

**THE MISSING FIRST CHAPTER:
A HISTORY OF THE FORMATION OF THE TEXAS LAW
REVIEW.**

By: John Robert Anthony with assistance from the Editors of the Texas Law Review

June 1974

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

John Robert Anthony received three degrees from the University of Texas, B.A. 1916, LL.B. 1921, M.A. 1928. He was Assistant Professor of English at T.C.U. 1916-18; Fellow in Government, University of Texas 1919-20; charter member of Si Sigma Alpha (national political science association). He is also author of the original initiation ritual. From 1929 to 1954 he was Title Attorney and Advisor to Landmen with Humble Oil and Refining Company in Houston. He has authored articles published in Texas Law Review and Texas Bar Journal; was member, vice chairman; and chairman of the Texas State Bar Standing Committee on Real Estate, Probate, and Trust Law, 1951-55, during which time he was principal author of the TEXAS PROBATE CODE. He taught law at South Texas College of Law, 1955-1957; was attorney with General Land Office of Texas, 1961. In 1972 he was cited by the Texas State Bar Section on Real Estate, Probate, and Trust Law for his contribution to Texas attorneys. He is presently practicing law in Bryan, Texas.

1. THE START OF THE MOVEMENT –

The idea of a law review at Texas was apparently first seriously expressed during the spring term of 1915. At that time the law school faculty boasted both Ira Polk Hildebrand and Charles Shirley Potts. These two scholars first proposed the idea and were two of its most ardent promoters throughout the seven years of discussion and planning which proceeded fruition.

Professor Hildebrand, with Bachelor's and Master's degrees from the University of Texas, attended Harvard Law School where his exceptional record afforded him the opportunity of writing for that school's law journal as a student. He joined the Texas Law School faculty in the fall of 1907 with a partiality for anything Harvardian.¹

Charles Shirley Potts became Associate Professor of Law at Texas Law School in September, 1914, after earning his LL.B. at Texas and attending for a short time the University of Chicago School of Law. At Chicago, he like Professor Hildebrand before him at Harvard, was exposed to the benefits of a law journal.

Professor Potts, a vigorous and prolific writer, was apparently the first to suggest the idea of a law review to Professor Hildebrand, so that members of the Texas Law School faculty would have an immediately available vehicle for the publication of their writings. His suggested model was the Harvard Law Review, and with this bit of fact Professor Hildebrand was easily persuaded. Thus was the movement to establish a law review at Texas Law School begun.

Other faculty members soon became aware of the Potts-Hildebrand idea and talk of the formation of a law review became a prime subject of discussion about the Law Building. Students too, heard of the idea and became excited about the prospect. Nevertheless, nothing was done and the talk gradually subsided as that spring term moved toward final exams.

But though the talk declined, the seeds of the idea were firmly planted. The faculty were in unanimous support of the idea; and the younger members especially spent many hours contemplating and discussing the prospect of a respected journal, with articles listed under their names in its table of contents. In the fall of 1915 the talk began anew, propagated by Professors Potts and Hildebrand, Leon Green, and George Butte.

According to Professor Green, who became a member of the faculty in that fall of 1915,² no action was taken or real progress made during the next three years. The subject does not appear on the agenda of any faculty meeting of that time, although faculty members and knowledgeable students continued to discuss the idea.

There was no definite leadership for implementation. No one was delegated to work on plans and no one assumed responsibility or initiative in the absence of an official decision to establish a law review. By 1918, nothing concrete having been done, the movement to launch a review had withered to nearly nothing. No one expected anything to be done in the foreseeable future although the idea itself still appealed to its advocates. The years 1918 to 1920 were years of incubation for the idea, during a time when the majority of student body were serving in the armed forces of World War I.

2. THE ORIGINAL LEON GREEN PLAN FOR FINANCING TEXAS LAW REVIEW—

The mass withdrawal of law students from the school to join the armed forces in the spring of 1918 left so few students for classes that Professor Green resigned and entered law practice in Dallas. During his two year of practice, Professor Green's serious interest in a law review at Texas failed to abate. In his free time he expended considerable thought upon the project, focusing particularly on possible schemes for financial structure sound enough to support publication on a permanent footing.

Professor Green realized that there was then no wealthy friend or group of friends of the Law School to whom the school might turn for money to fund such a project. He therefore became reconciled to the necessity of an alternative plan for financing the review. This period of thinking resulted in the first concrete step toward establishing the law review, the "Leon Green Plan" of endowment.

