An Occasional Paper
Number 21
2007

The Founding and Defining of a University

By: Marshall Terry

SMU® | CARY M. MAGUIRE CENTER FOR ETHICS & PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The Founding and Defining of a University

PREFACE

Southern Methodist University (SMU) was founded for a distinct purpose, to serve as the "connectional institution" for the Methodist Church west of the Mississippi when Vanderbilt University gave up its Church connection and that function.

Fortunately for the new university, the Church was in the strong Wesleyan tradition of "think and let think" and its founding president Robert Stewart Hyer was a physicist and knowledgeable academic who said at the outset, in 1916, "Religious denominations may properly establish institutions of higher learning, but any institution which is dedicated to the perpetuation of a narrow, sectarian point of view falls far short of the standard of higher learning." So, founded as a university with a theology school to train ministers and a tiny music school, SMU, while cherishing the spiritual and moral values and traditions of the Church, was by design denominational and not sectarian. Through the years this openness to various ideas and truth claims has led to SMU's firm educational basis in the liberal arts.

In this essay I will consider the character of the founding president, Robert S. Hyer, and of the defining president Willis McDonald Tate; and look at the definition of the University that emerged from Tate's 1962-1963 Master Plan; and finally assess some of the University's successes and failures to act according to its stated principles along the way to the present.

HYER

Who was this founding president and what were the attributes that allowed him to found and lead a new university of limited financial means compared with other new private universities such as Chicago and Stanford?

Hyer was a native of Georgia and graduate of Emory College. He came to SMU from Southwestern University in Georgetown, Texas (which remains a Methodist institution dedicated to the liberal arts), where he had served as president since 1898.

President Hyer not only had a keen intellect and embraced a broad perspective on education but also embodied the human side of

the founding of the University. He reminds us that such ventures are not possible without vision and persistence.

In a sense he sacrificed himself to his vision and to the task, for he interrupted his research career and was later relieved of his presidential duties, in a twist of dramatic irony, in favor of Hiram Abiff Boaz, who had tried to sell the new university to Ft. Worth and whom Hyer had brought into SMU to help him out promotionally. Hyer then returned to his laboratory and his teaching. As a matter of fact, he had taught all of SMU's courses in physics during his presidency.

This prime mover in SMU's founding was a scientist not a theologian, a teacher not a preacher. SMU would have to wait until 1939, and Dr. Umphrey Lee, to have such a real educator as leader again. Fresh winds were blowing in America, and in Texas, in Hyer's time, in the 1890s and early 1900s and breezing into higher education. The elective system was opening up learning. There were distinctive new academic disciplines. There was a new breed of liberal scientists who knew what the discipline of learning and research in a university might be, and Hyer was of that company. Fear of higher education on the recent frontier was diminishing, giving way to a more middle class desire for its practical benefits. Methodists were beginning to think that their preachers should be educated, like other professionals. All this centrally concerned Hyer's definition and his context.

After Hyer graduated from Emory College, he came as a science professor to Southwestern at Georgetown in 1882. In 1898 he read a report, "Some New Measurements of Electric Waves," before the Texas Academy of Science concerning his experiments with X-rays and ether waves. In 1904 he designed the first wireless station in Texas.

In *Southern Methodist University: Founding and Early Years,* Mary Martha Hosford Thomas writes that "as early as 1906 Hyer was convinced that Southwestern should eventually be located in Dallas." That is, the early drama had to do with whether Southwestern would be moved from Georgetown and then when it was decided there would be a new Methodist university, whether it would go to Fort Worth or Dallas. The man behind the scene was Wallace Buttrick,

who told Hyer around 1905, “Dallas is the best unoccupied territory in the south. Some day someone will build a university in Dallas and you Methodists are the ones who should do it.” Buttrick was executive secretary of the General Education Board of New York, organized by John D. Rockefeller to aid higher education.

As Thomas writes, “Hyer and Southern Methodist University did not fit into the same category as Chicago or Stanford. Instead of one enormously wealthy benefactor, SMU had to rely on the Methodists of Texas and the citizens of Dallas who contributed money in relatively small amounts. Nevertheless, President Hyer designed a campus and buildings on a grand scale that would cost the kind of money Chicago and Stanford had.” She goes on to say that, even though the ambitious plan nearly ended in a financial disaster in SMU’s difficult early years, “the remarkable feature about this plan is not that it was visionary but that the university developed very much as President Hyer wished.”

