proximity to Austin to wield whatever influence the presidents might have the power to exert. He told Evans that he depended upon his judgment as to the proper time to begin the campaign to get Watkins appointed. He used these words: "Whenever your judgment says do so, I will take the first train to Austin."<sup>2</sup> The governor appointed Watkins, who served on the board for six years.

The following event, which should have been foreseen by the lawmakers, soon occurred. On a crucial question before the board of regents, that group found themselves divided in a 3-3 tie.<sup>3</sup> Early in 1919, Evans started a movement for an increase in the number of regents—if for no other reason than to create

---

<sup>2</sup> Letter dated February 6, 1919.

<sup>3</sup> Conversation with President Evans, many years later.

a board with an odd number of members. As time went on, however, for reasons other than to create an odd number, Evans favored a board of nine members. First, he believed that a larger board would enjoy more freedom from political pressure; second, that a wider area of Texas would thus be represented; and third, that it would be easier to obtain members whose interests would be more specialized, especially concerning matters of education, and thus escape from the influence of a board "overloaded with lawyers," a complaint once made by President Hill. He learned, however, in February of 1919 that there was too much opposition to the proposed bill, and he wrote President Bruce as follows:

One of the senators informed me that the bill increasing representation on the boards did not pass. The Senate Committee has already amended the proposed bill by providing a method for settling differences in case of a tie. I made a second inquiry in Austin Thursday evening and again was informed that the Senate would not accept the House bill for increasing the membership of boards. I shall keep you fully informed.

Evans encouraged all the other presidents to be active in efforts to secure desirable members of the board of regents, and most of the presidents looked to him for leadership in any move aimed at this object. Answering such a suggestion from Evans, President Birdwell wrote on September 15, 1924:

Which of our board members go out of office next January? Please write me fully of your opinions and wishes. It is barely possible that I am in position to help.  
Evans replied by return mail:

Fred Martin of Fort Worth and Dr. H. T. Musselman of Dallas have terms expiring January, 1925. I may also add that A. B. Martin of Plainview, who was a staunch supporter of Mrs. Ferguson and a former worthy member of our board of regents, will accept an appointment on the board of regents if tendered him.

It would seem obvious at this point that with the support of the presidents of the teachers colleges and already in great favor with the Ferguson Administration, A. B. Martin would receive the appointment. Thus a board member experienced in the service of the teachers colleges was again in the group after a lapse of only four years.

In the meantime, the term of another Martin—Fred, of Fort Worth—had expired; and President Evans had received a cordial letter of appreciation from him. He addressed Evans as "Dear Sir and Friend." Evans replied:

I have your kind letter of February 25. The Presidents of the Teachers Colleges were unanimous in requesting your reappointment. Few men have served on our Board in as efficient and satisfactory manner as you have done. So far as we presidents are concerned, it is our purpose, just as soon as it can be done, to advise the incoming governor regarding your efficient service and desirability of having you again as a member of our Board of Normal Regents.

Fred Martin was not reappointed by Governor Ferguson, but all evidence indicates that he had been unusually well liked by the presidents, and he was later appointed to another term by Governor Moody in 1927.

The subject of the appointment of regents was uppermost in the minds of the presidents at least each biennium, now that three vacancies were to be filled every two years ; and, of course, also upon the death or' resignation of one of the members.

On October 4, 1930, President Evans wrote President Hill a letter which revealed the constant interest and activity he devoted to the subject of securing desirable regents :

Some two months ago while in Governor Moody's office on official business, mention was made of the appointment of a regent to fill the place made vacant by the death of W. H. Frey of Stephenville. I suggested to Governor Moody that Waco had never had representation on our board of regents and that since the law governing the appointment of regents contemplated appointments from the different sections of the state, it would be a diplomatic thing to recognize the Waco territory. Governor Moody promptly agreed to the wisdom of such an appointment and said he would try to find a suitable man in Waco. At one time he considered the appointment of Mr. Woodson, a Waco banker, and at another time actually appointed a Waco man, who, for some reason or another, declined to accept.

In the meantime several men had suggested the name of W. C. Crane of Franklin. I do not know from what source the suggestion of Crane came, but the first mention made of his name to me was an inquiry by Governor Moody. I stated

to him that I had known W. C. Crane for a number of years, considered him a very fine man to all concerned. A little later I learned that some of you knew of the consideration of Crane's name and felt friendly toward his possible appointment. Two other names were mentioned to Governor Moody, and in each instance I stated to Governor Moody that these two were high-quality men for appointment.

Senator Hardin of Stephenville made a fight to have a Stephenville man appointed. After Governor Moody had decided to appoint Crane, I received a long distance call from Senator Hardin protesting against presidents for having anything to do with the appointment of regents, and declaring that failure to appoint his man would be the equivalent of a slur at him, his man, and his county. I explained to him that the suggestion of Crane's name did not come from me, and that I did not know who first mentioned Crane's name. I also stated that upon inquiry, I had spoken kindly of the Stephenville man, and the two other men whose names were under consideration. I did not make a fight against appointment of any man though I gave preference to Mr. Crane. There was really no reason for a third appointment coming from Stephenville, and Erath County. John Tarleton College, another state institution, is located in Stephenville, and the people of that section would be expected to be primarily interested in the John Tarleton College.

Indeed it is strange to me that a Senator from the home town of another state institution of higher learning should be so determined to have a controlling voice in the appointment of a regent to a State School 100 to 500 miles distant. Still stranger is the fact that the man suggested by this Senator was a prominent member of a Stephenville committee in 1927, the purpose of which was to interview nearly all of the state Senators and enlist their opposition to Senator Hardin's fight against Dean J. Thomas Davis of the home college. The only questionable thing in the whole matter to me is the relation of my nearest regent, Henry Paulus, to Senator Hardin and the possibility of some prejudice being aroused against me. I did not nominate the board member, Mr. Crane, to the Governor, did not make a partisan fight for him, and I see no reason why any State Senator or any friends of his should be carrying ill will against me on account of mere preference of a man.

In case you come in contact with any member of the Board in discussion of this appointment, I will be very grate-

ful if you will do anything you can to correct erroneous beliefs. I understand that the Board is to be with you Monday week in Canyon.

I think it advisable for you to get to work at once if you wish to assure the reappointment of your Amarillo Regent. There has been a little missionary work done along the line of a change of Regents, which I will mention to you at another time.

The possible worth of a prospective regent was sometimes estimated in comparison with the qualities of former regents, one of whom was Fred Martin, who died in the fall of 1931, leaving a vacancy. And again the name of the other Martin, the well-like A. B. Martin of Plainview, appeared in the discussions.

On October 10, 1931, President Marquis wrote to President Hill with the familiar salutation of "Dear Joe." The message follows :

I went to Mr. Martin's funeral last week. While I was in Fort Worth I discussed the question of regents with Bob Stuart.<sup>4</sup> It was also mentioned later to Mr. Mayhew. I told him that Dr. Webb Walker of Fort Worth would be the nearest man to Fred Martin's caliber that could be found in the city. We were discussing the possibility of a successor to Fred being chosen from Fort Worth.

I feel exactly as you do about A. B. Martin. He would probably give the teachers colleges more time than any other man who could be found. Moreover, he is capable of doing the type of thing that anticipates problems two or three years prior to their arrival, and the capitol is an open book to him. I am not nearly so much concerned about where a man comes from when we are looking for a regent as I am about knowing that he believes that the public schools of Texas need trained teachers and that he is willing to hit some hard licks in the heat of the day to further this program of teacher training.

I suggest that you talk to A. B. before you come to Austin and get his consent to say to Moody and to Governor Sterling that he would be glad to have the appointment. Webb Walker received the appointment by Governor Sterling, as might be expected, instead of A. B. Martin, a supporter of the Fergusons, even though Martin had the strong indorse-

---

<sup>4</sup> Marquis refers to Senator Stuart, District 28, Fort Worth.

ment of President Hill and a majority of the other presidents. Moreover, Tom Beauchamp of Commerce, with the indorsement of President Whitley, was likewise rejected by the governor. President Estill had indorsed both men. Among the appointments made by Governor Sterling was that of a fellow-Houstonian, the venerable Thomas H. Ball, one time candidate for governor and well known all over the state.

For most of the years that Evans was in office there was never an opportunity to fill a position on the board of regents that he did not undertake to secure a person who, he believed, would be one with whom the presidents could work and agree. In 1929, when the number of regents was, by legislative act, increased to nine, there was again a flurry of correspondence on the subject of new appointments. On January 27, 1929, Evans wrote President Whitley of Commerce:

The bill increasing the number of members of the board of normal regents to nine has already passed the Senate and should pass the House within the next ten days. Suppose you and your friends get to work and be ready to recommend to the Governor a safe, loyal man from some county near you, preferably from the territory northeast of you. I think you had in mind a good man when you were in Austin.

To show the eagerness and frankness with which the teachers college presidents were willing to advocate a person for appointment to the board, a letter from President Hill, dated October 22, 1931, and President Evans' reply are presented. President Hill wrote that he wished the appointment of A. B. Martin to take the place of "Mr. Martin," referring, of course, to Fred A. Martin of Fort Worth, whose death has been mentioned. Hill stated that A. B. Martin was willing to serve for the third time on the board. He wrote further:

As soon as you think it advisable, if it 'meets with your approval, I hope you will take whatever steps in your judgment are best toward bringing about his appointment.

I am writing each of the Presidents a similar letter with the request that, if possible, they get someone from their territory and ask that they write the governor in behalf of Mr. Martin. I consider this a vital matter for us here and hope that the group will wholeheartedly support my candidate.

President Evans replied on October 27:

I was in Governor Sterling's office yesterday, but he was out of the office, supposedly in Houston. However, I discussed the appointment of our regents with Secretary Wigginton, who promised to pass the information on. I hope it will be all right. I think we would be fortunate to secure the services of A. B. Martin again on our board.

In turn, President Hill wrote a brief acknowledgement of Evans' letter, showing deep concern at the uncertainty of Martin's appointment. This was dated October 30:

I am glad to have your note about your visit to the Governor's office. I regret that he was not in and hope that if it is convenient, you will later see him.

If there should be objection on the grounds of the location, I suggest that you call attention to the fact that there is only one regent out of nine in the territory west of Dallas and north of the T. and P. Railroad.

President Hill, next to President Evans, played possibly a more active role in the appointment of regents than any of the other presidents. When a new regent took office, Hill made an effort to learn all about him, and passed this information on to his colleagues and to the other members of the board of regents. On January 29, 1930, he wrote:

r I am sure that each of you is interested in our new regent, Mr. John E. Hill of Amarillo, and I take pleasure in giving you the following information.

Mr. Hill is vice-president and general manager of the Panhandle Lumber Company—an organization which has forty yards in Northwest Texas. He has been in Amarillo some fifteen years and has gradually but surely forged to the front in the business, social, and developmental life of this section. Probably no man in Northwest Texas is better or more favorably known throughout the territory. He is an active member of the Amarillo Rotary Club and also the First Methodist Church. He is public spirited, resourceful, handsome, well balanced, and altogether likeable. He will work well with the group and will take an intelligent interest in our problems. I judge he is about forty-five years of age.

From this letter, one would judge that the appointment of John E. Hill (no relation, of course, to President Hill) would quiet the latter's anxiety over the failure to secure the appointment of A. B. Martin.



In 1933 it was apparent that the wishes of the presidents were largely disregarded in the appointment of regents. This fact may have signaled a turning point in the policy of incoming governors regarding the appointment of regents upon the recommendation of those over whom the regents would preside. It would appear, after all, that better administration of a college might ensue if no regent owed his appointment to the solicitation of its president in his behalf. President Estill took particular note of the changed situation in a letter to the other presidents dated April 3, 1933. He wrote:

Referring to our three new regents, none of these appointments was made at our solicitation. One of them, Mr. Ward Templeman of Navasota, is known to me as a planter and lifelong resident of Grimes County—a man of good standing and high character who, I believe, will render excellent service as a regent. I have only a slight personal acquaintance with him, but I consider him friendly to the teachers college program. Neither of the other two gentlemen is known to me. I understand that Dr. Ulmer [J. G. Ulmer] of Tyler is not a doctor of medicine but is dean of the business college, and that Mr. Andrews [T. C. Andrews] is known as a lawyer of McKinney.

After the biennium of 1933-1935, evidence of activity by the presidents in the selection of regents is almost wholly lacking.

### **The Work Regents Do**

The law establishing the "State Normal School Board of Regents" in 1911 charged this board with responsibility for the general control and management of all state normal schools for white teachers. It was given the authority to erect, equip, and repair buildings; to purchase supplies, equipment, etc.; to employ and discharge presidents or principals, teachers, and other employees; and to ~~fix~~ the salaries of the persons so employed. The duty was placed upon the president of each normal school to nominate annually to the board of regents such employees as in his opinion would promote the best interests of the institution. The board was also given authority to determine what departments of instruction should be maintained and what subjects of study should be pursued in each department; it was empowered also to fix the rate of incidental fees to be paid by students and to prescribe rules for the collection of such fees and for

the disbursement of such funds. The board was required to make a biennial report and to submit a recommended budget for the biennium.<sup>5</sup>

Regents are usually busy men, successful executives, or prominent professional people whose vocations occupy all their days, and some of them have little time to devote to the affairs of the colleges. Most of them, however, are conscientious and perform their duties faithfully, never missing a meeting nor failing to respond to a call for assistance from college officials. When forced to neglect their regential duties they write apologies for their shortcomings and explanations for their absences or failures to perform their duties. By their own testimony, as a result of their terms of service they uniformly leave the board with an awakened interest in higher education and a feeling of satisfaction that they have had a part in the development of the colleges. The roster of such persons is long, and their portraits on the walls of the presidents' offices bear witness to the high esteem in which they are held.

Through the years the regents have solved many problems facing the presidents. With all their authority to approve or reject and by their prestige as leading citizens rendering a vital public service with no monetary compensation, they have, on many occasions, impressed lawmakers and boards of control alike of the value and necessity of granting requests for aid without which the colleges could not have existed as senior institutions of higher learning.

The regents early entered the struggle to raise the standards of the teachers colleges. The first record appearing in the minutes of the board concerning this struggle appeared in November, 1916. At that time the regents granted permission to the normal schools to expand their work into four-year colleges. There was no formal meeting for this purpose, but President Sam Sparks of Austin took a vote by mail sent in by each regent to Sparks which showed a majority in favor of granting the expansion.

This action of the regents was momentous. The presidents were made aware of this decision of the board by newspaper accounts, but were very hesitant about announcing it pending

---

<sup>5</sup> *General Laws of Texas*, Thirty-Second Legislature, first called session, July 31-August 29, 1911.

official notification by the president of the board. And even after official notice was received, the conservative President Bruce of Denton was afraid to trust the announcement to a reporter, but made the report to the newspaper himself.

The outcry against this news, which was not unexpected, is reported in another chapter of this study.<sup>6</sup> Also, as indicated in that chapter, the regents took formal action again in 1921 to direct that the presidents of the normal colleges "proceed at once to meet the requirements of the University of Texas looking towards early recognition of their respective schools as colleges of the first rank." No more creditable page was written in the history of the board of regents than that of its record of support to the presidents in their entire struggle for recognition.

The annual visits of the board of regents to the colleges required by law were frequently events of celebration on the campus of the college visited. Excerpts from a news story carried in the San Marcos Record on May 18, 1922, are included here as an example of such a celebration on the campus at Southwest Texas.

The Board of Regents of the Southwest Texas State Normal College were visitors to San Marcos last Friday on their annual tour of inspection of normal colleges, this being the fifth college to visit. There were only four of the regents present on their visit here due to sickness of two of the regents, President Goeth of Austin and Mr. Eckhardt of Taylor. Present in the party were Judge M. O. Flowers of Lockhart, Mr. J. J. Bennett of Stephenville, Miss Margie Neal of Carthage, and Judge A. B. Watkins of Athens.

Normal auditorium was crowded to its utmost capacity on this occasion, the entire student body being present in addition to many of the most prominent citizens of the city. The audience was disappointed when it became known that Governor Neff could not be present, as had been previously announced . . . President Evans was in charge of the ceremonies, and introduced the first speaker, Judge M. O. Flowers, acting president of the board, who spoke briefly and effectively of the interest of the different members of the board in their work for education, and especially the fight the normals have had to wage in securing the place they now have in the educational system, and of convincing

---

<sup>6</sup>See Chapter VIII, "The Fight for Recognition."

the people, the legislature, and the governing authorities that the normals have a distinct and important field of their own which they are occupying effectively and adequately--- that of preparing the majority of efficient teachers for the schools of the state . . . . In conclusion he assured the student body and faculty of the sympathy and support of the governor who could not be present with the board at this time.

. . . President Evans then spoke briefly giving statistics to show the growth and progress of the Normal College in recent years. . . . Seventy per cent of the total enrollment of the present session represents college students, as compared with less than fifty per cent three years ago. Collingsworth County in the Panhandle, Marion in the extreme northeast, Jefferson in the far east, Cameron, farthest south, and El Paso County, farthest west, all have students in the Normal College.

. . . Reading from original documents, President Evans showed that the Southwest Texas State Normal College in the summer and fall of 1920 was thoroughly inspected by representatives from the University of Texas. Reports of the result of the inspection were made in February and March, 1921, and as a result of this and subsequent reports of the Southwest Texas State Normal College had met the standards of the Texas Association of Colleges as a college of the first class . . .

Following the program in the auditorium the social functions of the day for the Board were concluded with a luncheon in the Manual Arts Building served by the girls of the Home Economics Department under the direction of Mrs. McConnell. At the luncheon, in addition to the members of the board were the following: President and Mrs. Evans, Dean and Mrs. Birdwell, Dean and Mrs. Burkholder, Mrs. Woodson, Dean of Women; Miss Sayers for the faculty; Robert Saunders, president of the Student Council; Mrs. M. C. McGee, president of the local school board; Mrs. Manford Dailey of the local Parent-Teachers Association; A. L. Davis, Mayor of the City; W. E. Allison, president of the local Chamber of Commerce; Dr. L. L. Lee and A. L. Blair of the Rotary Club; and Walter Buckner of the San Marcos Record.

At times members of the board took it upon themselves to render assistance beyond their legal obligations. As an instance, in the matter of representation on committees and other groups involving other state colleges there was flagrant discrimination

against the teachers colleges. The following letter, written by President Evans to the other presidents on November 30, 1921, describes the situation. The letter was in reply to a letter from President Binnion arguing for fair representation. Evans' letter follows:

At the present time the six State Normal Colleges of Texas have exactly the same representation as the College of Industrial Arts or the Agricultural and Mechanical College. To state the case is to point out its absurdity.

When this situation was brought to the attention of the regents, they passed a resolution forbidding the normal colleges to participate in any organization which would not allow a separate representative for each normal college. This act of the board simply and effectively wiped out this form of discrimination. Thereafter the presidents had but to call attention to the ruling of the regents to gain instantly the right to equal representation with all the other colleges of the state.

Very valuable assistance was also accorded the teachers colleges on several occasions when one or more members of the board accompanied the presidents to a hearing before legislative committees or before the State Board of Control. The presence of the regents was helpful in impressing the men seeking information concerning the needs of the colleges, and this was for more than one reason. A. C. Goeth, principal owner and general manager of the Walter Tips Company of Austin; or A. B. Mayhew, owner of a chain of lumber and building supply firms; or M. O. Flowers, well-known attorney and civic leader — these men carried the prestige of their positions into the conference, and in that way made up in part for the disadvantage that any professional school man would face in those days in a discussion of business matters with lawmakers or agencies of the state government. A second reason for the value of attendance by the regents at these hearings was that the regent was frequently able to present a new angle of approach and to make suggestions for a better-organized claim for the needs of the schools.

In a letter to the presidents dated October 6, 1922, M. O. Flowers of Lockhart gave his reaction to his appearance before the State Board of Control with one of the teachers college presidents. He wrote:

. . . In going before the Board of Control with Mr. Binnion, I formed the idea that the only trouble with the board is that they do not understand the scope of the work that is being done by the Normal Schools. All of their questions indicated that they were laboring under the idea that the Normal Schools are doing the work that ought to be done by the high schools and by the other colleges.

President Binnion answered their questions well and did a lot of good, in my opinion. They don't ask any questions about your needs. They know all about your needs, but their trouble is that they can't understand why the State needs the normal schools. They know, for instance, that Dr. Bruce's main building is falling down; then why argue the need for a new building? That would seem silly to me.

I may be wrong, but, in my opinion, the fact that you have twenty-eight seniors enrolled for graduation this year and 596 doing college work are facts that ought to appeal to members of the Board of Control.

I think that if all of you presidents would get the idea and hammer it into the members of the Board at every opportunity, that you would get along better and would get what you need. You have the same trouble with the legislature. They didn't worry a minute about Binnion's needs. They were thinking of something else and that something is what you presidents must get out of their minds.

Please think about this and if my idea is worth anything discuss it with other presidents and use it to the best advantage. It is my purpose to go over to Austin early Tuesday, but I will probably be there only a part of the day, as I am very much crowded for time here.

I want you to know that I duly appreciate the great work you are doing and the soundness of your opinion.

In other matters also, Flowers was prompt and helpful whenever called upon by one of the presidents. Another letter from him shows his complete understanding of a problem presented to him by President Evans and his immediate approval of Evans' request. This letter was dated August 1, 1923:

Regarding the purchase of additional land across the street from the hospital with the available funds, will say that I am willing for you to make the purchase and think it fortunate that you can get some additional ground since you have so little. I haven't a clear idea of where the land is located, but that doesn't matter if it is near the school.

You are going to need a great deal more land than you have, and it may be some time before you get another appropriation.

I remember you wrote me a few days ago about getting a seal for the school and I approve that also. I am enclosing to you a statement from the bank and would prefer that they render you these statements each month, for I pay no attention to them when received.

The above letter was written in answer to a request by Evans for immediate approval of the purchase of land with a balance which had been left in an appropriation of two years previous for \$1,750. Evans explained that he had only recently been able to come to terms with the owner; moreover, that the appropriation must be spent by September 1, or it would lapse to the state treasury.

Numerous items of correspondence remain as evidence of the helpful work of the regents. The following are a few examples. On July 6, 1929, President J. A. Hill, secretary, and acting for the Council of Presidents, wrote a letter addressed to A. B. Mayhew of Uvalde and Henry Paulus of Yoakum. He wrote:

I am instructed by the teachers college presidents in meeting assembled in Austin, Tuesday, July 2, to extend to you our thanks for the splendid service you rendered the teachers colleges on the occasion of your visit with the Legislature in Austin.

The Presidents feel that your presence and help at that time not only expressed your personal interest in our appropriations but also gave the endorsement of the Board to the program which we are presenting to the Legislature. On March 4, 1930, A. B. Mayhew wrote to President Evans:

I had a very pleasant trip to the NEA with all the teachers college presidents except you and Mr. Marquis. It was a splendid occasion and a most worthy program, and I plan to attend regularly . . .

Mayhew became president of the board in 1930 and was, in some ways, one of the most cooperative of regents. The presidents for a long time had met with some difficulty in securing the wholehearted approval of the regents for their out-of-state trips to attend educational conventions and other meetings.

They hit upon the strategy of inviting the president of the board and certain other members to accompany them upon some of these trips, and at the expense of the colleges. This first trip by Mayhew made a firm believer of him.

Two years later, on January 12, 1932, Mayhew wrote again in anticipation of the meeting of the National Education Association :

About February 20 the National Education Association meets in Washington, D. C. with President S. H. Whitley in charge of the superintendents' division. I am sure all of the presidents will want to attend, and I am planning to attend also at, of course, my own personal expense. If any of the regents can spare that much money, I shall be glad to have them join me and I will introduce them to my neighbor, John N. Garner.

An earlier letter to President Evans from Mayhew gave an account of what he had done in an effort to influence Governor Moody to grant emergency aid for the summer schools of the teachers colleges. The letter follows:

I have your letter of the 26th concerning the trip you and President Morelock made to Governor Moody and the assurance he gave you that you could depend upon 80 per cent of the amounts we recently requested for Summer Schools.

I wrote Governor Moody concerning this some time back and he answered that he did not want to seem parsimonious, but, by all means, we should cut down the request as much as possible. I replied by giving him our figures again and stating that we could not possibly reduce our request and that if he failed to grant it in full we would simply have to give less service or fail to pay part of the debts that would be made.

Another contribution of A. B. Mayhew while he was president of the board was to foster the idea of forming committees consisting of two or more regents to act specially in the interest of certain teachers colleges to which the named committee would be assigned. In a letter dated June 1, 1932, addressed to the regents and presidents, he wrote:

By your authority I am appointing the following committees to be in direct consultation with the college named. I believe that all matters requiring action should be brought



before the entire board at its quarterly meetings, and I am asking Mr. Wm. Z. Hayes to act with the Canyon Committee in building the museum which has been arranged for.

He continued, naming the committee for each school, the committee for San Marcos being H. A. Paulus and A. B. Mayhew.<sup>7</sup>

In the twenties and early thirties one of the perplexing questions regularly brought before the regents was that of retirement of the presidents and other employees of the colleges and arrangements for financial security for these superannuated persons. The predicament of these poorly-paid men, even those at the top of the pay scale of the teachers colleges, is, perhaps, hard to understand by later teachers and executives after thirty or more years of security provided by the State. Some of the pitiable aspects of the situation in which the presidents found themselves were put into words by President Estill of Huntsville, who was nearing the age of retirement at that time. The date of the letter was December 30, 1925:

. . . The state cannot be expected of course, to continue full pay to those who are unable to work. At the same time the blood is not frozen in the hearts of Texans, and the people will approve recognition of faithful and efficient service . . . I further maintain that in a large faculty the presence of a few members still able to carry on their work, albeit with diminished physical vigor, is an asset and not a liability to any institution of learning.

For several years before President Bruce of Denton reached the age at which he must retire there was great worry on his mind, and he revealed his concern several times in letters to the other presidents and regents. He declared that with the expense of educating several children, the many calls upon him for contributions to worthy causes had left him with scarce savings to care for himself and his wife in old age. In 1923, Bruce retired and made an appeal to the board of regents for financial help. There was no provision in the law for compensation to anyone who did not render service contemporaneously with the compensation. A suggestion came from the regents that Bruce be given work for short periods of time by each of the other teachers colleges so as to relieve the North Texas College of some of the burden of caring for his needs. In addition, there

---

<sup>7</sup>Seven years previously Evans had bitterly objected to just such an arrangement. This event is mentioned later in this chapter.

was a suggestion that Bruce be used as a sort of agent for all the teachers colleges in some instances.

These suggestions did not meet with the approval of President Evans, as they appeared to mean the adoption of a dangerous policy for the future. Moreover, there had been a few occasions on which Evans and Bruce had differed rather widely on issues concerning the teacher-training institutions. A letter to President Hill, dated December 10, 1923, revealed the situation as Evans viewed it. He wrote:

Unless we act promptly, we are going to have a very serious embarrassment arising over the case of our good friend Dr. Bruce. As you doubtless know, the friends of Dr. Bruce are working to send him to the American Association of Teachers Colleges as the representative of all the presidents. I think that you and I have already been handicapped in our work by the ultra-conservatism as well as by the dotage of our good friend Dr. Bruce, and do not care to prolong the period of antagonism and distraction.

In addition thereto, the Board still has under discussion the assignment of Dr. Bruce as a kind of peripatetic Professor of Education spending a part of each year at each of the seven teachers colleges. If Dr. Bruce is too old to act as president of the North Texas State Teachers College, he is too old also to be a kind of semi-supervisor, or semi-expert, or semi-instructor in the other teachers colleges. The problem arising in the case of Dr. Bruce is wholly and solely a problem for the North Texas State Teachers College. I decline to be a party to this problem, and shall resent any efforts to drag me into it.

I am suggesting to Mr. Binnion that he confer with Dr. Musselman member of the board of regents in Dallas not later than Thursday so that no embarrassment may arise over the action of the Board in Alpine next Saturday. In the meantime I will see Mr. Eckhardt at Taylor.

In pursuit of their duties, the regents created considerable consternation among the presidents and their friends in 1917 by an announced reshuffle of the presidents. At the regular session of the legislature that year six colleges and junior colleges were established and the West Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College was authorized to be located at Abilene. Of these seven colleges, four were teachers colleges—to be located at Alpine,

Commerce, Nacogdoches, and Kingsville.<sup>8</sup>At the July meeting of the board, the following action was taken, as revealed by the minutes of the board:

Assignment of Presidents for the State Normal Schools of Texas:

Cousins, R. B. to the South Texas State Normal School at Kingsville.

Hill, J. A. to the West Texas State Normal at Canyon.

Binnion, R. B. to the East Texas State Normal at Commerce.

Birdwell, A. W. to the Stephen F. Austin Normal at Nacogdoches.

Fletcher, Thomas to the Sam Houston State Normal at Huntsville.

Estill, H. F. to the Southwest Texas State Normal at San Marcos.

Evans, C. E. to the Sul Ross State Normal at Alpine.

Bruce, W. H. to remain at the North Texas State Normal at Denton.

The time when these changes shall become effective will be later announced by the board.

Note that of the four teachers colleges then in operation, three out of the four presidents were transferred to other locations from the colleges over which they had presided for years. No sound reason was given for transferring Evans to Alpine to open a new college, or for the transfer of Estill from Huntsville to San Marcos to take Evans' place, and the appointment of Fletcher to the presidency at Huntsville. From the correspondence which took place between Evans and Estill, and between Evans and a number of other friends, it appears that no one was able to understand the action of the board. Among others, Clarence Ousley, Evans' friend of many years, and now with the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C., was notified by Evans of his transfer to Alpine. Then realizing that he had not given a clear explanation, Evans wrote again giving the full account of the changes made by the board.

On September 21, 1917, Ousley replied:

I am glad to have your letter of August 17, explaining the circumstances of your transfer to Alpine. I did not in the least imagine that the transfer was on account of any

---

<sup>8</sup>For a full account, see Evans, *The Story of Texas Schools*, op. cit., pp. 123-124.

default of yours. I rather imagined that, as a matter of fact, the board was paying you a compliment in having you do the pioneer work at Alpine, so I sympathize with you in the hardship which this imposes upon you. However, that is one of the incidents of public service, and I am not surprised that you have accepted the assignment cheerfully.

Be assured of my continued confidence and good wishes.

Evans was on a trip to Chicago when he received notice from H. A. Turner, secretary of the board of regents, that the transfer to Sul Ross College became effective at once, and that Evans would be expected, upon his return, to accompany an architect to Alpine for the purpose of determining locations of buildings and other matters looking to the construction and equipment of that school.

Although he quickly resigned himself to the ordeal in prospect, Evans had serious misgivings as to the future of Alpine. On March 10, 1917, before the final action of the legislature, he had written the following letter to A. C. Goeth, president of the board of regents:

My attention is directed this morning to a bill passed by the State Senate establishing a state normal school at Alpine. You will note that there has already been established a state normal school south of the 29th parallel of latitude, which is in the Corpus Christi country, and will be known as the South Texas State Normal School. In the territory embraced in the proposed Alpine State Normal School, and in the proposed South Texas State Normal School, there is not together more than one-half as many people as will be found in the territory of the Canyon Normal, which, as you know, is a thinly settled area of the State. It is nothing short of a positive calamity for both of these schools to be established when the state in no sense needs them. In this connection, I may add that few students go from the border counties to any institutions of higher learning. The attendance in both of these schools can hardly exceed 300 students for the first four or five years.

Is there not something to be done to secure negative action on the part of the House or executive veto of the proposed Alpine state normal school? It is too late to defeat the establishment of the South Texas State Normal School. The serious objection to these schools is not the number of students they will take from other institutions of higher learning, but the weakening of the State's financial

support for the four state normal schools already established. The demand for normal schools in South Texas and in the extreme western portion of the State is wholly a "pork barrel" affair, and will be productive of evil effects for years to come. No competent school authority has recommended or would think of recommending the establishment of these schools. The fight for the schools is a sectional affair, and is for sectional, personal, and political reasons.

One can only conjecture that this bitter opposition of Evans to the establishment of the school at Alpine may have been resented by Regent Goeth and, therefore, may have been partly the reason for Evans' transfer to that doubtful location.

There was for Evans still a ray of hope left, expressed in a letter from former governor *O. B. Colquitt*, which was in reply to a letter notifying him of Evans' transfer. "I understand," he wrote, "that the legislature may repeal the laws creating the new normals altogether, or at least suspend the appropriations for them." Colquitt's prediction proved accurate. The called session in September, 1917, postponed the opening of Sul Ross and the normals at Kingsville and Nacogdoches to 1920, 1923, and 1925, respectively. When the school at Alpine was finally opened, the board did the sensible and simple thing by assigning Thomas Fletcher to Alpine and leaving Estill and Evans in their places at Huntsville and San Marcos.

The presidents of the state teachers colleges may not always have been satisfied with the work done by the board of regents or the acts of certain individual members, but they were never willing to be placed under a centralized board of regents having authority over all the state-supported colleges of Texas. Such proposals as had been made in the legislature had met with the uniform opposition of the presidents, in the belief that these schools were specialized institutions which could not be efficiently governed by regents whose conception of a college was that of a liberal arts institution only.

#### Not All Was Harmony And Good Will

There were recurring incidents during the late twenties suggesting some discord and absence of harmonious relations between the presidents and the board of regents. Extremely sensitive to these incidents, President Evans had a tendency to magnify their significance; and his letters frequently became

something of a clarion of alarm, while those of the other presidents, in reply, appeared quite calm.

For a while in the spring of 1919 it was thought that the legislature, perhaps inadvertently, had abolished the board of regents of the normal colleges. This predicament came with the creation of the state board of control. Certain powers granted to the board of control were identical with those which had been granted to the board of regents. A logical conclusion would be that there had been a transfer of authority from the regents to the board of control, and it was reported in the news that the attorney general had so ruled. Evans, acting upon the urgent request of the other presidents, conferred with the attorney general. He reported that the attorney general's department was willing to admit a possible error in the ruling; however, an assistant attorney general, Evans wrote, maintained positively that the board of regents had not been abolished by the act creating the board of control. The case rested there.

On May 20, 1924, Evans wrote President Binnion voicing serious fears concerning the relationship of the presidents and the regents:

There were many things at the last meeting of the Board of Regents to invite misgivings and discouragements. It is a very peculiar thing to call a meeting of the Board to consider details of our budgets and openly tell us that we are not to be present. A personal, confidential, and fiduciary relationship does not exist in our official relationships with the Board. This supposed close personal relationship does, however, exist between the Secretary of the Board of Regents and the several members, but the Presidents are on the outside. I do not think our jobs are in the slightest danger, but the situation is certainly strange. Mr. Turner was kind enough to talk to me rather frankly Sunday afternoon, and his statements would add no encouragement to either you or me.

A measure of friction showed up again in 1928 when Vice-President of the Board, A. B. Mayhew, the trained businessman of Uvalde, expressed dissatisfaction not only at the size of the expense accounts for travel of the presidents, but also at the lack of itemization to reveal exactly how state money had been spent for that purpose. President Evans foresaw a curtailment of approval of funds for traveling, if not an attempt to abolish

completely out-of-state travel as a needless expense. As usual, he started a campaign to ward off this impending danger. On April 4, 1928, he wrote President Hill:

In view of a request that we presidents have received for an itemization statement of traveling expenses, and the forthcoming objection to the amount of bills in some of the colleges, I am making a few suggestions. You should see the regent nearest you and explain thoroughly to him that, beginning with the change of the Teachers Colleges from a normal school basis in 1917, it has been essential that we put our case before the people. It has also been necessary for us to establish all these colleges on a standard college basis and secure full recognition in college circles.

I do not believe our expense accounts are large and subject to legitimate criticism. Amounts fully as large as amounts for 1927 were spent as far back at 1919-20 and 1922-23, at which times there was no objection. The president of the University of Texas spent \$6,000 in 1926-27. President Bralley of the College of Industrial Arts spent more than \$1,500 in 1921-22. I think it will be a good thing for you to discuss this matter rather freely with Mr. Guleke [J. O. Guleke, member of the board from Amarillo] before he comes to the meeting of the Regents.

As has already been recorded in this chapter, it is interesting to note that Mayhew, four years later, was suggesting that all the presidents would want to attend the meeting of the NEA in Washington, D. C. and that he, himself, was going. Evidently his belief concerning the value of travel for the presidents had made an about face.

When Mayhew assumed the position of president of the board of regents in 1929, he advocated the adoption of rules of business management for the board as well as for the affairs of the colleges. He took the time to study the accounting methods of the several colleges and soon discovered a supposed lack of control exercised by the board of regents over the expenditure of local funds. As a matter of fact, there was never a time when the letter of the law was not followed in this expenditure by the vouchering of each item of disbursement and securing the approval of the president of the board of regents before checks could be issued. Heretofore, however, this had been a mere matter of form, the vouchers never getting the personal attention of the president of the board. The fact was well known by any

teachers college business manager that Secretary H. A. Turner would apply the rubber-stamp signature of the president of the board of regents to any item bearing the signature of the president of the college concerned. It is certainly not the belief of this writer that a single dollar of the local fund was spent contrary to the spirit of the law, and the freedom which the presidents had in the use of the local fund made it possible to keep the colleges in operation at times when without this freedom it would have been well nigh impossible to do so. But when Mayhew became head of the regents he ordered the vouchers sent to him at Uvalde for his personal inspection. And he soon arrived at the conclusion that the system needed changing. Moreover, he frankly informed the presidents that he believed the local fund should be under the control of the state treasury.

Faced with this attitude on the part of the president of the board, Evans immediately undertook to get a majority of the board to oppose any such move. An example of his efforts was a letter written to President Whitley of Commerce on February 2, 1929. Similar letters were dispatched to President Marquis of Denton and President Hill of Canyon. The letter to Whitley follows:

If the suggestion of Mr. Mayhew should carry, it will embarrass every Teachers College. In fact, it will be disastrous to most of us. Can you not, without using my name, take up this problem with Mr. Hayes [W. Z. Hayes of Dallas] and see that he thoroughly understands it? I will write again in a few days giving some figures.

To President Marquis he wrote:

When Jack Johnson [business manager at Denton] returns, ask him what was said by Mr. Mayhew to both of us in opposition to local funds. If the idea our regent has in mind should prevail with the Board, our local funds would be largely dispensed with, and we would be subjected to embarrassment to a degree that we could hardly estimate. Indeed, while we would largely be dispensing with our local funds, competitive state institutions would be using their local funds and finding some way to increase student contributions.

Just as soon as you have talked over the matter with Mr. Johnson, suppose you seek occasion to confer with Fred Martin [member from Fort Worth] and W. Z. Hayes. Let



us get our hands on the local fund situation in ample time so as to have a safe policy adopted for the New Year.

In addition to what was communicated to Whitley and Marquis, Evans wrote to President Hill of Canyon under date of February 7, 1929:

. . . Mr. Mayhew stated very strongly his opposition to the expenditure of local funds for general improvements or for miscellaneous purposes. In fact, he said that there was no necessity for local funds, and that fees should be reduced and the money given to the students. He insisted that the Legislature already makes necessary appropriations, and the local funds, as now used, constitute a surplus account which could be dispensed with. You will remember that not long since he stated to Morelock his opposition to expenditures from local funds.

Our Board of Regents is not to meet until March 11, instead of February 11, as first planned. If the suggestion of Mr. Mayhew should carry, it will embarrass every teachers college . . . Take up this problem with Mr. Guleke and see that he thoroughly understands it . . .

Evans was very much aware of the fact that the board of regents had always operated under few if any formal rules of procedure; he believed that authority was assumed and arbitrary action taken at times with little regard for established procedure usually followed by similar groups. He took it upon himself to try to remedy this situation. On October 2, 1936, he wrote President Hill:

It is my judgment that we should, through the leadership of two or three members of our Board, try to bring about the adoption of By-laws (sic) governing the action of the Regents. If such By-laws should be adopted it would prevent some tremendously embarrassing problems that have occurred in recent years. A copy of the By-laws and regulations of the University of Texas is instructive and will point the way.

After Henry S. Paulus of Yoakum was promoted from vice-president to president of the board of regents in 1935, a note of anxiety appeared in many of Evans' communications regarding the board of regents. Paulus was a lawyer by profession and one who believed that any service rendered the colleges should be compensated for, by an adequate fee. His mind was full of ideas concerning the correct place of the president of the board in

terms of service to the colleges. Paulus openly hinted at some of these plans and Evans became more uneasy.

On February 10, 1937, Evans wrote a letter to all the presidents informing them of late developments and possible dangers:

We were somewhat alarmed several months ago on account of the program of the president of our board to open up an office, employ a secretary, and work a very large part of the time at the job of being president. We may have the equivalent of this program on the road for our consideration. Recently in San Antonio the new president of the school board for the San Antonio schools announced that he was turning the administration over to the city superintendent, commenting that the superintendent had not had any kind of chance for several years on account of the dictation of trustees.

It is well also to remember that at more than one meeting of our board within the last year, outside negotiations determined a policy and program prior to the meeting, and the only thing left for the regents to do was to ratify a cut-and-dried program. This, too, is tremendously dangerous.

I am, therefore, taking the liberty to request that as many of you as can do so meet me in Austin Tuesday, February 16, Stephen F. Austin Hotel, 8:30 p.m. We will at that time have an executive session. Say nothing about this meeting to anybody. Keep this letter in executive confidence.

I remind you that through the years the suggestions or warnings coming from my desk have resulted just about as I had indicated.

Slightly more than a month later, on May 22, Evans hinted broadly to the presidents that the cost of the regents to the teachers colleges was greater than the value received from the services of that board. He also expressed the conviction that there was a limit beyond which no administrative body should go in governing a school. He wrote:

For 1936-37 the salaries, traveling expense, and miscellaneous items for the board of regents made a grand total of \$12,674. Without any reference whatever to anything occurring at this time, I will say that college and public school administration alike are unanimously on record that broad, intensive efforts of regents and trustees extending over the years instead of being helpful, really add to the difficulties. You will remember that Colonel Ball had in mind, after reappointment, to put full time in the work of

"regenting," maintaining an office and stenographer the year round. I have no comment to make.

There was some evidence that all was not quiet and peaceful in the spring of 1939. Evans wrote to President Hill, one of his very closest friends in the Council of Presidents and the secretary of the Council, The letter dated March 15, marked "Personal," speaks for itself:

About 7 p.m. Tuesday at the Austin Hotel, our friend Bob Barker turned loose on McConnell [president of the college at Denton] and me about the President of the Board of Regents. With a good many oaths and still more emphasis than oaths, Bob denounced payment of large sums of money by the president of our board to himself for alleged attorney fees. Insisting that the matter was generally known and everybody against it, Bob talked in a wild and excited manner until we got a chance to bow ourselves away. In this conversation, however, Bob was frank in relieving McConnell and me of a large part of the blame, although he did not think we were altogether free from criticism.

Bullock Hyder<sup>9</sup> also got in touch with some discussions in high circles continuing the things mentioned and also the paid lobby activities of the Texas State Teachers Association. A prominent friend of mine advised me to advise you and the other presidents to give our State Senators a chance to talk to us and we might learn some interesting things. If even a small per cent of the unfavorable gossip is to be considered seriously, this whole situation will be tremendously embarrassing to the Texas State Colleges.

I thought you would want to know the happenings of yesterday, and you are at perfect liberty to show this letter to John E. Hill (regent from Amarillo) if you so desire.

### In A Matter Of Discipline

In a preceding chapter of this study it has already been noted that regents, at times, took part in matters of discipline, and that they were generally expected to support the institutional authorities to the fullest extent. In most cases support for the presidents was more than willingly given. In that "bad year of disciplinary troubles," 1925, President Evans' request for advice to Regent A. B. Martin of Plainview and Martin's cooperative response have been recounted.

<sup>9</sup> Bothmen mentioned in this letter were members of the legislature of Texas.

Also in that year, the action of the president of the board of regents in granting a hearing to dissatisfied students and former students has been related in detail. During the fall of 1925, several letters passed between Evans and his former dean of faculty and friend, A. W. Birdwell of Nacogdoches. The action of M. O. Flowers was still rankling in Evans' bosom. He referred to the student revolt as—

. . . such a bold piece of insolent insubordination that I do not see how school people may differ; but when members of our official body sympathize with such, I am still more surprised. Dissatisfied students were permitted to have conferences with our nearest regent and make all the complaints and criticisms that they cared to make of the president and faculty. I, myself, am unable to forecast the perils involved in such a policy; some of our best men here are at a loss to know which way to turn.

Birdwell suggested that a conference with some of the other members of the board might be helpful. He told Evans that Miss Margie Neal, regent from Carthage, would be at Nacogdoches at a teachers institute and that he would endeavor to talk with her on the subject. On September 22, Birdwell wrote again as follows:

I went to Carthage Sunday to speak in the Methodist Church there, and was entertained in the home of Miss Neal. I took occasion to say to her that if the board of regents would absolutely refuse to hear disgruntled students, the college faculty could handle all the internal affairs. I believe I did some good. And I have a notion that if we will "keep our shirts on," and work quietly on the matter we shall accomplish more for stability of the schools. . . .

Evans was in such an upset state of mind that he took advantage of Birdwell's willingness to listen and make comments. During the Christmas holidays of 1925, while Evans was on a vacation in the Rio Grande Valley, he wrote Birdwell a final letter, still lamenting the happenings of the summer session. To this letter Birdwell responded:

. . . I am of the opinion that you are thinking too seriously about the situation that confronted you last summer. I do not believe that the former response on the part of the Board will ever happen again. In other words, that body learned with their experience, and it is my opinion that they would agree now that the method pursued last summer was

not the best one. Furthermore, I happen to know that they all have confidence in you, and in your ability, and I know also that a large majority of the former students of the college at San Marcos love you very devotedly. I talked to a large number of them during the Dallas meeting, and they expressed the unanimous opinion that your work at San Marcos has been all that it could be.

I am writing this because I think there is some danger that you may be thinking too much of the situation last summer. Since 1911 your record at San Marcos has been a remarkable one. The situation last summer was a mere incident, and cannot in any way mar that record.

### Odd Numbers

It should be said first that this caption is used because it approaches, at least, the opinion which President Evans at times expressed of those regents whose actions were contrary to the image of a regent which he carried in mind.

Statesmanship comes difficult for most people, and regents must be included in this sweeping observation. Some members of the board of regents of the teachers colleges were ever alert to the opportunity to secure for their friends or distant relatives employment on the staff of the College. In a few instances Evans found himself practically compelled to employ persons recommended by members of the board, but he was never pleased when faced with that situation.

The president of the board for almost seven years, M. O. Flowers of Lockhart, felt little hesitancy in making recommendations of new personnel to the presidents. He was too intelligent to insist that any one of these be accepted, but his position and long tenure of office would, of themselves, exert a modicum of pressure on a teachers college president. So far as the records show, however, there is not a single instance in which President Evans accepted the recommendation of Flowers. He always took care to have a candidate previously selected for any opening so as to forestall this very event. A letter from Flowers dated April 17, 1923, and Evans' reply thereto illustrated how Evans tactfully handled one such situation. Flowers wrote:

It has been suggested to me that Mrs. Woodson (Mrs. W. I. Woodson, the attractive and well-liked wife of the professor of Education and dean of men) might not want

her position next year as dean of women. If that is true, I have in mind a lady that I want to suggest for your consideration.

Evans' reply :

The work of dean of women has been handled so admirably by Mrs. Woodson that we may continue her another year. . . . I have not been satisfied with the women applying to me for a position. No applicant has the scholarship, the culture, and adaptability, and the executive ability essential for a wholesome and efficient dean of women.

I will give the most careful consideration to any name you suggest to me.

Other members of the board assumed considerable freedom to recommend those in whom they were interested, but none quite to the extent practiced by the regent of Lockhart.

As a side issue to the disciplinary trouble of the summer of 1925, there was a hard-fisted political campaign in progress in Texas, and in connection with it one of the faculty members, Bertram Harry, teacher of Education, was in trouble with the regents on account of his remarks in introducing one of the candidates for governor appearing on the College campus for a speech before the student body. It was in connection with this matter and the action of the regents regarding it that Evans wrote the following long letter to the other presidents. The date was August 26, 1925:

This communication must be construed to be confidential in the strictest sense. There are just a few things occurring in the last three months that are of vital concern to all presidents, and we should think over these matters with a view to working out harmonious, satisfactory relations all the way round.

During the months of April and May, without my knowledge and without any communication with me whatever, a regent corresponded with a citizen in San Marcos relative to Bertram Harry, a member of my faculty. Our regent friend also secured information regarding other members of my faculty who were alleged Klansmen. Incidentally, my own record was investigated but declared clear. When the Board of Regents met in Austin June 12, Bertram Harry was denied reelection, and no little feeling grew out of the fact that in the face of adverse criticism and opposition, I nominated the objectionable teacher. I have talked with

our San Marcos man who gave the information to our regent, and while I have considered him a friend of my administration, I do not consider him a representative citizen of San Marcos.

In the interval between the June meeting of the Board and the meeting August 21, the correspondence between our regent and local citizens has continued, if I am correctly informed. At the same time, some similar things are occurring with other regents. Recently, we had to enforce our authority through the suspension of several students. Dissatisfied students in large numbers have had conferences with members of our Board, in which these students very freely criticized the College administration from their point of view. In most instances, these dissatisfied students are troublesome, meddlesome, and bolshevistic; they resent authority and are unwilling to cooperate in the maintenance of college discipline. Strange to say, I have not yet been informed regarding what these dissatisfied students said to members of the Board of Regents. It now appears, however, that in the future troublesome, dissatisfied students are to be placed upon the same basis as the President and faculty, and together we are to fight out our case before the Board of Regents.

But this does not yet end the case. The suspended students employed a lawyer who had no difficulty whatever in getting a hearing before the Board, and still less trouble in promptly enlisting the cooperation of one of our regents along the line of interfering with the internal control of these suspended students. Fortunately, wiser counsel prevailed, and the College authorities were left completely in charge of the suspended students, and were thereby enabled to maintain the integrity of the College.

But even this does not end the case. A number of discussions at the meeting of the Board last Friday revealed an interesting fact: Each State Teachers College is rapidly being localized with a local regent; the other members declared that they are to be governed entirely by what this local regent says. For instance, San Marcos no longer has six regents, the members of the board agreeing to go entirely by what M. O. Flowers of Lockhart, our nearest regent, says. Canyon no longer has six regents, the members of the Board indicating very clearly that they intend to be governed entirely by what A. B. Martin of Plainview says. I have not yet the names of the assigned regents to the other State Teachers Colleges.