Professor Green's answer was a Texas non-profit corporation "for the purpose of maintaining and publishing a literary and scientific publication entitled, 'The Texas Law Journal' with an initial capital of 25,000 divided into 500 shares at \$50 each." He felt that the 6000 lawyers then practicing in Texas, most of whom were graduates of Texas

Law School, would provide a ready and sufficient market for the shares, and that, by means of tactful salesmanship, the lawyers could be “sold.”

The plan took advantage of the enormous amount of patriotism felt during the war by providing for purchase of the shares with Liberty Bonds, then very popular as a means of financing the war. The “Subscription Agreement” further provided that the principal sum of capital stock would remain invested in Liberty Bonds until their maturity. The Agreement continued in part: “. . . such capital shall not . . . be drawn upon for the purpose of maintaining and publishing said law journal and shall not be impaired for any other purpose—it being the intention of the undersigned subscribers that said law journal shall be maintained solely from the income derived from said bonds and from advertising and subscription receipts . . .”³

The Agreement outlined the purposes for publishing the law journal as being: (1) a means whereby the legal and governmental history of Texas may be published and preserved; (2) a medium for discussion of court decisions and needed procedural and governmental changes—for the benefit of the Texas Bar; and (3) a means of development for the faculty and students of the Texas Law School—so necessary for a first order law school. The stockholder would realize a return on his investment by virtue of receiving one copy of each issue per share owned for the duration of ownership.

After completion of the “shareholders’ Agreement” Professor Green submitted it to Mr. Maurice Locke, a partner in his law firm and a distinguished member of the Bar, for suggestions and his opinion. Mr. Locke enthusiastically backed the “Leon Green Plan.”

3. SITUATION RIPE FOR THE “MOVEMENT” TO MOVE AGAIN—

With the War over, students in great numbers returned to classes in the years 1919 and 1920. Professor Green followed them, resuming his teaching at Texas Law School in the fall term of 1920, bringing with him the plan so thoroughly worked out during his stay in Dallas. Having worked so tirelessly on the practical problems of funding, Professor Green became the leader of a revitalized movement to establish a law review. Armed with a plan for organization and implementation, and fortified with confidence in

its ultimate success, he was able to command the attention of his colleagues and to persuade them, and later the Bar, of the benefits of his scheme.

Upon his return to the law school, Professor Green was firmly resolved to see the period of mere talk and wishful thinking superceded by action. Talk of a review had begun anew among students and faculty before they returned, but circulation of the Green plan succeeded in focusing attention on the feasibility of a review.

The faculty were well aware that no legal periodical could attain and maintain the necessary stature if its financial support depended upon the uncertainties of subscriptions, advertising and charitable donations. That realization was the principal reason the movement had in the past never progressed beyond mere talk. This was emphasized at the first faculty meeting of the fall term, 1920, when Professors Green, Potts, and Butte, speaking to the issue, expressed doubt about the advisability of starting a law journal without a definite plan of organization and finance. Professor Hildebrand was particularly adamant about the impossibility of establishing a journal without assurance of financial support.⁴

The faculty perceived from the beginning that an endowment was the only method of successfully financing the enterprise, but prior to the formulation of the Green Plan they were at a loss as to the source of funds for an endowment. The Green Plan was unanimously recognized by the faculty as the solution to the financing problem. So confident was Dean Townes of the pending implementation of the plan that he sought out the support and cooperation of University President Robert E. Vinson, even so far as to submit a request to the President's office for the physical equipment that the Review staff would need to begin work.⁵ The hasty request assumed that the publication would soon be a going institution. Dean Townes would undoubtedly have considered anyone who predicted the two years wait an irresponsible pessimist.

At that first faculty meeting in the fall term of 1920 the first subject of the agenda was "the Law Review." Dean Townes opened the session by outlining the plan of organization and spoke at length on the field of opportunity for educational and professional service which a first-class law review could render. The publication would benefit faculty, students, practicing members of the Bar and the law school itself. He suggested that the work be done by students, with the aid of faculty members. He

explained that the scheme called for a faculty committee and a board of trustees; and, the board of editors and provisional board of student editors having been chosen, the only remaining ingredient for success was strong faculty cooperation. Dean Townes advised the appointment of an advisory faculty committee to “afford a medium of communication” and that such committee meet with the Board of Editors and with the student board of editors for discussion of matters pertaining to the Law Review.