A symbol and future reality of Hyer’s vision was Dallas Hall and the entire scheme of other buildings he projected for the future. It remains a remarkable vision.

Jay B. Hubbell, an early SMU faculty member and later a leading scholar in American literature at Duke University, wrote of our founding president, “President Hyer was a liberal and enlightened scientist. He put together a fine faculty made up largely of young men of widely different backgrounds, but all of them energetic, ambitious and well-trained and all of them with ideas as to the proper aims and organization of a university. He resigned in 1919. The university was in desperate need of money, and at 59 he was neither willing nor able to stage a big money raising campaign. He was spending too much time worrying about the unreliable second-hand pump in the university’s artesian well. He was seldom in his office.

“There were nevertheless elements of greatness in Robert Stewart Hyer. He had done a fine job of organizing a new institution of learning. He was a trained scientist and he thoroughly understood the nature and purpose of a university.”

Having weathered the war years as SMU president, Hyer was asked to resign and in 1920 made way for the new president, Hiram Boaz. Hyer said, “The president of a tax-supported institution must be

a politician; the president of a private institution must be a financier; the president of a denominational university must be both. Since I am neither I resign."

For ten years then before his death in 1929, Hyer continued to teach physics at SMU and keep the pump repaired.

TATE

Willis Tate was the president who moved SMU to be more than a college, to be a university.

Tate's metaphor for the campus was "family," and he reached out in his large embrace to Dallas. Nothing but SMU's Church connection and liberal arts tradition was as important to him as the connection to the city of Dallas—which had sought and sustained the new university—and the practical and cultural/spiritual needs of the city and its people. For he took to heart what the first president said when asked, "When will the University be completed?" "When the city of Dallas is completed," President Hyer had replied.

Tate was the fifth president of SMU, following the founder Hyer, the fund-raiser Boaz, the builder Selecman and the gentle scholar Umphrey Lee. He served from 1954 to 1972 as president, then became chancellor and came back to serve as president again during 1974-1975—altogether as long as the four presidents who followed him, to the time of R. Gerald Turner.

He led the University through difficult times: from the McCarthy era of the Fifties to the assassination of John F. Kennedy and protests of the Sixties and cultural changes in the Seventies. He was born in the same year, 1911, in which SMU was founded.

In his inaugural address President Turner said that SMU presidents must be measured by the yardstick of Willis Tate, and I believe that that is true. Tate was SMU's fulcrum president. What he did was to move an essential college on a recent frontier in a dynamic but anti-intellectual city to the status of a university and to interpret this university in understandable terms to its particular public.

He was courageous in the task, always insisting that SMU be a free university in the best tradition of American private higher education, and he was a genius at this interpretation—at explaining

and defining difficult propositions clearly and simply—that a university must pursue truth and hold freedom of inquiry as a *sine qua non.*

Willis was 43 when he became president, more than six feet tall, handsome, athletic, in fighting trim. He looked like the All-Southwest Conference football tackle that he had been, playing on SMU's championship team in 1931 for Coach Ray Morrison, whom he revered. He had been executive assistant to Paul Quillian, minister of First Methodist Church in Houston, and was an able administrator. He had been licensed to preach, and he brought his YMCA and Methodist Church values when he came back to his Alma Mater as assistant dean of students in 1945. He was steeped in the tradition of Methodism, including service and social concern, and in his heart was the Wesley maxim, "Let us unite those two so long divided, truth and vital piety."

He soon took on the role of backing up President Umphrey Lee, who had seen SMU through the war, whose health was failing and who did not like to make unpleasant decisions.

It is startling to recall that when Tate took office in 1954 SMU's annual budget was four and a half million, its endowment six and a half million, its enrollment 8000 students, 3000 of them in Dallas College, the downtown adult education branch. Tuition was $500 a year. (When he left office the budget was $30 million, endowment was $40 million, and there was a substantially greater number of regular undergraduates and graduate students, though the enrollment, by choice, had grown by little more than a thousand students. In the early years before, and then during, the Master Plan, we looked toward an endowment of $50 million as the Promised Land.)

As well as deaning and becoming SMU's first vice president for public relations, development, administration, and everything else the provost and financial v.p. did not do, Willis taught a popular Sociology course called "Marriage and the Family." He had B.A. and M.A. degrees from SMU in that discipline.