Under such condition of affairs, I am raising the question "Where are we at?" Is our Board of Regents to deal directly with the Presidents of the several State Teachers Colleges and cooperate with them in the maintenance of a consistent educational policy? Or, is our Board of Regents to go outside of the presidents and seek definite information from other sources? Two years ago, the Board of Regents went outside the President's office at Denton and made inquiry of local citizens regarding certain criticisms of him. One year ago, the President of the Board of Regents wired a banker in Alpine, permitting the students of the Sul Ross State Teachers College to have a dance, although the President and faculty of Sul Ross had expressly forbidden such a dance. What will be the effect upon the State Teachers Colleges if the policies mentioned are to be applied to all of them? The history of college administration for the indefinite past uniformly shows the danger involved in all attempts on the part of boards of regents to take charge of the internal administrative affairs of a college. More than one university in America has been "trusteed to death."

As you will note, I am using conservative, sober statements, and I am making no captious criticisms of any one. The peril involved in the continuance of policies named can hardly be forecast. Would we not do well to take counsel and discuss some of these matters in a heart-to-heart way with our Board? I have the highest confidence in the integrity, honesty and good motives of each member of our official Board, and, so far as I know, my personal relations have been very pleasant indeed.

On September 7, 1925, Evans wrote M. O. Flowers referring to the reaction over the removal of Bertram Harry, and expressed the opinion that the only real danger then for adverse comment would come from a former board member, Dr. H. T. Musselman of Dallas. It appears from this statement that Evans had knowledge of some empathy or understanding between Professor Harry and Musselman.

The opposition of A. B. Mayhew to the use and the very existence of the local funds, without the use of which the presidents of the teachers colleges would face financial problems, has already been narrated. Mayhew's opposition, naturally, lost for him whatever popularity he may have enjoyed in the Council of Presidents. A stand even worse than this was taken by Mayhew in 1926, when, in an interview, he publicly advocated the discontinuance of one of the state teachers colleges, the Sul Ross



College at Alpine. He also succeeded in placing a resolution for discontinuance in the caption of the biennial budget of that school, which the board was called upon to approve.

Upon receipt of this news citizens of the Alpine area, as well as in many other\*parts of the state, dispatched telegrams and letters to Mayhew protesting his action. Mayhew did not ignore these protests; instead, he replied at great length to some of them, defending his position. A copy of one of his replies, dated September 24, 1926, to Homer D. Wade, Stamford, Texas, was sent to President Hill, who passed it on to President Evans. The message follows:

Replying to your telegram of 22nd inst., protesting against resolution in caption of budget, Sul Ross State Teachers College at Alpine, beg to say that I cannot agree with you that it is against the interest of the college. I have been a member of the Board of Regents for about eight years,<sup>10</sup> and I believe I have some knowledge of the needs of Teachers Colleges of Texas. This resolution was passed after long and mature consideration. The per capita cost of this school to the taxpayers is considerably more than double that of any other Teachers College. A four-year college course in this school for one thousand students will lose the taxpayers of Texas one-half million dollars. The legislature can easily afford to pay the railroad fare of every student coming to this school to Huntsville, Texas, and can, by so doing, save the taxpayers many thousands of dollars. This college does not belong to Alpine—it belongs to Texas. The college can exist at San Angelo, for instance, and will have a student body of one thousand within a short time. The per capita cost for San Angelo, or some other place of similar size, could be reduced more than half, and the college could live and prosper and be of service to a section of the country that is in sore need of such institution. How could it be said, then, that to remove it would hurt the college? It might hurt Alpine, but I cannot agree with the view that Texas owes any particular town the duty of expending many hundreds of thousands of dollars, which, in effect, amounts to a gift from the taxpayers, since this amount could be saved and the same territory served by merely changing the location of the college.

In addition to this, the legislature has steadfastly refused to do anything for this school, and it has made no

---

<sup>10</sup>This is an error on Mayhew's part. According to the annual catalogs of Southwest Texas, Mayhew was appointed to the board in 1925 and served until 1935. This error is extremely difficult to understand.

appreciable progress. Every effort on our part to raise the salaries of Presidents and teachers has met with opposition because to do so meant the raise of salaries at this institution where, it seems, more thought the work did not justify any raise. In other words, the Teachers Colleges, as a group, are allowed a certain salary scale. This institution interferes with the other Teachers Colleges whose employees deserve and must have a raise. It is unfair to these schools to have their program impeded and their usefulness crippled by the existence of this school, which has very little attendance and has no hope of ever having a great attendance. Instead of hurting this school, our action will put this matter squarely up to the legislature for action; and they will either move this school outright or get behind it and support it as they should.

If this school is to be left there, then the writer is heartily in favor of getting behind it in every way possible and making it a real school, if such can be done. In no other way, in my opinion, could we put this before the legislature for quick and decisive action. The writer was a member of the Board when this school was located at Alpine," and I hoped then and have continuously hoped since that something would come of it. Being a product of West Texas, with a lifelong residence here, my sympathies are with her people and their aspirations. No finer body of people live than the citizens who are patrons of this school in and around Alpine, but my conception of the duties of my office compel me to look at the interest of all Texas and not the interest of some particular locality. Pork-barrel politics and political log rolling has been the curse of the educational system of Texas. If we could remove our educational system from the blighting curse of politics, we could have one of the greatest educational systems in the United States on what we,are now spending.. Instead, we go forward wastefully duplicating work, listening to local politics — just drifting without any broad policy and without any coordination between our different State Schools.

There are many reasons, too long here to detail, behind our action in this matter. I am glad of this opportunity to write you and I feel certain that if you are intimately acquainted with the inside working of these Teacher Colleges you would agree with me. Certainly, I would be the last man in Texas to want to cripple my section of the State, and if I know myself my action in this matter is prompted

---

<sup>11</sup>This is also an error, as the school opened in June, 1920, according to Evans' *Story of Texas Schools*, pp. 295-297, almost five years before Mayhew's appointment.

by the wholehearted desire to be of service to the educational interests of Texas.

I thank you for your telegrams and for the privilege of explaining my attitude, which, I believe represents the attitude of the Board.

If Mayhew's statements were true, they not only confirmed the fears and doubts about the location at Alpine which President Evans expressed in 1917 (recounted earlier in this chapter) but were a unique forerunner of the arguments six or seven years later against continuance of the college at Alpine and all of the other teacher colleges except two.

After six years on the board, Mayhew still did not understand many of the details of organization in the several teachers colleges. On October 7, 1931, he called upon President Evans to explain a number of differences which he found as between one college and another. He wrote:

I want to arrange figures' . . . for the benefit of the board of regents in preparing the next biennial budget. But there are so many things that keep me from making an accurate comparison that I would like your suggestions concerning it. For instance, Huntsville, Commerce, and Alpine seem to show their training school instructors separate and distinct from the rest of the Education Department.

Canyon seems to have a professor of sociology and also two people running a Bureau of Public Service. If these three people are valuable additions to the faculty at Canyon, why do not the other teachers colleges have them? If six of them consider it unnecessary, should not the board of regents cut down that expense?

I notice the legislature gave San Marcos \$300 more money for salaries than they gave Commerce, and Commerce has over one-third more people enrolled, undoubtedly, in the long term and ten per cent more in the summer term. How can you justify this sort of thing?

I would like to have a comparison of the size of classes and the teaching load of the faculty members and I think it would be very valuable if we had a comparison of buildings so that the facilities of one college could be considered in comparison with its student body rather than from the standpoint of the time since they received a new building. This letter was typical of Mayhew's activity on the board.

In the last sentence he was striking at the practice of almost every one of the presidents — that of complaining about the length of time since a new building was granted. Nevertheless, in a letter dated October 9, 1931, President Evans patiently explained to Mayhew that whereas one college might have a professor of sociology who might also teach economics, government, or history—related subjects—another might call the professor in such a position professor of history or professor of economics.

Evans admitted that Commerce was entitled to more funds but explained the difference in terms of the number of assistant professors or instructors whose salaries were smaller than those of teachers higher in rank.

He complimented Mayhew on the study he was making of costs and his comparisons between the several colleges. However, in this letter Evans omitted answers to many questions asked by Mayhew. Then on October 20, he seemed to have become aware of this omission and wrote again. He did fail in the first letter to give any information regarding buildings and facilities, and in the second letter he did the very thing Mayhew had requested him not to do; he went into great detail to enumerate every structure on the San Marcos campus giving the date of construction, the original cost, and the cost of any additions. He concluded by giving a total value of all buildings as \$290,000, "excluding only the old, unsatisfactory Main Building, costing about \$40,000, and the Library shack, (sic) costing \$15,000 . . ."

Another of Evans' "odd numbers" was R. A. Stuart of Fort Worth. While Stuart was president of the board of regents, he undertook to persuade President Evans "as a personal favor" to buy music supplies such as turntable attachments to radios, records, phonographs and the like, "anything in the music line you might need." He continued: "The store is partially owned by Dr. Webb Walker, former member of our board. I am very anxious to assist Dr. Walker and Mr. O'Keefe, who are owners of the business, in procuring some of the business from the schools. I am sure that they can meet the prices from any house from which you have been obtaining your music supplies . . ."

It was easy for Evans to sidestep this request. He wrote:

Practically all of the equipment of the kind you mention can be bought most economically through cooperation with the Board of Control. Where we go away from the Board of Control to make purchases for emergency reasons, we usually have competitive bids, awarding the contract to the lowest bidder. As soon as we are in the market for any of the equipment mentioned, I shall suggest to the Business Office that an opportunity be afforded the Music Land of Fort Worth to bid on same.

### Political 'Windbreak

Upon occasion Evans called on the regents when he was faced with possible trouble. And he seemed to know which regent to call upon at any particular time, as he took pains to inform himself, if possible, of the political leaning of all members of the board. One occasion of anxiety came when, after the primary election in 1924, the husband of the nominee for governor, James E. Ferguson, delivered a speech in which he declared that any state employee who belonged to the Ku Klux Klan, or whose sympathies for the Klan were expressed publicly, or who had been active in the political campaign, would be fired.

Any projection of the Klan issue in Texas naturally brought concern to President Evans, as his brother, Hiram, was the "Imperial Wizard" of the nation-wide organization. On October 29, 1924, Evans wrote M. O. Flowers, president of the board of regents, as follows :

I do not like the alarming reports in the papers this morning about statements made by former governor Ferguson in his speech at Denton yesterday. I have no knowledge that any member of our faculty at any school has been active in the Klan or in politics, and I hope that any report to the contrary will prove unfounded. In view of these statements I can see great possibilities of danger ahead for us, because there are mean people who will be close to the governor.

Flowers, who had always opposed Ferguson, gave Evans little reassurance. He mentioned the fact that the citizens of San Marcos had not accorded Ferguson a cordial reception when he spoke at San Marcos during the campaign.

Evans' reply to Flowers of November 4 expressed vexation at the attitude of certain San Marcos citizens. He wrote:

. . . I cannot at all understand the judgment of some of our local citizens in some things that are done. On July 23, when Governor Ferguson spoke at San Marcos, I gave instructions to our Dean to assemble the entire student body to hear him speak. However, Governor Ferguson did not reach San Marcos until late in the afternoon and spoke on the lawn of the court house. I heard all of his speech except the first 15 or 20 minutes. . . .

On January 15, 1925, Evans wrote to A. B. Martin of Plainview, a well-known supporter of Ferguson:

. . . At the time of expiration of your term in January, 1921, the entire group of presidents of Texas State Teachers Colleges earnestly desired your retention on our board of regents, and the present governor knew this when he failed to reappoint you. If the incoming governor does not know that he has met the wishes of the whole group of presidents in appointing you again, it will not take very long to discover this fact.

With kind personal regards,

### **Finis**

The last report of President Evans to the board of regents was dated August 26, 1942. His letter of transmittal was as follows:

Beginning my work as President of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College at forty years of age, it has been my good fortune to continue in service for thirty-one years, retiring August 31, 1942. As Professor of Education and President Emeritus, I hope to make further contributions to the cause of education in the College and in the State. The Regents, individually and collectively, have been considerate and kind to me. I will always remember the courtesies and cooperation given me in my efforts to build up a standard college. I thank you very much.

## **XI PROBLEMS AND PILLARS**

### **Overview**

Fortunate is the college president who never has a serious problem concerning a faculty member. President Evans did not escape this most serious of all problems in a college. On one occasion, after he had been ordered by the board of regents to dismiss a faculty member and severely criticized by some of the

. . . I cannot at all understand the judgment of some of our local citizens in some things that are done. On July 23, when Governor Ferguson spoke at San Marcos, I gave instructions to our Dean to assemble the entire student body to hear him speak. However, Governor Ferguson did not reach San Marcos until late in the afternoon and spoke on the lawn of the court house. I heard all of his speech except the first 15 or 20 minutes. . . .

On January 15, 1925, Evans wrote to A. B. Martin of Plainview, a well-known supporter of Ferguson:

. . . At the time of expiration of your term in January, 1921, the entire group of presidents of Texas State Teachers Colleges earnestly desired your retention on our board of regents, and the present governor knew this when he failed to reappoint you. If the incoming governor does not know that he has met the wishes of the whole group of presidents in appointing you again, it will not take very long to discover this fact.

With kind personal regards,

### **Finis**

The last report of President Evans to the board of regents was dated August 26, 1942. His letter of transmittal was as follows:

Beginning my work as President of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College at forty years of age, it has been my good fortune to continue in service for thirty-one years, retiring August 31, 1942. As Professor of Education and President Emeritus, I hope to make further contributions to the cause of education in the College and in the State. The Regents, individually and collectively, have been considerate and kind to me. I will always remember the courtesies and cooperation given me in my efforts to build up a standard college. I thank you very much.

## **XI PROBLEMS AND PILLARS**

### **Overview**

Fortunate is the college president who never has a serious problem concerning a faculty member. President Evans did not escape this most serious of all problems in a college. On one occasion, after he had been ordered by the board of regents to dismiss a faculty member and severely criticized by some of the

members for renominating the teacher in the first place, Evans declared that he felt as if he had just got up from a long spell of illness. This feeling of frustration, failure, embarrassment, and weakness, all combined, would make almost any strong man tremble.

Newspapers usually treat these matters with consideration for the institution involved unless one of the parties resorts to the news media to present his side of the controversy to the public. Buried in the Evans files, and thus escaping his weeding-out efforts at retirement, which sent to the trash cans secrets half kept through the years, were found fragmentary bits of evidence that brought back to memory complete episodes.

No college president can conceal completely from the public the most obvious events of a faculty problem case. But, to escape as much as possible any unwelcome publicity, statements may be issued which, many times, practically everybody knows are by no means the whole story. Denials of statements published and accusations of exaggeration of published reports are standard defenses resorted to by presidents, and Evans was no exception,

Again, fortunate is the college president who is confronted with only one faculty problem case at a time. At least once, Evans had two on his hands. Most of the time such cases were kept so quiet that few of the other members of the faculty were aware of what was happening. But occasionally the cloak of secrecy only caused rumors to spread and grow, and the happening became magnified to unrecognizable proportions in the minds of the local people.

In all fairness, it must be said here that charges of immorality were very rare, and all suspected "affairs" between the sexes were referred to as "indiscretion," rather than by a worse term. Faithful employees were not hard to find, it seems, who would keep President Evans informed when the gossip started. Furthermore, Evans was fortunate in having about him people whose loyalty, and even personal affection for him, could never be questioned. In times of trouble, this circle of faithful ones rallied to his side; and the influence of these faculty members extended out to ex-students and parents to form solid moral support. The letters which sometimes poured in spontaneously surprised President Evans by revealing how the closely-guarded



news of an event had leaked out. At the same time, these letters gave him pleasing reassurance that he had not made a blunder in handling the case.

Many times Evans communicated with the other presidents when trouble with a faculty member appeared to be brewing. Frequently he was somewhat devious in his method. For example, he would ask another president to take the matter up with a certain regent so that it could be said that Evans himself had not reported the faculty member to the board of regents. As early as 1919, when he was anticipating trouble with a faculty member, or was actually in the midst of it, he wrote a letter to President Bruce of Denton. As with all such communications, he kept the correspondence strictly personal and confidential in nature, in a few instances writing in longhand or on his old Oliver typewriter at his residence, and never filing a copy at his office. The replies he received were marked personal and confidential, which, of course, no secretary would dare open. These replies, however, were not always so marked and fell into my hands in the performance of my routine duty to read all correspondence unless properly marked as personal communications. The envelopes bearing the mark of privacy had been discarded.

One such reply from President Bruce of Denton, dated July 26, 1919, had all the earmarks of having been typed by the writer himself; it carried this message.

I shall attend to the matter that you mentioned with Mr. Watkins,<sup>1</sup> and you know you can depend upon him.

I believe the Board should investigate any adverse report against the president by a member of the faculty, and finding such unwarranted, or finding even that such member did not give the president notice of such complaint or attack, then the Board ought to relieve the president of such member. We ought not to be expected to maintain an efficient school at any one of the places without loyalty of the faculties.

I think you ought to talk to Mr. Flowers about the matter and have Mr. Hill talk to Mr. Martin. I know they both feel as you in this matter for they have both talked to me.

The Board ought, in meeting, adopt some policy and adhere to it. If the Board can do nothing else and does not

---

1 A. B. Watkins of Athens, member of the board of regents.

2 Regent A. B. Martin of Plainview.

wish to advise the president of cases of disloyalty, then the Board ought, quietly but positively, to decline to affirm the nomination of such member and so inform the member and not leave it to be said simply, "You were not renominated."

The following cases are presented here for the purpose of making the Evans story complete. That Evans' experience was not widely different from that of many other college presidents may be safely assumed. He dealt with typical, average human material over a period of 31 years, and the chances are good that the true story of C. E. Evans is on the one hand a valid example of the pitfalls, the hardships, the painful sacrifices, and the failures of college presidents in general, which should call forth sympathy, understanding, and encouragement. And on the other hand, it is an example of the accomplishments, the selfless devotion to duty, the attainment of public honor, and, finally, the unparalleled service to the state and nation, for which their fellow citizens should be eternally grateful. For college presidents, the toll of death and disability in office is appalling. This statement is notably true among presidents of Texas colleges. The position of college president, especially in the early years of this century, was not one for a weakling. Not only the weight of total responsibility rested upon him, but also the crushing burden of never-ending detail which would have destroyed a man of lesser strength. There were, however, two factors in Evans' nature, his fine physique and his intense love for his job, that enabled him to go to the end, sound in mind, body, and spirit.

A selection of problems is here presented, then, with sufficient facts only to show the authenticity of each case and to present it impartially. The names of those involved were, in a majority of cases, published in the newspapers at the time the trouble occurred. In a few instances, names are omitted and identity withheld in an honest effort to write this story without causing embarrassment to any living person or to tarnish the memory of those who have passed away. No attempt is made to present these cases in chronological order.

### The Blake Case

One of the serious cases of trouble with a faculty member occurred in the case of Professor V. W. Blake, teacher of chemistry and biology, whose name appears first in the College catalog

for the regular session of 1924-1925, although his work began in the fall term of 1923, and appears last in the catalog of 1931-1932, making a total tenure of about ten years.

About the second year after he came to the College, Blake first attracted unfavorable attention to himself when he failed to appear at the president's reception for faculty members and had a private party at his home the same evening. He made the excuse to President Evans that the party at his home had been scheduled prior to any knowledge of the date of the president's reception. This single incident would not have caused Blake any difficulty whatever had there not been a series of others. A note in the Redbook in the fall of 1926 recorded that Blake would not be given an increase in salary for the regular session of 1926-1927 and no promise would be made of his retention on the faculty. For the previous biennium Blake had been given an increase in salary which, at that time, was considered substantial, the amount of \$133.33 per month for the nine-month session. The note in the Redbook also referred to Blake's unsatisfactory attitude, and made the comment that Blake was rarely ever at school except when he must meet a class. Note was taken also that he had quarreled with the textbook librarian, with the dean of the faculty, and with the dean of women. Moreover, Evans had been informed that Blake's relations with his students were frequently unpleasant. And someone had told Evans that even at his lodge Blake had been involved in objectionable bickering.

When confronted with almost any serious problem, Evans relied upon the advice which he asked for and received from some of the other teachers college presidents. By 1927, the Blake trouble had become serious enough for Evans to seek the advice of President Birdwell of Nacogdoches, his one-time colleague at the College, and President Hill of Canyon. Also, in August of that year, he took the matter to M. O. Flowers of Lockhart, president of the board of regents. This in itself was proof that Evans was deeply concerned about his relations with Blake. After the 1925 rebellion of students, during which Flowers had listened to the complaints of students against Evans, the latter had been hesitant about consulting Flowers on internal troubles. But he felt that he must have the backing of the board at all times when there was the possibility of the discharge of a faculty member.

Evans took no action, however, at that time and renominated Blake for the session of 1927-1928. There had been, by this time, a constant complaint to the dean of the faculty from Blake's students because of the severity of his grading. At conferences with Dean Nolle, Blake would complain, in turn, that the students would not apply themselves and that he was not ready to surrender his standards in order to raise the grades of lazy students. He declined any suggestions of the dean that he reexamine his methods of instruction. Undoubtedly, Blake's scholarship was above reproach. He knew his subject matter by rote and apparently kept up to date. In his personal library were found the latest editions of books in his field. The senior member of the science department, C. S. Smith, remarked that perhaps Blake knew too much biology and, therefore, expected too much of his students. However, Smith never made any criticism of Blake to the dean.

By 1931 the reputation of Blake as a teacher had reached the point where it was difficult to persuade students to enroll in his classes. President Evans then undertook to reason with Blake; but, according to the notes made by Evans, Blake wanted to talk of discrimination against him. He told Evans his position was a "state job" and that he was being subjected to "salary pressure" to get rid of him. Therefore, notice was served on Blake, dated May 2, 1931, that his nomination for the year 1931-1932 would be as long as his position could be promised him, and a request ~~was~~ made for acknowledgement of the notice. Again on May 7 and also on May 27, notices were sent, but there was no response from Blake. Then a letter from the president of the board of regents informed Evans that Blake had placed his case before the regents, but that the board would take no action unless requested to do so by President Evans.

When it appeared certain that he had, in effect, been officially dismissed, Blake began to cultivate the favor of students, and instead of giving more than 50 per cent F's and no grade higher than C as he had done previously, he gave more than 50 per cent A's and no F's at all. He secured a petition signed by students and some of his friends in town, pleading for his retention. In addition, he began to accuse other faculty members of attending drinking parties at times, which included students as guests, and also of other misconduct. He even charged his

colleague, Professor Smith, with making derogatory statements about the College.

Blake received final notice of his dismissal on May 3, 1932. He immediately and quite meekly asked for work during the summer session, and begged for leave of absence rather than dismissal, promising to attend a university for study toward the doctorate. Evans yielded on the request for employment during the summer session but tried to make it clear that Blake's usefulness to the College had ended and that he should seek employment elsewhere.

It was then that Blake became beligerent, apparently intending to cause President Evans and Dean Nolle as much trouble as possible. Evans tried in vain to persuade Blake to confer with him for the purpose of showing the man that his actions could only do harm to his future chances for employment in the teaching profession. But Blake refused all invitations for a conference. By the first of August Evans was alarmed, and on August 5 he wrote the following letter to A. B. Mayhew of Uvalde, then president of the board of regents:

I think that the friends of Blake, and probably Blake himself, have cultivated ill will among citizens and students. Some very bitter, unkind things have been said, accompanied even by threats. To what extent Mr. Blake is involved it is difficult to say; in any event, he is exceedingly angry and is in no frame of mind to talk to anybody.

A few days ago, I suggested to Mr. Blake to come back today at one o'clock, and we would talk over matters. I had nothing in mind to say to him, but thought perhaps he would like to talk his situation over with me, especially since he asked me for a leave of absence. Today, he called me over the telephone, at first declining to come to my office upon invitation and notified me that he would talk to me only in the presence of witnesses. A few minutes later he came inside my door, declining to take a seat, saying that this matter should be settled at once, and that he would talk to me only in the presence of witnesses he selected. I told him I had nothing particular to say, but would talk to him if he wished me to do so.

It is my opinion that no good can come out of a conference with him in his present frame of mind, and certainly no good could come from a conference bringing in parties clean outside of the school. It is an effort to play politics again, just as he has on other occasions.

Again on August 27, Evans wrote the following brief note to Mayhew:

. . . I had a call this morning from V. W. Blake. He made some unusually vicious, unkind, and discourteous statements. I was not surprised, however, and paid no attention whatever to him.

Apparently the purpose of this note was to keep Regent Mayhew fully informed so that he could be prepared for whatever might happen. Evans was very uneasy that Blake might at the last moment resort to violence. He requested me to be alert and not to admit Blake until I had announced his presence. During the closing days of the summer session, I never left the office without informing President Evans and letting him know when I would return. At last, what Evans had anticipated happened. Blake walked into my office and started at once for the door to President Evans' inner office. I intercepted him with a firm grip on his arm. He said angrily that I had no business in this matter. Seeing no evidence that he was armed, I released his arm, led him into the office, and stood ready to protect President Evans.

If Blake had intended violence against Evans, he changed his mind, and after a moment or two he began trembling and mumbling almost incoherently that he had been grossly mistreated and that Evans would pay for it with the loss of his job. Furthermore, he said, Evans' "henchman," Dean Nolle, would take over Evans' job. Evans tried to find soothing words and assurances of no personal ill will, of all of which Blake took no notice. He finally went slowly out the door. With his going the case ended.

### **The Harry Trouble**

From a news story in the *San Antonio Express* of August 15, 1925, concerning the controversy with students during the summer session of 1925, the following quotation is taken:

. . . The students also protested failure of the board of regents to reelect to their places on the faculty Bertram Harry, who had been on the staff seven years, and H. A. Nelson, who had been in the college sixteen years.

. . . Bertram Harry would not talk. "I only trust everything is settled amicably," he said.

His friends claim that higher-ups ordered that he be not reelected by the Board of Regents because he introduced Felix Robertson, gubernatorial candidate, during the run-off, when the so-called Ku Klux Klan favorite spoke to the student body in the college chapel. They claim that Harry was an innocent victim because he was assigned the introductory speech by superiors.

The foregoing quotation would lead the reader to suspect, at least, that Professor Harry was the victim of injustice, as the story intimated. However, this quotation is only a fragment of the complete story. A statement issued by M. O. Flowers, president of the board of regents, after the opening of the fall term of 1925, adds much more information to the Harry case. It is as follows:

President M. O. Flowers of the State Board of Normal Regents has the following to say relative to the failure of the Board to re-elect Bertram Harry: "Mr. Harry was guilty of active, persistent, and offensive meddling in local, district, and other partisan politics. In local elections, district elections, in the race for county judge in Hays County, and in at least one gubernatorial contest, Mr. Harry took strong partisan stock. 111 May, 1924, Mr. Harry, upon request of the College Registrar, introduced Robinson (sic) to the student body of the College, as the next governor, and virtually advised the students to vote for him. This conduct of Mr. Harry was in direct violation of the standing policy of the College to invite all candidates for governor to speak to the student body, and to give these candidates impartial, non-partisan introduction. On several occasions Mr. Harry was warned by the President of the College to use better judgment, and keep clear of political rows. The Board of Regents believes that Mr. Harry, being the regular college instructor in School Administration, and being familiar with the literature on the subject of administration, had ample professional knowledge to know both the error and danger of dabbling in partisan politics, aside from any warning given him. The Board also believes that Mr Harry had sufficient warnings to stop meddling in partisan politics. Ignoring the best practice in the p ofession of teaching, and not heeding the warnings given him in full time, Mr. Harry has brought about his own dismissal.

"This policy of the Board is supported by the best professional authority and by the best professional ethics. City superintendents and college presidents advise their

teachers to stay out of factional political contests. The President of the Board of Regents, upon inquiry, is informed that standard professional books on education condemn the practice of teachers interfering with local political contests. The President has before him a copy of Suzzallo's *Our Faith in Education*, written by Dr. Henry Suzzallo, President of the University of Washington, from which he quotes the following paragraph :

'Of course, if teachers, like judges, are to have a certain undisturbable position in which to do their fundamental and influential work, they cannot at the same time be both partisan politicians and independent educators. There is no privilege which is not accompanied by a duty; no liberty that is not associated with a restraint. Thus there has grown up for teachers, as for judges, a certain code of proprieties which expresses their moral obligations.'

"This action of the Board of Regents is justified on the grounds of public welfare, and is even supported by the decision of higher courts. In a case passed upon by a higher court in California, the Court of Appeals refused to reinstate a teacher under suspension for engaging in politics, giving the following reasons:

'It is to be observed that the advocacy before the scholars of a public school by a teacher of the election of a particular candidate for public office—the attempt thus to influence support of such candidate by the pupils and through them by their parents—introduces into the school questions wholly foreign to its purposes and objects; that such conduct can have no other effect than to stir up strife among the students over contest for a political office, and the result of this would inevitably be to disrupt the required discipline of a public school. Such conduct certainly is in contravention not only to the spirit of the laws governing the public school system, but of that essential policy according to which the public school system should be maintained in order that it may subserve in the highest degree its purposes.'—*Goldsmith v. Board of Education*, 225 Pac. 783 (1924).

"The Board of Regents has in mind the establishment of a policy to guide the Teachers Colleges of Texas in the future. Not only must instructors in State Teachers Colleges stay out of the mire of politics; they should even go further by teaching the prospective teachers of Texas the danger of being partisans in local matters. The teacher in school and college is acting in a representative capacity; he cannot use his representative capacity to build up one faction by break-



ing down another faction, without endangering the highest welfare of the school. If our Supreme Court judges refuse to engage in partisan politics for fear of soiling their judicial ermine, should not instructors in State Teachers Colleges decline to participate in factional politics for fear of endangering the permanent welfare of the schools?"

But even the statement of the president of the board of regents does not complete the story. Harry was employed in 1918 to teach Education. He held the master of arts degree from the University of Missouri, which had been awarded that year. For the first four years of his tenure, there is no evidence that he was not in the good graces of the College administration. Then reports began coming to Evans in 1922 to create doubt that Harry was altogether satisfactory as a teacher. At a faculty meeting on November 10, 1922, Harry strolled into the meeting several minutes late. President Evans paused, looked at Harry, and before the assembled teachers, delivered a reprimand—not for being late to the faculty meeting, but for being late to his classes, at times as much as twenty minutes.<sup>3</sup>

Later the quality of Harry's instruction was criticized in reports to President Evans by certain mature students. In the spring of 1923, the Redbook records that Miss Alma Lueders, later appointed to the faculty, who had enrolled for Education 105<sup>4</sup> under Harry, complained to President Evans that the teacher was lecturing from the very same text which he had used in Education 245<sup>5</sup> a course which Miss Lueders had taken previously under Harry. Moreover, Miss Lueders charged that the lectures themselves were the same."

A note in the Redbook in 1925 indicated that President Evans regarded Harry as "visionary and impractical." He also added a note that one of Harry's students had refused to hand

---

<sup>3</sup>The Redbook for 1922 under heading of "Faculty Meeting." The note was written in pencil, and was the first mention of Harry in the Redbook, but it was by no means the last. Subsequently the writer was told of the incident by the late C. E. Chamberlin, Professor of Business Administration, who at that time was secretary of the faculty.

<sup>4</sup> Principles of High School Teaching, College catalog, 1922-23, p. 54.

<sup>5</sup> Selecting the High School Curriculum, *Ibid.*, p. 59.

<sup>6</sup> In a subsequent faculty meeting, April 28, 1923, Evans devoted some time to a warning against duplication.

in a paper required of all students; nevertheless, the student received a grade in the course. The opinion was written that other students did not believe that Harry took the time to read these papers.

The Redbook, under date of June 3, 1925, carried the memorandum that Evans would mention the problem of Professor Harry to the president of the board of regents, M. O. Flowers, at a conference set for June 12. On September 4, Evans wrote the following to Regent Flowers :

I have an engagement with Secretary R. T. Ellis (of the Texas State Teachers Association) in Fort Worth Saturday. I expect to go over the situation affecting Mr. Harry so that he may not get an erroneous idea. If the professional journals should once get it started that Mr. Harry's removal came about through the mere introduction of a candidate for governor, and for his being a member of the Klan, it would do us much harm among our teacher friends. Friends of the College need to know only the facts, and the facts will abundantly and loudly speak for themselves.

One year after Harry's dismissal, there was some evidence that he was working against the College wherever he could. Evans reported this information to M. O. Flowers in a letter dated June 4, 1926, part of which is quoted herewith:

. . . In the meantime, as information, I wish to call your attention to the action of Mr. Bertram Harry. He was in San Marcos last Wednesday, and suggested to a few students of the College a possible row that would occur Wednesday evening at our alumni banquet. The evidence points very strongly to connivance on his part with the summer trouble-makers of last year to the end that a new row may be stirred up some time during the summer quarter. We know that he was in close conference in San Marcos with members of the disturbing element of the summer of 1925. When I get the full information at hand I will submit it to you.

### The Case With The **Happy Ending**

The year 1925 has already been referred to in another chapter of this study as "that bad year." In the midst of one of the most serious student rebellions in the history of the College, there were troubles with two faculty members, both of whose

---

7See "Bring Back the Wayward," Chap. IX.

tenure was apparently secure, and the difficulties were of such a nature that one, Bertram Harry, was dismissed from the teaching staff; and the other, after having been dismissed, was reinstated.

The latter controversy was with H. A. Nelson, who had been appointed to the faculty in 1909, was now in his sixteenth year as a professor of agriculture. He was a diploma graduate of the College, 1909, and was a popular member of the faculty and of the ex-students association when Evans took office. Nelson's long tenure and good record, as well as the fact that he had been appointed by Evans' predecessor, made the difficulty with him all the more serious for Evans. A college president has enough troubles without being accused of discharging a faculty member because of the teacher's loyalty to his former chief.

The San Antonio *Express* of August 15, 1925, already referred to in the Harry case, also mentioned the Nelson case and gave the following account:

A petition addressed to Dr. Evans asking the reinstatement of Nelson has been circulated and signed by business and professional men in San Marcos.

Nelson told his own story to San Antonio Express Saturday. "The only grievance the board of regents has against me is that I sold them a lot adjoining the athletic field for \$500," he said. "The land is triangular in shape 90 by 73 by 126 feet." He said that he and Dr. Evans had sold approximately nine acres adjoining the College farm to the institution for \$5,000. Dr. Evans said that he and Nelson had loaned their credit to the College to purchase the acreage mentioned by Nelson and that they as individuals never had owned it and did not profit one cent by the transaction.

"The college did not have the money to buy the property, so we purchased it and gave the use of it until such time as we were reimbursed," Dr. Evans said.

Nelson said he would appear before the board of regents at a meeting during the week and that he is hopeful of being reinstated.

The first record which forecast the Nelson controversy was made in the Redbook in December, 1924, in a memorandum for the meeting of the board of regents. It consisted of four words: "Nelson, condemnation of land." Nelson's statement about the sale of the small piece of land might not have created such a

disturbance in the College administration had Nelson kept the matter quiet. The sum of \$500, no doubt, appeared to be no more than a reasonable figure to Nelson, and actually below the market price for the land. A high board fence had been built around the athletic field, and the workmen had mistakenly followed the driveway or narrow street leading from Pleasant Street along Nelson's property line to a small residential area north of the athletic field. The exact location of the boundary line between the Nelson property and the college-owned land was not known to the workman, the narrow street appearing to be the property line. A survey, however, showed that the athletic field then occupied part of Nelson's land in the shape and dimensions he gave in his interview to the *Express*.

A complicating factor at the time of the transaction which passed the title from Nelson, to the College was a campaign then in full swing among the students to raise funds for the improvement of the field. A generous idea formed in Nelson's mind that he would not accept the entire \$500, but would ask for only \$400 and contribute the remaining value of \$100 to the fund. He wrote the following news story, along with the headline and submitted it for publication in the *College Star*.<sup>8</sup>

Prof. H. A. Nelson Donates \$100 to Bigger, Better Evans Field

Mr. Nelson owns land on which the southwest corner of the present athletic field is located.

This includes about 156 feet south front, and about 130 feet west front<sup>9</sup> which property has been used for the past ten or twelve years by the athletic department free of charge.

This includes the large gate entrance at the southwest corner and some distance to the north and also to the east.

The real estate is valued at \$500. Mr. Nelson offers to

---

<sup>8</sup> Issues of the *Star* for 1925 could not be found. However, President Evans, after the story appeared, asked for the original copy submitted by Nelson, and this was retained in the Evans files. The writer remembers well the story published in the *Star*.

<sup>9</sup> Note that these measurements differ substantially from those he later gave to the *Express*. According to a survey by S. M. Sewell, surveyor and professor of mathematics, the actual measurements were, south front 67 ft. and west front 104 ft. The other, or inner, side of the triangle was 116 ft. making .07 acre.

donate \$100 of this valuation to the "Bigger, Better Evans Field" and take the balance, \$400 in cash.

Then, added by the editor of the *Star* was the concluding paragraph:

This donation from Professor Nelson is one of the largest yet received by the committee in charge of the drive and far exceeds the average amount pledged by the faculty members of the College. This support is a tribute to Mr. Nelson's spirit and his backing of the Bobcat teams.

After many weeks of discussion about the purchase of the land and already smarting under the feeling that the price asked by Nelson was almost three times the actual value of the land, Evans felt that the Nelson story added insult to injury. But knowing that court proceedings for condemnation of the small area would surely result in an almost interminable delay in the improvement of the field, Evans had very reluctantly agreed to Nelson's price. But after the appearance of the story written by Nelson himself, Evans could no longer restrain himself from a confrontation with Nelson. He refused to recognize the reduction of \$100 as a donation from Nelson. However, his better judgment dictated that a retraction of the Nelson story in the *Star* would only disturb student morale and, perhaps, dampen the enthusiasm for the raising of funds; so he authorized the payment of the entire \$500 to Nelson and presented the affair to the board of regents.

On March 14, 1925, Evans wrote the following letter to M. O. Flowers:

As per agreement with you over long-distance telephone, I purchased the H. A. Nelson lot on the southwest corner of our athletic field, paying for the same \$600, this amount of money being contributed by the students for this purpose. The estimated amount of land in this lot is one-fourteenth of an acre. The lot faces a small branch which, during rainy seasons, has running water . . . The survey made for Mr. Nelson changes somewhat the dimensions given in the report on valuation by the committee, a copy of which is enclosed, but the area is changed so little as to be negligible. You will note that one committee valued the lot at \$200, while a second committee valued the lot at \$100. The athletic field, of which this is a corner triangular lot, was bought in 1914 from the San Marcos Utilities Company at

an average price of \$650 per acre. The Nelson lot, at the same valuation, would mean \$7,000 an acre or more, and the entire athletic field would have cost the state \$25,000 or more, instead of \$3,150.

The state contemplated buying the two tracts, as indicated in the enclosed reports, but decided to abandon the purchase of the larger tract. It would be necessary to condemn both tracts of land in court after somewhat expensive litigation, and it is difficult to tell how long litigation would have delayed final judgment of valuation. For this reason, and in compliance with our agreement over the telephone, I requested the Attorney General to dismiss the suit, and our plans are to give up indefinitely the purchase of additional land from Mr. Nelson.

In order to keep the record absolutely straight, I desire to say that the price paid for this piece of land is unreasonable and unfair, and I have bought the lot under protest and solely because we must go on with improvement on our athletic field in order to continue in an efficient manner our athletic activities.

Evans' resentment against Nelson grew so strong that he could not bring himself to nominate his teacher of agriculture to the board for reelection. A note made in the Redbook, along with the date, July 8, 1925, included the following:

(1) A state employee should not sell land to the state at a price which public opinion would not approve, especially if the need for the land is imperative. (2) The price should be arbitrated if there is no chance for agreement otherwise. (3) The employee should leave off lawyers and get friends to help. (4) There is always danger of personal feeling being aroused. (5) Nelson's position is not filled, but when filled, may be only for one year. June 10 to July 12—four weeks since meeting.

Nelson, on the other hand, in the firm belief that he had acted entirely within his legal lights and in accordance with his moral duties, made no attempt, so far as is known, to undo the financial transaction for the land. He consulted an attorney, considered to be friendly to the College, and employed him to undertake his reinstatement in the favor of Evans and the board of regents. Nelson's numerous friends in San Marcos and among the ex-students spoke and wrote in his behalf. In the meantime, Nelson kept right on with his classroom duties. Mrs. Nelson

wrote a touching plea for her husband, which added its part in softening President Evans. However, on June 24, Evans wrote again to Regent Flowers, showing that he had not yet changed his mind:

I am enclosing letters which are self-explanatory. Mrs. Nelson is in no wise involved in this controversy and her name does not need to be dragged into it. The only request I have to make in the matter is to give Mr. Nelson a chance to present his side of the case before his successor is elected. This will make it much easier for us when fair-minded people inquire regarding the manner and cause of changing teachers. I will add, however, this sentence in regard to the transaction as a whole: No outside party, in selling property to the College, has displayed so small a sense of fairness and so little consideration for adjustment as has Mr. Nelson, a trusted instructor.

On June 25, Nelson sent a telegram to the regents requesting a hearing before the board. A letter dated June 26 from A. B. Mayhew, member of the board at Uvalde, reads as follows:

I had a telegram yesterday from Mr. Nelson asking for a prompt hearing by the whole Board of Regents before final action was taken in his case. I presumed it was sent to every member of the Board, but I mailed the telegram to Mr. Flowers with a copy of the letter I wrote to Mr. Nelson advising him to take the matter up with Mr. Flowers, because the Board meets only at Mr. Flowers' suggestion. . . .

The staff for the summer session, having been employed before this trouble grew serious, Nelson taught through the entire summer of 1925. He made no public statements, other than that mentioned in the *San Antonio Express*, and avoided any action which could be construed as insubordination or which had the appearance of fighting against the president of the College. On August 8, Regent Flowers wrote Evans that a friend of his, who had two daughters in school at the College, had visited him in behalf of Nelson and Harry. Flowers said he had agreed to a hearing for the men to be held in Austin, August 22.

A brief note in the Redbook dated August 14, gave evidence that Evans' desire to be rid of Nelson was fading. The note made the comment that the allegation that Nelson was a disagreeable person to his classes or other members of the faculty was false, that his only error had been in consulting lawyers in the controversy.

At the summer commencement exercises, Nelson took his place dutifully with other faculty members, displaying no outward sign that this might be his last public appearance as a member of the teaching staff of the College. Perhaps nothing he could have done would have reacted so much in his favor with the College administration. To many faculty members, attendance upon graduation exercises, especially in the crushing heat of an August evening, is a chore which they would have gladly shirked were it not for the duty they felt to the graduating students and to the College. The day following the exercises both President Evans and Dean Nolle were mentioning Nelson's presence with smiles of pleasure.

The determination and good judgment of Professor Nelson in doing all he could to allay animosity and keep the matter as quiet as possible had brought him his deserved reward. He remained on the faculty until retirement age some twenty years later. It was agreed, however, that Nelson would take a leave of absence for one regular session and pursue graduate study. He attended A. and M. College and received the master of science degree in 1926. Only one concluding statement is needed in the Nelson case. In a letter to M. O. Flowers, dated August 23, 1927—two years later—Evans wrote for the purpose of making additional nominations to the faculty and a few modifications to the payroll; and in closing he recommended an "adjustment" (a raise) in the salary of H. A. Nelson, all of which was approved by Flowers.

### **Gates Thomas, The Rebel**

A profound scholar, a devoted teacher of his mother tongue, an admirer of Walt Whitman, Carl Sandburg, Robert Frost, Edgar ~~Lee~~ Masters, and many other poets and writers of realistic literature, Gates Thomas assumed his position as teacher of **English** in 1909, having been appointed by T. G. Harris, the first president of the College.

In the make-up of Gates Thomas there was not a shred of hypocrisy. He dared to analyze social as well as educational conventions, and he believed his students had the maturity and the intellect to question these conventions as a means of enjoying literature and of gaining a better understanding of society, with little danger of their becoming confirmed iconoclasts. He felt



little, if any, necessity of warning his students not to go overboard in rejecting social customs; and he refused to detract from their enjoyment of literature by sermonizing. His patterned reply to a critical question from a student was, "I want you to be able to judge this for yourself. You may not always be protected against strange ideas; you may not always be fortunate enough to have indigestible printed matter screened out of your reading diet. Think for yourself!"

In a teachers college dedicated to the preparation of teachers for the public schools, where the whole atmosphere tended to be charged with the conservative, Thomas probably knew he was treading on thin ice; but he evidently believed that an appreciation of modern literature was worth the risk. Inevitably, in this situation, a few of his students were to misinterpret and be shocked by some of the selections which Thomas assigned; and just as inevitably, President Evans was to secure the distorted information which these few students carried from Thomas' classroom.

Beginning about 1920, Evans started a series of Redbook notes, making a record of the information which came to him concerning Thomas. The first comments charged Thomas with generally unsatisfactory activities, mainly outside the classroom. The following comments are typical:

Thomas: (1) Pleads lack of time and objects to a full assignment. (2) He is indifferent in all his work. (3) He hands in entrance examination papers late. (4) He dismissed classes early for several years. (5) Frequently he is gone during school hours. (6) He attends to private business during school hours. (7) He is not professionally spirited. (8) He takes no interest in school except doing the minimum amount of work. (9) If one-fourth of the faculty were like him, it would ruin any school. (10) His life is not an inspiration to a single student.

The Thomas problem gradually grew as the months passed. In 1922, notes in the Redbook declared that "He is radical in education, religion, and the Bible. He has seriously affected the religious beliefs of several young men. He says anyone can think as one pleases and what one pleases and express what one pleases. And one can act as he pleases without any regard to society. He says the Bible is a myth." Then Evans makes this comment

in question form: "Can a man think as he pleases and what he pleases without social restraint or without reference to a charter of principles and be a safe leader or a useful citizen?" Evans felt that Thomas "has fallen under the influence of the teachings of Emma Goldman, an atheist and disbeliever in all government and law, divine and human; her belief is that the rich are oppressors of the poor . . . She does not personally believe in violence or robbery except where necessary, and she would leave the question of necessity to everyone's individual judgment." Then Evans quoted Thomas as himself having told his students that "It is ethically and socially wrong to indoctrinate. Part of the trouble with education is intellectual vagrancy."

Evans also noted that Thomas "didn't believe the story of Adam and Eve, declaring it to be another myth of the Bible. He has the faculty of leading others to believe radicalism. He believes in the maximum of individual freedom with the minimum of social restraints. To him marriage is a serious, but not a sacred, affair." And here Evans made a list of reading matter advocated by Thomas, including *The Way of All Flesh*, the *New Republic*, and *Freeman*.

The notes resumed with the gossip that "Mr. Thomas is dating a certain lady, but he is not going to marry: he believes in free love. When a girl student told Thomas about her mother's comment on a book he had recommended, he said, 'What!' Did you let your mother see that book?' He discussed free love in class during a study of *Spoon River Anthology*. At one point he asked the students, 'How do you know there is a god? What do you learn in Sunday School?' Students consider him an infidel, unfriendly to the Bible."

Evans had the following statement, dated September 8, 1922, copied and a copy sent to Professor Thomas:

The Board of Normal Regents believes that students going out from the Normal Colleges of Texas to teach in the public schools should be encouraged to render positive service to the moral, social, civic, and religious life of their communities. The Board, therefore, expresses strong disapproval of all propaganda, whether in classroom, or social conversation, or books and magazines, which tends to undermine the religious faith of young men and young women, to develop the attitude of free thinking and skepticism, to create radicalism,

to break down accepted conventions and proprieties of conduct, or to destroy the belief of young men and young women in the sanctity of marriage. School trustees and school people generally are not seeking skeptics, atheists, radicals, bolshevists or free love defenders for teachers.

In the fall of 1922, the records indicate that Thomas took a leave of absence for graduate study at the University of Missouri. While Thomas was away from the campus, it appears that Evans tried to accomplish by correspondence with Thomas what he had failed to accomplish in face-to-face conferences. This correspondence was so confidential that President Evans never dictated to me (one of Thomas' "A" students) any of his admonitions or appeals. However, President Evans, just as in several other instances, was negligent in allowing some of Thomas' replies to fall into my hands in the routine of handling the correspondence of the office. His notes in the Redbook were without a doubt a first draft of his handwritten letter to Thomas. Apparently among the first of these communications is one which shows that in 1923 Evans was still in puzzlement over the case of the head of his English Department. He wrote in the Redbook: "Religious environment and wholesome influence help little when an instructor in the largest department whose moral support would be valuable is anti—" Here the note broke off without being completed. It seemed to occur suddenly to President Evans that a different approach would be more effective. At any rate, the following note was written as if it were to serve the purpose of a script to guide in the questioning of a witness or a defendant in court:

Did you cooperate last summer in eliminating objectionable matter? Did you place in the hands of students books that had been taken from library reserve shelves because of dangerous teaching?

Did you cooperate in 1921-22 in cutting out indecent publications? Did you have students briefing atheistic articles from paper, etc.? Obligations between any institution (and its faculty) are mutual. Your attitude is that of the boy who thinks the world owes him a living.

Your attitude toward preachers and churches is an attitude toward the College policy of building up religious influences through cooperation with churches and fostering Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. Has an institution any rights when it learns that its Head Professor is spending time and

energy in chasing socialistic rainbows and choosing to despise professional work in a professional school? Your fellow teachers think the community will not stand for an instructor who has contempt for the ideals the best people want.

You are employed to teach English. Your actions are the equivalent of departing from your subject matter and beginning to teach Hebrew. I have followed only a regular procedure—legitimate criticism and objections . . . Your response—insulting remarks. It is best to settle finally a policy. Two antagonistic policies are neither wise nor sensible—God and Mammon. You decline and run off after personalities. I confine myself to issues. While I do not know, I believe all 'this to be propaganda.

In spite of all that President Evans said and the apprehension he must have felt over what he believed was blameworthy conduct on the part of Gates Thomas, it is doubtful that Evans ever seriously entertained the idea of his dismissal from the faculty. The few letters which I was permitted to see, naturally, were the less controversial ones. When Evans was looking for a kindergarten teacher and received an application from a graduate student at the University of Missouri, he sent Thomas the following telegram :

Gates, Thomas, Columbia, Missouri: Advise with Williams regarding Miss Higginbotham. Write full statement. Hard fight in legislature on appropriations and governor's vetoes. Favorable meeting of regents.

Anyone who knew C. E. Evans could detect cordiality in this telegram. The information regarding a "favorable meeting of regents" could well have been omitted from this message if it had been a communication strictly of a business nature.

The absence of Thomas from the College for a period of almost two years may have helped him gain a better perspective of the mounting tension between him and Evans. And his marriage to a gentle and lovely lady in August of 1922, shortly before leaving for Columbia, Missouri, probably helped him to look with greater understanding and favor upon the conventions of society, some of which he had hitherto regarded as bars to his freedom.

The untimely death of Gates Thomas on June 9, 1945, after 36 years of service to the College, brought forth an outpouring of praise for him by his friends and in the public press. One of

the outstanding tributes to him was written by C. E. Evans, who had retired three years before.