The faculty enthusiastically endorsed Dean Townes’ ideas and he proceeded to appoint the Advisory Committee and to instruct them to proceed with organization and implementation of the “Leon Green Plan.” Professor Green being the youngest professor and most enthusiastic support, was chosen as Secretary of the Committee with instructions “to get busy.” There is no record of the personnel on this committee, but it is easy to guess that it included Potts, Hildebrand, Bobbitt, Butte or Rhea, in addition to Green.

The names of the men suggested by the faculty to serve as the “Founding Board of Trustees” in connection with the movement were well known and highly respected members of the State Bar. They were: Judge F.A. Williams, Galveston; Judge Nelson Phillips, Austin; Judge Dillard, Sherman, Judge Etheridge, Dallas; Judge Kimbrough, Amarillo; Cantey, Hanger, or Lee, Fort Worth; Turney or Thonason, El Paso; Jim Baker or H.M. Garwood, Houston; Judge John C. Townes, Austin, Ira P. Hildebrand, Austin; and Dr. George C. Butte, Austin. The “Founding Board of Trustees” was an honorary name for the corporation’s initial Board of Directors and was changed to the latter designation in the adopted charter’s by-laws. Professor Green defined their function in his circular letter to lawyers of October 16, 1920:

Ten or fifteen of the leading lawyers of the State . . . are being asked to join in the founding of the magazine . . . These men are to constitute the first Board of Trustees, in whose hands all funds will be placed and kept until the necessary amount has been obtained to launch the enterprise. When sufficient funds have been obtained, these Trustees will secure a charter . . . The Board of Trustees will become permanent with full power to manage and control the business and with power to choose their successors.⁶

Although faculty members were highly pleased with the Green Plan, some minor changes were needed. The name “Peregrinus” was dropped from the corporation title and the organization was perfected as indicated in the Charter’s Bylaws published in the first number of the Review, December, 1922. The name of the corporation became “Texas Law Review, a corporation” and the name of the publication was changed from Journal to Review. In addition, the annual subscription price of one dollar suggested in the “Subscription Agreement” was changed to \$4.00; and some other changes were made in language. No record of the argument or reasons for the changes has been found.

A new provision was added to the Bylaw to the effect that no cash dividends should ever be declared or paid, but in lieu thereof, each stockholder would receive free of charge one copy of every issue for each fifty-dollar share owned by him. This return on the stockholder’s investment would be equivalent to approximately 8% per annum so long as the shares were outstanding.

4. STUDENT CO-OPERATION—

In the meantime, a few students of the Class of 1921—W.B. Jack Ball, Roy C. Ledbetter, Hobert Price, John S. Redditt, and perhaps others—had been trying in an unorganized manner to come up with suitable plan of their own. They continued in their tireless efforts until the Committee of faculty members was officially appointed to implement the Green Plan. Thereafter these students ceased their independent efforts and volunteered their services to the committee, with which they worked diligently. They continued to talk of their dream of a law journal at Texas, with expectation that it would be realized before their graduation in 1921.

These young people were confident that the idea was an important one and were proud to perform a role in the movement. It is this Class of 1921 which deserves recognition for taking the active student initiative in the movement. Credit for the letter sent to President Vinson by Dean Townes should go in large measure to W.B. Jack Ball, who actually drafted it after attending discussions had by the faculty principals. Some of these students, including Ball and John S. Redditt, accompanied Dean Townes on several

official visits to President Vinson to assure student support and participation in the movement.

The faculty chose a first Board of Student Editors of the anticipated Review from this class. This “provisional board” was chosen on the basis of rank in class and included: W.B. Jack Ball, Editor-in-Chief; John S. Redditt, Associated Editor-in-Chief; John Robert Anthony; Harry Dow; Willie Zac Ledbetter; Irene Elizabeth Lohman; Hobert Price; and Lawrence Herndon Rhea. This staff quickly organized and assured the faculty that it was ready for work. Several of the editors even began doing research on specific problems and prepared case notes and comments in rough form for the first issue of the Review, which they expected to come off the press in 1921. This work turned out to be mere practice, for the actual date of beginning was yet another year away.

