



Nine hundred graduates and three thousand visitors attending the final colorful ceremony of the year.

« Some Implications of Growing Nationalism »

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF DR. JOHN G. HERVEY, '23, '25

I DEEM it an honor and a high privilege to address you on this occasion. Only ten years ago I stood before the president and faculty of this institution to receive the degree of bachelor of laws. Ten years ago I was filled with a feeling of trepidation as I wondered whether the faculty in all honesty had recommended me for the degree. In those days a degree was not yours until after it had been conferred, even though it had been earned. Today, I experience the same sense of trepidation as I rise to speak to a more critical faculty and a more enlightened graduating class. I sincerely trust that you will be as charitable as was Dr. Kulp, whom I still remember with the highest affection, when he placed a mark in Oil and Gas Law opposite my name on his grade sheet. After graduation, he advised me that my final examination paper was poor and that he had expressed both hope and charity in entering a passing mark for me.

Mr. President, I marvel at the progress which has been made by this institution during the past ten years—the rise in standards, the expansion of curricula, the

new buildings, the increase in campus area, and the additions to your distinguished faculty. Notwithstanding these shifts in the academic life of our University, somehow, I sense that the all-pervasive purpose of President Bizzell and his faculty has not been to build a great University: rather, it has been to build men and women who pass through this institution, to show them the way to a more noble, a more wholesome, and a fuller life, and thereby contribute to the solution of the manifold problems which now confront our state and society. As I glance over the list of graduates and note the positions of trust and leadership, in the business and political life of this state and nation, which they now hold, I am moved to tender my heartiest congratulations to those entrusted with the conduct of this institution, and I am indeed proud that I am an alumnus of the University of Oklahoma. This is indeed "a day for the gods to stoop and men to soar."

I entered this University just at the close of the World war. We who struggled through together witnessed the efforts of Woodrow Wilson to lock the Temple

of Janus forever. We thought that we saw in the League of Nations a cooling-off chamber for the disputes between nations. We welcomed the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Justice as a tribunal to which countries might resort for the pacific adjudication of international controversies. The Kellogg Peace Pact, and the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, was received with like approbation. The world had been knit into a single economic unit: isolation was at an end. Foreign markets would absorb our agricultural and industrial surpluses, and satisfied masses would dwell together in peace. It was no longer necessary to tighten our belts and endure the old order of things. Domestic security and world peace were at hand: the reign of the international game-cocks was over.

Today, as we contrast the ideal that then seemed possible, with the reality which now confronts us, we realize only too well that we saw only what we hoped for. International understanding and coöperation and the exalted life within our nation, are as far removed as at any time since the establishment of the states-system or the fall of the Holy Roman Empire. Isolation is again the order of the day. Self-sufficiency is to be attained by all nations at any cost: it is the altar at which all nations

worship. At the very moment when economic forces would satisfy every desire of man and would again knit the nations of the world into a single unit, in a day when one's voice may encircle the globe by telephone in one-quarter of a second, we are driven farther apart by nationalistic forces at work in all nations. At a time when democratic institutions, individual liberty, and domestic freedom, should be most secure, we find them nodding to their fall. To what force or forces may one attribute these things? Is the responsibility ours to shoulder and yours to counteract and correct? What does it imply as regards the state, the nation, the society in which you must this day commence your careers? What does it mean to you and to me? These are the matters to which I direct your attention, and that of your guests, on this commencement day.

I bear no message from Garcia. Like Emerson, only so much do I know as I have lived or observed. I do not believe that beyond the Alps of difficulty lie the green pastures of opportunity which await your arrival after the receipt of diplomas from this school. I did not find it so; neither will you. Opportunities are not bestowed by an Omnipotent Creator for the enjoyment of his creations, nor are they to be snatched full-bloom from the lap of a beneficent Providence. Opportunities are man made. They are yours to create. They are yours to grasp. But the character of your creation and the import of your grasp depend, in a large measure, upon the understanding of facts which exist, and tendencies which play upon them. Facts are stubborn things. Tendencies are the magnets which move them. As to both, man is a bundle of relations, a knot of roots, as it were. But it is not of man alone that I desire to speak; rather it is of a tendency, a nationalistic magnet, to which I direct your attention and invite your thoughts.

Now I am not so sophomoric as to believe that the present plight of civilized man is congenital, or that pathologically it may be attributed to any single causation alone. I do believe, however, that any diagnosis will attribute certain conditions in the world to a habit of thought—a *moré* if you choose to follow the terminology of Sumner—represented in the term "nationalism." This habit of thought and action is susceptible to change, and that change, if wrought, will be the handiwork of this and other graduating classes of our colleges and universities.