## **A Tribute To Gates Thomas**

By C. E. Evans

Devoting more than forty years of a full life to teaching young men and young women in high school and college, Gates Thomas typified the best in teaching to energize the best in students ; it took the best in the students to meet the Thomas goal of a rich student life. Students honored and loved Gates Thomas for the quality, the spirit, the human kindness, the sparkling brilliancy, the rare versatility, and the profound thought of his daily classroom instruction and daily personal contacts.

Among friends Gates Thomas represented kindness, sympathy, sincerity, goodwill, trustworthiness, broadmindedness, and high levels of thinking. Thomas harbored worthy, helpful, constructive, noble thoughts ; the little and the narrow never had a place in his life pattern. He never walked over the gold eagle of splendid living to look for the copper cents of trifling doings ; he expected the best in others and courted the best of life only.

Among fellow teachers, Gates Thomas was ethical, democratic, cooperative, constructive, and forward looking. He would give more to enable the fellow teacher to get more. He would frown down all suggestions of antagonism or disloyalty. The mischief maker, the marplot, or the cynic never got a hearing from Thomas ; he stood adamant for the sincerity and worth of his fellow teacher.

Among college executives, Gates Thomas was a Department Director and executive counselor with inspirational outlook and stimulating leadership. Responsibility lodged in him was accepted with a firm resolve to measure up to its highest obligation. Conscious of the wisdom of administrative policies advocated, he would prefer to be patient rather than stubborn, since time would soon show the soundness of his judgment. Gates Thomas was a powerful influence in the building of standards that make possible Texas State Teachers Colleges fully accredited in Texas and the nation over ; he forecasted the development of the many-sided student life of the teachers college of today. Our debt to him is great ; let's pay that debt by continuing the college forward march of sound, liberal, constructive, and progressive policies.

The foregoing tribute would seem to be impossible coming from C. E. Evans in view of the opinion he had held of Thomas twenty years earlier. The only reasonable explanation is that there was always between the two men a strong current of affection that motivated both, in the midst of an almost certain break between them, to seek earnestly for a means to restore their friendship. What Evans wrote is abundant proof that their reconciliation had been complete and lasting.

### Others

There were others also causing embarrassment and chagrin, but these loomed not so large in the life of President Evans. There was S. W. Stanfield, teacher of biology, who was removed from his position in 1919 because of insanity, and became a most bitter and outspoken enemy of Evans. Stanfield had been appointed to the faculty before the opening of the College in 1903 and was in the first faculty group under T. G. Harris. He was granted a pension by the board of regents of \$100 a month for a period of nine months after his removal from the faculty, although the records show that he was not placed in an emeritus relationship to the College.

Stanfield was not placed in an institution, and he met and accosted President Evans at the most unexpected times and places. When he came close enough to recognize Evans he would point his finger and shout, "That man is my enemy! I hate him!" Evans would always reply with words of friendship: "But I don't hate you, Mr. Stanfield," and would get away from him with as little disturbance as possible. Occasionally Stanfield would find his way to the president's office and Evans would be forced to walk out in order to lead the poor man outside. This remained one of the burdens on Evans' shoulders until Stanfield's death many years after his dismissal.

Through the years, a very few unmarried, attractive young women gave Evans cause for apprehension. In this respect, it would seem that he was fortunate that there were not more. A young woman in Evans' day was under more stern social restrictions than was a young man in the same position, or, than is a young woman of today. In San Marcos the younger set, in college or out of college, were outside the social sphere of a woman instructor in the Southwest Texas State Teachers Col-

lege. To this younger set, she was "older" and her book learning created a barrier over which few would try to venture. This left as eligible for her social company only the confirmed bachelors or, usually, much older widowers. Thus the young women teachers who chose teaching in the College as a career were almost certainly doomed to spinsterhood.

Evans looked upon these young women—in fact, all women, perhaps—as strange beings impossible to understand, to be contemplated with solemn wonder as a sort of awesome miracle. He recognized their capabilities as teachers; however, qualifications being the same, he invariably chose a man if a man were available. In some departments, of course, such as home economics and women's physical education, and also in the fine arts and language, especially, he found it necessary to employ women in order to obtain the better qualified teachers. Moreover, in the training of teachers for the elementary grades and kindergarten positions few, if any, male teachers were available.

As in all other situations around the College, rumors and gossip about teachers were not slow in reaching President Evans, and he recorded the details in the Redbook. By no means all of what he called "indiscretions" on the part of young women teachers were connected with their social activities. Some were fits of temper displayed in their business transactions in town. For example, one young woman in a rage tore her photograph to bits in a downtown studio and demanded the return of her money. Another was said by several coeds to have used harsh and profane language in a class in women's physical education. And the same teacher was accused of knowingly walking into the men's gymnasium when the men were taking showers and dressing.

When Evans could scent a difficulty looming concerning a young woman teacher, he knew that this meant big trouble in capital letters. He dreaded the necessary conferences, the possibility of emotional outbursts; and it was in these situations that he called upon the older, tried and trusted women of the faculty to lend him support in counseling the young women and in being present with him if dismissal became necessary. No record was found indicating that the case of any woman teacher was ever referred to the board of regents.

During Evans' last year in office, trouble arose with a young man who had been on the faculty only three years. Evans' notes concerning that case referred to the teacher as a recluse, non-cooperative, to being both of which, Evans recorded, the man admitted. Evans told the instructor that he very much feared that he would never fit into the situation at the College, and informed him that his probationary period would be extended not longer than two years with no promise of permanent employment. He suggested that the young teacher resign and not try to continue in a position in which he was clearly unhappy. The situation grew so serious during the summer session of 1942 that, upon the advice of J. G. Ulmer of Tyler, President of the board of regents, the teacher resigned his position.

In another note Evans referred to the "warped and distorted views of a young doctor of philosophy." And he wrote in the Redbook that "maladjustment in a college faculty is a symptom of maladjustment in other places." The note continued: "The disgrace lies not in appointing a misfit but in keeping him." On one occasion in a faculty meeting, Evans mentioned faculty members "dodging" executives or other college officials whom they did not like. He must have felt many times that certain faculty members were avoiding him.

### **Retirement**

Before the enactment of the statute establishing the Teacher Retirement System of Texas, which became effective in 1937 after the adoption of a constitutional amendment in November, 1936, most teachers in the public schools and the state colleges faced old age with little prospect of an adequate income for comfortable living. The fear of poverty haunted even the higher-paid teachers and executives. The situation was made worse by the pride of superannuated teachers that would not permit them to ask for help in their old age. Moreover, the suggestion of a pension for a retiring teacher carried with it the stigma of a dole to a pauper who, because of lack of thrift and good judgment, had become a charge upon the institution to which he had rendered service.

A dozen years before the retirement system was a reality, President Evans saw a great need for a plan for retiring old teachers. Not only would this be the best and kindest thing for



the teacher, but it would be of great advantage to the College. On October 28, 1928, he wrote M. O. Flowers of the board of regents on the subject. He said in part:

My own personal opinion is that the average college suffers much more from the inefficient service of excellent but outdated old teachers than it does from the temporary or permanently disabled. We do not hesitate to do something at once for the disabled; we do, however, hold back when it comes to tackling the ugly and delicate problem of readjusting the old teachers in the faculty who have strength and energy but who have outlived their usefulness. . . .

Specifically referring to a case in the College, he also wrote a letter dated September 22, 1928, to Flowers concerning Professor J. S. Brown, a teacher of mathematics whose term of service dated from the opening of the College. At the time the letter was written, Brown was still confined to bed after a long illness. Evans wrote:

Our Professor J. S. Brown has been believing all along during the summer that he would get better and that there would be a chance for him to do some part-time work sometime during the year. His case has progressed far enough now to make it clear to his own family and to the College that he is not likely to return to the classroom during the session of 1928-29. He and members of his family feel that whatever action in his case proves advisable should be taken in the next few weeks, and they trust that an emeritus relation with a salary, small or liberal, will be approved.

At the Galveston meeting of the Board of Regents, I submitted the recommendation to place Mr. Brown upon the basis of a professor emeritus at the nominal salary of \$100 per month for three or more months. There was opposition to this recommendation, as a result of which the whole matter was postponed until September or October. At that time Mr. Brown's condition was critical and it was very uncertain that he would live through the summer quarter. The particular precedent for my suggestion was that of our Professor Stanfield in 1920-21 who drew a nominal salary of \$100 per month for nine months.

Mr. Brown has been with the College since it was established, and lacked approximately one month only of completing a term of twenty-five years. In scholarship and devotion to school work he ranked among the highest. Dean Taylor of the University was a classmate of Mr. Brown's in Sam Houston State Normal School more than forty years

ago, and he called the attention of a member of Mr. Brown's family to the fact that Dr. Sutton of the University of Texas had been an emeritus for two years, and is drawing a salary. To what extent other state schools or private colleges are making salary allowances for retired members of the faculty, I do not know, but there are other instances. I am, therefore, submitting this matter for such action as you deem advisable. In the meantime, I am expecting to have a personal interview with you regarding the situation.

As a result of Evans' efforts Professor Brown was made an emeritus for the year 1928-29, at a salary of \$100 per month.

Another teacher, Miss Lula Hines, whose service also began with the establishment of the College, was granted \$50 a month for nine months for the session of 1932-1933. The minutes of the board of regents, meeting at Nacogdoches, November 14, 1933, record the following:

Dr. C. E. Evans of San Marcos was instructed to pay Miss Lula Hines, who taught in that school since its beginning, the sum of \$50 per month until further notice, she being ill and confined to her home at this time.

There were others who got nothing, because there was no fixed policy, no legal provision, for compensation after termination of service. The best that could be done by the board of regents was to take advantage of the fact that the statutes did not specifically prohibit the granting of an allowance under these circumstances. Fortunately this painful burden was lifted from the great heart of C. E. Evans by the enactment of the Teacher Retirement Law.

## XII

### THE SEVENTEEN-YEAR WAR WITH THE DALLAS NEWS

#### Hostilities Open

The war with the Dallas *Morning News* was not always a "shooting" war of words. At times it lapsed into the status of an armed truce or a "cold" war, but there was always beneath the surface the liquid lava of misunderstanding and distrust ready to erupt at the slightest buildup of temperature. This was not a war with the Southwest Texas State Teachers College alone, and President Evans had on his side a company of well trained and skillful fighters for this kind of combat--the heads of the other state teachers colleges of Texas. Arrayed against this group was

ago, and he called the attention of a member of Mr. Brown's family to the fact that Dr. Sutton of the University of Texas had been an emeritus for two years, and is drawing a salary. To what extent other state schools or private colleges are making salary allowances for retired members of the faculty, I do not know, but there are other instances. I am, therefore, submitting this matter for such action as you deem advisable. In the meantime, I am expecting to have a personal interview with you regarding the situation.

As a result of Evans' efforts Professor Brown was made an emeritus for the year 1928-29, at a salary of \$100 per month.

Another teacher, Miss Lula Hines, whose service also began with the establishment of the College, was granted \$50 a month for nine months for the session of 1932-1933. The minutes of the board of regents, meeting at Nacogdoches, November 14, 1933, record the following:

Dr. C. E. Evans of San Marcos was instructed to pay Miss Lula Hines, who taught in that school since its beginning, the sum of \$50 per month until further notice, she being ill and confined to her home at this time.

There were others who got nothing, because there was no fixed policy, no legal provision, for compensation after termination of service. The best that could be done by the board of regents was to take advantage of the fact that the statutes did not specifically prohibit the granting of an allowance under these circumstances. Fortunately this painful burden was lifted from the great heart of C. E. Evans by the enactment of the Teacher Retirement Law.

## XII

### THE SEVENTEEN-YEAR WAR WITH THE DALLAS NEWS Hostilities Open

The war with the Dallas *Morning News* was not always a "shooting" war of words. At times it lapsed into the status of an armed truce or a "cold" war, but there was always beneath the surface the liquid lava of misunderstanding and distrust ready to erupt at the slightest buildup of temperature. This was not a war with the Southwest Texas State Teachers College alone, and President Evans had on his side a company of well trained and skillful fighters for this kind of combat--the heads of the other state teachers colleges of Texas. Arrayed against this group was

the editorial staff of the News—frequently allied with other periodicals, with the entire state government of Texas (governor and legislature), with a powerful group of business men representing most of the commercial and industrial wealth of the state and hence the biggest taxpayers; part of the time the other state-supported colleges and the University of Texas ; and finally, some of the denominational colleges.

The first evidence of the conflict appeared in a letter written by President Evans to the other presidents on October 14, 1921, as follows:

The opening gun in the campaign for the destruction of teachers college interests in Texas was fired last Sunday morning by the Dallas *Morning News*. The inspiration for this article could very easily be traced to the ecclesiastical occupant of the president's chair of the University of Texas. You will, remember that in the closing hours of the special session of the Legislature a "Survey Resolution" made a clandestine route through both houses and was discovered by friends of the teachers colleges about six hours too late. By an overwhelming majority the House voted to recall the "Survey Resolution," but the Senate rejected the recall.

We need not deceive ourselves. President Vinson stated to Representatives Chitwood and Moore that the Teachers Colleges should be reduced to junior college rank. Director T. H. Shelby on Monday of this week, in conversation with one of our faculty members, boldly advocated the reduction of the Teachers Colleges to junior rank, and excused his stand by saying that he had never believed in the expansion of Teachers Colleges. This incident confirms what I have known all along, that Shelby has been completely dominated by the University of Texas, and cares nothing whatever about the development of Teachers Colleges.

So far as I am concerned, I think we just as well organize a fight to settle this issue beyond all question. If Doctor Vinson is to have his way in Texas there will be but one independent institution in Texas, and all other institutions of higher learning being relegated to the condition of vassalage. If there is a Teachers College President who hesitates to believe this statement, I suggest that he inquire of Representative R. M. Chitwood of Sweetwater and Representative Joe Moore of Greenville and learn of the conversation with President Vinson during the last week of the Legislature. The destruction of Teachers Colleges means destruction of all possibilities for Teachers College endeavor. We cannot permit this to be done.

## Early Chance For Peace

As far as the records show, for a little over two years there was quiet on the front; and then on December 3, 1923, President R. B. Binnion of Commerce wrote the following letter to President Evans, which seemed to show a way of opening negotiations with the Nezus:

Coming home from the Waco meeting in August, I had a long talk with Mr. Tom Finty of the Dallas News, and talked over a number of phases of Teachers College work with him. I endeavored to give him all the information I could about the Teachers Colleges, their new curricula, and the quality of work now turned out by them. Among other things, I then stated that I did not believe the press of the State was fully informed about the State Teachers Colleges, and I did not believe the Dallas News staff had all the most recent information relative to our development. I asked him if he would help us get our building status before the Dallas News staff to the end that we might receive more intelligent and sympathetic understanding and cooperation by his great institution. He gladly acceded to my request and suggested that we have a meeting of the Council some time in December, notify him in advance of our meeting, and he would be glad to have us as his guests at the Dallas News office and he would undertake to arrange a meeting for us with the powers that be on the Dallas News and we might express ourselves and go over the entire situation with them. He feels as we do about it and is entirely sympathetic with us. I urge, therefore, that you call a meeting of the Council some time in the near future to meet in Dallas. I suggest that you make an engagement with Mr. Finty in Dallas for us to meet the Dallas News staff, or such portion of it as he thinks desirable, while we are in the city. I think this will be very much to our advantage.

President Evans indorsed the suggestion and promised to call a meeting the second week in January for the purpose.

Less than a month after the meeting of the presidents in Dallas, many of the state papers including the Dallas News, printed a front page story of an incident on the campus of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. As a result of the appearance of the story in the News, President R. L. Marquis of Denton wrote under date of February 8, 1924, to Alonzo Wasson, of the editorial staff of the Nezos, and sent copies to the other presidents. The letter follows:

I have just read an article in the *News* of February 6, page 3, under San Antonio date line, in which we have a rather racy story concerning certain alleged events in the Southwest Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos. In today's paper, February 8, page 12, I find the *News* has printed a complete and categorical denial of the first attack, signed by President Evans. I have on my desk a telegram containing the same denial. I have undertaken, furthermore, to get possession of the facts, and find that we have two matters which have been tremendously magnified. In the first place, there was a little class-rush, which is a thing common to all schools and is probably the safest safety valve to be found in colleges. The other fact is that college authorities undertake to say where students may and may not room and where they may or may not eat, and this rule seems to have enraged some restaurant men and they have taken this occasion to inflame the imagination of citizens by these glaring reports.

I am convinced that the publication of this rather lurid story has done the college at San Marcos a great deal of harm which cannot in any way be repaired or limited. Moreover, it has hurt all the Teachers Colleges to some extent and all state schools in general to a degree. I hope that the Dallas *News* will pursue its past policy in such matters and, when enthusiastic reporters furnish such stories, see to it that they are verified by the proper authorities before they get into the press.

I assure you that we would greatly appreciate having this courtesy extended.

A year later, on February 7, 1925, a letter was written to Tom Finty of the Dallas *News* staff by President J. A. Hill of Canyon, probably the most determined and aggressive fighter in the entire group for the cause of the teacher colleges of Texas. This was not Hill's first entry into the conflict, and it was by no means his last. Years later, in his history of the West Texas State College, Hill referred to the Dallas *News* as a newspaper "long a powerful influence in Texas." Hill's letter to Finty was an acknowledgement of the receipt of an article entitled "Texas Educational Survey," written by Finty. After stating points of agreement and disagreement, Hill said:

It is now necessary to say that a teachers college, when organized and administered, is as highly technical in its nature and deals with as definite a field of human knowledge as law and agriculture and medicine. But there still re-

mained in Texas in the field of education a good many of the old barber-surgeon combination referred to above; and unfortunately, there are too many good and intelligent citizens who have never seen the anomaly. Some of us had hoped that the Survey would reveal the problem of teacher preparation in the light of modern and scientific discovery and advancement, but it appears that we have expected too much.

### **Allies For The Enemy**

For a while it appeared that the Dallas News would be reinforced by some other publications, namely, the Texas Farm and Ranch, a magazine devoted mainly to agricultural interests, and the Fort Worth Star Telegram. As the Farm and Ranch was under the same general management as the Dallas News, President Evans suggested in a letter to President Marquis, dated January 24, 1927, that Tom Finty of the News be consulted about an article printed in the *Farm* and Ranch. He wrote:

The Texas Farm and Ranch of last week contains a rather vicious article prepared by L. E. Stockard. The insinuations in the article are leveled more directly at the State Teachers Colleges. I am to be in Dallas Wednesday or Thursday, and I am wondering whether you could be with me and together secure the cooperation of Tom Finty in getting Farm and Ranch to do a little better. I think the Farm and Ranch is making a very serious mistake in opening up its columns to such low class stuff.

Before making the trip, I will notify you the day I am to be in Dallas.

President Marquis replied promptly on January 29:

I believe that a personal letter to Mr. Frank A. Briggs, the editor of the Texas Farm and Ranch, might help clear up the atmosphere in that office. Mr. Stockard goes about the state preaching the general doctrine that institutions of higher learning live at the expense of the country school, that the state institutions contribute nothing to rural life and rural education, and are out of sympathy with rural problems. For some reason which I do not now understand he seems to list the Teachers Colleges as the principal sinners. No doubt the files of the various schools would show that he has in the past been an applicant for a position and was not used. At the first opportunity, I shall go to Dallas and undertake to talk to the gentlemen there and discover if possible just what is in the back of their heads. I shall do what I can to find out what is going on.

The *Dallas News* published an article in its issue of September 28, 1927, over the signature of L. F. Benson, a graduate of the East Texas State Teachers College. President S. H. Whitley of the College at Commerce, on October 1, wrote a letter to the other presidents regarding the article. Whitley alleged that the article was full of inaccuracies. He thought that it was the result of the animosity of Benson against former President Binnion. Benson had applied for a position at the East Texas Teachers College a number of times, and upon one occasion had almost come to blows with President Binnion. He had also applied to President Whitley but had been refused a position. Whitley thought it best that some other president reply to the article since one charge made in the article was that the junior college bill had been defeated in the legislature largely because of the opposition of the teachers colleges. He seconded the suggestion of President Marquis that President Hill reply to the article.

On April 15, 1928, an editorial in the Fort Worth *Star Telegram* gave evidence that that newspaper was joining ranks with the *Dallas News* in the attack upon teachers colleges. President Evans took notice of the editorial and promptly wrote a letter, dated April 18, to the other presidents. The letter follows:

The editorial in the Fort Worth *Star Telegram* of Sunday discussing "Teachers Colleges" is dangerous and unjust. It objects to fair treatment of the Teachers Colleges on the ground that such treatment would be "duplicating the work of other state institutions." Instead of entering into a personal controversy with the *Star Telegram* we could, perhaps, accomplish more through personal conferences. I am taking the liberty to suggest that President Marquis and President Whitley, who are nearest to Fort Worth, confer with the proper officials on the *Star Telegram* and endeavor to set them right.

A letter from President Marquis written on April 19 to President Evans crossed Evans' letter in the mail. Marquis wrote:

You no doubt saw the editorial which appeared in the *Star Telegram* Sunday, April 15. The discussions found in this editorial, undoubtedly, were suggested by the series of articles which were supplied by Col. T. N. Jones of Tyler. This editorial was written by Mr. Benson. I had business in Fort Worth Tuesday and took occasion to go to the editorial offices and discuss this matter. When I first went in, Mr.



Benson was out and I talked the matter over with Mr. Jimmie Record. He insisted that I return later and go over the whole thing with Mr. Benson, which I did. Mr. Benson, it seems, is the man who writes the statements and editorials that have to do with education and the colleges of the state. He, himself, is a college man. I believe he took his academic work at Baylor. When I called Mr. Benson's attention to the misstatement of facts relative to the kinds of students that now attend these schools and to the general question of standards, he very graciously admitted that he was wholly misinformed, or rather uninformed. I spent a very pleasant hour and a half at his office reviewing the whole situation, and I was assured that the *Star Telegram* hereafter would not refer to the teachers colleges as normals and that the *Star Telegram*, further, would no longer be guilty of assuming or implying that these institutions are anything other than colleges of the first class. The fact is, I saw the order written for the reporters and due notice given by the editors. I think the interview will result in a decided change of tone whether the items carried are news items or editorials.

Marquis suggested that the other presidents also write to the *Star Telegram* concerning the matter, and President Whitley lost no time in letting the weight of his defense be felt by the writer of the editorial. He fairly took the editorial apart, as follows:

I appreciate very much the splendid services which the *Star Telegram* has rendered the cause of education in the past, especially the teachers colleges. It has been liberal in its policy toward the teachers colleges both in the space allotted to them in its news columns and in its attitude toward the work which they are doing.

The editorial referred to above, however, contains at least three criticisms of the teachers colleges to which I would respectfully call your attention. These criticisms, as contained in the editorial, are mentioned in this letter in the order in which they appear in the editorial.

The first criticism is to the effect that if an adequate salary scale is adopted for the teachers colleges that it is not at all certain that their service to the state would be improved. If this be true I am just wondering if the same argument would not hold true of the other types of institutions supported and maintained by the State. I have always been under the impression that any institution could render a better type of service to the State if it is permitted to

select men and women to fill the positions in it who represent the highest levels of preparation. The difficulty under which the Teachers Colleges of Texas now operate is that they are unable to hold the services for a very long period of time of teachers who represent the highest level of preparation simply because they are unable to pay them the salary that the other institutions of the state pay for the same type of service.

The next criticism I find in the editorial is that if the present status of the Teachers Colleges is raised that they will find themselves duplicating the work of other state institutions.

In the first sentence in the fourth paragraph of the editorial the statement is made that the Teachers Colleges are special institutions organized for the purpose of teacher training. If they are limiting themselves to teacher training, the duplication complained of is not chargeable to the Teachers Colleges, but is chargeable to other types of institutions organized for special purposes, but which find it necessary, for obvious reasons, to engage in the process of teacher training. In my opinion the Teachers Colleges should not be charged with duplicating the work of other institutions until they enter the fields of medicine, law, engineering, and technical phases of training.

The third criticism is contained in the last paragraph, second sentence from the last where the editorial says, "When the time comes that the State can obtain all the teachers it needs from those of entirely adequate qualifications, it may be able to afford neglect of the teachers colleges." I understand this sentence to mean that when other types of institutions are able to furnish all the well-trained teachers that the schools of Texas need, that the Teachers Colleges may be discontinued or neglected. The inference contained in this statement is that teachers colleges are second-rate institutions and are not entitled to the respect and support of the general public, but are only to be endured until the time comes when the State can find better agencies for the training of teachers. This last criticism is so wholly at variance with the facts in the case that I cannot resist calling your attention to the fact that these colleges have been classified and ranked as first class in their respective fields of work by the highest rating agencies in the country. These colleges now belong to the Association of Texas Colleges, the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges. They are first-class institutions doing a first-class type of work. The graduates of the Texas State

Teachers Colleges are now accorded the very highest recognition in the graduate schools in the country that is possible to accord the students of any other type institution. . . .

Sometimes it was a light skirmish rather than a full-scale engagement, but the war went on. In August of 1928, President R. B. Cousins of the South Texas State Teachers College at Kingsville, later the College of Arts and Industries, chose to reply to the gunfire out of Dallas. No copy of Cousins' missive was available, but in a letter to Cousins, President R. L. Marquis of the North Texas State Teachers College, on August 13, wrote as follows

I have just read your letter of the 10th. I like the way you present the matter relative to the claims of the teachers colleges. The leading editorial in the Dallas News of August 13 contains another dig at the teachers colleges. My notion is that it will be ten years before we get rid of this sort of thing. I have come to the conclusion, however, that what often appears a "dirty dig" is, after all, the result of lack of information. The newspapers have no desire to discredit teacher-training. They are like most other people, (sic) they simply do not consider it of first-rate importance.

#### Cease-Fire And Truce

After this minor set-to, the air was cleared considerably by a proposal of John E. King, managing editor of the News, that Staff Correspondent William M. Thornton be allowed to visit all the teachers colleges and write articles concerning them. President Marquis was enthusiastic about the proposed visit and the articles. Marquis wrote Thornton on September 3, 1928: "We are looking forward to your visit with much pleasure. I am convinced that you are going to tell the people of Texas a very interesting story about their public schools and the teachers in these schools."

On September 28, Marquis wrote President Evans suggesting that the latter go to Austin to meet with Thornton and give him the background of the teachers colleges and so forth. That President Evans agreed to do.

President Marquis was more than eager to give a favorable response to the peaceful gesture of the editor of the *News*. In a letter dated October 31, 1928, President Marquis wrote again enclosing a copy of a letter from Editor King which had been written the day before. Marquis suggested that each president

write Mr. King and express sincere appreciation "for the fine thing he is doing for the State of Texas and for the teachers colleges."

King's letter was indeed most conciliatory. Thornton had promptly performed his assignment with the full cooperation of every teachers college. The letter follows:

I have received from Mr. Thornton manuscripts of fifteen articles written after his visit to all of the state teachers colleges. Seven of these articles are introductory, giving the history of the teachers-college idea and its development up to the founding of the various colleges. He then devotes one article to each of the eight colleges. It is my idea that these articles should start in the News on Sunday following the election, which is November 11. I am also of the opinion that we can get more favorable reaction from these if they are published one each day for fifteen days, adequately displayed on Page 1. I intend to use them in Column 1, Page 1, which I regard as choice position. It is also my opinion that these should be picked up and used in our Semi-Weekly. Since the Semi-weekly gets two issues a week, they will run for fifteen issues or seven and a half weeks. I wish you would let me know if this program meets with your approval.

Incidentally, I expect to be in Denton next Monday and I shall be glad to see you and talk things over at that time. We plan to have Mr. William Z. Hayes<sup>1</sup> to read these articles over as soon as we get them in type to make sure that there are no serious errors as to facts. If you and Dr. Whitley find it convenient to be in Dallas before we begin publication of these articles, we shall be mighty glad to have either of you read them over for the same purpose.

With kind personal regards.

For a while there appeared to be a complete cessation of hostilities. The *News* had been most generous, devoting its front page to the story of the teachers colleges for fifteen days, November 11 through 25. Then the articles were collected and published in booklet form, and thousands of these were ordered by the teachers colleges. As a foreword to the booklet, a page was used for resolutions signed by every member of the board of regents and the secretary, commending the *Dallas News* and the author, Thornton. The resolutions, in part, were as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Member of the board of regents from Dallas.

Whereas, the Dallas News in the publication of these articles gave them prominence on the front page, and whereas the information for these articles was obtained by Mr. Thornton as a result of a personal visit to each of the eight State supported teachers colleges, and

Whereas, these articles were written from an unbiased yet sympathetic viewpoint, setting forth the plans and purposes of teacher training in the State of Texas in a manner heretofore unknown to the press of the State,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Regents of the State teachers colleges, first, that this Board express its appreciation for the interest which the Dallas News has shown in these institutions and to the general cause of education in Texas.

Second, that the board of Regents express its appreciation for the splendid high tone given by the Dallas News to the business of the State of Texas in its efforts to provide professional training for the teachers of the children of this great commonwealth. The Board feels that the News in publishing this series of articles has brought the general public to a better appreciation of the great problems with which it has been dealing for the past score of years. The Board expresses its deep appreciation for the aid which the Dallas News has given it in its effort to improve teacher training in Texas.

Third, that a copy of these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of the Board, that a copy be furnished Hon. Wm. Thornton, Austin, Texas; Hon. George B. Dealy, Dallas, Texas; Hon. James Charles Dealy, Dallas, Texas; Hon. John E. King, Dallas, Texas; Hon. Tom Finty, Jr., Dallas, Texas.

These resolutions were dated Austin, Texas, November 27, 1928.

A few paragraphs of Thornton's introduction, entitled "Rural Schools and Teachers Colleges," particularly won the gratitude of the teachers college presidents. A sample of these is quoted:

Texas was ranked thirty-seventh in public education by the head of an Eastern organization which makes a study of the schools of the United States, and that low standing has been bandied about as a reflection on this great commonwealth. Its correctness has been disputed in some particulars by Texas educators, but nevertheless some of the factors which went into computation have been accepted as reflecting conditions here.

One of the major counts against the schools of Texas was lack of teacher preparation. This did not apply to the city schools and those of the prosperous independent districts with their special school taxes, but principally to the rural schools. It was the low average in the country schools that pulled down the average of the State. This is unfortunate, since Texas has a large rural population, larger than its cities combined, and country boys and girls are denied the elementary education they should have. The greatest scholastic population of the State, that living in the country, is not receiving the school benefits deemed absolutely necessary in modern education and to which it is entitled under our very foundation of government.

### Education Pays Dividends

It is conceded that the welfare of the commonwealth depends upon the general average of intelligence and ability of all the people to take care of themselves in the best possible manner under living conditions. This means public education at public expense, and there is no other way to raise the general average of ability to produce and consume, this being the measure of our national wealth. Education is recognized as the only investment that, cost what it may, in every case pays a dividend far above the outlay. The educational needs of Texas today are not centered in the law school, or the medical college, or in the many academic branches of the various institutions in this State, but in the rural schools. It is the education in fundamentals for the children which demand attention, not the finishing colleges for the youth of the State. The latter appear to be taking care of themselves.

How these fundamentals can be reached and are being reached is the purpose of this series of articles. Eight State-supported institutions are striving to that single end. They are the teacher training colleges, formerly . . . normal schools. These colleges are not attempting to turn out lawyers, doctors, or engineers or dentists, but their exclusive concern is to give the State the best teachers that can be trained for the schools. How well they are doing it will easily be appraised when the facts are presented showing their accomplishments.

There are no distractions or versatility of purpose in the eight teachers colleges. There is no "pre" work of any kind, medic, law or what not. These institutions stick to the one text, "prepare teachers." They have never been led afield with the desire to expand into other channels and train young men and women for other vocations. This is in con-

trast with many colleges whose curricula embrace the newer sciences and wider fields of knowledge so that their upkeep has necessarily become highly expensive.

This single purpose of the teachers colleges has not deterred other collegiate institutions from engaging in the same work, for many have their departments of education where teachers are trained and graduated year by year, receiving life certificates, as do the graduates of the teacher training institutions.

### **Teachers college Rating**

The Legislature and the State Board of Control, in providing appropriations for the various institutions of learning, discriminate in their salary rating against the teachers colleges. Although training teachers for children, the potential citizens of the State, they are rated fifth in salary schedule by the State Board of Control in its budget making and the Legislature accepts the basis. The University, A. & M. College, Texas Technological College and the College of Industrial Arts all are ranked ahead of the teachers colleges.

Faculty members of the departments of education in the first four institutions listed receive relatively more salary than the instructors in the teachers colleges, although all are engaged in the same work, that of training teachers, and give their graduates identical results, namely, life certificates to teach. This situation has provoked vigorous protest from the regents of the teachers colleges, who fail to see the justice of discriminating against members of their faculties who impart the same line of instruction and grant similar certificates. The prediction is that in time, when the real worth of the teachers colleges is recognized, they will come first in salary grade.

The teachers colleges of Texas hold positions of dignity among the colleges of America, another proof of their high standing and recognition. This is attested by the fact that they were the first teacher-training institutions to be admitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the national accrediting body, and that they are also members of the Texas Association of Colleges and the American Association of Teachers Colleges and four of them hold membership in the American Association of University Women.

Students of the Texas teachers colleges are admitted to many of the graduate colleges and universities of America with full credit for their graduate work in education

done here. Notwithstanding this high mark of recognition, their instructional staffs are rated fifth in pay.

On November 3, 1928, in a letter to M. O. Flowers, chairman of the board of regents, President Whitley wrote:

The series is entirely satisfactory from my point of view, and will do much good for the advancement of the cause of teacher training in Texas. I think that this series of articles is the biggest single contribution that has been made toward advancement of teacher training in the past score of years. I believe with all my heart that the teachers colleges are coming into their own, and that the time is not far distant when they will be accorded the same recognition that is accorded other institutions of this type in the thinking of the people of this State.

President Marquis was so enthusiastic over the articles that he wrote the presidents on November 7:

. . . you will be more than pleased with this series of articles, and you will no doubt be astonished when you note the way he has digested the large fund of information which we severally gave him. . . . I hope that each of you will run a notice in your college paper calling attention to these articles and asking that the students read them; furthermore, that they ask their parents to read them and that they should, in addition, write the Dallas News and ask their parents to write the Dallas News expressing appreciation and interest in these articles.

#### Depression And Renewed Conflict

Had the great depression not come upon the economy of Texas, who knows but what permanent peace would have been thus established between the *Dallas News* and the Texas State Teachers Colleges? During the next three years there was only one editorial in the *News* which caught the watchful eye of President Marquis and drew from him a differing opinion. This editorial appeared on January 29, 1929, while the memory of the Thornton articles was still fresh. Marquis' letter was as follows:

I read with no little interest some days past the *News* editorial which commented upon the proposed bill to place the Kingsville Teachers College under a separate board and remove the restrictions which require it to confine its efforts to the training of teachers. The editorial mentioned criticized the proposed plan on the ground that it is just



another means of establishing another school similar to the Texas Technological College and the College of Industrial Arts.

As I see it, the proposed move would result in exactly the thing that the News most desires, namely the creation of no additional institutions. The citizens of South Texas are not satisfied with a state-supported institution restricted to teacher training. Unless the college at Kingsville is given larger scope and freer functioning, they will ultimately demand, and no doubt secure, a school similar to the institution located in Lubbock. This would, in my opinion, be most unfortunate. In the first place, the two schools, (in South Texas) would then be more or less rivals, by contributing much to the same service, namely, liberal arts training and preparation of teachers.

The principal output of the C. I. A. and the Texas Technological College is teachers, notwithstanding the fact that they were created for entirely different purposes. If the school at Kingsville is given a separate board and a liberalized program, it will meet the needs of the people in that section of the state and obviate the establishment of a South Texas Technological College.

I am heartily in favor of the proposed plan, because I believe that it is to the interests of this state and, in the long run, will be a saving economically.

If in the minds of those who made the editorial policy of the *Dallas News* there ever had been a notion that the Texas State Teachers Colleges held a rightful place among the institutions of higher learning in the state, that notion was wiped out when the great depression of 1929 descended upon the commonwealth. Clear evidence is presented by J. A. Hill in his history of the West Texas State College. In a chapter entitled "Surveyitis, Expertism, and Reactionaries,"<sup>2</sup> he describes the plight of the state colleges as they were forced to submit three times in 13 years to so-called "expert" diagnosis, the last of which was made by the Joint Legislative Committee on Organization and Economy, causing, as President Hill described it, a time when "all hell broke loose in Texas."

While Hill admitted that in 1931 the legislature "was driven to near desperation by the great depression and a terrible drouth in the western part of the state," he severely criticized this committee, pointing out the fact that no educator was in-

---

<sup>2</sup> Hill, *op. cit.*, Chapter XII, p. 114.

cluded among them, and that most of them were lawyers who merited little of Hill's respect in educational matters.

The Committee on Organization and Economy employed what Hill termed "a body of experienced and expert institutional surgeons, known as Griffenhagen and Associates of Chicago," which group was announced by the legislative committee as "possessed of qualifications and experience that are unrivaled in its field." Hill adds, "and probably it was, but what was its field? Certainly not Texas higher education."

Griffenhagen and his associates published a report in fourteen parts, Part X dealing exclusively with teachers colleges. President Hill remarks with some sarcasm, "It would be interesting and enlightening to know just who wrote this volume—whether Griffenhagen, the Committee, or someone entirely outside these two organizations." And he describes the document as "a compound of good information, misinformation (incompetent interpretation, ridiculous deductions, pre-conceived opinion, and plain bias. It is evident on its face that the writer of Vol. X had no purpose to make better teachers colleges. That fact stares one in the face on almost every page."<sup>3</sup>

The entire fourteen-volume report was made public in December 1932, only a month before the convening of the legislature in regular session in January. The newspapers all over the state devoted news and editorial space to the report. President Hill described the reaction of the Dallas News as follows:<sup>4</sup>

The Dallas News, long a powerful influence in Texas seized the cudgel at once, endorsed completely the report of the legislative committee, and trained its guns on the teachers colleges. As long as the legislature was in session, there were few issues of that publication that did not carry some kind of jeremiad about the uselessness and waste of these institutions. Even before the report was made public, the Dallas News, in an editorial on "Too Many Colleges," said of it: "In regard to education it (the report) exceeds in possibilities any development in the last forty years if we except the fortuitous fact of discovery of oil on lands of the University of Texas. . . ."

---

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 118.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 120.

"The first thing we may expect is a State Teachers College Association banded together to protect their institutions." And this prophesy was better founded than anything else the *News* ever published on the subject. As a matter of fact, the Teachers Colleges had been for a long time a close-knit unit to promote the sound education of teachers and, therefore, the welfare of Texas. They had fought battles before, and they were of no mind to run this time.

### More **Enemy** Reinforcements

In this renewal of warfare, the *Dallas News* now had many allies. On December 2, 1932, a committee of the State Taxpayers Association met in Dallas to study ways and means "to put into effect the program of governmental economy **and** efficiency." Among proposals made was one "to eliminate all but four teachers colleges." This proposal was rejected, however, because "political dynamite lurks in any attempt to touch local institutions like teachers' colleges . . ."<sup>5</sup>

The State Taxpayers Association met in Waco on December 31, 1932, to receive its committee report and recommendations. These included a resolution favoring the University of Texas as "the head and arch of all institutions in the field of higher education, as was originally intended by the framers of the constitution," and a further statement as follows: "We have gone too far in the creation of schools largely devoted to teacher training . . . Degree-granting institutions should be limited to three of the present teachers colleges and the University of Texas."<sup>6</sup>

In January, 1933, after the release of its biennial report by the State Board of Education, the *Dallas News* declared that the agreement in essential matters of this report with the report of the Legislative Committee on Efficiency and Economy, without consultation between the two, was "positively startling."<sup>7</sup> In a short time another powerful ally of the *Dallas News* appeared. The Tax Advisory Committee of the Texas Press Association reported that ". . . The economy to be effected by consolidation and reorganization alone will not serve the needs, and if the tax-

---

<sup>5</sup> *Dallas Morning News*, Dec. 3, 1932.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, January 1, 1933.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, January 24, 1933.

payers are to get the relief they imperatively need, it will be necessary to discontinue in whole or in part several governmental services now being rendered." In an editorial comment on this report, the Dallas News said it must have ". . . sent beyond doubt, a shiver down the spine of taxeaters all over the state. State schools that are where they are because of log-rolling will gird up their skirts in determination that the curfew shall not ring tonight for them."<sup>8</sup>

Another volunteer on the side of the Dallas News was the Industrial, Commercial, and Agricultural Conference of Texas. C. A. Jay, executive vice-president of the organization, issued from his Austin office a statement to the effect that "Reduced spending and not increased taxing is what the people want." The Dallas News in printing this story, quoted Jay as having "insisted that, instead of much talk of balancing the budget, the Legislature should consider budgeting the balance. . . ."<sup>9</sup>

An influential force was exerted in this struggle by the denominational colleges and universities. The presidents of the teachers colleges, as a group, felt that these institutions were, at least, willing participants in the attempt to reduce the teachers colleges of Texas to an insignificant status and would not hesitate to wield the sword of execution upon them.

A prime contributor to this belief was Dr. J. C. Hardy, president of Baylor Female College. In an address before the State Taxpayers Association at Waco on December 31, 1932, he declared his opposition to publicly supported higher education. He contended that the students should bear all the cost of this and that a high school education is all the state should pay for.<sup>10</sup>

According to the Dallas News of April 28, 1933, Dr. Oscar A. Ullrich, dean of Southwestern University at Georgetown, declared in an address before the Texas Society of College Teachers: "The multiplication of colleges at state expense and the duplication of departments among the colleges have become so great as to be highly wasteful and altogether unjustifiable." The implication of his remarks seems to have been that it was time to eliminate some of the state-supported colleges.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, January 18, 1933.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, February 12, 1933.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, January 1, 1933. See also Chapter III of this study.

The influence of the denominational colleges in the fight against the teachers colleges was strengthened by the fact that most of the men who expressed sympathy with the viewpoint of Dean Ullrich were widely known. President Hill related the fact that the chairman of the Appropriation Committee of the House, W. M. Harmon, came from Waco, the location of Baylor University (Baptist). Hill also said that Representative Harmon "was hard as nails, and an active agent for major operation."<sup>11</sup> Moreover, President Hill took note of the fact that Judge Harry N. Graves, chairman of the Legislative Committee on Efficiency and Economy and joint author of the Committee's reform bill, lived in Georgetown, the home of Southwestern University, a Methodist institution. Also Representative George G. Hester, professor of economics at Southwestern, who had some reputation as a public affairs expert, had made several addresses before important gatherings of citizens in different parts of the state, and that the tenor of these public addresses supported the Legislative Committee program.<sup>12</sup>

### The News Displays Reason

In all fairness to the *Dallas News*, however, it must be said that voices favoring the teachers colleges were granted space; and some of those who spoke in sympathy with the teachers colleges were connected with denominational schools. An article by Dr. J. W. Hunt, president of McMurry College (Methodist) at Abilene, appeared in the *News* of December 25, 1932, part of which was as follows :

I find myself in sympathy with the presidents of the state schools, whom I believe to be a fine body of men with the interests of the school children of Texas at heart . . . I do not believe that the teachers colleges ought to be reduced to junior colleges, nor that some of the combinations proposed will be at all feasible. . . .

So far as Western Texas is concerned, it has but four state colleges, separated by hundreds of miles from each other. Of these, the School of Mines at El Paso and the Sul Ross Teachers College at Alpine are so situated that each of them constitutes a problem, of its own. . . . But so far as the Technological College at Lubbock and the State Teachers College at Canyon are concerned, surely these

---

<sup>11</sup> Hill, *op cit.*, p. 122.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

schools ought to be allowed to continue with as little interference as possible. Both of them have large student bodies and are serving a tremendous territory. What little overlapping there is, if any, could be easily adjusted without the drastic measures proposed in this report.

It is a matter of interest, furthermore, to note that some of the bills introduced in the legislature during the early days of the 1933 session were so radical and unreasonable that the writers for the *News* opposed them. One of the worst bills was introduced by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative W. M. Harmon. Austin correspondent Alonzo Wasson wrote concerning this bill:

Apparently its motif is almost entirely fiscal. It is more of a tax bill than an educational measure.

The Harmon Bill is instinctive of the idea that the university and colleges have no proper place in a system of free

Another bill, equaling the Harmon Bill in the severity of its proposals, was introduced in the upper chamber by Senator Poage (also of Waco). This bill provided for the abolition of nine institutions as of the following September. Some of the most heated arguments ever heard on the floor of the State Senate were made by the proponents of the measure. But the very absurdity of the proposal brought about its defeat on May 8 by a vote of 16 to 10. This action in the Senate seemed to nerve other lawmakers to oppose the other bills of this kind.

An article written by W. M. Thornton, Austin correspondent who four years before had written the articles that almost established peace between the *News* and the teachers colleges, had anticipated the present trend toward sanity in the legislature as far back as February 5. In the *News* of that date, he wrote:

. . . It was apparent Sunday that the revolutionary changes recommended in the several committee reports for a far-reaching revision of the State Government could not be immediately considered or put into the new appropriations. . . .

These may ease the anxiety of a number of department heads and State educational institutions. All have been fearful of decapitation or a fatal shrinkage in organization and personnel. . . .

There has been a stay of execution . . . no one knows when the day of reckoning will come. . . .

In another editorial of February 7, the News said: "The disposition of the present legislature is to let governmental reorganization wait until a quite indeterminate future. . . ."

Some of the threats sprouting in the legislature jeopardized even the University and other state-supported colleges, notably those at Arlington, Lubbock, and not exempting the A. and M. College at College Station. In an editorial on February 14, 1933, and another on February 19, the Dallas News admitted that it was embarrassed because of the flood of protests pouring in from the alumni of the institutions named, at least one of which, the North Texas Agricultural College at Arlington, was in the heart of the territory served by that newspaper.

#### War Weary But No Peace

J. A. Hill related the dying efforts to devitalize the teachers colleges and, to some extent, hurt the other state-supported colleges, in these words:

Since the Anderson-Hughes-Metcalf Bill could not get through the House without debilitating amendments and the Poage Bill had been killed in the Senate, what hope was there for the most revolutionary of all Graves Bill? None at all, except by yielding to devastating amendments. But the reactionaries did not concede it. They fought right on down the line, albeit with gradually diminishing hope, until curfew rang the bell for them in June. With unflinching regularity the Dallas News continued to give the wrecking crew a shot in the arm. On April 20 it contrasted Georgia with Texas. The one imported Dr. George A. Works as a specialist, accepted his report, and swung the axe on nine institutions. Texas' plan, it said, is to hire experts "in order to shelve their reports." On April 24, in commenting on the plight of the University of Texas, it made that institution the victim of surplus colleges. "More education on fewer campuses means better education on all campuses," it said.

In May Wasson wrote from Austin: "The reorganization bill . . . is a supplicant in the Senate. It already has passed the House . . . However, it had to be subjected to several debilitating changes to win, . . . notably an amendment to defer the effectiveness of all but two sections to September, 1935, as well as to an amendment which threw overboard the original provisions for the discontinuance of a few of the superfluous colleges and the reorganization

of those it proposed to keep in existence. Therewith went probably seventy-five percent of the economy the original bill promised."

Just five days later the same authority reported that the bill to reorganize the state government was killed in the Senate by a vote of 17 to 9.

The next day after the death of this bill, the *Dallas News* preached its funeral. At the conclusion it expressed the hope that the people of Texas would elect some "really intelligent representatives pledged to make the government efficient."<sup>14</sup>

President Hill's correspondence with the other presidents reveals that he was "in there fighting," every inch of the way. On December 23, 1932, he wrote President Whitley as follows:

I have a copy of your letter to Mr. Wasson, and I congratulate you upon its tone and content. I am anxious to see what Mr. Wasson will say in reply.

I hope you will keep on this trail until the "coon is treed."

The *Dallas News* agent has just now left my office asking for my subscription for another year. I have told him that not only would I not subscribe, but also that I am going to do all I can to put this paper in the true light before the people of Northwest Texas. . . .

The editorial columns of the *News*, as President Hill declared, were kept very busy during the early part of 1933 on the side of those who were about the business of trying to close most of the state teachers colleges. The following editorial, appearing in the *News* of January 29, 1933, is typical:

### West Texas Schools

"People out here on the Plains have always suspected that the *Dallas News* has been rather prejudiced against this section," complains the *Canyon News* in response to an editorial in these columns on the proposal to change West Texas State Teachers' College into a junior college and transfer its two upper classes to West Texas Tech at Lubbock. The *News* leaves it to Lubbock to justify its right to be considered a part of West Texas. Should it be able to do so, that would surely acquit the *News* of the charge of showing in this case animus against the good people who dwell in that part of the State.

---

<sup>14</sup>Hill, *op. cit.*, pp. 128-129.



Elsewhere in its two-column editorial, however, the Canyon News more reasonably observes: "The institution should not survive unless it is returning a profit to the State, and no member of the faculty should be retained unless he is performing a service which would return a profit to the State." Accepting that as a basis, the News of Dallas tenders to the News of Canyon certain data not from the report of the Joint Legislative Committee on Organization, but from the report of the State Board of Education:

"It costs the State of Texas more yearly per full-time long-term student to educate a Texas boy or girl at Canyon than at Lubbock or at Austin. Specifically, at Canyon the cost is \$295.99, at Lubbock \$215.74 and at Austin \$249.77." Does that look like profit?

Per full-time student for the long session it costs \$666 a year to teach Latin at West Texas State Teachers' College. By moving him to Lubbock you can do it for \$141. Can Canyon claim a profit?

Per full-time student at the long session it costs \$419 a year to teach home economics at Canyon. About a hundred miles away at Lubbock it costs only \$146. Where is the profit there?

Perhaps it will be said that this is a teachers' college. Well, at Canyon education, on the same basis, figures out \$318 per year. At Lubbock education costs but \$112. If the Canyon News objects that education is better taught at Canyon, will it claim that a graduate in education at Canyon is better than a graduate in education at the University of Texas? Yet it costs only \$207 a year at Austin. Again the question of profit arises.

These are figures obtained by investigation in such detail as an auditor uses in going through a bank. Adjustments are made to render them comparable. They were intended for comparison. The explanation is not inefficiency or dishonesty or high prices, but a smaller student body and an expanded curriculum. Too many classes had only a few students in them. At Canyon, for example, last year there were eleven mathematics classes each with as few as ten students. Some had less. That is expensive instruction. At Lubbock, with all the advanced technical engineering mathematics, there were only five such small classes. Is it any wonder, then, that Lubbock can teach mathematics for one-third the cost per student that Canyon has to meet?

Savings from reorganization will not come to Dallas; they will not come to East Texas. They go to help the common schools in West Texas. Dallas pays more into that fund

than it gets back in scholastic apportionment. It ought to do that. There is no complaint on that score. Saving \$80 per student by moving him from Canyon to Lubbock leaves that much more to put into West Texas common schools. The Board of Education would move only junior and seniors from Canyon.