He had undertaken doctoral studies at the University of Texas at Austin, but did not have the Ph.D. He felt some insecurity about this; but as he grew in office and it became clear how deeply he respected the faculty and how he defended them always for expressing their ideas as long as they were in their academic fields, it came to bother

him less. And the faculty, except for a few, felt that he had come from them and knew them and stood by them.

Of course, early on, as Willis tried to explain this circus of talent and characters he presided over to the people downtown, faculty would chafe at such titles Willis gave his talks as “The Care and Feeding of Professors,” which was not one I wrote for him.

In May 1954 the first item on the agenda for the SMU Board of Trustees was to elect a new president. The second item involved a senior member of the faculty of the university and the meaning of academic freedom.

This was the case of the strangely perverted, and distinguished, scholar and teacher of Anglo Saxon literature and aggressive anti-Semite John O. Beaty. Beaty was my teacher at that time in *Beowulf* and “The History of the English Language.” He had inscribed to me—*Ad astra!*—a copy of his book “The Iron Curtain Over America.” Reading it, I was amazed to find that he had developed a theory that centuries ago the Teutonic Knights had stopped the Khazar Jews at the banks of the Elbe, but that now the Jewish-Communist conspiracy was aiming to take over SMU—he had written a pamphlet called “How to Capture a University”—and to take over the nation and the world. Essentially, all Communists were Jews and vice versa.

He was censured by the SMU faculty. The Trustees passed the problem to the new president. Tate handled Beaty calmly and firmly, denying him the martyrdom he craved.

The McCarthy era lasted in Dallas from the early Fifties to the assassination, and in that period the basic assumptions—freedom to think and express ideas, books in the library, speakers on campus—were not just questioned but strongly attacked by a rabid right wing in Dallas and beyond, including editorial writers of *The Dallas Morning News*.

In September of 1955, a year and a half in office, Willis spoke to the Kiwanis club of Dallas. It was just after the U.S. Senate censure of Joe McCarthy. Willis knew his faculty was being attacked, his libraries criticized and that his teaching-learning programs were under fire. In the words of his chief assistant Johnnie Marie Grimes, “It was

time to remind these business leaders of the true nature of a university in terms they could understand."

He said to them, "One of the most difficult tasks I have as president is to interpret the nature of a university. First, let me mention a few things a university is *not."* It was not, he said, a football schedule—not a school for juveniles—not a college. "The object of a college is to teach, but the object of a university is both to teach and to seek out the truth in every form. This is the process we call research. A university's stock in trade is not only students but also ideas, for new ideas are the most important things in the world. All progress has come from shocking ideas."

He went on to say, and this is pure Willis Tate: "Every university realizes there are risks involved in this freedom. One is the crackpot who takes advantage of this freedom . . . and another is the exploitation by some of this free discussion for their own benefit or protection. We think it is worth the risks involved. To be sure of our democracy we must create and maintain a great university here and keep it clothed in the atmosphere of freedom. This is our contribution to America and to mankind and in the service of a creative God. With His help, we are determined to do it well."

A decade later he was still at it, framing this truth in what he considered the necessary metaphor. Speaking downtown again, as he often did, he declared, "A university is a marketplace of ideas. It is a marketplace for the free enterprise of ideas. Every person in this room, I hope, believes in free enterprise. This concept of freedom in the market means that every product and service must stand in competition with every other. This freedom is essentially the same freedom as academic freedom dealing in the realm of ideas." He made clear, again, that this is a "risk-taking" freedom and must not be abused by academics speaking outside their field of competence.

Professors at SMU at the time, such as historian Paul F. Boller, Jr., have testified to Willis' quiet strength in defending their obligation to research, write, and speak freely in their fields. Often they did not know at the time that he had deflected criticism from them.

The racial integration of the University was also a challenge for Tate in the late Fifties and the Sixties. SMU led the way among universities in Texas and the South in integration, though it was

carefully and quietly done: first in Theology, then adult education, graduate and professional schools, and the college. (Jerry LeVias, in the Sixties, was the first African-American football player in the Southwest Conference.) “That was the way to do it,” Tate said in a later interview. “We didn’t try to get on the front page of the paper. I remember one man who confronted me. ‘You have blacks in the Law School?’ he said. ‘We’ve had blacks in the Law School for two years,’ I told him, ‘and no problem. What’s your problem?’”

The Master Plan came halfway through Tate’s term and was, he later said, a “hardnose, extensive” effort to “re-examine all our presuppositions” and “get everybody in the act.”