Nationalism is the order of the day, whether it be in Russia, Germany, Italy, Japan, France or the United States. Economic self-sufficiency is the dominant obsession of leaders everywhere and more recently it has joined the herd of sacred cows of some of our leading thinkers. I need mention only the two recent volumes of Charles A. Beard entitled *The Idea of National Interest* and *The Open Door at Home*. Perhaps, we were the orig-

inators of the nationalistic movement; other nations so charge. True it is that we refused to cooperate by entering the League of Nations, that we cast the World Court Protocol into the scrap heap after having advocated such a tribunal for more than a generation, that we erected tariff hurdles which render impossible the payment of foreign obligations, and that we have restricted production of economic necessities while thousands have suffered and even the Chinese men, during the past winter have killed their wives and children and lived off the blood which flowed from their veins. Be that as it may, we are in a morbid state which flows from economic disturbances, the total implications of which we are not yet fully conscious.

Explosive nationalism, in my judgment, was and is inevitable under the statesystem as it developed from the Battle of Waterloo to the Battle of the Marne. The English, American and French revolutions paved the way for sovereign states in which equality in political rights are assured to all irrespective of class distinctions. Aristocracy has been stripped of its inherent political power and that power has been entrusted to the masses in virtually all nations irrespective of any innate or acquired ability for self-government. The inevitable result of this shift in power has been to vest the control of political institutions, together with the property and personal rights to which they relate, in those least concerned. Concomitant with the rise of the national state, the Industrial Revolution worked a transformation in the ownership of property. Land gave way to factories as the vital element in production and the peasant toilers of the soil were supplanted by urban populations dependent upon continued industrial activity. The mercantilist class evolved into a capitalist class—the owners of the new instruments of production—and the stratification of society again set in. Although open breaks between classes were unusual before the World war, the industrial peace of former days seems to be passing into oblivion. Threatened breaks between classes over the distribution of income, and the abolition of a propertied middle class, are in the offing.

Following the World war, and more especially in recent years, class struggles have threatened us. The Russian revolution undertook to abolish the whole democratic state system. It substituted domination of the workers for political liberty; replaced private property with state ownership and inaugurated a world community to replace the national state. It sought to transfer the productive processes from private hands to a state directed by and for the workers and to supplant rivalry between national states with a struggle between capital and labor within one world-wide community. Russia was to develop a self-sufficiency and a system of oppression unparalleled in the annals of his-

tory. All plans were drafted to that end. A world revolution was in order and was openly incubated and financed from Moscow.

The Russian revolution was a direct challenge to the owners of property in all nations. The challenge was not without its effects. In Italy, the strain of the war and the unsatisfied demands at the Peace Conference, produced genuine unrest. There was a decided drift to the Left, and, in the face of parliamentary instability, the capitalistic class cast its lot with Mussolini, to be joined by the middle classes. Fascism triumphed and, as Garibaldi had been the symbol of Italian unification, Mussolini became and remains the incarnation of Italian greatness. But with what results? Mussolini, like Napoleon a century before him, proceeded to sweep away the democratic institutions which threatened his régime. Parliament was abolished, free speech ended, the press regimented, and workers disenfranchised. All was done in the name of a frenzied and volatile nationalism which continues down to the present moment. For a second time, democratic institutions were flouted—the Russian revolution destroyed them to retain power, Fascism demolished them to prevent Communistic triumph in the Peninsula.

But Fascism, like Communism, did not spread to Western democracies and the effect upon republican institutions was practically nil. Ten years ago it seemed that Communism in Russia and Fascism in Italy had come and gone without any serious impairment of democratic institutions in the world at large. We looked upon them as domestic experiments without exportable value. Russia was advancing under the Five-Year plan and seemingly away from the program of world revolution. Fascism was concentrating its attention upon domestic reorganization. When, in 1925, Germany signed the Pacts of Locarno and entered the League of Nations in 1926, the world seemed safe for democratic institutions and secure against both Communism and Fascism. At least we thought so.