From the other side of the state, President H. F. Estill of Huntsville and President A. W. Birdwell of Nacogdoches contributed munitions to the conflict. On March 31, 1933, President Estill wrote a letter to President Evans on another subject, but ended with a postscript severely criticizing the *Dallas News*. After a message of caution to Evans on the matter of attempting to establish cooperative relations with the local public schools for practice teaching, Estill adds in the postscript:

Have you noted in a late issue of the *Dallas News* Alonzo Wasson's contemptuous references to the teachers colleges? In writing up legislative proceedings he states that the proposed Hughes-Metcalf Bill will probably not have the vigorous opposition from the teachers colleges inasmuch as this bill does not abolish them entirely but merely limits their activities by "preventing them from realizing their ambition to be splendid universities." Such jaundiced attacks upon established educational institutions in connection with a news story are unworthy of a great news journal like the *Dallas News*. However, I have decided that a protest to the editorial department will do no good in view of the editorial utterances of the *Dallas News* in regard to the service and need of the teachers colleges.

The *News* slammed anyone who publicly took a stand to save a college. At the close of a letter written on March 30, 1933, President Birdwell said: "I presume you have all noticed that I have broken into either the 'Rogues Column' or the 'Hall of Fame,' according as one views the censures of the *Dallas News*."

The *News* did not, as some charged, intend to cripple every college in the state, although a general impression to that effect seemed to be prevalent. On April 4, 1933, President Estill wrote the following letter to the presidents:

I note a surprising editorial in the *Dallas News* of yesterday—surprising in that it evidences a change of heart toward one institution of higher learning and the chamber of commerce of the home town of that institution. I refer to the editorial endorsing Texas Tech and the brief of the

Lubbock Chamber of Commerce in defense of the college. Consistency has been thrown to the winds by the Dallas News.

After the adjournment of the legislature in 1933, the *News* kept its voice of contention subdued, biding its time during the biennium until it could strike other blows for reform of the state government and economy in the expenditure of its revenue. Its opportunity came when the perennial debate of teachers' salaries broke out in the legislature early in the session of 1935. On March 10 the News printed the following editorial:

### Teachers' Salaries

It made an impression on the mind of young David Copperfield when he heard the cobbler tell the schoolmaste that his boots could be mended no longer—that there was none of the original boots left to mend. The picture painted by Dr. T. O. Walton, president of the Agricultural & Mechanical College, for the House Appropriations Committee at Austin Wednesday, did not quite match the one that Dickens gives us, but it contains evidence that the tradition of the underpaid teacher is being maintained. Dr. Walton spoke for the faculty of the Agricultural & Mechanical College only, but the heads of other Texas educational institutions will intervene on behalf of their own faculties. Dr. H. Y. Benedict, president of the University of Texas, had something of the kind to say in his address in Dallas March 2 before the local ex-students' association.

The heads of Texas institutions contend that Texas does little better than maintain tradition in payment of salaries to teachers in its institutions of higher education. The average for this State is appreciably below the average for the country as a whole. They have the figures, it seems, to prove this statement.

r

At the bottom of this bad situation is a difficulty that is responsible for much of the poor showing of Texas in educational matters. Our system has been built according to political rather than educational planning. Log-rolling has built a State teachers college on every hilltop, but little effort has been made to build up a teaching profession. The average annual salary of the Texas school teacher is only about \$1,000, according to the State Department of Education. It ought to be more. The salary level in our institutions of higher learning should also be raised. There is nothing to prevent the Legislature giving attention to this matter immediately, but the ultimate working out of a

permanent solution of the problem of teachers' salaries depends on a general overhauling of the State's educational system.

In spite of the fact that the old veteran fighter, President J. A. Hill, had declared his determination to stop his subscription for the Dallas News, somehow he became aware of the editorial quoted above and was jarred into immediate action. Two days after the appearance of the editorial Hill dispatched a letter to the presidents as follows:

You perhaps saw in the Dallas News of March 10 the enclosed editorial. I suggest that we have a few prominent teachers college ex-students well-distributed over the state write the Dallas News their opinion of such stuff as is contained in this editorial—not for publication, of course, but simply that the Dallas News may know how some people feel about this matter.

We had just as well build a back-fire under Dallas News, and I am in favor of going after it.

Weary, without a doubt, of the long-standing feud with the News, President Evans wrote a letter on March 18, advising a conference with the editor rather than an attempt to "fight back" or "back-fire" as he wrote, with evident misunderstanding of Hill's Western figure of speech. Evans expressed the firm opinion that a conference would do more good than anything else. He suggested that President McConnell<sup>15</sup> and President Whitley be asked to confer with the editor of the News at an early date.

President Birdwell was also reluctant by this time to open large-scale hostilities. He wrote on March 15: "I do not think the Dallas Nezus editorial will do much harm. Personally, I did not get 'het up' about it. A little criticism now and then helps. I am more concerned about the situation at Austin."

About this time the board of regents held a meeting in Fort Worth mainly for the purpose of giving consideration to the contract for a dormitory at Canyon. On March 21, President Hill wrote:

Meeting yesterday with the Board of Regents in Fort Worth, in connection with my dormitory contract, some-

---

<sup>15</sup> W.B. McConnell who succeeded President Marquis upon his death in 1934.

body brought up the question as to the attitude of the Dallas News toward the Teachers Colleges. Because Col. Ball<sup>16</sup> is a personal friend of Mr. Dealey, the Board asked the Colonel to call on the Dallas News, and I think he is doing so today. I am having a few of my Exes write the Dallas News about its editorial. I believe that a similar policy from each of us would make some impression.

Sporadic sniping continued for the next three years, and then an article written by Alonzo Wasson, topnotch gunner for the Dallas *News*, appeared to be for the purpose of renewing the conflict. This article aroused no emotional response from any of the presidents except that ready sentry, J. A. Hill. On November 17, 1938, he wrote President Birdwell as follows:

Apparently the Dallas News is determined to destroy the Teachers Colleges if it is humanly possible. The real motive back of this thing, I think, is its fundamental anti-pathology to all democratic influences. Of course we all know that the Dallas News is the mouthpiece of predatory interests; and if we ever have fascism in this country, it will be the result of such practices and policies as the Dallas News stands for and promotes; and if we ever have communism, it will be the result of reaction against dictatorial and plutocratic agencies as the Dallas News represents. If I had the guts, I would say this out loud. Somebody is going to say it some of these days.

Of course, the above is no argument against the points of Mr. Wasson's article. We must meet his declaration with facts, and I am glad that you are undertaking the job. If you need further data, please call upon me.

### Conclusion

When the guns on one side cease firing there is a very good chance that the guns on the other side will in time fall silent. That appears to be the answer to the question, "How did the war end?" The shadows of the gathering storm clouds of World War II, without doubt, aided in taking the minds of Texans away from their local educational troubles. The teachers colleges had survived the attacks of their enemies, and the consciousness of the great service these institutions were now rendering and had been rendering for many years began to dawn in the minds of the leaders of the state.

---

16 Thomas H. Ball, member of the board of regents from Houston.

### XIII WITH POLITICAL FLAVOR

#### Evans' Interest

Even as a young boy, Cecil Eugene Evans had been interested in politics. His father was a probate judge in Ashland, Alabama, and as a clerk working for his father, Cecil gained some knowledge of county politics. He never lost interest in the subject. The Redbook<sup>1</sup> is full of notes of political interest—local, state, and national. As might be expected, any political activity which affected schools was of first-rank importance to him. One of the earliest political incidents which caught his attention was of historical interest in his native state, Georgia. He recorded that in 1896 W. Y. Atkinson, governor of Georgia, disagreeing with the action of the board of trustees of the school at Milledgeville in expelling a girl for cheating on an examination, called the board and took the granting of diplomas out of the hands of the faculty, giving the expelled girl a diploma. As a result, all diploma graduates of the school returned their diplomas and all members of the faculty resigned. This incident caused the defeat of Atkinson in his race for the United States Senate.

When R. B. Cousins entered the race for superintendent of public instruction of Texas in 1904, Evans, who was superintendent of schools at Merkel, immediately became an ardent supporter of Cousins against the incumbent, Arthur Lefevre. Evans had taught under the superintendency of Cousins at Mexia and had strong faith in his ability to discharge the duties of the state office. A letter dated January 14, 1904, from Cousins, written from Huntsville, where Cousins was serving as financial agent of the state penitentiary, was addressed to Evans at Merkel:

The campaign is taking shape finally. The best thing for us that has occurred yet is Lefevre's open-sewer communication to the Post of the thirteenth. If I can keep him writing such pieces as that we will not need any other kind of printed matter. Just put that into the hands of newspaper friends and it will accomplish the rest. If you have not a copy, write John W. Switzer at Weatherford for a copy of his paper and the editorial of Lefevre! There is some good reading matter in it.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter II "(The Little Redbook Encyclopedia.)"

In reply to yours of the tenth, I think your suggestions are indeed wise and I am always glad to get them. If it is possible for me to do so, I will be with you at Abilene on the sixth of February and visit other sections and places about that time.

Another occurrence which Evans deemed worth recording in the Redbook was a remark made by Walter Prescott Webb in his speech before the Scolia Club at Austin, November 16, 1937: "Coolidge died of intensive inactivity." And in another note he quoted from the Dallas News of February 23, 1938: "The best type of citizenship prefers not to offer for office while reasonably certain that the resulting campaign will resemble more a trial on criminal charges than the selection of the best-fitted aspirant for a public post." In 1940, he quoted in his Redbook from Woodward's United States History, p. 860. "Speaking of Calvin Coolidge, the author says, 'His mind was a roomful of echoes and mustiness. Most of his articles would have made a forty-dollar a-week newspaper reporter ashamed of himself.'"

After his retirement, Evans wrote for the San Marcos Record an article entitled "Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Commoner." He compared Roosevelt to Andrew Jackson, William Jennings Bryan, Thomas Jefferson, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson. He said:

The New Freedom of Woodrow Wilson, the New Nationalism of Teddy Roosevelt, and the "New Deal" of Franklin D. Roosevelt are merely different names for the same liberalism. Three times elected President by record-breaking majorities, Franklin D. Roosevelt, an American Commoner, champions the cause of progressives of all parties. In Jacksonian-Wilsonian ring, Roosevelt denounces "domination of the government by financial and industrial groups numerically small but politically dominant in the twelve years succeeding the World War," and declares that he has "earned the hatred of entrenched greed." The Roosevelt contribution to the common man will be realized when the American Dream for opportunity and security consolidates all gains of a half century, and adds a long list of new achievements invaluable to civilization for all time. And too—in civilization's greatest crisis, Roosevelt stands unequivocally for the "one world" with chance for small and large nations to live in peace and fashion their own destiny.

Evans mentions Roosevelt's fight for the League of Nations

as Democratic nominee for Vice-President in 1920, and fires verbal shots at reactionaries in the Republican Party . . . "the same Republican Party which repudiated Theodore Roosevelt, Wendell Wilkie, and George W. Norris, able liberals." He concludes with ". . . his defeat would be one of the century's tragedies. Wilson was a martyr to the cause of world security; America will not make Roosevelt another martyr to the same cause."

President Evans had uncanny ability to forecast the outcome of political contests, but he ventured to make a prediction only to his closest friends. And even these close friends rarely obtained from him a statement of how he was going to vote. He did, however, openly avow his allegiance to the Democratic Party, which, of course, was a perfectly safe thing to do in Texas at that time.

The writer remembers very distinctly the campaign of 1928, and how bitterly disappointed Evans was at the nomination of Al Smith at the Houston convention. His opposition to Smith was not because of his religion nor his political beliefs generally, but because of his advocacy of the legalizing the sale of liquor. Evans was a "dry"<sup>3</sup> in the strictest sense. This was the only time he ever asked me if I were going to vote the Democratic ticket, or, for that matter, ever asked any question concerning my political preferences. When I assured him that I always voted Democratic, I felt that my answer would meet with his approval. But to my surprise he said, "I can't vote for Al Smith; I would like to "pair" with you and both of us stay away from the polls." I agreed, but the very next day he told me to forget the agreement and feel free to vote as I chose.

### Candidates And Trouble

For the greater part of the term served by Evans as president of the College, when a candidate for governor was mentioned, some reference to the name of Ferguson was likely to be made. And with many of these references there was coupled some degree of anxiety for Evans. The correspondence of the presidents invariably revealed, sooner or later, the presence of any problem that confronted any one of them. The first reference

---

<sup>3</sup>In the Redbook for 1927, Evans indicated his attitude toward intoxicating liquor in a quotation from *Scribner's* for February: "Prohibition may not prohibit drink, but it has to a great extent prohibited public immorality."



found in the records to James E. ("Farmer Jim") Ferguson was contained in a letter dated December 31, 1914, from Clarence Ousley, then director of extension service at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. The letter is self-explanatory:

My dear Evans: I have yours of December 30. I have heard some of the rumors to which you refer, and I made some inquiries among some of Mr. Ferguson's friends and was told that the reports were untrue. I had a talk with one of his closest friends a short time ago, and he assured me that Mr. Ferguson had it in mind to appoint only high class men to the boards of control. Of course he could only influence one-third of each board since two-thirds of the members of each hold over. At the same time the new appointees of each board might give trouble if they were so inclined or so inspired.

I am led to believe from what Mr. Ferguson's friends have told me that he will not undertake to disturb the educational institutions. I think he has too much intelligence and patriotism to do so. Still I will not miss any opportunity to drop a word of admonition to his advisors.

The next reference to Ferguson was in a letter dated March 29, 1918, which raised the question of an inscription on the corner stones of the Education Buildings—one each of which had been erected at Huntsville, Denton, and San Marcos. The usual procedure, as is well known, is to include the name of the governor whose signature appeared on the appropriation authorizing the building. But, as is equally well known to students of Texas history, Governor Ferguson had been disgraced by impeachment and removal from office the year before. Apparently by consensus of agreement between the presidents and members of the board of regents, the name of Governor Ferguson was omitted from the corner stones. But as an epilogue to this bit of drama, in 1924, after the second primary when Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson, wife of James E. Ferguson, polled more than 56 per cent of the votes, President Evans contracted with the makers of the original corner stone on the Education Building to add the name of James E. Ferguson, Governor. Although President Evans' action brought forth some criticism from Dan Moody who overwhelmingly defeated Mrs. Ferguson in 1926,<sup>4</sup> the corner stone remains as revised.

---

<sup>4</sup>As attorney general of Texas, Moody had declared unconstitutional an act of the legislature restoring the political rights of James E. Ferguson.

A letter from M. O. Flowers of the board of regents, written on August 4, 1924, indicates the dilemma in which President Evans found himself after Mrs. Ferguson's victory. The letter follows:

It is a great problem to figure out what we will get from the next legislature. To do that we almost have to know who is going to win the race.

If Mrs. Ferguson wins we can remember that her husband was heretofore friendly to the teachers colleges, and the new ones that he is responsible for ought to have his liberal support. On the other hand, if Robertson wins, then he will likely be liberal with us, for some of his strongest supporters are our best friends. Birdwell is in a straight Ferguson county and some others are in the same condition, while you and Hill will likely be in Robertson counties. I can only say that I hope the result is not going to hurt our schools.

After the defeat of Felix Robertson in the run-off primary later in August President Evans initiated a plan to feel out the attitude of the Fergusons toward the teachers colleges. On September 9 he wrote President Birdwell:

Some time within the next month or six weeks, when campaign feelings have subsided to a considerable extent, it will be highly advisable for friends of the Teachers Colleges to have a conference with Mr. and Mrs. Ferguson at Temple. I am inclined to think that Eugene Blount<sup>5</sup> is one of several excellent men to help us. We don't want the Teachers Colleges to be embarrassed during the next two years. I saw Mr. Blount in Austin yesterday and found him enthusiastic about our prospects, . . .

President Evans was acquainted with many Ferguson supporters among prominent men in Texas. Among these was A. B. Martin of Plainview. September 3, 1924, Evans wrote to President Hill of Canyon and sent copies to the other presidents:

I had a conversation with A. B. Martin of Plainview yesterday in which I advised him to have an interview with Mr. and Mrs. Ferguson some time next month.

It will be comparatively easy for designing men to get in some work against us unless our friends reach the in-

---

<sup>5</sup>Blount at that time was representative from Nacogdoches, location of the teachers college. He was also a supporter of Ferguson and thus in a key position to befriend the teachers colleges.

coming governor in ample time. We want to be consulted about members of our Board of Regents and thereby be protected against possible serious troubles. Keep this in mind.

In the November, 1924, general election the Republican candidate for Texas, George C. Butte, received more than 42 per cent of the votes cast for governor, a total of 294,970 votes, this in comparison with the general election of November, 1922, when the Republican candidate received only 73,329 votes, and with the general election of 1926, two years later, in which he received only 31,531 votes.<sup>6</sup> These figures show the extent of the opposition in Texas to the Fergusons, thousands of Democrats being willing to vote for a Republican candidate in order to defeat the Fergusons. Without a doubt, this opposition kept alive the bitterness of the campaign—of all of which Evans was fully aware. But even before the general election Evans could apparently foresee the approximate results. On the day of the general election on November 4, 1924, before any results had been announced, he addressed a letter to two of the presidents, Hill and Marquis, in which he said:

By the time this reaches you the election will be over, and I hardly think the result either in the state or in the nation will be different from what all of us are guessing. I am suggesting a little information which, by active work, we may use to ward off possible troubles.

Early in September the San Marcos Fair Association, through a local citizen, invited Honorable and Mrs. J. E. Ferguson to address the citizens of this section at the fair. About ten days after this had been accepted, the citizen who had carried the message was notified by the president of the Fair Association to cancel the invitation on the ground that the women of San Marcos were objecting, and that the children of the schools, on whose day the address was to be given, would not be permitted to attend. A more silly, nonsensical piece of work could not have been contemplated, and it was carried out without consulting the fair directors, and without asking the advice of representative citizens of San Marcos. Naturally, Mr. and Mrs. Ferguson resent deeply this humiliation, and will tend to look in the direction of the Teachers College here for a place to strike back. In the discussion of this unfortunate conduct of the president of the fair association, Governor Ferguson took

---

<sup>6</sup> Texas Almanac, 1966-1967, p. 574.

occasion to express his resentment of discourteous and unkind treatment given him at Canyon and Denton. Further along in the discussion he was very positive in the denunciation of the Klan members in these faculties and said that he would cut all appropriations for salaries for these faculty members. I do not know how much was at that time implied in this threat.

In connection with his opposition to the Klan faculty members in the state schools, he had something to say in criticism of alleged Klan sympathizers. His opposition seemed to be more directly centered upon the faculty members who, as he said, were Klan propagandists. So far as I am personally concerned, I have never been connected with the Klan, and have not been directly or indirectly or in any other way a propagandist for the Klan. I am a college president, and my conception of the position would not permit me to engage in propaganda work along Klan lines, even if I conscientiously believed in all practices of the Klan.

I am taking this occasion to suggest to President Hill to get in touch with A. B. Martin of Plainview, who is very vigorous in his opposition to the Klan, and a long-standing friend of Honorable J. E. Ferguson, I also suggest that President Marquis get in touch with some prominent citizens of Denton who can assist in putting the right information at the right time in the hands of Mr. and Mrs. Ferguson. The truth will not injure any of us or our colleges.

The citizen who gave me this information cannot afford for it to be known that it came through him, and under no circumstances must either of you use me as authority for this absolutely dependable piece of information. "A stitch in time saves nine."

In a reply addressed to Evans and Hill, President Marquis, on November 5, wrote:

I am replying to Mr. Evans' letter of November 4 addressed to Mr. Hill and myself. I agree that the fair incident at San Marcos was most unfortunate. I am unable at this time to determine what discourteous or unkind treatment was given at Canyon or Denton. It has been my purpose to be courteous to all parties at all times. If I have failed it is purely a question of overlooking an opportunity. The air in this part of the State is full of rumors of all sorts—the pro kind and the con kind. I am not sure that anyone has authority to speak for anyone else. Undoubtedly many alliances will develop between now and January. The atmosphere is not clear at this time, but it seems to me that

the best thing that might be done would be an effort made in the dark.

It must be admitted that President Evans probably felt the need for someone else to ride in the same boat with him. Whether his letter to Marquis and Hill was in the nature of a search for such companions can only be conjectured.

At a faculty meeting on November 6, President Evans mentioned the danger arising for the College out of the invitation to Ferguson to attend the county fair and then the cancellation of that invitation after it had been accepted.

Apparently, after receiving President Evans' letter, President Marquis came to the rather swift conclusion that it would be wise to write a friendly letter to the Fergusons. Accordingly on November 6, he wrote such a letter and sent a copy to President Evans :

My dear Mrs. Ferguson: You and your husband have fought and won a great fight, and I extend the hearty congratulations such a victory merits.

Throughyou Texas has voiced her condemnation of organized intolerance and racial and religious prejudice. Fear, Hate, and Prejudice are triplets born of Ignorance and nurtured by her. This dangerous triune can be destroyed and its fateful influence dispelled only by substituting therefor the hallowed influence of intelligence, sympathy and confidence. Who knows but that you are at this hour God's chosen vessel, selected by Him and dedicated to the great task of bringing peace, tranquility and harmony to our beloved state? For a decade Texas has been harassed by contending factions, and because of bitter contests much harm has come to us. All love their state, but they move at cross purposes because they are confused and confounded, there being darkness instead of light. We need light to lighten our path, and confidence in each other which will result in cooperation. You, being a woman, who is also a wife and mother, are so well fitted to understand men and well qualified to counsel men who have grievously quarreled because they have misunderstood each other. I believe this great problem alone presents you with an unparalleled opportunity.

You are going to give Texas a good, sound, business administration. Of this there is no doubt. If you can, in addition, leave our state clear of old factions, with peace, harmony and good will once more the dominant force in the lives of her citizenship, you will be a double blessing and Texas will remember you as her Joan of Arc.

Marquis' letter may have prompted President Evans to write a similar one, especially since he was head of the Council of Teachers College Presidents and in a position to speak for all the presidents. On November 10 he wrote as follows:

As President of the Council of Presidents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges, I desire to extend to you our best wishes for a successful, popular, efficient, and business-like administration of the affairs of Texas by you as Governor. Speaking for myself as a citizen and as a Democrat, I submit this statement: After winning the fight in the regular Democratic primary in August, fairness and Democracy justly entitled you to the place on the ballot without a court contest, and to election in November by a large majority without a partisan fight against you. The teachers colleges may be counted upon to give you cordial cooperation.

With kind regards for both you and your administration, . . .

A comparison of the letters to Mrs. Ferguson from Marquis and Evans furnishes an accurate portrayal of the differences in their traits of personality and character which no descriptive language could reveal.

President Evans' foreboding about the immediate future after the general election of 1925 with the attendant incidents just recorded caused him to exert every effort he could think of to avert disaster. On November 17, he wrote Miss Margie E. Neal, member of the board of regents from Carthage, expressing his fears:

If I am correctly informed, there will be a meeting of the Board of Normal Regents this week and I thought it best to give you some accurate information along certain lines.

There is a decided uneasiness and unrest in the State Colleges on the account of alleged statements or of widespread rumors regarding appropriations or teachers in these colleges. The most common rumor is that the incoming administration will veto all appropriations for salaries of teachers who are members of the Klan; another rumor is that the boards of regents of the several state institutions will be asked to dismiss not only Klan teachers but also alleged Klan sympathizers; another rumor is that the several boards will be asked to dismiss alleged propagandists. Personally, I give very little credence to these rumors. I do know, however from responsible sources that trouble-makers are supplying Governor Ferguson with lists of names

of Klansmen in faculties of State Colleges and are also giving him full information regarding faculty members who voted for Butte in November. These agitators are even reminding Governor Ferguson how the college bosses voted in August and November in the race for Governor.

From the time I came to San Marcos in 1911, I have insisted vigorously that the College stay out of partisan politics. I, myself, do not take partisan stock for or against any gubernatorial candidate in any election. At times, I might profit by lining up the voters for a winning candidate for Governor, but in doing so I would be violating a principle of professional ethics very dear to teaching. I believe thoughtful people in Texas want Presidents of State Schools to stay off the stump in political campaigns and to teach the children of all the people free from partisan bias.

In no campaign from 1912 to 1924 inclusive have I permitted myself, or encouraged any employe to engage in partisan fights. One of the best ways to keep State Schools out of politics is for state employees to let partisan politics severely alone. For the reasons already stated as well as for other good reasons I have never joined the Klan, and have no intention of joining the Klan, and have never carried on Klan propaganda, and have never been mixed up in the councils of the Klan leaders, and have never made any kind of alliance with a Klan group. My brother, Superintendent A. W. Evans, who is now high school inspector under Mr. Marrs, has followed exactly the same policy. My youngest brother' who, as you know, is prominently connected with the Klan, knows our situations and our duties and has never in any wise requested either of us to tie on to the Klan or to engage in Klan agitation. A few of our faculty members are members of the Klan, but so far as I can learn they are not agitators for the Klan and certainly do not spread Klan propaganda among students.

You may make such use of this letter as you deem advisable.

This letter, an obvious plea in defense of himself, his brother, and the College, was sent to Miss Neal, the only woman member of the board of regents, probably in the hope and belief that she would lend a sympathetic ear and stand up for him if opposition to him developed in the board; moreover, her

---

7 Hiram W. Evans, Imperial Wizard, head of the national organization of the Ku ~~Klux~~ Klan, with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia. Evans refers to Hiram W. as his "youngest brother," but he had in mind the older set of children, sons of the same mother, Georgia Striplin Evans. There was a half-brother, Marcius, many years younger than Hiram W.

influence would, without doubt, be effective with Mrs. Ferguson.

The friendly gestures of the presidents of the teachers colleges reached the Fergusons and were given courteous reception. A letter dated December 3, 1924, from President Hill to the presidents read in part:

. . . Coming on to Temple, I spent the night there and had a very satisfactory conference with Governor Ferguson. Senator Reid and Mr. Guenther were with me and we were all delighted with what appeared to be the results. Governor Ferguson seems to think that Dr. Musselman's term does not expire until next January. He gave us his unconditional promise that A. B. Martin would be placed on the Board. The only promise I got from him with reference to Fred Martin was that he would investigate his merits. In another connection he stated that it would be the policy of the administration not to remove people who are giving efficient service.

A further commentary on the Ferguson problem was put into a letter from President S. H. Whitley, dated December 12, 1924. This letter was marked "personal and confidential" and a note at the beginning indicated that the letter was in reply to President Evans' request to confer with Ferguson:

On Saturday, December 6, I went to Temple, Texas, for the purpose of calling on Governor and Mrs. Ferguson (sic) and paying them my respects. The purpose of this letter is to give you my impressions of the conference which I had with them.

I found Governor Ferguson in a happy frame of mind and well pleased with the progress of things in general. I found his attitude toward Teachers Colleges in general very satisfactory, I thought.

After having talked with him a little while, I discovered that he was pretty badly disappointed at the college towns because most of them, he said, had registered a majority vote against the Democratic Party in the recent election. It appeared upon further investigation, that he was somewhat inclined to think that the faculties of the institutions at these places could have prevented this occurrence if they had chosen to do so. I tried to show him that this was not altogether a faculty responsibility, but he called my attention especially to A. and M. College, where 84 votes were cast and the Democratic Party received only three out of the 84.

---

<sup>8</sup>The two men mentioned were Senator J. W. Reid of Canyon and Professor Ferdinand Paul Guenther of the college faculty at Canyon.



He further mentioned the fact that there were two faculties at Denton and it appeared to him that that town ought to have gone for the Democratic Party.

One question on which the presidents of the teachers colleges were united was that the candidate for governor, who won nomination in the Democratic primary should be "educated" as to the needs of the teachers colleges and their proper place in the educational system of Texas. September 9, 1926, just a few days after Dan Moody had decisively defeated Mrs. Ferguson in the run-off primary, President Hill addressed a letter to President Estill, sending copies to all the other presidents. He said in part:

I am still of the opinion that the teachers colleges overlook an opportunity if they do not seek to educate the incoming Governor. I believe that we ought to have a committee from teachers colleges to call on Mr. Moody by appointment and discuss at length with him the problems of the teachers colleges.

The selection of the proposed committee to call upon the governor-elect took some time. President Estill suggested Hill, Marquis, and Evans; but Hill suggested a "better man than myself" be selected and proposed young Bartow Cousins, son of the well-known R. B. Cousins. Bartow Cousins was then an assistant in the attorney general's office. Hill said of young Cousins, "He has as good approach to the new administration as any in our group, and I should gladly have him take my place on the committee." President Evans, however, felt that the elder Cousins, then president of the teachers college at Kingsville, would be a wiser choice, and suggested that President Cousins be joined by Presidents Estill and Whitley. Whereupon, President Hill gave his immediate approval to Evans' suggestion.

October 2, 1928, President Evans raised the question of a common policy among the teachers colleges in permitting candidates for public office to make political speeches to the student body. He wrote to the other presidents:

Since I came to San Marcos in 1911 I have consistently refused to give my approval to the making of political speeches to our student body from the College platform. In my judgment, political speeches from a college platform are fully as unwise as political speeches by candidates from pulpits on Sunday. However, I invite gubernatorial and senatorial candidates who are in San Marcos during the

day and at times when the student body can assemble, to address the student body. With a single exception in 17 years I have found the candidates themselves understand the impropriety of making political speeches in the College auditorium, and yet at the same time the students have the opportunity of seeing the candidates for the highest offices in Texas. We are also liberal in the matter of excusing our students from classes in order to attend downtown political speeches by candidates of recognized ability.

I am submitting this statement to all the presidents as our solution to a problem that arises biennially.

President Hill had a more liberal policy in this matter. He wrote on October 4:

I have taken the position that, since ours is a state institution and since our teachers need to be informed on public men and measures, our platform is open to all who come seeking the suffrage of the state. All such ones are given equal opportunity to present the issues of the campaign.

For four years the Fergusons stayed away from Texas politics, but in 1930 Mrs. Ferguson again became a candidate for governor and was defeated by Ross Sterling. In 1932, the Fergusons were back with renewed political strength and defeated Sterling by a close vote in the run-off primary. Again the old fear suffered by President Evans was resurrected, but happily, the amity which he so carefully cultivated in the 1924-26 biennium bore fruit when Mrs. Ferguson returned to the Governor's Mansion in Austin.

Evans was extremely careful during the campaigns of 1930 and 1932 to see that nothing happened which might be embarrassing to him as head of the College. In spite of his declaration of policy made to the presidents in 1928, Evans invited both Sterling and the Fergusons to speak without restrictions at Riverside Park, the College resort on the San Marcos River, and both accepted. Each had a very large audience.

August 1, 1932, President Evans wrote President Hill declining an invitation to visit the Canyon college and gave the following reasons:

Governor Miriam A. Ferguson and James E. Ferguson are to open their next campaign at San Marcos Saturday evening, August 6. Two years ago, Governor Sterling was in San Marcos Thursday evening before the August primary

the following Saturday. My absence from the Ferguson meeting would be misconstrued and would occasion some embarrassment. In addition thereto, the Ferguson rally will be held at our Riverside Park, where the Sterling Rally was held two years ago. You will, therefore, understand how it is impossible for me to be with you next Sunday. . . .

The din of the political repercussions was always within the hearing of President Evans. Political commentators have made the unrefuted statement that Ross Sterling's political success was due to the influence of Dan Moody.<sup>9</sup> Although personally out of the arena of Texas politics in 1932, Moody expressed publicly his resentment at the courteous treatment accorded the Fergusons wherever they went. The following letter dated August 13, 1932, to President Whitley shows how Moody's attitude affected at least one of the state colleges. President Evans wrote:

. In conversation yesterday with one of our faculty members who is a relative, Gib Gilchrist<sup>10</sup> told our faculty member that Dan Moody sent a telegram to the Commerce State Teachers College condemning the courtesies extended to an impeached governor. This is just another confirmation of your belief regarding the origin of a telegram of two years ago. The more I think of your situation and mine, the more I am surprised. Both Jim and Ma have been governor; to refuse to show them the courtesies extended other governors would be narrow and unfair.

Again, as in 1924, many Democrats in Texas supported the Republican candidate rather than see the Fergusons return to office. Anticipating the same type of campaign as had been carried on in 1924, with its aftermath of bitterness, President Evans had waited for a request by partisans before giving any sign of approval for the appearance of either of the candidates on the College campus. In the meantime the news that Orville Bullington, the Republican opponent of the Fergusons, who was strongly wooing the Democratic vote with his slogan, "Good Democrats will vote for Bullington," was scheduled to speak at the Sam Houston State Teachers College in Huntsville. President Evans wrote a short letter to President Estill urging caution against any happening that might arouse the ire of "Farmer Jim" Ferguson. October 10, President Estill replied:

---

<sup>9</sup> s. S. McKay, *Texas Politics 1906-1944*, op. cit., p. 53.

<sup>10</sup> Gilchrist was Chief Engineer, State Highway Department, later Dean of Engineering, **Texas** A, and M. College, and still later President and Chancellor.

He (Bullington) is an alumnus of the Sam Houston Normal and a member of our Ex-Student Association . . . I am inclined to believe that Mr. Bullington himself is entirely friendly to the Normal Colleges. Therefore, when urged by several prominent ex-students to invite Mr. Bullington to our campus, I could see no logical way to refuse.

One of the most embarrassing political problems faced by Evans was short-lived and in the end caused no serious damage to the College. In 1934, Thomas Dunlap was elected to the Texas House of Representatives from the San Marcos district consisting of Hays and Caldwell Counties. Dunlap was a graduate of the College who had been in minor disfavor with Dean of Men H. E. Speck. Dunlap undertook to avenge himself by making a severe cut in the appropriation for the dean's salary. This unwise act caused a wave of resentment and apprehension at the College and among the many friends of Speck. President Evans described Dunlap's action as "outrageous." Immediately after the appropriation bill was enacted into law fixing the salary at the low figure insisted upon by Dunlap, President Evans asked for and received approval from the board of regents to supplement the salary out of local funds and restored it to the original amount. In 1936 when Dunlap announced for reelection, Evans still took no action whatever to influence votes. He predicted privately that Dunlap's action would be the cause of his defeat, and this prediction materialized when Cleveland, the opponent, won by a small margin. The Redbook shows that in Caldwell County Cleveland won by only two votes, but in Hays County by 305 votes, or in the two counties a majority of 330 votes out of a total vote of 5,511.

The only reference to the Dunlap case found in Evans' correspondence was a letter dated September 30, 1936, addressed to the presidents. He wrote as follows:

A committee of five regents met in Austin Saturday, September 26. This committee discussed with a number of our faculty members an internal problem and reached a satisfactory conclusion. The problem grew out of bitter antagonism of our local representative.

Several prominent businessmen and attorneys from San Marcos were elected to the legislature during the Evans administration, and generally his relations with these men were pleasant and cooperative. On Evans' part no pressure tactics were

ever attempted to influence any local representative to cast his vote for measures which he favored. He held firmly to his belief that a lawmaker should be free to use his own judgment. In 1919 when C. T. Bass was a member of the legislature, President Bruce of Denton called upon Evans to influence Representative Bass to vote for a higher appropriation for the normal schools. Evans replied:

I do not know what I can do with Mr. Bass; as a matter of fact, I doubt if anything can be done. I believe he will vote for the increase we expect. I think I have accomplished all with him it is possible to do, and further discussion would be of doubtful advantage. Some of the teachers are doing what they can to assist.<sup>11</sup>

### "The Situation in Austin"

It is entirely understandable that whatever took place in Austin was of paramount importance to President Evans and the other presidents. While Evans was very much opposed to participation by any state employee in a political contest or any effort for or against a candidate for office, nevertheless he was willing to do everything in his power to influence the men in the legislature to provide adequate funds for the teachers colleges. In his view, this was a perfectly legitimate lobby—the improvement of the schools for the training of teachers. He also encouraged in every possible way the efforts of the Texas State Teachers Association before the legislature to secure greater support for the public schools of the state.

A letter from President Birdwell indicates something of the manner in which lobbying activity was carried on with the members of the legislature. On December 15, 1924, he wrote:

I have read with interest your letters concerning the present status of our appropriation bills.

I am very decidedly of the opinion that our only hope is before the finance committees of the State Legislature. I have not seen the report of the Board of Control on my own budget, but I am sure that it has suffered the same mutilation that the rest of them have. As I see it, it will be

---

<sup>11</sup> Ralph Bruce, son of President Bruce, was employed in the business office of the College for a few years. He was married to Representative Bass's daughter Corinne. This fact may explain in part the request of President Bruce.

practically impossible to get the Board of Control to change its recommendations now, but, in my opinion, it will be possible to secure substantial adjustments before the Legislature. I am already trying to build up a sentiment to this effect among the representatives in this section of the State. There seems to be a disposition among the men with whom I have talked to treat the teachers colleges liberally. To be sure, the whole matter depends on how much money will be available for the higher institutions of learning. I do not think that there is any earthly chance to get additional tax legislation, and we will, therefore, be dependent on the available revenues. Certainly, the incoming administration will not be unfavorable to our cause, and I am not expecting any great complications to arise on political questions.

On one trip to Austin in January 1925, Presidents Marquis and Evans talked with "a large number of Senators," and President Marquis declared in a letter dated January 16 that they would "devote themselves to House members later." Marquis expressed the opinion that the teachers colleges had more friends in the Senate than ever before, and, he added, "they are pretty well in possession of the facts." The main object of Marquis and Evans was to "sound out" the members of both the Senate and House on the question of making a lump-sum appropriation. At that time this was, and probably continued to be for many years later, the desire of every college president, because it would allow him freedom to disburse appropriated funds for such items as were needed at the time of the need and the authority to shift expenditures to emergency items as a situation might develop. Marquis thought there was a chance for securing lump sums for salaries, maintenance, repairs, and contingent fund for all purposes. He believed that some lawmakers were ready to consider this proposal.

The Speaker of the House and members of the Senate Finance Committee were visited next. Here Marquis accused Lieutenant Governor Barry Miller of failure to live up to his announcement that he would appoint on the finance committee senators representing districts where colleges were located. He noted that Texas Tech and A, and M. College would be taken care of by the appointment of senators from the districts in which these colleges were located.

After his trip to Austin and his visit to the capitol with Evans, Marquis joined Whitley of Commerce in a special trip to

Dallas to confer with Lieutenant Governor Barry Miller on the matter of appointments to the finance committee of the senate. As a result of this conference, Miller promised to name Senator J. W. Reid of Canyon, and this was entirely satisfactory to the two college presidents.

Back in Austin before leaving for Dallas, Marquis and Whitley had an interview with the Board of Control. Marquis described the meeting with the board as a "sympathetic hearing." One member of the Board of Control at first vigorously opposed Marquis' request for a higher salary scale, but he finally conceded that a more favorable salary scale would probably be a good policy—provided "we did not plan to establish eleven universities."

Next there was another interview with Lee Satterwhite, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Satterwhite received the presidents with "vigorous and hearty assurance that the Teachers Colleges would be carefully considered" in his appointments to the Appropriations Committee. Already Representative Eugene Blount of Nacogdoches had been appointed chairman, and Marquis felt that "This is as fortunate as we could hope for." He stated that the Speaker was in favor of lump sums, the subject so dear to the hearts of the presidents. Chairman Blount also looked favorably on the idea. "But," he added, "they both fear . . . that considerable opposition may arise."

Their last conference was with Senator Edgar Witt of Waco, and this conference included "several of our Senator friends." These senators, however, were not in favor of lump sums, but were milling to attach a rider allowing the board of regents of the colleges to modify the items as long as the totals were not exceeded.

There was a hint in Marquis' letter that a plan was on foot to separate the building program from the regular budget and utilize available revenues for all items not including buildings. Marquis said, "This plan seems to contemplate a separate source of revenue, and the amount hinted at approximates five million dollars." The plan was expected to be included in the governor's message to the legislature after inauguration.

An interesting side light on the conference with Barry Miller was brought out in Marquis' communication. Marquis declared that Miller's mind had been poisoned by reading an article in the Dallas **News**. He wrote:

I call your attention to the pamphlet by Tom Finty, "A commentary on the Texas Educational Survey," . . . I found a copy of this on Barry Miller's desk. In fact, he called attention to it. He asked my reaction to it, but as I had not had an opportunity to read it I told him it would be necessary for me to return home, read it, and write him later. I furthermore suggested that he might like to know the opinion of each of us, and he enthusiastically requested that you write him giving your reactions to the pamphlet.

It will not be out of place for me to tell you that lie thinks Tom Finty is a mail capable of speaking of educational matters, and he is now placing a great weight upon what Tom Finty may have to say. I wish to make this observation in order that you may not even appear to offend.

Furtherfore Governor Miller is full of venomous propaganda that we do not train teachers,---that ~~me~~ are simply so many colleges. He is interested in the number of graduates (and he thinks of four-year graduates) who actually teach. I am taking the percentages supplied by you in your recent letters and, with your permission, I am going to furnish him with these data in a brief letter at once. . . .

April 1, 1925, Evans wrote to R. B. Binnion, former president of the East Texas State Teachers College, and now provost of George Peabody College for Teachers. The letter was in reply to a request by Binnion that President Evans write him all the news. Evans' letter follows in part:

. . . Right now we can't tell just what Governor Jim is going to do. Indeed, I think he is inclined to veto all our buildings, and unless something is done, we will go two years more without a building program. The last Legislature had a good many live issues. The penitentiary system came in for a rather thorough overhauling. I can't tell you just how much good has been done if any whatever. Really I am afraid the politicians are merely playing with the convict system of Texas and not even offering the State any kind of constructive effort. Almost the same thing is true in the matter of providing a sensible revenue system for Texas. If the Legislature would give us a few sane revenue projects, we could accomplish a great many things in an educational way in Texas. Whenever anything is proposed, the



Texas Power and Light Company joins with the oil producers, and then things get busy in Austin. It looks a little like the combination mentioned is going to hold the situation down in Texas for some years yet.

Several of the presidents became very skilled at the game of politics played in the state capital. Among those who became proficient in this fine art was President Hill, notwithstanding his occasional denial that he was in any wise a politician. On January 4, 1927, just before the legislature convened, he wrote a letter to the presidents in which he referred to a proposal by "Governor Elect—now Attorney General—Moody" to adopt a mill tax. President Hill said he felt it would be useless to argue the matter with the attorney general. He declared:

I do not believe that the legislature will submit such a proposal in the first place, but I think it might be well for Mr. Moody to find this out rather than for us to oppose his suggestion. We expect him to cooperate with us and we should show some sympathy with his idea so far as we can honorably do so. In other words, I would not think his proposal would get anywhere and our sympathetic attitude toward it might be worth something to us with him.

President Hill further displayed his political thinking in a letter dated September 28, 1927, a part of which is quoted herewith:

. . . President Evans' suggestion of close cooperation between Teachers Colleges is an ideal for which some of us have longed for some time. There seems to be adequate cooperation among the presidents and between the presidents and Board of Regents, but our political strength is unmobilized. I believe that we should see to it that our respective Senators in the Forty-first Legislature and our State Representatives shall be willing to go down the line for a Teachers College program for Texas without modification in the slightest particular and irrespective of all other considerations. If we can obtain such solidarity in the Legislature as we have in our own Council we need not fear the results. I am suggesting that each of us now begin a program that has for its objective the alignment of the several legislators in our respective areas.

When the legislature met in 1929 there was the same old scarcity of funds in the state treasury, and there was an immediate threat of danger to the summer school. As a matter of fact, some of the presidents had risked the displeasure of the

legislature by attempting to create a deficit in the operation of the summer school of 1928, in the belief that a request to pay "a just debt" for services rendered the state would at the last moment be granted. Evans had warned against the deliberate creation of a deficit in the form of "back salaries" promised instructors and items purchased with local funds which ordinarily were purchased with state appropriations. And on January 31, 1929, he reported on the situation in Austin as he observed it.

. . . Personally, I doubt the wisdom of going on the floor of the House to fight the action of the committee until we have converted a large per cent of this committee to our viewpoint. I am, therefore, suggesting that each President get in touch as quickly as possible with friends in the House and through other friends get in touch with Governor Moody. I really think Governor Moody could handle the situation with ease if he could be induced to say the word. . . .

Apparently the efforts suggested by Evans were not without favorable results. A telegram and a follow-up letter by Evans on February 21 carried encouraging news. The telegram read: "Free Conference Committee voted today to allow unpaid salaries of last summer . . ." The letter was as follows:

You have no doubt received my telegram I sent you from Austin. I arrived in Austin Friday morning, February 15. I found there Presidents Birdwell and Estill. President Estill left on the afternoon of the fifteenth, however, and President Birdwell left that night. We three, together with Mr. Henry Paulus, of our Board, decided to offer the Free Conference Committee a compromise on the summer school item of 1928. The substance of the compromise is that the Free Conference Committee give us money to be used in paying the unpaid salaries for the summer of 1928, and to give us such other items for the current year and for the summer of 1929 as the House and Senate had previously agreed upon. The members of the Free Conference Committee from both the House and Senate agreed to accept this compromise.

I waited all day Friday and all day Saturday for the Free Conference Committee to get together; but it did not do so. Sunday came without anything having been done.

Monday morning I went to the members of these committees to find out when action would be taken. The Senate Committee said it would be perfectly willing to consider the matter any time it might secure an invitation from the House Committee to do so. I went to see the House Committee. Each committee said it would see the other in hell before

it would call a meeting. This presented a precarious situation. Jack Hubbard of the College of Industrial Arts and I worked all Monday morning on the proposition. We finally succeeded in getting the House Committee to take the initiative in calling a meeting. The meeting was held at 1:30 Monday afternoon of this week, and it took them about thirty minutes to reach an agreement in accordance with the compromise as stated above.

I am writing a detailed statement to you relative to this situation in order that you may understand that the Senate and House are not very close together in so far as their attitude and point of view are concerned,

I hope the compromise that was effected meets the approval of all the Presidents. According to my notion, it was either this compromise or nothing, and I felt that we could not afford to wait any longer in order to find out what we were going to do for the summer school of 1929.

The free conference bill will be introduced in the legislature this week. I feel confident that it will pass without any further trouble.

Now, thirty-seven years later, it is probably difficult for the average citizen to believe that in 1930 the very minimum needs of the teachers colleges had to be secured through such political chicanery. In January of 1930, in the midst of a very cold winter on the High Plains of Texas, President Hill of Canyon wrote to President Eirdwell of Nacogdoches:

I have your letter with enclosure from the Governor. Indeed "we are confronted with a serious situation." Apparently the Governor never intended that we should have what we gave him as the minimum essentials.

I know nothing to suggest unless we organize a bloc in the Senate to defeat all legislation unless our needs are cared for. I admit that this is an ugly thought and one against which my best nature revolts. The Governor asked us to state the minimum sums with which we could get along without serious impairment. Each of us has done that. In fact, I placed one item too low. In view of the extreme winter which we are having, our fuel item should be four thousand dollars. If we do not get it or something like that amount, we shall be compelled to choose between asking the utilities companies to carry our account over a period of months or closing the institution.

If you think of anything I can do at Austin or elsewhere in this connection, kindly wire me.

Evans had no scruples about naming his enemies in the legislature, taking this means of letting the regents and the other presidents know where the opposition was located. On May 2, 1931, he wrote to A. B. Mayhew, president of the board of regents at Uvalde, telling of the hard fight for appropriations then going on in Austin. He remarked that "our friend Coke Stevenson is the most influential leader in the fight on the appropriation bill." The term "our friend" was undoubtedly used facetiously. On the other hand, he kept in his little Redbook a record of the friends of the College in the legislature of Texas. After a loss by the College in the defeat of a free conference report, he checked the legislative record to find whether the local representative was present. He listed many occasions of absence when the presence of this representative had been sorely needed to protect the interests of the College.

It was necessary to keep political activity going constantly, and the subject occupied much of the thinking and time of the presidents. On September 17, 1936, President McConnell of the North Texas State Teachers College wrote to President Evans deploring the fact that at this date there was no appropriation available or in sight for the summer session of 1937, and the question had been raised whether to ask the governor to submit a request for appropriations for summer schools at a special session. President McConnell wrote:

I am wondering if it would not be well for the presidents of state colleges to formulate some systematic procedure intended to secure us of a favorable appropriation committee for the Forty-fifth Legislature irrespective of who may be the speaker of the House. It is idle to think other educational interests opposed to state schools will be inactive. I think a statement to the Governor made in the proper way could safeguard our interests if Bob Calvert<sup>12</sup> should be put in.

. . . I think I have a contact with two intermediaries between him and me who can be very effective in dissuading him from taking any aggressive stand. I have intended using these two.

### At The College Door

President Evans knew as well as, or better than, any other college president in Texas the danger lurking for a college when

---

<sup>12</sup> Calvert was representative from District 60, Hillsboro.

political interests assumed control and the true place of the college in the affairs of the state was forgotten. He had knowledge of many instances of colleges being all but destroyed by the actions of politicians holding offices of power and influence.

One such incident was the case of his predecessor at the San Marcos college who, in 1910, as a member of the Anti-Saloon League, took an active part in the political contest between Ramsey and Colquitt for governor. His open support of Ramsey, who was defeated, had caused Governor Colquitt to order his removal from the position as head of the College.<sup>13</sup>

Another instance was that of President Lindsay Blayney of the College of Industrial Arts who remained in the position as head of that institution for only one year, 1925-1926. There had been others in Texas and as well as many in other states. In commenting upon the situation at the College of Industrial Arts, President Hill wrote in a letter dated November 6, 1925, to President Evans:

College presidencies under the existing system are semi-political positions. I wish it were not so, but I am a poor politician, and because, too, I do not believe the state's best interest is served in conditions of this kind. Your position and mine are much more insecure than is that of any member of our faculties. Under the existing organization of colleges I know of no way to remedy this condition.

In other states the situation was no better. At Stillwater, in 1924, the A. and M. College of Oklahoma was the victim of the interference of Governor Walton. Along with a number of other faculty members, Mary C. Brogdon, the dean of women at that institution, resigned and accepted the position of dean of women at the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. In a telegram indorsing the application of Miss Brogdon, President J. B. Eskridge of the Stillwater institution declared that if Governor Walton had not "wrecked the institution" Miss Brogdon would still be employed, and under normal conditions, at a salary of one thousand dollars a year more than she was being offered at San Marcos.

In the matter of politics on and about the campus, President Evans said at a meeting of the faculty on June 15, 1934:

---

<sup>13</sup> See Chapter I, "The Appointment."

. . . In saying our college instructors should not be handicapped, limited, or restrained in the responsible exercise of citizenship, I should also say that they have no concern in mixing with local, factional, or partisan scrambles for public offices. In district, county, or city, they have no desire to be the weapons with which one bloc may fight some other bloc; they want freedom to vote their convictions, bloc or no bloc. We have no college bloc in local trade, or in local politics.