Willis kept an office in the Law School in retirement. He was largely overlooked by Presidents Zumberge and Shields but honored and given his place by President Pye. All of those who loved him—the extended “university family”—mourned his passing in his native Colorado in early October of 1989 at the age of 78.

THE MASTER PLAN

The Master Plan of 1962-1963 came right at the mid-point of Willis Tate’s twenty years as president. A year-long effort, it was the first time the university had formally addressed its educational philosophy, direction for the future, and financial needs.

In rolling up his sleeves to get at this major undertaking that would include faculty, staff, students, alumni, and friends, Tate said (as quoted in J. M. Grimes, ed., *Views and Interviews),* “We didn’t want to take any other university as our model. The process was thrilling. It was a new beginning for me. The Master Plan was a turning point in the University.”

It was an elaborate set-up. There were faculty and student committees on every aspect of the university’s academic and student life programs. There was a Committee of Fifty: educators, Trustees, friends, alumni, Dallas and Texas civic leaders, including the likes of Stanley Marcus and Erik Jonsson. There was a central student committee, including students John Hill, David Bray, Hugh Hart, and Milla Cozart, that had real input and set up a future situation of students having a voice in university policy. There were the educational consultants Oliver Carmichael and Thomas McConnell. There was a Faculty Committee chaired by the distinguished church

historian Albert C. Outler, who had the idea of a "University College" as home for general education and who authored for the Master Plan the elegant essay "The Idea of the University and the Idea of SMU as A University." The members of this Faculty Committee went on to become university leaders, James Brooks, Aaron Sartain, Charles Galvin as deans, and Brooks as long-time provost, and Laurence Perrine and William Tittle as department chairs.

The question posed in Outler's essay was, "Can a Church-Related university like SMU become a great private university?" The answer was a resounding yes, SMU could—because of the nature of the Wesleyan tradition of higher education and devotion to that principle of "Think and Let Think." President Hyer had, as noted, stated firmly at the beginning that SMU was to be denominational but not sectarian, a university open to various ideas and claims to truth. But the Church must come in with understanding, leadership, and financial support.

I was at that time Public Relations Director and an assistant to Tate, while teaching. In the Master Plan structure Johnnie Marie Grimes and I were associate coordinators. They brought in a strange duck as coordinator, Jesse Hobson, from Stanford Research Institute. He had been dean of engineering at Illinois Tech and was reputed to have clout with the Ford Foundation. The great hope was to receive a significant grant from the Ford Foundation following this year of extensive planning. I liked Jesse, but we rarely saw him. He spent most of his time in the air, I think literally and figuratively. One of the great ideas he came up with from a trip to Central America was that SMU might open a campus in Honduras to which we could ship all our non-productive tenured faculty.

As a coordinator, I attended many meetings of the inner circle and the larger circle. I wrote the Master Plan, or as Lon Tinkle wickedly put it in introducing me to someone, "Marsh is, ah, amanuensis to Willis Tate."

The much quoted sentence in the Master Plan that describes SMU's academic position is as follows: "The essence of SMU's educational philosophy is that professional studies must rise from a solid foundation of a basic liberal arts education." This statement has been repeated in every strategic academic document since then.

We had high ideas and ideals. We had John Henry Newman in hand. We had a good prairie college and we were creating a university. We were, in a sense, amateurs but we took as inspiration, just as Hyer had, the leading American private universities.

The salient features of the Plan were indeed those of any American private university which might aim high: selective admissions, the cherishing of each individual student inside and outside the course structure, academic freedom as a *sine qua non,* and a balance between the humanities, social sciences, and sciences and between teaching and research.

We debated the academic weakness of the business and engineering schools, deciding to keep and strengthen them. What to do with the small music school was debated, and I remember Johnnie Marie springing to the blackboard and drawing a box parallel to the other schools and saying, “There it is, put it there,” and so we did, creating the School of the Arts, which has turned out all right.

It was a grand year, and put some wind back in Willis’ sails halfway through his term as president, and led to some things good and bad. The Board of Trustees was reorganized from its unworkable size of 85 and a small Board of Governors as an executive committee formed. Most of these Governors were Dallas people, and the concentration of their power led to the governance (and football) problems later in the 70’s and 80’s. (In the firing of Paul Hardin in 1974 and the payment of football players ten years later.)