Three years later, however, a depression cast its shadow over the world and that shadow fell first upon Germany. The German workers, like the Italians a decade before, under the stress of privation, also turned to the Left. Capitalistic institutions in Germany, as in Italy, were confronted with a threatened revolution, or so it seemed. This furnished the pretext for a German reaction conducted under the tyrannical and merciless guidance of Herr Adolph Hitler, and for an overthrow of the stable, pacific policies of Stresemann. He followed the examples of Napoleon and Mussolini and swept away a representative parliament, free speech, and an unshackled press. Political parties, other than the National Socialist, were abolished and republicans and communists alike met in the same concentration camps. A prece-

dent embalms a principle and democratic institutions in Germany, as in Italy, have ceased to exist. Patriotic emotions are exploited by Hitler in imitation of Mussolini and as the latter revives the memory of the glory of ancient Rome in the name of Fascism, in like manner Hitler recalls the greatness of the First Reich in his attempt to establish the Third Reich. Even now he exalts unity and self-sufficiency above democratic institutions and purges the Nazi ranks with blood and executes religious adherents with a vengeance which would put Pontius Pilate to shame.

The economic blizzard also cast its spell over the Orient. Nationalism, which had been brewing in China since 1895, struck with full force with the elevation of Sun-Yat Sen to power and has run rampant ever since. Chinese emotions have been transferred from stable patterns to unfamiliar values; the philosophy of Confucius, along with the controls which it nurtured for untold generations, have been overboard and disintegration has set in. The Filipinos boldly assert their inherent right to contract a nationalistic fever uncontrolled by a distant people who cannot conceal their racial and political superiority. Nor is it possible to overestimate the implications of the revolution and the evolution now going on in India. India is religion, but swaraj—*independence*—is now the watchword of all India. In order to attain it, there is the same exaggeration of emotions, the same appeal to prejudices and passions, which occurs in Italy and Germany. When the Indians succeed and the nationalistic fever is in full bloom there, as will occur during our generation, not only the British Empire, but your and my positions will be measurably altered, dependent upon what we propose to do about it.

And Japan? Need I dwell upon the craze which pervades that Empire, which carries a chip on its shoulder, and creates an international situation every time an American tourist photographs an object of interest within the Empire or American warships ply the waters of the Pacific? Suffice it to say that Japan has adopted a program which cannot be distinguished either from that of Hitler or Mussolini. National interest has been set above international law and specific treaty obligations. She gazes upon other powers with envy and suspicion, and develops anti-social temper, flirts with the theory that might makes right.

But what of America? Why dwell upon the situation of foreign powers? It has been done to show exactly what has happened to democratic institutions elsewhere, and to incline your thoughts to what may occur in our own land should the present tendencies continue unarrested. The years from 1930 to 1932 constituted a period of political upheaval which was accompanied by economic stresses no less acute. Although the economic strains did not disturb our political institutions at

the moment, the latter are supple, and the upheaval has circumscribed a transformation in economic practices which now threatens our political institutions unless it is proscribed. Faced with the economic evils of idle factories, surplus agricultural products, vanishing foreign trade, and delinquent foreign obligations, which have accompanied the blizzard of depression, we broke with the traditions of *laissez-faire*, and launched upon a program of controlled economy, restricted production, currency manipulation—nationalistic self-sufficiency, if you please—which rivals the combined mechanisms of foreign powers. The primary difference lies in the fact that class controversies have not necessitated the abolition of democratic institutions, but the changes have been wrought by appeals to the passions, the prejudices, and the non-enlightened judgments of the masses, just as in Italy and in Russia. The drum beatings of the New Dealers, anti-New Dealers, and clerics alike, bear witness that the germ of abolition is present in our system, and should we lose our Anglo-Saxon temper, our sense of balance, then democratic institutions may perish in the United States in a bloody purge under some Other Deal and prelates and anti-administrationists may meet in the same concentration camps.

In the sketchy recital of the world trend toward nationalism, I have indicated its meaning as applied to the peoples of particular countries and by implication what it may mean to you and your generation. Permit me, however, to set forth a bill of particulars on four counts. Unless it is terminated, growing nationalism has four definite implications which may mar opportunities you create or strive to grasp. In the first place, it destroys freedom of conscience, together with all which that implies. It thrives on propaganda rather than upon intelligent information: experience shows that no claims are too exaggerated so long as they are effective. Blood, history, and religion are magnified into universals. The nation supplants God and freedom of conscience. Economic organization is offered as a substitute for ecclesiastical systems and all the psychological processes of fanatical religion are attuned to the worship of the state. Such is nationalism.

It is quite obvious that this entails a controlled press, a shackled educational system, and the subversion of the church by the state to its own ends. On the other hand, the tendency of Christianity and freedom of conscience has been to perpetuate democratic institutions, to break down national barriers, and to erect universals in their stead. Extreme nationalism is now moving civilization in the opposite direction. The world was most nationalistic in the time of Christ and normally Christ would have been expected to be a nationalist. Actually, however, every word he spoke lifted the values developed within nationalistic states to the universal plane.

