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CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The Texas Music Educators Association (TMEA), an organization of school music educators, has the following goals: to stimulate professional growth, to promote public awareness of music education in the public schools, to maintain communication among music teachers throughout the state, and to foster productive working relationships with other organizations having similar goals.¹

Begun in 1920 as the "Texas Bandmasters Association," the organization formally adopted its present name in 1938. By 1989, the TMEA reports to include 5,127 members who teach music at all levels from pre-kindergarten through postgraduate.² The TMEA's membership also includes college students, businesses and non-teaching musicians as well. It employs a full-time executive director and three-member staff whose office is in Austin.

The TMEA is a teacher-oriented group which has strived through the years to improve the teaching skills of its members. Since its leadership believes that better teachers

¹What is T.M.E.A.?, pamphlet (Austin: Texas Music Educators Association, 1984), 1.

produce better students, the direct beneficiaries of a music education program of excellence are intended to be the students themselves.\textsuperscript{3} To reach its stated goals, the TMEA implements a continuing program of activities and projects. The most highly visible of these is the annual statewide clinic-convention. Held for three days in early February, the clinic-convention includes choral, elementary and instrumental clinics, demonstrations and concerts, along with research sessions and addresses by nationally recognized educators.

The All-State band, orchestra, choir and jazz-band rehearsals, under the direction of noted conductors, are held during the convention. The concerts by these groups are scheduled in such a way as to provide a "grand finale" for each clinic-convention. Also occurring during the convention is a trade show by over four hundred publishers, instrument manufacturers, and other music related firms that give Texas music teachers the opportunity to become acquainted with new materials.

Another TMEA project is the sponsorship of workshops at the regional level. As an extension of the in-service aspect of the annual convention, TMEA makes available to its districts $17,600 in financial grants each year.\textsuperscript{4} This averages out to approximately $800 for each of the

\textsuperscript{3}What is T.M.E.A.?, 1.

\textsuperscript{4}What is T.M.E.A.?, 1-2.
twenty-two districts. Administered at the regional level, the workshops funded by these grants provide clinicians to instruct elementary, choral and instrumental music teachers in music teaching techniques.

The TMEA publishes a monthly magazine, *The Southwestern Musician* combined with the *Texas Music Educator*. The organization has also served as a lobbying force over the last fifty years with regard to promoting music as a fundamental subject in school curricula. Beginning in 1970, the TMEA has sponsored four music symposia. The first was organized as a three year project that took place during the February clinic-convention each year. Panels of music educators representing the entire state led discussions of various topics, with the main emphasis on improving the training of music teachers. During the summer of 1977, a second symposium convened in Austin to evaluate the music education programs in Texas schools and the TMEA’s influence upon these programs. In 1979, a third symposium was held in Dallas. From the discussions of the music educators attending these sessions, a booklet was published titled "Public Relations and the Music Educator."\(^5\)

In 1985, the fourth symposium was co-sponsored by the TMEA, Fine Arts Department of the University of Texas at

---

Austin, Texas Bandmasters Association, Texas Orchestra Directors Association, Texas Choral Directors Association, Texas Music Educators Conference, and the Texas Association of Music Schools. The symposium, titled "Music is Essential to Quality Education," was funded by the Music Industry Council, TMEA sustaining active members, the University of Texas, and TMEA. The primary focus was on seeking the most effective means of communicating the value of music education as a viable component of quality education at all levels. In exploring the potential of the arts as a vital tool for the development of each child's own potential, the participants sought to: (1) encourage the type of curriculum, scheduling and funding which would perpetuate quality arts experiences for students, (2) clarify the place of music in the total education of students in Texas, (3) analyze public opinion about music education and determine ways to shape that opinion, and (4) define ideal music curricula and education programs.

The present remarkably strong status of the TMEA raises the question of how its growth came about. How did a group of a dozen municipal bandmasters in the early 1920s evolve into a complex music educator's organization? What were the decisions which influenced the outcomes of key landmark events that faced the TMEA through its historical

---

*What is T.M.E.A.?, 2.*

*What is T.M.E.A.?, 2.*
development? Webster defines landmark as: "an event or development that marks a turning point or a stage." ⁸

History shows us that the developmental process for organizations and associations is often highlighted by significant events which are pivotal in nature. These events usually hinge upon the decisions of individuals and institutions which exert influence. For the purpose of this study, landmark event is therefore defined as a conflict or dispute between two or more parties that becomes a turning point or pivotal incident in the development of an organization. A study of such pivotal incidents can help us to understand how Texas music educators organized and dealt with their professional needs and with outside pressures.

In the past several decades, scholars in the social sciences have provided a considerable body of literature on the subject of decision-making. The fields of political science and business administration in particular have produced much research and writing concerning the decision-making process⁹ and the nature of "change," both in governmental and non-governmental organizations.

---


⁹For the purpose of this study, "decision-making process" will be defined as "selecting among action possibilities whether conscious or unconscious"; Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), 4.
In 1959, Charles Lindblom proposed a stimulating, if somewhat controversial, model of decision making which he called "muddling through." This decision-making principle considers only incremental or limited changes which build closely on past experience. Great emphasis is placed upon the value of "agreement and consent," and upon minimizing trauma by making relatively small degrees of policy changes. Lindblom later co-authored a book with David Braybrooke in which "muddling through" was given the more sophisticated title of "the strategy of disjointed incrementalism," but the message remained strong that major policy innovations are rare. Rather, the model has a strong bias in favor of the status quo.

Political scientist Robert Dahl is less skeptical about the likelihood for social systems or organizations to achieve change, yet he grants that only incremental change is the normal pattern. His model encompasses three magnitudes of change, depending upon the configuration of influence: (1) incremental, or marginal change, (2) comprehensive change, and (3) revolutionary change. Incremental (or marginal) change occurs when the operating structure is unaltered or changed only in minor detail, and


policy changes are gradual, resulting from negotiating and bargaining among spokesmen for relatively stable groups. Comprehensive change refers to a situation in which the operating structure is altered very little but sweeping innovations or decisive reversals of established policies occur, and these changes result from shifts in the relative influence of different groups. Revolutionary change is present when comprehensive changes in policies and relative influence of different groups is also combined with profound alterations in the operating structure.\(^\text{12}\) Dahl's model is more open to the potential of major policy change for organizations, but acknowledges that the likelihood for such change is limited by the requirement that the right combination of forces and circumstances be met.

The strength or weakness of the groups to which Dahl refers is dependent upon seven sources: size, cohesion, geographic distribution, organization and leadership, program and ideas, status (how they are regarded by their peers), and the political and social environment in which the group must operate.\(^\text{13}\) "Size" refers to a group's membership; the cliché "strength in numbers" applies here. "Cohesion" is defined as the level of effectiveness in which


the group communicates and works together, and its tendency to "stick together" on significant issues. "Geographic distribution" refers to how widespread the working membership is, while "organization and leadership" refer to the level of effectiveness in these two areas (i.e., constitution and by-laws and how effectively tasks are implemented). "Program and ideas" deal with the question of whether or not they are "good" ideas, or a "good" program, and deal with the purpose and subject matter that is the core of a group's reason for existence. An organization's "status" means how it is regarded by its peers and its many "publics." The "political and social environment" refers to specific outside forces which exert influences upon groups. A particular strength or weakness in any of these areas, according to Dahl, can greatly influence the direction or outcome of an organization's important decisions.

The common thread that runs through all branches of political science studies is "power."¹⁴ The term refers to more than the popular idea of overwhelming or unlimited control. It shades off by degrees to the opposite extreme of the most gentle influence. Through these subtle influences, decision-makers often cause a greater impact on "change" than they realize.

¹⁴V. O. Key, Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups, 2d ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1948), 266.
Harold Laswell's description of politics as "who gets what, when, and how," and his definition of political science as "the study of influence and the influential"\textsuperscript{15} are relevant concepts for understanding the decisions that were made by the key players of the TMEA during the specific landmark events under study. Both definitions reflect the importance of individuals in positions of leadership or authority, and the power which they use.

In preliminary study, three landmark events from TMEA's past were identified as crucial turning points for TMEA, and therefore are included in this research. All former TMEA presidents from the years 1938-1980 were sent a questionnaire (see Appendix A) asking them to choose or list the three most important events in the history of the association. Of the twenty-three former presidents who were contacted, twenty replied. A compilation of responses revealed many different opinions, with the following "landmark events" being most frequently mentioned: (1) the change from a band organization to a music educators organization (1938 - adding the choral division, and later adding the elementary and college divisions), (2) the University Interscholastic League (UIL) takeover of contests

in 1947,\textsuperscript{16} and (3) TMEA's separation from the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) in 1976.

A wealth of historical information regarding the TMEA is available at the association's headquarters in Austin, Texas. These resources include minutes of general session and executive board meetings dating back to 1925, a complete catalog of TMEA journals (the association magazine), annual convention documents and preserved records of correspondence and unpublished materials. Many former TMEA officers from the 1940s and 1950s are still alive, some of whom possess and have provided personal correspondence and records relevant to this study.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected landmark events in the historical development of TMEA, 1938-1980, and the decisions which influenced their outcomes. Specific questions were:

1. Who were the principal participants in the decision-making processes and who influenced the outcome of these events?
2. What was the role of each of these participants in the landmark decisions?

\textsuperscript{16}The University Interscholastic League, which was originally sponsored by the University of Texas at Austin, is the statewide organization which administers virtually all extra-curricular and co-curricular competitive activities for Texas public schools.
3. What other factors (i.e., forces, circumstances, events, etc.) influenced the outcome of these events?

4. What patterns of similarity exist, if any, in the decision-making processes among these events?

5. Did the final decision in each event lead to a gain or loss in TMEA strength with regard to its:
   (a) Size
   (b) Cohesion
   (c) Geographic Distribution
   (d) Organization and Leadership
   (e) Program and Ideas
   (f) Status?

Related Literature

Four main bodies of research were deemed relevant to this study: (1) unpublished and published materials concerning the history of associations, organizations, or music education in a particular geographic area, (2) historical studies about music education in Texas, (3) historical studies dealing specifically with the TMEA, and (4) research in the disciplines of social science regarding the nature of decision making in an organization context.
Historical Studies of Associations

Many studies of music associations have been conducted during the last thirty years, and they have almost exclusively been dissertation research. Three investigations are particularly relevant to this research, addressing the histories of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), the Michigan School Band and Orchestra Association (MSBOA), and the Florida Music Educators Association (FMEA).

Investigating the history of the MENC, Harry Kauffman reported a chronological summary of the association's development from 1907 to 1942. The purpose was to present an overview of the MENC's growth, emphasizing outstanding influences, worthwhile efforts and significant outcomes. Kauffman stated that there was a "need for rescuing from oblivion the many pertinent facts which were rapidly becoming legendary." Resources for the study consisted of journal proceedings, yearbooks and MENC publications. The researcher also wrote letters to past presidents of the association asking them for their insights on specific issues pertinent to the study.

Studying the Michigan School Band and Orchestra Association, James Hause's purpose was:

to identify those forces which were instrumental in the creating and the perpetuating of an organization

which in a democratic fashion vigorously dedicates its resources to the instrumental music education of the boys and girls of Michigan.\textsuperscript{18}

Primary resources consisted of association records, interviews and correspondences with observers, and various other professional sources. The researcher conveyed a great sense of pride in the organization, which contributed to his writing being very subjective. He wished the dissertation to:

serve as a reference source for facts and details pertinent to the development of the association, and to provide a readable source through which members and other interested parties can learn something of the heritage of the association.\textsuperscript{19}

The study was presented chronologically and was grouped in chapters according to who was president of the MSBOA during a certain period of time.

Whiteside's purpose was to compile a history of the Florida Music Educators Association and its component organizations. It was the writer's thesis that within the context of this historical study certain concepts would be evident which would assist in the general improvement of music education in the State of Florida. The researcher believed that there was a lack of historical works which

\textsuperscript{18}James Barnham Hause, "A History of the Michigan School Band and Orchestra Association, the First 25 Years, 1934-1959" (Ph.D. diss., The University of Michigan, 1969), i.

\textsuperscript{19}Hause, vi.
offered perspective and tradition to the profession. He justified his research by siding with Thurber H. Madison in pointing out the need of music educators to develop a historical perspective of their field. To support this view, he quoted Madison from *Basic Concepts in Music Education*:

> There is also a feeling in a few circles that music educators need to be more aware of their professional history, and it is urged that more studies of a historical nature be undertaken. This is not for the sake of the historical information itself, but for the sake of a better understanding of the concepts which have played a part in building music education to what it is today.

Resource materials utilized included association records, personal interviews and public and private records. The research was presented chronologically, ending with the researcher's conclusions that the FMEA's development and growth was almost exclusively oriented towards the improvement of performance standards, while neglecting general music and music scholarship areas, such as composition and theory. Whiteside also stated that there existed a suspicion and lack of trust within the profession which prevented the group as a whole from having a unified set of goals and objectives. The researcher's main

---

20 Thomas Lewis Whiteside, "A History of the Florida Music Educators Association and Its Component Organizations" (Ph.D. diss., The Florida State University, 1970), 2.

recommendation was for the association to strive for more cooperative efforts as one professional body, and not to perpetuate separate interests to the detriment of the whole organization.

Historical Studies of Music Education in Texas

Historical research dealing with music education in Texas consists of four main documents. Although none of these studies deals with the TMEA in depth, they each give their own insights into the general historical setting in which the TMEA developed.

Bakkegard's research is a brief (ten pages) historical sketch, beginning with an introductory description of the early Spanish missions in the 1500s. She then describes the years 1830-1954, to which the rest of her research is devoted. She states that in 1886 an organization called the Texas Music Teachers Association was formed. This extension of the National Educators Association (NEA) had seventy-six charter members, and was made up almost exclusively of piano teachers. Nearly all of the remaining material deals with the early 1900s and mentions the TMEA in only a few paragraphs.

Although Lotta Spell's Music in Texas devotes only a few sentences to music teacher organizations, it presents a

rather thorough treatment of Texas music education during the 1800s and early 1900s. She describes the development of Texas' early music educator associations as follows:

Among the professional organizations in the state, the most powerful should be the music section of the State Teachers Association, but it has not exerted itself in proportion to its ability. Joined with it should be the membership of the Texas Music Teachers Association, which has functioned since 1915, but whose membership is largely made up of private teachers of limited perspective as to the whole music program of the state. The Texas Bandmasters Association formed in 1922 has been active; credits have been secured for band and orchestral work in the schools.23

The Texas Bandmasters Association mentioned above was the start of what would eventually become the TMEA.

William Martin's study of the Texas Association of Music Schools (TAMS) had a threefold purpose: (1) to trace the historical development of the TAMS, (2) to make a critical analysis of the activities of this organization in relation to the curricular modifications that member institutions have made since 1945, and (3) to make recommendations for improvements and further research. He found that the TAMS was instrumental in helping Texas colleges and universities to increase their course offerings in music, as well as standardizing the music curriculum.24


Sloan's "History of Texas Public School Music" gives a very general description of music's development in Texas, covering the years 1659-1968. The research is divided chronologically into five chapters: (1) Roots, 1659-1872, (2) Divergence, 1873-1899, (3) Early Supervisor Roles, 1900-1919, (4) Inception of State Influence, 1920-1932, and (5) Amalgamation of Goals, 1933-1968. Sloan's history is quite broad, touching on widespread trends and developments, with limited in-depth reference to specific associations such as the TMEA.25

Historical Studies of the TMEA

Although no dissertations or books have been written about the TMEA, four historical documents have proven to be very useful in this study. Ralph Beck, a charter member of the original Texas Bandmasters Association, wrote a brief outline of TMEA's history from 1920 to 1940,26 which also appears as a fourteen page addendum to the Minutes and Procedures of T.M.E.A. - 1924-1961. Beck's outline is based largely upon his own anecdotal recollections, as well as from the associational minutes.

Jack Mahan, TMEA president in 1949, wrote an informative and interesting thesis, "Texas Music Educators


Mahan, like Beck, had free access to all associational minutes, plus a first-hand knowledge of the inner-workings of TMEA's executive board. His study provides many insightful commentaries regarding the association's decisions and developments through the years.

Another TMEA officer, C. R. Hackney, wrote a thesis titled "A History of the Texas Music Educators Association," in 1939. Hackney's study begins with the later 1800s and offers many of the same resources which Mahan utilized. Although Hackney's research is not as in depth as Mahan's, he offers many unusual items, such as questionnaire results from school band directors, and specific histories of major music festivals.

A fourth study of TMEA was written by Charles Sandford Eskridge, titled "A History of the T.M.E.A. as Recorded in State Secretaries' Minutes of Annual Meetings." His thesis primarily consisted of descriptions and quotes from TMEA minutes and offered little information beyond that of the other sources.

---


In summary, there have been numerous historical studies done concerning various aspects of music education in Texas. However, the collective information from these studies gives the reader only a general view of the TMEA as it has evolved since 1920. Also, this researcher has found that every music association dissertation reviewed consisted primarily of a chronological reporting of events. Research questions presented, if any, usually consisted of determining the current status of the organization, or determining what impact the organization had made upon music education in its geographic area. In addition to the studies already summarized in this chapter, other studies reviewed chronicled the American Bandmasters Association, the College Band Directors' National Association, the Nebraska Music Educators Association, the Kansas Music Educators Association, and the Mississippi Music Educators Association. None of these studies has probed into the decisions which may have affected the historical development of any given organization. Considering the significance and size of the TMEA, a study of specific decisions surrounding pivotal historic events in its development appears to be a fruitful and important endeavor.

Overview of Research on the Decision-Making Process

The third body of research relevant to this study is the work done by social scientists on the decision-making
process, particularly in an organizational context. Economist Herbert A. Simon provided strong research leadership during the post-World War II period in focusing on the decisions of individual administrators in the broad organizational sense. Many others have since contributed to the growing body of research with varying foci within the fields of business administration, public administration, political science and sociology.

Schuman and Oluff describe four broad categories or models which seek to explain the process of decision making: (1) rational models, (2) legal models, (3) political models, and (4) social-psychological models. All models that are built on the concept of rationality assume that choices are based upon conscious deliberations of which means may best achieve predetermined ends. This view is deeply ingrained in both democratic political theory and classical economic theory. In their purest sense, rational models picture the process as the choice of a single, logical decision maker on the basis of clear, objective standards. A more realistic


variation of this model places intendedly rational decision makers in the context of organizational reality. In this setting, the decision makers work in a complex environment of people and events over which they have only limited control. Rational choices are limited by ignorance, prejudice, unanticipated consequences, and "sunk costs." When facing this reality, the decision maker, according to Simon, really seeks only to make reasonable decisions rather than perfect ones.

One of the most severe attacks on the rational model has been made by Pfeffer and Salancik in their book on the external control of organizations. They contend that the rational theory is inadequate because it focuses too much on internal perspective, to the exclusion of all kinds of influential external constraints (e.g., the economy, depression, war, societal values, ideas, etc.) that impose competing and frequently conflicting demands on an organization. Taken to its ultimate logic, the ecology (the environmental forces external to an organization), dictates

33 Schuman and Oluff, 368.


its decisions in a kind of social determinism, relegating to a lower level of significance the rational concepts of leadership, motivation, task design, or communication, which were advocated by earlier researchers such as Simon.\textsuperscript{36} However, Pfeffer and Salancik still emphasize the significance of individuals in general and managers in particular in making "right decisions" in response to a given organizational environment.\textsuperscript{37}

The legal model for making decisions is exemplified by standard procedures in a court of law. Elaborate rules direct and influence the proceedings, the roles of participants, the methods of arriving at the facts of the matter, and the ultimate decisions themselves. The proceedings generally work on an adversary basis, so that the organization, business or individual charged with a violation is entitled to a notification of the charge, time to prepare a response, a hearing or set of hearings to determine the facts of the case, and opportunities for appeal. The specific type of legal reasoning may vary according to whether the subject matter involves constitutional principles, statutory interpretation, or development of common law. The legal model can apply to rule making within businesses and government agencies. It can also usefully describe the decisions often made in

\textsuperscript{36}Pfeffer and Salancik, xi.

\textsuperscript{37}Pfeffer and Salancik, 89.
organization growth and change when laws and legal matters come into play.\textsuperscript{38}

Political models of decision making assume limited rationality of participants except as it is rational to compromise and seek "satisficing" consensus among competing organized interests.\textsuperscript{39} This emphasis on political consensus in decision making tends to keep the outcome not very different from earlier policies. In the political model, change occurs in increments and, as cited previously in this chapter, Charles Lindblom and others refer to this as incremental decision making. According to Graham Allison, the dynamics of incrementalism is rooted in organizational collections of offices with different configurations of biases, desires, and political skills and influence. He concludes that "different groups pulling in different directions yield a result distinct from what anyone intended."\textsuperscript{40}

Rationality is not excluded from the political or incremental mode. Amitai Etzioni has described a kind of modified incrementalism called "mixed-scanning," or a

\textsuperscript{38}Schuman and Oluff, 368-69.

\textsuperscript{39}Herbert Simon uses the term "satisfice" to describe reaching a decision that is satisfactory, with benefits that suffice to meet the situational needs, in Simon, "Administrative Decision Making," Public Administrative Review 25 (March 1965): 33.

\textsuperscript{40}Graham T. Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," American Political Science Review 63, no. 3 (September 1969): 707.
two-level search for alternatives in policy making.\textsuperscript{41} The most basic variables are considered in the first level, perhaps leading to a fundamental decision on a long-term goal. The second level may involve detailed consideration of incremental decisions in the fact of budget feasibility and other contextual factors.

Strong emphasis has been given more recently to the political or "power model" of organizational decision making by Jeffrey Pfeffer.\textsuperscript{42} Pointing out that the concepts of organizational politics and organizational power have been conspicuously absent in the literature of business management and organizational theory, Pfeffer borrows heavily from the literature of political science to make his case. He argues that power—not rational choice—strongly affects decision outcomes ranging from budgets to executive positions to the design and redesign of organizational structures. He concedes that it may not be necessary to choose between the different decision-making models or analytical frameworks if the role of power is considered in all models. Pfeffer's "law of political entropy" is that, given the opportunity, an organization will tend to seek and maintain a political character. Rationality is said to be


fragile, and organizations tend, over time, to be more and more characterized by the political model.\textsuperscript{43}

The social-psychological models emphasize the effect of a "role" on an individual's decision-making process. This model has not figured as prominently as the other three in the literature of administrative decision making, but warrants discussion in the context of this study. Certain factors may affect a decision maker's perception of the environment, and consequently influence his reaction to that environment. One factor is loyalty to the group, which sometimes develops into a decision to defend the group, or what they represent, above and beyond the boundaries of good sense. People in governments often have a "seige mentality" and trust only those around them, thus greatly limiting the rationality of the decision-making process.

A second factor affecting perceptions is a trained or acquired bias or incapacity resulting from a field of specialization or cultural belief. Texans are sometimes accused of exhibiting this kind of "lone star" bias against outside ideas and institutions. As Texas historian T. R. Fehrenbach has described it in his book \textit{Lone Star} (perhaps the best regarded history of the state), "Texas is a little like Brittany or Wales, places that have been absorbed into

\textsuperscript{43}Pfeffer, \textit{Power in Organizations}, 5-9.
a larger culture but retain their own consciousness." In speaking of the fiftieth anniversary of the Texas Institute of Letters, Dallas, writer A. C. Greene described Texans' tendency toward independence with perhaps some tongue-in-cheek: "We are the guardians of the Texas myth, the final keepers of the Texas Holy Grail."

A third factor involving perceptions of decision makers in the socially-psychological model is an assumption that is also shared by the political model. In both models, there is a belief that decision makers cannot act "rationally." These models emphasize that our limited cognitive capacity allows social, organizational, group, and interpersonal factors to greatly influence decisions.

Pfeffer and Salancik do not want to follow slavishly the "old concepts" of leadership, motivation, task design, communication and control. They are saying that the "rational theory," as well as "internal perspective only," are inadequate. As indicated earlier, they lean more heavily toward the political power model, but they are open to the analytical usefulness of all models. Pfeffer's and


46Pfeffer and Salancik, xi-xii.
Salancik's approach should help us to understand how TMEA decisions were affected or constrained by such external influences as school superintendents, the Texas State Department of Education, school music parent booster clubs, Chambers of Commerce, the Texas State Legislature, Texas Education Agency, Music Educators National Conference, the economy, cataclysmic events such as World War II, and societal values and ideas, such as racial/sexual equality, national cooperation/unity, fair play, teamwork, and Texas "lonestarism."

Pfeffer and Salancik contend that managers and administrators are seldom "manipulators of their organizational environments," rather, the environment influences ninety percent of organizational behavior, while managers influence only ten percent. However, the authors also admit that some managers can be more than "symbols" and "processors of demands"; some are able to adjust to the environment and even alter the environment.\(^47\)

A somewhat different classification of decision-making models is given by Pfeffer, who compares four types: rational, bureaucratic, decision process/organized anarchy, and political power.\(^48\) Application of any decision-making

\(^{47}\)Pfeffer and Salancik, 19.

\(^{48}\)Pfeffer, Power in Organizations. See chapter 1 for an interesting tabular comparison of the various qualities and dimensions of his four organizational decision-making models.
models to reality is problematic, due to the complexity, risk and uncertainty of real life situations.\textsuperscript{49} Since the context of decision making is enormous, including political issues, inter-organizational conflict, program development and involvement with human behavior, no model can serve all purposes. Rather, most real life decisions tend to utilize a combination of several models. The analyses of the decisions surrounding TMEA landmark events utilize these models to the degree that they are helpful to understand the historical development and significance of the Texas Music Educators Association as an organization.

\textbf{Methodology}

Many historians have attested to the role of historical research in scholarly efforts to show the effects of past education practices. They have also acknowledged the role research plays in offering explanations of how past practices developed and why they prevail.\textsuperscript{50} Edward J. Power describes the function of historical research in education as follows:

\begin{quote}
The history of education offers no guarantee that it will answer the present-day questions concerning goals, curricular methods, costs, and administration. Offering such answers is not its function. It can, however,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{49}Schuman and Oluff, 374.

provide us with some insights into the way these, or similar problems have been handled in the past.51

The historical research for this study has relied on a combination of documentary sources and personal interviews. The interviewer captured oral history from informed observers and/or participants, whose descriptive phrases help preserve the flavor and atmosphere of events more effectively than official minutes or other documents. Information used in addressing the research problems and questions was obtained from the following specific resources:

1. The minutes from TMEA meetings beginning in 1924, which are nearly completely intact.52

2. Published information from several music journals, including the *Southwestern Musician*, the *Texas Music Educator*, later combined as the *Southwestern Musician* combined with the *Texas Music Educator*, *The Texas Bandsman*, *The Bandmaster*, *The School Musician*, *the Texas Music Educator*, and the *Texas School Band and Orchestra Magazine*.


52 Mr. Bill Cormack, current executive director of TMEA, has made all associational resources (including the minutes from meetings) available for this writer. A letter from Mr. Cormack expressing the TMEA's support of this research project is included in Appendix C.
3. Unpublished correspondence, memos, letters, position papers and other documents on file in the TMEA archives in Austin; also correspondence which is in the current possession of various former TMEA officers.

4. Dissertations or other studies relating to the TMEA's history.

5. Published and unpublished UIL correspondence, and minutes of proceedings.


7. The minutes from MENC meetings.

8. Interviews and correspondence with former TMEA officers and members who were directly involved with the landmark events (see Appendix D).

9. Interviews and correspondence with non-TMEA members who were directly involved with the landmark events (such as school superintendents, former MENC and UIL officials) (see Appendix D).

Survey instruments and interviews are firmly established as standard techniques in historical research. Oppenheim offers an in-depth description of survey design and the formulation of interview questions.\(^{53}\) Phone and personal interviews with persons directly involved with the

events were used to gather primary source data, as well as
to develop a flavor of oral history for the study. Before
each interview was held, a letter was sent to the
interviewee outlining the general areas of questioning.
Data gathered from each interview was checked for accuracy
by verification through at least two other sources.

The first landmark event, "changing from a band
organization to a music educators organization," was
investigated through interviews and correspondence with the
following people:

1. Raymond Bynum - TMEA president, 1944-46
2. Weldon Covington - TMEA president, 1947-48
3. Robert Maddox - TMEA president, 1946-47

Persons interviewed concerning the second landmark
event, "the UIL's takeover of contests," included:

1. Weldon Covington - TMEA president, 1947-48
2. Robert Fielder - TMEA president, 1954-55
3. Robert Maddox - TMEA president, 1946-47
5. Nelson Patrick - TMEA president, 1957-58, and
   later U.I.L director of music activities
6. F. W. Savage - UIL director of music activities,
   1947
7. Alto Tatum - Gladewater High School band
director, 1947
The third landmark event, "TMEA's separation from MENC," was investigated through interviews or correspondence with:

(1) Charles Benner - MENC president, 1975
(2) Bill Cormack - TMEA president, 1974-75
(3) Charles Gary - MENC executive secretary 1968-75
(4) Wiley Housewright - MENC president, 1968
(5) J. W. King - TMEA president, 1972-74
(6) Jerrold Longwell - TMEA president, 1975-76
(7) David McGuire - TMEA college division chairman, 1973
(8) J. R. McEntyre - TMEA president, 1970-72
(9) Jack E. Schaeffer - MENC president, 1973
(10) Paul Van Bodegraven - MENC president, 1964

All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. From the transcriptions, excerpts were selected for inclusion in this study. Interview data were categorized according to how they best addressed the research questions, philosophical issues, and chronological information for each specific landmark event. Once categorized into topical files, quotations were utilized throughout the dissertation to support or enhance material.

The specific analyses of the decisions made in these three events, that is, the decisions made by officers and representatives of various power-wielding organizations, were conducted through application of the decision-making
models and principles discussed within the rationale and related research sections of this chapter.

The remaining chapters of this study are organized in the following manner. Chapter 2, "The TMEA - An Overview of Historical Development, 1920-1980," presents a chronology of the association's growth, providing the historical context for the three landmark events. Much of the information drawn for that chapter rests on extant research and writings on aspects pertaining to the development of the TMEA. Each of the next three chapters deals with one of the landmark events, utilizing interviews, minutes and other official documents to describe and analyze the decision-making process on the basis of the above set of research questions. Chapter 3 deals with the change from a band organization to a music educators organization, chapter 4 discusses the University Interscholastic League takeover of contests, and chapter 5 considers the separation from the Music Educators National Conference. Chapter 6, Summary and Conclusions," summarizes the research findings, gives an analysis of patterns of similarity and dissimilarity in the decisions surrounding all three events, and presents the researcher's concluding observations on the nature of decision making and organizational development in the history of TMEA.
From 1920 to 1935, an organization of Texas band directors developed into a statewide association. Orchestra directors were admitted in 1936, and in 1938 a vocal division was added. This addition of vocal teachers marked the beginning of the TMEA. The following historical outline is chronologically divided into two sections: (1) 1920 to 1937, and (2) 1938 to 1980. In describing the early development of the TMEA, much information must be credited to Jack Mahan, Ralph Beck, C. R. Hackney and Charles Sandford Eskridge, who each have conducted important research on this early phase of TMEA.