5. YOUNG PROFESSOR IN ACTION—

Having been officially appointed Secretary of the faculty Advisory Committee on the Law Review project at the faculty meeting on October 13, 1920, and being charged with the responsibility of establishing a first-class law review with all deliberate speed, Professor Green moved forward in the fall of 1920. His first task was the drafting of an outline of persuasive arguments for establishment of the Review under the Green Plan. These “Points for Argument” were designed to aid faculty and student efforts to “sell the idea and plan to the lawyers and judges of the state.”

In his outline Professor Green enumerated the functions of a law periodical, including its benefit to students and members of the Texas Bar, its usages in other states, and its undeniable influence if managed properly. He also asserted reasons for adopting the organization proposed in the Green Plan, with special emphasis on the necessity of the Review's independence from financial problems. The basis for these arguments was the notion that a quality journal could be produced, reflecting credit on the school and the Bar, only if the Bar supported the project with the resources available to it.

Drawing freely from his “Points for Argument,” Professor Green, aided by Dean Townes and Professor Potte, composed a form letter to be sent to every lawyer and judge in Texas. The letter was carefully drafted to present the most persuasive arguments in

support of the project. The hope of the draftsmen was that this letter would instill in its recipients a feeling of professional pride and privilege which would be manifested by subscription of the \$50 shares being offered. Tact and subtlety were the keynotes of the document.

Professor Green set out six contemplated purposes of such a publication:

1. To furnish a medium of expression for the Texas Bar.
2. To provide a means of preserving the results of research done by members of the Bar.
3. To afford a means of recording the achievements of Texas lawyers.
4. To record the progress being made in the development of jurisprudence.
5. To furnish a means whereby the research and writing work of students, so essential to good legal training, could be published as incentive to the students.
6. To establish a channel of communication between the Law School and the Bar, mutually beneficial to both.

Assurance was given that those who had been actively on the plan were convinced of the worthwhile nature of the project. Professor Green advised that students of the Law School had already organized and begun work under faculty supervision. He boosted the plan by announcing that various leading members of the Texas and other state Bars had already undertaken to prepare articles for publication. He gave assurance that the Law School faculty would do whatever was necessary to maintain the publication at a high standard and was willing “to underwrite this feature of the undertaking.”

With this foundation thus laid, Professor Green boldly introduced the problem of financing the project. “The whole undertaking at this time,” he wrote, “depends on financial support. Actually, this is the next and final hurdle to be cleared. The publication must be insured of continuous life in order to command respect of contributors, subscribers, and advisors—and to command and sustain the interest of the Bar. No one wants to be connected or burdened with an enterprise certain to fail; and, unless the financial support is provided now, all within a year or so, the burden of carrying on the publication will fall upon the shoulders of a few loyal men and sooner or later end in failure.”⁷

He estimated that the annual cost of the publication would be about \$5,000; that subscription and advertising, being wholly uncertain, would best provide only part of the necessary income. "Furthermore," he admonished, "it is desirable that every law firm in Texas receive the publication and that the subscription price be small." He then suggested that endowment was the only secure method of financing the enterprise. He stated: "After mature deliberation, a conclusion has been reached that an endowment is the only dependable means of financing the project. An endowment of \$50,000 invested in safe securities would yield about \$3,000 per year. This amount, plus income from subscriptions and advertising, would support the publication and lend it the security necessary for its continued success."

The letter next outlined the plan for securing an endowment. The plan called for enlisting leading attorneys and judges "to join in the founding of the magazine by lending their names and influence to vouch for the earnestness and sincerity" in which the effort was being made. Those men, the "Founding Board of Trustees", would receive and hold all funds until the necessary minimum sum should be obtained to begin the enterprise, whereupon they would secure a charter for an educational corporation to be named "Texas Law Review." All subscribers would be considered charter members, and the Board of Trustees would become the Board of Directors, with power to manage the business and choose its successors.

The professor added remarks designed to show the sincerity of the undertaking on the part of all of those who were immediately involved. "Everyone who has been approached on the subject so far is thoroughly in sympathy with the movement and promises support. It seems only a question of getting the matter attended to. The time seems ripe to begin procuring the necessary funds. But, if it takes two or five, or even twenty, years to get adequate funds, it will certainly be desirable to wait until that time before launching the actual publication." He concluded the letter by stating the eagerness with which the magazine's promoters would accept suggestions from the Bar and desire to have the support and approval of as many lawyers and judges as possible.

