

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
 MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP
 J. DROSSAERTS, D. D., LL. D.,
 CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION
 J. J. FOIK, C. S. C., PH. D., CHAIRMAN
 EPH G. O'DONOHUE, SECRETARY
 EPH I. DRISCOLL, LL. D., STATE DEPUTY
 JOHN S. MURPHY, LL. D., STATE CHAPLAIN
 PETER GUILDAY, PH. D., LL. D.

DIOCESAN HISTORIANS
 REV. M. S. GARRIGA, ARCHDIOCESE OF SAN ANTONIO
 REV. JOHN S. MURPHY, LL. D., DIOCESE OF GALVESTON
 REV. JOSEPH G. O'DONOHUE, DIOCESE OF DALLAS
 REV. DANIEL A. LAMING, DIOCESE OF CORPUS CHRISTI
 REV. HENRY D. BUCHANAN, DIOCESE OF EL PASO
 REV. A. A. BOEDING, DIOCESE OF AMARILLO

TEXAS
 Knights of Columbus
 HISTORICAL COMMISSION
 HEADQUARTERS
 ST. EDWARD'S UNIVERSITY
 AUSTIN, TEXAS

May I suggest that there should be quarterly meetings when the society can go on record, proclaim its finished products and provide means for the publications of articles properly annotated and skillfully interpreted. There may be the proverbial baker's dozen in the beginning to attend these assemblies, but what of it? I would much rather have an intelligent gathering of the few around a table in seminar fashion where formality does not exist and where discussion is carried on in orderly fashion according to the dictates of logical reason and common sense. In anticipation of each quarterly meeting the program should be announced in advance so that study and research may be carried on not only by the person or persons presenting the matter but also by several others interested in the topic.

You raise the question of discourtesy to the Yanaguana Society just organized. In answer I would say that the nature of that body was defined in a cut and dried way before it was brought into open forum. Discussion was not encouraged because the organizers did not permit free deliberation, nor was any sufficient attempt made to explain the reasons for such executive action by the organizers. When suggestions were made, they were merely tolerated, and the chairman did not ask to put the revision in the form of a motion so that the assembly could give its expression. Debate was curtailed by the application of the provisions as originally stated.

Such domination has advantages and disadvantages; to the intelligent worker in the field of history it is almost despotic in its character; to the governing body it gives an arbitrary power that tends to perpetuate a dynasty where self-interest reigns supreme. The only aristocracy of intellect that I recognize is that of achievement. I am sure that in that regard I do not differ from the ordinary common class of people who join such societies. They also acknowledge merit and give credit to whom credit is due in the course of events.

A society of pioneers or the descendants of pioneers is not necessarily a historical society, even though it may tickle their pride to be regarded as the "firsts" of their class. It is grand when they have an appreciation backed up by intelligence and a fair historical training. It matters not how they have been acquired: at the fireside, in the library or in the school.