The Pre-TMEA Years, 1920-1937

The most comprehensive description of the TMEA's beginnings was researched by Ralph Beck, who was a charter member of the original pre-TMEA band director organization.\textsuperscript{54} He states that the earliest roots of the TMEA date back to 1920, when Mr. James E. King of Waxahachie set up a meeting on April 21 with six other directors of

\textsuperscript{54}\textit{Ralph W. Beck, "History of the Band Association of Texas,"} (unpublished TMEA clinic paper, TMEA Files, Austin, 1940).
amateur bands in the central Texas area. The meeting took place in the Lone Star Band room in Waxahachie. There were no "school" bands as we know them today. These men established an organization which was initially known as the Texas Band Masters Association (TBA), and Mr. King was elected president. The purpose of the organization was to promote better band teachers and band conditions in Texas. Mahan reports that annual dues were set at one dollar.\footnote{55}

As Beck describes it, in its first few years, the organization's main accomplishment was to start an annual "statewide Band Meet" on San Jacinto Day to promote interest in the development of bands. The first contest was held on April 21, 1920, just eighty-four years after the day of Texas Independence. There were only three participating bands, the Grandview Band, directed by O. E. Hale, the Maypearl Band, directed by C. E. King, and the Midlothian Band, directed by Ralph W. Beck. All three groups were municipal bands. Since there were only two loving cups to award as prizes, it was decided to restrict the award to Ellis County bands only. Ralph Beck remarks, "We had only two cups to offer and, of course, Conway and I both had to have one; so we declared the Grandview Band ineligible."\footnote{56}

\footnote{55} Jack H. Mahan, "Texas Music Educators Association: 1920-1949" (Masters thesis, Southern Methodist University, 1949), 3-4. Mahan was president of TMEA in 1949, and also served as executive secretary of the organization.

\footnote{56} Beck, 5.
The only contest rule was that all performing groups would be classified according to the length of time which they had been organized, from first-year bands to fifth-year bands. Any band that had been in existence more than five years was considered to be professional.\footnote{Mahan, 7.}

In 1921, nineteen directors attended the TBA meeting, and dues were reduced to fifty cents. According to Mahan, the membership strongly favored the annual contest idea as a means of creating a greater incentive for improving each band's musicianship.\footnote{Mahan, 9.} In 1922, the contest was invited to Dallas. Sixteen bands participated, and the prizes offered were valued at approximately $5,000. Concerning the early contest, Jack Mahan writes:

> The thrill of conquests had begun to overshadow the ideals leading to a firm foundation for the music program. The attitude of deception rather than sincerity with a progressive intent was prevailing in the contest. The elements of growth and organizational development were seemingly cast aside in favor of winning a prize.\footnote{Mahan, 10.}

The emphasis of the contest is evidenced by the fact that the TBA began to hold its meetings during the contest events.

The contest site was changed each year, and by 1923 seventeen bands were competing for thousands of dollars in prize money. Conway King, newly elected president of TBA
and director of the Weatherford Band, was awarded a gold plated Conn cornet by Whittle Music Company, as high point bandmaster. Many bands "loaded" their personnel with union professionals, which was considered unfair. Beck reports:

I remember this contest very well, as I attended it. The feeling was on a very nervous edge between the directors, each thinking that the other band had 'loaded' against him. Some of the bands had ten or twelve union musicians playing with them, and this was known, which made the feeling all the worse. 60

Soon this kind of deception began to seriously override sincere interest in musical growth. Membership in the TBA was up to forty-nine, which was approximately one-half of the directors in the state. The TBA slogan was "More Bands, Bigger Bands, and Better Bands." Much discussion was made regarding the new Band Tax Law in Iowa. As Mahan described it, this law provided a percentage tax for the upkeep and maintenance of a municipal band. Any town could call for a vote on the Band Tax, provided a petition calling for the vote was signed by ten percent of the voters. The TBA membership felt that such a law would be a catalyst for rapid growth of the band movement in Texas. 61

The 1924 band contest was held in Brownwood, and a set of TBA rules was established. This was a step away from the exploitation of bands and toward director improvement. One

60 Beck, 3.
rule read, "Any band director who plays with his band in contest will be fined fifteen points for the offense." No union musicians were allowed to participate in the event. A comment at the bottom of the rule sheet given to all band directors read as follows: "Write G. Ward Moody, Lamesa, Texas, and if you have a kick or complaint, make it now, as we want to pull this contest fair and square for everybody."  

Up to this time all TBA events mainly involved east and central Texas bands. However, during the early 1920s, bands in West Texas were developing very rapidly. These West Texas bands had also begun participation in contests in conjunction with town chamber of commerce conventions. The first such event was held in 1922 in Plainview, and the "Old Gray Mare" band from Brownwood (under the direction of R. Wright Armstrong) was the winner. In a sense, this contest was exploitation, in that the sponsors had decided it would be cheaper to offer prizes for the contest rather than to hire professional bands. This was the beginning of what later became referred to as "Outlaw" or "Wildcat" contests. In 1923, the West Texas contest was held in San Angelo, and Mahan reported that twenty bands participated.  

On June 21, 1924, the first statewide meeting of both East

---

62 Beck, 5.
63 Beck, 5.
64 Mahan, 11-12.
and West Texas band directors was held in Sherman, Texas. The concept of separating contest events from association meetings was adopted.⁶⁵

There were two meetings in 1925, and the topics discussed at the January meeting in Fort Worth included: (1) organization of the state into eastern and western divisions, (2) the need for more band director clinics, (3) standardization of salaries, (4) support for the band tax law, (5) establishment of a standard for membership, (6) standardizing instrumentation, (7) the need for sightreading contests, (8) questioning the awarding of cash prizes in contests, and (9) getting the association incorporated.⁶⁶

"The Texas Band Teachers Association" (TBTA) was chartered on January 19, 1925, in Sherman, Texas, with the purpose of "the promotion of music and other fine arts and betterment of municipal bands in the state of Texas." This new name reflected a gradual shift in the bandmasters' duties, which had broadened to include more instruction than before. The organization gave interested musicians sixty


⁶⁶"Minutes of the Texas Band Teachers Convention," Fort Worth, at the Texas Hotel, January 9-10, 1925, as found in Minutes, 3-8.
days to pay one dollar in order to become charter members. E. A. Lightfoot of Sherman was elected president.⁶⁷

At the next meeting of the association, June 10-11, in Dallas, the organization elected its first complete set of officers, including divisional officers. That same year, Mr. Crockett began publishing The Texas Bandsman as the monthly TBTA journal. This was a forerunner of an idea to establish a permanent state periodical. The concept of annually holding two divisional contests and one state contest was established. The two divisional contests were held for the first time, with the Eastern Division in Corsicana, and the Western Division in Mineral Wells. The state contest was held at the State Fair in Dallas. At this time, school bands were beginning to make their appearance felt all the more and municipal bands were losing support.⁶⁸

In 1926, the state TBA meeting was held in Waco on June 11 and 12, and G. C. Collum of Stamford was elected president. P. A. James moved that the association investigate the possibility of schools giving credits for band. This was the first step toward recognizing public school music and considering it as a standard subject rather than as an extracurricular activity.⁶⁹ Divisional meetings

⁶⁷ "Texas Band Teachers Association Charter," Department of State, Austin, as found in Minutes, 14-16.

⁶⁸ Mahan, 28.

⁶⁹ Mahan, 20.
were held in Amarillo and Waco, and dues were raised to five dollars. An initiation fee of ten dollars was also established.\textsuperscript{70}

In 1927, the convention was held on January 17 and 18 at the Raleigh Hotel in Waco. The state contest was voted to be held during the first weekend in May, which was National Music Week. The site for the contest was Waco. The Bandsman, a magazine from Kansas City, was adopted as the official publication of the TBTA. A motion was passed to eliminate all cash prizes from band contests. A constitutional amendment was passed requiring prospective members to pass a music literacy test prior to admission into the association. This amendment read as follows:

\textbf{AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION}

\textbf{Article #3-A Membership}

Section 4. That the President appoint an Examining Board composed of two members of each of the following sections: North, East, West, South, and Central Texas, and that hereafter all applications for membership shall be referred to the two members of the Examining Board in the Section nearest which the applicant resides, and that they shall proceed to examine him in the manner hereinafter described: First, a full investigation in his past record; Second, if found to be of good character and worthy, they shall proceed with such written and other examination as the Association may adopt. A grade of 75\% being necessary to pass such examination. All written work to be graded by the President and Secretary, and then such applicants as may make a grade of less than 75\% and more than 50\% may be accepted as Associate members, until such time as they may feel qualified to pass a new examination, which

\textsuperscript{70}C. R. Hackney, "A History of The Texas Music Educators Association" (Masters thesis, Sam Houston State Teachers College, 1939), 15.
shall be granted at the discretion of the President, or upon the recommendation of the committee making the first examination. Such Associate Members shall pay full entrance fee of $10.00 and yearly dues to the Association of $5.00.\textsuperscript{71}

At this time, there were forty-three members of the association, and the amendment was designed to keep the membership at a high standard. However, C. R. Hackney stated in his study of the TMEA that although the amendment "looked good in the minutes" of the association, he was certain that no bandmaster was ever required to take this examination.\textsuperscript{72} Many committees were appointed, which was an indication that the association was taking on a more professional approach. One such committee was set up to choose the required contest music. This was the first time that specific prescribed music was selected for the association's approved events.\textsuperscript{73}

Through a desire of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, the state contest for 1927 was shifted from Waco to Wichita Falls. However, cash prizes were still awarded. The officially prescribed loving cups were awarded, plus $5,000 in cash. Even though the association had voted to

\textsuperscript{71}"Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Texas Band Teachers Association Inc.," Waco, Texas, at the Raleigh Hotel, January 18, 1927, as found in Minutes, 13.

\textsuperscript{72}Hackney, 16.

\textsuperscript{73}Mahan, 21.
eliminate cash prizes only four months earlier, money still prevailed.\textsuperscript{74}

It is interesting to note that the high school class had begun to consistently include more participants than the municipal band class. The municipal bands were being replaced by school organizations. When it was found that the state contests were becoming too large, a motion carried that contests be held separately for West and East Texas.\textsuperscript{75}

In 1928, the association began to look toward the National Band Contest for leadership in contest adjudication procedures. The Eastern division contest was held in Greenville, but there was no state contest designated for 1928. Some examples of the problems which still existed regarding regulation of those contests are illustrated in the situation recalled and reported by Ralph Beck:

> At the Greenville contest there was one band entered whose director played cornet with the band and another band that could not recite its contest numbers because all of the trombone section had passed out on that 'East Texas Corn.'\textsuperscript{76}

R. E. Frazier of Breckenridge was elected president of the association.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{74}Mahan, 23.

\textsuperscript{75}Hackney, 16.


\textsuperscript{77}"Minutes of Texas Band Teachers Association Meeting," Breckenridge, Texas, the Burch Hotel, 1928, as found in Minutes, 18.
In 1929, the offices of state vice-president and divisional secretaries were formed. During these early years chamber of commerce representatives were present at most meetings in order to lobby for contest events. In 1929, T. E. Jackson, president of the State Fair in Dallas, offered $10,000 to get the TBTA to sponsor its state contest there; they accepted the offer. Eighty-five bands participated in what turned out to be the largest contest to date. This was also the first contest in which solo competition was held. The winning soloist won a $100 cash prize.

D. O. Wiley writes that the Simmons Cowboy band sponsored the first contest for "school bands only" in the spring of 1929. There were eleven competing bands:

The judges for this contest were three members of the Royal Belgian Band who were on tour, and played two concerts that afternoon and evening. None of these fabulous musicians could speak a word of English, but could read figures. Judging was on the basis of 100 being perfect. Some of the comments were hilarious, in retrospect. One judge wrote on one sheet: 'Da Pats Da Fooots,' and gave a grade of 17. No band rated higher than 40 points out of 100.

As 'Chairman' of this first school band contest, I had to do some fast talking to keep the participants in a mood short of murder. The bands who came in first were somewhat consoled, simply because they were first (we had A, B and C classes even then). The second place winners were not so happy, and the third on down, if

---

78 Mahan, 26.
that many in a class, were breathing fire. Bob Maddox nearly set a building afire!\textsuperscript{79}

At the 1929 Dallas convention, Mr. E. A. Lightfoot moved that the state be split into three divisions. Each division would have its own set of officers. His motion passed, and the Eastern, Western and Southern Divisions were created. The association also voted to discontinue involvement in the chamber of commerce contests. Much attention was being given to the problem of raising the quality of the music teacher, and a committee was appointed to write a "code of ethics."\textsuperscript{80}

At the 1930 convention, which was held in Abilene, the association voted to require all band directors who entered TBTA contests to first become a member.\textsuperscript{81} Paul A. James of Memphis was elected president. An amusing and typical experience regarding the 1930 Western Division contest in Abilene was reported by Jack Mahan:

The writer, at that time a captain in the Fort Worth all-city High School Cadet Band, and a fellow officer bandsman, Dick Sloan, were exploring back stage during the time a high school band was playing its numbers in the contest. Attention was attracted to a bearded, white haired man playing trombone behind the curtain, directly in line with the band's trombone

\textsuperscript{79}D. O. Wiley, Lubbock, to Dr. Nelson Patrick, Midland, January 10, 1968, UIL Archives, Austin. This account was also verified in this researcher's interview with Robert Maddox on December 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{80}"Minutes of Annual Meeting of the Texas Band Teachers Association, Inc.," at the Baker Hotel, January 18, 1929, as found in Minutes, 20.

\textsuperscript{81}Minutes, 19-23.
section. We watched him all during the warm-up march with great amazement, and between numbers we asked, 'What are you doing back here?' His reply was, 'Hell, I'm playing trombone! What does it look like?' We were struck dumb! When the band started playing, so did he, while we hastened away, too frightened to mention the incident to anyone then.\(^2\)

During the 1931 Dallas convention, vice-president R. J. Dunn predicted that teaching certificates would be required of public school band directors in the near future. He also hoped "that music would soon have an even break with athletics and a place in the curriculum."\(^3\) At this time, solo competition began to be offered along with the concert band contests. Hackney referred to it as a strong incentive toward the development of the individual musician.\(^4\)

During this time, public relations and pride in the local school band were important aspects of the bandmaster's job. Raymond Bynum made the following interesting remarks in interview, describing how bands developed during that era:

> When the contests were started, I was pretty glad about taking my band. Actually, I was still trying to find out what it was all about. I took the Abilene High School Band in 1931 to one of the last 'national' contests. I wrote some good publicity; I read it the other day. It said that the Abilene band rated above all the Texas bands. They ranked them one, two, three, etc. Amarillo got 15, Cisco 14, and Abilene High 13. The three Texas bands were at the bottom of the heap,

\(^2\)Mahan, 27-28. This account is also reported by David Sloan in History of Public School Music in Texas. He was told this story by his father, Dick Sloan.

\(^3\)Mahan, 29.

\(^4\)Hackney, 40.
but my publicity sounded real good! I did get to where I had a top band, eventually.\textsuperscript{85}

The first summer band camp for directors was organized by the TBTA and held in Lampassas in the summer of 1931. Cost was twenty-five dollars for two weeks, and classes were taught in acoustics, ear-training, harmony and arranging. Teachers were Major R. J. Dunn of Texas A&M, and N. J. Whitehurst, bandmaster of Sam Houston State Teachers College. Seventy-five directors attended, and it was considered to be both a huge success and a pioneering event in the development of Texas bands.\textsuperscript{86} That same year Mr. Dunn, the association president, stated that he thought "orchestra directors should be asked in as members, holding orchestra contests in conjunction with band contests."\textsuperscript{87} No action was taken by the TBTA.

In 1932, the first All-State Band performed for the Texas State Music Teachers Meeting in Fort Worth. The band was composed of solo contest winners. Everett McCracken, the TBTA president, stated that the orchestra and speech associations were trying to unite with the Texas State Teachers Association; some of the TBTA membership began to advocate this move. The committee on standardization, which

\begin{footnotes}
\item[85] Raymond Bynum, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Abilene, Texas, November 30, 1988.
\item[86] "Minutes of Annual Meeting of Texas Band Teachers Association, Inc.," Fort Worth, January 29, 1931, as found in Minutes, 37.
\item[87] Minutes, 32.
\end{footnotes}
was headed by N. J. Whitehurst, was searching for a music method in hopes that the State Department of Education would certify it as an official text. D. O. Wiley discovered John Victor of Abilene, who was working to complete a four year unison course of instruction for all instruments of the band and orchestra. Wiley worked closely with Victor in developing the manuscript for the method books, and Wiley's Texas Tech Concert Band read each book for Victor. In an attempt to add more members, dues were reduced to $3.00, and the $10.00 initiation fee was discontinued. Also in 1932, D. O. Wiley was elected state treasurer of the association.

In 1933, it was voted to replace The Bandsman magazine with The School Musician as the official association publication. A TBTA band composition contest was initiated with cash prizes ($100 for first prize), and only marches and waltzes were to be considered.

---

88 Mahan, 32.


90 Hackney, 17.

91 "Minutes of Annual Meeting of Texas Band Teachers Association, Inc.," Fort Worth, January 30, 1931, as found in Minutes, 43.

92 "Recommendations for the Texas Band Teachers Association," Waco, January 28, 1933, as found in Minutes, 60-61.
One year later the state was divided into four divisions, each with a vice-president who also served on the state board. Mr. D. O. Wiley was elected as president.\textsuperscript{93} Hackney reported that sightreading contests began to be included in with the concert band festivals, and bands began to take more time in teaching fundamentals.\textsuperscript{94} A resolution was passed endorsing "the movement to create the office of State Supervisor of Instrumental and Vocal Music in the Department of Education." It was also recommended that "all matters of educational requirements for teachers of band and orchestra in the public schools be placed in the hands of the State Board of Education."\textsuperscript{95} After numerous committee meetings of TBTA members with Dr. L. A. Woods, State Superintendent, and Miss Nell Parmley, director of the Music Division for the State Department of Education, the Victor Method was adopted as the state course of study.\textsuperscript{96} In August, 1933, two units of college entrance credit were authorized for all students completing four years of band or

\textsuperscript{93} "Minutes of Regular Annual Meeting, Texas Band Teachers Association, Inc.," Dallas, January 27, 1934, as found in Minutes, 66.

\textsuperscript{94} Hackney, 42.

\textsuperscript{95} "Recommendations for the Texas Band Teachers Association," Waco, January 28, 1933, as found in Minutes, 60-68.

orchestra in public schools. This officially took effect in 1935.\(^9^7\)

In the 1930s, a group of well known band directors in the Panhandle had established their own organization, known as "The Panhandle Band Association." In 1932, a letter was sent to them explaining why they should join the TBTA, and in 1934 they accepted.\(^9^8\) The western division was immediately formed, giving the TBTA complete coverage of the state, with a total membership of seventy. The divisional presidents became designated as state vice-presidents. The 1934 convention marked the first recorded discussion of setting up a band director's clinic.\(^9^9\) This convention was held in Dallas and was dedicated to John Philip Sousa, who had passed away in 1932.\(^1^0^0\)

In 1935, The Bandmaster was voted to become the new official magazine. Rudolph Willman, the chaplain, made a motion to invite orchestra leaders to join the TBTA. Orchestras had been struggling, and many of their directors were turning to band directing, with its higher salaries and greater prominence. C. R. Hackney credits Major R. J. Dunn of A&M College as the leader of the movement to invite the

\(^{9^7}\) Mahan, 35-36.

\(^{9^8}\) Mahan, 37.

\(^{9^9}\) Mahan, 31-37.

\(^{1^0^0}\) "Fifteenth Annual Convention, Texas Band Teachers Association, Dallas, January 26-27, 1934," TMEA Archives, Austin.
orchestra directors.\textsuperscript{101} The motion passed, and in 1936 the name was changed to the "Texas School Band and Orchestra Association" (TSBOA). This also signified that high school bands had entirely taken over the position that community bands once had. Also in 1935, school administrators began showing an interest in combining instrumental and choral music education under one department.\textsuperscript{102} This interest in unification laid the groundwork for the addition of choral teachers to the TSBOA in 1938.

In 1936, the official date for the TSBOA's annual convention was set for the first full weekend in February. A one dollar annual convention fee was initiated, along with the concept of having a clinic every year in connection with the convention. The clinician in 1936 was William D. Revelli. The Weslaco High School Band, under the direction of Lloyd Reitz, TSBOA president, was the first clinic band to perform at a Texas convention.\textsuperscript{103} Association membership was up to 198, having more than doubled from the 1935 roster of eight-two members. Dean Shank made a motion that the association affiliate with the National Band Association, and a committee was formed to study the proposal. A new constitution was drawn up to reflect the addition of

\textsuperscript{101}Hackney, 20.

\textsuperscript{102}L. A. Woods, Austin, to Lyle Skinner, Waco, July 3, 1935, TMEA Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{103}Beck, 11-12.
orchestra directors. Another significant organizational change was the formation of the association's first board of control. It was decided that the association was too large to conduct all of its business in general membership meetings. The board consisted of the four division presidents, and the president, secretary, and treasurer of the entire organization.

In 1937, the convention had a band and an orchestra clinician—William Revelli and Adam Lesinsky. Instead of having only one clinic band, five Texas bands performed the required contest music (each band played from a certain list): Waco High, Waxahachie High, Baylor University, The Cameron Band and Waco West Junior High. This way each band had to learn only twelve pieces, while the year before, the Weslaco band had to learn approximately sixty pieces! The first-ever clinic orchestra was organized by Miss Cobby de Stivers, director of the Waco High School Orchestra.

That same year, G. Ward Moody made the motion that all TSBOA contests follow the National Band Association (NBA) contest rules. A committee was appointed to study the idea of organizing a clinic band and orchestra to be composed of members chosen from various school groups across the state.

104"Minutes of the Texas Band Teachers Association Annual Convention," San Antonio, February 1, 1936, as found in Minutes, 82.

105Hackney, 20.

106Hackney, 21.
This "all-state" concept had been suggested by Mr. Revelli during the 1936 convention.\(^{107}\)

Clinics were held on the Victor Method of Instruction in Austin and Lubbock, leading the way toward systematic statewide band and orchestra instruction. A motion was made that the state supply these textbooks, and on April 1, 1940, this finally became a reality.\(^{108}\) For the first time a list of eligible contest judges was put together (it included twenty-four names). Association membership had grown to 261, with twenty-four sustaining business members.\(^{109}\)

It is important to point out that while this chapter describes the rise of Texas school bands, similar developments were occurring in many other states. Therefore, the growth of public school bands and orchestras, as well as choral programs, was not only a Texas phenomenon, but a national movement as well.

The TMEA, 1938-1980

Throughout the 1930s, choral teachers had been lobbying for involvement in a state organization.\(^{110}\) In 1938, the TSBOA voted, after long deliberation, to combine with vocal educators to form the Texas Music Educators

\(^{107}\)Mahan, 44.

\(^{108}\)Mahan, 46, 56.

\(^{109}\)"Minutes, Membership in the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association," 1937, as found in Minutes, 114.

\(^{110}\)Mahan, 50.
Association. Charles S. Eskridge, whose involvement in the association dates back to the early 1930s, makes the following report of this action:

With the organization of the Texas Music Educators Association . . . came the longest stride ever taken in Texas toward a well-balanced music program. . . .

. . . when the Texas Music Educators Association completed its reorganization, the opening of the fall school term found the following officers handling the regular business of the organization: Ward G. Brandstetter, president; Russell Schrader, secretary; Weldon Covington, treasurer; Charles S. Eskridge, chairman of the band division; Julien Paul Blitz, chairman of the orchestra division; and Cobby de Stivers, chairman of the vocal division.¹¹¹

Also during the late 1930s, school superintendents were considering a University Interscholastic League (UIL) takeover of band and orchestra contests because of the excessive travel involvement that chamber of commerce events were causing. Regional and state contests were beginning to literally take control of many band programs in that the directors and participants felt great pressure to enter every year. Some bands, orchestras and choirs traveled to as many as five overnight events in a single year, and many of these students were in all three groups. Nelson Patrick, former UIL director of Music Activities, described in interview the problems which school administrators had to face:

As contests were further refined, the old chamber of commerce events began to become interwoven with a

'school contest' concept. The school bands which were beginning to take over were really 'mixed' bands. Chambers of commerce back then really liked to have bands for parades. When there was an event in each town, they had their own band and would attract other bands by having a contest with expensive prizes—mostly large cash prizes. Sometimes the prizes would be new instruments, and also the directors would often get a prize. It was not unusual for the director of the winning band to get a gold-plated trumpet. When I was teaching in the Valley, for example, I inherited a gold-plated sousaphone that had been won at one of these contests. Since these bandmasters were not directly responsible to the superintendents, they could hold these contests just about any time they wanted to, and any place they wanted to. They were encouraged to continue this approach by the chambers of commerce. This made it very difficult, now, for the superintendent, because he had very little power or input regarding these contests. After all, his patrons within his own town were backing them. Town 'A' wanted their band to go to Town 'B,' because later on they wanted Town 'B's' band to come to their own celebration. If you multiply this by five, six, seven, or ten schools within a 150 mile radius of each other, this got to be a rather heavy menu. It was magnified, too, by the heavy prizes, and most of the time the director came out with a big part of the prize. So it became a difficult thing for the schools to handle.¹¹²

Along with these changes came a division of the state into eight regions, in order to align with the UIL administrative regions. Each region elected a representative from band, choir and orchestra. These twenty-four representatives would comprise the board of control, with state officers being elected from them and by them.¹¹³ The executive


¹¹³ "Minutes of the TMEA Board of Directors Meeting," Fort Worth, the Worth Hotel, July 12, 1938, as found in Minutes, 136.
committee of the state association was composed of the state president and secretary, plus the three division chairmen.

1938 was also the first year of official association affiliation with the Music Educators National Conference.\textsuperscript{114} That same year saw the first student All-State bands (called the Red Band and Blue Band) and orchestra at the TMEA convention.\textsuperscript{115} The band clinicians were Mark Hindsley from the University of Illinois, and Harold Bachman from the University of Chicago. The orchestra was conducted by Ralph Rush of Cleveland Heights High School in Ohio. A committee, headed by Otto Zoeller of San Antonio, sent applications to all school bands and orchestras, asking the directors to submit the names of their most outstanding student musicians.\textsuperscript{116} The application asked for the number of years the students had played their instruments, contests they had entered, and honors which they had received. Each student was sent his music two weeks before the clinic, in order to practice and get help from his director. Hackney reports that "all students wore the uniforms from their respective schools, which presented a very colorful scene with the different colors blending on stage."\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{114}"Minutes of the TMEA Board of Directors Meeting," Austin, the Hotel Driskill, August 1, 1938, as found in Minutes, 143.

\textsuperscript{115}Mahan, 49.

\textsuperscript{116}Hackney, 23.

\textsuperscript{117}Hackney, 23.
In 1939, the TMEA continued to recommend a full-time state director of music to the State Department of Education.\textsuperscript{118} That same year, the first All-State student choir performed at the annual convention. Noble Cain, choral director of the National Broadcasting Company, was the conductor.\textsuperscript{119} All-State band conductors were Raymond Dvorak and Gerald Prescott. The orchestra was under the direction of Henry Sopkin of the American Conservatory of Music.\textsuperscript{120} The performances of these groups were broadcast by radio.\textsuperscript{121} There were approximately 400 all-state students and 308 active music teachers in attendance. The cost of music for the convention was nearly $1000. In this same year the Texas Music Educator was adopted as the TMEA magazine. This was actually the same magazine that R. J. Dunn had been publishing called the Texas School Band and Orchestra Magazine, simply with the title changed to reflect the new association's name.

At the 1940 convention, special meetings were held to discuss an issue which was dividing the membership.\textsuperscript{122} Many

\textsuperscript{118}Mahan, 54.

\textsuperscript{119}"Minutes of the TMEA Board of Directors Meeting, Austin, the Hotel Driskill, August 1, 1938, as found in Minutes, 142.

\textsuperscript{120}Minutes, 142.

\textsuperscript{121}Mahan, 56.

\textsuperscript{122}"Texas Music Educators Association Annual Clinic/Convention Program, Houston, February 1940," TMEA Archives, Austin.
members felt that the new administrative structure gave the
state officers too much power, with the regions having
little independence. They also were displeased with the
addition of vocal music teachers to the association. After
long discussions, administrative changes were proposed which
prevented a split in the association. However, a group of
approximately thirty male band directors did organize the
Texas Bandmasters Association, designed as a state version
of the American Bandmasters Association. G. Ward Moody was
elected president and R. T. Bynum was elected secretary.

The 1940 TMEA officers were elected under new
Amendments to the Constitution. Charles S. Eskridge was the
first state secretary actually elected by the board. The
executive board was beginning to realize that the office of
state secretary was becoming more difficult to manage on
"free time." A committee was formed to study the
possibility of a permanent, full-time secretary-treasurer.
A ninth region in the Rio Grande Valley was added.
Russell Shrader was elected TMEA president.
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\[123\] Mahan, 57.
\[124\] Mahan, 57.
\[125\] "Letter and Petition from Superintendents of the
Rio Grande Valley Area to the TMEA," as found in Minutes,
199-200.
\[126\] "Minutes of the TMEA General Business Session,"
Mineral Wells, Texas, February 3, 1940, as found in Minutes,
188.
The state convention featured an innovation--two clinics designed to benefit individual student performers. Robert W. Buggert taught drums, while Virginia Page Nutt taught drum majors\textsuperscript{127}. This concept was to be greatly expanded upon in the future.

In April 1940, state-furnished textbooks for band and orchestra became a reality for Texas public schools. The school all-music sweepstakes trophy was abolished. According to Mahan, it had proved to be very unpopular.\textsuperscript{128}

In 1941, the Texas State Teachers Association decided to investigate three problem areas in the band field: (1) legislative control of contests, (2) types and number of contests, and (3) expenses involved in band programs.\textsuperscript{129} Superintendent F. L. McConnell of Gladewater was appointed as the chairman of this investigation. A questionnaire was sent to 241 school superintendents in Texas whose bands had attended one of the 1940 "National Contests." These contests had been held across the nation under the auspices of the National Band Association. Up until 1937, the National Band Association had sponsored a single, national band contest. The event had attracted so many participants that it was becoming difficult to manage. Also, the expense

\textsuperscript{127} Mahan, 58.

\textsuperscript{128} Mahan, 59.

\textsuperscript{129} "F. C. McConnell to Lyle Skinner, May 30, 1941," as found in Minutes, 235-36.
for school bands to travel across the continent was becoming a major concern. As a result, in 1937 the single national contest was divided into ten regional events, which still bore the "national" title. Texas, Oklahoma and New Mexico comprised Region Six of this plan. The "Texas Nationals" had involved 434 schools in 1940, which made for a student participation of over 21,000. However, the event drew criticism from administrators because of the cost in time and money. These statewide events were always held in addition to regional contests.

The results of the questionnaire reflected the superintendents' dissatisfaction with the situation. When asked if they wanted the "national" contests in Texas eliminated, 107 said yes, 16 said no and 16 wanted all contests eliminated. When asked if band programs were too expensive at the present time (indicating a need to cut down on travel, budget, etc.) the sentiment was 112 to 59 that it was, indeed, too expensive. The TMEA's response to this information was to recommend: (1) to discontinue the Texas National Contests, (2) to reduce the number of

---

130 "National School Music Competition Festival - Official Program," Region Six, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Abilene, Texas, May 19-21, 1938, TMEA Archives, Austin, 1.

131 "National School Music Competition - Festival Report," 1941, as found in Minutes, 263-64.

132 "Report of the Superintendents' Committee, Mr. F. C. McConnell, Chairman," as found in Minutes, 241.

133 Minutes, 241.
students involved in All-State, and (3) to put more emphasis on regional contests.\textsuperscript{134} A major complaint of school superintendents was the "looseness" of rules, from eligibility requirements to judging inconsistencies. Raymond Bynum, former TMEA president, made the following observations in interview:

We ran the band contests kind of sloppy. The directors were interested in getting a raise by making a top rating. Some accused others of using 'ringers,' and I did, too.\textsuperscript{135}

In July of 1941, the State Music Advisory Council met. It consisted of representatives from the Federated Music Clubs, Texas Music Teachers Association (TMTA), Texas Association of Public Schools, Texas State Teachers Association (TSTA) and the TMEA. A merger was planned between the TSTA music section, the TMEA and the TMTA. A committee was formed to study the proposal, and the plan was eventually dropped.\textsuperscript{136} Mahan speculates that this was due to the individual organizations' fears of losing their own identities.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{134}"Minutes of the TMEA State Executive Board Meeting," Fort Worth, August 9, 1941, as found in Minutes, 245.