6. SLOW RESPONSE FROM LAWYERS—

Through the winter of 1920-21 Professor Green had his letter multigraphed, signed all copies, addressed and mailed them to lawyers and judges as speedily as his limited stenographic help made possible. Favorable response was slow in coming—not because the lawyers felt unkindly toward this innovative proposal and appeal for help, but simply because, like other busy businessmen, they were absorbed in pending cases and professional matters. They thus laid aside for “the time being” this new appeal that apparently offered only theoretical benefits to them.

Response was so slow that less dedicated proponents would have become discouraged. The faculty even decided that President Vinson should be reassured by another booster letter, a further “selling” argument on the contemplated law journal.⁸ This letter enlarged upon the benefits which such a journal would confer to our students and the faculty of the law school and upon the value of the journal as a bridge between academia and the Bar. Also expressed was the belief that the journal would serve as a link between Texas Law School and other law schools around the country, links which would expose the Law School in the best light for appraisal and judgment by other schools. The purpose of this “Report” to the President was to boost his interest in the project which, so far as he knew, had made no progress since he authorized the request physical equipment nine months before.

The letter, in recognition of the belief that the journal could not be operated without adequate financial security from the first, further suggested the innovative scheme, endorsed by the faculty, of publishing an interim legal bulletin devoted to matters which ought to be included in a law review. Such a bulletin could be distributed freely in the manner of other University bulletins, and copies sent to members of the Bar without charge. The bulletin would be published only until the shares of stock in the Law Review corporation were subscribed. The letter concluded by stating the eagerness of the faculty to try such a scheme and with assurance that costs would be limited to reasonable amounts.

There is no known record of President Vinson’s response to this proposal or whether an issue of the bulletin was ever published. But the proposal evidenced the

earnestness of the faculty members' resolve to move forward with the establishment of a law review and indicated their serious desire to begin editorial work in advance of corporate organization.

7. RENEWED ACTION FOR FINAL DRIVE OVER THE TOP—PROFESSOR GREEN'S APPEAL TO LAWYERS AT THE STATE BAR CONVENTION.

Not satisfied with the gradual, but encouraging progress being made as a result of the letter circulating through the Bar, Professor Green took the opportunity of addressing the convened members of the Texas Bar at their Association Convention in Fort Worth on July 5, 1922. His speech on behalf of the Law Review told of the efforts of the Law School faculty and students to establish the journal and of the plan proposed for organizing and financing it. Professor Green reported on the reaction to his letter, which to that time had brought in 420 subscriptions to the stock, totaling \$21,000 with \$9,500 paid in and the balance payable with the next few months. He explained that the subscriptions already taken had come from the urban bar associations where it had been possible to reach a large number of lawyers in a short period, and that he believed that twice that number could have been obtained if the smaller associations could have been personally reached.

He assured his audience that enough subscriptions had been sold and money received to justify perfecting the organization; but that the campaign would continue until \$50,000 was received so that the financial structure of the corporation would be permanently assured. After enumerating the advantages of a law review, he adopted a persuasive tone in the hope of gaining the support of his audience:

Notwithstanding the rather promising start, those who have been pushing the campaign feel that the idea of the law review has by no means achieved a beloved place in the big heart of the profession. It is still an orphan—to most of the profession, a doubtful experiment . . . Moreover, most of those who have subscribed feel that their money support was the end of their participation in the enterprise. But that is not so. It is to be regretted that every lawyer in this state has not taken the

time to consider the proposed publication in all its possibilities. We truly believe it deserves your deepest professional interest and support

In short, a legal periodical, such as the proposed Texas Law Review, is the only feasible agency for supplying that intimate relationship so necessary to a healthy professional spirit. It is the only practicable means for reaching that great majority of lawyers who are so absorbed in their daily practice that they do not attend professional meetings. It is the only medium by which the intellect of the profession can be brought to bear on our common problems—the only vehicle of expression through which the power of the lawyers of Texas can be effectively harnessed for the welfare of the state!”

Having laid this predicate, Professor Green proceeded through an explanation of his plan for financing the journal, emphasizing the necessity of removing the review from dependence upon subscriptions and advertising for its financial base. He explained how the \$50,000 figure had been settled upon and how the anticipated \$3,000 annual income from that amount would be sufficient to insure financial security. He also described the realization of 8% per year which would accrue on each invested share through the perpetual subscription to the Review. He concluded the speech with this climax:

A first-class legal periodical, such as Texas Law Review will be, carrying the best thought of our best lawyers, month after month, year after year, must within our lifetime—not only hasten the day for reconstruction of our badly dilapidated machinery of government, not only contribute to the clarification of the body of our written and common law, not only help to build to the highest point of service the great profession of which we are proud to be members, not only help property to safeguard the institutions through which our profession’s life is constantly renewed, but more than any of these, Texas Law Review should in time become the living voice of that body of men into whose care has been entrusted the orderly development of the society of a great State and a great people!⁹

After the conclusion of Professor Greens's speech, Professor Robert W. Stayton moved that the Bar Association approve the plan of organization and financing the Review which Professor Green had outlined. The Chair put the question and it duly carried.