Also, and this was a key act of judgment, Tate decided not to throw in with Erik Jonsson, Cecil Green, and Eugene McDermott and let the Graduate Research Center get away from SMU. This led to the Southwest Center for Advanced Studies as a separate research institution and later to the creation of a full scale university, the University of Texas at Dallas. Tate did not think SMU should try to follow a Caltech model, and the Master Plan, with its heavy emphasis on the undergraduate program in the liberal arts and on law and theology, shortchanged the sciences, scientific research, and engineering even though the Master Plan called for and created Ph.D. programs, the first in Economics.

That decision has been questioned many times. Did SMU pass up a great opportunity? Much salvage work has been done through the

years to develop the sciences, engineering, and research. Yet I think the decision made sense at the time.

The stated goals and objectives of SMU in the Master Plan are these:

> 1. To be a university whose educational process and program are committed to the highest possible academic integrity, quality, and substance; whose institutional character is marked by a centrality of concern for the basic arts and sciences and by a balance, on the one hand, between the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences, and, on the other hand, by a balance between undergraduate, professional, and graduate education; and whose enterprise as a private, pacemaking institution proves of real benefit to its students, the Southwestern region, the nation, and humanity.
> 2. The pursuit of truth and the preservation, dissemination, and extension of knowledge.
> 3. To encourage in students both natural individuality and the development of the whole person for the sake of the individual and for a free society whose sanction and salvation lie in the knowledge, wisdom, and moral and social responsibility of each of its citizens.
> 4. To take full advantage of the University's relation to its sponsoring denomination, emphasizing especially the traditional concern of the Methodist Church for high quality, non-sectarian, education.
> 5. To insist on an atmosphere for learning in which freedom of inquiry, thought, and expression is a *sine qua non*, in the belief that the valid is confirmed and the fallacious exposed by a free enterprise of ideas, and in the faith that truth so arrived at is indeed liberating to human individuals.
> 6. To create and maintain an unparalleled "community of concern" in which each student and faculty member is valued as an individual.
> 7. To serve society as a source of intellectual, cultural, and spiritual energy; to do so through the regular educational offering and by community services such as adult and continuing education, special institutes and seminars, use of the

University's talents and facilities by the community, and in other ways whenever these are consistent with the objectives and role of the University and the legitimate needs of society.

UPS AND DOWNS: A PARTIAL ASSESSMENT

Has SMU been true to its stated goals and objectives? (I realize that I may be presumptuous in "grading" the University, but I care deeply about these issues and, like Thucydides, I had a bias and was there.) Here is a sampling of our ups and downs.

*Freedom of Inquiry and Expression

During and since Tate, the University has a strong record in regard to academic freedom, both in free discussion and in support for faculty pursuing their legitimate work in teaching and research. Tate was awarded the Alexander Meikeljohn Award in defense of academic freedom from the American Association of University Professors in 1965. He stood behind the students' right to invite the controversial former editor of the *Daily Worker* to speak on campus in 1958, and in the 60s invited Martin Luther King Jr. to speak, both acts of courage at the time. Since then, the SMU tradition of free inquiry has held firm in the faculty and students, though faculty specialization and student lethargy have not usually made our campus a hotbed of conflicting ideas.

*Student Participation

Toward the end of Tate's term, in order to avoid the student disillusionment and rebellion in much of the nation, an elaborate system of "shared governance" was worked out (in the early 70s) to include students. It was soon abandoned as cumbersome but led on to a role for the developing Student Senate in student life on campus. Presently a student serves as a voting member of the Board of Trustees and student committees manage finances and take responsibility for much of the program of student life. SMU has an impressive record in this regard.

*Service to Society

This has been an up and down, back and forth path through the years, but the reality has remained that the University is

in a dynamic city and has variously tried to help meet the city' s educational and cultural needs and aspirations. The Master Plan kept the then-weak schools of Business and Engineering. Later efforts were made by the administration to curtail and then eliminate Education. President Pye's model for a strong private university did not include Education, but the pendulum has swung back and last year a new School of Education and Human Development was created. An evening Law degree was recently reinstated and a new campus for some non-traditional subjects of interest to the Dallas community created at Legacy in Plano. And so it goes.

SMU cannot escape Dallas, and by the same token the best way any university can "serve society" is to graduate intelligent and able citizens.

*Church Relationship

I chaired a task force for President Pye on the relationship to the United Methodist Church, which was the last time it was formally reviewed. We reaffirmed the original traditional relationship, which is so well established that it is a near non-issue. The Church is still there and we are still Southern Methodist University with no present impetus to change the name. The Church supports and encourages the University and at times, as in the football scandal, and presently lends moral/ethical guidance. By ownership and trusteeship the Church continues to be a firm part of SMU's spine.