\textsuperscript{135}Raymond Bynum, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Abilene, Texas, November 30, 1988.

\textsuperscript{136}"Minutes of the Meeting of the State Music Advisory Council," Austin, July 13, 1941, as found in Minutes, 242.

\textsuperscript{137}Mahan, 61.
Also in 1941, the TMEA bought the *Texas Music Educator* magazine from Coulter Hoppes of Bryan, making it the first time that the Association was sole owner of its journal.138 Jack Mahan became the editor and publisher. That same year instructional clinics were presented at the annual convention on most of the major instruments. This new convention feature was a popular event which continued for many years. Students were selected from across the state to participate in these clinics, which greatly increased the overall convention attendance.139 The association elected Lyle Skinner of Waco as their 1941 president.140

The next year, a new constitution was adopted during the convention in Galveston. Due to the superintendents' complaints about missed school time, there was no All-State Band in 1942. Instead, college bands were used. The economy was so depressed and travel so restricted, that three separate conventions were held at three different sites. The following year so many TMEA officers were serving in the armed forces that the annual convention was

---

138 "Minutes of the TMEA State Board of Directors Meeting," Abilene, Texas, at the Wooten Hotel, October 5, 1941, as found in Minutes, 249.

139 Mahan, 59.

140 "Minutes of the TMEA State Board of Directors Meeting," San Antonio, at the Gunter Hotel, June 1, 1941, as found in Minutes, 238.
canceled. When Jack Mahan entered the armed forces in 1943, D. O. Wiley was elected to replace him as the secretary-treasurer of the association. Wiley continued in this position for twenty years.\textsuperscript{142}

In 1944, the Music Educators National Conference offered to hold its annual convention in conjunction with the TMEA convention in Dallas. However, MENC wanted to meet in March, and Texas decided to keep their meeting in the traditional February time. Not only did the joint convention fail to materialize, but the war again caused the state convention to be canceled. Membership in 1944 was only 164.\textsuperscript{143}

In 1945, the convention was called off for the third consecutive year. However, the TMEA was helping the war effort by sponsoring War Stamps and Bonds through a series of statewide "school victory concerts." Mr. Charles Eskridge announced at the 1944 board meeting that almost three million dollars worth of War Stamps and War Bonds had been raised through the TMEA's efforts.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{141} "Minutes of the TMEA State Board of Directors Meeting," Dallas, August 29, 1942, as found in Minutes, 286.

\textsuperscript{142} Jim Hansford, "D. O. Wylie: His Life and Contributions to Instrumental Music Education in Texas from 1921 to 1963" (Ph.D. diss., North Texas State University, 1982), 172.

\textsuperscript{143} Mahan, 66.

\textsuperscript{144} "Minutes of the TMEA Board of Directors Meeting," April 8, 1944, as found in Minutes, 296-97.
letter from Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the U. S. Treasury, was sent to the TMEA shortly after the Victory Concerts were initiated:

TO THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND MUSIC EDUCATORS OF TEXAS:

I have recently learned of the outstanding contribution which the schools of Texas are making to the War Savings Program through a series of Victory Concerts. The enthusiasm with which the teachers, parents, and students of your state have responded to these concerts is a fine example of the loyal and patriotic support being given to the War Savings Program by Americans everywhere.

Through the Victory Concerts, your schools have given significant financial assistance to the world-wide offensive now being waged by our country and its allies. The $1,250,000 invested in War Savings Bonds and Stamps would pay for 2 heavy bombers, 2 medium bombers, 2 pursuit ships, and 2 medium tanks. Less concrete, but also of importance, is the contribution which these concerts have undoubtedly made in building morale and providing inspiration through good music.

It is my sincere hope that your remaining four concerts will be even more successful than the first, and that they will be further distinguished by the participation of all schools that have not yet joined in this effort.

Will you express to all those who have had part in this worthwhile project my deep appreciation of their patriotic understanding and support of the War Savings Program.

Sincerely,

Signed: H. Morgenthau, Jr.\textsuperscript{145}

Five policies were intended to guide TMEA through the war years:

1. To aid in the sale of War Bonds and Stamps by the Department of Music in the Public Schools of Texas by means of regularly scheduled Victory Concerts to be

\textsuperscript{145}Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, to School Administrators and Music Educators of Texas, February 22, 1943, TMEA Archives, Austin.
given simultaneously throughout the state by TMEA member schools in cooperation with the State Department of Education.

2. To endeavor to build up the communities' realization of the values of music by the use of local festivals and programs which will, in a measure, take the place of excessive travel to distant points.

3. To encourage musical instructors who are not in the armed forces to aid adjoining school systems who have lost their instructors by offering their services as part-time instructors to these schools.

4. To standardize marching instruction for bands to conform to U.S. Infantry Drill Regulations.

5. To divide the state into a minimum of three units which are to hold convention-clinics as a substitute for one centralized State Convention-Clinic in order to eliminate excessive travel and to keep closer touch with each school.\(^\text{146}\)

During World War II, the Texas Music Educator was phased out, due to lack of funds. From 1943 to 1947, occasional news sheets were distributed by D. O. Wiley as an attempt to continue the association's statewide communication.\(^\text{147}\) Also, the TMEA began to buy space in the Southwestern Musician magazine, edited by Clyde J. Garrett of Arlington, as the official journal of the Texas Music Teachers Association.\(^\text{148}\)

In 1946, Superintendent Brown from Nacogdoches chaired a committee from the State Superintendents Association, the purpose of which was to develop a plan to turn contests over

\[^{146}\text{Bill Cormack, "History of the T.M.E.A.," (unpublished report, TMEA Archives, Austin, 1976), 44-45.}\]

\[^{147}\text{Jack Mahan, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Arlington, Texas, November 14, 1988.}\]

\[^{148}\text{"Minutes of the TMEA Board of Directors Meeting," April 8, 1944, as found in Minutes, 296.}\]
to the University Interscholastic League. This idea had been discussed for several years, and most TMEA members felt that it was an unwanted but inevitable change. A questionnaire was sent to the superintendents of all Texas schools having a music program, asking them to vote for or against putting the League in control of music contests.

In May 1946, Lyle Skinner chaired a committee of TMEA officers which met with Superintendent Brown's committee with the purpose of reviewing the league's Music Contest Proposal. Robert Maddox, TMEA president, recalled the atmosphere of this meeting:

> It was, shall we say, a hostile meeting. However, there was not anything we could do, because the superintendents had made up their minds that they were going to take it over. Their way of breaking it to us wasn't too gentle, either. They just said, 'Bang! This is it!' Mr. McConnell was one of those who acted agitated throughout this time, and Alto Tatum, his band director at Gladewater, was strongly opposed to the UIL takeover, as I was.

---

149 "Minutes, TMEA Committee on Texas Interscholastic League Music Competition," May 16, 1946, as found in Minutes, 307-08.

150 "TMEA Committee Report After Meeting with Representatives of the Superintendents Association Concerning Interscholastic League Suspension of School Music Contests 1946-1947," February 8, 1947, as found in Minutes, 308, 330.

151 "Minutes, TMEA Committee on Texas Interscholastic League Music Competition," May 16, 1946, as found in Minutes, 307-08.

152 Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.
In February 1947, the TMEA voted, after years of deliberation, to recognize the League as the official channel through which the music competition festivals be held. Later that year TMEA president Weldon Covington asked Jack Mahan to appear before the UIL's State Executive Board and present a plea for a real music plan, not just one that operates as a "football and baseball plan as well." \textsuperscript{153}

F. W. Savage, chairman of the UIL Music Department, set up guidelines that were basically the same as before, but with much more stringent eligibility rules. Mr. Savage made a study of all other states' music plans, and remarked in interview:

At that time, as well as today, Texas was pretty far advanced, ahead of most states. We got a few 'general' ideas, but not many. At that time, I don't believe any other states' contests were being run by the school activities association. The few states that had organized contest plans, such as New York, were being run by the music educators. So, I believe that Texas was kind of a pioneer in combining these two groups together. \textsuperscript{154}

The TMEA convention was also extended to include Wednesday afternoon, adding a half day to the previous format. \textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{153} "Minutes, TMEA General Business Session," at the Hotel Roosevelt, February 14, 1948, as found in Minutes, 334.

\textsuperscript{154} Winston Savage, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

\textsuperscript{155} Mahan, 71.
first "grand concert" was held, featuring the All-State bands, orchestra and choirs in the same evening.\(^{156}\)

In 1948, the first annual band clinic of the Texas Bandmasters Association was held in September at Alamo Heights High School in San Antonio. This organization had been loosely organized in 1940,\(^ {157}\) but had not become formally established until 1948.\(^ {158}\) Pat Arser was elected as the first TBA president. The association voted to discontinue buying space in the *Southwestern Musician*, and to raise dues by one dollar (to four dollars) in order to finance a new and better communique of their own. That same year, the TMEA constitution committee recommended amending the constitution to insert the word "white" in the articles discussing membership restrictions as they pertained to race. This amendment was passed, making the membership limited to "any white person engaged in music education" and to "any white student of music or music lover."\(^ {159}\) Also in 1948, a tenth TMEA region was established. Region Ten

\(^{156}\) "Texas Music Educators Association Annual Clinic/Convention Program, Galveston, February 6-8, 1947," TMEA Files, Austin.

\(^{157}\) See pages 57-58 of this study.


\(^{159}\) "Minutes, TMEA General Business Session," at the Hotel Roosevelt, February 14, 1948, as found in Minutes, 336.
consisted of the Fort Worth and Denton areas, which split from the large metroplex region.\textsuperscript{160}

MENC offered to have a combined convention in April 1949.\textsuperscript{161} MENC had approached TMEA several times before regarding a joint meeting, but an agreement had never been worked out. The TMEA board decided that April was too late in the Spring, and that February was a critical time in terms of pre-contest clinics. During the 1948 convention the issue was debated in general session, and some of the membership were critical of the board's recommendation to reject MENC's offer.\textsuperscript{162} A combined convention was proposed from the floor and approved by the majority of the voting membership. Later that morning the state board again met and decided unanimously to overturn the convention vote, and therefore did not offer a joint convention to the MENC in 1949.\textsuperscript{163}

The board approved a new method of nominating and electing the TMEA president, which involved publishing nominee information in the association journal well in

\textsuperscript{160} "TMEA Regional Officers," \textit{Texas Music Educator} (November 1949): 6.

\textsuperscript{161} Minutes, 340.

\textsuperscript{162} Minutes, 340.

\textsuperscript{163} Minutes, 342.
advance of the convention. The state board also suggested a new form of staggered terms of office for board members.\textsuperscript{164}

The UIL proposed an evaluation "test" to be required for all contest judges, rating such areas as "sincerity," "personal appearance," "professional reputation" and "ability to maintain judiciary dignity."\textsuperscript{165} The TMEA board went on record as opposing this procedure, and the proposal was quickly dropped. That same year the Texas Music Educator was revived and adopted as the association's journal, with D. O. Wiley as editor.\textsuperscript{166}

In 1950, the elementary division was voted into the TMEA.\textsuperscript{167} This issue had been brought up and frequently debated during the 1940s. By 1951, association membership had grown to 598. In January of the same year, the TMEA board held a combined conference with university officials, public school administrators, representatives of organizations such as the Texas Music Teachers Association, the Texas Association of Music Schools, the Texas Federation

\textsuperscript{164} "Minutes, TMEA Board of Directors," Galveston, Texas, at the Buccaneer Hotel, February 9, 1949, as found in Minutes, 348.

\textsuperscript{165} "Minutes, TMEA General Business Session," Galveston, at the Buccaneer Hotel, February 10, 1949, as found in Minutes, 354-55.

\textsuperscript{166} "Minutes, TMEA General Business Session," at the Hotel Roosevelt, February 14, 1948, as found in Minutes, 350-55.

\textsuperscript{167} "Minutes, TMEA General Business Session," Mineral Wells, Texas, February 11, 1950, as found in Minutes, 376.
of Music Clubs and the Texas Association of College Teachers of Music Education. The purpose of this conference was to study proposals on certification, accreditation and the preparation of music teachers in Texas.¹⁶⁸

In general, the 1950s were marked by contest rule changes, refinements in the TMEA convention format, association constitutional revisions and modification of the "TMEA Music Festival" which was held annually at the State Fair in Dallas.¹⁶⁹ In 1954, the Texas Music Educator was merged with the Southwestern Musician, and D. O. Wiley became the editor. Wiley followed Grady Harlan, who had published the Southwestern Musician for the previous seven years. Wiley gave Harlan a down payment of fifteen hundred dollars from his personal funds to secure the magazine for the association.¹⁷⁰ The TMEA board voted to reimburse Mr. Wiley as soon as the money became available.¹⁷¹

In 1955, the Texas State Teachers Association was asked to make TMEA a "music section" of that "parent organization," thereby making a parallel relationship to the MENC's place with the NEA. TMEA immediate past-president

¹⁶⁸ "Report of the Meeting on Certification of Public School Music Teachers," University of Texas at Austin, January 27, 1951, as found in Minutes, 386-87.

¹⁶⁹ Mahan, 75.

¹⁷⁰ "Minutes of the TMEA Executive Board Meetings," Dallas, August 27-29, 1954, as found in Minutes, 450.

¹⁷¹ Minutes, 450.
Robert Fielder proposed the following resolution to the executive board:

Because we feel that members of the Texas Music Educators Association as members of the Texas State Teachers Association can be of greater service to the parent organization, and more importantly, that the joining of our forces can speak more loudly in behalf of education in Texas, we suggest that the Texas State Teachers Association give consideration to making use of TMEA as an organization to serve as a Music Section of TSTA. This situation parallels the national organizations where MENC is an adjunct of the NEA.172

The executive board adopted this proposal, and it was studied for several years.

The TMEA board also held a meeting with Dr. Floyd Graham, a music professor at North Texas State University. Dr. Graham made a presentation to the board on public relations and the future of the TMEA.173 According to Bill Cormack, TMEA executive director, this was becoming a major area of emphasis by the association, and its leadership realized that better public relations would open more doors to future progress.174 In 1955, TMEA membership had grown to 1,124, almost doubling in just five years.175

---

172 "Minutes, Second TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Dallas, Adolphus Hotel, May 29, 1955, as found in Minutes, 470.

173 Minutes, 470.

174 Bill Cormack, phone interview by author, April 18, 1989.

175 "TMEA Membership Questionnaire," TMEA Archives, Austin.
In 1956, the executive board discussed the possibility of granting permission "to Negroes to attend some of our educational meetings." However, the board decided to "do nothing along this line until the Texas State Teachers Association made the first move." Two years later the matter was again discussed by the executive board, but because of the problems involved in housing and other public facilities, no action was taken.

In 1957, the TMEA made the decision to begin selecting and securing convention sites several years in advance. This would greatly improve the organization's ability to plan for subsequent conventions. That same year, the association began discussions concerning the abolition of the "option III" MENC membership rule, which allowed TMEA members to join MENC without paying full dues or buying its official magazine, the Music Educators Journal. The reason some members wanted to abolish option III was to make the TMEA organization decide either to join MENC "in full," as was being done in all other states, or to disassociate completely. The advocates of affiliation with MENC

176 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board," Dallas, Adolphus Hotel, February 11, 1956, as found in Minutes, 483.

177 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board," Dallas, Adolphus Hotel, February 16, 1957, as found in Minutes, 495.

178 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board," Dallas, Adolphus Hotel, October 7, 1957, as found in Minutes, 498.
thought that most TMEA members would join MENC "in full" if there was no option III.

In 1958, president Nelson Patrick called for the election of a new executive secretary during a state board meeting which had a very small attendance. D. O. Wiley had been the executive secretary for the last five years, and previous voting regarding this office had been somewhat informal, with his re-election rarely even involving an opponent. In this election he was defeated by one vote. The next day the membership of the general session of the annual convention voted to ask the state board to reconsider their vote. The board did so, and Mr. Wiley was reinstated as executive secretary for a one year term. Later meetings resulted in the decision to elect Mr. Wiley to serve a total of five more years. Also in 1958, the association voted for TMEA to become the Music Section of the Texas State Teachers Association, which required a constitutional amendment. However, although the 1959

179 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Galveston, Buccaneer Hotel, February 20-22, 1958, as found in Minutes, 501.

180 Minutes, 503.

181 Minutes, 505.

182 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Austin, Stephen F. Austin Hotel, July 6-7, 1959, as found in Minutes, 546.

183 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Galveston, Buccaneer Hotel, February 20-22, 1958, as found in Minutes, 505.
TMEA constitution includes this change, this affiliation was never finalized, and the issue is never mentioned again in the minutes.

During the late 1950s, the TMEA decided to begin filming their annual convention concerts for television and public relations purposes. This was one of the ways by which the association was attempting to put public school music education in a positive spotlight.

In February 1959, during an executive board meeting, Cloys Webb, Chairman of Region XXI, then offered the following resolution: 'Be it resolved that our Region recommend that the T.M.E.A. amend any sections of its constitution relating to the race of members or participants in its activities.'

The board discussed the resolution at length, because it "would in fact ask for integration of TMEA." The board refused the motion, again pointing out that the TSTA had not yet integrated, and that since the TMEA was a private, not public, organization, it did not fall under any present Supreme Court rulings. At the general convention of the association that year, a new constitution was adopted and amended which included in Article I, Section 4 the statement that "membership of any kind shall be limited to white

---

184 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board," Galveston, Buccaneer Hotel, Buccaneer Room, February 18-21, 1959, as found in Minutes, 532.

185 Minutes, 532, 533, 555.

186 Minutes, 532.
persons only." During that same year, D. O. Wiley retired from his position at Texas Tech and subsequently became the first full-time executive-secretary in the history of TMEA. Also, TMEA purchased from D. O. Wiley the rights, printing machinery, and title to the Southwestern Musician combined with The Texas Music Educator for a sum of four thousand dollars.

In general, the 1960s were a time in which the TMEA spent its efforts in five areas: (1) organizing the conventions, (2) developing better public relations, (3) working on curriculum (with the Texas Education Agency), (4) refining staff organization and association communication, and (5) revising the constitution to serve a growing and changing membership. Presidents of TMEA during the 1960s were Herb Teat, Bryce Taylor, Fred Junkin, Harry Lantz and Hugh Sanders.

---

187 "Minutes, Constitution Adopted and Amended at the Annual Clinic Convention," Galveston, February 19-21, 1959, as found in Minutes, 550.

188 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board," Austin, Stephen F. Austin Hotel, East Room, July 6-7, 1959, as found in Minutes, 545.


In November of 1960, UIL representatives met with the TMEA board in order to discuss the problem of students missing school time during the February convention. D. O. Wiley expressed the following concerns to the association membership:

This may come as no surprise to many of you, but there is a definite move on among certain school administrators to curtail, or even delete, the use of talented students from our Clinic-Convention. And we mean by talented students, the very cream of the school music students of the whole State. We have even had intimations that the University Interscholastic League might make a survey among administrators with the purpose of curtailing, or even prohibiting, students in schools from participating in our Clinics during school time. Carried to its logical conclusion, this would force us to have our meetings during the summer months, or leave our most gifted ones at home. Whether or not this would be a good thing in any sense of the word is open to serious thought, frank discussion and much soul searching.¹⁹²

TMEA president Teat pointed out that three years earlier the All-State participation had been reduced from over 2,000 to about 750 (250 per division). The UIL music committee, headed by Dr. F. W. Savage and Superintendent Guillette reacted favorably to the TMEA's presentation and voted to continue allowing the current practice of student participation in the February convention.¹⁹³

In July of 1961, Phil Baker made the motion that a college student section of TMEA be created. The motion


¹⁹³"Minutes, Executive Board Meeting," Austin, Driskill Hotel, November 5-6, 1961, as found in Minutes, 584-85.
carried unanimously.\textsuperscript{194} Association membership had grown to 1,569.\textsuperscript{195} In this same year, Robert Fielder submitted a motion to the board that all TMEA members be required to join MENC, therefore eliminating the previous "option III" that had existed. The motion did not carry.\textsuperscript{196} Also in 1961, the Texas Orchestra Directors Association (TODA) was founded.

In 1962, the association voted to racially integrate the All-State organizations. A motion was also passed stating that the TMEA would send official statements to radio and television networks strongly urging them to show or feature half-time performance during their broadcasts, rather than "cutting away." The motion carried.\textsuperscript{197} The next year, Mr. Joe Lenzo was chosen to become the editor-publisher of the TMEA journal and association executive secretary, replacing D. O. Wiley.\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{194}"Minutes, State Board of Directors and Executive Board," Dallas, Statler-Hilton Hotel, February 9-11, 1961, as found in Minutes, 592.

\textsuperscript{195}"TMEA Membership Questionnaire," TMEA Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{196}"Minutes, State Board of Directors and Executive Board," Dallas, Statler-Hilton Hotel, February 9-11, 1961, as found in Minutes, 592-93.

\textsuperscript{197}"Minutes, TMEA State Board of Directors Meeting, Dallas, Municipal Auditorium, February 1-3, 1962," TMEA Archives, Austin, 6.

\textsuperscript{198}"Minutes, TMEA Executive Committee, Houston, Rice Hotel, Sam Houston Room, July 15-17, 1963," 3.
In 1966, the TMEA board, under the leadership of president Fred Junkin, voted to ask the MENC that the current TMEA/MENC relationship be allowed a three-year extension, with the understanding that the board would conduct an extensive educational program concerning the benefits derived from a mutual state and national affiliation.\(^{199}\) The hope was that the TMEA membership-at-large would be receptive to voting for a full TMEA/MENC affiliation after this extension. The extension was granted, and three years later the TMEA board still refused to bring this issue to the membership.

In 1968, the TMEA board members traveled to Seattle, where they asked for, and received, another three year extension. In 1973, the TMEA board finally called for a vote of the general membership in attendance at the annual convention. The motion was to delete the "special active membership - option III" from the constitution.\(^{200}\) This constitutional amendment would have required all TMEA members to also become full dues paying MENC members. The

\(^{199}\)"Minutes, TMEA Executive Committee, Dallas, Adolphus Hotel, October 9, 1966," TMEA Archives, Austin, 1.

\(^{200}\)J. W. King, "Official Notice - Important!" Southwestern Musician combined with the Texas Music Educator 42, no. 2(September 1973): 28.
motion failed, with approximately ninety percent of the membership voting against requiring full MENC membership.\textsuperscript{201}

The next year, MENC asked that another vote be taken, and the outcome was still in favor of "option III" and against requiring full MENC membership of all TMEA members. The vote was 517 against changing the status quo with 265 in favor of the change.\textsuperscript{202} In 1974, TMEA president Bill Cormack and President-Elect Jerry Longwell traveled to Virginia to address the MENC board. At this meeting the MENC "subpoenaed" the TMEA with a twelve-month notice.\textsuperscript{203} This document stated that if TMEA did not change its membership to include a mandatory full membership in MENC as well, then TMEA would no longer be the Texas affiliate of the MENC.\textsuperscript{204} Twelve months later (in 1975), the TMEA was officially "cut off" from the MENC. That same year a new organization, the Texas Music Educators Conference (TMEC), was formed as the new Texas affiliate of the MENC.\textsuperscript{205} This

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{201} "Minutes, TMEA General Membership Session, Fort Worth, Sheraton Hotel, February 12, 1972," TMEA Archives, Austin, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{202} Bill Cormack, "President's Message," Southwestern Musician combined with the Texas Music Educator 42, no. 9 (April 1974): 4.
\item \textsuperscript{203} "MENC Minutes, July 1-2, 1974," (unpublished and unbound documents), MENC Archives, Reston, VA.
\item \textsuperscript{204} Jerry Longwell, "Personal Memoranda and Correspondences Regarding TMEA," (unpublished material, TMEA Archives, Austin, 1974-1976).
\item \textsuperscript{205} "TMEC Minutes, Informal Meeting, Omaha, Nebraska, April 5, 1975," J. R. McEntyre's Personal Files, 4.
\end{itemize}
new organization was formed through the leadership of the TMEA board, several of whom later held offices in the TMEC.\textsuperscript{206} The TMEC constitution makes that organization an affiliate of both the TMEA and the MENC.

From 1975 to 1980 the association continued to refine its convention organization, including the revision of All-State housing forms and the development of a format to allow commercial firms to sponsor clinicians. The TMEA also began scheduling the San Antonio Convention Center as the most frequent conference site, which led to more efficient planning and use of facilities.\textsuperscript{207}

In 1978, the first All-State jazz ensemble was organized.\textsuperscript{208} The TMEA entered into a cooperative plan with the Texas Chapter of the National Association of Jazz Educators, and used a format similar to the All-State orchestra tryout procedure.\textsuperscript{209} In February, the Texas Music Adjudicators Association (TMAA) was founded.\textsuperscript{210} In October of that same year, executive secretary Joe Lenzo died. On

\textsuperscript{206}J. R. McEntyre was the first president of TMEC. This development will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5 of this study.

\textsuperscript{207}"Minutes, TMEA Executive Board, San Antonio, Hilton Hotel, June 4, 1980," TMEA Archives, Austin, 3.

\textsuperscript{208}"Minutes, TMEA Executive Board, Fort Worth, Hilton Hotel, June 8-10, 1978," TMEA Archives, Austin, 1.

\textsuperscript{209}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{210}"Minutes, TMEA Executive Board, Austin, Hilton Hotel, October 22, 1977," TMEA Archives, Austin.
June 1, 1979, former TMEA president Bill Cormack was hired as the new executive secretary.\footnote{Bill Cormack, phone interview by author, May 12, 1989.}

In 1979, a symposium was held at Southern Methodist University in Dallas from June 14 through 16.\footnote{"Report on Public Relations Symposium, Minutes, TMEA Executive Board, San Antonio, Holiday Inn Downtown, October 6, 1979," TMEA Archives, Austin.} The purpose of the workshop was to develop a public relations handbook concerning music teachers, school administrators, and the general public. Five participants were selected from each TMEA division (band, choral, orchestra, college and elementary), five public school music supervisors, and five participants who were either board members or school administrators. Also in 1979, a handbook was completed which was designed to serve as a guide for TMEA officers and office personnel. That same year, the TMEA purchased a thirty thousand dollar computer system which has since paid for itself many times over, by leasing computer time to other organizations and businesses.\footnote{Bill Cormack, phone interview by author, May 12, 1989.} Also in 1979, a motion was passed to move the association headquarters from Houston to Austin.\footnote{"Minutes, TMEA Executive Board, San Antonio, Palacio Hilton Hotel, June 6-8, 1979," TMEA Archives, Austin.} This decision paved the way for the
development of a central TMEA office, located in the State Capitol.

Summary

The TMEA's history has been highlighted by many landmark events. The association's move in the 1920s from its emphasis upon municipal bands to public school music education was an important step. The establishment of the annual clinic/convention format instantly doubled membership and began to address more instructional needs. The integration of races in the early 1960s was another landmark event. The symposia and public relations efforts of the 1960s and 1970s were further important steps for the association. The purchase of TMEA's computer in 1970 was still another important event, as was the movement of the association's headquarters to Austin.

However, the three events selected by those responding to a preliminary questionnaire on this matter seem to especially stand out as pivotal historical events: (1) the change from a band organization to a music educators organization (1938 - adding choral division, and later adding elementary and others), (2) the UIL's takeover of contests in 1947, and (3) TMEA's separation from MENC in 1976. The description and analysis of the decisions surrounding these three landmark events comprise the following chapters and the core of this research project.
When the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association invited choral teachers into its membership in 1938, the association made a pivotal decision which brought together many music teachers from across the state. This event was preceded by repeated inquiries and requests from leaders in the choral field throughout the early 1930s, efforts of school administrators who eventually began to be interested in unifying instrumental and choral teachers, and a series of meetings of the TSBOA board in 1937, along with meetings of its Constitution and By-laws Committee.

In Nelson Patrick's *Sixty Years of Music Contests in Texas*, he gives a good introduction to the atmosphere which set the stage for this landmark event:

The vocal people ('song birds,' as they were called by some band directors) were pushing for membership. Several regions were conducting unofficial vocal contests, and vocal teachers wanted official recognition on par with band and orchestra teachers. The acceptance of the choral directors and choral contests were resolved only after many bitter fights. The minutes do not reveal the jolt that was given to some of the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association members.\(^{215}\)


---

CHAPTER 3

THE CHANGE FROM A BAND ORGANIZATION TO
A MUSIC EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION

When the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association invited choral teachers into its membership in 1938, the association made a pivotal decision which brought together many music teachers from across the state. This event was preceded by repeated inquiries and requests from leaders in the choral field throughout the early 1930s, efforts of school administrators who eventually began to be interested in unifying instrumental and choral teachers, and a series of meetings of the TSBOA board in 1937, along with meetings of its Constitution and By-laws Committee.

In Nelson Patrick's *Sixty Years of Music Contests in Texas*, he gives a good introduction to the atmosphere which set the stage for this landmark event:

The vocal people ('song birds,' as they were called by some band directors) were pushing for membership. Several regions were conducting unofficial vocal contests, and vocal teachers wanted official recognition on par with band and orchestra teachers. The acceptance of the choral directors and choral contests were resolved only after many bitter fights. The minutes do not reveal the jolt that was given to some of the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association members.\(^{215}\)
The attitude of many band directors is illustrated in the following interview statements by Weldon Covington, former president of TMEA:

It took a long time for a band director to admit that he would vote for a choir person to become president. At the time, I remember that if you were a band director and you voted for a choir person, you were on a 'black list'.

Raymond Bynum, TMEA president from 1944 to 1946, stated that he was one of those opposed to inviting choral teachers into the association, and that he had a difficult time adjusting to the change:

I was pretty strong on keeping anyone out who was not a band director. I just thought we had a good little association going. We didn't think it was little then. Col. Irons was strong to keep the choral people out, too, and the Odessa man, Moody--elected first president of the Bandmasters [TBA]--he was also against it. We thought if we got all those choral women in there, they would elect all the officers, and we'd be left out in the cold.

As early as 1935, the school administrators were showing an interest in combining all areas of music education under one umbrella. In July 1935, State Superintendent of the Department of Education, L. A. Woods, wrote the following in a letter to Lyle Skinner, band director at Baylor University:

It is the plan of the State Department of Education to organize a state-wide music program this year in the

---

216 Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

fields of vocal and instrumental music. The central committee personnel for the work of outlining a program, setting up standards, etc., is as follows:

**Instrumental:**

- Mr. Lyle Skinner, Waco
- Mr. E. D. Crites, Fort Worth
- Mr. George E. Hurt, Dallas
- Mr. H. A. Anderson, Lubbock
- Mr. R. T. Bynum, Abilene
- Mr. Victor Allessandaro, Houston

**Vocal:**

- Miss Alva Lochhead, Fort Worth
- Mrs. Lena Milam, Beaumont
- Miss Sudie Williams, Dallas
- Miss Irma Nala Voss, Wichita Falls
- Mrs. Ella Lovelace, Waco
- Miss Lulu Stevens, Houston

Would you be willing to serve on this committee? It is the plan to call a meeting of this group at Waco in the near future.\(^{218}\)

D. O. Wiley, association president from 1934 to 1936, wrote the following recollections in a letter to Bill Cormack:

I do remember distinctly that through the efforts of Euell Porter and his cohorts, the Vocal Division was created during my term as president, and thus it became the modern Texas Music Educators Association, and was incorporated as such shortly.

In retrospect, I believe that the State Department of Education, under Dr. L. A. Woods, was an encouraging factor behind this action, for he was the first man in high office in Texas that had ever taken any interest in music in the public schools, and I know that from personal contact with Dr. Woods. He wanted a well-rounded program of music in the public schools, and considered the vocal, or choral, program, as important as the band and orchestra, and told me so on many occasions.\(^{219}\)

---

\(^{218}\)L. A. Woods, Austin, to Lyle Skinner, Waco, July 3, 1935, TMEA Archives, Austin.