8. FINAL PLUNGE TO SUCCESS—

As Professor Green noted in his speech, 420 shares of the initial 500 contemplated had been sold by July 1922. The appeal to the assembled Bar brought 38 immediate subscriptions, raising the total to 458 on July 5, 1922—still 42 short of the 500 authorized by the Green Plan. Nevertheless, the supporters of the Review were determined to see it established then and there. Anticipating this decision, they had notified all shareholders as of June 28 that an initial meeting would be held during the Convention, lacking the 42 shares, a number of the most eager subscribers agreed to underwrite them so that the figure of 500 could be reached and the corporation could be perfected.

Twenty-one stockholders attended the meeting, with eleven more represented by proxy. Dean Townes was nominated and temporary Chairman of the meeting, and Professor Green was elected Secretary. On motion, the Chairman appointed a committee of five stockholders to make nominations for such number of directors as they deemed best and report back to the meeting. This committee was composed of C.S. Potts, Robert W. Stayton, Claude Pollard, R.E. Thomason, and Lewis R. Bryan. Fifteen persons were nominated, with the committee's recommendation that there be fifteen Directors under the initial capitalization with an increased number of capitalization should be increased. The committee's recommendations were approved.

Those attending the meeting unanimously endorsed the Leon Green Plan and resolved that it be immediately implemented. The Corporation Charter was signed and acknowledged on November 6, 1922, by the three incorporators, Judge Ireland Graves, Professor Ira P. Hildebrand, and Professor Leon Green. The charter named the Directors for the first year, providing that there be no fewer than eleven and no more than twenty-five. It provided for capital stock of \$25,000 divided into 500 shares at \$50 each, all of which had been subscribed and 50% paid in. It provided for term of 50 years, expiring

November 6, 1972. It was duly certified by C.W. Payne, Chief Clerk, Acting Secretary of State, on November 6, 1922.¹⁰

While the Green Plan was at last being implemented, faculty members were enthusiastically preparing articles for early issues of the journal. Professor Potts was the leading promoter of this editorial phase of organization, and was elected Chairman of the Board of Editors. At a faculty meeting on January 3, 1923, he urged all who were preparing articles to have them completed by January 10. Of the fourteen articles published in Volume One, ten were prepared by faculty members and four by Texas lawyers. Members of the faculty also prepared twelve of the “Comments.”

The student staff, whose first Editor-In-Chief was A.W. Walker, Jr., worked in spartan surroundings. The editorial staff had no meeting place other than the Senior Law classroom; there were no staff offices, books, typewriters, or desks. But the students had complete responsibility for the “Case notes” Section and it was hoped that they would soon take over the “Comments” as well. And so, while Professor Green was busy perfecting the Corporation and promoting subscriptions, the two boards of editors were hard at work preparing suitable material for the first volume of the Review. At long last everyone was engaged in his coveted task, and the Texas Law Review was a reality.

FOOTNOTES

1. Professor Hildebrand became Dean of the law school in September 1924.
2. Professor Green is currently teaching law at Texas Law School. He is among the most distinguished members of the current faculty, after a lifetime dedication to law teaching and scholarship, during which time he has been Dean of the Law School at Northwestern University.
3. The original “Stockholders’ Agreement” and proposed charter written in longhand, and his revised Agreement and typed “Suggested Points for Argument” are in Professor Green’s personal files. Professor Green has indicated that these might be passed to the Texas Law Review for permanent filing.
4. Law School Faculty Minutes, October 13, 1920.
5. A list of the items requested is included *id.*
6. Professor Green’s letter is on file in the Texas Law Review Record Book.
7. *id.*
8. The letter is set out in full in the Law School Faculty Minutes, supra n.4.
9. The full text of Professor Green’s speech is recorded in the Texas Law Review Record Book.
10. The original Charter and By-laws appear at 1 Tex. L. Rev. 117-22 (1923).