In an address to the Jeffersonian Society, a student organization at the College, President Evans cautioned against the danger of "dabbling in politics" by students or faculty members. He said, "I have kept the College out of politics and have resisted political 'drives for positions in the College. Our faculty members are selected by invitation and appointment." He related to the audience of young men a list of "political fads" in Texas and United States history. For example, the main issue of a political campaign may be fashioned into a catch phrase, as "The Age of Neff" in Texas, or the slogans "Me for Ma," and "The Plight of the Tenant Farmer." He reminded his hearers of politicians who had become such popular leaders as to assume dictatorial power.

Many times in general assembly, Evans told the students, among other things: "A political school job is not worth having when you get it." He also declared, "Teaching can't be a great profession unless teachers can stand or fall on merit."

President Evans abhorred the idea that the College was in any way bound up with local political contests or that the administration and faculty should exercise any influence over local voters. As indicated earlier in this chapter, he was eager that the local people should refrain from antagonizing any candidate for governor, for fear that such action might result in harm to the College.

As in most situations when he felt that danger and trouble were in the offing, he wrote the other presidents. One of these occasions was on December 15, 1924:

Five citizens from the San Marcos Chamber of Commerce called upon the Fergusons in Temple about two weeks ago. This committee did so without consulting me, the primary purpose, as I understood, being to correct a wrong

done Governor Ferguson this fall by the Hays County Fair Association. I very strongly agree with President Marquis that we will make a serious mistake when we tie the cause of the Teachers Colleges to local influences. When once we begin, we will have turned loose special influences for interference and meddling. Already, I find it exceedingly difficult to get some of our best citizens to see that the Southwest Texas State Teachers College belongs to all the people of the state.

Indeed, it is a very strange situation when state officials expect presidents and faculties of state colleges to line up for the Democratic ticket, or any other ticket in elections. To express this principle in still another way, I think it is unfortunate for the cause of education when any prominent man or set of men demand of teachers in state institutions that they vote on grounds of expediency or of fear of results in any election. To bring pressure upon teachers in state colleges to vote for a winning candidate unless they look forward to slashing of appropriations or a cut in their salaries, is absolutely disastrous to successful democratic government. This condition, in my judgment, will be considerably helped when all presidents and all teachers in state colleges will refuse to make political speeches, or to take political stock in partisan campaigns [sic]. If one state college makes a political asset by playing politics in favor of a winning candidate, all other state colleges are expected to pursue a similar partisan policy. Speaking for myself, I have never helped, and do not ever intend to help line up my county for any candidate for governor; my sense of professional self-respect revolts at such an idea. The state colleges belong to all the people—Catholic, Protestant, Jew, Republican, Democrat, Klan, and anti-Klan. Instead of our being judged by the votes cast in the primary or in the November elections, let us insist that the legislators and governo judge us by the efficiency of the service rendered to the children of Republicans, Democrats, or what not, alike.

### In **State** Politics To Stay

Notwithstanding all attempts to stay out and declarations of aloofness from state politics on the part of the teachers college presidents, during the formative years of the teachers colleges the position of president was indeed, as President Hill declared, a semi-political office which it would have been well nigh impossible to maintain without participation to some extent in state politics. In the first place, the candidates for public

office, from the office of governor down, entertained the general belief that the college citizens, both students and faculty, represented the top stratum of intellectual accomplishment, social status, and individual influence over others when their beliefs were expressed. Therefore, these candidates took many opportunities to solicit support of faculties and students whose beliefs could well influence the votes of their relatives and friends.

Recognizing this situation, some of the presidents frankly responded to the overtures of politicians by asking in return for a clear-cut statement of attitude toward education in general and particularly toward the teachers colleges. Any candidate would assert his beliefs in the "great value of an educated citizenship," but too often when safely in a legislative seat in Austin he would be perfectly willing to see the state teachers colleges take a third-rate position in financial support.

The correspondence between the presidents frequently revealed their attitude toward candidates. President Estill of Huntsville, a conservative by nature and personal philosophy, wrote to President Hill on August 19, 1933:

I heartily approve of your letter to Colonel Thompson in regard to the candidacy of Hon. Walter Woodul for Lieutenant Governor. Friends of this college join you in their attitude toward candidates for state offices who seek our support. We shall want definite commitments in regard to their educational program, particularly as related to the teachers colleges.

President Evans manifested his sustained interest in Texas politics with a letter dated December 21, 1937, addressed to the presidents. He said that he had on his desk four volumes of *Texas Democracy*. After making some criticisms of the work, including the cost, he declared that since the publication was prepared under the direction of the Democratic Executive Committee, it was political in nature. Then he added:

. . . It is a matter of sincere regret that the list of prominent Democrats includes so few school men. Four heads of state schools, two city superintendents, the State superintendent and the Assistant State Superintendent are listed among the prominent Democrats. . . . For a lifetime I have fought on the front line to divorce schools from politics and keep highclass positions from being filled through personal or political drives. Friends are telling



me that during that time some good has been accomplished. To be included in the biographical list of Texas Democrats is political in no sense. The inclusion of so few school men in this history will operate to the disadvantage of school interests.

Under the head of obiter dicta, I say in conclusion that the more recognition presidents of teachers colleges can get, the better it will be for our cause. At the dedication of the Texas Museum at the University of Texas, Sunday afternoon, December 19, I saw no school men. It is my judgment that it will be part of a bigger program when we are seen if not heard at all the great occasions in Texas.

## XIV AT CHAPEL Purpose

In the minds of thousands of students who have sat through the chapel programs at the Southwest Texas State College during the Evans administration there may still linger the question, "Why this requirement?" As everyone knows, of course, its first purpose was devotional, to inject into the school life a religious atmosphere and, to some measure, place before a group of young people the teachings of Christianity. During the early years chapel was held daily, the duty of the head of the school being to conduct the religious exercise. Under the guidance of C. E. Evans, this part of the program and the frequency of the meetings were gradually diminished, and finally the word "chapel" was replaced by the term "general assembly." As the character of the general assembly underwent change, so there developed a change in the conscious purpose to be served by this regular coming together of the entire student body and faculty.

First, Evans realized that the general assembly could be made into a valuable unifying force for the student body, the faculty, and the administration. At that time every person connected with the College could find a seat at the same time in the auditorium of the Main Building. The easy communication in this relatively small group, the contagious enthusiasm on some occasions, the promotion of acquaintanceship by this gathering, all made for school spirit in the best sense. At no other moment was the over-all authority of the president more positively felt than at the general assembly. The assembly seemed to generate

me that during that time some good has been accomplished. To be included in the biographical list of Texas Democrats is political in no sense. The inclusion of so few school men in this history will operate to the disadvantage of school interests.

Under the head of obiter dicta, I say in conclusion that the more recognition presidents of teachers colleges can get, the better it will be for our cause. At the dedication of the Texas Museum at the University of Texas, Sunday afternoon, December 19, I saw no school men. It is my judgment that it will be part of a bigger program when we are seen if not heard at all the great occasions in Texas.

## XIV AT CHAPEL

### Purpose

In the minds of thousands of students who have sat through the chapel programs at the Southwest Texas State College during the Evans administration there may still linger the question, "Why this requirement?" As everyone knows, of course, its first purpose was devotional, to inject into the school life a religious atmosphere and, to some measure, place before a group of young people the teachings of Christianity. During the early years chapel was held daily, the duty of the head of the school being to conduct the religious exercise. Under the guidance of C. E. Evans, this part of the program and the frequency of the meetings were gradually diminished, and finally the word "chapel" was replaced by the term "general assembly." As the character of the general assembly underwent change, so there developed a change in the conscious purpose to be served by this regular coming together of the entire student body and faculty.

First, Evans realized that the general assembly could be made into a valuable unifying force for the student body, the faculty, and the administration. At that time every person connected with the College could find a seat at the same time in the auditorium of the Main Building. The easy communication in this relatively small group, the contagious enthusiasm on some occasions, the promotion of acquaintanceship by this gathering, all made for school spirit in the best sense. At no other moment was the over-all authority of the president more positively felt than at the general assembly. The assembly seemed to generate

in each individual a feeling of oneness with the group and of loyalty to the school.

Second, the general assembly furnished a gentle means of keeping students and faculty constantly aware of the strict rules under which it was thought the institution must be governed. It furnished the opportunity to prevent disciplinary trouble. A developing situation could be brought to the attention of the student body and a warning sounded, which ordinarily was all that was necessary to eliminate a budding difficulty. Moreover, from the attendance records at the assembly the college administration could identify from their absences many of the malcontents, the possible trouble-makers, and get to them with warning and counsel before time for the sore to fester.

Third, in the later years President Evans used the assembly as a sounding board for his own philosophy and propaganda for the teachers college movement in Texas and the nation. He felt that the students themselves could become the best advertisements of the College to future students, and choice missionaries to carry the message of the value of teacher training in the state. Therefore, he lost few opportunities to let students understand that inducing a friend to attend the College would be an act of service to Texas as well as both to the friend and the College. The assembly also gave Evans the opportunity to lead, encourage, inspire, and teach young America. By this means, he felt that he could keep his finger on the pulse of students and prevent impending danger. And, not least, he could, by his own insistence upon rectitude on the part of students, convey to his faculty members a notion of the sort of conduct expected of them.

After twenty-five years of conducting chapel and assembly, President Evans found himself so thoroughly convinced of the value of this coming together of students and faculty that he still took occasion to persuade the student body to accept his belief. On September 29, 1936, the Redbook shows that he spoke as follows to the students:

The General Assembly is our chance to get together. It is an opportunity to understand the College and other students. We expect all to attend. You will miss and lose something valuable by absence. Have a good General Assembly attendance record. We appreciate your college atten-

dance for what you are, what you mean to us, what you mean to Texas. You accepted our invitation to use an opportunity for your own development. The College needs you and Texas needs you. We want you to be happy. We should like to see your willingness to consider the rights of others. A democratic campus spirit will help put the common interests of the student body above the selfish interests of the few. Be open and above board. Sincerity is the forerunner of good will and genuine happiness.

Mingle with other students. We want you to be an all-round success in college. Make good marks. Be happy in hard work. Attend class meetings. See that your societies [clubs] do a real work. Attend the church of your choice. Tie onto safe, sensible, and wholesome forces. What you achieve in college is splendid preparation for after life.

### Prayer And Exhortation

In the early years Evans' prayers in chapel were studied and polished. Later they became more stilted and memorized and brief. In 1912, the following was one of his favorite prayers, and it was moved along from one Redbook to the next to be always available:

Our Father: Conscious of our needs each day, we come this morning to invoke Thy richest blessings upon our efforts. So guard, guide, and direct us, both in thought and conduct, that we may walk in uprightness and serve Thee in sincerity and humility. Grant, Our Father, that our lives may fully exemplify the virtues, the truths, the ideals we are seeking to inculcate. Help us to understand that truth, righteousness and goodness are the only abiding things in life, and thereby contribute to the development of Christian manhood and womanhood. Amen.

Another prayer first appearing in 1913, and also carried along through the years, remained in part in his prayers throughout his career:

Heavenly Father: Our opportunities for doing good are great; help us to make the best possible use of these opportunities. Deliver us from selfishness, worldliness, and sin; lead us into the paths of righteousness and holiness. Grant that we may realize the power of noble purpose and consecrated lives. And whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are Christ-like, help us to give our whole soul

and life to these things and thereby bless others and glorify God. Amen.

A typical prayer of 1913 is the following:

Father: We thank Thee for the many evidences of Thy favor and care which we see on all sides. Thou hast preserved us from evil and harm; Thou hast directed us that goodness and mercy have followed us all along through our lives. Be with us today in our efforts as students and teachers to perform the moral, mental, and spiritual obligations resting upon us. Grant that fidelity to right and loyalty to Christ be uppermost in our minds and hearts. May we realize that purity of heart and devotion to Thy cause are the true foundation upon which to build our lives. Amen.

The following prayer, with its borrowings and paraphrases, nevertheless, in typical Evans fashion, wasted no words and was a model schoolmaster's supplication:

Our Father: Realizing that every good and perfect gift comes from Thee, we are assembled to ask divine blessings for this day. Grant that we may meet the duties of the day with intelligence, honesty, courage, and fidelity. Lead us to reverence clean, holy, and honorable living that we may be instruments in elevating others to higher levels of wisdom, faithfulness, and holiness. Grant that the spirit of unselfish, Christ-like service characterize our daily walk. . . . .

There are many modifications and repetitions. Few sounded original, but all carried a note of sincerity. All offered thanks for the blessings of protection against evil and sought for guidance through the day's work and help against our own sins of irreverence and ungodliness.

The Bible readings, brief and varied, followed no perceptible pattern of subject matter. During the first few years Evans made comments upon the Bible passages which he had selected to read. These comments took the form of those used by the average preacher. Indeed, Evans was experienced in filling the pulpit in Methodist churches as a lay speaker. He referred to these church talks as "lay sermons." In later years he omitted readings from the Bible and spoke on popular subjects of the day, those most likely to have considerable interest for students. This change-over appears to have been gradual, and about the

year 1925 the designation of "chapel" was dropped, and all references thereafter were to the "General Assembly."

Evans considered it the duty of every schoolmaster to secure from each pupil the best work of which the pupil was capable. He believed in stiff requirements, and failures worried him greatly. He was convinced that most student failures were caused by trifling or shirking work. All through the years, from his first chapel exercise in 1911, he took occasion to exhort students to honest effort. At times he tried to analyze with the students the causes of failures, which were not always the student's fault, he admitted. He would urge students to form good habits of study. He preached diligence, industry, application, wise use of time, hard work—these led to scholarship, he stated. Some students, he declared, were "in school," but were not "of the school." He referred to lazy students as "camp followers, mere ornaments, here for entertainment only"; and he would remind his hearers that "The function of the Normal School is to provide an opportunity for professional training—not for social entertainment."

He urged a systematic program of study and regular periods of recreation. The one was as necessary as the other, he said. But college classrooms were not to be used during vacant periods for "reception rooms or for prolonged conversations." During the day, he told students in 1912, all vacant periods were study hours. He repeated many times that the purpose which justified students being here was the opportunity to study—not to entertain or be entertained.

On the opening day of the spring term of March 1913, he said to students assembled: "Get to work today. Go to all your classes and do a day's work today. . . . There will be no corridor course offered this term," he declared, which always brought laughter from both students and faculty. He admonished students not to collect in groups in the halls or in front of the Library Building [now Leuders Hall] or the Science Building. He had no objection to students using the seats on the campus on the south side of Old Main, provided they were at work. He recommended individual effort rather than two or more trying to study together. He was afraid the latter would lead to "dawdling." Schedule changes could be made if done so at once, but he warned students not to make changes in order to get

easier subjects. There must be a better reason, he declared. He also warned that no student had any excuse for being on the streets during school hours. All business engagements should be arranged for after school hours. Loafing around stores or on the streets was the best possible evidence of trifling. Absence from classes was a problem then as now, and Evans chided the students who gave the excuse of being too ill to attend class but were able to play baseball or basketball or go to town. On this occasion Evans made a final request: "Don't call my office before school hours."

### Directions

Although the *Star*, student newspaper, with the appropriate word preceding—"Normal" or "College"—had been published continuously since before Evans came to San Marcos, there is no record of its being used in the early days to convey routine directions to students. Moreover, bulletin boards apparently were not deemed proper media for this purpose. So the chapel period was used for most announcements. The directions usually given in chapel seem quaint after the lapse of years and are included here as an interesting bit of College history.

At the chapel period on September 9, 1914, Evans announced that there would be: (1) School from 9:30 to 12:15 and 1:30 to 3:55. The regular chapel period would be from 11:45 to 12:10 with all students expected to be present. (2) Recitation periods were 45 minutes long, with five minutes between classes. At this point he made a comment: "The five-minute periods are for passing—not loafing or entertainment." (3) Monday to Friday evenings, 7:00 to 10:00, and all vacant periods, were to be spent in the prosecution of school work. "Don't waste time asking for exemptions from this rule. The test of a satisfactory student is the readiness to make sacrifices to meet school obligations. Are you willing to pay the price?" (4) Social visits: Read the regulations. Frequent social visits work forfeiture of social privileges. This last rule was a constant threat held over the heads of students.

The next year, on January 8, 1915, at the chapel period there was the first indication of a designated place for students to study when not in class. The Redbook says of this matter: ". . .(4) When not reciting, students should report to the library reading room or to vacant rooms. Be seated and keep quiet so

that all other students in the room may study effectively. All rooms are study halls when not used for class instruction. Don't assemble in front of any building during school hours."

After approximately another year, a note was added to the above directions regarding a study hall: "Main Building vacant rooms are to be used by girls for study. Science Building vacant rooms are to be used by boys for study. Library Building may be used by both."

The Redbook records at this point an apparent sudden realization of the danger of fire in the following memorandum: "See if janitors know how to use fire plug between the Science and Library buildings." There was also the note that waste paper in the basement of the Main Building was a fire hazard. The date of this note is March 15, 1916. A note written the following October 21, 1916, shows a partial solution to the problem of safety from fire: "Janitors to test fire hose once in 30 days. Fire hose in building injured by leaks. Special trash room under Main Building. Fire escapes for Library Building. Waste can for engine room."

Some time about the opening of the spring term in 1916, there appeared the following note written in seeming exasperation: "Loafer's License: I desire to loaf in the corridors during hours not used in recitations. I am of kindergarten disposition and, therefore, unable to stay in the library and keep quiet longer than ten or fifteen minutes at the time. I will pass from one building to another as many times as possible and guarantee the minimum of work with the maximum of trouble to my teachers."

On May 1, 1916, as the closing days of the session drew near, Evans said to the assembled students: "(1) Class work continues until close of day on Thursday, May 22. A suitable test for a good student is dependability on closing days. (2) Correct conduct is as obligatory during that time as at any other time. Twice in the history of the school it has been necessary to forfeit certificate privileges on account of misconduct. A student who cannot conduct himself properly at closing of school cannot be depended upon at any other time and should not be turned loose upon Texas to direct the training of boys and girls . . . (4) Students desiring to be excused to go home prior to May 22 should call at the President's office today."



An announcement made at chapel on April 18, 1916, reveals that "Riverside" is about to be opened to students.

On January 30, 1917, as a small part of his remarks in chapel, Evans told the students: "Chapel is neither a joke factory nor a funeral service. We don't promise fun or sermons. It is an informal and wholesome part of our work. Applause is good in its place but it is out of place for devotional songs. We don't applaud prayers, sermons, or sacred music."

In chapel, February 17, 1917, Evans recommended that students make contact with county and city superintendents and use friends to learn of vacancies in the public schools. He advised students not to place faith in general testimonials which, he said, were of little value. He urged those who desired positions to enroll with the Teachers Committee.<sup>1</sup>

On March 9, 1917, President Evans notified his chapel audience of the following rules: "(1) All games should be called not earlier than 4:15 P.M., and students should not ask to be excused from eighth-period classes. (2) The winter term closes March 20, and no reports will be given to students who are absent on that day. (3) Don't take time from school to go visiting, even when parents request it. (4) It is impossible to construct buildings or make improvements in such a way that damage cannot be done to the property. Is it creditable to injure or to deface property? Is vandalism reputable or honorable? The school is endeavoring to make your environment attractive."

### **Evans Speaks His Message**

Evans' chapel and general assembly talks covered a fairly wide range of subject matter. The following list of subjects is compiled from his notes in the belief that it is representative of his particular brand of leadership in directing the thinking of students.

**Better** Speech: This advice was repeated to every class of students: "You are recognized by the quality of your correspond-

---

<sup>1</sup> Through the years this public service office has done very valuable work for the College in aiding students to secure employment. Thousands of ex-students owe, their first positions, not only in the teaching field, but in business, industry, and civil services, to the help rendered free of charge by this efficient organization. The official name of this employment bureau has been changed a number of times.

ence and your conversation. Correct pronunciation, spelling, and punctuation are valuable assets in your application for positions and in your everyday contacts with other people. These are fine evidences of an education. An educated man may forget Greek and Latin, but correctness and precision in the use of his mother tongue still mark him as a scholar. Practice the choice of the most effective words. Abraham Lincoln's style was influenced by reading three books—the Bible, Aesop's Fables, and Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. A refined and gentle manner comes from fixed habits of thought and action. A pleasing manner does not make, but does reveal the man.

"We live in a strenuous age. Self-examination and evaluation of things about us contribute to our power. of growth and our power to do."

Cigarettes *and* Liquor: Evans was fond of certain Bible verses, and of one in particular, Hebrews, XII, 1: ". . . Let us lay aside every weight and sin which doth so easily beset us and let us run with patience the race that is set before us." This he used as an introduction to his talk on the evils of drinking. He said: "I would like to call your attention to the rules of the Illinois Central Railroad which forbid the drinking of intoxicating liquor by employees on duty. Businessmen and bankers abstain from drinking during business hours. Case after case could be cited to show that drinking is one of the chief causes of business failures. A firm of four men started a business. All were drinkers. A few years later two were dead, one was a drunkard, and the fourth was a pauper. Surety companies will not bond a habitual drinker. An English underwriter says that half of the losses on the sea are due to drinking by captains and helmsmen,

"In First Corinthians, Chapter VI, Verse 19, Paul says 'What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God and ye are not your own.' Degradation of body with intoxicating drinks, opiates, cigarettes—all forms of self indulgence—is 'mortification' to the Lord. 'If thine eye offend thee pluck it out. If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off.' We are taught that consecration pleases God.

"Students who drink intoxicants and smoke cigarettes subject themselves to legitimate criticism. We do not knowingly issue diplomas or certificates to young men who drink intoxi-

cants. Students are invited and enter with knowledge of school standards. The Normal School is not a reformatory. We refuse admission each year to some students and demand the resignation of those who prove unworthy. The Illinois Central Railroad forbids the drinking of intoxicants and looks with disfavor upon smoking cigarettes. Certain standards of conduct are demanded of applicants, and these standards are found everywhere. Any school that is worth the time and expense of attendance has standards which require both self-denial and effort as part of the price' to be paid for entrance to its classrooms. If a student is unable or unwilling to meet these standards, he should not enroll in school; if already in attendance, that student should withdraw from school. The requirements of the College for standards of conduct are no more than what 75 per cent to 90 per cent of the students would meet in the absence of any regulations. We are asking you to do only what you would do if you were a student in a public school. Our regulations apply to all students alike. There is, at times, an erroneous impression that local students whose homes are in San Marcos are not under Normal regulations."

*Excellence:* The general assembly at the beginning of the winter term and spring term was used as an occasion to announce publicly the list of honor students of the previous term. Evans usually found this an opportunity to emphasize the value of achievement. He would say: "The school appreciates these students, parents approve them, and all others respect them for doing well. A good college record markedly increases chances for success in life. The boy who loafes in high school and continues to' do so in college expecting to win distinction in life has well been said to be taking the risk of the man who goes over Niagara in a barrel. A study of Harvard College students shows that out of 239 graduates without distinction only 36 per cent made high marks in medical school. Out of 141 graduates with distinction 92 per cent made high marks in medical school. Yale and other universities have found similar records. A study made of the successful men who were graduates of the University of Oregon from 1878 to 1901 shows that 53 per cent were good students, but only 17 per cent were weak students. Of those who had not made a success, only 12 per cent were good students.

"President Charles F. Thwing of Western Reserve University says: "There is no exception in the records of any Amer-

ican college to the general rule that those who achieve most before graduation are likely to achieve most after graduation.' There are handicaps which accompany dodging, shirking, bluffing, or getting around work. It is most likely that students who throw off in school cannot do so without starting the habit of shirking elsewhere. Bad work, like Banquo's ghost, does not down. Unreliability in school is no foundation for dependability and success outside of school.

"There is no necessary conflict between excellent standing in all classes and participation in student activities. We object to substitution of student activities and student social life for the essential work of school. Loafing and trifling can to no extent be condoned, dignified, or excused by being a good debater, a fine athlete, or a hail-fellow-well-met. A young man should not enter college merely to play games or to be part of social life. To be entitled to honor of any kind or to be eligible for school representative on a team, a minimum of seven grade points is required. On the other hand, students should take part in all facets of school life. It is a mistake to believe that school life is only the study of textbooks."

In an assembly on January 4, 1923, Evans started the New Year with one of his "pep" talks. He told the students the value of each grade which a student might earn, from **A** to **D**, as follows: "**A** means scholarship. **B** means clear understanding but not complete mastery. **C** means partial and fragmentary knowledge but second-hand and hardly safe. **D** means exposed to the subject often enough and long enough to leave a few faint traces of knowledge in the student's memory which a kind-hearted teacher is able with some difficulty to identify." When he came to **F** he said, "**F** means that if you are laboring under the impression that you are really learning something in class, you are sadly deceiving yourself. You should find a quiet room back at home with your parents to think seriously of what you might have done if you had experimented somewhat with work. Try a little work to see how you feel."

*How to Succeed:* In the early years, Evans seemed to be aware that some students have come to college without learning how to study. Moreover, some students have very hazy notions about any of the aspects of the path toward success. In the general assembly he tried to perform a service by inform-

ing these students. He advised them as follows: --(1) Have fixed hours for study periods and plunge in when the hour comes. Retire at a fixed hour. Haphazard students frequently fail to study at all. Students who don't work here during the day will not work at night. (2) Begin by recalling what you already know. This will help to show the purpose and create interest. (3) Study the lesson **as** a whole; then go back to the difficult points. And then go over the lesson and read into every part the significance given by the previous general survey. (4) Practice recall as you study; and in drill work repeat at increasing intervals. (5) Make a synopsis and visualize it. (6) Learn when and how to read rapidly.

"If you would be successful in college use your opportunities; use your commonsense. (a) Be pleasant and agreeable, appraising other students at full value by showing kind consideration. 'After you, please' is an expression of the nice, gentle manner. Be just as courteous as the best salesman you deal with in Austin, San Antonio, or San Marcos. (b) Take part in student activities. Play on teams—basketball, baseball, archery, swimming and so on. Join the Harris Blairs, Chautauqua, the Shakespeares, Idyllics, Y. M. C. A., or the Newman Club. Don't listen to any person anywhere who attempts to shunt you away from religious duties. Learn to yell. (c) Do all things well. Create for yourself a creditable standing. Leave a record that will help you. Make yourself eligible for promotion. It is an amusing request when a boy or girl who has made low grades asks us for work. (d) You will actually have a better time if you work. Hard work is a background for enjoyment. (e) A good record will make you stand better with your fellow students. You command the real respect of your associates when they know you are doing well. Don't be a street loafer. (f) Your sense of self-respect demands that you do your best."

*Inspiration and the Bright Future:* "It takes a live fish to swim upstream," Evans told his students at many assemblies. There are no obstacles in the way of one who is alert and willing to work. This was the theme of his messages of inspiration. Great achievements in every area of human activity were held up to the view of students as proof that success awaits those who prepare themselves for life's work. It is a man's brain that has created the wonders of science and industry. Facetiously,

he told students many times, "Your body is worth less than a dollar on the market. It contains enough fat for seven bars of soap, iron for two 10-penny nails, lime to whitewash a chicken coop, sulphur to kill insects on one white leghorn chicken, total value 98 cents." Again he drew the following comparisons to illustrate brain work: "A bar of rough iron may be worth \$5; made into horse shoes it is worth \$12; made into needles, \$350; made into knife blades, \$3,000; made into watch springs, it is worth \$250,000."

In another comment on the opportunity of improving young minds, Evans told the students that the state has established institutions of higher learning, "designed to elevate ideals, enrich the lives, and increase the capacity of people for democratic government," this being a quotation taken from the law establishing the Texas Technological College.

When, on one of his numerous out-of-state trips, President Evans viewed the work then in progress on Stone Mountain, and being directed by the great sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, he was greatly impressed, took notes, and brought back a message of inspiration for a general assembly talk on February 19, 1925. In this message, he tried to create a word picture of the magnitude of the figures being etched in the granite of the mountain. He said: "A 16-story skyscraper standing at the hoofs of General Lee's horse, the cornice of the building would barely touch Lee's hat. The average height of the figures," he said, "is 140 feet. At luncheon 30 people sat on Lee's shoulder protected by a canvas enclosure, on each side of which there is a precipice 500 feet down. Memorial Hall, 300 feet by 50 feet in area and with walls 45 feet high, has 13 windows for the original 13 states." He described the working drillers suspended in chairs, the man chiseling Lee's hat appearing no larger than a fly.

From his extensive reading, Evans copied much to preserve in the Redbook. From the Houston *Chronicle*, he read in 1926, "It makes little difference: (1) Where a man lives if he does something well in the world. (2) How brilliant the speech if the speaker is insincere. (3) How good the receiving set if there is nothing worth hearing. (4) What college the boy attends if he has a thirst for knowledge."

From the *American Mercury*: "A full stomach cannot be aroused to revolt over the empty dinner pail of someone else."

From the president of Antioch College: "That is the best education which most effectively and in best proportion enlists all the qualities of the individual, all the material resources of his environment, and all the accumulated knowledge and understanding of men to give fullness, significance, and effectiveness to his life."

Evans frequently charged his hearers to develop a wholesome philosophy of life, so as to pass the tests of character which troubles bring. When life's current runs smooth, when men tell the truth, are honest, while banks are solvent, while farmers make good crops, men may forget adversity. Then come the punctures, and flats may happen; for there is no puncture-proof fabric of life. Tests give strength. Soldiers in training are tested with gunfire. When trouble comes, good spirit is a tremendous asset. Cheerfulness makes power, but moodiness is likely to reveal weakness.

On January 17, 1927, Evans revealed his admiration for great athletes. He told stories of George Young who swam from Catalina Island to the coast of California, and of Gertrude Ederle who swam the English Channel. He took great interest in these feats of endurance and mentioned them on several later occasions.

On September 25, 1934, in a spirit of happiness because of a substantial increase in enrollment after almost four years of doubt and depression, Evans made one of his longest, best-organized, and most significant general assembly speeches. He said:

We are happy today because of our large enrollment. We are happy for the college opportunity for students. We are happy in believing college worthwhile. We are happy that Federal funds are helping almost one hundred students. We are happy because we can forecast fine results for the year. Happiness is epidemic on the campus. In a happy frame of mind we can discuss seriously all questions.

We are living in a 'squeeze that elbows for attention.' There are so many wants in these modern days. A hundred years ago there were about 72 wants, but only 16 necessities. Today there are about 484 wants and 94 necessities. A hundred years ago the average man was asked to buy 200 articles. Today the average man is asked to buy 32,000. Almost all states are spending large sums for the relief of

the poor. There are difficult problems for solution in government, business, society, everywhere. We need trained public servants. In England, boys study for public life. In Russia an ignorant public official may be condemned. We read of the President's Brain Trust. Many of you are studying to be county superintendents, district judges, perhaps governor of the state.

The world's tasks are impossible without college graduates. It is up to the college to train the needed leaders.

On April 23, 1936, he took from his memorandum in the Redbook the caption, "American Dream." Then he said:

The College indorses, in theory and practice, the merit system in college, in public schools, in life everywhere. The humblest college boy should have a free field and a fair chance for achievement in public and private life without embarrassments of political spoilism and without obligations or vetoes of special interests. With no partisans but his personal integrity, with no wealth but his native ability, and with no advertising agency but his vocational efficiency, the college boy must have the opportunity to carve out a destiny commensurate with his worth.

Then turning his thoughts back to the College scene, he said:

Learning to live with other people is a tremendously valuable thing in college and in life. Campus activities and campus life generally, when wholesomely conducted, are social science laboratories. Mingle freely, helpfully, and sympathetically. Look for the best in all. Social mindedness is the foundation, not a by-product, of successful modern business. Well does Baird say: "Civilization must prove that it can endure; we dare not risk a machine civilization unless sensitized to human instincts and social values." Sober mindedness and a sober view of life's problems must be attained. There may be intoxicated thinkers as well as intoxicated drinkers. Men and women, drunk on witchcraft in 1692, hanged 16 innocent persons and pressed one to death. Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini could never have ruled people of sober political thinking. Sober mindedness, the willingness to attack hard problems with straight thinking, is the only prophylactic against the mob mind and the craze. "If we had only thought," said the people of Salem after the witch craze in 1692; said the people of Scotland in 1728 when potatoes were feared as being unfit for Christians and would give people leprosy and fever. The appearance of the perpetual-motion cranks was evidence of a sort of craze.



Newton thinks—and the law of gravitation is discovered. Washington thinks—and an independent republic is born. Jefferson thinks—and a democracy grows. Lincoln thinks—and the Union is saved. Herbert Hoover thinks—and Belgium escapes famine. Woodrow Wilson thinks—and the League of Nations is brought into existence. William Jennings Bryan thinks—and the income tax and the provision for the election of United States senators by direct vote are put into law. The Brain Trust thinks—and the New Deal is a reality. The college faculty thinks—and we have stimulating instruction and worthwhile college academic work. A student thinks—and his college studies have richness, meaning, and power.

Of paramount importance in our world are social mindedness and sober mindedness.

At the opening of the fall semester of 1940, Evans' talks were brimfull of brightness and cheer for the students. Most of the perplexing problems, the disappointments, the strenuous work of earlier years had gone. On September 21 at the first general assembly, with more students before him than ever before, Evans waxed enthusiastic in relating to the students how the College had grown, not only in enrollment, but in plant and equipment. He opened his address to the students with these words: "I bring you greetings for a great year!" And he launched into an account of what had been accomplished. With the aid of Federal Government funds for WPA projects, the Auditorium-Laboratory School (ALS) Building' had been completed during 1939-1940. The campus had been enlarged with the purchase of more land. Dormitories and cottages had been built, and there was great hope for other new buildings and further development and progress. In glowing terms he told of the increase in enrollment and described the territory from which the students had come. He told them that 47.21 per cent of the students lived within 50 miles or less from the College; and that 72.45 per cent lived within 100 miles of the College.

He listed the opportunities now offered students. He said:

Wholesome student interests abound on this campus. You may become members of the band, the orchestra, play on the teams, join the clubs, and, in addition to other courses offered, you may have the opportunity to become

---

2 See Chapter VII "The Laboratory School," for details and the full significance of this building.

an airplane pilot under the program of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

War, Patriotism, and Peace: All schools were called upon shortly after the beginning of World War I, in April, 1917, to offer special courses pertaining to the war. The normal schools of Texas complied wholeheartedly. Requests came at intervals from various agencies, such as the Department of Education at Washington, the Secretary of War, the Department of Food Administration, the National Security League for Peace. Some of the courses duplicated others, and coming irregularly as they did, tended to disorganize the regular work and result in a measure of confusion all the way round.

There seemed to be an impression in Washington that the normal schools needed direction from universities and other higher institutions in doing this work. Men and women traveled about asking for the privilege of addressing students, claiming to be representatives of the various agencies of the Federal Government; but in some instances, at least, appeared not to be authorized.

This state of affairs caused Presidents Evans and Bruce, with the approval of the board of regents, to make a trip to Washington in the summer of 1918 to try to find agreement for a plan of action to be carried on by all five of the normal schools and to convince the government representatives in Washington that the members of the faculties of these schools were fully capable of doing the work which the lecturers out of Washington had been doing with doubtful results. Furthermore, Evans and Bruce wanted to show that the normal schools needed no direction from other institutions.

Young men students and faculty members left the College in considerable numbers to enlist in the armed services, and reports of casualties soon brought the war very close to the campus.

The Redbook makes the first reference to the gathering in Old Main Auditorium, on November 9, 1917, as "a general assembly." On this occasion Evans said to the students:

We are in this war to preserve civilization, international law, and humanity itself. Not only must we win the war, but we must see that our own standards of morality,

civilization, and democracy are conserved and enobled. As we must send our soldiers to France, we must bring them back with sound morals and clean lives. Let us keep our faces to the future. The best service that can be rendered our country in this great crisis is to do your best work in school. Be determined to get the best results from your investment in school. You will receive from the school in the proportion that you give your best energy.

On February 2, 1918, Evans spoke on "Thrift" as the way to win the war, and he praised the strength of America which would prevail over her enemies. He said:

The United States produces 76 per cent of the world's corn, 70 per cent of the world's cotton, 72 per cent of the oil, 59 per cent of the copper, and has one-third of the world's surplus wealth. Although the United States is only one-seventeenth of the world's surface, yet 82 per cent of our people leave nothing at death. Fifteen per cent leave less than \$10,000. Three per cent \$10,000 or more. Of one thousand people in this country only 108 save money; of one thousand people in Europe, 288 save money. Be an intelligent, honest money-earner. Use your talents to best advantage. Earn money by work—not by gambling or speculation. This is financial leprosy—getting something for nothing. Be an intelligent, conscientious money-spender; foolish, useless spending of money is a form of intoxication—degrading, weakening, humiliating to character. It tends to dishonesty, embezzlement, and other wrongs.

Let me suggest the buying of thrift stamps, war savings stamps, liberty bonds:

"If a thrift stamp you can buy, pass it on.  
Biff the Kaiser in the eye, pass it on;  
Don't forget, 'twill help you, too,  
Intrest on it will accrue,  
And 'twill all come back to you, pass it on."

At another assembly on April 9, Evans spoke on "Mobilization." He said:

We must mobilize the energies of all our people. Work is a patriotic duty. Keep well informed about the war. Fight pacifism to a finish. Advocate the election of county, state, and national officers who are loyal. Repose slight confidence in any man who protests loudly his patriotism but who continued to denounce England, our ally. Talk war, defend war, but invest dollars in war. Patriotic dollars are as necessary as patriotic men.

At the close of this speech the Redbook records that a group of seven faculty members, including President Evans, pledged to buy over \$1,500 in war savings stamps.

After the war was over, Evans asserted in an assembly speech on Bolshevism that he had no sympathy for the Russian revolution. He told the students that the revolution of March, 1917, was political in nature, but that the class revolution came later in the year. He declared that the Root Commission never saw nor understood the real Russia. He said the revolution was neither democracy nor socialism nor communism; it was a dictatorship of mainly lower elements of the proletariat. He opposed the action taken by the Russians in nationalization of property and industry. He said the movement did not give any place to intelligence. It offered no incentive to individual effort for saving and accumulation. It proscribed and enslaved the thrifty, the well-to-do and the enterprising. He contrasted Marx with Jefferson, and declared that the Bolsheviks, in their doctrine of class hatred and in their ignorance, were adopting a ruinous philosophy.

At a general assembly in 1927 Evans read from First Corinthians, Chapter XIII, which, of course, does not mention peace so much as charity. But the subject of his speech that followed was largely related to the subject of peace. He said in part: "We must control or overcome anti-social passions that set man against man." He used for illustration of strife rather than peace, the story of the Roman general, Hannibal. Then he turned to later history to tell the story of the feud between cattle men and sheep men in the days of the settlement of the West. He urged brotherhood—not the battle line—to quiet the antagonisms between men. Where there is love of God and neighbor, there can be no hatred. Men have enough natural enemies without fighting among themselves, he declared. On every side microbes and insects threaten human life. The French under De Lesseps could not dig the Panama Canal because they were defeated by tropical disease. But the Americans with Gorgas destroyed the disease-carrying mosquito which had driven out the French, he related. In Mexico are the ruins of a civilization built by a race which is extinct. Man's food and clothing, the product of the cotton fields of the South, are threatened by the boll weevil and the pink boll worm. Science will make no

peace with these destroyers. They will be controlled or overcome just as typhoid, yellow fever, and diphtheria mere overcome. Man's needs are great, but, Franklin said, "A wise man will desire no more than he may get justly, use soberly, distribute cheerfully, and leave contentedly."

He closed with the following bit of verse:

"It ain't the guns nor armaments nor funds that they  
can Pay,

But the close cooperation that makes them win the day.  
It ain't the individual nor the army as a whole,

But the everlastin' team work of every bloomin' soul."

## XV

### EVANS AT FACULTY MEETING

#### The Presidential Duty

The minutes of the faculty meetings so carefully kept by President Evans for thirty-one years, in a leather-bound, loose-leaf volume, were nowhere to be found when sources for this study were sought by the writer. After each faculty meeting it was the routine duty of President Evans' secretary to copy the notes taken at the meeting into a page of the book. The minutes were typewritten, and the leaf returned to its place between the heavy covers. The pages of the book were numbered, and there must have been almost a thousand. The pages were standard 8 1/2 by 14 (legal size) paper, and there probably would have been enough space to record the faculty minutes for half a century. The storage place for the minutes was in the concrete-and-steel vault in the registrar's office in the Main Building, which also housed the records of that office. When the vault was dismantled and removed from the building during the early years of the Flowers administration, a search was made for the book of minutes, but no one knew anything of its whereabouts.

Evans sent many records out as wastepaper when he retired, but most of them were likely of no value. It seems inconceivable to this writer that Evans would have intentionally, destroyed the minutes. Their loss, of course, can never be evaluated; but this chapter of the Evans story would never have been written except for the fortunate habit which C. E. Evans formed of using the little Redbook, referred to in detail in other

peace with these destroyers. They will be controlled or overcome just as typhoid, yellow fever, and diphtheria mere overcome. Man's needs are great, but, Franklin said, "A wise man will desire no more than he may get justly, use soberly, distribute cheerfully, and leave contentedly."

He closed with the following bit of verse:

"It ain't the guns nor armaments nor funds that they  
can Pay,

But the close cooperation that makes them win the day.  
It ain't the individual nor the army as a whole,

But the everlastin' team work of every bloomin' soul."

## XV

### EVANS AT FACULTY MEETING

#### The Presidential Duty

The minutes of the faculty meetings so carefully kept by President Evans for thirty-one years, in a leather-bound, loose-leaf volume, were nowhere to be found when sources for this study were sought by the writer. After each faculty meeting it was the routine duty of President Evans' secretary to copy the notes taken at the meeting into a page of the book. The minutes were typewritten, and the leaf returned to its place between the heavy covers. The pages of the book were numbered, and there must have been almost a thousand. The pages were standard 8½ by 14 (legal size) paper, and there probably would have been enough space to record the faculty minutes for half a century. The storage place for the minutes was in the concrete-and-steel vault in the registrar's office in the Main Building, which also housed the records of that office. When the vault was dismantled and removed from the building during the early years of the Flowers administration, a search was made for the book of minutes, but no one knew anything of its whereabouts.

Evans sent many records out as wastepaper when he retired, but most of them were likely of no value. It seems inconceivable to this writer that Evans would have intentionally, destroyed the minutes. Their loss, of course, can never be evaluated; but this chapter of the Evans story would never have been written except for the fortunate habit which C. E. Evans formed of using the little Redbook, referred to in detail in other

chapters,<sup>1</sup> for his guidance on all occasions. In the Redbook he made notes in advance of almost every faculty meeting and consulted the memorandum as a program of procedure. For some eighteen years, I served as secretary to the faculty. Thus, the notes in the Redbook brought back to me the memory of many incidents which, because of their nature, were not included in the official minutes of the meetings. As an example the occasion on which President Evans reprimanded Bertram Harry: was not placed in the minutes. Nor was another occasion when President Evans gave Professor R. A. Tampke something exceeding a mild reprimand for a critical remark which Tampke made at a meeting in the early thirties.

President Evans seemed to look upon the purpose of a faculty meeting much as he regarded that of a chapel exercise and a general assembly. A sizeable percentage of the faculty meetings which he called had no readily apparent purpose. It must have been that the gathering together of his teaching staff gave him the feeling of having done his duty—like saying his prayers and going to church on Sunday. Once when C. E. Chamberlin was my predecessor as secretary of the faculty, while I was a student and stenographer in the president's office, Evans called a faculty meeting at a time which broke into part of the radio broadcast of the World Series. Chamberlin, a baseball fan, was at such a complete loss as to what should be recorded about the meeting that he handed to me to put into the book only these words: "No hits, no runs, no errors!" Translated dutifully by me, Chamberlin's notes went into final form "The faculty met on this date for a brief discussion of school affairs. No regular business was transacted."

Two subjects occupied about equal portions of Evans thinking at faculty meetings: (1) The conduct and work load of students and (2) the duties of faculty members. At intervals; from 1911 to 1941 these subjects were always certain to be brought up.

### **Be Good And Be Strict With Students**

The Redbook shows that President Evans prepared much more carefully for faculty meetings in the early days than a

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter II entitled "The Little Redbook Encyclopedia."

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned in Chapter XI, "Problems and Pillars."

later times. During his first year as head of the College, he made well-organized outlines of the procedure he would follow in a faculty meeting. The following is taken from the notes for a meeting on December 5, 1911:

- I. Explanation of new law—probable effect.
  - (1) State schools de-localized.
  - (2) Better financial support.
  - (3) Professional basis for election of teachers.
- II. Dissected and disjointed condition of courses.
  - (1) Permission to change or drop courses.
  - (2) Permission to become irregular.
  - (3) Such permission to be reported properly.
- III. Absentees from class—call strictly to account.
- IV. Poor students.
- V. Questions for discussion.
  - (1) Per cent of failures—why large? Better classification.
  - (2) Trial system—suggested discussion.
- VI. Town-going of students—discourage this.
- VII. Committees to be appointed.

Here followed a list of thirteen committees. Number four on the list was a "Committee on Social Affairs," and near the end of the list there was the "President's Advisory Committee," consisting of Miss Hornsby, Miss Hines, and Miss White. This advisory committee apparently was for the purpose of getting assistance from the three women in the handling of problems of conduct of female students. There was no dean of women at that time.

At a meeting on September. 14, 1914, much of the time was devoted to "cheating on examinations." He urged teachers not to view the matter with indifference when they had knowledge of violations of regulations. He also mentioned for the first time, so far as the records show, the perennial problems of the fish hatchery. Included here, also was the subject of the San Marcos River, and the practice of girls meeting boys at cold drink stands.

He warned teachers not to miss classes, declaring that students were entitled to 60 recitations as a unit of recognized work, and he commanded instructors to meet classes each day and remain a full period.



In September of 1915, Evans requested the cooperation of all teachers in keeping in close touch with all student conduct and application to work. He reminded the teachers of the rule that all students must have a class card entitling them to entrance to class. He ordered the teachers to report promptly all students absent from classes or dropping classes.

On February 17, 1917, again the matter of absence of teachers from their classes was brought up. By this time he was advising that students were entitled to 48 recitations a term. However, freshmen were still entitled to 60 recitations per term. He requested teachers to inform the president when they found it necessary to be absent on account of illness and to suggest any arrangement thought advisable by the teacher for the conduct of classes during absence. He told the teachers to keep a record of their own absences.

He took up the matter of the daily schedule of a teacher's classes. He asked the question: 'Should a teacher ask a committee to arrange a schedule so as to give him mornings off or afternoons off?'

He mentioned the new standards for secondary schools: five subjects four times a week, or four subjects five times a week. For college classes: five subjects three times a week.

### Work Week

Again in February, 1917, Evans revealed to the faculty his conception of a work week for a faculty member, as follows:

- (a) Hours per week of classroom teaching: 15 to 18, with 20 to 25 pupils to a class.
- (b) In physical training: 12 to 15 hours in classroom and 30 to 40 hours in the gym.
- (c) In laboratory and shop: 25 to 30 shop hours, with 3 lab hours and two teaching periods for each class.

Total hours required should not exceed 44 hours of 60 minutes, including grading papers and committee work—5½ days of 8 hours each. For librarians 44 hours per week recommended. Students should not have more than 44 hours' work per week. Each teacher should make a contribution to professional work. For example, each faculty member should visit public schools.

In the fall of 1926, Evans had come to the conclusion that a work load for a teacher was five classes, each meeting three

times per week. He mentioned the rule that two laboratory hours counted as one class hour. Definite administrative duties, he said, would replace hours in the classroom, but assisting in the general assembly was not considered a part of administrative duties. The faculty members should post on their office doors conference hours for students and all other office hours. He could not at this time refrain from reminding teachers that "Classifying students is a judicial matter—not a game of grab between teachers and departments." Furthermore, he informed faculty members that full attendance at faculty meetings was imperative.

On February 25, 1918, he warned the faculty against making criticisms of college employees or other teachers in the presence of students. This, he said, invites friction, trouble, and bad feeling. He also informed the group that assignment of work on committees and other "subsidiary" duties was as obligatory and binding as was meeting classes. Throwing off on such work would affect a teacher's standing with the school. A full load of work, he said, was fifteen to eighteen hours per week. A teacher with only four classes would not be credited with a full load.

At a meeting on September 9, 1918, he requested faculty members to confine their announcements at faculty meetings to items of general interest, and that no "advertising" would be permitted. He seemed to be afraid that teachers might develop a feeling that certain courses belonged to them individually, and he informed the group that transfer to other work would be made at any time it was deemed to be for the good of the College. Again, he reminded his hearers that five classes, with fifteen to twenty hours per week in the classroom was a full load, but now he increased the number of students to the class to "30 to 40 students." He did not want the science teachers and some others to forget that laboratory work would increase the number of hours of work per week. In addition to all this, he wanted everyone to know that the class schedule must allow for chapel. If a teacher's classes were scheduled for morning hours only on any series of days, that teacher would be expected to spend at least one afternoon hour in his office on those days, and he suggested the sixth period.

On June 10, 1920, Evans told the faculty that a large enrollment might mean six classes to teach or that at least an "unusual assignment" might be made. He took note of the rivalry between certain departments and between certain instructors for students. He pleaded for "an institutional attitude," not "each for self and the devil take the hindmost." He declared that the chairman of a department held a position of trust; that he should have a cooperative attitude toward other departments for the good of all. Referring to the subject of a large enrollment, he said that the College would accept all who came and all students would be taught in the best manner possible. He informed teachers that no money was available with which to pay extra teachers and that he had no authority to employ extras.

At this meeting he brought for the second time the subject of the college enrollment, and, in spite of having suggested the possible burden of a large enrollment, he now said there had been, since 1917, a steady and marked reduction. In 1916-1917 there were 941 enrolled in the College, and the enrollment had fallen every year until presently it was only 567.<sup>8</sup> Whereupon, he asked these questions: "Is this a vanishing college? If so, why? Is it caused by the indifference of faculty members to the personal welfare of students? Are we interested only in getting rid of the students? Are we guilty of unnecessary failures and too many technicalities of entrance? Is a policy of a large measure of control over students satisfactory to parents and the regents?" Then he said: "You can help or you can knock"; and he reminded the faculty of his oft-repeated suggestions that every faculty member become interested in the recreation and general welfare of students.

At a faculty meeting on November 1, 1922, President Evans complained that some faculty members were not cooperating with the administration. He gave as an example the fact that students had been known to be absent all day from the campus and yet their absence was not reported by four teachers in whose classes the students were enrolled. He compared absence from classes with absence from football practice. In the latter

---

<sup>3</sup>See College catalog for that year. One year later the enrollment had dropped to 694, and two years later Evans ordered the figures omitted from the catalog. However, the catalog of 1920-1921 verifies Evans' figures.

case! a student was certain to be reported, Then he commanded the teachers to report all absences and not excuse a student for anything. Furthermore, he said, a student was to be reported for every absence until a drop card was received from the registrar's office.