\(^{219}\)D. O. Wiley, Lubbock, to Bill Cormack, Midland, June 17, 1973, TMEA Archives, Austin.
There is no mention in the TMEA minutes of the issue regarding adding choral teachers until 1938. On March 5, 1938, the TMEA board of directors met in Austin at the Driskill Hotel. President Brandstetter appointed six committees to deal with a wide assortment of new business for the upcoming year. One of these committees was the Constitution and By-laws Committee, headed by Lloyd Reitz of Waco. Five other teachers were on the committee, as well as R. H. Brister, a superintendent from Waco. It is significant to note that two members of this committee were choral teachers who were listed in State Superintendent L. A. Woods' letter—Alma Lochhead and Lena Milam. This committee was instructed:

- to study the problem of our set-up as an organization;
- to inaugurate an expansion program by getting a reaction from the vocal teachers as to including them in the organization - working toward a Texas School Music Association.

The impact of Ward Brandstetter's leadership is reflected in Robert Maddox's statement: "Ward Brandstetter

---


221 Minutes, 132.

222 Minutes, 132.
was a key person—a good politician and organizer; and he carried a lot of clout with the band directors."^{223}

Raymond Bynum also concurred with this assessment, stating: "Ward Brandstetter was a very strong leader. I think Ward wanted to have a big association—you know, numbers. And at that time, in the '30s, we were not many bands yet."^{224}

Jack Mahan observed that:

the average 'joe' in the association really didn't give it much thought one way or the other. It was just basically the board of directors and the people with power that made the decisions. I think Brandstetter had sold them so well, that it happened.^{225}

On April 7, the Constitution and By-laws Committee met at the Driskill Hotel to discuss "the need of co-ordinated effort in the school music field in Texas, and the desire of instrumental music teachers to cooperate in building a balanced school music program."^{226} The committee came to the conclusion that the Texas State Band and Orchestra Association (TSBOA), in its present form, would not meet the needs of school music across the state. They felt that

---

^{223}Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 6, 1988.

^{224}Raymond Bynum, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Abilene, Texas, November 30, 1988.


^{226}C. R. Hackney, "A History of the Texas Music Educators Association" (Masters thesis, Sam Houston State Teachers College, 1939) 30.
adding a division for choral activities would satisfy these needs. The committee, by unanimous vote, adopted the following resolutions:

Whereas, there exists a pressing and imperative need for coordinated effort in the field of public school music in Texas; and,

Whereas, it is the desire of the instrumental music teachers in Texas to cooperate fully in the building of a balanced school music program; and,

Whereas, your committee feels strongly that the needs of public school music in Texas as shown by careful and intensive survey, can be better served through the mutual helpfulness of all school music teachers that may be brought about through the encouragement and fostering of the Texas Music Educators Association;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that this committee recommends that the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association, Inc., be dissolved, and that its members forthwith affiliate themselves with and render their fullest cooperation to a new musical organization, to be called the Texas Music Educators Association; that all assets of the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association, Inc., be devoted to the furtherance of the program of the Texas Music Educators Association; and that it be recommended to the Texas Music Educators Association that its activities be carried on under the direction of the present officers of the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association, Inc.\textsuperscript{227}

The forward-looking philosophy of the Constitution and By-laws Committee is reflected in this resolution, which asked for sweeping change in the composition of the TSBOA. This researcher speculates that the use of the words "cooperate" and "cooperation" seem to imply a perceived "uncooperative" image problem, which the TSBOA was trying to improve. TMEA's leadership in deciding to add choral directors to its organization was partially motivated by the

\textsuperscript{227} Hackney, 30-31.
strength that was to be gained through unification of all school music groups, as stated by Jack Mahan:

You've got to remember that we had the flack about contests and all this other stuff, so unification of the entire music program was kind of an important thing in the minds of those of us who were in the leadership. Not to get the superintendents off our backs as much as that there's strength in numbers, shall we say. We really all envisioned what we have today, but didn't voice it, and didn't really know that this was what we were doing.\textsuperscript{228}

As a result of these recommendations, president Brandstetter instructed secretary Russell Shrader to notify the general membership of the TSBOA that there would be a special associational meeting, to be held on May 14, at South Waco Junior High School.\textsuperscript{229} The association magazine, The Texas Band and Orchestra Magazine, was utilized to publish all information with regard to the proposed reorganization. C. R. Hackney writes:

All directors had plenty of time to think over the new plan and to discuss it. There had been some objections to the new change in the organization. Rumors were heard to the effect that certain sections of Texas were going to secede if the project went through. However, as a result of discussion through this magazine, the bandmasters realized the benefits to come from the new arrangement.\textsuperscript{230}

At the meeting, those present from the general membership discussed and voted on the resolution. The TMEA

\textsuperscript{228}Jack Mahan, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Arlington, Texas, November 14, 1988.

\textsuperscript{229}Russell Shrader to the TMEA Membership, "Notice of Called Meeting," as found in Minutes, 135.

\textsuperscript{230}Hackney, 32.
minutes have a special transcript of this meeting. It is the only such "verbatim" record in the entire association's sixty-five years of proceedings, and is, therefore, quite unique.\textsuperscript{231}

President Brandstetter opened the meeting with the following introduction of the issue:

Most of you are familiar with the purpose of this meeting. Some years ago the Texas Band Teachers Association was organized. Two years ago it was changed to include band and orchestras, and reorganized and renamed the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association. Since that time the organization has made a great deal of progress, especially in promoting good will among teachers and between music teachers and the superintendents. At present there is a very good feeling between them. In the past six months there has been quite a deal of agitation among the vocal teachers to have an organization of their own, or to promote an organization to include all phases of music. The superintendents agree that they would like to have the organization include the entire field. The various teachers' reactions is unanimous. A committee was appointed and approved by the Board of Directors to study and make recommendations. We will hear the report of that committee. The reaction was that they organize a Texas Music Educators Association; that some move be made by our organization to include the vocal teachers and organize in such a way that each teaching field would retain its individuality, and at the same time make up a cooperative group from their definite fields.\textsuperscript{232}

Brandstetter's address very effectively communicated that both vocal teachers and school administrators had been taking steps to combine the choral and instrumental areas. Still, his response to this pressure was a positive one,

\textsuperscript{231} ''Minutes, TMEA Special Called Meeting of General Membership,'' Waco, South Waco Junior High School, May 14, 1938, as found in Minutes, 127-32.

\textsuperscript{232} Minutes, 127-32.
pointing out the importance of good public relations with both teachers and administrators.

The committee report was read in several stages, with considerable discussion between readings. At one point the transcript reads:

Mr. Koenigseder: 'Mr. President, I do not think that this will work out.'

Brandstetter: 'Each field could do its own work and maintain its individuality.'

Koenigseder: 'If they stay in their own field, it would be all right, but as far as changing the name and going into direct connection, then I do not think it is going to work.'

Question: 'What do you propose to call this new association?'

Brandstetter: 'The Texas Music Educators Association.'

Koenigseder: 'Would there be any restrictions to the teachers? Would any fourth, fifth or sixth grade teacher be admitted to this organization without any restriction?'

Brandstetter: 'That would be controlled.'

McCracken: 'We need to unify this work and to work out a balanced, sane program, to regulate the whole field of school music. If we do not, it will be done for us. It is going to be rather hard for some of the old-timers to take the idea that the band will not occupy the spotlight. It is not best for us to go to extremes . . . some of our efforts to make a five year band in one year will be slowed down. The pupil does not get much out of this. They have been too hurried. We want to learn to take it a little easier. Why not let the leader (bandmaster) work the same as other teachers? Who else works as hard as we do? If we do not do something, the schools will. It will be better for us if we quit spending too much time on the bands . . . . Lots of the directors are going to die before they get
The statements from this meeting clearly point out the division within the band directors themselves. Some were strongly opposed to inviting choral directors, while others believed Texas bands were getting overly competitive to the point of teacher and student burn-out. The latter group hoped that bringing in choral directors would "de-escalate" this perceived negative trend.

Further insight into the reservations which some band directors had concerning the addition of choral teachers is shown in Robert Maddox's interview comments:

You'll find that the band directors were, shall we say, sort of 'clannish.' Band and orchestra had already come together in the association, with many directors having both bands and orchestras under their leadership. There were some who felt that the tradition of the organization did not intend to include choral people, so they were opposed. However, there were enough level-headed ones to realize that this is something which would help to better serve music, and the schools, as well as give us more 'clout' through a larger membership. . . .

Let's put it this way. Some of the band people were so very strong. They hated to give up their own power, and felt that adding the choral people might weaken them. We had some band directors who were actually stronger than their superintendents. They could dictate whatever they wanted, and thought this proposal was undermining their authority.  

The committee's resolutions were moved for adoption by Everett McCracken and seconded by Dean Shank. All but two

233 Minutes, 127-32.

234 Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.
in attendance voted in favor. One opposed and one did not vote. This is a rather remarkable consensus, considering the amount of controversy that has surrounded the event, recorded in reports, association minutes, and interviews. This author speculates that the decisiveness of this vote was due to the level of Brandstetter's influence, the influence of the constitution committee and its report, and to the likelihood that there was a rather small attendance at the meeting. In fact, this was not a general session vote during the annual convention; rather, it was an unusual called meeting at the end of the school year.

A meeting of the new State Board of Control was proposed to be held in Fort Worth on June 4, to set up the new organization, so that the new association would be ready to function by September. There are no minutes of this meeting or any other evidence as to whether it was really held or not. This author speculates that the meeting was probably not held, due to summer conflicts and such short notice.

On July 12, 1938, the music teachers who had comprised the now dissolved TSBOA board of directors met in Fort Worth at the Worth Hotel. The minutes of this meeting state that there was:

\[\text{Minutes, Special Called Meeting of Entire TMEA Membership,} \] Waco, South Waco Junior High School, May 14, 1938, as found in Minutes, 137.

\[\text{Hackney, 32.}\]
a detailed discussion of the re-organization of the association as to making certain that all sections of the state were entirely willing to proceed with the new organization plan. The discussion was very intense, and the matter was thoroughly covered from every angle by the points under consideration. It was then regularly moved by J. Richard Walker, that the work of putting the new set-up into effect be started, and that a chart, map, and complete explanation be sent to every paid member. The motion was seconded by Eskridge, and carried.237

The new constitution called for a new board of directors, consisting of the state officers, plus three division chairmen (band, orchestra, choral) and an overall chairman for each of the eight regions.238

On August 1, 1938, the first official board of directors meeting of the Texas Music Educators Association was held at the Driskill Hotel in Austin. Only eleven of the thirty-five member board were in attendance. Again, this is probably because all of these meetings were held with short notice during the summer months. In the minutes it is mentioned that "a short discussion took place to ascertain a quorum."239 At this meeting, the board voted to use national rules for the TMEA band, choir and orchestra contests. They also voted to give each region control of organizing and administering its own contests. Standardized

237"Minutes, Board of Directors Meeting," Fort Worth, Hotel Worth, July 12, 1938, as found in Minutes, 136.

238Minutes, 136.

239"Minutes, Board of Directors Meeting," Austin, Driskill Hotel, American Room, August 1, 1938, as found in Minutes, 140.
TMEA entry blanks and awards were developed for all association contests, while still retaining individuality in each division. An all-music sweepstakes winner was to be named from each region, based upon a prescribed point system. The annual convention was discussed, with clinic conductors being selected for all three divisions.

Principal Participants, Their Roles, and Other Factors Which Influenced the Decision-Making Process

Ward Brandstetter, Cobby de Stivers, Euell Porter, Lyle Skinner, Lloyd Reitz, Everett McCracken and D. O. Wiley were the main decision makers, composing an "inner-circle" of TSBOA members and outside participants who were the most involved. The overwhelming consensus among those interviewed (Jack Mahan, Robert Maddox, Weldon Covington, and Raymond Bynum) was that TMEA president Ward Brandstetter was the dominant force in convincing Texas band and orchestra directors to invite choral teachers into the association. The concept of strong, individual leadership playing a significant role in pivotal historic events clearly applies here.

Each interviewee was given definitions for three specific categories of decision-makers and was asked if any of the categories were accurate descriptions of particular participants in the landmark event. The categories were:

Minutes, 141.
a. Active Initiator: One who is at the forefront of the development of new ideas, and remains involved through the chain of events leading to a final outcome.

b. Suspensory Veto: One who is not actively involved in the development of a plan of action, but who uses his power of "veto" to greatly influence the outcome.

c. Passive Bystander: One who does not take a strong position on either side of an issue, and allows others to influence the outcome.

When asked what kind of role these leaders played in the landmark event, interviewees consistently categorized Ward Brandstetter as an "active initiator." State Superintendent L. A. Woods was also an active initiator, forming study committees and bringing instrumental, choral and administrative leaders together.

There was a strong influence from outside the association by administrators, led by superintendent L. A. Woods and the choral teachers. Choral teachers wanted to develop the convention/clinic workshops, top-rate contests and overall enthusiasm for their programs just like the band teachers had already established. Administrators saw that uniting all music groups under one associational "umbrella" would benefit the entire school. These two outside groups developed a "loose" coalition in their separate causes to
organize and unify public school music education. They helped to persuade TSBOA leadership that an instrumental/choral "coalition" was in both groups' best interest.

The Final Decision's Effect upon TMEA's Gain or Loss of Organizational Strength

All interviewees agreed that TMEA gained strength in the areas of size, geographic distribution and status. The rapid growth in membership, as well as the broadening of music subject areas, were definite gains for TMEA. Many of those interviewed felt that the addition of choral teachers has contributed to the present TMEA organization's cohesiveness. However, several interviewees qualified their remarks with statements similar to Robert Maddox's response: "At the very first, I don't think it helped. But after a while it made us stronger. At first there was some jealousy and resentment."241  Jack Mahan added: "In the long run, that [cohesiveness] was strengthened. In the short run, the reorganization made it hard to be as cohesive for a while."242  Raymond Bynum disagreed, however, stating that

241 Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

he believed adding choral directors to the association "may have diminished the 'togetherness' of the membership."\textsuperscript{243}

The unification with choral teachers was an unusual event which "jolted" many instrumental teachers. Nelson Patrick commented in interview that

The combining of choral and instrumental teachers into a unified association was quite a significant occurrence. Very few states had combined these music groups back in 1938, and some are still separate today.\textsuperscript{244}

When asked about the effect of adding the choral division upon TMEA's "program and ideas," all but one interviewee believed that the association had gained in strength. Robert Maddox said: "It was strengthened, it broadened the agenda of the association."\textsuperscript{245} However, Raymond Bynum, who opposed adding choral directors to TMEA, said: "That [cohesiveness] didn't necessarily get stronger or weaker, it just changed into something different."\textsuperscript{246}

When asked if the change weakened associational leadership, with regard to possible problems of dissension among some band directors, Maddox responded:

\textsuperscript{243}Raymond Bynum, interview by author, Tape recording, Abilene, Texas, November 30, 1988.

\textsuperscript{244}Nelson Patrick, phone interview by author, May 8, 1989.

\textsuperscript{245}Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{246}Raymond Bynum, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Abilene, Texas, November 30, 1988.
Some directors had some difficulty accepting the choral addition, because it, shall we say, imposed upon the groundwork that had been laid in the organization. G. Ward Moody was an 'anti' type person. However, I don't think the leadership was particularly changed at all.\textsuperscript{247}

Weldon Covington summarized the reasons why he believed TMEA's decision to add choral teachers was the best choice to make:

I think it was very advantageous; I think it was the best thing to do. It would have been a big mistake to vote it down. If TMEA had voted 'no,' the choral people might have organized a separate organization, or the superintendents might have come in and ordered TMEA to accept it. We didn't need any more arguments with the superintendents about anything.\textsuperscript{248}

Robert Maddox added:

I felt like it was beneficial for the schools as a whole. Every child couldn't play an instrument, just like they couldn't all play football. Those who had a talent had more of an opportunity to discover, improve, and use their talent. The kids did overlap in their participation. At my school I had choral people playing instruments too, and we learned to share the kids. This was to their own benefit.\textsuperscript{249}

When asked if they would "go back and make the same decisions again," Jack Mahan's response was representative

\textsuperscript{247}Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{248}Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

\textsuperscript{249}Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.
of most of the interviewees: "I wouldn't change anything; I was for it then, and it proved out to be for the best."²⁵⁰

Summary

In summation, this researcher finds that the decision to invite the choral teachers into the TSBOA was an interesting mixture of pragmatism and idealism. It involved a combination of elements from two different models of decision making—the rational and political models. The strong awareness by TSBOA leaders that the superintendents were in agreement on the need for some kind of overall unification of coordination of music, and that the superintendents might act if the TSBOA did not, makes the political or power model applicable to a significant degree. External constraints were clearly a factor in the perceptions of those leading and voting on the change. On the other hand, the formal decision-making process was characterized for the most part by positive, forward-looking "ideals" in the minds of the TSBOA leadership. The rational case was strong to do what the organization suspected that the superintendents might make them eventually do anyway. These ideals, once implemented, effected revolutionary change rather than incremental change²⁵¹ in the organization, and even opened the door to the risk of a


²⁵¹ As defined by Dahl; see pages 6-7 of this study.
possible voting takeover by the choral teachers. However, the end result was consistent with the positive predictions of the organization leaders--a historic leap of progress for the music educators of Texas.

It is interesting to note that of the various sources of potential organizational strength (i.e., size, status, etc.) being analyzed as part of this study, only one, "cohesiveness," was mentioned as possibly being weakened because of including choral teachers in the organization. While there is certainly a value to be placed upon the distinctive cohesiveness which TSBOA instrumental directors enjoyed, this researcher believes, with some of the interviewees, that the gain in associational "size" and overall "music teacher unity" was of much greater ultimate value.

Also, a strong case can be made for the argument that the cohesiveness of the TSBOA was more of a "fraternal" and "social" close-knittedness, rather than cohesiveness in the organizational context. Even if the instrumental teachers did have a special associational bond, one can argue that it was not integral to the development or growth of the organization. Most growing, developing organizations tend to sacrifice a degree of "cohesiveness" in return for significant growth, as the inevitable price paid for their new strength and progress. This particular landmark event in the history of the TMEA set the stage for its steady
growth, not only in numerical size, but also in organizational influence and capacity to work effectively for the interests of its members.
CHAPTER 4

THE UNIVERSITY SCHOLASTIC LEAGUE

TAKEOVER OF CONTESTS

According to Patrick, the years spanning from 1939 to 1947 were referred to by many administrators as "the band problem years." Most administrators referred to all "music problems" as "band problems" and did not seem to recognize that orchestras and vocal music were also involved. A major focus of the problems was the music contest itself, along with its organization and financing. Winston Savage, the UIL's first director of music, described the superintendents' complaints:

> The administrators were objecting to the practice of band directors' bringing musicians to perform at contest who were not enrolled in school; in other words, professional musicians or recent graduates of the high school. These band alumni, you might say, were invited back and put into uniform to perform as high school students. Of course, now that's almost unthinkable.

Another thing that the school administrators objected to vociferously was the fact that music companies were sponsoring the local contest. They were not necessarily influencing the event, but the league did not like a 'given' company sponsoring a contest in a particular city. The music company was getting favors regarding instrument displays, and the matter of a degree of 'economic control' was implied. Use of school time, often a whole week for a band to travel all the

\[252\] Nelson G. Patrick, Sixty Years of Music Contests in Texas, (Austin: UIL Archives, 1982) [hereafter referred to as Patrick, Sixty Years], part 2, 1.

\[253\] Patrick, Sixty Years, part 2, 1.
way across the state, was a major concern for school administrators.\(^{254}\)

Alto Tatum, then the band director at Gladewater High School, commented about his own experience:

Obviously from mid-term until the end of school, I think most of us would have to agree that there was considerable getting ready, traveling, being out of school, and going to contests perhaps beyond the point of reason. Administrators had this feeling about it all, and from their viewpoint, I think their main reasons for wanting contest to be run by UIL--the cost of uniforms, the cost of travel, the pushing by band parents and boosters to have the school board and superintendent support what they wished--these were the reasons.\(^{255}\)

Nelson Patrick, former president of TMEA and former UIL director of music activities added these insights when interviewed:

Let's take this 21 year-old, for example. He comes down and registers for, let's say, an English course, just so he can play in the contest. As soon as the contest is over he'll quit school. This caused discipline problems. The superintendents finally said, 'We've had enough of this.' By this time, they were saying that they must either completely cut off bands from the schools, or else get them under the League's supervision.\(^{256}\)

Although these comments point out the problems which the contests were causing the administrators, for many school bands the music contests were often a catalyst for

\(^{254}\)Winston Savage, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.


\(^{256}\)Dr. Nelson Patrick, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
resolving, rather than creating, problems. Advancements for the school music programs were being promoted that would have been difficult to achieve without the appeal and public support which was generated through the contest activity. Music contests developed a large following among school patrons, and there was a broad level of interest which applied to all parts of society. Prior to this time, music contests were sponsored and administered by the music people, but by 1939, school administrators felt the need for input. Many of them believed that all educational contests should be controlled by school administrators.\(^{257}\)

Although the administrators had not yet organized any official plan of action, band directors across the state began to hear more and more complaints from their own administrators. The growth of the "national band contests" had become a concern to school superintendents, as Jack Mahan reported:

> With the advancement of the state contests there had come a certain amount of public force, causing some school administrators much concern. The music program had gathered a following of many patrons who had been and were being swayed by the glamour and thrill of contests. These contests had grown to be national in scope, . . . [in] 1941, when some 9,257 participants from Texas alone were entered at Waco, Texas, there was a steady growth, the momentum of which had enveloped a large following, much as does athletics. The program

\(^{257}\)Patrick, *Sixty Years*, part 2, 1.
was demanding a tremendous outlay of finance, and was
wielding an alarming amount of public sentiment.\textsuperscript{258}

On February 4, 1939, the TMEA Board of Control
discussed the problems of non-approved contests:

It was moved . . . that a committee be set up to handle
all matters pertaining to all contests, and that their
decisions shall be final. Seconded by Roy Johnson.
Motion carried. . . . It was moved by Clyde Rowe and
seconded by Roy Johnson, that the regional executive
committee in regions where requests for a contest not
sponsored by the association were made, have the
authority to make the final decision permitting the
proposed contest; and that the former motion . . . be
rescinded.\textsuperscript{259}

Therefore, we see that although the matter was
discussed, the TMEA was not willing to pass a statewide rule
curtailing these contests, and by leaving that authority at
the local level, they allowed the decision for approval or
disapproval of a contest to remain a very difficult issue.

Band directors often felt pressures from the business
community, parents, and other schools, regarding the
continued sponsorship or participation in certain contests.
As Patrick pointed out, many of the directors received part
or all of their salaries from sources other than the school,
such as chambers of commerce, city budgets, band parent

\textsuperscript{258} Jack H. Mahan, "Texas Music Educators Association:
1920-1949" (Masters thesis, Southern Methodist University,
1949), 60; also "Statistical Report, National Competition-
Festivals, Waco, May 7-10, 1941," TMEA Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{259} "Minutes of Joint Meeting of Boards of Control,"
Lamar Hotel Cafeteria, February 4, 1939, as found in Nelson
G. Patrick, ed., Minutes and Procedures of T.M.E.A., 1924-
1961 (Austin: Texas Music Educators Association, 1970)
[hereafter referred to as Minutes], 160.
organizations, and individual tuition fees. Many schools did not assume full financial responsibility for the band program and left this responsibility to other groups. Voting against or refusing to attend a contest sponsored or favored by a music director's benefactors could mean the loss of that director's funding or job.

Another credibility problem faced by contest participants was the possible lack of fair and objective adjudication. Nelson Patrick commented on this concern:

One of the things that was so bad and inconsistent in those early contests was the judging. Sometimes it was a matter of who could 'buy' the judges. I remember one contest I was hosting in Ballinger, Texas. I had to rope off the judges' area. But people were still sitting behind them and making comments like, 'Oh! Did you hear that oboe? That oboe is out of tune. I've never heard an oboe played that badly!' This kind of talk would go on behind the judges.

In his 1939 thesis, C. R. Hackney reported a brief description of the rise of independent festivals and the problems they created:

Texas is festival minded and almost in every county or group of counties there is some kind of yearly celebration called a festival. Several years ago some of the fathers saw the great stride made by the bands and the colorful display at the contests, and conceived the idea of inviting bands to their celebrations. They also imported a judge, had a band contest, and awarded trophies to the winners. This made it possible to get ten or fifteen bands that would take part in the parade, to help put the celebration over, and also entertain the people with very little cost. These festivals grew so

260 Patrick, Sixty Years, part 2, 2.

261 Dr. Nelson Patrick, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
fast that they had a tendency to retard the regular contest sponsored by the Texas Music Educators. . . . The Battle of the Flowers Celebration in San Antonio was the largest competitor to the Texas Music Educators Association. . . . The TMEA felt that these types of contests were destroying the real art of music which they had been so long in developing. This led to a great deal of controversy for a while.\textsuperscript{262}

Robert Maddox commented that:

the band directors were going to whatever contests they wanted, and it was creating, shall we say, a bad image in the schools. Kids were missing large amounts of class time going to many contests, often involving very long amounts of travel. Well, we started policing ourselves, and the maximum number of contests was set at three. There were so many chamber of commerce 'wildcat' contests, offering cash and instruments for prizes. It was very difficult, and sometimes impossible, for band directors to stay away from these events, which were many in number. There was a lot of politics involved. Some well-established band directors had more 'clout' in their town than the superintendent did. They could even hire or fire a superintendent. Most of these situations were in East Texas.\textsuperscript{263}

He went on to say:

The contests were taken over because there were a few band directors who did just what they wanted to, and built a problem that their superintendents could not solve on their own.\textsuperscript{264}

Regarding these issues of student eligibility, the "wildcat contests," missing too much school time, and escalating costs, the TMEA leadership simply could not control its rank and file membership. The school band movement in Texas was

\textsuperscript{262}C. R. Hackney, "A History of the Texas Music Educators Association" (Masters thesis, Sam Houston State Teachers College, 1939), 48-49.

\textsuperscript{263}Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{264}Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.
enjoying a rapid growth and position of prominence that was making self-regulation more and more difficult. Also, the problem of bands missing too much school time was compounded by extended travel time to football games, as Bill Cormack recalled:

When I was in school, it took us all night Thursday and all day Friday to get to a football game in Abilene, San Angelo or Odessa. Travel was by train, and this was just a district game—not a trip to a contest or some other 'far-off place.'

By early 1940, there is evidence that the school administrators were looking into the band contest problem. The Administrative Advisory Committee of the UIL was informed that a "committee of executives" was looking into the band problem. Mention was made of establishing a "Music League" to sponsor music contests in opposition to TMEA contests. The administrators did not feel that they could accomplish the needed reforms by working within TMEA contests, so some of them established their own contest, with the intention of eventually replacing the TMEA contest. In East Texas, the superintendents organized and held their own "Music League" band contest in the Fall of 1940, but the event was not very successful, according to Alto Tatum.

---

265 Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

266 "Minutes of the Interscholastic League Advisory Council, Austin, Driskill Hotel, November 1941," UIL Archives, Austin.

Regarding the "Music League" idea, Nelson Patrick stated that the superintendents "didn't have much luck. At one time the superintendent at Weslaco, F. C. McConnell, tried to organize the 'Music League' in order to take over contests themselves, but it didn't catch on."  

Alto Tatum credits Henry Foster, superintendent of schools in Longview, with running this contest. The "Music League" idea was not very successful, because it was not a statewide program. It was only a small regional event, designed to solve the administrators' problems in East Texas only. The failure of this contest proved to the school superintendents that TMEA band contests were so strongly supported by the communities, that the only way to take control of the situation would be to launch a new contest plan statewide.

On February 15, 1941, during the annual TMEA Convention, the Board of Control heard superintendent McConnell, who had moved to Gladewater, address the "band problem." This was the first of many times in which Mr. McConnell took a leadership role with the

268 Dr. Nelson Patrick, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.


270 "Minutes, Address of Mr. F. C. McConnell, Superintendent of Schools at Gladewater, Texas," as found in Minutes, 235.
administrators.\textsuperscript{271} In his opening remarks, he tried to calm the band directors' apprehensions:

The superintendents' interest in this convention is a natural one. Each year we select three of many problems for study. From eleven or twelve problems on file, we select three or four. This year the executives selected the band problem for their study problem. . . .

. . . the band program should take a look into the superintendents' complaints. . . . If you think I am snooping as an individual, I can't help it, I am snooping for the interests of the Gladewater schools. . . . I'll go back and say to you that our study this year is as wholesome as one could be. We pledge our cooperation! We do not want to see band music get on the level of football; we must keep out certain problems that are arising.\textsuperscript{272}

Superintendent McConnell did not mention the specific nature of the complaints until May 30, when he sent a letter to Lyle Skinner, president of TMEA. In this letter he listed the three major problems, as determined by his committee of administrators: (1) legislative control of contests, (2) the type and number of contests, and (3) the expenses involved in handling the band program.\textsuperscript{273} During the month of June, Lyle Skinner wrote back to Mr. McConnell, expressing his feelings that Texas school music directors were working very hard to solve those problems, and that

\textsuperscript{271} Nelson Patrick attempted to conduct a telephone interview with Mr. McConnell during the 1960s, but due to Mr. McConnell's age and poor health, a successful interview was not possible.

\textsuperscript{272} "Minutes, Address of Mr. F. C. McConnell, Superintendent of Schools at Gladewater, Texas," as found in Minutes, 237.

\textsuperscript{273} "F. C. McConnell to Lyle Skinner, May 30, 1941," as found in Minutes, 236-37.
"there will be some adjustments made for next year concerning the number of contests and the expenses incidental to attending them.\footnote{Lyle Skinner to F. C. McConnell June 30, 1941, as found in Minutes, 244.}

Superintendent McConnell was not able to attend the next TMEA board meeting, so he did not address the music educators again until August 9, in Fort Worth. At this meeting, he presented the results of a questionnaire which had been sent to 241 superintendents whose bands, orchestras or choirs had competed in the 1940 Texas National Contest. One hundred sixty-one of them replied, yielding a 66% return rate. The following is a summary of the results of the administrators' responses:\footnote{Report of the Superintendents' Committee, F.C. McConnell, Chairman, as found in Minutes, 241.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Who should have legislative control of contests?</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TMEA Board of Directors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interscholastic League</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A group of administrators</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Combination of 1 and 3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Combination of 2 and 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. How many contests should be held?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The present number</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eliminate National Contests</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Eliminate all contests</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Is band too expensive?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. If your answer to III. is yes, then where and how should the band program be changed?

1. Reduce number and distance of trips  61  46%

2. Uniforms  28  21%

3. Decrease size of bands  6  04%

4. Reduce expensive instruments  18  13%

5. Reduce contest expense  19  14%

Question one shows that the TMEA administered contests were approved by only 3% of those who responded, although 20% felt that a joint effort between administrators and the TMEA was their best choice. A strong 74% favored either Interscholastic League or school administrator control, thereby favoring taking contests away from the band directors. Question two shows a decisive 77% voting to eliminate the National Contests, and question three had 80% respond that band was, indeed, too expensive. The final question gave five alternatives toward cutting band cost and asked the administrators to make their top choice. Keeping in mind that some respondents likely would have marked more than one of these cost-cutting proposals, the number one choice was to reduce the number and distance of trips, with 38% of the vote. This questionnaire was just what the administrators had needed—a statewide consensus (or near consensus) which called for TMEA's relinquishing control of contests, elimination of the Nationals, and a general mandate to cut down on the number of trips.

Unfortunately, the TMEA minutes do not reveal what discussions followed the presentation of this report. It
only mentions that "after being in session from 2:15 until 7:15, and all possible business transacted, the meeting was adjourned."\textsuperscript{276}

In response to the questionnaire results, some immediate steps were taken by the TMEA. These included the decision to conduct the upcoming 1942 convention without student participation. They also voted to abolish the Texas National Band Contests.\textsuperscript{277}

At the October 5 meeting of the TMEA board of directors, a list of sixteen questions related to "the band problem" in Texas was presented.\textsuperscript{278} Mr. McConnell had mentioned the list at the August meeting. This list was a compilation of administrators' questions, and it provides some insights into the apprehensions which were held by many administrators throughout the state:

1. Can the State and National Band Contests, as now conducted, be justified from an educational standpoint?
2. Is the expense of attending contests and festivals justifiable from an educational standpoint?
3. Would the educational values of the band program be reduced if less attention should be given to contests and public exhibitions?
4. How large should organized bands be? Is the present limit as set by the national rules satisfactory?