*Firing of Paul Hardin

In 1972 Tate was named Chancellor and forty-year-old Paul Hardin, president of Wofford College, came in as president. Two years later he was in effect fired, though he did resign, then tried to take it back. Edwin L. Cox was chairman of the Board of Trustees, which would give no reason or explanation for Hardin's leaving. For months the Faculty Senate tried to get a reason from the Trustees and was stonewalled. Due process had been overcome by secret unilateral action. This caused tension and mistrust between the faculty and Trustees for several years, even though

Tate came back in as president for the interim. Hardin had reported an athletic violation to the NCAA and many thought that this was the cause of the Board's action. Others thought that Hardin had been acting too independently of the Board, especially of the Board of Governors where the power was. The Church (Paul Hardin's father was a Methodist bishop) also criticized the Board. It was a time of bitter and unfortunate disharmony in SMU and a symptom of a major flaw in governance.

*Governance

In the later 70s other strains appeared, for example, the firing by Board fiat of an eccentric young professor in the Business school. The Board of Governors was at least close to direct intervention in the academic process. This was at the root of the troubles that came in the 80s. The football scandal and the way it was handled by Trustee leadership was a consequence of close-bound power held by a few members of the Board of Governors created by the Master Plan in 1963.

*Football Scandal, 1986

The direct paying of football players resulting in the so-called Death Penalty involved some Trustees as well as alumni and other boosters. Some of them were prominent people, all shielded from public disgrace by then Governor Bill Clements, who had no part in setting up the scheme. It was unbelievable to the faculty and a dark day for SMU and showed again that big-time football was the antagonist to our academic purpose and goals. The recovery, which involved the restructuring of the Board of Trustees and elimination of the Board of Governors, followed by the tough leadership of A. Kenneth Pye, was nationally recognized as remarkable and greatly to the University's credit.

*The Bush Library

I was going to say that there had been disappointingly little discussion or debate over the prospect of the Bush Library coming to SMU. That changed from last November to the present, with much discussion and debate, mostly over the proposed Bush Institute (or "Belief Tank") under the control

> of the Bush Foundation with no such overview as there is at the Hoover Institute at Stanford. There has been a split within the Faculty over the issue and some individual voices from the Church concerned about the ethics and morality of the war in Iraq. But the point here is that this was and is a debate and discussion in line with our goal of free expression, worthy of a university attempting to be true to itself.

All in all, with some significant growing pains, I do believe that SMU has been true to its stated goals and objectives. We have had a remarkable ascent as a free private university in a short time as university time is measured.

Certainly the University faces a very challenging time ahead. Because of our academic tradition, location, and the growing excellence of our faculty, I have faith that SMU will meet the challenge well.

THE CARY M. MAGUIRE CENTER FOR ETHICS AND PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The leaders of Southern Methodist University believe that a university does not fully discharge its responsibility to its students and to the community at large if it hands out knowledge (and the power which that knowledge eventually yields) without posing questions about its responsible uses. Through the Cary M. Maguire Center for Ethics and Public Responsibility, SMU strives to foster the moral education and public responsibilities of those whom it empowers by:

- Supporting faculty research, teaching, and writing in ethics that cross disciplinary, professional, racial/cultural, and gender lines;
- Strengthening the ethics component in SMU's undergraduate and professional curriculum;
- Awarding grants to SMU students who wish to study issues in ethics or engage in community service.

SMU also believes that a university and the professions cannot ignore the urban habitat they helped to create and on which they depend. Thus, while not an advocacy group, the Maguire Center seeks to be integrally a part of the Metroplex, attending to the moral quandaries and controversies that beset our common life. To that end, the Center:

- Has created an Ethics Center Advisory Board of professional and community leaders;
- Organizes local seminars, colloquia, and workshops featuring SMU and visiting scholars;
- Publishes occasional papers and books based on the Center's endeavors that will be of interest to both academics and the general public.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Cary M. Maguire Center for Ethics and Public Responsibility
Southern Methodist University
PO Box 750316
Dallas, TX 75275-0316
214-768-4255
www.smu.edu/ethics_center

Any of the occasional papers may be obtained from the Maguire Center for Ethics and Public Responsibility for $2 per paper. Please make checks payable to SMU.