Evans was again in a mood to criticize at a meeting in January 1923. He said that certain teachers had been making ill-advised, though, perhaps, honest and conscientious, statements to their classes. For example, a teacher was known to say to his students, "I am going to teach this class, but I don't know anything about the course." Another example, "I gave you a low grade because---" Evans also mentioned the ill-advised changing of textbooks, although he admitted that this happened infrequently. He lamented what he called "cross firing by confusion of duties," meaning, probably, misunderstandings of some teachers as to the division of labor expected between certain individuals in assignments.

A month later Evans was still in the same mood. At this meeting he started off by mentioning "crowded instructors and crowded students." He said that a teacher's attitude was unsatisfactory when that teacher resolved to do only as much as was required and no more; or when he harbored the feeling that when the regular assignment was done, the work was finished. A proper attitude would be expressed in these words, he said: "An emergency exists, and I will do my regular work and also help carry the unusual load resting upon all." He told the instructors that the institution needed the cooperation of everyone to care for students. "Help us lead and direct student life along wholesome lines," he urged. "Encourage students to join societies, the Y. M. C. A., the debating squads, athletic teams, and help develop the spirit of comradeship."

Then he turned to other duties for which a faculty member would be held responsible. "Keep up with student class attendance. Watch for class cutting and student bluffing. Be careful in your grading so that there will be few requests for review of your grades." He said that the president's official action would be to refuse to review grades given by teachers. "Avoid criticism of your fellow teachers when conferring with students," he requested. "And," he said, "please remember that the institution

has some rights notwithstanding your efforts to create an independent entity of yourself."

On May 25, 1923, this being very near the close of the spring term, Evans took occasion to criticize the "tendency to hurry away" before all faculty duties were performed. He asserted that this practice was demoralizing upon students. And he cautioned the teachers to get in all reports on time. This fear seemed to haunt Evans always, and was equaled only by his fear that teachers would be tardy in arriving for the beginning of a term.

The following October 3 found him admonishing the teachers not to accept unsatisfactory classwork by students. He called this "an unsafe policy which is badly abused," and he invited the teachers, if they thought a case was getting out of hand, to turn the student over to him or to Dean Nolle. He promised, "We will think of the best thing to do." He also urged again that a careful check be kept on attendance and that all absentees be reported. "We ought to know the when and why of absences," he said.

At this time he also reminded science teachers once again that laboratory courses were no heavier than others—"two hours' study to one for recitation." He condemned "crip courses," "class bluffers," and "class cutting." In a much-used plea, he said, "It means much to smooth and regular running of the College if classes are dismissed promptly upon the ringing of the bell and if classes are always kept full time." Also, in a time-worn preachment, he urged each faculty member: "Contribute something to institutional life. Be a wholesome influence and a good example." And his final request, which has been made many times since by his successors, was for the help of every faculty member in seeing that favorable publicity be given the College at all times. "Help popularize College enterprises — the cafeteria, Riverside, and all college-sponsored events," he urged.

### **The Shepherd**

The attitude toward faculty members which President Evans most often assumed in faculty meetings was that of pastor and flock, and he carried the burden of keeping the members

of his flock under control and of guiding them in their professional and private lives. This attitude was particularly noticeable in the years following the troublesome year of 1925. He continually warned teachers of the bad effect on students if teachers were tardy to class, if classes were dismissed before the end of the period, if fellow faculty members were criticized in the presence of students, if a teacher should go to class unprepared for the assignment of the hour, and so on. He greatly desired a closer touch with students, and he complained that faculty assistance was not reaching the personal lives of students "in a persuasive way." He commented on several occasions that "The College does not rate high any instructor who merely meets classes and then strikes a bee-line for the city or home."

For a few years Evans became extremely critical of certain members of the faculty, and appeared to be suspicious of any teacher who was unusually popular with students. He spoke at times of faculty "cooperation with troublesome students in breaking down standards." Some of his notes in the Redbook were reminders to reprimand certain faculty members; but most of these were canceled, as if he had changed his mind at the last moment.

He was careful to instruct the faculty in the procedure for handling College funds. On several occasions he asked for the cooperation of the faculty in seeing that "honest, efficient work is done by janitors, carpenters, painters, and others." At the same time, he informed the teachers: "No order should be placed for materials or for work to be done without prior approval from department heads or administrative officers." And he warned against extravagances in the use of utilities and supplies.

Evans read everything he could find on the subject of the courts and the colleges. At one faculty meeting he cited a decision of the Michigan Supreme Court (1924) against a professor who sought to enjoin the State Teachers College at Ypsilanti from dismissing him on the charge that he was addicted to smoking cigarettes. Then he reminded the faculty that "the students in our teachers colleges are being fitted for a profession requiring the highest standard of personal conduct."

At the same meeting he then turned to the subject of politics in the College. He pointed out that generally a teacher

should have freedom to vote as he chooses, but he must not become a "handy man" of any political school of thought or organization. And he gave the example of being a "handy man" for the Klan or for an anti-Klan group; for the "drys" or for the "wets"; or the Democrats, and so on. While there might be restraint upon a teacher's personal conduct or his political activities, Evans guaranteed to his faculty academic freedom in the strictest sense.

At a faculty meeting in May 1938, Evans let it be known that "parietal regulations rest with the Board of Regents. The regular channel for communication with the Regents shall be the President of the College." There was one unpardonable act of which a faculty member must not be guilty, and that was going over the head of the college president and taking a grievance to the board of regents.

### Sermons **And** Reports

Evans taught the men's Bible class at the Methodist Church in San Marcos for many years and was widely known in the western part of Texas as a lay preacher. He seemed to be always in search of an idea for a sermon.

One of his favorite faculty meeting sermons was entitled "Elements of Teaching Power." A sketch of the outline for this talk is listed as follows:

- (1) Aptitude for vicariousness.
- (2) An already accumulated wealth of knowledge.
- (3) Power to invigorate life through learning; to make knowledge pleasant.
- (4) Readiness to be forgotten.

At a faculty meeting on May 12, 1920, Evans listed the qualities of a teacher which could be considered in "salary adjustment," the term he used when referring to increases. The list follows:

- (1) Equipment—training and experience.
- (2) Responsibility—large or small department; rank in the department.
- (3) Service—in the classroom and in the school as a whole.
- (4) Quality of influence—wholesome or doubtful, or helpful or antagonistic.

- (5) Inequalities.
- (6) Institutional attitude — willingness to work for the school as a whole just the same as for self; not the minimum but the maximum. Example: musical entertainment; taking part in the chapel program.
- (7) Willingness to work with and for others for the common good.

Another theme for a faculty-meeting sermon was headed "Institutional Spirit," which he delivered first to a faculty meeting on September 22, 1922. In this speech he told the teachers to "Seek full assignment and work where we need you. Adjust yourself to your work. The policy of the Texas State Teachers Colleges: sane, constructive, and reasonable regulations. Criticizing, knocking, and ridiculing regulations only add to the burden of enforcement. Under present conditions freshmen and sophomores don't belong in large, modern universities; and university authorities are anxious to get rid of them." Then he quoted from some unidentified source:

When a college faculty accepts full responsibility for the social and moral life of the campus and exercises constant and sympathetic supervision and control over individual students and their organizations, there is no question that the moral standards of such a college community are nigher, cleaner, and more uplifting than those of any American town or city. A day in such an institution is generally safer, from a moral standpoint, than at home.

Then Evans declared: "We must send these boys and girls back to their homes with more wholesome habits and cleaner ideals than when they come to us." He remarked that allowing students to get by with irregularities or violations destroys the self-respect of the student as well as the respect for the institution. A small amount of work required for credit in a course, he said, develops dishonest, trifling, worthless citizens.

At this point he departed from his text to say to the teachers: "If you have a heavy schedule, keep in mind the fact that the Board of Control cut seven teachers for this year . . . The work is here to do. What about it? If over-work is necessary, what is your answer? "

At one faculty meeting he read Walter Foss's poem "A House By The Side of The Road."



President Evans was fortunate during the first few years after his appointment as president of the College to have the privilege of traveling extensively at state expense. The purpose of his trips was ostensibly to visit other normal schools in Northern states and learn something that might be of benefit to his own school. Back at San Marcos, he would relate at a faculty meeting many of the things he had learned. At one meeting, after his return from a visit to the teachers college at Kirksville, Missouri, he reported that faculty meetings were held weekly at that college, but that these were conducted in a democratic way. He made the comment: "There is strong presidential influence, but no dictation." There he found out the cost per kilowatt hour of electricity. He noted that teachers in the training school were called "supervisors"---not "critics." He mentioned the date on which the Missouri college was established, the growth of the enrollment, and the present number enrolled. He had made a close study of the course offerings and read the details which he had copied into the Redbook. He took note of the physical makeup, the number and kind of heaters used and their arrangement to warm the buildings. These were but a few of the details which he recorded in the Redbook for future use in the long years ahead. At other times he visited the teachers college at Cedar Falls, the Bradley Polytechnic Institute, and others.

Once in a while at a faculty meeting he would share with the teachers the thrill he had experienced at the knowledge of a great engineering feat or an achievement of scientists. At one of these times he gave a word picture of Boulder Dam, 677 feet high, the highest dam in the world. This dam imprisoned water enough, he said, to cover 26 million acres to a depth of one foot. The dam would back up the water through the gorge 118 miles, and would furnish electrical energy estimated at 600,000 horse power.

At another meeting he told the story of a little girl eight months old who had no upper lip, no upper gums, no palate, and nose and nostrils deformed. Kind friends contributed money to give her hospital care. In fourteen months, new gums were grafted, her teeth which came through the sides of her face were pulled together by clamps and fastened, her nose was straightened and new skin grafted, her palate was rebuilt, and she became a normal child.

In September, 1941, Evans gave a complete report on faculty retirement. He said that the regents had taken action in May, instructing the presidents to put into effect the retirement system, making retirement optional at 65 and compulsory at 70. However, the regents had agreed that individual hearings would be granted, and especially in the cases of faculty members who were just reaching 70, some adjustments could be made. At the same time, he noted, a modification of the rule in an individual case would not change the general rule.

### Recruiting Students

Anyone who worked closely with C. E. Evans for any length of time during his administration knows that there were few moments in his thinking when the enrollment figures of the College were not involved. The subject was brought up regularly at faculty meetings, and the teachers were urged to collect names of prospective students wherever they went at vacation times and from all available sources, Evans himself was a walking advertisement of the College.

A typical faculty meeting devoted almost wholly to the subject of recruiting was held in the fall of 1916. He prepared a list of items to discuss in the meeting as follows:

- (1) What can we do to help worthy students who have no means?
- (2) Would permission to enter late increase the enrollment?
- (3) Lists of our graduates should be kept up to date and the help of these ex-students requested in sending students to the College.
- (4) Committees will be appointed to work on the problem of getting and holding students.
- (5) Faculty members will be asked to be sponsors for students from certain areas and to visit the schools in those areas.
- (6) Faculty members must stop belittling normal college work. There is a great need for strong young men and young women for the third and fourth college years.
- (7) The treatment students receive at the College has much to do with their transfer elsewhere to do their upperclass work. Poor clerks can drive away customers from a business.

- (8) Preference should be given to graduates of teachers colleges for positions as teachers in those colleges. This will encourage students to finish their work here.
- (9) The goal is to recruit 100 senior college students for the summer session and 75 senior college students for the next fall term.

On the last item, the number set as a goal by Evans increased from year to year. For example, by 1920 he was suggesting 150 for summer school and 100 for the regular session. At a faculty meeting in May of 1921, he suggested that the faculty could help get a list of summer school students interested in coming back for their degree. He deplored the crowded boarding house situation at the College for summer school students but thought that college-owned dormitories were only a fond dream. He thought that the Interscholastic League contests held at the College served to acquaint high school students with the College. He suggested that every courtesy be extended these students to gain their good will.

On October 6, 1921, Evans appeared very much concerned that the senior class was so small. He told the faculty that a vigorous campaign should be put on for the retention of seniors. Again he urged the teachers to assume more responsibility for the social and moral life of the campus and exercise a constant and sympathetic supervision and encouragement of student activities. He declared that a busy student was not likely to form "immoral and unwholesome habits."

Always, it seemed, the closing days of registration in the fall term brought to Evans disappointment that the enrollment was no larger. At these times he would call a faculty meeting to see what steps could be taken at the last moment to help the situation. This went on all through the years. In 1937, on October 8, he called a faculty meeting and expressed alarm that the enrollment was so small. He declared that worthy and needy students not yet enrolled might be found and offered help. At that time a question arose in the mind of this writer whether Evans was concerned more with the many unfortunate boys and girls who would never be able to enroll in a college, or with greater numbers to hasten the growth of his college. Without a doubt his motive was both.

He said at many faculty meetings: "We must find a way to tie on to or attract students to the College. Don't let a student go away. Offer a liberal deal for all students. Other schools are finding a way to get students and not raise technical objections to their credits for entrance." He advocated a campaign to "use all forces and all members of the faculty' to recruit students. He emphasized his belief that the faculty was responsible for "wholesome surroundings and helpful — not deteriorating — influences. The faculty is responsible for wholesome and adequate recreation."

### The Dismal Outlook

C. E. Evans suffered so many disappointments, so many failures to obtain required support from a penny-pinching legislature, so much criticism from regents and lawmakers, and so much worry about the shortcomings of faculty members and students, it is small wonder that he tended to lapse into a chronic posture of gloom when dealing with his faculty. Most of the time crisis was the "normal" state of being for the College; indeed, Evans referred every biennium to the outlook for increased appropriations as a crisis. In April, 1920, when the budget for the following biennium was being prepared to present to the legislature almost a year later, he declared a crisis, because the survey of the Board of Control had indicated that there must be a reduction in the costs of higher education in Texas. The creeping decrease in the number of students enrolled caused Evans to foresee smaller classes, which in turn would convince the Board of Control that fewer teachers would be necessary. He called the attitude of the legislative committee members working with the Board of Control "deliberate antagonism" against the College.

The faculty meetings of 1921 to 1923 showed the repeated announcement that there would be few if any increases in salary for the following year. There had already been a long period without any substantial increase in salaries. During this time he kept before the faculty the constant warning against expansion of departmental courses. He questioned the multiplicity of courses, especially in Education. There was also the statement that there would be no additions to the faculty for the next two years. Property of the College was being worn out and supplies

consumed, and there was little money in sight for replacements; therefore, he urged faculty members to be responsible for the property of which they had charge.

The doleful theme emphasized the fact that the Southwest Texas State Teachers College was in a very vulnerable location, being so close to the University of Texas with its comfortable dormitories and well-equipped classroom buildings. Students, he feared, would pass by the San Marcos institution to attend the University in the years to come. Moreover, the salary scale at the University would attract the best qualified teachers, leaving the poorer ones to accept positions at San Marcos. Unless the College could get adequate buildings and equipment, even the denominational colleges would be serious competitors for students who might otherwise come to San Marcos. The latter institutions had dependable endowments for their support, but a state school was "a creature of the legislature" that could be destroyed by the failure of that lawmaking body to provide sufficient funds. He declared that one modern dormitory with a capacity of 250 students would increase the College enrollment by 400 students, but he did not explain how, other than to say that each year about 500 students would have a chance to spend some time in the dormitory and go back home, each a satisfied "booster" for the College.

The few cases in which it was necessary to expel students were magnified by Evans as a problem with potentially fatal results for the College. He illustrated his point in this way: "Two boys drinking and gambling will influence twenty other boys. These go home and become a bad influence in their communities. Good people will blame this school for their conduct."

For a few years following 1929, there was nothing imaginary about the gloomy situation facing the College; it was real. In September 1929, at the first faculty meeting of the session, Evans bemoaned the fact that a library building, the appropriation for which had been passed by both houses of the legislature, had been vetoed by the governor, and along with the building, \$25,000 in salaries had also been blue penciled. He told the faculty: "We are back to 1925. There is no new salary scale. Therefore, few adjustments can be made. Miscellaneous appropriations were also pared by the governor in proportion." The appropriation for the

summer school for 1930 was so small, he said, that a drastic reduction must be made, and he advised all teachers to depend upon only six weeks' work during the summer session. "Heavier assignments are most likely," he said, and advised teachers not to complain about the load. Any teacher might be transferred to do part of his work in another department. There would be no promotions; on the other hand, there would be no demotions. Each teacher would be expected to accept the "give-and-take" of team work.

In the midst of all the dark clouds, Evans urged the teachers to take every opportunity to improve their scholarship by further graduate study.

He then took notice of the "hard financial situation," and requested the faculty members to "practice economy for students." This meant, he said, not to ask students to buy any materials which were not essential.

Admitting that the financial outlook was by no means bright, yet Evans told the faculty that he disapproved "outside money-making." And he let it be understood definitely that no attempt would be made to fix a teacher's schedule to fit outside duties. He said, "If you don't get up early enough to get through with your home duties and make your first morning class, you cannot expect the College to change your working hours. You had better change your own habits. We regularly call on you any time of day you are needed. Keep regular office hours and schedule extra-curricular activities accordingly."

Ten years later the story had to be changed very little. In a faculty meeting February 10, 1939, he said that the regents had passed regulations making it mandatory for all teachers to take off six weeks every third summer. He predicted that the appropriation bill, still being considered by the legislature, would show no net increases and there would be large reductions in the funds for repairs and improvements. These would probably be no more than \$3,000 to \$8,000 compared with the previous biennium with \$24,538. Moreover, no new buildings for any state school would be allowed, he predicted.

The same note of gloom was voiced at the last faculty meeting in the summer of 1939. There would be no funds for repairs, improvements, or upkeep; and the salary budget had been

cut \$11,000 below the amount he had requested and even below the recommendations of the Board of Control. The appropriation for the summer school of 1940 was less than for the summer school of 1937.

On December 20, 1940, the last day but one for classes before the Christmas holidays, he called a faculty meeting. The purpose of this meeting appeared to be to lay before the instructors the gloom and disappointment which were heavy on Evans' mind. After a brief announcement that classes would begin January 3, 1941, which was Friday, a fact that every teacher already knew, he launched into the melancholy statement of his belief that the appropriation for the summer school of 1941 would suffer a cut. Therefore, the class offerings must be reduced. He said that work on the summer schedule must be started immediately after the holidays. He also announced that the student payroll was too large and that any vacancies occurring would not be filled. He proceeded again to lecture the faculty on the time-worn subject of teachers in politics and, as if he had never given them this warning before, he said solemnly that no teacher should be guilty of "offensive partisanship."

### **The Sounding Board**

One of the uses which a college president may find for his faculty meetings is to express his philosophy and show forth his learning, or impress his faculty with the amount of important work going on in the president's office. As representative of the college before various governmental agencies and the general public he acquires information which is not always available to the classroom teacher, and this he can pass on to his staff with whatever interpretation he thinks necessary. Moreover, the president has time for a wide range of reading, and he can be helpful to his faculty members by suggesting that they too may profit from the books which he recommends.

Evans took full advantage of his opportunities in meeting with the faculty. He would appoint committees assigned to definite tasks of investigation and require these committees to report to the entire faculty. Evans had one serious weakness. He never called for the reading of the minutes of the previous faculty meeting, and there were times, therefore, when he would forget the old business which had been scheduled for the present

meeting. Of course, there is also the probability that he may have simply changed his mind about giving these matters any further consideration.<sup>4</sup>

One of the topics about which Evans was thoroughly informed and about which he enjoyed talking in the faculty meetings was the inner workings of the state government at Austin. He was an avid student of political science and had a surprising knowledge of the personnel of the legislature and of officeholders in the various levels of state government. During his three years of service as general agent of the Conference for Education in Texas with headquarters in Austin, he had formed many acquaintances and close friendships with state officials. The accuracy of his forecasts of political action in Austin was uncanny. Whenever he discussed this subject, the faculty members listened with rapt attention, for they knew an expert was speaking.

Occasionally Evans brought to the faculty meeting some of the vast store of facts which he had accumulated on educational matters throughout the United States. He attended the meetings of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and was thoroughly informed concerning standards of that body. There was hardly a state in the Union whose rural school system and normal schools were not familiar to him. Armed with his little Redbook, he could present very interesting comparisons of the College with other similar institutions all over America.

## XVI THE LEADER The Setting

C. E. Evans took the position of president of one of four state normal schools of Texas, the other three being at Huntsville, Denton, and Canyon. The presidents of the other three schools were, respectively: H. F. Estill, who became president of the Sam Houston Normal Institute in 1908; W. H. Bruce, who became president of the North Texas State Normal School in 1906; and R. B. Cousins, who became president of the West

---

<sup>4</sup>The writer remembers well being appointed on a committee, his part being to make a report to the faculty on the Chicago Plan which had been given wide publicity in the middle thirties. Pleased with the honor, he spent his spare time for three weeks in this task; but was never called upon to make the report. At least, he profited by learning about the Chicago Plan!



meeting. Of course, there is also the probability that he may have simply changed his mind about giving these matters any further consideration.<sup>4</sup>

One of the topics about which Evans was thoroughly informed and about which he enjoyed talking in the faculty meetings was the inner workings of the state government at Austin. He was an avid student of political science and had a surprising knowledge of the personnel of the legislature and of officeholders in the various levels of state government. During his three years of service as general agent of the Conference for Education in Texas with headquarters in Austin, he had formed many acquaintances and close friendships with state officials. The accuracy of his forecasts of political action in Austin was uncanny. Whenever he discussed this subject, the faculty members listened with rapt attention, for they knew an expert was speaking.

Occasionally Evans brought to the faculty meeting some of the vast store of facts which he had accumulated on educational matters throughout the United States. He attended the meetings of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and was thoroughly informed concerning standards of that body. There was hardly a state in the Union whose rural school system and normal schools were not familiar to him. Armed with his little Redbook, he could present very interesting comparisons of the College with other similar institutions all over America.

## XVI THE LEADER The Setting

C. E. Evans took the position of president of one of four state normal schools of Texas, the other three being at Huntsville, Denton, and Canyon. The presidents of the other three schools were, respectively: H. F. Estill, who became president of the Sam Houston Normal Institute in 1908; W. H. Bruce, who became president of the North Texas State Normal School in 1906; and R. B. Cousins, who became president of the West

---

<sup>4</sup>The writer remembers well being appointed on a committee, his part being to make a report to the faculty on the Chicago Plan which had been given wide publicity in the middle thirties. Pleased with the honor, he spent his spare time for three weeks in this task; but was never called upon to make the report. At least, he profited by learning about the Chicago Plan!

Texas State Normal School in 1910.<sup>1</sup> In 1911, W. H. Bruce, whose tenure of office had been five years, (two years longer than that of any other normal school president) was considered the leader and had been informally elected president of the Council of Normal School Presidents.

Within two years after his appointment in 1911, Evans began to assume a leading role among the members of the group. The fact that he was the youngest member did not stand in his way. From the first year of his administration he took it upon himself to hold the other presidents to agreements made and to keep a close watch for signs that any of the others were lax in enforcement of entrance requirements which might lead to an unfair advantage in recruiting students. Moreover, Evans was never timid in calling the other presidents to account for their actions.

#### Guide And Critic

Evans was not only ready with criticism, sometimes quite severe, but he was also willing to counsel with his colleagues and help them over their difficulties. Furthermore, his proximity to Austin placed him in a strategic position to be helpful as an adviser on legislative activities. But perhaps the few survivors may remember him more vividly for his stinging rebukes, which were usually followed by softer language, especially if the lash of his words had caused an outcry of protest from the object of his momentary displeasure.

The first example found was a mild reprimand directed to President Estill. The date of this letter was August 4, 1913:

The minutes of the State Board of Education for the June meeting seem to show that you recommended Mrs. Rosa Buchanan for a full professorship at a salary of \$1,800. It is my understanding that we agreed in the spring of 1912 not to pay any of the women teachers more than \$1,500. I trust this record in the minutes of the Board is an error. Certainly, the precedent will give a world of trouble to the State Normal Schools. Please let me hear from you.

On February 16, 1917, Evans criticized rather severely the head of the group, President Bruce, for the latter's complaint that he could not run the summer school at North Texas State Normal on the \$20,000 appropriated for the purpose. Evans also criticized Bruce for cutting the summer session short. He wrote:

---

<sup>1</sup> Evans, *The Story of Texas Schools*, op. cit., pp. 276-297.

I understand that your summer term opens on Tuesday, May 29, and closes Friday, July 27, which is a term of nine weeks. If your term should be ten weeks this would make you close Friday, August 3. This will be exactly six days more than two calendar months. Your appropriation is certainly large enough to pay your teachers for two and one-fourth calendar months. There is little probability that our summer appropriations for 1918-1919 will be any larger than our summer school appropriations for this summer. You refer to the fact that our appropriation for the summer of 1917 is larger than it was as included in the regular bill. Let me remind you that the attendance of the Southwest Texas Normal School has exceeded that of the Huntsville Normal one-third, and that of the Canyon Normal almost one-half, and yet the summer school appropriation for us is the same as for the two other summer schools. It will be just as difficult for us to maintain a ten-weeks' term and meet all expenses with an appropriation of \$15,000 as it will be for you to do so on your appropriation of 920,000. I am willing to make any reasonable sacrifice in order to standardize the summer term. College work the world over is limited to fifteen to eighteen hours per week. The State Normal Schools of Texas have been attempting to do twenty-five hours of college work each week, with the time reduced one-fourth. It can be a question of but a very short time when the standing of our summer school will be considerably depressed. Personally, I believe that our summer term should be eleven weeks this summer, but in order to help you out of your difficult situation, I will accept ten weeks as entirely satisfactory.

By all means, let us not continue to attempt twenty-five hours of work per week in a term reduced one-fourth and yet make the preposterous claim that the summer term is the equivalent of the regular term. Normal Schools should keep within speaking distance of facts.

So long as the summer term was on the basis of tuition, we could not do anything else than what we have been doing. As the State made us a good appropriation for this summer, we should endeavor to meet the teachers and authorities half way by doing something toward standardizing the summer term. It will hit me as hard as it will hit you, but I am willing to stand it.

### **Head Of The Council**

When R. L. Marquis became president of the North Texas State Teachers College upon the retirement of President Bruce in 1923, President Evans was elected to succeed Bruce as presi-

dent of the Council of Teachers College Presidents. This move placed Evans in a position of influence with the other presidents of the teachers colleges. By that time the state teachers colleges had increased to seven, with the addition of the East Texas State Teachers College in 1917, R. B. Binnion, president; Sul Ross State Teachers College in 1920, Thomas Fletcher, president;<sup>2</sup> and the Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College in 1922, A. W. Birdwell, president. At this time, also, J. A. Hill had succeeded R. B. Cousins at the West Texas State Teachers College.

While Evans recognized the unusual ability of President Marquis and admired him for his success and rapid rise in educational work in Texas, he was not ready to relinquish his place of leadership to the younger head of the North Texas State Teachers College, at that time the largest teachers college in the United States." The first clash with Marquis happened during his first year at Denton. Evans wrote Marquis on July 2, 1923, and the letter explains the occasion for Evans' displeasure:

I have before me your letter of June 26, in which you state that you took up with the Board of Regents in the absence of the other Presidents, a change of policy in the matter of textbooks. A copy of the minutes of the Board of Regents of May 26 is also before me. I find the following statement in these minutes: "The following recommendations, having been approved by the Council of Presidents, were unanimously adopted: (1) That the policy of free textbooks be discontinued," etc. To express the situation concretely: The Presidents of the Texas State Teachers Colleges met in May and secured unanimous action of the Board of Regents on a policy of free textbooks, but one President secures a reversal of the agreed policy. Certainly, such action sets a rather dangerous precedent, What is the use of agreements anyhow? Further comment is unnecessary.

In his letter of June 26, President Marquis had undertaken to explain the reasons for his request to the regents by relating that the College of Industrial Arts at Denton had proposed to continue the policy of free textbooks, which would hurt the enrollment of the North Texas Teachers College, but this explanation did not overcome Evans' resentment that Marquis had

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 297. Actually, Fletcher served only a few months, when he was succeeded by R. L. Marquis. When Marquis was moved to Denton, H. W. Morelock became president.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 277.

acted without the approval of the other presidents. If there was one thing for which Evans contended without exception or change of mind, it was that a uniform policy should be adopted by the Council of Presidents and followed without deviation.

Later the same year Evans found it necessary, in his opinion, to condemn another unauthorized act of Marquis. In a letter dated November 1, 1923, he accused Marquis of making a contract with the *Texas School Journal*, without consulting the presidents of the other teachers colleges, for advertising of all the state teachers colleges. Evans emphatically objected to this action on the grounds mentioned. Marquis replied defending his action, and on November 10, President Evans wrote a stronger letter :

Replying to your letter of November 1, I still hold the same view regarding the inadvisability of the action of any president or faculty member in making contracts the effect of which is to bind other presidents and colleges without previous approval. I think friction and misunderstanding are certain to follow unless matters of policy are approved in conference by all the presidents.

Not only is this the case, but an examination of the Penal Statutes will indicate the inadvisability of contracts between members of the Board of Regents and the several Teachers Colleges. The State Purchasing Agent repeatedly refused to award any contract to the Walter Tips Company so long as Mr. Goeth was a member of our Board of Regents.' In a public statement in 1915, Governor Ferguson gave his reason for the removal of a member of the Board of Control of the San Antonio Asylum that such member had made contracts with a firm with which he (a member) was connected. Frankly, I doubt if the Board of Regents, with a full meeting, would advise or approve the action you have taken. On the supposition that it has gone so far as to make diplomacy and expediency essential, I am agreeing to accept 500 copies of *The Texas School Journal*. However, I will pay for these copies in some other way than from State Funds. With kind personal regards,

After any attempt at explanation or defense of his act, Marquis usually found himself the target of still more of Evans' criticism. Marquis had agreed with the management of *The Texas School Journal* to take several thousand copies of the

---

4 What Evans is referring to here is the fact that one of the members of the board of regents has a financial interest in *The Texw School Journal*.

magazine. When Evans consented to take only 500 copies, Marquis wrote that the copies were so valuable that the North Texas State Teachers College would use the surplus. Furthermore, Marquis explained that his suggestion that copies of the magazine be accepted by the other colleges was not an agreement of any kind—that North Texas intended to take copies of the *Journal* regardless of what others did.

Notwithstanding all this, Evans seemed to feel that Marquis had missed the significance and gravity of his unilateral contract with the magazine; and on November 19 he wrote Marquis again. And this time there was still another matter with which he chose to deal:

A contract with a member of our Board<sup>5</sup> to take so many thousand copies of his paper, from a legal point of view, does not vary one iota from a contract with the Walter Tips Company for a crude-oil engine, when A. C. Goeth is a member of the Board of Regents. The present order is just the same as if we were to contract with Fakes and Company of Fort Worth for our college furniture while F. A. Martin is a member of our Board. Frankly, kindly, but firmly, I must repeat my objection to the action of any president in committing all of us to a policy in advance of conference and agreement.

All of us know the friction and division in the Board of Regents last spring over the case of our good friend, Dr. Bruce. The situation was nicely adjusted by the election of Dr. Bruce as President Emeritus of North Texas State Teachers College at full salary. Without being at all unkind to Dr. Bruce, or to the North Texas State Teachers College, it is not going to suit several of the other Teachers Colleges to join in the suggestion embodied in the recent letter of Dr. Bruce. When I get too old to render active service for the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, I will be too old to ask the North Texas State Teachers College to help provide employment in any form for part of the year. I don't think Dr. Bruce should make this request of us. I believe you can help us get out of this delicate situation without any unkind feeling. With kind personal regards,

Evans must have felt that this closing phrase of many of his letters would dull the sharp barbs carried in the message. To him the phrase, "With kind personal regards," was sufficient

---

<sup>5</sup>The records indicate that the regent referred to was H. T. Musselman of Dallas.

proof that no personal ill feelings were involved. Also, with Evans, when the storm was over there should be immediate fair weather. This trait of his personality revealed itself most strongly after harsh words had been directed at, or exchanged with, another person. If he found it possible, he would do some service or favor for the person in an apparent, though sometimes awkward, attempt to restore possible lost friendship and good will.

November 82, just three days after the date of the previous letter, Evans wrote Marquis suggesting that the latter attend the Centennial of Professional Training to be held at Terre Haute in December as representative of the Texas Teachers Colleges, and also that Marquis make reservations for the Chicago meeting of the presidents to be held immediately thereafter. Marquis' reply showed the lingering bitterness after Evans' castigations:

I would gladly act upon your suggestion and make the hotel reservations if I were sure that no member of our board of regents owns any stock in Chicago Hotels, Inc. It would be just my luck to select one and make another stupendous mistake. Probably my enthusiasm for the State Teachers Colleges of Texas will prompt me to make many more mistakes, but I am becoming quite timid because of the certain castigation that follows practically every effort I put forth. Notwithstanding all that has happened, I still find myself thinking in terms of the entire group rather than of the North Texas State Teachers College alone.

I am grateful for your suggestion that I represent the group at the Centennial Celebration at Terre Haute, Indiana, on December 6th and 7th. Nothing would give me more pleasure, but I am convinced that a more mature and experienced member should be selected. . . .

I think the current issue of the Texas School Journal is a good one. I particularly like my article and feel that it should be read by a large number of people. With this in mind, we are mailing a thousand copies from this college. With kind personal regards,

Possibly it is characteristic of any true leader to dislike a negative answer to a request for service coupled with honor., and usually such a leader will not take "No" for an answer. Evans replied to Marquis, repeating his insistence that the latter attend the Centennial Convention. He wrote:

Certainly, the Texas Teachers Colleges should have a regular representative, and unless the Presidents in conference decide otherwise, I am going to continue to insist that you are the person to go. A copy of this letter is being forwarded to the other Presidents. . . .

This letter apparently soothed the ruffled feelings of Marquis, whose love of travel and immaculate dress were well known, and he wrote Evans:

If it is the desire of the Council that I go to Indiana and attend the Centennial Celebration I shall attempt to do so. I see no reason why I cannot go. I shall take it up with the Board while it is in session in Dallas December 1.

One of Evans' assumed duties was to act as spokesman for the teachers colleges in arranging for their appearance before the Board of Control and legislative committees regarding their biennial budgets. This review of budget requests usually took place in the late spring of those even-numbered years when the legislature was not in session. Generally the counsel and recommendation of President Evans were followed by the other presidents. They fully recognized that Evans not only knew the schedule of legislative activities at Austin, but also that he had opportunities to peep behind the scenes and forecast the outcome of many of these activities.

June 9, 1927, in what appeared to be an obvious spirit of jest, President Marquis proposed that some action be taken to raise the salaries of the presidents of the teachers colleges. He wrote:

. . . I furthermore favor the Board of Regents' taking the horn by the bull and making the salaries of the Presidents of the Teachers Colleges as much as was recommended by the Board of Control. Some of you will cry out that this is dangerous, but I reply that there is no danger whatsoever. Two or three institutions of higher learning in this state have consistently refused to obey the mandates of the Legislature and so far as I am able to determine they are biennially rewarded with increased appropriations for this audacity and courage. . . .

Ever ready to oppose any radical suggestions, and apparently overlooking the facetious language and spirit of Marquis' letter, Evans replied on June 18:



The fact that two or three institutions of higher learning in this state have consistently refused to obey the mandates of the Legislature, if a fact, does not, by any means, justify the State Teachers Colleges in overriding legislative intent in the matter of salaries of Presidents and Deans. I do not believe it to be a fact that two or three institutions have done so, and received a reward for "audacity and courage." New York and Maryland have, as states, consistently defied the Eighteenth Amendment; even if I did not believe in the Eighteenth Amendment, I would be violently opposed to Texas joining in such a policy of evasion. Let not the Teachers Colleges attempt anything that looks like duplicity, evasion, or trickery.

There is no record of a reply to Evans' admonitory message.

Evans diligently watched the words and acts of his colleagues, and he made his reasons for doing so quite evident; if he could prevent it, nothing would be done by any of the other presidents to damage the cause of the teachers colleges; moreover, no policy would be adopted by one of these colleges which would give that institution an unfair advantage in the competition for state funds and for students. He also guarded jealously his position as leader. On this score, however, the only potential rival was R. L. Marquis, head of the largest teachers college, at Denton. As already indicated, he objected vigorously to any move of Marquis which reflected a tinge of independent action that might threaten the solidarity of the Council of Presidents in dealing with the regents or other official groups.

For three or four years after his verbal bout with Marquis in 1923, there were only sporadic eruptions at Denton. Then in 1930 Marquis acquired the notion that, as the largest of the teachers colleges, North Texas State should be allowed to offer a program of graduate instruction. He appointed a committee of his faculty members early in the year and submitted the findings of this committee to the board of regents at its Austin meeting on February 10.<sup>6</sup> After presenting a very logical list of reasons why there was need for graduate work to be offered for the benefit of prospective teachers in Texas, the North Texas committee ended its report with the following paragraphs:

Because of quite practical considerations, the graduate work should not be done by all the state teachers colleges.

---

<sup>6</sup>Minutes of the board of regents, February 10, 1930.

At present there are but 407 graduate students in the University of Texas, and only 61 in the institution in Texas ranking next in number. It is fair to assume that there would not at any time in the near future be more than 400 or 500 graduate students enrolled in all the seven state teachers colleges, if graduate work were offered in all of them. Yet, to fit one of them to care for 400 or 500 such students would be almost as practical and economical as to fit any one of them to care for 50 or 100. . . .

The committee is of the opinion that the institution or institutions chosen for this work should be selected with some regard to the number of bachelor's degrees granted by the various teachers colleges as well as to the number of students already enrolled in advanced classes. The work should be offered only in departments which have an adequate number of teachers with standard doctor's degrees or the equivalent and which have other facilities for doing the work properly.'

This report was submitted to the board without any consultation in advance, but a copy was handed to each president at the meeting.

Prior to that date President Evans had, in correspondence with the regents, declared himself opposed to the offering of graduate work by any state institution of higher learning other than the University of Texas and the Agricultural and Mechanical College. Marquis' obvious suggestion that the North Texas State Teachers College should be designated to carry on such a program aroused the opposition not only of President Evans but of most of the other presidents as well.<sup>8</sup>

February 14, 1930, President Evans wrote President Marquis:

Let me suggest that all of us give the subject of Graduate Study the most careful consideration, that thereby we may work out a program of Graduate Study which will commend itself to the State Board of Education, the Board of Regents, and to all the faculties in the Texas State Teachers Colleges as being constructive, wise, and fair alike to the rapidly-growing needs of all. I am sure we have the ability and cooperative effort to do so.

---

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*

---

<sup>8</sup>Hill, *Move Than Brick and Mortar*, op. cit., pp. 107 ff.

The letter was a feat of restraint on the part of President Evans.

Later, in April, 1930, President Evans believed it necessary to draw President A. W. Birdwell of Nacogdoches back into line with the adopted policy of the Council of Presidents. His letter to Birdwell, dated April 15, speaks for itself:

I regret the publication of an interview in the Dallas News, dated April 12, that 52 members of the Stephen F. Austin College expect to donate a week's service per term to the Summer School without cost to the College. This is evidently the work of newspaper correspondents who do not understand the situation, and will create cross-currents that may be productive of harm. If I mistake not, the Board of Regents instructed the seven State Teachers Colleges to pursue a uniform policy regarding the two weeks of the Summer Session for which no funds are provided. We are standing flat-footed on the action of the Board of Regents and the agreement of the Presidents, believing that either Governor Moody will grant the essential deficiency warrant, or that the next Legislature will make the appropriation for payment of salaries for the two weeks. With kind personal regards,

A letter of explanation was promptly sent by Birdwell. He wrote:

I do not know how the statement in the Dallas News was sent out from Nacogdoches. Certainly, it was no interview from me, and I think no member of this faculty here gave the publicity.

I think I did state at a meeting of the chamber of commerce that the school would last twelve weeks, even though members of the faculty would not receive any salary for two weeks of the time. I presume the correspondent of the Dallas News made up the story from the statement. The statement that I made before the chamber of commerce was made some three weeks ago. I did not even see the notice in the Dallas News, and, of course, I regret that it was in the paper; however, the situation here and at other colleges in Texas is about as stated. As a matter of fact, that is precisely what the Board of Regents mean for us to do. In other words, we are going to do here precisely what the Board of Regents instructed us to do; and as I understand it, they instructed us to try to pay our teachers their full salary for ten weeks.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>The date of this letter was April 17, 1930.

Birdwell's explanation by no means satisfied Evans. On April 23, in a letter of reply, Evans took pains to let Birdwell know the truth of his statements was in doubt:

The Dallas News on April 12 reported that 52 members of the Stephen F. Austin College faculty expected to donate a week's service per term to the Summer School without cost to the College. Mention was also made of the fact that the President publicly commended the teachers for their action, which was given liberal credit for being "public spirited." Reading your letter of April 17 very carefully, I gather that "What the Board of Regents instructed us to do was the payment of our teachers for ten weeks" only; the Board at the time instructed us to make a fight for a deficiency warrant of \$75,000 apportioned as we had agreed. The two instructions are complementary and are to be taken as making up a unit. I understand also that there is a probability of our requesting the next Legislature for an emergency appropriation for payment of the two weeks, in case a deficiency warrant for a sufficient amount cannot be granted.

Mr. Mayhew and I, in strict accordance with the instructions of the Presidents and the Board of Regents, conferred with Governor Moody in Austin Saturday, March 29. We presented the request of the seven colleges, including that of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College for \$11,000 and your request for \$7,600. I think I have had two conferences with Governor Moody since the meeting named. We cannot very well donate our services for two weeks of the Summer Term when we are, at the same time pressing a claim for payment for such service; we cannot very well ride the free horse and pay horse at the same time, since the two horses are traveling in opposite directions. The suggestion of donation of service will be cordially welcomed by members of the Legislature who are opposed to the financial support of the Summer School, and can very easily hazard the chance for a deficiency warrant.

Again Birdwell undertook to defend his statements to the faculty and the chamber of commerce at Nacogdoches. On April 25 he wrote :

I have your letter of April 23, but I cannot tell whether you wish to press your criticism of the report that went out from this school, or whether you want something done about it.

The action of the faculty here happened before our meeting at Fort Worth. I tried to explain to them that we

had \$32,000 to pay a \$40,000 bill with, and that I thought the obligation was pretty clear to conduct the school for twelve weeks. It seemed that one of two things would have to be done—either the salaries would have to be reduced, or payment would have to be made for a short time. The faculty chose the latter. I tried to explain to them very carefully that a deficiency warrant was problematical, and that there was no obligation on the part of the next Legislature to pay the bill. Therefore, in choosing whether or not they would work the summer, they did but regard the two weeks service as a donation to the State. I think it was right to make this explanation, and I think it was right for the faculty to have all the facts before them, in order that they might make intelligent decisions.

This whole question was discussed by the Council of Presidents, and it was agreed that we would recommend to the Board of Regents that the faculties be paid for ten weeks their full salaries. The Regents instructed us to do that very thing. To be sure, they did instruct you and Mr. Mayhew to ask the Governor for a deficiency warrant, and the reservation was understood that the next Legislature would be asked to pay the bill. I tried to explain to you in my letter before that the representative of the Dallas News based his story on what I said at the Chamber of Commerce. That body was anxious to know whether the school would run six weeks or twelve weeks, and I informed them that it would run twelve weeks, even though the faculty had to donate two weeks of service. That was the literal truth, and I cannot see how any harm could come from that statement. Indeed, I thought that the Chamber of Commerce had a right to know the exact truth. The representative of the Dallas News, some two or three weeks later, sent in his story. I did not see it and have not seen it, but as it has been reported to me, it conformed very closely to the facts.

Personally I do not think the statement will do any harm. Certainly there was no effort either to appear as martyrs, or to assume any unusual virtues. Perhaps you recall that I have been in favor, for several years, of trying to get the Legislature to settle the summer school question. We have to beg for deficiency warrants, and have to humiliate ourselves by begging: the Legislature to pay back bills, which they have no authority in law to do. I do not think it will hurt the people of the State to know the situation. If the people do not want summer schools, it is their right not to have them. If they do want them, they ought to face the situation, and the Legislature—their servants—should pass the necessary appropriation bills.

To be sure, I hope the Governor will give us the deficiency warrant. I think he should do so. Whether this faculty or yours is willing to work for nothing for two weeks, should have nothing to do with his action. As a matter of fact, if he does not give the deficiency warrant, both your faculty and mine will work two weeks for nothing but a forlorn hope. Of course, I hope that the Legislature will see fit to pay the bill, but I doubt very seriously whether there is any warrant for paying back bills by the Legislature.

I have tried to make this all very clear, for your recent letter indicates that you did not believe what I said about it in the first place. I want you to understand my attitude in the matter. . . .

As usual, when his opponent complained, Evans dropped his harsh attitude. On April 29, he wrote to Birdwell:

My letters to you have merely called attention to a contradictory situation, without any thought of unkind criticism, or without any desire to bring about any correction of action you or your faculty have taken. Whether the action of the faculty was taken before or after the meeting of the Board of Regents, it amounts to a proffer of free service. I was apprehensive that such a statement would reduce the chances for a deficiency warrant or for an emergency appropriation.

When a situation will probably be misunderstood, I think it best for us to discuss it frankly with each other. . . . I believe everything will work out all right. . . .

The final letter in this series was written by Birdwell and showed something of the esteem in which he held President Evans, notwithstanding the latter's forceful and almost bitter language. Birdwell wrote' on May 7:

I was really glad to get your letter of April 29. I was afraid that you were a little bit "peevd" with me, and I would dislike very much for that to be. I think you know that I trust your judgment more than that of any other man, and I am also a little suspicious of my own behavior when you call it in question.

It would take several misunderstandings to shake my confidence in you and my love for you.

We are planning a big summer school. Our correspondence indicates that we will be crowded. If Governor Moody means to do anything about a deficiency warrant, he should indicate his action as early as possible; however, we shall

have a good summer school. We are going to give as good program as ever, and we are going to do our best to deserve better treatment at the hands of the State Legislature. With the highest personal regards,

### Through The Gloom

In the depth of the depression years, President Evans fell in line with the usual thinking—that a policy of retrenchment was good for the state and that as a matter of economy certain overlapping of services among the institutions of higher learning should be eliminated. This attitude was, of course, at that time sound politics. On February 10, 1933, he wrote to A. B. Mayhew, president of the board of regents, and in the letter he submitted the following topics for the consideration of the board:

1. The University of Texas should not duplicate the elementary field of teacher training now covered satisfactorily by the Texas State Teachers Colleges. He relates that other states are designating certain colleges in their state systems for carrying on the work of teacher training. "I do not mind saying," he wrote, "that we are definitely committed to limitation of majors for our senior students with a maximum of four college years. We do not endeavor to prepare the highly specialized group of high school teachers."

2. "The Teachers Colleges should promptly announce retirement from the graduate field," he continued, "There is no necessity for the multiplication of graduate schools and the cost of such expansion is beyond the state's willingness to pay. . . ."

3. He suggested that a "better inter-Teachers College allocation of subjects" might yet be made. He felt that "possibly if this were done the program of the Economy Committee might be adopted and bridge over the wide variance in the per capita costs of the Teachers Colleges. "It is my judgment," he said further, "that the Legislature will not very long make appropriations to Teachers Colleges for salaries on a basis ranging from \$143 per capita to \$289 per capita. The several Teachers Colleges must get nearer together in their per capita requests for salaries."

4. Evans declared that the divergence in the summer school requests was as great as in the requests for the regular session.

And he expressed himself in this way: "I very much fear that these wide variances have counted considerably against us in the fight for retention of the summer schools, which fight, at the present time, seems almost on the point of being lost."

Previously Evans had broached the subject of per capita cost to the other presidents. At one time he referred to the situation in the colleges where the per capita costs of operating the colleges differed so widely as having "no real justification, and, therefore, must soon pass." He asked the question, "Is it to the interest of the college getting the highest per capita appropriation to continue the present questionable and dangerous situation?"

Viewing these remarks in retrospect, the writer believes that Evans had two purposes in mind. He wished to show, first, that the situation was, as he declared, dangerous to the whole system of teachers colleges, since it might lead to a refusal of the legislature to continue support for any teachers college. Second, in the competition for state funds, if the least efficient teachers colleges were discontinued by the legislature, the struggle for existence of the ones remaining would be far less severe. Thus a benefit for the survivors would be gained. That he held this belief is supported by the fact that the statistics show the Southwest Texas State Teachers College as always having been in a very favorable position when measured by per capita costs.

After the long fight and victory of the Texas State Teachers Colleges in securing recognition and membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1925, Evans became dissatisfied with the administration of that accrediting body. Even though considerable recognition had been accorded the teachers college presidents by election to high offices in the Southern Association, Evans lost interest in attending the annual sessions. On November 23, 1933, he wrote President Whitley of Commerce:

It was my privilege to attend the Southern Association continuously for the sessions of 1922 through 1926, until working with the group as a team, we were able to place the seven Texas State Teachers Colleges on the Southern list. When we saw this piece of work completed, I preferred to attend other associations, and have regularly sent a dean or two deans to the Southern Association. I do not intend to



make the trip to Nashville. However, I am expecting to send representatives.

. . . The Southern Association has been, and will continue to be a one-man organization with the real control vested in the traditional group. It is my opinion that the only solution lies in a new organization which should consist of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Arkansas. We made a tremendous mistake when we joined the Southern Association. It is my purpose to cooperate with you and other members in effecting any wholesome changes in the Southern Association, but the fight will be long-drawn and may never succeed.

The Texas State Teachers Association this year is in about the same condition. One man has five outstanding positions at the Austin meeting, and this man has no connection whatever with the public schools or state colleges. Checking the committees and programs, you will find other illustrations of the same kind which the president calls "coordinating." If I had any suggestion to make to Stillwell,<sup>10</sup> I would suggest that this one man be made chairman of the twenty-one committees listed in the Outlook, and thereby have a splendid piece of educational Fascism. . . .

Evans was never entirely satisfied with the lack of unanimity, slight as this lack probably was most of the time, among the presidents of the teachers colleges. Several times during the later years he deplored the growing tendency of the teachers colleges of Texas to break loose from their cohesion and become separate and distinct institutions. At every opportunity he urged his colleagues to strive for agreement upon proposals before submission to the board of regents. There was, of course, the natural concern of a leader who sees a division among his followers and a tendency to break away from his leadership. On January 4, 1936, he addressed a circular letter to the other presidents in which he praised the Whitley-Birdwell recommendations for a ten-year program of work for the teachers colleges. He suggested that part of this report should be a study of the building needs. He said :

. . . Probably the common cause and the common ground of the several schools have lost out on account of the failure of the presidents to meet and reach more agreements to be ratified by the regents. Within the last five years the tend-

---

<sup>10</sup>H. W. Stilwell, superintendent of the Texnrkana public schools and then president of the Texas State Teachers Association.

ency to make each teachers college entirely distinct from the other teachers colleges has grown and it will continue to grow unless something is done to check this unsafe tendency.