\textsuperscript{276}"Minutes, TMEA State Executive Board Meeting," Fort Worth, August 9, 1941, as found in Minutes, 246.

\textsuperscript{277}Minutes, 245.

\textsuperscript{278}"Pertinent Questions, As Related to the Band Situation in Texas," part of "Minutes, TMEA Board of Directors Meeting," Abilene, Texas, Wooten Hotel, October 5, 1981, as found in Minutes, 259.
5. Should the band contests be placed under the direct control of the University Interscholastic League or remain under the direction of the Texas Music Educators Association?

6. How much time during the school day should be allowed for band work?

7. Should band be [a] full credit subject?

8. Who should be held responsible for accepting or rejecting engagements for the band?

9. Should band directors and other school officials receive commissions on the sale of instruments in towns where there are no music dealers?

10. How much time in and out of school should the band be allowed or required to spend playing for outside activities such as: Chamber of Commerce, Service Clubs, and other community activities? This question also refers to activities in neighborhood towns and communities.

11. How much equipment should be owned by the school? Which instruments?

12. Should a portion of the funds taken in at football games be set aside for the band?

13. Are band parent's organizations desirable and necessary to a good band program?

14. Is the total band program too expensive as compared with other expenditures in the schools?

15. Is too much money spent for uniforms?

16. How does the per capita cost of band programs compare with other departments in the school? In this connection, how does the value of the band program compare with other phases of the school program?279

These questions address the issues stated earlier in this chapter: expense, need for control of independent contests and non-school performances, the National Contests, and the role of parent support organizations, which often developed into special interest "pressure groups."

Many band directors were caught between their "patrons" and their superintendents. Patrick wrote:

Directors were enjoying the benefits of winning many contests, gaining personal publicity in addition to

---

279 Minutes, 259-60.
having the backing of band parents, chambers of commerce, and frequently the aid of local service clubs. The combination of forces behind the director did not give the superintendent much clout in handling his band and its problem. The director frequently accepted contests, trips, college band day festivals, or other invitations without prior administrative approval. Some directors made extensive purchases of instruments and music, relying upon the school or parent organizations to pay the bill without having approval of school administration. In several schools these procedures led to the dismissal of either the superintendent, the band director, or both. The conditions began to define an unhealthy educational situation.²⁸⁰

This "unhealthy situation" was one in which the band directors at some schools were beginning to wield more power than was considered by many educators to be appropriate, to the extent of threatening the authority of the superintendents.

In December of 1941, Nat Williams, superintendent at Mexia and president of the Association of School Administrators, addressed the Advisory Board of the UIL, outlining a history of "the band problem," and recommending that band contests be abandoned in all schools.²⁸¹ No action was taken at this meeting, and the UIL was still not ready to step into this heated dispute.²⁸²

²⁸⁰Patrick, Sixty Years, part 2, 6.

²⁸¹"Minutes of the Interscholastic League Advisory Council, Austin, Driskill Hotel, December 1941," UIL Archives, Austin.

²⁸²"Minutes of the Interscholastic League Advisory Council, Austin, Driskill Hotel, December 1941," UIL Archives, Austin.
This UIL position is also confirmed in TMEA minutes from their general membership meeting on May 14, 1938.\(^{283}\)

When asked about the possibility of the UIL's taking over contests, president Ward Brandstetter stated:

They don't want our contests. It would require more facilities than they have at present. They are not interested in taking it over. The superintendents, according to the report as a result of the question, voted against it. In another vote which was taken later, the majority voted for it, but the objections were the conflicting dates and the fact that it was being handled by outside interests rather than by the school interest. We do not have a great deal to worry about if we will do our job and do it right, and keep in the good graces of the superintendents.\(^{284}\)

At this point, president Brandstetter was explaining to his constituents that although administrators were beginning to voice some criticism and concerns about TMEA sponsored contests, as long as TMEA worked hard to maintain better communication, the administrators probably would not interfere. However, during the next seven years the TMEA did, indeed, have a great deal to worry about with regard to UIL intervention into the contest administration.

In February 1942, during the TMEA convention in Galveston, the association adopted a new constitution. Among the many changes contained therein was a provision to place three school administrators on each region contest committee, along with three music educators representing

\(^{283}\) "Minutes, Special Called Meeting of Entire TMEA Membership," Waco, South Waco Junior High School, May 14, 1938, as found in Minutes, 130.

\(^{284}\) Minutes, 130-31.
band, choir, and orchestra. The music teachers hoped that this new involvement by school administrators in the contest administration and policy-making would convince the superintendents that "the band problem" was well on its way to being solved. The new constitution stated in Article 7, Section 1, that "no competition-festival, clinic, or contest shall be recognized as an official event until it has been approved by the State Board of Directors." This meant that the power and responsibility to sanction contests was finally taken away from the individual regions, which were so often pressured to give in to "wildcat" events. Section 3 of the constitution stated: "the location of the regional contests shall be decided by a vote of the music educators and school administrators in the regular meeting," indicating that an effort was being made to include administrators in the contest decisions.

By the time the new constitution became effective and some of the contest problems were alleviated, the United States was at war, and many contests were cancelled. For three years, the contest-festivals came to a standstill. Jack Mahan reported the situation in his 1949 thesis:

Contest activities had been curtailed because of government restrictions on travel since 1942, but 1946 was the year designated as the time to resume this phase


286 1942 TMEA Constitution, TMEA Archives, Austin.
of work. Before the contest plans were fully made, the Texas Association of School Administrators strategically moved to place all public school music competitions under the control of the University of Texas Interscholastic League.\footnote{Mahan, 67.}

On November 17, 1945, three superintendents addressed the UIL Executive Committee, urging them to sponsor music contests. This time, however, the administrators were not just a "committee of executives." They now represented the Texas Association of School Administrators and were an organized and determined group. The administrators were Mortimer Brown from Nacogdoches, A. M. Tate from Marlin, and E. D. Dennard from Marshall.\footnote{"Minutes, Interscholastic League Advisory Council, Austin, Driskill Hotel, November 17, 1945," UIL Archives, Austin, 5.} Although the committee did not accept the administrators' recommendation, a committee was appointed to investigate the feasibility of adopting a music contest program for the UIL.\footnote{"Minutes, Interscholastic League Advisory Council, Austin, Driskill Hotel, November 17, 1945," UIL Archives, Austin, 5.}

In February, 1946, at the TMEA annual convention, association president Raymond Bynum appointed a committee to meet with the school administrators.\footnote{"Minutes, TMEA Membership General Session," Galveston, Texas, Buccaneer Hotel, Convention Meeting Ballroom, February 8, 1947, as found in Minutes, 317.} On May 11 of that same year, this committee of music educators and school administrators met to discuss the placement of contests
within the framework of the UIL. Representing the school administrators were Brown, Dennard, Tate, Williams from Sweetwater, Wilkerson from Bryan, and Carruth from Waco; Mr. Carruth was presiding. Representing the TMEA were Lyle Skinner from Waco, Robert Maddox from Odessa, Alto Tatum from Gladewater, Raymond Bynum from Abilene, Tirey Lee from Waco, and D. O. Wiley from Lubbock.\textsuperscript{291} These TMEA representatives were all band directors, with no choral or orchestral teachers represented, thereby lending support to the argument that "band" was the central issue in the debate over contests.

At this meeting, Raymond Bynum suggested an alternate plan in which the contests would be jointly governed by the administrators and TMEA. Mr. Maddox offered documentation that the administrators in his region were satisfied with the present TMEA administration and structure of the contests. At this point in the meeting, superintendent Brown stated that:

\begin{quote}
this committee had definite and specific instructions from the Texas Association of School Administrators [TASA] to work out a plan for placing the music contests under league supervision at the earliest possible date.\textsuperscript{292}
\end{quote}

Then Lyle Skinner pointed out that neither he nor the other TMEA representatives at the meeting had the authority to act

\textsuperscript{291}"TMEA News Bulletin Number 23," September 23, 1946, TMEA Archives, Austin, 2.

\textsuperscript{292}"Committee Report," Minutes, May 16, 1946, as found in Minutes, 307.
for the association. Whatever discussion may have occurred at this time was not recorded, but, as will be shown below, interviews with two of the music educators who were in attendance indicate that the bluntness of the administrators' presentation resulted in a walkout by the music educators.

Alto Tatum remembered Mr. Carruth's making the statement "that the purpose for our being here was for the UIL to take over the contests." He recalled:

At that point, I got up to go get my hat. My friend, Red Dennard from Marshall, asked me where I was going. I said, 'Well, I was elected by the TMEA members, and I have nothing to give away. There's nothing in their [TMEA's] constitution which permits me to give anything away, so I feel that it's useless for me to be here!' A recess was taken at the request of Mr. Dennard, and we came back. This time the superintendents had a more conciliatory attitude in their asking for our help, expertise, and guidance in how the contests can better work.  

Weldon Covington also described the event:

It was a pretty violent meeting. Alto was there. . . . But we had talked about what we would do if it happened--whether we would have a lot of vote in it. They said they wanted to know what we thought, and we decided later that they really didn't want to know what we thought. We walked out on the meeting and then came back.

A thirty minute recess is documented in the TMEA minutes, and during this recess the band directors and

---


294 Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
administrators met, each group in a separate room, to
discuss their position.\textsuperscript{295} Jack Mahan reported that the
music educators decided:

1. Since the administrators were determined to put the
school music contests in the League, and
2. Since the administrators are the ones who are, in
the final analysis, responsible for all school
activities to their respective boards,
Then it might be the best thing to do to:
1. Continue as a committee to help set up the League
school music competition festivals on as sound a
basis as possible, and
2. Work out and submit a set-up, as nearly like the one
under which we have operated for several years, as
possible.\textsuperscript{296}

After the recess, the two sides worked together to begin the
shift in contest control.\textsuperscript{297} Another meeting was set up for
June 13-16 of the same year.\textsuperscript{298}

Nelson Patrick wrote, "the period from 1945 through
1946 was one of volatile emotions, a situation of the kettle
calling the skillet black."\textsuperscript{299} Winston Savage, in a report
written to R. J. Kidd, commented:

During the preceding time that the University
Interscholastic League offered competition in music, a
very large percent of the personnel involved,
principally music educators, were violently opposed to
having an organization outside their jurisdiction offer

\textsuperscript{295}"Minutes, TMEA Membership General Session,"
Galveston, Texas, Buccaneer Hotel, Convention Meeting
Ballroom, February 8, 1947, as found in Minutes, 317.

\textsuperscript{296}Mahan, 68, as cited from "TMEA News" No. 23, 1946.

\textsuperscript{297}"Committee Report," Minutes, May 16, 1946, as found
in Minutes, 308.

\textsuperscript{298}Minutes, 308.

\textsuperscript{299}Patrick, \textit{Sixty Years}, part 2, 8.
competition in music, which had been sponsored by their own professional organization for so many years. This opposition, which was directed in the main at the Administrator's Association, created severe strained relations between the two professional organizations.

On June 13, 1946, a meeting was held at the Driskill Hotel in Austin with the following in attendance:

Administrators—Williams, Brown, Dennard, Foster of Longview, and Moore of Kerrville; Music Educators—Maddox, Tatum, Skinner, and D. O. Wiley. The purpose of the meeting was to incorporate music contests into the League program. A copy of the administrators' proposal was presented by Brown, with a request to vote whether or not the music educator committee favored incorporating music into the League program. A music plan of competition was set up, with the following code:

Participation in the League Competition-Festival implies that each member school shall observe all the implications of fair play, courtesy and sportsmanship. Achieving the ultimate in excellence of a performance shall be the goal instead of 'winning.' The competition is designed to motivate musical education through the year, rather than to 'prepare for a contest.' Directors shall use the Competition-Festival to encourage and teach musical appreciation, technical ability, stage deportment, audience deportment, and good citizenship in general. Competition-Festivals should assume and maintain a regular position as an agency for education.

---

300 F. W. Savage, UIL Director of Music Activities, Austin, to R. J. Kidd, Bureau of Public School Service, Austin, July 13, 1949, UIL Archives, University of Texas at Austin.

301 "Minutes, TMEA Membership General Session," Galveston, Texas, Buccaneer Hotel, Convention Meeting Ballroom, February 8, 1947, as found in Minutes, 318.
and character building in the general education philosophy of the public schools.³⁰²

When Lyle Skinner reported back to the TMEA regarding this meeting, his report stated that several music plans were studied including:

The Louisiana Plan, the Illinois Plan, the Kansas Plan, and the Texas Plan. This session lasted about ten hours, during which time the rules and regulations of the Interscholastics pertaining to school contests were read and studied.³⁰³

If the music educators actually approved the proposal, it is not reflected in the TMEA minutes. As a matter of fact, the TMEA did not even vote on the matter until February of the next year.³⁰⁴ This writer speculates that although the TMEA leadership was poised and ready to work within the UIL structure, they were still reluctant to officially recognize the UIL contests until the last possible moment. However, in the November minutes of the UIL Executive Committee, it shows that a "music plan" for UIL contests had already been organized, as was now being presented:

Music Plan of Competition--The music plan of competition recommended by the committee of music educators and school administrators was presented to the (executive) committee, and motion was made and passed that the plan

³⁰²"Music Plan of Competitions," University of Texas Interscholastic League, June 15, 1946, UIL Archives, Austin.
³⁰³Minutes, 318.
³⁰⁴Minutes, 317.
be incorporated into the Constitution and Rules and Regulations of the League.\textsuperscript{305}

The UIL records also show that at the same meeting, "F. W. Savage, Director of Music Activities and [others] . . . were introduced to the State Executive Committee."\textsuperscript{306}

Therefore, Mr. Savage was hired prior to the UIL's actually having accepted the music plan, and several months prior to official acceptance by the TMEA.\textsuperscript{307} This points to the fact that the superintendents, now in close alliance with the UIL, were clearly the "power players." They had no need even for TMEA approval of the new UIL Music Plan, except from a public relations point of view.

Winston Savage recalled the November meeting with music educators in this light:

This plan was constructed by F. W. Savage and offered for consideration to a composite committee made up of five school administrators appointed by the Texas Association of School Administrators, and five music educators appointed by the Texas Music Educators Association at a meeting on November 16, 1946. With a few minor changes, this plan was approved by this committee and put into immediate operation.\textsuperscript{308}

\textsuperscript{305}"Minutes of the Interscholastic League Executive Committee," Austin, Driskill Hotel, November 1946, UIL Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{306}"Minutes of the Interscholastic League Executive Committee," Austin, Driskill Hotel, November 1946, UIL Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{307}Patrick, Sixty Years, part 2, 9.

\textsuperscript{308}"F. W. Savage, UIL Director of Musical Activities, to R. J. Kidd, Bureau of Public School Service, July 13, 1949," UIL Archives, University of Texas at Austin.
On February 7, 1947, during the annual TMEA convention in Galveston, Lyle Skinner presented a report to the general membership. His report concluded with a recommendation to recognize the UIL as the official channel through which music contests be held. The report was not acted upon until the next day, when Roy Bedichek, Director of UIL, introduced F. W. Savage as State Director of Music Activities. It was at this meeting on February 8 that the Skinner report was placed back on the agenda. A motion by Jack Mahan that the Skinner report be adopted was passed.\textsuperscript{309}

Nelson Patrick wrote:

R. J. Kidd, assistant director of the League . . . has a very vivid description of the proceedings. According to Mr. Kidd, Bedichek did not want music in the UIL, and would not accept the report from the administrators or his own executive committee. The entire administrative matter was settled only after Theo Painter, president of the university, called Bedichek to his office and directed him to assume responsibilities for music contests and gave the League $4,000 to hire a director of music activities. Kidd relates that Bedichek applied for a year's leave of absence and resigned.\textsuperscript{310}

Therefore, while some Texas band directors looked upon the UIL as a "power hungry" organization "out to get" the TMEA, it is more accurate to say that the UIL was a rather unwilling participant in the early stages of the takeover.

\textsuperscript{309}"Minutes, TMEA Membership General Session," Galveston, Texas, Buccaneer Hotel, February 8, 1947, as found in Minutes, 317.

\textsuperscript{310}Patrick, Sixty Years, part 2, 9. This story was told to Dr. Patrick by R. J. Kidd in private communication.
On April 4 and 5, 1947, the TMEA Executive Board met in Austin to advise Mr. Savage on the contest rules and plans for the Fall of 1947. Mr. Savage was not able to attend, due to an emergency, but sent a detailed letter of instructions instead. The minutes of this meeting state that:

After long and serious study of the rather lengthy letter from Mr. Savage, Mr. Covington asked Mr. Mahan and Mr. Martinez to appear before the State Executive Board of the League and present a plea for a real music plan, a plan that would concern music only. . . . Mr. Mahan presented several points of difference in a workable music plan and the plan that applies to football, clarifying his statements by saying that people may gamble on football, but that there was no chance for anyone to gamble on band or other competition festivals. Thus, the stringent rules that in the League rules should apply only to football, and should not necessarily apply to music.312

On April 5, the TMEA Board adopted the following statement, which was presented to Mr. Savage before the May 3 meeting of the Executive Board of the League:

In view of the fact that the Music Plan for the Competition-Festivals as now adopted by the Interscholastic League does not seem to serve the best purposes of Music Education in Texas, the Executive Board of the Texas Music Educators Association shall recommend to the next convention meeting of the association that they discontinue attending competition-festivals, and inaugurate a series of regional or sectional clinics that will be of definite educational value to the students of music in Texas.313

Robert Maddox recalled:

311 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Austin, Driskill Hotel, April 4-5, 1947, as found in Minutes, 320.

312 Minutes, 320.

313 Minutes, 320.
Band directors felt like the administrators were usurping their power and position, and that it was an unfriendly takeover. Many band directors were very obnoxious in their attitudes toward the UIL transition and involvement, and the way the administrators approached it fueled this attitude. The superintendents could definitely have been more diplomatic. We just felt like we were being saddled with making the best of it. . . .

Band directors were very belligerent about it, because they felt that Mr. Savage was not a really strong band man. I had never heard of him before! He tried, I'll give him that, but we were not in a very receptive mood. He really sweated it! Also, to put it mildly, he was not very diplomatic at times. When he first spoke at the TMEA convention, they really 'grilled him' with questions! It was like the President at a press conference: 'What are you going to do about this? What about that? Why this? What that?' But, in the end, he had the final word.\(^{314}\)

Winston Savage recalled similar experiences:

There were only one or two directors who made this into a personal affair, and I almost came to blows with those couple of people. I made it a point to come to all of the TMEA conventions, and the music educators were courteous enough to give me a convention time slot in which I could discuss recent changes and upcoming events. I remember one of those panel clinics at a TMEA convention in Galveston, when one of the band directors and I almost tangled, because he was taking something I said very 'personally,' when I did not mean it that way.\(^{315}\)

On May 3, 1947, Mr. Mahan and Mr. Martinez made an appeal to the UIL regarding "the liberalization of eligibility rules for music competition."\(^{316}\) The UIL did

\(^{314}\)Robert Maddox, interview by author, Odessa, Texas, his home, December 8, 1988.

\(^{315}\)Winston Savage, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

\(^{316}\)"Minutes, State Meeting of Delegates to the League, May 3, 1947", UIL Archives, Austin.
not grant this request, and TMEA refused to endorse the League contests.\footnote{317 "Minutes, TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Austin, Driskill Hotel, April 4-5, 1947, as found in Minutes, 320.} However, a committee of TMEA members asked the League Executive Committee for a waiver of League rules for one year. Permission was granted, and during the 1948 TMEA convention in Waco, several music educator committees were appointed, with the purpose of studying the contest problems and making recommendations to the UIL. Two very important committees were established which have had far reaching consequences: the Committee of Delegates to the UIL, and the UIL Music Advisory Committee.

Again, Maddox commented:

Band directors knew that the contests would be taken out of their hands. They felt like the rules for UIL were designed for athletics, and that it would be a disaster unless an entirely new set of rules was drawn up by a committee of band directors.\footnote{318 Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.}

Alto Tatum expressed an interesting view of the administrators' motives behind the takeover of music contests:

It is my opinion that school administrators were looking for the UIL to make decisions for them, instead of facing up and running their own local schools. What I'm really saying is, that they wanted to be able to say to the community, to the band parents' club, and to the individual directors, 'No, we can't do this because there is a rule against it.' You have the same thing in athletics. So to this extent, the UIL is still deserving of some 'negativism.' in my opinion, with all of the events which they govern. There always seems to be something in the way of curtailment or diluting the
activity. So I believe the administrators were looking for a way, in the political sense, to say, 'There is a rule against it.'

Principal Participants, Their Roles, and Other Factors Which Influenced the Decision-Making Process

The most influential decision makers regarding the UIL takeover of contests appear to have been the leaders of the Texas Association of School Administrators, along with Theo Painter, president of the University of Texas. The administrators were led by F. C. McConnell, Nat Williams, Henry Foster, Mortimer Brown, E. N. Dennard, A. M. Tate and Urbie Carruth. Their persistence and use of power eventually influenced Theo Painter to force Roy Bedichek and the UIL to take over music contests. However, if Painter had refused the administrators' demands, his "veto" would have been the ultimate controlling factor. For a few years Roy Bedichek, director of the UIL, was single-handedly overcoming the administrators' efforts by simply refusing to let the UIL become involved.

Each interviewee was given definitions for three specific categories of decision-makers and was asked if any of the categories were accurate descriptions of particular participants in the landmark event. The categories were:

a. Active Initiator: One who is at the forefront of the development of new ideas, and remains

involved through the chain of events leading to a final outcome.

b. Suspensory Veto: One who is not actively involved in the development of a plan of action, but who uses his power of "veto" to greatly influence the outcome.

c. Passive Bystander: One who does not take a strong position on either side of an issue, and allows others to influence the outcome.

When asked what kind of role these leaders played in the landmark event, interviewees placed the entire group of administrators in the "active initiator" category. Weldon Covington commented: "The administrators were definitely the "active initiators"--very aggressive. At times we felt like that third group [category of decision-maker]--passive bystanders."¹³²⁰ When asked if any single music teacher stood out as a particular leader, he stated that, "We all tried to get through this thing without losing the basic format of the contests. It was a cooperative effort, I would say."¹³²¹

Apparently, the TMEA leaders had very little influence over the fundamental decision regarding the UIL takeover; but when it came time to advise Mr. Savage concerning the

¹³²⁰ Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, November 22, 1988.

¹³²¹ Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, November 22, 1988.
rules and organization of the contests, they did make an impact. Principal TMEA leaders were Lyle Skinner, Jack Mahan, Alto Tatum, Robert Maddox, Raymond Bynum and Tirey Lee. Jack Mahan observed:

I think we salvaged it [the contests] beautifully, because they [the superintendents] got what they wanted in that they had control of the situation, and we got what we wanted in that we created an advisory committee to the UIL, so that all the rules and regulations we had were actually set up by the bandmasters.322

An external factor which influenced the outcome of this event was World War II's disruption of the contests, as well as the school band programs in general. Jack Mahan noted:

World War II was an important factor. The administrators had the opportunity to get organized because there weren't any contests. Whenever we started to crank up again, they just said, 'If you're going to have contests again, you're going to do it under this set-up.' So then we started checking around and developing the best format possible under their guidelines.323

Weldon Covington concurred: "I think they've got a point--those who think that World War II made it [the UIL takeover] possible."324 Alto Tatum also agreed. However, Nelson Patrick disagreed. When asked about World War II's influence, Patrick stated:


324Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
I think that most of that is conjecture. However, it is true that many of these stronger directors were getting old right about then. They had started out of the 'pit,' playing in theatres and the like. So retirement of that generation of bandmasters was an important factor. The 'music man' syndrome was dying out. But it is true that the war was very significant; it was almost a marking point for change. Prior to the war, my salary might have been based on a percentage of instruments I sold and how much tuition I collected, because the kids paid tuition. But after the war, it was more of a salary situation, and the band programs took on more of an 'educational approach.'

The Final Decision's Effect upon TMEA's Gain or Loss of Organizational Strength

The UIL takeover of music contests did not cause a significant gain or loss in TMEA's membership (size) or geographic distribution, as the association continued along its regular pattern of growth. Prior to World War II, TMEA membership had grown to almost six hundred, but the association almost ceased to exist during the early 1940s. Membership dropped to 191 in 1942. However, by 1947, membership was up to 427, and in 1949, TMEA had grown to a membership of 518. The cohesion of the organization was somewhat weakened for a short period of time. Some of the membership felt that TMEA's most special activity had been the victim of an unfriendly takeover, and that the contest's future was not very bright. Jack Mahan reported:

325 Dr. Nelson Patrick, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

326 "Report of Annual Memberships," as found in Minutes, 222.
Even though the ballot of schools taken by the Administrators Association in July 1946, showed 189 schools in Texas favoring League sponsorship of contests, and only thirteen opposed, the music people objected because they felt they had been experienced in music contest procedures, while the League had not. They knew the League had originally, in 1910, been the State High School Debate League, organized by E. D. Shurter, to foster public speaking contests in secondary schools. They also knew that the music memory contests continued after 1923 only as county meets.

All League music contests prior to 1946, were only county meet activities, while the eligibility rules of the League had been formulated and swayed by athletic events rather than fine arts activities.\(^{327}\)

However, while TMEA's upper level of leadership had the same concerns, this event caused them to work together with much determination in their efforts to help make the UIL contests as much to their liking as possible. In this regard, the TMEA leadership was drawn closer together. Jack Mahan commented:

The advent of the takeover of contests by the UIL without a doubt brought the membership of TMEA closer together in the same way that Pearl Harbor brought the American people together during World War II. In other words, it was 'war' to us. We were actually fighting for our lives. We had no assurance that the UIL's contests would be at all successful.\(^{328}\)

TMEA's status was greatly improved as a result of the UIL takeover of contests. School administrators felt that their musical organizations were more a part of the regular school program. No longer did they have to worry about band contests being scheduled without their knowledge and in conflict with other major events. They also did not have to

\(^{327}\)Mahan, 69.

worry as much about music groups' deciding to make long trips or major purchases without prior administrative approval. Since superintendents were more comfortable with their music groups, they tended to support them more, and the level of friction between them and their music teachers was greatly reduced. When asked about positive outcomes, Jack Mahan commented: "The number one thing was harmony between the administrators and the bandmasters. A second good thing was that music teachers didn't have to deal with this time-consuming task anymore."

Most interviewees also believed that the TMEA gained in overall associational strength as a result of the UIL takeover of contests. Weldon Covington explained:

I think in the end it [associational strength] was strengthened . . . . It worked out in time. It allowed the TMEA to focus on other things instead of being bogged down in administration; they realized this was something they didn't need to do. They got to go about their business without having to worry about contests.

Winston Savage agreed:

As far as I'm concerned, the TMEA gained strength, although they did not make the final decisions. They

---


331 Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
may have lost some personal prestige, but not a loss of real associational strength."\textsuperscript{332}

Therefore, the UIL takeover of contests truly instituted sweeping change for the TMEA. Not only was TMEA able to assume new "non-contest" priorities, but the UIL proved to become a very strong avenue for music competition. To this day, the UIL, when compared to "activities associations" in other states, is an unusual organization for the administration of school competition. Dr. Patrick commented:

Most activities associations that 'make their own rules' regarding competitions tend to eventually develop into a situation in which the members in power begin to make rules to favor their own groups. This usually leads to problems and the establishment of a 'new' association to take its place. The UIL's longevity should be credited, in part, to the way in which it is structured into three distinct groups of people: the participants, the superintendents who make the rules, and the UIL affiliates, who administer the rules. This division of responsibility has been a special ingredient in the UIL's success through the years.\textsuperscript{333}

TMEA's "program and ideas" were also greatly changed. The majority of interviewees agreed that this change was not only for the better, but that it marked an important step in TMEA's development as a professional organization. Without the massive burden of statewide band, choir and orchestra contests to administer, the TMEA began to turn its energies

\textsuperscript{332}Winston Savage, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

\textsuperscript{333}Nelson Patrick, phone interview by author, May 10, 1989.
more than ever before toward improving its annual
convention. Weldon Covington commented:

[The UIL takeover] probably strengthened TMEA, in that
we had more time to look beyond 'contests' as an
association.\textsuperscript{334}

Jack Mahan agreed:

Look at the TMEA today. This action freed TMEA to turn
its attention somewhat from a 'contest agenda' to a
broader base. It has also kept the different TMEA
divisions from having to bicker over contests' profits,
etc.\textsuperscript{335}

Robert Maddox added:

It was the best thing that could have happened. We were
so proud and jealous of our independence. But the UIL
ran the contests just like we thought they should be.
However, we couldn't see this coming in.\textsuperscript{336}

The philosophy of helping all Texas music educators to
become better teachers began to assume the position of top
priority for the association. Where "contests" had
previously been considered TMEA's main vehicle for the
advancement of music education, now different areas were
emphasized, instituting a comprehensive change in the
association's thrust. Instructional workshops for both
students and teachers, curriculum development from
elementary through college levels, and the all-region and

\textsuperscript{334} Weldon Covington, interview by author, Tape
recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22,

\textsuperscript{335} Jack Mahan, interview by author, Tape recording,

\textsuperscript{336} Robert Maddox, interview by author, Tape recording,
his home, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.
all-state band, choir and orchestra programs became three of TMEA's main areas of emphasis.

If TMEA had continued to administer music contests, that task in itself would have been staggering because of the huge growth of school music contests in Texas, which is well documented. In 1946 to 1947, the number of music groups participating in contests was 414. By 1952 to 1953, this number had more than doubled at 857. During the 1987-1988 school year, the UIL estimates 64,986 students participated in UIL Solo and Ensemble competition, and 224,795 students participated in music organization contests (such as marching and concert bands, choirs and orchestras). This brings the 1987-1988 total student participation in UIL music activities to 289,781.

All interviewees agreed that if TMEA was still administering music contests, then the association's other areas of emphasis would severely suffer. They also agreed that under UIL music administration, contests developed faster and into a much larger activity across Texas than anyone ever dreamed. D. O. Wiley, in a letter to Dr. Nelson Patrick, commented on how difficult it would be for the early bandmasters of the 1920s to comprehend or predict the huge growth of music contests:


No one, at that time, could have possibly ever dreamed that by the early fifties this 'thing' [UIL music contests] could have ballooned to the extent that it did, and should one have mentioned the 1967 figures [for participation], he would have probably wound up in the 'pokey' as a nut.\textsuperscript{339}

\textbf{Summary}

Regarding the UIL takeover of music contests, the TMEA's role as a decision-making body was very minimal, indeed. This landmark event was clearly a case of external constraints exerting great influence here, as described by Pfeffer and Salancik.\textsuperscript{340} The school administrators, a powerful group which impacted the TMEA from the outside, dictated their decisions to the TMEA, and thus effected "comprehensive change" in the association.\textsuperscript{341} Although TMEA's constitution and organizational structure (i.e., format of officers, division of regions, etc.) remained the same, jurisdiction over one of its most time-consuming activities had been taken away from them. The planning and administration of regional and national marching and concert band contests, as well as solo contests, plus contests involving orchestra and choir, had always occupied a central position in the association's efforts. Contest preparation

\textsuperscript{339}D. O. Wiley, Lubbock, to Dr. Nelson Patrick, Austin, January 10, 1968, UIL Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{340}See pages 21-22 of this study.