Send \$3
Be a member

IMAGE IS NOT AVAILABLE
ONLINE DUE TO COPYRIGHT
RESTRICTIONS.

A paper copy of this
issue is available at
call number LH 1 .06S6 in
Bizzell Memorial Library.

At the very center of one of his most appealing parables, he, though a Jew, chose to make the hero one taken from the despised race of Samaritans. The length to which Russia has gone in attempting to stamp out freedom of conscience and religious worship is a matter of record upon which I will not dwell. Chancellor Hitler is determined to make the church a part of a totalitarian state: to compel regimentation of the church by the state, with complete dictation as to its precepts and absolute control of conscience. Less than two months ago the Reich decreed the death penalty for pacifists. Only a year ago Hitler personally conducted a blood purge which eliminated by the firing squad method dozens of his old companions who fought with him to the peak of power, merely because the companions dared to oppose the Chancellor.

There is a tendency in America, also, to assert the supremacy of the state over the conscience of the individual as regards certain matters, which is yours to continue or to relegate to the scrap-heap. Many of us, for example, believe that wars seldom settle international disputes and in good conscience, that war should be resorted to only after attempts at settlement have failed. Nevertheless, the dictates of conscience of one who desires American citizenship must, under the present decisions of the courts, yield to the fiat of the state. In the selective draft cases the Supreme Court of the United States made it quite plain that exemption from military service is a matter of grace and not of constitutional right. In the Macintosh case the same court affirmed the denial of citizenship to a distinguished faculty member of the Divinity School of Yale University because he would not swear to bear arms at the command of the state in a war which he felt was unjustified by Christian conscience, and this in spite of his distinguished record in the Canadian army during the World war. Likewise, under the most recent decision, young men who have conscientious objections to participation in military drill may be refused admission to, or be expelled from, our colleges and universities because of their refusal to so drill. Witness, moreover, the legislative enactments in recent months requiring oaths of teachers and the investigations which have been made into the teachings to and activities of students in some of our institutions of learning, notably the University of Chicago. How far is this tendency to go now that entering wedges have been made? Shall the views reflected in the opinions of the courts and in the oath-binding statutes be entrenched in our national life and followed to their logical conclusion, or shall the constitutional privilege of freedom of conscience be preserved? In the forum of conscience, is duty to a moral power higher than the duty to the state? Shall the individual yield his freedom to make a choice? In Germany, Italy, France, Russia, France,

and Japan, the answer has been given in the affirmative, but as regards the America of the future the decision is yours to make.

In the second place, nationalism always strengthens the military and invites conflict. It produces unhealthy adhesions inside the body politic which are not conducive to accord, either within or without the state in which they flourish. Neither Mussolini nor Hitler could have maintained himself in power without the Black and Brown Shirts of their respective nations, and now that internal troubles have beset them in the face of their ailing self-sufficiency programs, these dictators seek to divert the attention of the populace elsewhere. Ethiopia must be put in her place and the intolerable burdens of the Versailles Treaty must be lifted from Germany by the use of force, if necessary. The German threat was met with a bigger threat. A resolution of the Council of the League of Nations explicitly calls for collective action to meet the triple threat of German militarism, German repudiation of treaties, and German manifestations of aggressiveness. It is a game of Ring Around the Reich. France wants England to keep Italy out of Ethiopia; Italy wants France to keep Germany out of Austria; France wants Russia to keep Germany out of France; Russia wants France to keep Germany and Poland out of the Ukraine; England wants France to keep Russia out of India; and Austria wants all of them to keep out of Austria.

Standing armies have been increased, compulsory military training has been re-established, and each nation increases its naval and air forces under the pretext of keeping pace with other countries. The press headlines from abroad in any one week are enough to discourage any of you. An Associated Press dispatch of April 28, 1935, reads: "Air Defense Boom Swells Nazi Army: War Spirit Reigns." It declares that "new factories are being pushed ahead. Recruiting is progressing apace. War games are being played daily. . . . Not of the least importance is the propaganda: seemingly the people approve conscription as a patriotic duty." A like dispatch from Rome under date of May 24, 1935, declares: "Il Duce Asserts His People Prepared for Any Trial," as guns are placed in the hands of fourteen-year-old future fighters. The Italian dictator addressed an assembly of 20,000 as follows: "The words of an Italian soldier scrawled on the walls of a house demolished by a shell, 'it is better to live one day as a lion than one hundred days as a lamb,' are not merely an order—they are gospel for us. We swear to respect this sacred injunction everywhere and in spite of anyone. Let no one in Italy or abroad delude themselves." Later dispatches declare that the Soviets are fortifying their borders and that Germany has secret understandings with Poland and Japan.