Indeed, it will be very easy for one of our group to go before the Board of Regents with a special program and obtain favors that, if rightfully asked for by the other six colleges, would make the single request impossible.

Evans believed that the ultimate good of all the group of teachers colleges rested in the uniformity of their requests for funds and in the expenditure of these funds, and, indeed, in all other matters. June 19, 1937, he wrote two letters to the other presidents. In the first, he advised uniform salaries for top positions in all the teachers colleges. For example, the dean of the faculty in each college should receive \$3,500; others in a range from \$3,100 to \$3,300. He closed with the comment: "The present divergence is highly inadvisable."

In the second letter, he urged that Dean McElhannon, who had been dismissed from the Sam Houston State Teachers College, not be given employment by any of the other teachers colleges of Texas. He wrote:

It is my judgment that the employment by any teachers college of a person dropped by another teachers college under the same board of regents will create misunderstanding and even trouble. It is my fear that such employment will create ill will between the two institutions.

Evans attempted to assume leadership in the relations of the presidents with the board of regents, and he tried to get group action on all questions involving the choice and the activities of the members of the regential body. As an illustration of his concern with these matters, a letter dated April 1, 1939, was addressed to the other presidents. As had happened more than once before, he expressed his opposition to the appointment of a so-called "executive secretary" of the board of regents who would have administrative duties. He said there was no precedent in America for such a position. Any secretary should have clerical duties only. He expressed the opinion that the candidate for the position was not qualified and cited the candidate's lack of scholarship and his mediocre performance as superintendent of the Mineola school for thirteen years. He suggested that the way to defeat the proposed position was for each president to

"stand up on both feet and be counted when he votes . . .," In criticizing the proposed position he said: "It could even become the position of a snooter."<sup>11</sup>

As he neared retirement, Evans became more strict at the meeting of the Council of Presidents and seemed to suffer somewhat from the fear that less and less respect was being accorded his authority. In a call for a meeting to be held in Alpine May 1, 1939, he stated that the time of the meeting should not be later than four o'clock P. M., and that the program should be rigidly followed. He added the assertion that "To expedite business there will be more rigid respect in handling business along lines of Roberts' *Rules of Order*. He then listed the topics for discussion, an unusual procedure on his part in calling a meeting.

One of these topics happened to be of considerable historical interest. It was the fourth topic, entitled "P. W. A.<sup>12</sup> Projects Now Pending." In his remarks under this heading he appeared to desire settlement of certain issues in advance of the meeting. He objected to the sending of a representative to Washington to present claims to the Government on behalf of the teachers colleges. He maintained that "At Washington nobody can answer the questions raised except the president." And he said further that ". . . the president who does not go to Washington and make a fight for his own project is uncomfortably sleeping on his opportunity." He quoted from Section 4 of Docket 2178-F to prove that anyone who employs another to lobby in Washington may forfeit all rights under any agreements made with such representative. He concluded this exhortation with heading Number 6: "If we are to have P. W. A. projects, why not cut out entirely the Second Attorney and fees for consulting architects? We do not need two watches or two pocket knives a bit more than we need two attorneys or two architects."

Upon the invitation of his successor, J. G. Flowers, Evans attended the meeting of the board of regents in Houston on Monday, October 12, 1942. On Sunday afternoon preceding the meeting Evans was invited to address the Council of Presidents.

---

<sup>11</sup> Webster's *New Collegiate Dictionary* does not include this word. He probably had *snooper* in mind.

<sup>12</sup> These initials represent "Public Works Administration," one of many U. S. Government service organizations, during the thirties designated by Letters of the alphabet.

In this, his last appearance before the Council over which he had presided for almost twenty years, he pleaded that a common policy for the seven teachers colleges be restored to its force of ten years earlier. He urged that joint recommendations be agreed upon before asking for action by the regents. He said that greater uniformity, wise and better understandings were essential. He advised the presidents to be ready at all times to build up the effectiveness of the group of presidents and make its sessions more valuable. He declared that one of the greatest needs of the teachers colleges was a permanent building program. He wished for the Council lasting friendships and cordial personal relations.<sup>13</sup>

### Agent And Adviser

Throughout his administration Evans was called upon regularly to represent and speak for the other teachers colleges. One reason for these requests was that San Marcos is centrally located and only thirty miles from Austin. Before the use of automobiles, the trip to Austin by train was inconvenient and time-consuming. Moreover, Evans was among the first of the presidents to own a car. In 1916, when he purchased his first car, the word got around to the other presidents; and they lost some of their former reluctance to call upon him to inconvenience himself by attending to their business in Austin. As an example, on June 23, 1916, President Estill wrote asking Evans to represent the interests of the Sam Houston State Normal. He wrote :

You are acquainted with the situation as it affects the normal schools, and you are fully competent to safeguard our interests. On account of your proximity to Austin and the added fact that you are the proud owner of an automobile, making you independent of time and space, I hereby empower you to act for me, and this letter will serve as my official proxy.

In representing his colleagues, President Evans was constantly aware of the fact that he was acting as an agent, and he made frequent reports of what he had done in the interest of the others. Moreover, he wished the other presidents to know that at any time he acted in a representative capacity in matters concerning the presidents and the board of regents he did so at

---

<sup>13</sup> The Redbook, 1942

the request of the regents or of the several presidents. On November 25, 1939, he wrote a letter to assure the presidents that at times the regents had asked him, as president of the Council, to transmit requests to the other presidents for certain information. These requests, he maintained, were not initiated by himself but by the regents. He made the following comment: "There is freedom in action for each president that belongs to him and the Board of Regents, and I have no desire to limit or control this freedom in private conversations with individual regents or in meetings of the regents." He then referred to a specific recent request which the regents had made for information on the indebtedness of each college.

With the possible exception of President Marquis of Denton, the other presidents relied on Evans' swift and sharp comprehension of the problems faced by the colleges and of the available information on the subject of these problems. Particularly was this true of President R. B. Binnion of East Texas and President H. F. Estill of Huntsville. But none were so dependent upon President Evans as was President Birdwell of Nacogdoches, the former dean of the faculty of Southwest Texas. From the time Birdwell took office at Nacogdoches in 1922, until his retirement, his requests for advice and assistance were continuous. Such expressions as the following were found in his letters:

I am asking these questions because I have confidence in your procedures and because I want to comply with all the proprieties in this matter.

---

If you think it the least bit better for me to be in Austin on the 10th, please tell me so. You see I am still relying on your judgment, and you must not let me go wrong.

---

How do you handle your working account? It is necessary for me to employ several Negroes by the day to work on the campus. They have to be paid each week, else they cannot eat. Is it the policy of the board of regents to allow a small sum out of the local fund in advance to pay for this sort of labor? Or shall I make out the accounts in the regular way at the close of the month? Perhaps I should know all this; but I have gotten so in the habit of asking what your policy is that it is second nature.

---

This letter grows out of mere ignorance. Does the

board of regents have any regulations about indemnity bonds for college authorities'? A few days ago, Mr. Turner<sup>14</sup> gave my name to the American Surety Company as one who would be required to make such bond. Please tell me all about it.

To this last request Evans replied informing Birdwell that bonds were required by the regents for both the president and the treasurer; that the premium for the bonds usually cost about \$20 each; and that the bonds could be obtained through local Nacogdoches people or through Austin firms, but he could see no reason why Austin companies should have this work.

When a new hospital was nearing completion in Nacogdoches, President Birdwell asked President Evans what kind of contract Southwest Texas State Teachers College had with the Memorial Hospital in San Marcos, telling Evans: "Frankly, I do not know what to expect or what we ought to pay, but I am sure your contract will give me the necessary leads."<sup>15</sup>

There were many other similar requests from Birdwell, and Evans never failed him. On occasion, however, Evans did not wait; for a request from Birdwell if the latter were in apparent need of guidance. This was especially true during the sessions of the legislature. Two examples occurring in 1923 and in 1925 respectively, seemed to put Birdwell on the safe road to success in Austin. On February 10, 1923, Evans wrote:

I think it is advisable for you to be in Austin not later than Wednesday of this week and remain, if you can do so, until Saturday. Dr. Bruce will be back in Austin during the following week. It is best for some Normal College president to be on the ground.

And again on February 21, Evans wrote:

I suggest that you plan to be in Austin several days beginning the latter part of the week. If the House and Senate are to pass Bralley's<sup>16</sup> emergency for a heating plant you can afford to take up your emergency for your Summer School. This is not my business, however.

On February 7, 1925, Evans wrote Birdwell:

Get in your emergency request for paving as soon as possible, sending same to Chairman Eugene Blount. I think

---

<sup>14</sup>H.A. Turner, secretary to the board of regents.

<sup>15</sup>The date of this letter was September 27, 1928. Evans replied that the contract at San Marcos provided for a flat rate of \$200 per month.

<sup>16</sup>F.M. Bralley, president of the College of Industrial Arts.

this item will be added to similar items presented by Sam Houston and Southwest Texas.

This part of the Evans story would hardly be complete unless the following letter from R. B. Binnion were included. Binnion was the first president of the East Texas State Teachers College after the plan of a private normal school had been acquired by the State of Texas in 1917.<sup>17</sup> He resigned in 1924 to accept the position of provost at George Peabody College for Teachers at Nashville. The letter was written April 8, 1925, inviting President and Mrs. Evans to visit the Binnions, and concluded with the following tribute:

I want to express to you once more my very great debt of gratitude to you who so kindly helped me and advised with me continuously from the very first day I became president of a state teachers college in Texas until the hour of my departure. Frankly, I do not see how you ever amassed such a wonderful fund of information relative to the work of the state teachers colleges and other colleges of the country and how you always had that information so well organized and at your tongue's end. I always felt that I could talk with you for an hour or two about any phase of teachers college work and find out more about it than I could in a month's reading; and I frequently was lazy enough to depend upon you rather than dig it out for myself. I shall never forget your kind assistance and your generosity at all times. . . .

In 1923, on March 23, Senate Bill No. 256 created an Educational Survey Commission with authority to employ an out-of-state staff of experts to make a survey of all the schools of the state.<sup>18</sup> This commission, with Governor Pat M. Neff, chairman, called upon certain educators for recommendations of men qualified to conduct the survey. Among those called upon for recommendations was President R. L. Marquis of the North Texas State Teachers College. Marquis immediately wrote the following letter to President Evans:

You no doubt have seen the names of the commission which is to select the surveyors. I do not know the personnel of the commission well enough to say whether we have one which will select favorable or unfavorable men to do this work. I mean by "favorable" whether they are likely to

---

<sup>17</sup>Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 286.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 229.

select persons who are already committed against the Teachers College idea. Knowing that you are the best informed man on this subject, I am writing you to ask that you hand me at once the names of competent surveyors who would do this work without prejudice to our system. I am making this request because I have been invited to give their names. . . .

In a somewhat evasive reply, Evans mentioned the names of Presidents Butcher of Emporia and Seerley of Cedar Falls.

During the two years in which Marquis had been president at North Texas Evans had found more than one occasion to criticize certain of his actions, as has already been mentioned in this chapter. There is little question that at least a small amount of animosity, or perhaps jealousy, was present in Evans' attitude toward certain policies of Marquis. Be that as it may, in 1925, when President W. B. Bizzell left the A. and M. College at College Station to become president of the University of Oklahoma, Evans made a gesture in the direction of helping to place Marquis in the A. and M. post. July 13, Evans wrote to Marquis:

Some weeks ago I requested my personal friend and fellow member of the Board of Trustees of Southwestern University, F. F. Downs of Temple, to speak to Pink Downs<sup>19</sup> in your behalf. It would mean much to the development of our system of colleges in case the head of one of them could be advanced to the presidency of the Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Marquis' reply showed that he was receptive to the suggestion of being invited to go to A. and M. From Evans' point of view, this could, incidentally, also have removed a potential rebel from the ranks of the teachers college presidents. As is well known, however, T. O. Walton was chosen to succeed President Bizzell.

A letter of greeting at Christmas, 1932, from his faithful friend A. W. Birdwell, is included here as a closing tribute to Evans' leadership.

Only in crises do life's real values appear; only in doing the hard things is strength obtained; only in sharing the heart throbs and the trials of others are personalities enriched; only in achieving under difficulties is progress assured.

---

<sup>19</sup> Presumably the brother of F. F. Downs and member of the board of regents of the A. and M. College.



May we all have courage and wisdom in meeting the problems of 1933. Profound changes are going on; readjustments will have to be made. On the economic and social wreck of the present must be built a finer civilization. Integrity, poise, wisdom are sorely needed. It is my prayer that you, because of your capabilities, will have a big part in making our common life sweeter and stronger and better; and that the New Year will bring you and yours happiness and prosperity.

## XVII

### PRESIDENT EVANS AND THE FUTURE PRESIDENT

#### Lyndon On The Campus

In the early days of 1927 Lyndon Baines Johnson, a tall, thin youth of 19 years, made his way to the Southwest Texas State Teachers College with a great determination to get book learning. His stay here has already been chronicled more extensively than that of any other person ever to set foot on the campus; and that includes presidents of the College, members of the faculty, and alumni alike. Even at that tender age, Johnson was not a bashful country boy, and he was not long in making acquaintance with all those in whom he developed an interest. President Evans liked the boy on sight, and his interest in Johnson was increased when he learned that young Johnson was the son of a former member of the Texas House of Representatives with whom Evans was well acquainted.

Years later, after Johnson had won his seat in Congress, Evans wrote a brief sketch of his stay at the College:

Lyndon B. Johnson entered the Southwest Texas State Teachers College March 21, 1927, and graduated in August, 1930. From freshman entrance to Bachelor of Science degree he worked his way through college. For more than two years he was secretary in the President's office, holding a close relation to the President. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Lyndon came to the College under much the same circumstances as other hill-country students—with little or no funds and with only the hope of obtaining a part-time job. Published

---

<sup>1</sup> This is part of a story written for the San Marcos *Record* soon after Johnson was elected to Congress. The date of March 21, 1927, has interest. Lyndon had enrolled in "sub-college" classes six weeks earlier to "prove" his credits from the Johnson City High School which, at that time, did not have full affiliation with the State Department of Education. It took him only six weeks to convince his instructors that he was ready for college.

May we all have courage and wisdom in meeting the problems of 1933. Profound changes are going on; readjustments will have to be made. On the economic and social wreck of the present must be built a finer civilization. Integrity, poise, wisdom are sorely needed. It is my prayer that you, because of your capabilities, will have a big part in making our common life sweeter and stronger and better; and that the New Year will bring you and yours happiness and prosperity.

## XVII

### PRESIDENT EVANS AND THE FUTURE PRESIDENT

#### Lyndon On The Campus

In the early days of 1927 Lyndon Baines Johnson, a tall, thin youth of 19 years, made his way to the Southwest Texas State Teachers College with a great determination to get book learning. His stay here has already been chronicled more extensively than that of any other person ever to set foot on the campus; and that includes presidents of the College, members of the faculty, and alumni alike. Even at that tender age, Johnson was not a bashful country boy, and he was not long in making acquaintance with all those in whom he developed an interest. President Evans liked the boy on sight, and his interest in Johnson was increased when he learned that young Johnson was the son of a former member of the Texas House of Representatives with whom Evans was well acquainted.

Years later, after Johnson had won his seat in Congress, Evans wrote a brief sketch of his stay at the College:

Lyndon B. Johnson entered the Southwest Texas State Teachers College March 21, 1927, and graduated in August, 1930. From freshman entrance to Bachelor of Science degree he worked his way through college. For more than two years he was secretary in the President's office, holding a close relation to the President. . . . !

Lyndon came to the College under much the same circumstances as other hill-country students—with little or no funds and with only the hope of obtaining a part-time job. Published

---

\*This is part of a story written for the San Marcos *Record* soon after Johnson was elected to Congress. The date of March 21, 1927, has interest. Lyndon had enrolled in "sub-college" classes six weeks earlier to "prove" his credits from the Johnson City High School which, at that time, did not have full affiliation with the State Department of Education. It took him only six weeks to convince his instructors that he was ready for college.

reports that Lyndon had been promised work by President Evans prior to his arrival on the campus are erroneous. That was not the way President Evans operated. He relied much on his personal interview with a student in order to "size up" the applicant before granting a job. He always made a cautious inquiry into the finances of the student, because only the most needy could be taken care of. The fact that Lyndon was the son of Sam Johnson, a former member of the legislature, did not in this case change the order of Evans' procedure in extending help to a needy student.

All that has been written is true concerning Johnson's attractive personality, his alertness, his ability to make friends, and the keen intellect and foresight which enabled him to see opportunity where others saw only facts; but any suggestion that he was brash or in any way thoughtless in his attitude toward President Evans is in error. I was present in the office much of the time when Lyndon was also there, and the reported intimate relations between President Evans and Lyndon while the latter was still an undergraduate have been greatly exaggerated. It is true that President Evans was attracted to Lyndon—who wasn't? Lyndon was far superior to the average student who had been employed to work in the president's office. Lyndon looked eagerly for assignments because he knew instinctively that service in the office was his opportunity to make the favorable impression which he was determined to create. But it can never be said that President Evans "made a soft spot" for Lyndon to occupy. The boy was given assignments without partiality or favor, and he effectively discharged whatever duties Evans laid on his broad young shoulders.

Perhaps the thing that made young Johnson such an outstanding worker was the fact that he was the only employee ever to work in the president's office who would make a systematic and prompt report back to President Evans when any assignment was completed. I have seen him standing at the president's elbow holding a written list of the items to which he had devoted himself, calling these off and checking with his pencil as the signal that each had been completed; and, furthermore, he frequently saw other things which he believed should be done, and made sure that Evans was aware that these, too, had been included in the list as finished.

The implied statements carelessly made that President Evans "made" work for Lyndon; that is, that he allowed Lyndon to do wholly unnecessary and even wasteful work in order for him to pay his room rent while he was living in the apartment over the president's garage, were false and entirely contrary to the principles for which Evans stood. It is very strongly believed by this writer that Evans would never knowingly waste a dollar of the state's money, even in the good cause of giving aid to a needy and worthy student; and that Evans would have testified in the face of any such charge of this nature that the abundance of *necessary* work always cancelled any temptation to put a student through the mere motion rather than doing something honest and worthwhile.

The writer is conscious that thousands of words have already been published about the extracurricular activities of Lyndon Johnson on the campus. Generally, these reports are accurate and most assuredly would be an enviable page in the record of any student on any American college campus. Moreover, his transcript also shows a creditable scholastic record. As one of his teachers, I was to be given a still closer insight into his manner of thinking than had been mine already from my association with him in the president's office. As has already been recorded,' Lyndon became preoccupied with journalism early in his college career. However, no course in journalism was offered by which the aspiring young journalist could learn something more than was available to him from observation. Ever athirst for knowledge above and beyond his reach, he petitioned Dean A. H. Nolle to place a course in journalism in the curriculum. Dr. Nolle, in characteristic fashion, first looked at the records of the various faculty members, especially those in English and the other languages. In this search he discovered that I had credit from the University of Texas for nine semester hours in the subject, and he asked me to teach the course, provided a sufficient number of students could be obtained to justify the class. When Dr. Nolle informed Johnson what had been done, Lyndon immediately came to me and said: "Leave it to me: I'll get; a class. He recruited four others, and Dean Nolle let the class of five materialize. This was the winter term of 1929.

---

<sup>2</sup>See Lyndon Baines Johnson, *The Formative Years*, by Pool, Craddock, and Conrad, 1966, Southwest Texas State College Press, Chap. VI.

I decided that with this limited offering only one course in the subject, instruction in news writing, headline writing and format, or makeup, would be what these students most needed. Lyndon was, perhaps, the only student who was genuinely interested in the subject, and he easily earned an **A** in the course. Something of his leadership in other matters was revealed in the enrollment in the class. Enrolled with Johnson were his old friends Wilton Woods, H. E. Richards, J. A. Clayton, and a girl, Elaine Smith. No doubt these signed for the course mainly because of the urgent request of Johnson.

The course appeared afterwards in the College catalog, English 119, for several years and proved to be a fairly popular course.

One of the assignments in that first class was to "make up" the front page of a newspaper. In order to do this, I had first explained that the gathering of news for a front page was something like gathering driftwood along the banks of the Mississippi River. One never knows what the river will bring, nor what will happen for tomorrow's newspaper headlines; nor what the magnitude of any event will be. Therefore, the editor is in the position of selecting from the happenings of the day all over the world. He may not be able to record all these happenings, or the news may be so scarce as to force him to use less significant items for the front page. I asked the class to clip from newspapers enough stories, mixing long with short items to fill their proposed page. Then I put the clippings in a box and thoroughly mixed them. In turn, each student drew from the box until all the clippings were gone. Thus each "editor" had before him a list of events, and it was the student's duty to classify these items according to importance and show this "ranking" of the news by position on the '(front page."

On this assignment Lyndon was given only a **B**—an occasion in which the judgment of the student was up against the judgment of the instructor. He brought the project back and undertook to explain his understanding of each situation in which I had made a critical comment. Some of his contentions were really sound, and I placed a question mark beside the **B**. However, this one mark did not weigh heavily enough to lower the final grade.

Lyndon was eager to learn from his elders. His father told me that Lyndon revealed this trait when very young. The boy would sit at his father's feet and listen to conversations with neighbors and friends instead of indulging in play as would the usual child. Lyndon seemed to believe that any person who was farther along the road of life than he might be helpful to him. He sought the advice of most people with whom he was closely associated.

There is no doubt that he talked to President Evans about his plans for the future, but there is considerable doubt that Evans ever urged him, as did Professor H. M. Greene, to go into politics. The most valid reason for this belief is that there was no real evidence at that time that Lyndon wished to be a politician or that he expressed any desire to hold public office; certainly, he expressed no such desire to me in the many conversations I had with him. But just as certainly, on the other hand, President Evans would not have discouraged Johnson from any undertaking in which he expressed an interest.

For Lyndon Johnson there arrived finally that never-to-be-forgotten moment one hot August evening in 1930, at a spot on the campus called Riverside, when he was awarded the bachelor's degree. It was the custom of President Evans to make an appropriate comment on many of the graduates who took their diplomas from his hands. It was often a very agreeable surprise to the graduate, for instance, to hear President Evans remark publicly that this student had achieved his goal in spite of the fact that he was the father of three children and had worked his way through the entire four years of college; and certainly his good wife deserved her share of the honor. Or for another to find out that the president of the College was aware of the fact that this graduating student was the fifth in his family to take the degree at Southwest Texas State Teachers College, the first being his father, then his mother, and then two sisters. There were numbers of these brief eulogies.

When Lyndon Johnson walked with quick vigorous steps across the crude outdoor stage, there was already a smile on "Prexy's" face before the youth came to a halt. President Evans delivered the parchment, shook hands with Lyndon, but detained him a moment. He said: "Here's a young man who has so abundantly demonstrated his worth that I predict for him great

things in the years ahead. If he undertakes his tasks in the future with the same energy, careful thought, and determination that he has used in all his work in the classroom, on the campus picking up rocks, or **as** an assistant in the president's office, success to him is assured."<sup>3</sup>

I was sitting beside Lyndon's father on this occasion, and as these words were spoken by President Evans, Sam Ealy Johnson leaned over and whispered to me: 'We shall never forget what President Evans has done for our boy.'

### Johnson's Career

After his graduation, Lyndon never lost touch with President Evans nor with a great many other friends in San Marcos. During the Christmas holidays, 1931, he came to my home, bringing a sheaf of letters of Congressman Kleberg, for whom he was then secretary." Lyndon was looking for stenographic help. I offered to help him, and he dictated to me the answers to this correspondence. I transcribed the letters on Kleberg's official letterheads which Lyndon carried in his briefcase. At that time his Washington office may not have been very well organized, **as** he had been there only about two weeks. Lyndon spent most of the day in San Marcos and included a visit with President and Mrs. Evans.

President Evans followed Lyndon's political fortunes with great interest. When Lyndon resigned from the position as secretary to Congressman Kleberg in 1935 to accept appointment as state director of the National Youth Administration of Texas, President Evans was again in close touch with him, and a unit of enrollees in that undertaking was assigned to Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

In 1937 when Lyndon announced his candidacy in the special election to fill the position left vacant by the death of Congressman James P. Buchanan, he made the opening speech of his cam-

---

<sup>3</sup> President Evans frequently devoted several hours before a graduating exercise—with my help and that of Miss Ethel Davis, assistant registrar, who knew almost everybody ever to set foot on the campus at that time—in assembling short sketches appropriate to be used with the several diplomas of those who merited special attention.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Emmie Craddock gives a most interesting account of Kleberg's campaign, his victory, and the appointment of Johnson as secretary. *Lyndon Baines Johnson, The Formative years, op. cit.*, pp. 167-173.

paign on March 7 in the College auditorium in Old Main. Here was, no doubt, the greatest temptation President Evans ever had to introduce an avowed political candidate on the platform of the College. However, this honor was given to County Judge Will Burnett.<sup>5</sup> Although it was a steadfast policy of Evans not to take an active part in political contests of any kind, nevertheless he was very much interested in Lyndon's campaign for the House seat in Washington. Evans made many contacts as he traveled over the state, and he wrote a circular letter to all the other presidents of the teachers colleges, saying, "Lyndon's friends believe the ex-students of all the teachers colleges should help elect Lyndon as the representative most likely to be interested in the welfare of these institutions." Lyndon's victory gave Evans unbounded pleasure.

In the years following, because of his close relationship with the young congressman, Evans was requested occasionally to use his influence with Lyndon Johnson. On one of these occasions two of the regents of the College<sup>a</sup> joined in asking Evans to recommend their endeavor to establish a "State Capital Broadcasting Station" in Austin, Texas, for which they were seeking approval by the Federal Communications Commission. May 5, 1937, Evans wrote as follows:

Dear Lyndon: R. B. Anderson, Jess Wallrer, and R. A. Stuart are making a fight for approval of a State Capital Broadcasting Station. I have only a limited personal knowledge of the project, but I do know Anderson and Stuart well. This project concerns the Tenth District and will, therefore, come directly to you. In any event, I think you may expect one of the two men or a representative of these men to call on you in Washington. Any consideration you may show them will be appreciated.

With kind personal regards,

On the same date and enclosed with the above letter, Evans wrote a short note:

Dear Lyndon: The attached letter is written at the request of two of my regents. I do not know what is involved in it and, therefore, I am not in position to give you advice. Do what you please. Sincerely

---

<sup>5</sup> San Marcos *Record*, Friday, **March 12**, 1937.

<sup>a</sup>One of these regents was R. A. Stuart of Fort Worth, president of the board. Evans did not reveal the name of the other. Two other names were mentioned, presumably attorneys representing Stuart and the other regent.



For the few remaining years while Evans was in office he suppressed to a great extent his desire to get out and campaign for Lyndon, much as he would have enjoyed doing so. However, he lost no opportunity to speak privately to his acquaintances in Johnson's behalf. On March 2, 1938, Evans attended the 102nd Anniversary Celebration of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence at Old Washington on the Brazos. The next day he wrote Lyndon in part as follows:

. . . There was a tremendous crowd from a large area of South Texas. Bishop C. E. Byrne of Galveston and Governor James V. Allred were the principal speakers. A number of prominent visitors including judges of the higher courts and state officials from the Capital were present.

In mixing among the prominent citizens and representative people from the different sections, I gathered much of political matters now going on. I heard your race of 1937 and your services in Washington mentioned quite a number of times. Without a single exception, the person making the statement openly declared that you would not have any opposition, and if any person had so little sense as to run against you, he would not get to the first station. There seemed to be considerable sentiment against any person embarrassing you at this time by a fight on you in the primary. So far as I can judge, the Brenham country is just about as much for you as this county, and I think you know what this county will do. I should also mention the enthusiastic friendship for you of Mrs. J. V. Carroll. Mrs. Carroll took a great deal of pleasure in telling me and Mrs. Evans of the hard fight she made for you in 1937 and her enthusiasm over your record in Washington. Spinn, Ehlert, and the Brenham Mayor appeared to be holding your lines intact.?

I thought you would like to know these things.  
With highest personal regards,

Evans was also active in Lyndon's behalf in another way. As an example, in early February, 1938, he wrote an editorial for the San Marcos **Record** as follows:

The Austin Statesman, Sunday, January 30, 1938, carried a strong editorial commending the services of Lyndon B. Johnson, Congressman of the Tenth Texas District, which includes both Travis and Hays Counties. The editorial properly suggests that, in view of the services Johnson has

---

<sup>7</sup> Richard Spinn, B. S., 1930, and Berry W. Ehlert, B. A. 1933, friends of Johnson.

rendered, he should be unopposed in the primaries of 1938, thereby freeing him of the expense and burden of a campaign, and enabling him to give his full time to the needs of his district. The Record observes with considerable interest the achievements of Congressman Johnson, achievements almost without parallel in the things put over successfully. Financing the Colorado River projects. Austin Public Buildings, slum clearance program, and farm tenant benefits constitute a small but a very significant part of a very fine piece of work. The Record mentions with special interest that Congressman Johnson obtained an additional carrier for the San Marcos Postal Delivery, and a Public Works Administration Grant of \$25,000 for the Education Building Addition at Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

The Record cordially joins the American Statesman in the endorsement of the splendid services of Congressman Lyndon Johnson. We feel personal interest in the achievements of our young Congressman, who was a resident of San Marcos a number of years, completed his education in our College, and identified himself for several years as a citizen in our county. We insist that his splendid piece of congressional work forecasts a much larger program of achievement for the future, which his constituents should, without opposition for reelection, give him the chance to carry on.<sup>8</sup>

On August 19, 1942, Lyndon Johnson accepted the invitation of President Evans to speak at the last commencement exercise over which Evans would preside. Evans regarded the occasion as so important and was so desirous of paying adequate tribute to Lyndon that he had typed and read the introduction of his erstwhile protege, instead of relying on his usual Redbook notes:

### Introduction of Lyndon B. Johnson

#### Graduating Exercises

Wednesday evening, August 19, 1942

Some fifteen years ago, a tall, stout-looking (sic) Johnson City boy, with ambition and pep galore came to Southwest Texas State Teachers College, he wanted a sure-enough, honest-to-God education along with a happy, helpful college life. To stay in college, he wasn't afraid to soil his hands in labor; he could cut weeds or dig ditches on the campus, or sweep floors in buildings. He and two other boys slept in

---

<sup>8</sup>This editorial was not published in the San Marcos Record, perhaps for lack of space or timeliness—certainly not because of a contrary belief by the Record management.

a room over the President's garage and called it their home. Every time he moved, it was up; every time he met a college boy, he made a friend; every time he led, boys scrambled to follow. In a very short time he was an assistant in Prexy's office. He did a good job; he always does a good job. You couldn't meet him without liking him; you couldn't know him without trusting him.

His winning qualities became known over large areas. The Tenth Texas Congressional District trusted him in **elec**-tion to Congress in 1937; in 1942, county after county in his district signed the petition to place his name on the ticket for the democratic primary. The people gave him a vote that looked like unanimity.

In Congress at Washington, his influence was powerful. He is the friend of our Commander-in-Chief, Franklin De-lano Roosevelt. If civilization is to be saved, the world's greatest war leader, President Roosevelt, is going to do it. Roosevelt trusts Lyndon Johnson to the limit. Johnson has been with Admiral Ghormley in the South Sea battles; the Navy knows and appreciates Johnson. Our cups are full and running over with joy at having him, here for our g aduat-ing exercises. I present Lyndon B. Johnson, a great Texan and a great American, growing greater and still greater in our country's service in the crises of World War.

Early in July, 1946, President and Mrs. Evans drove to Aus-tin to hear one of Johnson's campaign speeches in his campaign for reelection. Evans became so enthusiastic over Lyndon's speech that in a day or two he sent to the Austin American the following communication :

Dear Editor: On Saturday night, July 6, 1946, after I heard Congressman Johnson's address in Wooldridge Park, I said to Mrs. Evans: "I heard Jim Hogg in Austin, in 1896, make the greatest speech I ever listened to. I heard our Congress-man make a greater one tonight."

C. E. Evans, San Marcos, Texas

Evans constantly encouraged Lyndon by his letters. After the crucial campaign in the race for United States Senator against the veteran state politician and former governor, Coke R. Steven-son, Evans wrote Johnson a very encouraging letter of congratu-lation and praise. On October 4, 1948, Lyndon replied:

It really brightened my day to find your thoughtful and friendly letter on my desk. I appreciate so much your interest in me through all these years.

It makes me very happy to know that you tell your colleagues such stories as was related by Dr. Hill. It has been a long time now since those days in college, but I still remember them very clearly, and I am certainly pleased to know that you haven't forgotten.

Please let me hear from you soon. It always brightens my day to receive a letter from you.

After Evans' retirement, he was free to take whatever part he desired in political activity. In Lyndon's campaign for the United States Senate in 1948, already mentioned, Evans rendered very valuable assistance in helping to win the paper-thin margin of 87 votes by which Lyndon won the contest. This assistance was in the form of a letter addressed to thousands of ex-students of the College. The letterhead bore the address of Evans, 222 Talbot Street, San Marcos, Texas. It was dated June 15, 1948:

Dear Friend: Speaking with all my heart from more than fifty years in schools, and remembering kindly the thousands of former students and other strong friends, I desire to tell the story of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Lyndon came to my office in 1927, asking to work his way through college, like hundreds of other poor boys. Working first on the college campus and in buildings, and later promoted to assistant in the President's Office, his years in college earned for him the standard degree, with splendid academic record. His magnetic personality built close friendships among students, faculty and San Marcos citizens.

After teaching in Cotulla, Pearsall and in Houston high school, he served as Secretary to Congressman Kleberg; resigning this place to become State Director of NYA, he had the coveted opportunity to assist thousands of boys and girls all over Texas to get an education. Elected to Congress in 1937, Lyndon has the record of a "Go-getter" in service to cities, towns, schools, and colleges of his district, including the addition of essential buildings to our college plant. Southwestern University honors his distinguished service to that institution by conferring on him the degree of Doctor of Laws.

I know, honor and love Lyndon Johnson as I would a son. He will prove a valuable friend to education on all fronts. Lyndon favors Federal aid to public schools without Federal control, assuring better salaries for all teachers just as Smith-Hughes Schools now pay better salaries all over the South, in districts and counties. Furthermore, in

No one will dispute now that the State Board of Education made one of its wisest decisions when you were chosen to be principal of Southwest Texas Normal back in 1911. The position could not have been given to a man who better fitted it than you, as those who have known and loved you through the years will testify. I, for one, am mighty glad that you were able to disappoint those who fought to get you out of the job after the first year.

I certainly hope that I can do as much with my talent and my life from my 40th birthday on as you have done during the same span. Certainly, you are correct in pointing out that the precedent of Federal interference in State affairs would lead to a hopeless jumble of contested elections and virtually deprive the voters of any say-so in choosing elected officials. I was greatly pleased by Justice Black's decision upholding the rights of the State.

Your interest in me is something I'll never forget. I was very happy that I could pay tribute to the work you have done in a state-wide radio broadcast on the last night of my campaign. I shall always owe you a great debt for the guidance and inspiration that you gave me when I was just a kid . . . .

And on January 1, 1951, Lyndon acknowledged another letter from his beloved Prexy:

Thank you very much for your message of congratulation upon my election as Majority Whip. Your thoughtfulness in taking the time to let me know your sentiments is very gratifying.

I am indeed humble and proud to have this opportunity of serving the people of Texas in my new position.

Please let me continue to hear from you in the future. It is certainly heart-warming to know that I have friends such as you.

All of Lyndon's letters were addressed to Mr. and Mrs. Evans.

At every opportunity or excuse, Lyndon communicated with Evans. The occasion for the following letter, dated January 27, 1951, is revealed in the communication :

I have just read an article by Dr. J. A. Hill in the Amarillo Times of January 9. The article commended me highly and, according to Dr. Hill, was based to a great extent on information he received from you.

my judgment, this election will decide the fate of the pending Taft Bill which provides better salaries for teachers.

Lyndon has my endorsement as to character, honesty, integrity and all-round ability. His election to the United States Senate will promote our common cause of education, conserve the best interests of Texas and the nation and give Texas an outstanding young statesman for service in the Senate. I believe that you will want to become an active worker in Lyndon's behalf and I urge you to do so at once.

Sincerely

(Signed) C. E. Evans<sup>9</sup>

### Help With The **Laboratory School**

As indicated in another chapter of this study,<sup>10</sup> President Evans in 1938 began negotiations with the Public Works Administration for a grant and a loan for the construction of a building to be used as a laboratory school for practice teaching.. Congressman Lyndon Johnson devoted himself tirelessly to the Evans application. After several delays and considerable doubt that the request would be granted at all, Lyndon telegraphed President Evans on Saturday, October 15, 1938: "I stayed over here until today and put the job over. I have asked my office to notify you. This announcement cannot be released until Monday night. This is given you in strictest confidence. Please do not release." Two days later on October 17, another telegram was received by Evans: "Glad to advise you our efforts have finally met with success. Got PWA to approve Docket 2178 today, grant of \$112,909 and loan of \$71,000. LBJ"

As noted in the chapter on the laboratory school, negotiations with the San Marcos School Board failed, and Evans amended his application for the construction of a building to house the lower grades of the San Marcos public schools and provide for an auditorium for the use of the College. The amendment was secured with the able assistance of Congressman Johnson and the senators from Texas. When this grant was approved, President Evans received telegrams from both United States Senators from Texas as well as from Johnson.

---

<sup>9</sup> Evans refused to allow these form letters to be signed with a rubber stamp. He sat for many hours writing his familiar signature at the close of each letter.

---

<sup>10</sup> See chapter entitled "The Laboratory School."

It was natural that President Evans would invite Lyndon to the dedication ceremonies upon the completion of the Auditorium-Laboratory School Building, now Evans Academic Center. However, Lyndon did not find it possible to attend. He telegraphed on April 5, 1940:

Deeply regret that duties here prevent my being with you today for dedication of your Auditorium-Laboratory School Building. This building along with other outstanding improvements your progressive administration has brought to the College, will stand as a monument to your untiring efforts in behalf of Central Texans who want an opportunity to attend college. The fine spirit of cooperation the College and the citizens of San Marcos have always manifested stimulate those of us who are anxious to see our Federal Government aid us in meeting the problems presented, and Central Texas folks are better today for the efforts all of us have made to improve our great institution.

### "Bird" Johnson Takes Over

It is recorded history that Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson announced in his campaign for reelection in 1940 that if the United States entered the war he would immediately join the armed forces and fight shoulder to shoulder with the sons of his constituents, and that Johnson made good this promise. While he was away from his office in Washington, his talented wife Lady Bird became both a secretary and a goodwill ambassador for her husband. President Evans called to see Mrs. Johnson at the Congressman's office in Washington in the spring of 1942 and was immensely pleased with the reception he received. Upon his return to San Marcos, he wrote her an enthusiastic letter of thanks, and he assured her that he would do everything possible to see that Lyndon's name was placed on the ballot for reelection that year, notwithstanding the congressman's absence from the office for service in the Navy. On May 5, 1942, Mrs. Johnson wrote the following letter to President Evans:

Another example that old friends are the best friends!  
There is no substitute.

The petition from our good friends in San Marcos and Hays County requesting that Lyndon's name be placed on the ballot for reelection this summer has just been received. Lyndon has never had a finer tribute in his whole life, and it makes us very humble to know that our friends back home

think so much of the work he has tried to do for the district. It makes us want to work harder each day.

I am well aware of the work you did in helping get such a good number of signers in Hays County, and of course, you know that I deeply appreciate it. Lyndon thinks you are one of the best men in the world, as we all do.

In her own handwriting Mrs. Johnson added the following: "By the way, I expect you have heard that Lyndon is now in the Southwest Pacific battle area!" Mrs. Johnson's letter has every appearance of having been typed by herself. The letterhead shows that Lyndon was at that time a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

May 16, 1942, the next day after the board of regents elected his successor, President Evans wrote Lady Bird Johnson as follows:

At a meeting Friday, May 15, J. G. Flowers, who is now president of State Teachers College at Lock Haven, Pa., was elected to succeed me. Flowers was a student in this college in 1912-13; I knew him real well, After teaching several years, he drifted to East Texas and graduated from the East Texas Normal College, and was director of the training school there for several years. Transferring to the position of dean of the State Teachers College at Montclair, N. J., he had an opportunity to go back and forth to Columbia University in New York and earn his doctor's degree. After three years as dean of the college, Flowers was elected president of the State Teachers College at Lock Haven.

Mrs. Flowers was Lora Hogan, a student in our college for several years, including 1915-16. J. G. Flowers and Lora Hogan married in the Hogan boarding house on our campus in the fall of 1916. I knew Mrs. Flowers' family well.

Quoting statements given in the newspaper: "One of our boys and one of our girls have come back home."

I would appreciate it as a kindness shown me if you will write President Flowers at Lock Haven expressing Lyndon's and your interest in him as my successor. He has been a staunch friend of mine all the years, and all his wife's family have been my friends. Make it a good, strong, cordial letter.

I will probably continue in San Marcos, accepting an emeritus relation. I will continue as president until August 31, 1942. Mrs. Evans and I will live in our home on Belvin Street, San Marcos, which will be my office number. I am



expecting to be in Washington some time in the spring. In arranging a conference with me in Washington please remember that on my last visit to Washington I set up an office so as to be able to work cordially with you. My office is 1320 House of Representatives Building.

With highest personal regards to both of you: the best Congressman Texas ever had, and the best secretary of the best Congressman Texas ever had.. .

May 19, Mrs. Johnson replied to Evans' letter:

I am grateful to you for taking time off from your busy day to write us in complete detail concerning the new Head of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

Of course, I knew it was coming, but to see the official announcement that a new President has been elected marks the end of an epoch to us. No one will ever take your place with the College, with the City, or with Lyndon and me.

I was very fond of the office headquarters you had on your last visit to Washington and want to assure you that your desk will be clean and your office chair spick and span when you return.

With best wishes and love,

(Signed) Bird Johnson

One of the very last communications from Lyndon left among the Evans papers was a copy of the telegram which Lyndon sent on April 12, 1955, on the occasion of the autograph party given in honor of Evans on the publication of his book *The Story of **Texas** Schools*. The telegram reads :

Wish I could be with you today to enjoy with you another great contribution you have made to the people of Texas. I look forward with great anticipation to reading your book, because there is no one of whom I am more fond and to whom I owe a greater debt.

Lyndon B. Johnson

## XVIII PERSONAL GLIMPSES **Family Man**

The figure of a man in his late thirties with a ruddy, Irish complexion leading a little readheaded girl of, pe haps, seven, carefully dodging the horse-drawn carriages and buggies and

expecting to be in Washington some time in the spring. In arranging a conference with me in Washington please remember that on my last visit to Washington I set up an office so as to be able to work cordially with you. My office is 1320 House of Representatives Building.

With highest personal regards to both of you: the best Congressman Texas ever had, and the best secretary of the best Congressman Texas ever had.. .

May 19, Mrs. Johnson replied to Evans' letter:

I am grateful to you for taking time off from your busy day to write us in complete detail concerning the new Head of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

Of course, I knew it was coming, but to see the official announcement that a new President has been elected marks the end of an epoch to us. No one will ever take your place with the College, with the City, or with Lyndon and me.

I was very fond of the office headquarters you had on your last visit to Washington and want to assure you that your desk will be clean and your office chair spick and span when you return.

With best wishes and love,

(Signed) Bird Johnson

One of the very last communications from Lyndon left among the Evans papers was a copy of the telegram which Lyndon sent on April 12, 1955, on the occasion of the autograph party given in honor of Evans on the publication of his book *The Story of **Texas** Schools*. The telegram reads :

Wish I could be with you today to enjoy with you another great contribution you have made to the people of Texas. I look forward with great anticipation to reading your book, because there is no one of whom I am more fond and to whom I owe a greater debt.

Lyndon B. Johnson

## XVIII PERSONAL GLIMPSES **Family Man**

The figure of a man in his late thirties with a ruddy, Irish complexion leading a little readheaded girl of, pe haps, seven, carefully dodging the horse-drawn carriages and buggies and

dray wagons, and an occasional, rather fearsome automobile on the streets of the capital city of Texas, is a picture drawn with vivid words by that tiny girl, now a grandmother. The man was Cecil Eugene Evans, slightly less than medium height, inclined to be thickset and muscular; whose small feet moved with energy and precision, and whose sensitive hands firmly but gently guided his little daughter along the bumpy sidewalks and the roughly paved streets. They always walked, the two of them, because they had no other means of conveyance. As the man and child came to a vacant lot, the little girl exclaimed at the sight of a merry-go-round, and they paused to look over the contraption standing idle for lack of customers. The manager, in response to Evans' casual inquiry as to the state of the business, at once launched into a pitiful tale of his failure to get patronage. Whereupon Evans gave him some money, and the grateful man started the merry-go-round and gave little Bernice Evans a ride all by herself.

Evans' concern for his only child never ceased, although, as Bernice—now Mrs. Erwin Soyars—declares, he never would admit just how great was his concern when she was very young.

C. E. Evans married Miss Allie Maxwell of Anson, May 18, 1899. Two years previously, Miss Maxwell had graduated from the Anson (Texas) high school where her future husband was the *principal*, as he was called at that time. Actually, he was the head of the entire public school system of Anson. Miss Maxwell had attended the Sam Houston State Normal Institute at Huntsville after her graduation from high school. The Evanses made their home in Anson where their daughter was born.

Who's Who In America (Volume 23, 1944-1945) lists Cecil Eugene Evans as having been born in Bowden, Georgia, January 21, 1871. The Evans family moved to Alabama when Cecil was two or three years old. Here Cecil grew to manhood. His parents were Hiram Martin and Georgia Ann (Striplin) Evans. From both sides, Evans was a direct descendant of pioneer immigrants from the British Isles. On his mother's side the Striplin family could be traced to William Striplin, who served in the Revolutionary War. His father, H. M. Evans, a teacher at the age of 20, enlisted in the Confederate army as a lieutenant, was captured at Missionary Ridge, and spent months in the Johnson

Island prison on Lake Erie. Here he was allowed a few textbooks and writing materials so that he could teach his fellow prisoners of war to read and write.

Seven children were born to H. M. and Georgia Ann Evans, four girls and three boys, Cecil being the second child and eldest of the three boys. H. M. Evans, the father, is described as "a very slender, tall, stately gentleman of the old school, his coat always on in the hottest weather, and a mouth full of gold teeth."<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Soyars relates:

"When Grandfather came, he and Dad had the most lengthy and sometimes bitter arguments over religion, politics, and many other matters, such as maneuvers of battle and strategy. But we always had family prayers when Grandfather came. When he got ready for his bedtime, he got his Bible, read a scripture, and then we all got down with him on our knees and he prayed. His prayers were classics, and I wish I had copies or could remember the wording; however, his choice of words and proper speech were always observed."

When Cecil was near the age of 13, his mother died on November 25, 1883. Her age was only 37, and she left a family of seven children ranging in age from an infant son, Hiram Wesley, to a daughter, Virginia, age 15.

Cecil began teaching in Alabama in 1889, after graduating from Oxford College (Alabama) the previous year; then he came with his father and the family to Texas in 1892 or 1893 and lived at Fairfield, in Freestone County, where the father was a teacher. Here, according to one record,<sup>2</sup> Cecil assisted his father in the school work. Cecil taught at Mexia during the sessions of 1894-1895. In 1896 he was elected superintendent of schools at Anson, Texas, and was probably the youngest superintendent (age 25) ever to be elected to that position. He remained at Anson until 1902. From that post he went to Merkel as superintendent of schools and remained there until 1906; and from 1906 to 1908 in a like capacity he served the Abilene school system.

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Mrs. Bernice Evans Soyars, Sabinal, Texas, February 9, 1961.

<sup>2</sup> *Houston Post*, Sunday, November 6, 1938.

Throughout his life Cecil Eugene Evans performed deeds of service and help to his relatives. The younger brother, Hiram Wesley, lived with Cecil Eugene and his wife and went to school at Anson, and later, with the financial help of Cecil, attended a college of dentistry and followed the profession of dentist until he assumed leadership of the Ku Klux Klan. A half-brother, Marcius (Mark) Evans, lived in the Evans home on the San Marcos College campus.<sup>3</sup> Evans assisted his father in numerous ways, and the elder Evans also lived briefly in the C. E. Evans home while he reviewed certain college subjects. In a Redbook note in 1925, President Evans made the following comment: "Evans family attending the College—wife, Mrs. Allie M. Evans; daughter, Mrs. E. L. Soyars; son-in-law, E. L. Soyars; Mrs. Laura Booth, sister; H. M. Evans, father."

In another Redbook note he listed nine relatives who served in the Confederate army: "Two died in service and one was badly crippled. Two in-laws who married Evans women also served in the Confederate army." President Evans was very proud of his younger brother Arthur W. 'when the latter joined the faculty of the Texas Technological College. Dr. Arthur W. Evans had previously been assistant to State Superintendent of Public Instruction S. M. N. Marrs, and he had served for twenty years as superintendent of the public schools of Uvalde, Texas.

President Evans was very fond of his grandchildren, the sons and daughter of Erwin and Bernice Soyars. The granddaughter, Leerie Soyars, was born with a slight physical defect which caused Evans poignant worry until the child, with the best of medical care which her grandfather assisted in providing, overcame the difficulty. President Evans noted in his personal files the many important occasions in the lives of the grandchildren—their educational achievements, their positions attained after graduation, their marriages, and the births of their children—his great grandchildren. When his first great granddaughter was a few weeks old, he received a note from the infant's mother, wife of Erwin Soyars, Jr., inviting him to visit the family and approve of the baby. Then she assured him, in a spirit of fun, that if his approval should be withheld, she was not going to "send the very beautiful baby back."

---

<sup>3</sup> Letter from Mrs. Soyars already mentioned.

## Achievements

Unlike most teachers at that time, Evans carried on graduate study during his years as superintendent of public schools, and in 1906 he received the master of arts degree from the University of Texas. In 1908 he accepted the position which brought to him the opportunity of making his first real contribution to statewide education in Texas as general agent and campaign worker for the Conference for Education in Texas.

Will H. Mayes, feature writer for the *Houston Post*, said of Evans' work with the Conference for Education in Texas:

The Evans energy made this campaign quite successful and fruitful, as it culminated in three school amendments to the state constitution:

- (1) An amendment authorizing the increase of local school tax, making possible better schools.
- (2) An amendment authorizing county-line school districts.
- (3) An amendment validating outstanding school bonds.

These amendments were the most fruitful accomplishments of this conference, whose outstanding purpose it was "to help every legitimate educational endeavor in the state."<sup>4</sup>

The Conference for Education in Texas was permanently organized at Austin, February 22 and 23, 1907."