\textsuperscript{341}"Comprehensive change" is one of Robert A. Dahl's three "categories of change" referred to in chapter one of this study.
and administration had been the prime clinic and agenda focus at the annual conventions. Jack Mahan commented:

During the 1930s and '40s, the activities of TMEA were 'contest oriented.' Today the activities are oriented toward 'professional things.' The headquarters is now in Austin, where TMEA can effectively lobby in behalf of music education. This is very different from the early years of the association.  

While the association did broaden its focus beyond the preparation for contests, the next chapter will point out that TMEA continued to emphasize music performance as the cornerstone of its efforts. Differing philosophies concerning the emphasis upon performance proved to be an emotional point of debate between TMEA and MENC in later years.

Although this study focuses upon TMEA decisions, this author will go a step further and consider the school administrators' decision-making process. While one might argue that the administrators' decision is a clear-cut example of the rational model, a closer look reminds us that some of them were in favor of leaving contests under TMEA control. At the other extreme, there were superintendents who wanted to abolish "bands" from the schools altogether. Others just wanted all contests abolished. It was a difficult task for the administrative leaders to accomplish a consensus which favored UIL control. This researcher

---

343 See questionnaire results from Chapter 4, pages 113-14, of this study.
believes that the UIL plan basically followed the "intendedly rational" theory, as described by Schuman and Oluff, and was, to some administrators, a compromised "reasonable" decision rather than a "perfect" one. On the other hand, the political or power model best describes the decision from the perspective of TMEA, facing the external constraints of the school administrators over the music educators.

According to Gortner, Mahler and Nicholson, the ability of an organization and its leadership to react quickly to external forces is a key ingredient to success:

Unplanned change requires quick and appropriate reaction; thus, organizations must maintain the flexibility to respond to it. Those that do can prosper; those that do not can expect hard times. Public administrators must recognize this ubiquitous change in the environment and learn how not only to survive, but to turn this environmental characteristic into a useful tool when it is appropriate to do so.

Jack Mahan expressed his views concerning TMEA's response to the UIL takeover, and although his statements specifically referred to band directors, his comments can apply to all areas of TMEA's leadership:

I think the bandmasters, you ought to know because you are one, you don't take defeat - you don't look at it that way. You grab what you have and make it better. So what we did was, we saw the writing on the wall, and

---


we felt that we had had our heyday, and now that it was over, just make the best of what we could. So that's exactly what we did. We just took the whole thing, made it into a successful program like that. I think we salvaged it beautifully, because they [the administrators] got what they wanted in that they had control of the situation, and we got what we wanted in that we created an advisory committee to the UIL, so that all the rules and regulations we had were actually set up by the bandmasters.\textsuperscript{346}

TMEA leaders made the best of what they perceived as a bad situation by reacting quickly to the UIL takeover. This effective reaction resulted in an actual gain for TMEA. The TMEA leadership's involvement was one of coping with, or adjusting to, the reality of external power. Pfeffer and Salancik would give TMEA leaders high marks for adjusting to these environmental controls in a way that maximized TMEA's autonomy and long-term strength.

\textsuperscript{346}Jack Mahan, interview by author, Tape recording, his home, Arlington, Texas, November 14, 1988.
CHAPTER 5

THE SEPARATION FROM THE MUSIC EDUCATORS
NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The National Conference of Music Supervisors was organized in 1907 and established its monthly publication, the Music Supervisors Bulletin, in 1914.\textsuperscript{347} In 1915, the publication's title was changed to the Music Supervisors Journal,\textsuperscript{348} and in 1920, the organization changed its name to the Music Supervisors National Conference.\textsuperscript{349} In 1934, the organization changed its name to the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), and its publication was retitled the Music Educators Journal.\textsuperscript{350} MENC has played an important role in developing a national policy for all of the arts. In 1988, the organization's membership was over 57,000.\textsuperscript{351} It must be noted here that unlike other state affiliates of MENC, TMEA had not originated as an MENC unit.

\textsuperscript{347}Peter W. Dykema, ed., Music Supervisors Bulletin I, no. 1 (September 1914).
\textsuperscript{348}Peter W. Dykema, ed., Music Supervisors Journal, II, no. 1 (September 1915).
\textsuperscript{349}Peter W. Dykema, ed., Music Supervisors Journal, VI, no. 3 (January 1920).
\textsuperscript{350}Clifford Buttelman, ed., Music Educators Journal, XXI, no. 1 (September 1934).
and that TMEA made efforts, after it became established as a music educators organization, to seek affiliation.

The first mention of TMEA affiliation with MENC is found in the August 1, 1938, minutes of the first meeting of the newly formed TMEA board of directors:

The matter of becoming definitely affiliated with the National Music Educators Conference was brought up. A discussion brought out the two possible means of becoming affiliated – one of which was by payment of the dollar membership fee for each state member, and the other a cooperative affiliation which called for an exchange of membership lists by the secretaries, and that the stationery should bear the statement of the official national magazine being the Music Educators Journal. It was moved . . . that we take up a cooperative affiliation. \(^{352}\)

Although the TMEA adopted a cooperative affiliation with MENC at this meeting, there is no evidence indicating that this resolution was ever followed up with anything concrete, such as a commitment to “dues paying” affiliation written into the TMEA constitution. In reality, TMEA was not at that time a legitimate MENC affiliate, or even partially affiliated.

On February 8, 1947, during the TMEA convention in Galveston, Marion Flagg, a teacher from Dallas, submitted an amendment to the constitution proposing "that the TMEA join actively with the MENC. There was some discussion on this proposed amendment. When the question was called, 71

\(^{352}\)"Minutes, TMEA Board of Directors Meeting," Austin, Driskill Hotel, Pan-American Room, August 1, 1938, as found in Nelson G. Patrick, ed., Minutes and Procedures of T.M.E.A., 1924-1961 (Austin: Texas Music Educators Association, 1970) [hereafter referred to as Minutes], 143.
members voted for the amendment and 10 against."\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^3\) At this point TMEA developed a category of association membership called "Option III."\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^4\) This was an option which allowed Texans to join TMEA without joining MENC. With "Option III" in effect, some TMEA members were also "dues paying" MENC members, while others were not. Option I referred to full membership in both associations, and Option II referred to full membership in TMEA, with associate membership in MENC.\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^5\) None of these options were ever written into the association constitution. They were simply listed on each year's annual "registration for membership" forms.

In April 1948, the MENC Board of Directors met in Detroit and discussed the status of the state unit's affiliation. The minutes reported that North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, Texas and California were accepted as affiliated state units "subject to completion of technical requirements in certain instances."\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^6\) The "technical requirements" referred to were needed changes in

\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^3\) "Minutes, TMEA General Membership Session," Galveston, Texas, Buccaneer Hotel, February 8, 1947, as found in Minutes, 314.

\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^4\) "1949 TMEA Membership Application Form," TMEA Archives, Austin.

\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^5\) "1949 TMEA Membership Application Form," TMEA Archives, Austin.

\(^3\)\(^5\)\(^6\) "Jerry Longwell Papers," TMEA Archives, Austin.
the state constitutions to bring them into conformity with the MENC constitution.

Paul Van Bodegraven, MENC president in 1964, mentioned an additional point of view:

Information at that time, from Texans who knew the situation, was that Texas, in prior years, had been reluctant to make the needed change, and that 'Doc' Wiley and Cliff Buttelman, our first executive secretary (1930-1956), kept this from the MENC board hoping something would be worked out. Vanette Lawler, executive secretary during my tenure, confirmed this.\footnote{Paul Van Bodegraven, Tucson, Arizona, to Ross Grant, Desoto, Texas, February 24, 1989.}

Wiley Housewright, president of MENC in 1968, gave a more in-depth description of the historical background:

Clifford Buttelman,\footnote{Clifford Buttelman was MENC Executive Director from 1930 to 1955.} executive secretary for many years, worked with Prof. Wiley, who headed the Texas group, in an effort to broaden their base to include a larger segment of the profession, i.e., all public school, private school, and college teachers of music. Prof. Wiley was a strong leader of the band directors of the state, and for many years did not wish to extend membership to others. Ultimately, however, he agreed with Mr. Buttelman that it was the wise thing to do. He did not wish to present the proposal to other members, because he believed that they would view it as a move to vitiate their strength, leadership and control. He assured Buttelman that after his (Wiley's) demise, the unification of the state organization and its affiliation with the national organization would occur. Mr. Wiley lived a long life and at his death the Texas group was no nearer affiliation with MENC than it had been in his lifetime. MENC officials kept in contact with the leadership of Texas and encouraged their participation on the basis of full membership. Several TMEA officers participated in affairs of MENC on that basis. A substantial number of Texas members from the
old-guard band organization opposed the full-membership participation in MENC.359

J. W. King, president of TMEA in 1972, had similar recollections:

When TMEA first decided to affiliate with MENC, I think at Mineral Wells in 1938, TMEA was even more than now a 'band director' institution, in that they had not had the choral division in very long at all, or any other divisions as well. A lot of the TMEA membership didn't feel that the objectives of MENC and TMEA were compatible and were reluctant to join MENC. Nevertheless, the affiliation was made. . . . Through the years, evidently, there was supposed to be some future time when Texas had sort of agreed to bring their dues structure in line with MENC. Well, it just never happened.360

J. R. McEntyre, also a former president of TMEA (1970-1972), gave a third view of the situation:

D. O. Wiley is probably the reason why TMEA had 'option III.' He was the executive secretary back in the 1940s, and I think that we got this 'option' through "default"--by MENC being a little bit loose--a relatively young organization. Communication wasn't as effective back in the '40s. I also believe that this is one of the things that changed TMEA to be such a flourishing state organization. After all, most of our efforts were directed, selfishly, toward our own state. It was always interesting for me to observe at the regional and national MENC meetings, that the only people who showed up from the other states were the college music education people, plus the music supervisors. In Texas, the grassroots guys who were 'doing the job,' were the ones who showed up. I immediately noticed the difference between our membership and the other states. In Texas, TMEA is the band, choir, orchestra directors--the applied music people. In most other states it's the college people


and supervisors . . . who don't know what's going on in the trenches. They were all into research, while Texas was into 'doing the job.'

Robert Fielder, TMEA president during 1954-55, was invited to a meeting by Vanette Lawler, assistant secretary of the MENC, which was held in Oklahoma City in 1953. He recalls that she set up the meeting:

between D. O. Wiley, L. H. Buckner, and myself with her. L. H. Buckner was president . . . I was band chairman, and D. O. Wiley was the executive secretary. This meeting . . . was designed to encourage us to encourage our organization to come into the MENC 'fold.' Mr. Buttelman, who was executive secretary of MENC, had made it very plain that this was the only way we could come in, meaning that we would have to require all TMEA members to join MENC. Vanette took a much more subtle, perhaps Machiavellian approach, when she was encouraging us to act just like we were doing, and try to work this out as we went along . . . My own interest in MENC was somewhat improved . . . As a result of my experience in Oklahoma City . . ., I invited the president of MENC to be the keynote speaker at the opening of the TMEA convention, which he did. I must say, in all candor, that he 'dropped the ball.' For some reason he was not prepared, he was physically disturbed at the meeting, and his speech was certainly not motivational. It did not accomplish what he meant for it to accomplish at all. So, from then on, the 'battle lines' became more clearly drawn than they were before.

---


362 Vanette Lawler later served as Executive Secretary of MENC from 1955 to 1968.

Mr. Fielder was referring to MENC president Robert Choate, and the 1955 TMEA convention.\footnote{Minutes, TMEA General Membership Session," Dallas, Adolphus Hotel, Roof Garden, February 11, 1955, as found in Minutes, 460.} On October 7, 1957, during the TMEA Executive Board Meeting, the minutes state that Ed Hatchett:

made a motion that at the first State Board meeting in Galveston, considerations be given to dues and the membership year. This had to do with the proposed raise in MENC dues and the deletion of Option III from the TMEA dues set-up. The motion was seconded by Charles Nelson and carried.\footnote{Minutes, TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Dallas, Adolphus Hotel, October 7, 1957, as found in Minutes, 498.}

On February 20, 1958, during the TMEA convention in Galveston, minutes of the State Board of Directors meeting mention that Allene Watrous, president of the Southwestern division of MENC, and Vanette Lawler, at that time the executive secretary of MENC, were in attendance.\footnote{Minutes, TMEA Executive Board Meeting," Galveston, Texas, Buccaneer Hotel, February 20-22, 1958, as found in Minutes, 501.} Due to a clerical error in the printing of the convention program, which listed regional chairmen as the only members of the State Board, many board members were not in attendance. The minutes stated that:

After considerable discussion beforehand, J. W. King made the motion that the Texas Option III, which is the option on which Texas members pay state dues only, be abolished. ... The motion did not carry.\footnote{Minutes, 502.}
Therefore, the TMEA board changed its position on this issue, and the "Option III" matter was not brought before the general membership for a vote.

J. W. King mentioned another event which occurred at that same convention:

Vanette Lawler came ... and interviewed a committee, of which I was the chairman, regarding our own publications. This happened to be primarily the TMEA magazine, called the Southwestern Musician combined with The Texas Music Educator. Vanette Lawler was a very refined and elegant person, and it really was a pleasure to have her sit in on the committee. At the same time, though, I felt that we were being scrutinized by people from Washington a little harder than an affiliation justified. In other words, it's fine for us to tell her what the magazine is like and what its purpose is, but when we started having to justify certain aspects of the publication, it made me start wondering how close the affiliation was.368

Through the 1940s and 1950s, the MENC strategy was a "soft-sell campaign," which accomplished some degree of success with several TMEA leaders. However, as MENC probed deeper into the problem, it is the consensus of the majority of those interviewed that anti-MENC sentiment began to grow.

On February 10, 1961, the issue again came up for a vote, this time in the second general session of the TMEA convention in Dallas. The resolution was submitted by Robert Fielder and read:

We recommend to the Board of Directors that TMEA eliminate Option III from our membership application, that TMEA dues be set at $8.00 and that Option I read

$8.00 plus $4.00 partial MENC (to include subscription to the Music Educators Journal). Option II to read $8.00 TMEA membership plus $6.00 for full MENC membership.

The motion did not carry.369

In the late spring of 1965, MENC president Paul Van Bodegraven corresponded with TMEA president Fred Junkin in an attempt to get the facts regarding the TMEA's constitutional status.370 Mr. Junkin informed him that the 1963 TMEA constitution contained no provision mandating unified membership in MENC as a provision of TMEA membership. One of the reasons that the unified dues issue had become more critical was that the Ohio MENC unit had expressed concern regarding MENC's special exception which TMEA was allowed. The Ohio music educators communicated to the MENC National Executive Board that their own state wanted the same "treatment" Texas was getting.371 It was time for MENC to "bring TMEA in line" or to give all other

369 "Minutes, TMEA General Membership Session," Dallas, Dallas Memorial Auditorium Theatre, February 11, 1961, as found in Minutes, 594.

370 "Summary of Recent Historical Developments Affecting the Maintenance of the Federated State Relationship Between the Music Educators National Conference and the Texas Music Educators Association," unpublished document, TMEA Archives, Austin [hereafter referred to as "Summary of Recent Historical Developments"].

371 David McGuire, interview by author, Tape recording, University of North Texas Campus, Denton, Texas, November 8, 1988. This incident was also described in interviews with Charles Benner, Bill Cormack, J. W. King, and J. R. McEntyre.
state units the same choices that Texas had been given. Dr. Bodegraven advised Junkin that the TMEA constitution was in violation of the MENC constitution and by-laws. The matter was presented to the MENC Executive Committee and thereafter to the National Executive Board (NEB) at the August 1965, meeting. At that meeting the NEB terminated the affiliated status of TMEA with MENC to be effective on March 1, 1966, conditional upon possible revision of the TMEA constitution to bring it in line with the MENC requirements.

In response to this action, the TMEA Executive Board proposed that MENC grant it a three-year exemption from enforcement of the MENC constitutional provision, in the interest of letting the TMEA leadership conduct a campaign for a unified dues structure among TMEA's membership. The MENC National Executive Board agreed.

The TMEA leadership effected a change in the association's constitution in the Spring of 1968, which eliminated "Option III," but created a new category of membership called "special active," which did not require MENC membership and basically just took the place of the "Option III." The MENC National Executive Board stated that this change did not really solve the problem and met with

---

372 "Summary of Recent Historical Developments."

373 "Summary of Recent Historical Developments."
TMEA leaders in Seattle during the Spring of 1968. In the interest of supporting the TMEA leadership for the progress which had been made and encouraging them to work toward complete unification by the 1969 deadline, MENC president Louis Wersen invited the TMEA leadership to a joint dinner meeting with the MENC National Executive Board.\(^374\)

Several years later, MENC president Jack Schaeffer wrote the following explanation of the Seattle conference and subsequent events:

In 1968 a delegation of T.M.E.A. leaders under incoming T.M.E.A. President Hugh Saunders presented a draft of a proposed revision of the T.M.E.A. Constitution to the MENC National Board of Directors for an informal reaction. As a member of the MENC Board at that time, it is my impression that the T.M.E.A. leaders anticipated the proposed revisions would be accepted by the Board in satisfaction of the changes necessary to meet the requirements in the agreement concluded several years earlier. Vice President Paul Van Bodegraven pointed out that the provision established the category of special active-full T.M.E.A. members continued the violation of the MENC provisions on federated affiliation. He noted that there was no way in which the Board could approve or endorse the proposed revisions in the T.M.E.A. Constitution.

\[\ldots\] it was agreed that the T.M.E.A. leadership would actively promote fully unified membership among the T.M.E.A. members in the coming year. Further, the T.M.E.A. leaders agreed to urge further revision of the T.M.E.A. Constitution to eliminate any category of non-unified dues. In the following membership year, as the appended data shows, there was a substantial increase in unified membership. Since that time, however, the increase in unified membership in Texas appears to be

\(^{374}\) No minutes of this meeting could be located in the MENC historical archives.
only comparable to similar increases elsewhere in the country.\textsuperscript{375}

Bill Cormack, Executive Director of TMEA (and TMEA president in 1974), in an interview with this researcher, mentioned his concern that there had been a continuity problem, in that each set of new TMEA officers seemed to force MENC to start the negotiation process all over again. He commented:

I became aware that a very special meeting had been held at the 1968 Seattle MENC conference, at which time our executive board came to an agreement with their NEB, that we would definitely come back to Texas and make every effort to convince our membership that unification was 'the thing' to do.

... once I became very actively involved, I then found out that there had been some misrepresentation made at an earlier time. So we were very embarrassed to have to admit some of these things at a later time.

... The hierarchy of MENC was about ten years ahead of TMEA on this. They definitely stepped out and said, 'We want this fixed,' and we kept dragging our feet, either through clandestine agreements, or whatever--but we just didn't do anything. I was not aware that we had promised to do things until a later time. Apparently we really made no attempt to make a change ... but we led them to believe at times--probably through Mr. Lenzo--and our board, either collectively or through one or two of the officers had led them to believe that we would definitely accede to their wishes. Well, that was not true. We did not attempt or desire to do that.\textsuperscript{376}

In February 1969, MENC president Wiley Housewright made a presentation to the TMEA Board of Directors

\textsuperscript{375}Jack E. Schaeffer, Seattle, Washington, to J. W. King, Canyon, Texas, September 22, 1972, MENC Archives, Reston, VA.

\textsuperscript{376}Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
concerning the problem. He wrote the following comments in a letter to this researcher:

As national MENC president and a native Texan who had taught music in Texas public schools—elementary and secondary, instrumental and vocal—I had a strong interest in resolving the problem. The MENC board asked me to meet with the TMEA president and board to negotiate a settlement.

I pointed out the advantage I saw to both groups of a unified membership. Over the years I had observed several Texans who I thought had national leadership potential, and who would benefit both the state and national organizations if they had a national outlet, a voice in national issues. Most of all, I felt Texas should join the mainstream of the music education profession. I had observed excellent teaching in Texas schools, and felt that national attention to it would be mutually beneficial.

With all due respect, I did not feel that the TMEA board accepted any of the arguments for unified membership. The attitude of the TMEA board was that they had a viable organization and did not need MENC. They appeared to be suspicious of any one or any group that suggested any changes. In all candor, their first concern was financial. Joe Lenzo and others had built a strong financial base for the organization. Its leaders bragged that anything MENC could do, TMEA could do better. They voiced the strong suspicion that the only reason MENC wanted unified membership was to tap into TMEA's financial resources.377

Charles Benner, MENC president in 1974, added these thoughts regarding TMEA's reluctance to fully unify:

I think that the TMEA had experienced a great amount of growth in instrumental music, really ever since World War II, due to the leadership, aggressiveness and imagination of their teachers. Texas responded to what has been regarded as a 'Texas manner'—it was big! It was big, big, big! So I think it was a time when TMEA grew to the extent that it felt it was probably 'bigger' than MENC. If MENC wanted to join TMEA, then, but Texas was too big, its conventions were too big, and there was too much money down there for TMEA to feel the need to

affiliate with a national organization. Now that's a kind of 'political syndrome,' I think.\textsuperscript{378}

J. R. McEntyre agreed with this explanation:

Our message to MENC was that we thought they needed us. After all, when we went to their national conventions, they wouldn't be as big a deal as our state conventions. So we had this inflated opinion, probably, of our own importance, and we thought they needed us and were bluffing.\textsuperscript{379}

During the 1970 TMEA convention in Dallas, president J. W. King invited MENC Executive Secretary Charles Gary to speak at the band division luncheon. Mr. King recalled:

Gary managed to put down the band division pretty hard over two or three points, regarding what he called the 'over-emphasis of competition in Texas.' Mr. Gary was not very endeared to the band directors after his speech.\textsuperscript{380}

In 1972, J. W. King recalls going to the MENC convention in Atlanta, Georgia. During that convention, Charles Gary, Fran Andrews (immediate past president of MENC), MENC president Jack Schaeffer, and several other MENC leaders invited him up to their suite in the Hyatt Regency for lunch:

It was a very elaborate affair, fine food, all kinds of nice visiting. Then, after all of that, the question was put, 'Mr. King, when are you going to have TMEA correct this membership situation and bring it into

\textsuperscript{378}Charles Benner, phone interview by author, his home, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 11, 1988.

\textsuperscript{379}J. R. McEntyre, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{380}J. W. King, interview by author, Tape recording, Texas Tech University Music Building, Lubbock, Texas, December 9, 1988.
line?' I said, 'Folks, I am not ever going to do that. That is a question for the executive committee and the membership to decide, and I thought it had already been resolved. As far as we're concerned, it has been decided . . . it was in Seattle.' They said, 'Well, we just can't go with that any longer. There are other pressures coming in, and we'll just have to correct this and do away with that special active membership.' In order to do this, they wanted to send out a mail ballot to all of TMEA, and let them decide by mail ballot. I said, 'Folks, we don't use a mail ballot in TMEA. You come to the convention if you want to vote.' They said, 'Well, but for this, we want a mail ballot.' I said, 'MENC uses mail ballots, TMEA does not. Folks, I can't promise to you to do anything towards solving this problem other than to discuss it with our executive committee.'

This disagreement concerning the use of mail ballots would continue to be a troublesome issue between the two organizations for several more years.

In August of 1972, Schaeffer wrote J. W. King, asking for the number of special active TMEA members and the number of full TMEA/MENC members. King replied that:

At the close of our membership year we had a total of 2,897 members, of which 1,029 were full MENC and TMEA, and the remainder, of 1,868, were special active TMEA members only.

Therefore, less than one-third (approximately thirty-two percent) of the total TMEA membership was also a member of MENC.

---


382 J. W. King, Canyon, Texas, to Jack Schaeffer, Seattle, Washington, August 12, 1972, MENC Archives, Reston, VA.
In November of 1972, the MENC National Executive Board unanimously approved a motion "requesting the Texas Music Educators Association to bring the TMEA constitution in accord with the MENC constitution."  Finally, the TMEA officers agreed to bring the issue to its general membership for a vote during the 1973 convention in San Antonio. Each TMEA member was given two ballots to choose from:

**Ballot A**
I am in favor of the TMEA Executive Board authorizing the President to appoint a committee to draft an amendment to the TMEA Constitution which would eliminate the special active membership clause which is in conflict with the MENC Constitution Article VIII, Section 2, By-Law V, which states that all members of a state association applying for federated status must also be members of MENC. This would be the basis of a plan to be submitted to MENC by May 15, 1973 in compliance with the National Executive Board action concerning Texas' federated status with MENC.

**Ballot B**
In view of certain historic events concerning this relationship, I believe that Texas has adequately established its federated status, is not currently applying for federated status, but has established this with preceding National Executive Boards. I also believe that TMEA should strengthen its efforts to gain new MENC memberships among its special active members.

J. W. King reported the results of the balloting in the April issue of the TMEA magazine:

The group [MENC representatives] met informally with the TMEA executive committee to continue studying the

---


federated status of TMEA with MENC. The survey ballot concerning this relationship resulted in an expression from the TMEA membership by a ten to one ratio in favor of the present relationship. Future actions of the executive committee will be guided by this response. This ballot expressed the feeling that TMEA should strengthen its effort to gain new MENC memberships, but that it is believed that the federated status has been adequately established through prior actions and acceptance.

J. R. McEntyre vividly recalled:

We invited all of the MENC National Executive Board people to come speak at the TMEA convention general session. They did talk, and talked at the division meetings also, trying to persuade everyone to unify. This was also the time when we voted, and the place was packed! It was also packed because there was also going to be a vote regarding the TMEA 50th anniversary celebration 'extravaganza.' This event had been planned, brainstormed and promoted to gigantic proportions, to the extent that many members had serious reservations about the whole idea. So, here were the two big agenda items to be voted upon. First, the membership voted soundly against the anniversary plans. Understand now, that the MENC people were all seated up on the platform, watching the membership 'zap' the TMEA executive committee . . . I mean 'destroy us!' Then the next thing to vote on was MENC unification. Remember, the MENC people had just had their say. We spoke, too, and tried to look at both sides. We never had the courage to get up in front of our membership and say, 'You've just got to do this,' because we knew how they felt. The motion was drastically voted down. So, the MENC people saw, first hand, that 'they don't rubber-stamp in Texas.' Texans are fiercely independent and have a voice. The grassroots people run our association. It was not long before MENC finally shut us off.


Also in April, Jack Schaeffer, MENC president, asked to meet with J. W. King in Amarillo, Texas. Schaeffer again informed Mr. King that the agreement in Seattle could no longer be considered as adequate measures to resolve the problem. He also expressed the concern that the wording of the motion which was voted upon by the TMEA membership did not allow for a fair response. Mr. King agreed to put the issue to a vote once again, this time with MENC people developing the wording for the motion.

On June 22, 1973, the Texas problem was again discussed at the MENC National Executive Board meeting in Washington, D.C. Bill Cormack and J. W. King represented TMEA at this meeting. After a considerable period of dialogue:

It was moved by Chrisman, seconded by Robinson and carried, Baird abstaining, to suspend the affiliation of Texas Music Educators Association for a period of one year effective June 30, 1974, with cancellation of the affiliated status of TMEA becoming automatic at the expiration of the suspension period, June 30, 1975. The suspension of federated status of the Texas Music Educators Association will be revoked by the National Executive Board upon presentation of satisfactory evidence that the federated status requirements as established in the MENC constitution and bylaws have been met by the Texas Music Educators Association. Such revocation must occur prior to June 30, 1975.

387 "NEB Minutes," as quoted by Jack Schaeffer in his letter to TMEA membership, August 23, 1973. These minutes were also confirmed by the MENC Archives in Reston, VA.

During the summer of 1973, David McGuire, music faculty member at North Texas State University, and former TMEA college division chairman (1972-1973), mailed a letter to all TMEA members, urging them to vote for unification with MENC. He thus became the chief "in-state" proponent of unification with MENC. He included signatures of other TMEA members who supported this position, and made the following statements:

We, the undersigned, are convinced that TMEA needs and must have a national voice. We are convinced further that TMEA would be professionally weakened if it were to disaffiliate from the only organization we have that binds music educators from all states together in the most powerful way possible . . . To disaffiliate from MENC would mean:

(1) declaration of minimal interests outside Texas,
(2) resignation from facing mutual threats and problems with other states, and
(3) developing in-grown qualities resulting from always looking to ourselves for answers.

. . . The weight of pros and cons balance heavily in favor of supporting our national voice, the Music Educators National Conference. We stand to lose more if we choose to disaffiliate.389

The following signatures were offered in support of his letter and position:

Sara Dunn Sistrunk
Robert L. Briggs
Lammel D. Miller
David C. McGuire
Ann S. Brown
Robert Lind
J. T. Hightower
Ralph Darrel
Ruth B. Parson

James C. Smith, Jr.
R. Paul Green
Jerry P. Woods
Ruth Red
Gloria O'Neal Duke
Leslie F. Munson
Michael Mamminga
Marjorie Keller
Douglas Smith

389 Dr. David McGuire, Denton, Texas, to all TMEA Members, Summer 1973, Jerry Longwell Papers, TMEA Archives, Austin.
Dr. McGuire asked Jerry Longwell, director of fine arts for Euless-Bedford school district (a suburb of Fort Worth), to add his signature of endorsement to the letter. Mr. Longwell was elected president of TMEA in 1975. In a cover letter to Mr. Longwell, he wrote:

The TMEA/MENC controversy is giving many of us much concern these days as we try to find a solution for the problem that will be agreeable to both organizations. Meanwhile, there seems to be a need to counter-balance some of the vitriolic and unthinking arguments against MENC that are being voiced in many parts of the state.\(^{390}\)

Mr. Longwell's reply was as follows:

The general tone of the tentative statement you ask me to endorse appears to place the 'blame' on TMEA. That seems unfair. I have never voted to 'disaffiliate' with MENC, nor to my knowledge has TMEA. To the contrary, MENC has voted to expel TMEA. This is a unilateral action in which TMEA has done nothing other than to support the aforementioned Seattle compromise. The list of 'advantages' and 'disadvantages' you suggest seem to contain some assumptions which are

\(^{390}\) Dr. David McGuire, Denton, Texas, to all TMEA Members, Summer 1973, Jerry Longwell Papers, TMEA Archives, Austin.

\(^{391}\) Dr. David McGuire, Denton, Texas, to Jerry Longwell, Bedford, Texas, September 18, 1973, Jerry Longwell Papers, TMEA Archives, Austin.
subject to question. The disadvantages indicate some overt act by TMEA, pulling itself away from MENC. This simply is not the way it is. Our interest in the development of an even stronger relationship with national forces in music education is not weakened, although MENC may force us into a position where our ability to pursue a course will be severely limited.

The maximum potential new MENC membership through unification would be 1800. Has anyone figured the potential loss of membership in MENC due to the present action [expelling TMEA]? Has anyone figured the potential TMEA loss of membership if unification were to come about? Does anyone really believe that these 1800 can all be forced to join MENC?

I could support a movement to resolve this problem that deals fairly and honestly with both parties, with mutual respect and understanding. MENC's solution is no solution at all. It aims at conclusion, not resolution. Certainly MENC, if anyone, is guilty of 'vitriolic and unthinking' action in the castigation of TMEA.\(^{392}\)

It appears that the TMEA/MENC debates sparked some personal conflicts between individuals on each side of the issue. Joe Lenzo, TMEA executive secretary from 1963 to 1978, was a very visible and active partisan for TMEA.

Regarding Lenzo's role, Jerry Longwell commented:

Joe Lenzo was a very controversial figure . . . . My opinion is that Joe was much like all the officers, in that he understood what was happening, and he understood what the politics involved were, about letting the membership voice its opinion. Now, he had some very, very serious run-ins with people from MENC . . . . A lot of the people at MENC just didn't like Joe, and he didn't like them.\(^{393}\)

On August 14, 1973, a special meeting of the National Executive Board was held during the MENC Interim Meeting

\(^{392}\)Jerry Longwell, Bedford, Texas, to Dr. David McGuire, Denton, Texas, September 28, 1973, Longwell Papers, TMEA Archives, Austin.