But one says, "No such power is con-

centrated in the hands of the military and such tensions could not possibly develop in the United States." Allah forbid that it should, but who knows? Only ten days ago the Senate of the United States voted a peace time record for a regular naval appropriation bill—\$460,000,000—providing for the addition of 24 new ships and 555 new airplanes to the nation's defense. The appropriation met with the hearty approval of the American press. Moreover, it appears that one brigadier-general has advocated, before the House military committee the scrapping of the century-old tradition of unguarded frontiers between the United States and Canada. He suggested the establishment of a camouflaged air base near our northern border. He admitted that the proposal would arouse adverse feeling in Canada as it did do, and suggested therefore that it be labelled "an intermediate station for transcontinental flights." "It means the same thing," he said. Is America to go the way of Europe? Is every border to be guarded or fortified? True it is that the proposal was rejected and President Roosevelt, as commander-in-chief of the military forces of the nation, administered a public spanking both to the brigadier-general and to the committee in question, but the tragedy of it is that such a suggestion was ever made, regardless of whether it was revealed. The incident disclosed our trend of thought. Must such things be, or am I merely growing old and alarmed?

If you concede momentarily that we may not be strengthening our military and that no trouble may develop from that source, I would remind you that we have plenty of share-the-wealth radicals and capital-baiting demagogues whose leadership may prove most difficult to combat in time of crisis. God forbid that we ever should fall a prey to such leaders. They would create conflicts between groups for purposes of ulterior gain, and would surrender the good of all to group ambitions. That cannot be, because the history of the nations shows that democratic institutions, nay government, cannot long survive when the interests of a favored few are placed above the desperate need of the many. When Rome became corrupt and luxurious and a small group trampled underfoot the rights of the many, the Vandals ransacked the Eternal City. When the royal court laughed at the sufferings of the masses, a reign of terror brought the royal favorites to the guillotine. Such history will repeat itself whenever the opportunity presents itself. It now appears that we are on the road away from such a leadership, but the germ is still present within the body politic. Whether any such state of affairs shall beset us, depends on you and others like you. May we have a good deliverance!

In the third place, nationalism, whether in the United States or elsewhere, means unprecedented regimentation of the faculties and resources of our peoples. Already

we have developed a limited planned economy, with the AAA and the NRA heading the list of alphabetical groups, and even though the Supreme Court of the United States may have held that the standards of action were not sufficiently definite to sustain the NRA statute, such regimentation will continue, either under governmental supervision or voluntary action, if nationalism prevails in future years. I might say in passing that nationalism raised to the *n*th power would mean the destruction of jurisdiction of the courts of the land to declare acts of legislative bodies to be unconstitutional. No court in Italy, for instance, would dare to refuse to enforce or uphold a statute promulgated by Il Duce, and if nationalism means any one thing, it means the termination of an independent judiciary in the end. Foreign markets are gone, so we are told, and production must be limited to domestic consumption. If we are to continue along the chosen path, then escape from further regimentation is impossible. Frankly, I view it as a dangerous policy, because planners who possess the abilities of a Platonic Socratic Solomon are not to be had, nor is the economic counterpart of an Einstein abroad in our land. In addition, forces of nature must be reckoned with and Nature has a method, sometimes mystic, for taking care of surpluses, which method usually is far more effective than man-made schemes. It will also mean arbitrary limitation as to the number who may enter a given trade or profession. Such is the logical conclusion of economic planning. Already there are those in our midst who tell us that there are too many lawyers, doctors, ministers, etc. Who am I to say, "Thou shalt not enter here," or, "Enough have entered already"? Who is to be the judge? By what standards are selections to be made? Frankly I do not know: the choice of alternatives is yours to make.