After his appointment to the presidency of the College in 1911, he was never for very long without duties state-wide in nature. In 1912 Governor Colquitt placed him on the State Textbook Commission, on which he served for sixteen years until the commission was abolished by a constitutional amendment in 1928. Shortly after the termination of his service on the Textbook Commission, Evans made the following memorandum in the Redbook:

1. Appointed to the State Textbook Commission, 1912.
2. Forty-three adoptions, valued at more than twelve million dollars.
3. Books submitted: 200 readers, 60 arithmetics, 80 grammars.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Houston Post*, *op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> For a fuller account of his service and the resultant influence of this upon his future life at San Marcos, see Chapter I of this study.

4. Rules governing adoptions :
  - (a) Open sessions.
  - (b) Book agents invited to leave Austin.
  - (c) No lobbying
5. Clean, good adoptions.

Other notes showed that he made a thorough study of books submitted for adoption. In 1918 the legislature established the State Textbook Nominating Commission, for the purpose of submitting a list of names for members to be appointed to the State Textbook Board. The Nominating Commission was made entirely ex-officio, the act naming the state superintendent of public instruction, the presidents of the University of Texas, the Agricultural and Mechanical College, the College of Industrial Arts, and the Southwest Texas State Teachers College. Thus Evans continued in the new capacity on the Commission, In this position, Evans was charged with his part of the responsibility for nominating fifteen individuals each biennium, from whom the governor selected seven members to serve on the Textbook Board. In an article written for the *Texas Outlook*, Evans said of the work of the Commission:

The sessions of the Texas State Textbook Commission were harmonious, and its decisions, with but few exceptions, were made with unanimity. Names were suggested to the full Commission, freely discussed, legal objections, to membership considered, and selection made. There was an honest, conscientious effort at each meeting to make high-grade appointments, free from partisan considerations. Occasionally, members of the commission received suggestions of names from outside sources, but these names were considered in open meeting on the basis of merit."

Evans incurred a small amount of ill will when he advocated the rotation of the members each biennium and that at least three changes in the personnel of the Textbook Board be made every two years. However, only one member who was not retained on the Board by reason that the commission did not recommend him for reappointment ever allowed his dissatisfaction to be made known to the Commission. From 1921 to 1942 Evans was the representative of the Texas State Teachers Colleges on the committee on affiliation of high schools. From 1911 to 1923 Evans served as secretary of the Council of

Teachers College Presidents, and from 1923 to 1942 he served as president of the Council. In the latter position he was frequently the spokesman for the group in the relations with the Board of Regents of the Teachers Colleges and with the several state boards and the governor's office.

### **Champion of Student Activities**

In his printed annual report to the board of regents, August 31, 1927, President Evans devoted more space to "Student Activities" than to any other item. In this part he referred the regents to Spaulding's Official Football Guide for 1927, which mentioned in favorable terms the Bobcat team and Lyons McCall, the outstanding halfback for the previous season. Evans then called attention to the records of Ben Brite, the winner of the 440-yard run, and Claude Dailey, record-holder in pole vault, who were instrumental in winning the T. I. A. A. championship in 1926. He also praised the Pedagog, student annual of 1926, which won the All-American rating in competition with student annuals from all parts of the country, and won first place in the Texas Intercollegiate Press Association contest that year. Lela Stulting was editor and Dee Horton was business manager. Evans concluded this part of his report with the following observation: "In the modern college the activities of students outside the academic studies occupy a large portion of time. The oversight of student activities is, therefore, one of the major responsibilities of college authorities. . . ."

Retired Director of Athletics and Head of the Department of Physical Education at the College, O. W. (Oskie) Strahan, said to President Evans in 1955:

It was back in 1919, in the Union Station at St. Louis, that you hired a young man from Iowa as your director of athletics and coach. You acted quickly, and the business part of that conference was short and to the point; however, afterwards there was time for a personal chat. That procedure was characteristic of all the sessions we had in the next twenty-four years that you were my boss. I recall that at our Union Station meeting you told me that the College had no gymnasium—that there were only a few gymnasiums in the South, due to the mild climate. However, just a year and a half later you called me in and told me that we had to have a gym.



We built one in a hurry, with the faculty and students pitching in to help. We didn't get it quite finished before the first game. We played that first game before the roof was on, and, of course, it rained during all the game.

Throughout all the years of our relationship, your attitude toward athletics was the same as you have revealed in your book: that athletics was part of the whole educational process. Your long-range vision gave to athletics a stability which has been so helpful. I, as your coach, am thankful that you did not listen to the critics who wanted a change of coaches after each losing season.<sup>7</sup>

Strahan relates further :

To illustrate another trait of his character, when I came to the College, our football dressing room was a small narrow room with one cold-water shower under the baseball grandstand, which leaked very badly when it rained, and the fall of 1919 was a very rainy season. I asked for a dry room and hot-water showers and was given a spare room in the power house. Dr. Evans said that Rufus Wimberley would keep the place clean, but that he was the engineer and, therefore, should not be treated as a janitor.

For the first season of basketball, we used the assembly room of the old abandoned Coronal Institute across town. We padded three posts that ran down the middle and set up old-fashioned recitation seats around the wall for the public. We thought it would be ample seating space as we had been told that nobody in San Marcos liked basketball. For a bath after practice and games we dipped towels in a washtub heated by a kerosene stove. In the last game, there were so many people we had to lock the doors before the teams came out for pre-game warm-up practice. Some spectators climbed in windows after the doors were locked, and there was scarcely room to play.

Dr. Evans came up to me right after the game—how he got in I don't know—and said to me, "Strahan, we've just got to have a gym."

For the way he worked to get us a respectable athletic field, it was voted to name it Evans Field. When he was voted into the T-Association, a delegation went over to his office and asked him to come to the meeting. He came in bristling and ready to say "No" to whatever request was going to be made to him. I shall never forget his expression of surprise

---

<sup>7</sup> Program on KTBC-TV in Austin, **April 18, 1966**, 7:30 p.m. This program was a public service presentation in honor of C. E. Evans.

and pride when he was told that he had just been made a member of the T-Association. I don't think he missed the annual "T" banquet from that time until his death. Lettermen were pallbearers at his funeral."

A list of the names of the captains of the football teams all through the years of the Evans administration reveals that a large percentage of these outstanding athletes were known personally by President Evans and that he took a special interest in them while they were students and after they finished their college work. Most of their names are included in the memoranda of the Redbook.

### **Student of Jurisprudence**

As a social thinker by nature, C. E. Evans found considerable pleasure in acquiring a knowledge of law. He had great respect for the legal profession and often compared the strict professional standards advocated in the practice of law with those in the teaching profession which in the early days were loose and unenforced.

He looked for and found authority in the law for the exercise of necessary control over students in college. In 1935, under the heading *Courts*, he cited twenty-six court decisions among which were the following:

1. University rules are binding if reasonable.
2. Formal hearings not necessary for dismissal or suspension of a student for using intoxicants in his home.
3. Regents have full power over buildings.
4. Control of college property rests with administration with approval of regents.
5. Construction of dormitory from funds for campus maintenance and improvement authorized.

He then copied the following quotations from case decisions on these additional subjects :

(a) As there are so few who are so stupid to make of teaching a life business, . . . the teacher is fairly well paid and his business is not in any way laborious or hazardous. It affords more leisure than any industrial business. In each week the teacher has only thirty working hours which are reduced by holidays and vacations.

---

8 Letter from O. W. Strahan, December, 1966.

(b) There can be little doubt that the effect of the costume worn by these Sisters of St. Joseph at all times in the presence of their pupils would be to inspire respect even sympathy for the religious denomination to which they so manifestly belong . . . The introduction into schools of teachers of persons who are by their striking and distinctive ecclesiastical robes necessarily and constantly asserting their membership in a particular church and in a religious order within that church and the subjection of their lives to the devotion and control of its officers. N. Y. 184: 428-9.

An incident which speaks for itself was recorded in the Redbook and dated August 16, 1933. The account shows that Evans paid damages to one Bernice Taylor for a small scratch or dent on the fender of her car. Evans noted that he was not to blame. However he went with the woman to the garage where the charge of \$3.50 was made by the repairman. Whereupon, Evans paid the money. Then he wrote a receipt on a page of the Redbook as follows: "Received of C. E. Evans \$3.50 in payment of damages in car accident." The receipt was signed, "Bernice Taylor, San Antonio, Texas." Evans then called upon the repairman to witness the receipt by adding his signature.

### Random Snapshots

The following brief comments are intended to give the reader a clearer conception of some of the traits of character and personality of President Evans.

Early in his career Evans developed the tendency to reify, perhaps a convenient device for any executive. His writings are full of such expressions as, "The College believes"; "The College will not permit"; "The College will cooperate." This trait was called to his attention by Gates Thomas, who suggested that Evans try to separate himself from the College.<sup>9</sup>

Evans was also somewhat prone to seize upon cliches and high-sounding words and phrases. Many were copied into the Redbook for possible future use. For example: "Voltaire observed, 'History is, after all, only a bag of tricks we play on the dead.' "

He loved old-fashioned oratory, For example, the following was recorded in the Redbook: "Lasso an avalanche, pin a napkin

---

<sup>9</sup> "Problems and Pillars," Chapter XI.

to the mouth of a volcano, skim the clouds from the sky with a teaspoon, paste a tent on the moon, and light your cigar with the flame of a falling star, but you can't convict this innocent girl."

In another place he quotes Mark Twain: "I hold my job because I know where the bad places ain't."

From the Dallas **News** of October 3, 1929, he took this aphorism: "If he can't build a good hen coop, you can't trust him to build a house."

As the solution to one problem in teacher training, he recorded: "Cooperation means so to conduct ourselves that others may be able to work with us."

The following well-known bit of verse appears in the Red-book in 1929:

### Peace

When navies are forgotten and fleets are useless things,  
When the dove shall warm her bosom beneath the eagle's  
wings;

When the memory of battles at last is strange and old,  
When nations have one banner, and creeds have one fold;  
When the hand that sprinkles midnight with the dust of  
powdered suns

Has hushed this tiny tumult of sects and swords and guns;  
Then Hate's last note of discord in all God's world shall  
cease

In the conquest which is service and the victory which is  
peace.

Under the heading "Karl Marx," Evans copied the following quotation:

He was a man embittered by persecution, enraged by passion of hate . . . It was hate that goaded him to his enormous literary description of industrial England; it was hate that fixed his economic principles, that twisted his arguments, that vitiated all his conclusions. *Das Kapital* (1867) is the Koran of class war . . . founder of satanic anti-religion, apostle of class-hatred." Inge, p. 99.

In a brief list of words, he included the phrase *belligerent misanthropy* and defined it as "ill-will directed against fellowman with no rime or reason."

In 1954, twelve years after his retirement from the presidency of the College, he put in the Redbook under the head of "Vital Speeches" the following: "If you could get religion like a Baptist, experience it like a Methodist, be loyal to it like a Jew, be proud of it like an Episcopalian, pay for it like a Presbyterian, and enjoy it like a Negro, what a great religion you would have !"<sup>10</sup>

The text, "Give the country boy a chance," was an integral part of Evans' conception of his duty to the youth of Texas. In a letter to President Estill, September 27, 1924, he said:

" . . . A young man over twenty-one years of age appreciates an opportunity to do something, has a much better attitude towards his work, and will respond to the opportunity. For instance, a mature married man from a ranch entered our freshman class some years ago, failing in almost all the work for the first term. Upon a statement that he had worked from eight to ten hours per day in the preparation of courses, in addition to classroom hours, and upon a plea for another chance, we enrolled him for the winter term, and his class average was between C and B. For the following year, his grades ranged between B and A, and he is one of the most satisfactory students we have ever turned out. It is my deliberate judgment that his classification was worth something less than the tenth grade."

On more than one occasion Evans' stormy emotion brought down on his head the lash of reproach from his colleagues. One of the earliest of these cases took place in 1915 when he wrote a bitterly-worded letter to President Bruce, alleging the latter's failure to live up to an agreement as to the length of the summer session. Bruce replied on May 31 that Evans had most certainly agreed to the length of the summer session but had later evidently changed his mind, and he concluded with a paragraph: "Think over my letter. Do not be rash, hasty, impetuous, headstrong, or stubborn."

Another such letter in 1918, written to President R. B. Cousins of Canyon, amounted to an accusation of unfair practice at the Canyon college in its failure to enforce entrance requirements for high school students. Cousins replied on January 12:

Replying to your emotional letter of January 9, I beg leave to suggest that possibly you did not read carefully the communication to which you refer. It was prepared by our

---

<sup>10</sup> Evans failed to give the source of this quotation.

committee on entrance, submitted to you for reference to your committee in order that problems arising in the admission of students might be solved in a practical way. . . . If you had read to the end of the communication you doubtless would have observed that Mr. Marquis' name was attached rather than mine.

Our institution has followed implicitly in every instance the agreements of the presidents confirmed by the action of the regents in the management of the normal schools. I am, therefore, somewhat puzzled to understand the implications of your letter.

A situation which Evans seemed to handle most awkwardly was one in which he found himself faced by an irate woman or a woman in any kind of trouble. Probably he was not at all unusual in this respect, as most men, no doubt, experience similar difficulty in a like situation.

A short time after I began work as part-time secretary in his office in the fall of 1922, one morning when I came from class I heard a commotion in the inner office and peered through the glass panel in the door to see what was going on. The College librarian, Miss Blanche Hawks, a New Englander-with a decided Yankee accent, was standing shaking her long finger in Evans' face, talking loudly and rapidly, while Evans, with what appeared to be a very faint smile on his lips, sat speechless. This was the woman's reaction to a mild reprimand and criticism for something which had gone wrong in the library. She terminated the conference with a fast exit. Evans sat for a moment or two and then strolled into the outer office. In one of the understatements of his life, he remarked, "Miss Hawks is somewhat sensitive!"

On another occasion a divorcee who was a tenant in one of the several cottages owned by the College got behind on her rent, and the business manager, after being consistently ignored for weeks, brought the case to President Evans. Evans wrote her a polite request to pay the back rent or vacate the property at once. She ignored this request also. Then Evans tried by telephone to get some kind of response from her, but she banged up the receiver when she learned the purpose of the call. In this difficulty Evans called upon his trusted employee, "Ab" Clayton, thinking perhaps Clayton's position as general overseer of the

College real estate might enable him to achieve what the higher officials had failed to do.

Clayton reported back to Evans that the woman had told him frankly and positively that she would leave the house if and when she could find a more suitable house, But Clayton promised Evans he would try again. To the surprise of Evans, in less than a week, the woman suddenly moved out. At first the cause of this move was a mystery. Finally, however, the explanation leaked to the president's office that one of Clayton's assistants, "Doc" Hargus, had, on Saturday morning, plugged up the sewer line leading from the house, In a few hours the tenant was in distress and was calling the business office, which was always closed on Saturday afternoon, as was every other department of the College where she might secure relief. The workmen were strangely absent from their homes on this particular weekend, and even on Monday and Tuesday no one seemed to be available to unstop the sewer pipe. On Wednesday the tenant gave up in defeat and moved out.

### **Joy and Gloom**

Those who were close to President Evans remember him by a trait of his nature that wafted him to the heights of joy when things were running along smoothly and plunged him into gloom at the first sign of a change of fortune. When trouble of whatever nature appeared, it was difficult for Evans to take his mind off it until it was downed or until he had the assurance that a solution was forthcoming promptly. A problem of discipline, questionable conduct by a faculty member, a sudden turn of events in Austin adversely affecting appropriations for the College, a financial reverse for him personally, action or lack of action taken at a meeting of the board of regents—any one of these was enough to darken his whole outlook. But the thought of giving up in despair never for a second entered his mind. Fortunately, he would begin immediately to work out of the difficulty, and the panacea of work usually had for him great curative powers.

An incident in February, 1924, will illustrate this side of his nature. He received a letter from President Hill reminding him of the meeting of the North Central Association in

Chicago, March 20, 21, 22, and suggesting that the two of them meet at some point on the way to Chicago and travel together the rest of the way. Such a proposal always brought to Evans the pleasant thought not only of a profitable convention of educators, but also a most enjoyable association with a congenial traveling companion, But the suggestion from President Hill reached Evans during a period of gloom. In reply, he sent the following letter dated February 26, 1924:

Very much to my sincere regret, I find it impossible to attend. The reasons are personal and financial. My own personal losses in the last two years have been so heavy that really I have very little left. The College has run far ahead of its expenses up to date [sic] on account of the purchase of a piece of land. I have, therefore, abandoned the Chicago trip in March, and ask the substitution of another president for me.

About two weeks later, however, the outlook for Evans was not so dark. On March 7 he wrote:

There is the bare probability that I will be able to get off to attend the Chicago meeting of the North Central Association. . . . I do not feel able to stand the expense of the trip for even myself. . . .

On March 12 Evans sent a telegram to Hill and followed it with a letter the next day :

Confirming telegram sent you yesterday, I am of the opinion that it is best for us to make the Chicago trip. The Texas State Teachers Colleges must affiliate with the North Central Association of Colleges or with the Southern Association of Colleges. If we do not make this trip we will probably postpone action for one year by an accrediting association.

Thus all at once it appeared imperative that Evans accompany Hill to Chicago. The gloom had faded away.

It became almost a matter of habit for President Evans to communicate his joy or gloom to one or more of the other presidents. He felt especially close to President J. A. Hill of Canyon, to President A. W. Birdwell of Nacogdoches, and to President R. B. Binnion of Commerce. On May 15, 1924, he wrote to Binnion as follows:



Two propositions advanced by the Board for consideration are, in my judgment, doubtful if not dangerous. The towns in which the teachers colleges are located should not be required to make assessments of their citizens for the colleges. If the State can buy campus and grounds for the University of Texas, the A. and M. College, and the Texas Tech, it is none too poor to foot the bills for any campus that we may need. If Texas can build dormitories for C. I. A., it has ample funds to build dormitories for your school and my school without unloading on us a debt for a period of 50 years or more. If we finally adopt the Musselman<sup>11</sup> plan, we will hamstring the teachers colleges for almost all time to come. Dormitories in the colleges at times lose money as well as make money. One of the best dormitories of Southwestern University lost approximately \$10,000 during the session of 1921-22.

I am not at all troubled with modesty in making requests. I am personally willing to ask for as much money as anybody else seeks, although I know that there are limits common sense and expediency should place. When I get a dormitory, I am personally willing to come back and ask the Legislature to give me a bigger and better dormitory, although I know my asking might probably prevent some other teachers college from getting its first dormitory. When I get a really good building, which I trust to be able to get within the next twenty-five years, I expect to be back at the next session of the Legislature asking for a building costing twice as much as the other one. Of course, I won't get it, but in any event I will not be burdened with modesty. If we are not to have any kind of cooperation on the basis of urgent needs, I am abundantly able to take care of myself in the game of grab, which is going to happen. This is merely a frank statement of the situation as was portrayed by the events of the several meetings in Austin.

By return mail President Binnion, in an obvious desire to help Evans get rid of his melancholy, replied:

I am very sorry and really surprised at your misgivings. I really left the meeting of the Board Saturday feeling that a new day had dawned for the State Teachers Colleges in Texas. As you and I have both said over and over so often, the main thing that has kept the State

---

<sup>11</sup> Musselman was a member of the board of regents from Dallas. It appears from Evans' letter that he was at that time opposed to the issue of bonds for building dormitories and having revenue from the dormitory rentals pledged to the payment of such bonds. Later he saw the feasibility of the plan.

Teachers Colleges in subjection for so many years and on a second- or third-class rate basis so far as buildings are concerned, has been our extreme modesty in presenting our cause to the people. In my judgment, this extreme modesty has covered every feature of teachers college work. Until now we have never asked for a salary budget commensurate with the work we have undertaken. We are not even now presenting a building budget coinmensurate with the absolute and immediate needs of the institutions.

I understand something of the conditions we are up against. I know something of the powerful interests that are opposing any sort of educational expansion and development, but we have always had these interests against us, and we shall die fighting them. As for me, my face is set toward the future, and I try to see the State Teachers College System, not as a bunch of uncorrelated, disconnected units, but as one system of teacher training for the greatest State in the American Union. Our resources and financial abilities are unmatched by those of any other State in the American Union. A few other States have greater wealth assembled, but no other State has anything like our possibilities, or anything like our probabilities, or anything like the natural capacity and ability which this State possesses. I agreed with Dr. Musselman that the time will soon come when there will be ten Teachers Colleges in Texas and that before many years have elapsed, and that each and every one of them will be a full-fledged college of which no one need be ashamed as to salary budget, faculty employment, laboratories, library, and buildings. To attempt to minimize our situation at this time, in my judgment, is suicidal. We must have economy, but economy does not mean that we must cut off fifteen million dollars, or ten million dollars, or five million dollars from the educational budget which is going before the Thirty-Ninth Legislature. Economy has not so much to do with the question as whether or not the dollar shall be spent as it has to do with the result achieved by the spending of the dollar. If this last statement were not absolutely true, then the miser who holds his dollars out of sight, hard, cold, unproductive, must be the wisest man in the world. It is true that economy consists in getting one hundred cents' worth of results out of every dollar spent.

I have known you many years. I am probably as intimate with your work and career as with that of any other man in Texas. You have always stood for progress, high standards, and ideals; and we are looking to you, as President of our Council, to lead us from peak to peak. I under-

stand, of course, that we have to go through the valley to reach the peak, but the peak is the true objective.

With all good wishes and assurances of high personal esteem,

### The **Evans** Creed

At the time of his retirement in 1942, *Who's Who In America* refers to Cecil Eugene Evans in the following abbreviated terms: "Member N. E. A. Democrat. Methodist. Mason. Rotarian." He was all of these, but he was first and forever an American. Next, he was a teacher., faithful to his profession. Late in 1931 an idea came to him that he would condense and put into writing his fundamental beliefs which he thought students in college should embrace. This he called "Our College Creed." Few tasks ever performed by him absorbed more of his time and thought. The revisions numbered in the dozens before he was willing to see it in print. It is given here as an expression by him and valued highly by him :

#### Our College Creed

By President C. E. Evans

##### 1.

I believe in college education, and appreciate the State's investment in money to provide college opportunity for me. College training, properly planned and directed, means culture for the enjoyment of life and efficiency for success in trade or profession, thereby promising versatile, capable, serviceable, well-balanced men and women.

##### 2.

I believe in college students. They are sincere, conscientious, and worthy; they have aspirations and ideals which hold the possibilities of the constructive leadership so urgently demanded in our modern life. I will do my part in the maintenance and elevation of proper ethical standards in college, the enrichment of associations and friendships, and the promotion of merit and good will among my fellow students. I will have no part in the pessimism, cynicism, or personal antagonisms in my community or in my college.

##### 3.

I believe in the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, its traditions, spirit, and ideals, I believe its faculty, Deans

and President are honestly and faithfully working for the welfare of students and the upbuilding of the College. Wherever I may work, I will, by the quality of my life and service, reflect dignity upon my calling and honor upon my college.

#### 4.

I believe that the worthwhile things of life come to young men and young women who are willing to pay the price in effort and sacrifice; I do not seek something for nothing, and, therefore, feel obligated to do an honest day's work each day and a creditable term's work each term of the year. I believe in the trinity of heart-work, head-work, and hand-work. I have faith in right thinking and recognize the power of the heart in the issues of life.

#### 5.

I believe in the development of students through participation in student activities and cooperation with College officials; I will, therefore, root for the debating teams, yell for the football, basketball, baseball, track, and tennis teams, support the *Star* and *Pedagog*, college clubs and societies, help make my class the best, and back up the College on and off the campus.

#### 6.

I am an American, through and through. I love my country, will obey its laws, support its constitution, and defend it against all enemies in peace and war.

January 7, 1932.<sup>12</sup>

This was President Evans' creed for students. His own was a creed of service to mankind. One of his favorite quotations was, "Blessed is the man who has found his work; let him ask no other blessedness." Evans really had found his work; he took such joy in it that it ceased to be work. In the discharge of his duties he was indefatigable. Few people ever observed signs of weariness in him. Although he constantly faced a multitude of problems and a heavy detail of duties, he could rest when the opportunity came and would fall asleep almost the moment he closed his eyes. The end of long trips by bus or train found him fresh and rested, because he had spent much of the time in restful sleep, leaning back in his seat.'

---

<sup>12</sup> This appeared along with the "Creed" in the *College Star* of that week, from which it is copied verbatim.

To him idleness was evil. He made a note in the Redbook in 1923, "The mark of a great man is his willingness to try big things. Example: the Bobcats are willing to play against A. and M." He noted in another place that "The majority magnify difficulties; the minority magnify opportunities." Here he made a reference to the Old Testament, Numbers XIII: 17-20, **23-27**, and added the comment that it was impossible to make good soldiers of the Israelites who were reared in Egypt; and that it is impossible to make efficient life workers of men and women who spend their high school and college years in ease and extravagance and idleness.

On the question of racial prejudice, he urged instead sympathy and the big-brother attitude. He said, "These 'wops,' 'dagoes,' and 'greasers' have cast their lot with us. Let us cast our lot with them. A cosmopolitan population makes us a stronger nation. These people make sacrifices to educate their children. They should have equal opportunities with all other Americans."

Under the heading of "Why Men Fail," Evans listed from Bradstreet's *Report* the following: "Lack of training in fundamentals which underlie all business makes men incompetent; leaves them ignorant of the experience of others; tabs them as poor risks for capital; brands them as poor risks for credit extension; and exposes them to all the frauds which prey on business ignorance." To this he added:

A teacher is different from a lawyer, physician, or banker. The teacher is being paid for his opportunity to have influence. Be careful in your attitude toward religious belief in the community. Don't mix in local politics. Identify yourself with the community and be of positive worth to the community—the church, Sunday school, and clubs. Listen more attentively to criticism than to compliments. Respect local sentiments and traditions. Convince pupils and parents and your fellow teachers of your sincerity.

Evans could always visualize a bright future for his students and his friends. "We are facing a new day" was the essence of many of his "messages" to the *Star* and *Pedagog*. Even in the dark days of the depression, he could look beyond the temporary paralysis of economic activity to the time when the problem of crises and depressions could be solved. In his speech to the

graduating class of August, 1932, on "The Challenge of the Depression," he said:

. . . With a change of emphasis from wealth to persons, we will have our best chance to save both wealth and persons. If the weakest link determines the strength of the chain, the weak link of depression shows a breakdown, temporarily at least, of capitalism's chain under the present business policy of profit as a major incentive. We should long ago have learned the lesson that heads and hearts and hands and character pooling effort are greater contributing factors in the settlement of economic problems than lumber and steel and merchandise and power, even with large profits.

In his "Message to Students" at the opening of the fall session of 1931, Evans wrote :<sup>13</sup>

. . . In its call for trained men and women for public service and private life, the State looks to the college. The college man of the past has been a large factor in everything that made a better life; the college man of the future must help save the good things of the past and construct greater and better things for the future. The difficult problems of today are a challenge to college men and women. Get ready to answer the challenge.

In his last "Message to the Pedagog" written on March 12, 1942, he wrote:

In the midst of war's destruction, largest in all history, we dedicate our talent, our energy and our incomes to conserve our way of life and civilization's achievements. Americans' initiative, resources, manpower and thoughtpower challenge totalitarianism and offer suffering nations real hope of rescue from bondage and frightfulness. The world today counts on America; let's make America's service count the full measure. With all forces in America united in doing their utmost, our country's obligation to civilization will be properly met, In this program of patriotic service, colleges will take an ever-increasing part. As in 1917, the Southwest Texas State Teachers College responds to the country's call with enthusiasm and loyalty.

### **The New Year Greetings**

The records do not reveal positively when the practice of sending New Year greetings began. President Evans never gave

---

<sup>13</sup> These messages from the president were always published on the front page of the *Star*.

a hint that he disapproved of sending Christmas cards, which usually include a wish for happiness and prosperity for the New Year. However, he never sent Christmas cards, unless to his immediate family; instead he always, to the very year of his death, sent New Year greetings to a long, select list of his friends. These included many ex-students and faculty members as well as people in all other walks of life.

His greetings were not ready-made by some commercial firm, but were composed by him in his own characteristic language and on the familiar subjects of current events or the basic truths of our existence. However, the part of these greetings so much prized by those who received them was the handwritten addition to the message meant exclusively for the recipient. The latter task consumed many, many hours of his time.

It is hoped that the few following excerpts will convey an adequate idea of the nature of the messages sent and the reasons why so great a value was put upon them by those fortunate enough to receive them.

The 1914 greeting may have been the first of the series, although this is not certain. It was as follows:

New opportunities and new responsibilities are ours. Being teachers involves high standards of morality, integrity, and gives us a chance for upright and godly lives.

From the greeting of 1931, the third and last paragraph read:

The nation looks to the colleges to train the leaders indispensable for protection of society against destructive influences and for the promotion of the common welfare along all necessary lines. But the college must have help to win the fight. Laymen, teachers, college students, and alumni have the making of a team that can put over the comprehensive program of a Christian civilization, What is your part? *"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might."*

The next year, 1932, he used a unique heading for a New Year's greeting, and the message is so packed with the Evans philosophy that it is presented complete:

## Motives for Life's Work

The dollar is the motive for many persons. When honestly making money, a man is worthily employed. The accumulation of property adds dignity, conveniences, satisfaction, and stability. It also increases the possibility of service, usefulness, and honor.

Duty is a favorite motive. Duty, private or official, makes large claims upon men of integrity and worth. Duty calls for sacrifice, courage, sincerity, knowledge, and achievement. The Roman soldier in the ruins of Pompeii is standing at the post of duty. The captain of the *Titanic* discharged the sailor's duty by death with the sinking vessel.

While dollar considerations have values, and while duty elements appeal to thoughtful, conscientious people, greater results in duty and dollars come from love of work. The man in love with his job outdistances in quality and output the man at war with his job. Love of work cuts out drudgery and supplies zest. We trust that the New Year will unite properly dollar earning, devotion to duty, and love of work, that thereby joy, contentment, conscience, profit, and efficiency may abound.

Sincerely,

Southwest Texas State Teachers College  
San Marcos, Texas

C. E. Evans  
President

January 1, 1932

The message for 1940 concluded with,

... Each year must carry over from the dying old year better understanding among men, multiplied good will, happier ways of living, better building of worthy enterprises, and better tools, thereby contributing to *A Better World of Tomorrow*.

The entire message of 1947 is presented as Evans composed it:

New Year's Greetings, **January 1, 1947**

Happy are people who welcome New Year's challenge for thinking and doing.

Abundant are the occasions for judicious conduct in every-day life.

Personality, thus, develops and enriches.  
Possibilities for service abundantly multiply.

Yesterday's blunders are warnings for today's guidance.



New Year cries out for relief from social evils.

Energies, group and individual, must battle sectional jealousies, personal grievances, factional quarrels, and religious intolerance.

Wise executives steer clear from these destructive forces ever seeking complete understanding, hearty goodwill, and cordial cooperation.

Year after year, age and youth alike, expect the New Year to settle youth's problems with meanings in terms of life's needs.

Endowment of youth's talents and interests call for team work.

Agencies working for common effort easily find common objectives.

Recognizing the worth of the sentiments and dreams of youth, we must respond with sympathy, encouragement, and the support essential to society and youth everywhere.

San Marcos, Texas  
222 Talbot Street

Cecil Eugene Evans  
Allie Maxwell Evans

To this message, addressed to Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Crawford, old friends, (Mrs. Crawford, the former Helen Hornsby, having been a member of the first faculty of the College) Evans added in his own handwriting: "You deserve the best of New Years: worthy attitudes, wholesome ideals, community service. In fact, you contribute to all the things that make San Marcos and its people happier and better."<sup>14</sup>

The last New Year message dated January 1, 1958, was infinitely fitting and proper. Taken from Philippians IV : 8, it was the prayer which he had recited so many times in chapel that, perhaps, it remains in the minds of more ex-students of the College than any other verse from the Bible:

[Finally, brethren,] whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.

---

<sup>14</sup>Helen Hornsby Crawford very graciously included the card among other gifts to the College on the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the opening of the College.

## The Late Years

Never an idler, C. E. Evans busied himself in the College library for some months after his retirement and then settled down to the research which culminated, after ten years, in the publication of *The Story of Texas Schools*.<sup>15</sup> His health remained generally good, and he had the appearance of contentment and satisfaction. He carried on his church work as in the past; he traveled some, and constantly acquired books and periodicals to keep himself informed on the news and thought of the world. At first, of course, he was absorbed in the news of the great war raging in Europe and the Far East. There was considerable demand for his time as speaker at various gatherings, and he faithfully kept up his attendance at the Rotary Club. He stood for everything American and would listen to no one who had any doubts concerning the wisdom of our involvement, first, in the assistance of England and her allies, and then in our waging of war against what he called the enemies of freedom and democracy.

For a few years he continued to operate his farm, but as his physical activity had to be curtailed with the approach of age he became convinced that it would be better to sell the farm. Moreover, his retirement income was not large, and his savings were quite limited. He and Mrs. Evans moved from their home on Belvin Street, which was more than a mile from the College campus, and settled on Talbot Street near the college. At this place, he could walk the distance to the library, and he then gave up driving his car.

On November 6, 1954, in a speech at Home Coming to ex-students, he told of his many years of work on his book. He said it was his hope that publication would be made in a few months. He related the facts of his appointment to the presidency of the College and his acceptance three days later. He told briefly of the struggle he had made to create a college, handicapped with lack of funds and a chronic shortage of buildings and money for salaries. He praised some of the great teachers who had helped him achieve his goal. His and Mrs. Evans' plans after the publication of the book were to travel.

---

<sup>15</sup>The Steck Company, Austin, 1955.

In the years following, these plans were not to be realized, however, on account of the prolonged illness of Mrs. Evans which totally incapacitated her. This misfortune was enough to discourage any strong man, but Evans bore with fortitude the dwindling of his resources and the loneliness for the woman who had been such a loving and understanding companion through the long, happy years.

The Redbook for 1958 reveals that his handwriting was as steady as ever. His eighty-seventh birthday had been on January 21. The jokes in the little book were all accumulated as usual. The perennial bus schedule was completed on a page for his convenience. He still found quotations from his reading to preserve in his rugged and not very legible handwriting. There was also the combination to the vault in the registrar's office, where he kept the original notes of his speeches. These he referred to as his "dynamite." In the Redbook for that year, also, he put down and underlined the dates of Mother's Day and Father's Day.

After a very brief illness, he died on August 22, 1958. His friends who were with him when the ambulance came to take him to the hospital on the first day of his illness testify that he protested that he was not very ill and would be all right in a few hours.

### **Eulogy**

The press of the state and nation chronicled his passing with fitting obituaries. On October 18, a memorial service was held in the auditorium named for him. That was Home Coming Day, and the auditorium was filled to capacity.

One of the few survivors of the men with whom Cecil Eugene Evans had worked during the early years, Dr. J. A. Hill, President Emeritus of the West Texas State University, delivered a eulogy which was a masterpiece. With his permission it is included here:

### **In Honor of C. E. Evans**

When some day a competent historian shall write the history of the Teachers Colleges of Texas he will reveal an amazing saga of educational statesmanship. In that story

C. E. Evans will not play an inconspicuous role, for he was a prime actor in the drama.

C. E. Evans was not a mill-run American. He was a man of distinct parts, whose facsimile was nowhere else to be found. His strength was his originality—his own pattern of life—a pattern that he consistently followed. That pattern was based upon—perhaps grew out of—a philosophy of life.

And let it be said in this presence that men do not get far on the road toward happy and useful living until they work out, each for himself, a basic belief in human values and ~~fix~~ their own relationship thereto. That is what is meant by one's having a life philosophy.

I think all who really knew C. E. Evans would say that he possessed an intelligent yet humble self-respect. He recognized his own responsibility for the quality of his life and allowed nothing to hinder its constant improvement. He was always looking out for his better self—his highest concept of life. As a consequence his personal habits were above reproach.

He knew that self-indulgence, whatever its form, was obstructive, if not damaging, to the ideals and purposes which his philosophy of life compelled him to revere. For this reason there were those who thought he was abstemious. The difference between him and all such critics was that he was simply more intelligent than they. He recognized fool's gold when he saw it, and they didn't.

This clear-cut understanding of values was supported by extraordinary courage. When principle was involved C. E. Evans was as bold as a lion. He and I have fought many a battle side by side. I never saw him once exhibit the white feather. People knew where he stood and that he would fight for his convictions.

And such a fighter as he was! In strategy he was a past master. I have known him to win battles before his opponents knew there was a war.

Another outstanding quality of Dr. Evans was his well-known respect for facts. He would never undertake to solve a problem or meet an adversary without a full knowledge of pertinent data. He was a near genius at getting and keeping all relevant factual information. He was the acknowledged walking encyclopedia among the Teachers College Presidents. This talent guaranteed him a place of leadership among his fellows.

Time limitations compel me to pass over much that I should like to say. But it is enough to remember that personalities like C. E. Evans do not die. They only change habitats. Our lamented friend who is said to be dead, lives on in the minds and hearts of thousands giving immortality to his life of service, Paraphrasing a bit of the philosophy of John Quincy Adams as he viewed the sunset, let us say that C. E. Evans is quite well, thank you. Only the house he lived in has tumbled down. He now abides in another house—one not made with hands, where he enjoys fellowship with the King of Kings. Thank God for his sojourn among us,

The next speaker was one of many "boys" to whom Prexy had endeared himself. This ex-student was Jesse C. Kellam, who had made a success as a teacher and as a business man and was later to become chairman of the Board of Regents of the College. Only one who had known C. E. Evans from the position of a student under his control and direction could have expressed himself in this eloquent manner:

### **Prexy Evans**

On occasions such as this, words are in order. Yet, for those of us who knew this man as his students, no words are necessary—and certainly none are adequate—to express our feelings.

Others knew him in different ways. It may be possible for them to summarize his achievements or generalize about his activities. For his former students, neither is possible. His role in the lives of those who knew him as students cannot be summarized or generalized. Take the full list of the hundreds and thousands who came under his influence as an educator and, for each, there would be a different story to tell. The influence of Dr. Evans was just that personal.

In saying this, perhaps the ultimate has been said. The memory of Dr. Evans—among all his former students—is as a personal inspiration, not as an educational administrator, nor even as an educator. This is greatness—and there was greatness in this man. There was more than greatness, though—there was genius.

Where some might win student affection for the moment by relaxing the standards of his office, Dr. Evans did not. Rather, he won enduring devotion by upholding the highest standards—and inspiring all whose lives he touched to do likewise. He did not come down to the level of those of us who were young and inexperienced. He brought us, instead, upward to levels beyond ourselves, and made us wiser than our years.

He gave meaning to higher education. He gave purpose to life, itself. He opened broad horizons to thousands who, otherwise, would never have lifted their eyes. Because he did so, most of us—if not all of us—have had an inspiration before us no matter what our pursuits in life. This, I think is the highest test of the man—as a man and as an educator.

Dr. Evans saw to it, while we were here, that we received an education. By this genius of his personal interest and influence, he has remained in our lives to see to it that we used what we received here. He is the cornerstone on which many of us have built.

C. E. Evans lives, no longer in one heart, but in the hearts and lives of thousands. Of only a few men can such ever be said. Of Dr. Evans, this can be said in truth—he was one of the great citizens of the human race. He lived his life for his students. I know, from personal experience, that many of his students have, in turn, lived richer lives for him—and because of him.<sup>16</sup>

These were "flowers for the departed." Following are excerpts from a collection of encomiums which came to President Evans on the occasion of his twenty-fifth anniversary as president of the College.<sup>17</sup>

From O.B. Colquitt, who appointed C. E. Evans to the position.

. . . When I went into the office of Governor in 1911 I determined to name a new President of the San Marcos Teachers College and when the time came to elect one by the State Board of Educators, I recommended, as President of the Board; the selection of Evans for that position, and the Board of Education ratified my recommendation.

His fine service to the State, and his success in the management of that institution has been a matter of pride and gratification to me, and has fully justified me in my determination to make a change then, and in the selection of Dr. Evans for the place. I am glad to know now that the people of San Marcos and his associates in the College are going to do him honor. Twenty-five years is a long public service and in itself signifies and attests his ability and fitness. It fully attests the fact that no mistake was made in his appointment.

---

<sup>16</sup>At the request of the writer, Mr. Kellam very kindly searched his files to find a copy of his eulogy to be included in this study.

<sup>17</sup>Mrs. Evans, too, received her full share of honors on that occasion.

Nothing but signal success and fitness for the place, could have kept him at the head of this great school for so many years. I am delighted to know that people among whom he has moved so many years are going to do him honor. . . .

From James E. Ferguson. The remarkable thing about this testimonial is the fact that such esteem for President Evans expressed by former Governor Ferguson was in itself an excellent bit of testimony to the tact and diplomacy of the man who could have been regarded by Ferguson as one of his enemies.<sup>18</sup>

. . . During the various Ferguson Administrations we have had opportunity to become almost intimately acquainted with Dr. Evans, and his services always seemed to be of the highest standing.

Please permit my wife and me to join in the spirit of the celebration although it is not convenient for us to be personally present.

From Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson. Of course, the same comment could be made in this case as was made just above.

. . . It affords me great pleasure to say that while I was Governor it was my privilege to know Dr. Evans personally as well as officially. I take pleasure in testifying to his sterling worth as an educator.

I trust that the celebration of the long years of service of Dr. Evans will be in keeping with the dignity which he has always maintained.

From Pat M. Neff. The sentiment expressed by former Governor Neff, who at that time, was president of Baylor University, was not an exaggeration. I recall once when I was with President Evans in Austin, that we went to the Picadilly Cafeteria, filled our trays, and went to a table. In a few minutes Neff came in and, seeing President Evans, turned from the table where he was about to be seated and came over and ate at the table with us. Neff wrote:

Tomorrow, when your Institution pauses to honor the twenty-fifth anniversary of the unbroken services of its President, I wish to join his many admirers in trumpeting my tribute of appreciation for the splendid services he has rendered to the state during these years.

---

<sup>18</sup>See Chapter XIII of this study entitled "With Political Flavor."

I have known him intimately, personally, and officially during the years and I know that whatever honors are bestowed upon him will be worthy honors, worthily granted.

From Dan Moody. President Evans must have enjoyed this letter of praise. While Moody was governor, Evans frequently referred to him as "our young Governor." he sincerely believed that Moody was a friend to the Teachers College of Texas. The date of Moody's letter was April 19, 1936:

I learned that the faculty and ex-students of the Southwest Texas State Teachers College and the citizens of San Marcos are celebrating your twenty-fifth anniversary as President of Southwest Texas State Teachers College on April twenty-third.

You and the College are entitled to congratulations upon your substantial accomplishments in your years of useful service to the State and this Institution, and I herewith send my congratulations.

As you look back over this span of a quarter of a century and contemplate the thousands and thousands of young men and young women whom you have helped to train and equip for citizenship and for useful life, it must be a source of gratification to you that in your early manhood you chose the career of a teacher. I do not know of any work that is more challenging, more worth while, or a greater work of service to mankind than that of teachers. Usually their remuneration in the way of salary is meager, but there is a great reward for their work in the good that they do for others. I am confident that every young man and every young woman whose lives you have touched have been impressed for the better by their contacts with you and the satisfaction that comes from that must be great.

You have my best wishes,

From James V. Allred, If the magnitude of Evans' contribution to the cause of education in Texas could be communicated to the citizens of the state, the sentiments expressed in this letter would indeed be in the hearts of all of them, Governor Allred wrote the letter on April 14, 1936:

Too often in the busy whirl of our life do we fail to give flowers to the living. I am delighted, however, to learn of the tribute being paid to you by the Southwest Texas Teachers College and the City of San Marcos in recognition of your twenty-fifth anniversary as President of the college.



Your leadership in educational affairs of Texas has endeared you in the hearts of those who recognize your contribution to the history of Texas education.

I am indeed sorry that engagements of long standing prohibit my attendance upon this occasion, but believe me that I am no less sympathetic with the occasion than those friends who are with you.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes,

There were many others, including former Governor W. P. Hobby and Clarence Ousley, the latter having worked with Evans closely in the service of the Conference for Education in Texas.

During the regular session of the Texas Legislature in 1959, the House of Representatives passed a memorial resolution commemorating Cecil Eugene Evans and expressing condolences to his family. An official copy of the resolution was sent February 5, 1959, to Mrs. Bernice Evans Soyars of Sabinal by the representative from District 79, Jack Richardson of Uvalde.

The End

# INDEX

- Allison, W. E. 267
- Bailey, Jos. W. 4
- Baines, Ben 216
- Ball, T. H. (Tom) 107
- Beretta, Mrs. Sallie 171
- Binnion, R. B. 99, 114, 115, 182, 185, 189, 277, 322, 433,
- Birdwell, A. W. 12, 54, 69, 123, 128, 133, 153, 258, 283, 343, 345, 362, 421, 422, 424, 434
- Bizzell, W. B. 60
- Blair, A. L. 267
- Blake, V. W. 296
- Bobcat, The (See Coers Brothers) 222
- Booth, Cullom H. 6, 11
- Booth, Mrs. Laura 453
- Briesemeister, A. J. 237
- Bralley, F. M. 2, 6
- Brister, R. H. 27
- Brite, Ben 456
- Brogdon, Mary C. 156, 225, 229
- Brown, J. S. 319
- Bruce, W. H. 51, 110, 113, 114, 177
- Buckner, Walter 267
- Burkholder, A. C. 267
- Butcher, T. W. 22
- Cavness, Raymond M. 245
- Crawford, Helen Hornsby 473
- Cousins, R. B. 51, 176, 184, 211, 328, 347
- Cole, William (Bill) 242
- Chamberlin, C. E. 25, 394
- College Exchange 222
- Cauthorn, E. B. 198
- Coers, Leland and John 222
- Colquitt, O. B. 1, 279, 478
- Cunningham, L. T. 4, 9
- Chapman, Walter R. 4
- Clayton, J. A. 45, 83, 462
- 206, 207, 227, 264, 272, 343, 361, 373
- Evans, Allie M. 453
- Evans, Arthur W. 453
- Evans, H. M. 453
- Evans, Hiram Wesley 453
- Evans, Marcius 452
- Ferguson, James E. 112, 128, 146, 479
- Ferguson, Mrs. Miriam A. 132, 479
- Fletcher, Thomas 275, 276
- Flowers, John G. Preface, 174
- Flowers, M. O. 99, 111, 117, 129, 145, 146, 225, 237, 268
- Gardner, Fred S. 149
- Garrard, Tom 84
- Garrett, Lynton 25
- Glick, Walter 235
- Goeth, A. C. 110, 115, 268
- Guleke, J. O. 72, 74
- Hague, Aileen 15
- Hall, J. L. 15
- Hall, Mrs. W. F. 242
- Hardy, J. C. 53
- Hargus, "Doc" 463
- Harris, Claude 47
- Harris, T. G. 1, 4, 12, 13, 15, 211
- Harry, Bertram 300
- Hawks, Blanche 462
- Hill, J. A. preface, 57, 71, 73, 109, 119, 120, 124, 136, 138, 151, 163, 183, 187, 189, 192, 195, 197, 203, 206, 207, 209, 262, 270, 323, 334, 335, 338, 340, 345, 346, 357, 359, 366, 368, 370, 463, 475
- Hill, John E. 72, 263
- Horn, P. W. 10
- Horton, Dee 456
- Ickes, Harold L. 156
- Jay, C. A. 130, 337
- Johnson, Lady Bird 448
- Johnson, Lyndon B. 155, Ch. XVII
- Kaderli, James N. 237
- Kellam, Jesse C. preface, 477
- Kidd, L. H. 236, 245
- Dailey, Claude 456
- Dailey, Mrs. Manford 267
- Dallas *News* Ch. XII, 100, 227
- Davis, A. L. 267
- Davis, Ethel 440 (footnote)
- Derrick, Leland E. preface
- Ehlert, Berry W. 442 (footnote)
- Estill, H. F. 52, 58, 60, 106, 115, 121, 127, 162, 182, 192, 195,

- King, John E. 328  
 King, Tom C. 152  
 Kirk, John R. 22  
 Kirksey, Mrs. O. T. 15  
  
 Lee, Dr. L. L. 267  
 Lynn, Moore 126  
  
 McCall, Lyons 456  
 McConnell, J. W. 369  
 McConnell, Mrs. J. W. 267  
 McGee, Mrs. M. C. 267  
  
 Marquis, R. L. 52, 101, 102, 108,  
 115, 190, 261, 322, 324, 326,  
 328, 333, 353, 354, 365, 414,  
 417, 420, 433  
 Mayes, Will H. 454  
 Martin, A. B. 233, 351  
 Mayhew, A. B. 72, 108, 121, 125,  
 153, 215, 268, 270, 271, 277,  
 279  
 Miller, P. T. 13  
 Moody, Dan 128, 129  
 Musgrave, Alvin W. preface  
 Musselman, H. T. 103  
  
 Neal, Miss Margie E. 355  
 Neff, Pat M. 188  
 Nelson, H. A. 15, 145, 304  
 Nolle, Alfred H. 26, 87, 168, 236,  
 437  
  
 Owsley, Clarence 47, 274, 350  
  
 Parr, A. C. 112  
 Paulus, Henry 270  
 Pennybacker, Mrs. Percy V. 4  
 Porter, R. H. (Doc) 237, 244, 245  
 Pruitt, H. H. 237, 242, 243  
  
 Reed, Robert (Bob) 242  
 Russell, B. L. 3  
  
 Sandefer, J. D. 4, 7  
 Sanderford, Ghent 86  
 San Marcos *Record* 82, 265, 267  
 Saunders, Robert 267  
 Sayers, Jessie A. 267  
 Sewell, S. M. 4, 10  
 Shaver, C. N. 183  
 Smith, C. S. 241, 298  
 Smith, John Marvin 1  
 Soyars, Mrs. Bernice Evans pre-  
 face, 451, 453  
 Soyars, Erwin L., Jr., 453  
 Speck, H. E. 105, 217, 229, 235  
 Spinn, Richard 442 (footnote)  
 Splawn, W. M. W. 182  
 Stevenson, Coke 369  
 Strahan, O. W. 456  
 Streeter, Don 105  
 Stulting, Lela 456  
  
 Tampke, R. A. 394  
 Templeman, Ward 264  
 Texas *Almanac* 100  
 Thomas, Gates 217  
 Thornton, William M. 328  
  
 Ulmer, J. G. 318  
  
 Vernon, Mrs. W. C. 15  
 Vinson, R. E. 51  
 Vivion, King 53  
  
 Watkins, Royal L. 94  
 White, Adeline 15  
 White, E. V. 3, 7, 8  
 Whitley, S. H. 98, 100, 124, 137,  
 176, 199, 325, 326, 333, 357  
 Wildenthal, Bryan 48, 149  
 Wiley, E. O. 236  
 Wimberley, Rufus 44, 83, 457  
 Woodson, W. I. 217, 241  
 Woodson, Mrs. W. I. 221  
 Wright, L. N. ("Deacon") 218