\(^{393}\)Jerry Longwell, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Fort Worth, Texas, November 21, 1988.
held in Washington, D.C. J. W. King and Bill Cormack were invited to the conference to address the Board. At this meeting the TMEA officers agreed to publish several articles written by MENC representatives, which would state their stand on the issue. TMEA president J. W. King informed the association membership of this decision and provided an overview of the situation in a special article published in the September issue of the TMEA magazine.

The first MENC article was written by Joan Gaines from Washington, D.C., and presented the following reasons why she believed music educators needed a national MENC:

Only a national MENC has ongoing contacts with national-level groups and government agencies that can help win support on tough national issues affecting all music educators.

Only a national MENC can protest 'on behalf of 62,000 members' when a local crisis threatens a musical program.

Only a national MENC has the resources to blanket public media with 'support music in your schools' messages.

Only a national MENC can speak for all music educators in contacts with the U.S. Congress.

Only a national MENC provides a forum where concerns, criticisms and proposals from every state can be heard, debated and acted upon for the benefit of the entire profession.

Only a national MENC can represent music education in organizations made up of national associations, such as the National Music Council, the American council of the Arts in Education, the International Society for

---

394 "MENC Minutes," MENC Archives, Reston, VA.

395 J. W. King, "OFFICIAL NOTICE--IMPORTANT!," Southwestern Musician combined with the Texas Music Educator 42, no. 2(September 1973): 28.
Music Education and the Alliance of Associations for the Advancement of Education.\textsuperscript{396}

The second article was a series of eight questions and answers supplied by the MENC office in Washington, D.C., which dealt with the concerns most commonly expressed by TMEA members.\textsuperscript{397} The questions were:

1. What would happen to our TMEA Clinic-Convention if MENC wanted to come to Texas for a convention?
2. Would MENC try to tell us how to run TMEA?
3. Since MENC is not organized into instructional divisions of music education, such as band, vocal, orchestra, elementary, and college, would we stand to gain any help in any one division from MENC?
4. Would an acceptable alternative not be a revision of MENC's constitution rather than TMEA's?
5. If we change the Texas constitution, won't it imply that the states are being downgraded in that they are becoming subject to the will of the national organization?
6. Why do we have to go along with MENC's wishes when MENC isn't willing to subject itself to the demands of the National Education Association? Isn't the issue the same?
7. When MENC cites its constitution as the reason for changing the TMEA constitution, this sounds like a decision made from the top. Who decided on the MENC constitution in the first place?
8. MENC has failed to 'sell' Texans on the values of the national organization. How can we be expected to buy unified membership now?\textsuperscript{398}


\textsuperscript{397} J. F. Lenzo, "More on MENC-TMEA Relations," Southwestern Musician combined with the Texas Music Educator 42, no. 7 (February 1974): 18.

In February 1974, at the annual convention in Houston, the issue was brought before TMEA's general membership for the second vote. Again, many MENC officers were on hand and presented speeches to the different TMEA divisions. The results of the TMEA voting showed 517 votes against changing the TMEA constitution (voting against unification with MENC) and 265 votes for changing the TMEA constitution.\textsuperscript{399}

In April 1974, Bill Cormack and Jerry Longwell attended the MENC meeting in Anaheim, California. Mr. Cormack described his attempt to discuss the Texas unification issue with the other state delegates:

Fran Andrews was running it. I said, 'I'd like to speak,' and she said, 'What is it that you're going to say?' I said, 'I'd like to speak about our unification ultimatum.' She turned off the microphone, and we never, ever, got a chance to tell everybody about what was happening.\textsuperscript{400}

On June 28, 1974, Bill Cormack, then president of TMEA, sent a letter to MENC president Charles Benner. In it he stated:

While we intend to pursue any reasonable means and compromise to attempt to settle the issue between us, nevertheless, we, and our mutual members, believe that we have certain valuable and vested rights which have grown out of and matured in our affiliation with MENC. This belief is reinforced by the attached letter from our attorney. Regardless of anything else, we feel that the attorney's letter raises serious questions about he

\textsuperscript{399}Bill Cormack, ed. "President's Message," \textit{Southwestern Musician combined with the Texas Music Educator} 42, no. 9 (April 1974): 4.

\textsuperscript{400}Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
basis and the authority for the June 22, 1973 resolution. We invite your serious consideration of these matters. Likewise, we make the demands for hearing as set forth in such letter.\textsuperscript{401}

The attorney's letter stated the following interpretation of this "constitutional crisis":

We question the June 22, 1973, action of the National Executive Board because:

1. The basis of the action (that the TMEA constitution does not stipulate that all of its members must also be members of MENC) was waived by MENC at the time Texas became an affiliated unit in 1948. Since 1948, the Texas unit and its members have acquired certain vested rights in MENC as well as benefits growing out of affiliation, and it can be seriously contended that MENC is now estopped from cancelling the affiliation and attempting to terminate these rights.\textsuperscript{402}

Later that summer, Mr. Cormack and TMEA president-elect Jerry Longwell attended a meeting with the National Executive Board in Vienna, Virginia, at the MENC headquarters. At this time, the NEB officially placed TMEA on one year's probation.\textsuperscript{403} After further research, TMEA's attorney had informed the TMEA executive committee that MENC did, after all, have the legal right to expel TMEA. Therefore, that avenue was not discussed at the meeting, and the legal threat was dropped. Also at this meeting,\textsuperscript{404}

\textsuperscript{401}Bill Cormack, Midland, Texas, to Charles Benner, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 28, 1974, TMEA Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{402}Ted M. Kerr, Midland, Texas, to Bill Cormack, Midland, June 28, 1974, TMEA Archives, Austin.

\textsuperscript{403}"MENC Minutes, July 1-2, 1974," MENC Archives, Reston, VA.

\textsuperscript{404}"MENC Minutes, July 1-2, 1974," MENC Archives, Reston, VA.
guidelines were discussed for establishing a new Texas unit for MENC.\textsuperscript{404}

In June of 1974, the TMEA appointed a committee whose purpose was to develop the constitution for a new organization which would be the Texas affiliate for MENC.\textsuperscript{405} The constitution committee consisted of Dr. Nelson Patrick, Ken Fulton, J. W. King, Jerry Longwell, Ruth Red, and J. R. McEntyre, chairman.\textsuperscript{406} Many of these committee members were extremely concerned about the new organization's possible potential for rivaling or dividing the TMEA. On July 30, the committee discussed the many problems involved with satisfying the desires of both TMEA and MENC, and charged Dr. Patrick with the task of formalizing the constitution. The proposed name for the new organization was the Texas Music Educators Conference (TMEC).\textsuperscript{407}

On February 15, 1975, during the Dallas TMEA convention, approximately one hundred educators met to discuss the report of the Constitution Committee. Charles Benner, president of MENC, and James Middleton, MENC

\textsuperscript{404}Bill Cormack, phone interview by author, March 12, 1989.

\textsuperscript{405}"Minutes, MENC/TMEA Constitution Committee, San Antonio, Texas, Palacio Del Rio Hotel, July 30, 1974," TMEA Files, Austin.

\textsuperscript{406}"Minutes, MENC/TMEA Constitution Committee, San Antonio, Texas, July 30, 1974."

\textsuperscript{407}J. R. McEntyre to all Texas MENC Members, February 4, 1975, TMEA Archives, Austin.
Southwestern Division chairman, were in attendance. During the meeting, Dr. Benner explained several problems in the proposed charter constitution which would cause it to be rejected by MENC, and subsequent changes were made.  

David McGuire recalled a problem during the meeting:

J. R. [McEntyre] was the chairman of the committee assigned to come up with a constitution, and he was the first president [of TMEC]. When he got up to make his presentation, everybody had already seen the charter, and a whole lot of people had objections to the way it was designed. J. R. said his piece and then he just sat down, in effect saying that if you don't accept what my committee has put together, then you'll have to start from scratch with a totally new committee. Obviously, we couldn't delay this for another year, and everybody wanted to 'get on' with the split. So that was a very tense business meeting.

J. R. McEntyre recalled:

We didn't have any trouble proposing a constitution, but MENC kept rejecting it! We wanted to fix it so that the affiliate would not be a competitive organization to TMEA. David McGuire and I fought like cats and dogs over this constitution.

Jerry Longwell mentioned:

J. R. was elected as the first president [of TMEC], which was kind of a joke! J. R. was rather antagonistic toward MENC.

408 "Minutes, TMEC Organizational Meeting, Dallas, February 15, 1975," TMEA Archives, Austin.

409 Dr. David McGuire, interview by author, Tape recording, University of North Texas Campus, Denton, November 8, 1988.


Dr. Benner wrote a letter to Mr. McEntyre on March 12, in which he listed the next appropriate steps toward gaining official affiliated status. In that letter he mentioned the need for an election of officers to be held.\textsuperscript{412} This became a major issue, because the first slate of TMEC officers had already been designated in its charter constitution, with J. R. McEntyre set up to be TMEC’s first president.

On March 19, the following week, Mr. McEntyre mentioned in his letter to David McGuire that a rumor had surfaced that MENC was considering helping a different Texas affiliate to organize:

I am very concerned about a conversation between Dr. Benner and Bill Cormack, which Bill related to me several days ago. Bill said that Dr. Benner called him last week and was considering the organization of another group of Texas MENC members which would be more acceptable to the national office. I do hope that Dr. Benner doesn’t follow through with this plan, because our committee has worked hard and in good faith to try to get something going in the right direction.\textsuperscript{413}

The "right direction" to which Mr. McEntyre referred is the direction which would keep TMEC in a somewhat limited role during its first few years of existence, thereby avoiding any threat to TMEA's size or organizational strength.

\textsuperscript{412}Charles Benner, Cincinnati, Ohio, to J. R. McEntyre, Odessa, Texas, March 12, 1975, from J. R. McEntyre's personal files.

\textsuperscript{413}J. R. McEntyre, Odessa, Texas, to David McGuire, Denton, Texas, March 19, 1975, J. R. McEntyre's personal files.
Almost a year earlier, James Middleton wrote a letter to Bill Cormack and Jerry Longwell. In it he expressed his concerns regarding TMEC's independence from TMEA and its election of officers:

I feel that it is very critical that in your appearance before the [MENC] board that you impress the board with the fact that the new group which you will be forming in Texas will not be a 'dummy' operation, or organization which has only a paper context, but that it is a for real organization of music educators which will have a distinct identity and a distinct function. . . . The question may arise as to whether an officer of TMEA can also be elected to a position in TMEC. You probably won't plan it that way, but conceivably it could happen? This may have painful implications to some of the board, I just don't know. . . . Just don't give the impression to NEB that TMEC will only be a shadow. . . . Power to you gentlemen. I'll be listening intently as your ally.414

On April 5, at the Omaha MENC meeting, a group of Texas MENC members presented their proposal for establishing the Texas Music Educators Conference. At this meeting, Charles Benner expressed his concern that the proposed slate of officers for TMEC had been appointed, rather than elected. He suggested that a mail ballot be conducted to elect the officers. J. R. McEntyre, Bill Cormack and Jerry Longwell all argued that the TMEC charter constitution did not permit a mail ballot, and that the TMEC members had approved this slate of officers at the February 15 meeting. Dr. Robert Klotman of Indiana University, president of the

414James Middleton, Columbia, Missouri, to Bill Cormack, Midland, Texas, and Jerry Longwell, Bedford, Texas, June 19, 1974, Longwell Papers, TMEA Archives, Austin.
North Central division of MENC, suggested that another vote be made.\textsuperscript{415} David McGuire agreed, suggesting that TMEC ask MENC to grant them temporarily affiliated status until a slate of officers could be elected. McEntyre, Cormack, Longwell and TMEA executive secretary Joe Lenzo persisted with the argument that TMEC had already met the requirements for affiliated status, and expressed no desire or intent to initiate a new election of officers. Dr. Benner finally stated that if the Texas members were satisfied with the procedure, then he would agree to it.\textsuperscript{416}

J. R. McEntyre stated: "Had it not been for Bob Klotman, MENC president, the TMEC constitution may never have been accepted. He finally got the national board to accept it."\textsuperscript{417}

In August 1975, TMEC executive secretary Nelson Patrick reported:

At this writing, TMEC has an eligible membership of 99. This is quite a difference from the membership of 1970-71 which was slightly over 1,000, and is a 500% drop from last year's membership of 582.\textsuperscript{418}

\textsuperscript{415}"TMEC Minutes, Informal Meeting, Omaha, Nebraska, April 5, 1975," J. R. McEntyre's personal files, 3.

\textsuperscript{416}"TMEC Minutes, Informal Meeting, Omaha, Nebraska, April 5, 1975," J. R. McEntyre's personal files, 4.

\textsuperscript{417}J. R. McEntyre, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{418}TMEC - National Assembly Report, Washington, D.C., August 12, 1975, J. R. McEntyre personal files.
In 1988, TMEC's membership was 652, still well below the 1970-71 figure.\textsuperscript{419} TMEA's total 1988 membership was approximately 6,000, more than triple the 1973 figure of 1,800.\textsuperscript{420}

**Principal Participants, Their Roles, and Other Factors Which Influenced the Decision-Making Process**

Since the controversy between TMEA and MENC stretched out over a period of more than twenty years, there have been many key participants in the decision-making process. In the early stages, D. O. Wiley and Clifford Buttelman were the principal actors, with Vanette Lawler entering during the 1950s. TMEA presidents Robert Fielder, Fred Junkin and Hugh Sanders became involved during the 1950s and 1960s, and finally J. R. McEntyre, J. W. King, Bill Cormack and Jerry Longwell figured prominently during the 1970s. Key leaders for MENC from within Texas were Dr. David McGuire and Ruth Red.

During the early stages of the controversy, TMEA presidents Robert Fielder and J. W. King went on record as favoring unification.\textsuperscript{421} However, as the controversy developed through the 1960s into an "ultimatum" type issue,


\textsuperscript{420}TMEA Membership Directory: 1988-1989, Texas Music Educators Association, Austin.

\textsuperscript{421}See page 148 of this chapter.
both Mr. Fielder and Mr. King discontinued their support for
unification. Once MENC began to press the issue, starting
with president Paul Van Bodegraven's letter to Fred Junkin
in 1965, there has been no evidence of any support for
unification shown by any of the TMEA presidents.

In the 1960s and 1970s, MENC presidents Bodegraven,
Wiley Housewright, Francis Andrews, Jack Schaeffer, Charles
Benner and Robert Klotman were all involved with "the Texas
problem," and each gave one or more addresses to the TMEA
executive board or general membership. Another important
player was Charles Gary, who became MENC executive secretary
in 1968. On the TMEA side, executive secretary Joe Lenzo
was also influential, and a staunch believer in TMEA's
maintaining a separate autonomy. Bill Cormack agreed: "At
that time and the years prior to my coming on board,
Mr. Lenzo apparently utilized these meetings to fan the
flames of anti-unification sentiment."

Each interviewee was given definitions for three
specific categories of decision-makers and was asked if any
of the categories were accurate descriptions of particular
participants in the landmark event. The categories were:

a. Active Initiator: One who is at the forefront
    of the development of new ideas, and remains

---

422 Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording,
TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
involved through the chain of events leading to a final outcome.

b. Suspensory Veto: One who is not actively involved in the development of a plan of action, but who uses his power of "veto" to greatly influence the outcome.

c. Passive Bystander: One who does not take a strong position on either side of an issue, and allows others to influence the outcome.

When asked about the categories of decision-makers to which each TMEA and MENC leader belonged, the interviewees' consensus was that nearly all of these association presidents and officers were "active initiators." The main difference in describing these leaders' participation concerned their "style," rather than level of involvement. Of the TMEA members, J. R. McEntyre, Joe Lenzo, David McGuire and Bill Cormack were most frequently listed as "aggressive" leaders and decision makers. J. W. King, an important figure during the controversy, was considered to be a strong "stabilizing force" within the TMEA executive board. J. R. McEntyre described his leadership qualities: "J. W. King was a great mediator. He is a calm and careful mover. Cormack and I, on the other hand, are both wild and crazy 'grassroots.'"423 The MENC leaders who were described

---

as most active and aggressive were Jack Schaeffer and Charles Benner.

Three factors which figured prominently in the decision-making process were: (1) the perceptions of differing philosophies between TMEA and MENC partisans, (2) the concept of association membership versus upper-level authority and the role of mail-ballot voting, and (3) finance-related problems with unification.

Perceptions of Differing Philosophies between TMEA and MENC

In studying the decision-making process involved in this event, it appears that many participants on both sides had a perception of differing philosophies between the two organizations. Even in the 1950s, Robert Fielder recalled his impressions of the MENC demand for unification of the dues structure:

This struck a rather adversarial chord in the minds and hearts of Texas people, who I think, with some justification, did not see that MENC would serve them very effectively. They were pretty satisfied, as a matter of fact quite satisfied, with the activities that were sponsored by TMEA, and this so called, and I hasten to say so-called, 'professional' approach that MENC advocated did not appeal to them. I guess if you wanted to put it in pedagogical terms, it would be that the Texas people believed in 'application and demonstration,' whereas the MENC spent much of their conference discussing the psychology and philosophy of teaching. As a matter of fact, when attending their conferences, you got the impression that they didn't believe in what we would call 'applied music.' They were more interested in appreciation and aesthetics than they were in performance and production. I think all of us, both TMEA and MENC, recognize that you can push
either one of these aspects too far in one direction or the other.424

Many TMEA members have expressed the view that the MENC had never enjoyed a very positive image with Texas music teachers, especially band directors. Bill Cormack offered these insights:

What you need to understand is that as late as 1974, there was still a residue out there of members, and first generation member's students--does that make sense? People like J. R. and myself. Our teachers have had bad feelings toward MENC ever since the 1930s and '40s. I can't tell you why, or where they came from. Very few of our old-timers were pro-MENC. They always felt like they were going to come in and take over. People like Jack Mahan and Raymond Bynum would just absolutely become rabid when you talked about it. So it wasn't at all hard to inflame our membership, and yet, those were some very hot moments. I can only say, if we had really turned our membership loose, I think we'd have had an absolute donnybrook.

The MENC philosophy, in those days, was anti-performance. Mary Hoffman, the MENC president, introduced me in Wisconsin . . . we were two 'presenters' at a banquet--we were political enemies, but very close friends. She introduced me to a whole roomful of people, saying, 'This is Bill Cormack, executive secretary of the Texas Music Educators Association. Now, he's in charge of performance--they don't teach music in Texas, they teach performance!' The people of Wisconsin . . . all came up to me afterward and asked, 'Why is it that Texas really doesn't believe in music education?' MENC has always propagated that argument against us.425

Cormack cited another reason for the anger and misunderstanding between the two organizations through the years:


425 Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
We've always viewed MENC as strictly being college people and administrators, and they view us strictly as 'concert givers.' Obviously both organizations are bigger and broader.\(^\text{426}\)

Charles Benner, former MENC president, offered a different perspective:

There came on the scene during 1974 to '76, some persons in Texas, who were very eager to have an affiliated state organization. I think David McGuire had just moved down from the North Central area. He was one of them. There were some college people, and they were usually people who had 'immigrated' to Texas. Then there were some persons who had been in Texas the whole time. One of them was Ruth Red, another was a music supervisor in Dallas, and I think there was an 'Alice' someone, but I can't remember. They asked to meet with me, six to ten of them, at the Southwestern Division conference. You see, these Texas people really had no division conference to go to. They felt that TMEA, first, was being very insular and parochial, by not participating in the national scene. After all, TMEA did not provide all the answers for all its music educators. They also felt that all areas were not being well represented in the association, and that the convention was highly dominated by the band and performance-oriented things. Elementary music, general music and teacher education were fields which they were interested in, but which had little visibility or attention in TMEA. Among these people, I felt they were reaching out for some kind of fraternity that would give more attention to their needs. TMEA was dominated by what they considered to be decisive specialization. One example was a fellow who was involved in teacher education. He told of going to the TMEA convention. At the convention he was asked how he wanted to register, whether he wanted to register as a band person, or choral, or whatever. He said, 'I want to register as a music teacher,' and they had no classification for him.\(^\text{427}\)

\(^{426}\)Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

\(^{427}\)Charles Benner, phone interview by author, his home, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 11, 1988.
There appears to be a philosophical disagreement between the two organizations with regard to the role of the grassroots membership in determining policies. J. R. McEntyre had the following observations:

When I was [TMEA] band chairman I attended a [MENC] conference in Chicago. One thing that was very interesting, and also bothered me, was that the state presidents really had no voice in the governance of the organization—-it was a farce! The executive committee made all the decisions. We did not have a mechanism like our TMEA state board at all. The state presidents served as a national board, but they couldn't decide anything--it was a formality--advisory only! This upset me a great deal.\textsuperscript{428}

Jerry Longwell added:

I sat on the national assembly; there was one representative for each state. State representative after state representative would go to the microphone, and they would give a report about their state's activity, or they would make recommendations that the executive board might consider. But lo and behold, all that is advice! The national assembly, the presidents of all the state organizations, could vote unanimously to do something, and the executive board could say, 'no.' It is a very closed organization.\textsuperscript{429}

When asked what alternatives were considered during the controversy, Bill Cormack stated:

One alternative was to stay like we were. Another alternative that we came up with was to take the 'option III' out of our constitution. It was a 'constitutional crisis.' We had to change our constitution in order to abide by their wishes, meaning our membership had to vote to do it. MENC couldn't understand this. They thought, 'Well, can't your executive board just vote to do it?' See, their membership doesn't have a vote on

\textsuperscript{428} J. R. McEntyre, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{429} Jerry Longwell, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Fort Worth, Texas, November 21, 1988.
anything. All they get to vote on is dues increases and officers. 430

The idea of Texas music educators and Texans in
general possessing a "lone star" attitude of independence
carries many strong arguments. When asked if this attitude
played a significant role in TMEA's separation from MENC,
Robert Fielder's answer was:

I would have to respond affirmatively. I don't mean
that these are a bunch of 'bubba' guys with gun racks in
the back of their truck. I do think that there is a
strong sense of independence and self-confidence that
what they're doing is good, and they had some evidence
to back that up. 431

Charles Benner, former MENC president, also agreed
with this position, and offered:

That's a nice question! I would say that we on the
outside, not during the process, but in our own
reflections, felt that there a was a pattern of thinking
and argument, that is characteristic of what we, on the
outside, at least, assume to be 'Texas syndrome.' Yes!
Yes! 432

Bill Cormack added these comments:

Of all the reasons [for not unifying], that's the one
that MENC could not accept. We kept telling them, you
just don't come down to Texas and tell us what to do. I
told them that at every MENC meeting. Fran Andrews went
and got me a cup of coffee in Washington, D.C. She
said, 'Would you like to have a cup of coffee, Mr.
Cormack?' I said, 'Yes, ma'am.' . . . I had never
spoken to her in my life, and she says, 'Go ahead and

430 Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording,
TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

431 Robert Fielder, interview by author, Tape
recording, his home, Plano, Texas, November 14, 1988.

432 Dr. Charles Benner, phone interview by author, his
drink it, it doesn't have strychnine in it--but we may arrange it later!' These were the first words that woman ever said to me! That was their prevailing feeling, though, it seemed. I had to say, 'You just don't understand Texans, from the Alamo to today.'

Wiley Housewright, former MENC president, provided these thoughts:

I do know that the decision [by TMEA not to completely unify with MENC] has caused other states to question the commitment Texas has to the profession generally. They have not understood the distrust Texans seem to have of MENC. I join that chorus.

A wise man once said we have made our culture, now we must live in it. I agree with those who say that our attitudes, feeling and discernment grow out of the agar of the society in which we grew up. In Texas, that was a society of fiercely independent people who lived many years in rural settings where strangers were regarded with suspicion. There were residues of that in the TMEA board members. I recognized it because I might have been one of them, arguing from the same perspective, if my frame of reference had not been modified in later years elsewhere.

I share the pride of Texas musicians in their accomplishments. I admire the dedication of those who see their mission to extend beyond state borders, beyond parochial standards or small private concerns. I respect the impressive program of TMEA and its strong leadership. I look forward to the day when they will join the union of other states of America to set an agenda for the musical youth of our nation. Neither their independence nor individuality will be threatened. Dissolution of the union did not work in 1960 for our country, nor can it be constructive for our profession now.

Dr. Housewright enclosed an article from that same day's New York Times titled, "A Separate Reality - In Remaking Itself, Texas Hasn't Lost Its Myths and Memory," by

---

433 Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.

Peter Applebome. The article contained several elements from Dr. Housewright's position:

Texas was the only state to enter the union as a sovereign nation. Texans can remind you of it ad nauseam, but it does help explain why people in small towns like Wink, Waskom and Wimberly feel links to Dallas and Houston, in a way you won't find people in other states feeling about their metropolitan centers. Because of the way it entered the union, all the public land in Texas belonged to the state, not to the Federal Government, accentuating the state's sense of its own independence . . . the brutal frontier that shaped Texas only a century ago, and the far-flung settlements that defined it until recently, created a self-reliant and often harsh Darwinian world view that remains characteristic. If Texas after the bust is not quite the imperious oil kingdom it liked to see itself as before, it still has the sense of self-contained, sprawling duchy with its own rules.\textsuperscript{435}

The majority of persons interviewed held the belief that before MENC began to shift its approach from "urging" TMEA's unification to "demanding" unification, there was a more positive relationship between the two organizations. Two TMEA presidents, J. W. King and Robert Fielder, submitted motions asking for the elimination of "option III." However, the idea of MENC's "demanding" Texas to unify began a negative situation which eventually caused most of MENC's existing membership in Texas to withdraw from the national association, even before the actual separation. Jerry Longwell stated:

\begin{quote}
You see, it's interesting that it was voluntary for people to be in MENC, and yet we had a large MENC membership in Texas. But when MENC tried to say, 'You have to do it,' they [the Texas MENC members] nearly all
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{435}New York Times, February 12, 1989, sec. 4, p. 5.
left. You see, the next year there wasn't anybody left.\textsuperscript{436}

Most Texans, even MENC members, felt that the national organization should not make this demand, especially after so many years of what most regarded as a positive relationship. Bill Cormack commented on this subject:

The number one argument [against unification] was not letting MENC 'take over' Texas. A term which was used over and over was that 'Texas is a right-to-work state, and we don't believe in union shops.' It never got much further than that. We would not be 'told' that we 'had' to join MENC.\textsuperscript{437}

One major factor in TMEA's decision not to unify concerned a perception held by many members that the two organizations did not adhere to the same set of priorities in music education. TMEA members accused the MENC of overemphasizing general music and research, while MENC members accused TMEA of overemphasizing performance. J. W. King offered these thoughts:

The most active leaders of TMEA at that time [1960s and early 1970s] were often band directors, who were not used to arbitration, and who were used to aggressive decision making. I think that there is a basic reason, here, that TMEA never embraced unification. TMEA's roots go back to its beginning, as an organization dedicated to building better bands. Later, it took in other performing mediums and divisions. MENC, on the other hand, developed originally from an interest in general music and vocal music. Performance was not necessarily a fundamental ingredient in their philosophy of music education. In band directing, performance is

\textsuperscript{436} Jerry Longwell, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Fort Worth, Texas, November 21, 1988.

\textsuperscript{437} Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
synonymous with survival. Those band directors who are striving for the best performances possible are probably going to neglect some areas that MENC considers important. They probably are not going to be much into research, because of their business at hand. These are just two paths that probably never would meet. Many other states had no organization at all, and they called on MENC to help them start one. Of course, MENC set these state associations up in its own image. But Texas wasn't in that situation; we had a strong TMEA organization already functioning. A lot of its membership was enthusiastic, and couldn't care less about any help from a national organization. There were two divergent viewpoints here, and both organizations were strong. To me, the only way it could have worked for both was to leave it the way it was.438

Many of the debates concerning this issue were carried on between members of the TMEA board. Throughout this controversy, the board was always split regarding unification. J. R. McEntyre gave a representative example:

David McGuire would say that the Music Educators Journal was of tremendous value. Every time he'd say that, I'd say, 'Yes, David, but I haven't read an article in there yet that's for the grassroots band, choir or orchestra director. It's written in the vein of research. The majority of "your" people are in a cloistered kind of academic environment that isn't the real world. All of "our" people listen to you, and listen to your philosophies--all the university folks--and we try to shape that into a philosophy of our very own that will work at the grassroots.' He never would understand where I was coming from. This has to do with different philosophies. You know, marching band may not have a whole lot to do with music education. It only has to do with what's happening in the real world. You need to take where the real world is, and shape it, as carefully and slowly as possible, so that people in that community and school system will accept as much of what you believe is 'music education' as is possible. This is my view, and Dave could never buy that. So it was like two guys talking furiously to each other, and one speaks

Swahili while the other speaks some other foreign language. 439

He went on to say:

One of the speeches I made to the executive committees of both organizations was that Texas is a performance-oriented state. MENC had just gone through a major national campaign to promote the idea that school music education's great evil is performance. They were advocating 'music for every child,' clear through their senior year in high school, with less emphasis on performance. They thought that we should water down the advanced performing groups—especially bands.

The way we teach public school students in my field is to turn them on to music; they're willing to learn the history, the theory; they're willing to do all these difficult things; but, if you start from that, you're going to have only a tiny bit of music for every child, and how to spell 'music' is about as far as you'll get with that approach. You're not going to turn anyone on to music with that approach. 440

Association Membership Versus Upper-Level Authority

The question can be raised as to the amount of influence TMEA's officers exerted on the association membership during this controversy. At no time did the TMEA Executive Committee, as a group, take a public stand supporting either side of the issue. When asked why, J. W. King explained:

In the final analysis, it was the membership of TMEA that decided what they wanted to do. It was our executive committee's job to present the information to our people, while also giving the MENC people the opportunity to 'sway' or present their cause to our


membership. I can't emphasize enough that in the end, the TMEA grassroots membership was the real power in this confrontation.441

What if the TMEA executive committee had really made a strong pitch for unification? Would their "leadership clout" have influenced the membership to favor unification? J. R. McEntyre responded this way:

No way. We'd have been impeached! There were too many guys like Bryce Taylor who are very independent! Selling our membership on unified dues at that time would have been like trying to sell a snowball to an eskimo! On the other hand, if we had spoken out against MENC--shook our fist at them--we would have come across very 'macho.' But we didn't think that was right either.442

Jerry Longwell added these comments:

If the leadership of TMEA had taken an open or belligerent position against MENC--boy! You talk about 'whipping up the troops!' You could have, in a three minute speech, made yourself into the biggest hero in TMEA's history by taking a strong anti-MENC stand. So I think that the judgment exhibited by the leadership to be cautious probably kept things as smooth as possible.443

David McGuire presented a different view:

Throughout this debate, I heard some TMEA members from the band division say that they would just withdraw from TMEA and only support the Texas Bandmasters Association. I never heard the 'impeachment' idea voiced, though. I really believe that if the TMEA board had publicly come out in favor of unification, then it would have made a


favorable impact upon the membership. However, I still
don't know if a unification vote would have passed.\(^4^4^4\)

MENC executive secretary Charles Gary offered an
interesting perspective regarding the influence that
national politics may have had upon some MENC members:

President King was the first to make me understand why
Texans were so unwilling to appear to be losing their
independence to a Washington based group. Incidentally,
this Washington tarnish is something I, as executive
officer of MENC, encountered in other situations. The
Watergate mess colored the way that some MENC board
members interpreted their roles in the National
Headquarters Building Fund Campaign.\(^4^4^5\)

Dr. Gary later explained that Texas was not alone in their
distrust of "Washington." As the Watergate incident made
national news, this "state versus national" or "grassroots"
attitude became especially common. It was at this time,
according to Gary, that some members of the MENC national
board began to assume somewhat of a "watchdog" position
toward their Washington, D.C. office, with regard to such
activities as the collection of and accounting for funds
toward the new headquarters building.\(^4^4^6\)

Another aspect of this debate which led to serious
conflict between the two organizations was the issue of mail
ballots versus allowing only those to vote who attend the

\(^4^4^4\)David McGuire, phone interview by author, April 25,
1989.