The fourth and final implication of the nationalistic trend in America to which I invite attention is the acid test to which our political institutions will be put. On May 23, 1857, Lord Macaulay wrote to an American friend as follows: "As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World, and while that is the case, the Jeffersonian policy may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity. But the time will come when New England will be as thickly populated as Old England. Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes laborers mutinous and discontented, and inclines them to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell them that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million while another cannot get a full meal. . . . Through such seasons the United States will have to pass in the course of the next century. . . . I wish

you a good deliverance. But my reason and my wishes are at war, and I cannot help foreboding the worst. It is quite plain that your government will never be able to restrain a distressed and discontented majority. I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act like people in a year of scarcity, devour all the seed corn, and thus make the next year a year not of scarcity but of absolute failure. There will be, I fear, spoliation. The spoliation will increase the distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stay you. When civilization has entered on this downward process, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Cæsar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and the Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions." That excerpt from a letter was written more than three-quarters

of a century ago and by one non-resident to our soil. In many respects it would seem that our institutions are now passing through the crisis of which Lord Macaulay wrote. Most assuredly it appears that we are heading in that direction. Will the institutions survive? That also depends on you and others like you.

The picture of the future is now being painted. Is the backdrop which I have sketched too dark? Am I too pessimistic? Can both individual freedom and an enduring civilization, founded upon democratic institutions, be encompassed upon the same canvas? There are many who say "no." But it must be done and the job is yours to do. The mightiest powers by the deepest calms are fed. I dare you to think. I challenge you to act. To live is not merely to breathe, it is to act. Do this and success will attend you and immortality will be yours. For after all, the only visible immortality we possess lies in the offspring we bear and the continuing accomplishments which we leave behind us as we wrap the draperies of the couch about us and lie down to pleasant dreams. To live in the hearts and in the acts which we leave behind, is not to die. It is immortality.

Sooner Roll Call

Directory Changes

George E. Bertholf,'28bus, care of Pickwick Bus Company, Dallas, Texas
 Harry Marks Buchner,'34geol, Box 416, Medicine Lodge, Kansas
 R. R. Burns,'33bus, 5524 Baywood, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
 Cecil A. Darnall,'33bus, 336 West Brooklyn Street, Dallas, Texas
 Harry Winfield Day,'30bus, 525 North Detroit Street, Los Angeles, California
 J. Minor Durrett,'23as, 1605 A Taylor Street, Amarillo, Texas
 H. Wendell Ford,'34as,'34law, Johnson Hotel, Shamrock, Texas
 Frank F. Gillam,'23as, 1108 East 11th, Oklahoma City
 Vivian Estelle Howell,'34nurse, 400 Northwest 10th Street, Oklahoma City
 Kermit McKinney,'30bus, 310 North 3rd Street, Okemah
 John Louis Mulhall,'34law, 1524 Grandview Boulevard, Sioux City, Iowa
 Mrs. Dora Childress Newman,'24as, 128 Eighth Avenue, North, Nashville, Tennessee
 Mrs. Elizabeth Ozment Van Dusen, 428 Virginia Street, Mercedes, Texas
 Robert Rex Reed,'34eng, Kelly Field, Texas
 Dr. Joseph F. Trigg,'28as, Missouri Baptist Hospital, St. Louis, Missouri
 Mrs. Florence Williams Feuston,'29M.A., 504 West 16th Street, Austin, Texas

Births

Mrs. Etta Anderson Hefley,'31ed, and Lieutenant Maurice Hefley,'31eng, a son, April 18, Home, Ardmore.
 J. Richard Gentry,'20as, and Mrs. Gentry, Enid, announce the birth of a son, Jerauld Richard, May 16, 1935.

Deaths

Roy A. Mahaffy,'24ex, died May 3 in St. Anthony Hospital, Oklahoma City, following a mastoid operation. At the time of his death Mr. Mahaffy was secretary of the Local Building and Loan Association of Oklahoma City. He was a member of the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity.

Year by Year

1906

Dr. Guy Y. Williams,'06as,'10M.A., colorful head of the University department of chemistry, has completed a year as chief executive of the Sooner athletic council. Doctor Williams, voted into the presidency of the council a year ago, became chief of the five-man executive committee that took over the duties of the athletic director. Many improvements on the stadium and an unusually successful season so far as sports championships were concerned are written in the athletic association's book for the 1934-35 school year.

1910

Had there been a prize for the largest number in one family returning for the commencement-homecoming celebration on the campus, the Wantlands of Edmond would have been unopposed for the honor. Charles W. Wantland,'10as, director of athletics at the Central State Teachers college, Edmond, had his wife and five children and a daughter-in-law with him when he returned to the class reunion—eight Wantlands and all from Edmond. Mrs. Wantland is the former Agnes Lindsey. Their children are Mary Agnes, David, John L., Charles P., and William L., and the daughter-in-law is Mrs. W. L. Wantland.

1915

John P. Toberman,'15law, Buffalo, New York, has received a two-year appointment as arts and