\(^4^4^5\)Charles Gary, Washington, D.C., to Ross Grant,
Desoto, Texas, March 2, 1989.

\(^4^4^6\)Charles Gary, phone interview by author, May 17,
1989.
annual convention. Regarding the first election of officers for TMEC, Charles Benner observed:

I recall that the 'disenfranchisement' of a member who does not attend the convention seemed to be an undemocratic issue. Apparently the other states have no problem voting by [mail] ballot."

J. R. McEntyre held an opposing view:

I opposed mail-out balloting because of my TSTA [Texas State Teachers Association] experience. Many, many TSTA members are voting for or against people who they've never seen and issues they know nothing about. If they don't have the energy to come to the annual meeting, I don't think they should be able to vote."

Voting by mail ballot as a means of securing more direct democracy in organizational decision-making was not possible for TMEA members at the time, and MENC partisans felt they would have a better chance to win the unification vote in this way. On this particular issue, however, there is little evidence that a ballot by mail would have been subject to a significantly different configuration of influences or would have produced a different outcome. Still, mail ballots can enhance the total membership's sense of personal involvement in governance of an organization. However, direct democracy has always been subject to criticism by advocates of representative democracy who argue that mail-ballot voting tends to be less well informed than

---


the representative voting which follows an open floor discussion.

**Finance-Related Problems with Unification**

In addition to the philosophical differences which have already been stated, the monetary problem of requiring MENC dues of all TMEA members greatly concerned many of TMEA's leadership. Every former TMEA officer interviewed listed the requiring of additional dues as one of the top two reasons not to unify. J. R. McEntyre stated: "Money was the first problem. We would have lost many members."\(^{449}\)

Jerry Longwell stated:

> I remember people saying, 'What! Do you mean it costs $30 (or $40, or whatever it was) a year to join MENC? Why, man, I can't afford that! Don't they know I'm a school teacher?' There were a lot of people who believed that if we passed a rule requiring everyone to join, then TMEA would lose a lot of members, because they couldn't afford it.\(^{450}\)

Wiley Housewright disagreed with this reasoning, however:

> No one presented 'evidence' that members of TMEA would withdraw membership if they were asked to pay MENC dues. No one suggested that TMEA members were poorer than music educators in other states. The central problem was fiscal, though . . . .\(^{451}\)

This view was contested by Paul Van Bodegraven:

\(^{449}\) J. R. McEntyre, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.

\(^{450}\) Jerry Longwell, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Fort Worth, Texas, November 21, 1988.

\(^{451}\) Wiley Housewright to Ross Grant, February 12, 1989, p. 5.
It was obvious to me, and I think also to the Texas board members, that this was a 'no win' situation. If Texas changed its dues requirements, the organization would lose many members. Neither could the MENC waive this requirement for Texas without doing so for all the other affiliated states. Even so, I believe that at least six consecutive MENC presidents accepted invitations to go to Texas and talk with the officers - and the results were always the same.\textsuperscript{452}

Tied to the dues issue was another 'money related' problem which was mentioned just as frequently. David McGuire explained:

Now, it was a concern that if the national convention came to Texas, the state revenues would be reduced that year, because MENC takes most of the registration. Most states suffer somewhat when the national convention is held there.\textsuperscript{453}

J. R. McEntyre added: "We were afraid we'd lose our shirt! We had talked to some other state presidents who said that hosting the MENC National [convention] almost made their local association fold up!"\textsuperscript{454}

Charles Benner defended the positives of having a national convention held in someone's home state:

I don't think the national has ever let it be devastating to a hosting state association. To my knowledge, no other state has ever refused to be the host state; they're eager to get the national convention. I don't think, in reality, this is a problem. Most take the position of, 'Gee, think what a

\textsuperscript{452} Paul Van Bodegraven, Tucson, Arizona, to Ross Grant, Desoto, Texas, February 24, 1989.

\textsuperscript{453} Dr. David McGuire, interview by author, Tape recording, University of North Texas Campus, Denton, Texas, November 8, 1988.

\textsuperscript{454} J. R. McEntyre, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.
boost it will be for music education and for our teachers to place a national convention right here in our state! Gosh, let's see if we can get it!'"\(^{455}\)

The Final Decision's Effect upon TMEA's Gain or Loss of Organizational Strength

Since its decision of separating from MENC, the TMEA has continued to increase in membership at approximately the same rate as it was growing prior to the separation. In 1975, TMEA had an active membership of approximately 2,200, and by 1989, their active membership had grown to over 5,000. Also, the 1989 membership count by geographic regions is well balanced."\(^{456}\) As Jerry Longwell observed: "This was probably just a 'ripple in the waters' that got everybody's attention for a short period of time, but the organization continued to thrive."\(^{457}\)

Concerning organizational "cohesion," meaning the tendency "to stick together" on significant issues, the preponderance of responses from TMEA leaders was that the MENC "debate" drew TMEA closer together. Robert Fielder commented:

The fact that TMEA 'won the battle,' if you can put it that way, was a real morale boost for both the leadership and membership of the association. I think

\(^{455}\)Dr. Charles Benner, phone interview by author, his home, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 11, 1988.

\(^{456}\)TMEA Directories of Membership, 1974-1975, and 1988-1989, TMEA Archives, Austin.

\(^{457}\)Jerry Longwell, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Fort Worth, Texas, November 21, 1988.
the grassroots took it as another 'battle of the Alamo.'

David McGuire added:

Probably it [organizational cohesion] was strengthened, because everyone had to examine their own position, and that they tended to draw together more. The TMEC was slow to get started, but J. W. and I both tried to give it identity and a connection with the national news through early newsletters. We did all this, though, while making a clear effort not to 'rock the TMEA boat.' We didn't have our own separate convention, for instance, but chose to meet during TMEA.

J. R. McEntyre found TMEA's "cohesion" difficult to define:

I'm sure it brought us closer together. However, it's a hard question to answer, because Texans have always had the philosophy of 'I have a right to my own opinion.' The band director at school 'A' feels that his way of doing things is the 'right' way, and that he has 'the right' to do just that. Band director 'B' across the state feels just as strongly that his way is 'the right' way. The TMEA accommodates all of these diverse opinions, but when these grassroots people come together as TMEA membership, we are 'one.' As long as we have a grassroots forum for resolving all of our differences, even if we 'lose' an argument individually, we 'win' organizationally.

TMEA's geographic distribution of membership within the state of Texas has not changed at all; therefore, the MENC controversy had no effect upon this aspect of its structure. With regard to TMEA's "program and ideas," every

---


459 Dr. David McGuire, interview by author, Tape recording, University of North Texas Campus, Denton, Texas, November 8, 1988.

former TMEA leader interviewed said that this area grew stronger as a result of the controversy. Jerry Longwell explained:

I think that it [the separation from MENC] not only strengthened it, but clarified what we're here for, as well; that is, primarily to help classroom teachers to become better classroom teachers, and as a result of that, kids will get a better music education. This was one of the primary things that was discussed, whether or not MENC helped accomplish this. TMEA decided that it did not, at least in any practical way. Our goal has always been just that. However, at the same time, I have often times wondered if the debates regarding the value of music education of having somebody 'up there' dealing with those more philosophical, 'ivory tower' kinds of issues, whether or not that discussion might have caused people to be a little bit disturbed in their thoughts about TMEA's former role is a possibility. Maybe it allowed us to get past this state into the symposiums. That was when I was president in 1976, when we actually decided to fund the symposium.\(^{461}\)

Bill Cormack agreed:

It forced us to really get serious enough to take care of outsiders when it comes to curriculum. We started availing ourselves and branching out into more areas than just focusing on giving concerts at TMEA. There was a very positive effect.\(^ {462}\)

Jack Schaeffer, MENC president in 1973, held an opposing view:

In my opinion the TMEA made a poor decision. Music educators all over the nation are in need of much support in the future, as the so called 'fundamentals' of education are being lauded. I would predict that TMEA will need the support of national leaders in music education as music programs become increasingly

\(^{461}\) Jerry Longwell, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Fort Worth, Texas, November 21, 1988.

\(^{462}\) Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.
difficult to finance. Modern school budgets are becoming tighter and tighter.\footnote{\textsuperscript{463}}

The final category, "status," is defined as how TMEA is regarded by its many publics (i.e., administrators, parents, students, and educators both from Texas and from outside Texas). Jerry Longwell believed that the MENC separation had little effect upon TMEA's "status":

In terms of the general public in the state of Texas, I don't think they really knew or cared. I think administrators had only the most minor concern. The music leaders in other states were, I think mostly in the dark about it . . . they were told that we 'withdrew,' so the monkey was put on TMEA's back, perhaps.\footnote{\textsuperscript{464}}

J. R. McEntyre related a different view: "The only feedback I ever heard from the other states was mostly positive, such as 'Hey, I wish we could do that.'"\footnote{\textsuperscript{465}} Bill Cormack, who is still the executive director of TMEA, agreed:

You can't believe how other states look up to us. I go to three or four conventions a year. I'm going to Ohio next week. The very first question I'll be asked is, 'Now, Texas isn't a part of MENC, right?' I'll say, 'right.' They'll say, 'How did that happen? Is that why you have so many members?' I'll go, 'Sure! If you didn't have to make everybody join MENC, think how many more members you'd have.'\footnote{\textsuperscript{466}}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{463} Jack Schaeffer, Edmonds, Washington, to Ross Grant, Desoto, Texas, March 5, 1989, 2.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{464} Jerry Longwell, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Fort Worth, Texas, November 21, 1988.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{465} J. R. McEntyre, interview by author, Tape recording, his office, Odessa, Texas, December 8, 1988.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{466} Bill Cormack, interview by author, Tape recording, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1988.}
Summary

In summary, TMEA's separation from MENC involved a series of many decisions made by leaders of both organizations over a long period of time. TMEA leaders were satisfied with the status quo and did not want mandatory unification. When faced with MENC pressures to change, TMEA leaders sought to limit changes to minute incremental ones, minimizing the departure from their previous situation. As revealed in interviews, TMEA leaders tried to "stall" as long as possible, postponing an ultimatum, or even hoping that MENC would soften its position of mandatory complete unification. In the end, however, two decisions were made: both TMEA and MENC demonstrated a distinct "show of power," with each organization ultimately making clear-cut, political and rational decisions consistent with its perceived self-interest. MENC exhibited the power of a national organization over its membership requirements by dictating to TMEA mandatory and complete unification. TMEA's response, in voting against mandatory unification, demonstrated the Texan's strong "independent spirit" and their determination to survive, even without the help of the national association. The decisions involved in this final "showdown confrontation" were definitely long-term, far-reaching decisions. Incremental or short-term solutions were unacceptable to both sides.
The final decision by TMEA to reject mandatory unification was technically a vote against changing their own constitution. In reality, though, it was far more than a simple vote for the status quo. The TMEA membership knew that it was really voting on whether to become 100% joined with MENC, or to become completely "disenfranchised." This decision effected change on two levels. On the state level, TMEA's decision caused only incremental changes in the association. However, regarding TMEA's national ties, it effected "revolutionary change," the most extreme of the three levels categorized by Robert Dahl.\textsuperscript{467} Since TMEA was one of MENC's largest state units, its separation prompted music educators across America to ask "why?". This author believes that the image of TMEA and music education in Texas was damaged by their separation from MENC. Also, as TMEA continues to grow, its impact upon music education across the nation will be lessened without affiliation with MENC. Finally, TMEA lost the benefits of MENC's network of national lobbying, programs, communication, publications and political action.

One interesting aspect of TMEA's separation from MENC is the application of the legal model of decision making.\textsuperscript{468}

\textsuperscript{467}See Chapter 1 of this study for a description of Dahl's levels of organizational change.

\textsuperscript{468}See page 22 of this study for a description of Schuman and Oluff's "legal model" of decision making.
This controversy was often referred to as a "constitutional crisis." TMEA's affiliation with MENC did not satisfy MENC's own constitutional requirements, but MENC had chosen to "overlook" the problem for many years. TMEA's constitution did not include mandatory MENC membership for all its members; therefore, TMEA's constitution would have to have been changed in order to comply. When possible options and solutions were discussed by both sides through the years, the two constitutional documents always remained central to the issue. At one point, TMEA's attorney investigated the possibility that MENC's demands would not be legally justifiable in a court of law. In this regard, the separation from MENC takes on some of the characteristics and spirit of the legal model of decision making. Former MENC president Paul Van Bodegraven stated to this researcher in response to a questionnaire:

You are investigating a problem that never occurred. TMEA DID NOT SPLIT WITH MENC. If two single people are living together, they cannot get a divorce (split) because they aren't married.\(^{469}\)

This author disagrees with Bodegraven's statement, since it is a matter of record that MENC "took TMEA in" as its one and only Texas affiliate in the 1940s. During the following twenty-five years, MENC never established a separate Texas affiliate unit, nor announced a "disclaimer" regarding the

TMEA. During this twenty-five year period, thousands of TMEA members paid MENC dues. These monies were accepted by the national office, which, in the opinion of this author, constituted an acknowledgment of TMEA as their Texas unit.

In terms of the impact of this decision on the organizational strength of TMEA, there is little or no evidence indicating any adverse effect on its size, cohesion, geographic distribution, organization or leadership. Growth continued at the same rate as before. The dimensions of organizational strength on which partisans disagree has to do with "program and ideas," "status" and "philosophy," but these concepts are difficult to quantify as they relate to strength. MENC partisans believe deeply that TMEA will be ultimately hurt by structural isolation from the major national organization of music educators. They would argue that the separation reinforces some of the stereotypes of Texas provincialism, lack of sophistication, and neglect of the national concerns of their colleagues. TMEA partisans, on the other hand, can give considerable evidence that even these aspects of its strength have not been adversely affected, and may have even received a boost. They point out that the trauma of the arguments over the separation brought on some healthy soul-searching on the part of TMEA concerning matters of its ultimate mission, curriculum emphases, and the meaning of professionalism.
These were constructive developments regardless of how the TMEA membership voted on the issue of separating from MENC.

One other conclusion seems clear: TMEA came out of this conflict surprisingly well, but more because of its leadership's quick response to the changed situation than because of structural change itself. The decision to separate from MENC was fraught with all kinds of risks to TMEA, such as the potential walkout by many of its membership in opposition to the decision, and the challenge of a new MENC state unit to vie for its own support. However, the role of TMEA leadership in responding and adjusting to the external threats to its organizational strength, was of critical importance. TMEA's leaders quickly took the lead in organizing and controlling the MENC state affiliate TMEC during its initial development in such a way that the new organization did not become a significant competitor to TMEA. One can only speculate what the effect upon TMEA would have been if MENC partisans had been more aggressive in shaping the TMEC as a competitor to TMEA. It is possible, of course, that TMEA was so strong, especially following the emotional vote against the MENC unification requirement, that TMEC was destined to be only in the shadow of TMEA. The TMEA separation from MENC demonstrates once more the universal difficulty of national organizations to adequately understand regional and local "feelings," and to influence the grassroots membership.
CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary and Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected landmark events in the historical development of the Texas Music Educators Association, 1938-1980, and the decisions which influenced their outcomes. These landmark events were selected by polling twenty-three former presidents of TMEA. The twenty who responded named many significant events, but gave the most votes to the following, as the most significant landmark events that helped to shape the history of TMEA: (1) the change from a band organization to a music educators organization in 1938, (2) the University Interscholastic League's takeover of contests in 1947, and (3) TMEA's separation from the Music Educators National Conference in 1976.

In addition to developing a historical chronology from documentary sources, in-depth interviews were conducted with actual participants in these landmark events. The interviews utilized comparable questions, in order to identify decision-making patterns, while also capturing the atmosphere and visceral context of TMEA history. Literature from the social science disciplines on organizational
decision-making was explored for help in understanding what happened, how, and why. This study has sought to identify the principal participants in the decisions surrounding each landmark event; to identify their role and degree of influence in the outcome; to identify other factors influencing the outcome; to identify patterns of similarity in the decision-making processes for all three events; and to discuss whether the final decision in each event led to a gain or loss in TMEA strength.

The aggregate results of the interviews proved to be valuable for recording the oral history and capturing the emotional context permeating the landmark events in TMEA's history. Interview responses were used with considerable confidence by this researcher, when there was strong consensus in particular answers, but have been used with appropriate caution where there was division of opinion on specific issues. This researcher has sought to record these differences of perception and opinion, where appropriate.

The Change from a Band Organization to a Music Educators Organization

The change from a band organization to a music educators association was a culmination of the efforts of choral teachers, administrators, and some band directors throughout the 1930s. As choral teachers began to recognize the success of the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association clinic-convention, along with the association's
well established contests, they lobbied for expansion of the organization to include choral teachers.

Strong individual leadership from TMEA president Ward Brandstetter provided a great influence upon the association membership. The most influential participants in the landmark event included Brandstetter, along with a small group of other TMEA leaders, and key school superintendents and choral teachers. As a result of inviting choral teachers into the association, the new TMEA experienced a gain in membership, revenue, and status. The change also caused a broadening of the organization's agenda and brought in many fine choral leaders onto the board of directors.

The decision to invite choral teachers into the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association was a mixture of pragmatism and idealism, combining elements from both the rational and political decision-making models. While the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association leaders approached the unification from a positive, forward-looking philosophy, they were also aware of external pressures by the school superintendents to unify all music groups.

The UIL Takeover of Contests

The UIL takeover of contests was preceded by several years of study by school administrators regarding "the band problem." Some aspects of the "band problem" included eligibility rules which were not considered to be strict enough, a system in which the scheduling and administration
of music contests was not held accountable to school superintendents, too many contests, too much travel, and too much expense. In an effort to establish reasonable control and responsibility for music competition, the superintendents entered into a coalition with the interscholastic league, which shifted contest administration from TMEA to the League.

The "power players" in this event were definitely from outside the TMEA. Leaders of the Texas Association of School Administrators, along with University of Texas president Theo Painter, forced a rather hostile takeover of TMEA's primary activity. The TMEA leaders had very little influence over the fundamental decision regarding the UIL takeover, but their willingness to work closely with the UIL in formulating its rules and procedures made a great impact on the contests' eventual success.

Many interviewees pointed out that the weakening of school band programs caused by World War II gave the administrators the political leverage to effect their takeover. However, other informed observers, such as former TMEA president Dr. Nelson Patrick, expressed the belief that the contest takeover would have occurred anyway.

While this landmark event did not cause a significant gain or loss in TMEA's membership, the association's cohesion was somewhat weakened for a short period of time. Some of the membership felt that TMEA's main activity--the
contests—was going to be poorly run by the UIL. However, not only did the UIL contests succeed, but TMEA was able to turn its attention more toward improving its convention and cultivating the professional growth of its members.

TMEA's Separation from MENC

TMEA's separation from MENC came about only after twenty years of dialogue between leaders of the two organizations. The latter half of those years was characterized by increasingly heated debates, resulting in a "constitutional crisis." After countless speeches and lobbying from both sides, and two votes by the TMEA membership, the end result was TMEA's rejection of mandatory complete unification with MENC. Because of the controversial nature of this issue, strongly partisan opinions were expressed by TMEA and MENC supporters.

In this third landmark event, significant power was exercised by both organizations. TMEA leaders were not successful in modifying MENC's demand for a change in the status quo with regard to TMEA's unique "partial affiliation." Neither were MENC leaders successful in convincing the TMEA membership that mandatory complete unification of dues with MENC was a positive change.

Throughout the long debate, many officers in both organizations played key roles in their attempts to come to an agreement. An important factor influencing TMEA's final vote was the belief by many Texans that the requirement of
MENC dues for all TMEA members would cause a significant loss of TMEA membership, or even a split in the association. They also feared the potential loss in local revenue from hosting a national MENC convention in Texas. Finally, there existed among many Texans a perception that MENC's philosophy emphasized research and general music, while TMEA's philosophy emphasized performance. This perceived philosophical difference was another important factor influencing the final decision. Along with these perceptions of differing philosophies was the issue of "lonestarism"—the grassroots Texan's desire for independence.

Another highly debated philosophical difference was MENC's policy of requiring mail-ballot voting, while TMEA's constitution allows only those members to vote who attend the annual convention. TMEA partisans would argue that their organization had a more direct line to their constituency than MENC, since TMEA's membership was allowed to vote on many more associational matters than MENC members may vote. However, MENC partisans were quick to point out that a TMEA member who could not attend the annual convention was not allowed to vote on even the most basic issues, such as dues increases or unification with MENC. Indeed, supporters of unification with MENC were denied the opportunity of having a membership-wide vote on this issue by mail ballot. This caused some MENC partisans to allege
that TMEA's grassroots membership was disenfranchised on this issue. Even if the TMEA's constitution had provided for direct democracy, however, there is little evidence that a ballot by mail would have produced a different outcome on unification/separation.

The separation from MENC has not appeared to slow the growth of TMEA. However, while TMEA's cohesion and membership currently appear to be strong, there are opposing views regarding both its status and its program and ideas. Most Texas music educators would argue that TMEA's status is still strong, but MENC leaders have voiced the belief that TMEA has become provincial and shut off from the world in which it lives. Although TMEA's agenda has expanded to include more emphasis upon curriculum, research, and general music, many MENC partisans believe that TMEA is still rather narrow in its strong focus upon performance.

Patterns of Similarity in Decision Making

One pattern of similarity in all three events under investigation is that the final decision was strongly influenced by factors external to the TMEA organization. This follows the theory argued by Pfeffer and Salancik, who propose that external constraints often dictate the ultimate decisions and policies in organizational change. In the first event, adding the choral division, the administrators and choral teachers were strong forces with which TMEA had
to reckon. If the association had not cooperated with these forces, a choral teachers' organization almost certainly would have developed and eventually grown to a level that would have put it in an adversarial position to the Texas State Band and Orchestra Association (the predecessor to TMEA).

In the UIL takeover of contests, external forces in the form of school superintendents, a University of Texas president, and the UIL executives virtually dictated the outcome. TMEA leadership was only a factor in that they cooperated and participated in the transition period.

Concerning the TMEA/MENC controversy, an ultimatum from MENC to the TMEA was a strong external influence upon the TMEA. However, the ultimatum was rejected by TMEA, due to a combination of internal organizational influences.

A second pattern of similarity in all three landmark events is the prominent roles which individual leaders on both sides of the issue played in each event. TMEA president Ward Brandstetter was a very dominant actor in the association's decision to invite choral teachers. His strong leadership qualities consisted of both excellence as a bandmaster and outstanding communication skills.

In the UIL takeover of contests, nearly all of the most influential leaders were external to the TMEA. Key leaders among the school superintendents were F. C. McConnell, Mortimer Brown and "Red" Dennard. These
individuals persisted with their task, even after being rebuffed by the UIL, interrupted by World War II, and frustrated by the difficult task of trying to communicate with and unify administrators all across Texas.

Regarding the MENC controversy, the TMEA officers were always divided on the issue, and it is difficult to determine which actors were most influential in the TMEA rejection of unification. Ultimately it was the vote of the association membership at its annual convention, not the influence of the TMEA presidents and executive board members, whose power determined the final decision. Whether or not the individual TMEA officers could fairly be called decision makers in the MENC-TMEA controversy, they certainly moved quickly to minimize the chances of a new, strong MENC state affiliate being established that might have competed with TMEA for membership. Individual leadership was an extremely important factor after the separation occurred, as well as during the events leading to the separation.

A third pattern of similarity is that all three of the landmark events contained elements of what Robert Dahl describes as comprehensive or even revolutionary changes, rather than incremental changes. However, preceding all three events, incremental steps did take place which led up to the confrontation or landmark decision. One might argue that adding the choral teachers was an incremental step, following the addition of orchestra directors a few years
earlier. Still, uniting the instrumental and choral teachers was a very rare occurrence for 1938 and very removed from "normal" incremental growth in school music educator organizations. Not only had very few states combined these music groups back in 1938, but many are still separate today. Jack Mahan's comments support this position: "Adding orchestra directors to the association was a very natural step. Most of these men also directed bands and simply needed the same educational opportunities for their orchestras as they already enjoyed with their bands."\textsuperscript{470} Mahan went on to point out the sharp difference in bringing choral teachers into the association: "However, the choir people were the 'other element.' These were perceived as the ones who were going to take 'our' students."\textsuperscript{471}

The decision to separate from MENC brought about more far reaching change than incrementalism would produce. TMEA was forced to undergo a period of self-analysis and preparation for self-sufficiency. The organization also had to deal with the challenge of a new MENC/Texas unit, the TMEC, which possibly could have divided TMEA's membership.

Although in every case, these decisions caused sweeping reform at the time of their occurrence, none brought about long term organizational "trauma." This may

\textsuperscript{470}Jack Mahan, phone interview by author, May 8, 1989.

\textsuperscript{471}Jack Mahan, phone interview by author, May 8, 1989.
be considered a tribute to strong TMEA leadership during all three landmark events. The TMEA leaders made quick but careful responses, dedicated to the self-interest of TMEA as they perceived it. Anyone of these events could have thrown TMEA off its track of growth and development. If the Texas School Band and Orchestra Association had refused to add choral teachers to its membership in 1938, Texas music educators in 1989 would not be able to enjoy the benefits of a unified association as it presently exists. If TMEA had not worked with the superintendents in developing quality music competition through the UIL, then UIL contests might have been unsuccessful, possibly resulting in school music programs diminishing in the quality of their performance groups. After all, if TMEA had rejected the UIL contests, then the contests would not have benefited from the music educators' knowledge and experience. Many schools might have discontinued participation in contests of any kind. If TMEA had unified with MENC, they might or might not have experienced a significant loss of membership, but they certainly would have had a loss in local and regional power in decision making.

Conclusions and Discussion

As was previously cited in Chapter 4, the ability of an organization and its leadership to react quickly to
external forces is a key ingredient to success. The ability of an organizations' leaders to make quick decisions and adapt to sudden change in their environment should therefore be viewed as a key factor in TMEA's response to two of the confrontations addressed in this study. In both the UIL takeover and the MENC debate, TMEA leaders presented many compromise or postponement proposals. However, after these attempts had failed, and sweeping change was inevitable, TMEA moved forward quickly to minimize its losses.

The study by Pfeffer and Salancik of the external control of organizations, discussed at various points in this dissertation, might seem initially to be only an interesting theory, emphasizing organizational resource dependency. However, this study of TMEA has made their theory a relevant reality, confirming the presence of strong external constraints and the need for quick recognition and understanding of these forces, with appropriate, timely response. There is every indication that these external forces, as well as the need for adjustment and response, are present today and will continue in the years ahead. Also, while strong leadership has been one of the key factors in TMEA's successful responses to its environment, the need for this continued leadership shows no sign of disappearing.

In each of the three landmark events, the "power winner," that is, the ultimate wielder of decision-making power, is different and without consistent pattern. In the choral addition to TMEA, a mixture of power is exerted, both by association leaders and external factors. Significant objections to change by some members of the organization are overcome by this mixture of internal and external forces.

The UIL takeover of contests is clearly a demonstration of external power, represented by the school superintendents who got exactly what they wanted. The "power winner" of the MENC controversy is not easy to discern. However, as perceived by most of the interviewees and interpreted by this researcher, the confrontation with MENC was primarily the TMEA membership's exercise of power to reject pyramidal, external pressure.

Another aspect of organizational change is the study of the "triggering element," or "the straw that breaks the camel's back." Although change usually occurs through a series of many steps, often a single event can ultimately set a multitude of persons and organizations in motion.

This researcher suggests that the triggering element for the choral addition was the joint efforts by the choral teachers and school administrators. Concerning the UIL takeover, an important triggering element was the huge amount of power being wielded by a small number of band directors. As these directors began to spend large sums of
money, organize trips, and establish their own rules without addressing any other authority, school superintendents felt the pressure to regain control of the band program.

Regarding TMEA's separation from MENC, the triggering element was the pressure which began to be exerted by the Ohio Music Educators Association and other MENC state units, which began to demand that Texas not be allowed a special exemption from the mandatory unified dues structure. MENC was forced to either "bring Texas in line" or open the partial membership format to all other states.

In summary, it is the author's opinion that the TMEA's history reveals an organization which has been, and continues to be, clearly subservient to (dependent upon) the decisions of others, but at the same time strongly independent and self-sufficient in spirit. All three landmark events examined in this study illustrated these clear limits to TMEA's independence, with the wishes of school administrators prevailing, when they were united and persistent. Similarly, the national music educators' organization forced TMEA to choose between expulsion and giving up their voluntary membership arrangement with MENC, when neither alternative was wanted.

The three events also demonstrate, however, a continuing spirit of independence and, indeed, a fierce dedication to charting a course which maximizes that independence in the future. The strong roots of independent
"lonestarism" have both positive and negative implications for TMEA and its future. To the extent that TMEA's lonestar pride fuels the drive for professional excellence in music education (and this author believes it does), this bodes well for Texas music educators. To the extent that lonestarism encourages and supports positive grassroots democracy in TMEA, with widespread involvement by the rank-and-file members, this too bodes well for the future, even with the known imperfections of democracy.

On the other hand, to the extent that TMEA's organizational independence and lonestarism becomes an unnatural barrier between music educators in Texas and the national organization of music educators, this will have negative implications for the future. In the opinion of this author, the ultimate commitment of TMEA and its leadership is to the goal of strengthening music education and, as quoted in the first paragraph of this study, fostering "productive working relationships with other organizations having similar goals." As time heals personal wounds of the MENC-TMEA separation, surely persons of goodwill in both organizations will find ways of re-opening the unity issue without requiring TMEA to risk losing its strength and independence.

Recommendations for Further Research

In the process of conducting this study, four areas for future research have been revealed that touch upon
theories of decision-making processes, and their application to many music educators organizations in the United States.

First, in the literature on organizational decision-making, far more attention is given to models for making a decision (rational, political, legal, etc.), than to the process of responding to decisions externally imposed. In a way this may be what Charles Lindblom was groping for when he first wrote of decision making as "muddling through," or "disjointed incrementalism," but it is not articulated as a focus on organizational response to external decisions. The three factors in the survival, growth, and development of TMEA were response factors, primarily by organizational leadership, following the imposition of a decision by external forces. Researchers on decision making would do well to broaden their research, theory building, and model construction to include the process of response to externally imposed decisions as a co-equal and inseparable part of the study of organizational development and history.

Second, of the various sources of organizational strength used in this study to measure the impact of the three landmark events (size, status, leadership, geographical distribution, etc.), cohesiveness is one factor that especially seems to need more study. During the debate over each of the landmark events, some of the sharpest disagreements revolved around predictions of loss of the spirit of togetherness, or cohesiveness. Still, TMEA seemed
to come out of each decision crisis with as much cohesiveness as before, and perhaps even more. In this context, a comparative study focusing on the cohesiveness of different musical organizations would become necessary. Comparative survey research could also help us to understand the qualitative shades of difference between the cohesiveness of different groups of musicians. For example, public school band members could be compared with public school choir members, or Texas band and choir members could be compared with band and choir students from other geographic areas. A study of the essential characteristics of cohesiveness for music educators, in general, would be helpful in understanding the histories of music educator associations and their organizational strengths and weaknesses.

Thirdly, researchers should investigate the historical development of other state music educator organizations, looking specifically at the decisions involved in their landmark events. Within this study, questions such as "did the organization originate as an instrumental teachers association," and if so, "how did it deal with the issue of joining with other music teachers?" could be explored. A comparative study could be conducted, involving responses to external forces such as MENC and specific state activities associations.
Finally, the concept of "lonestarism"--the Texas independence syndrome--is a worthy subject for future research. It kept coming up in the interviewees' responses to questions, with a strong consensus that this was a significant factor in TMEA members' rejection of the MENC ultimatum. It would be helpful to have the benefit of social scientists' research on this phenomenon, in understanding why music educators would choose the call of lonestarism over the call of national unification.

Several other areas of possible research have also emerged during the conduct of this study, including the role of contests and other kinds of music performance in music education for all students, and the power/influence relationship among school administrators, music administrators, the TMEA, and the various "publics" of school bands and choral groups. It is hoped that this study of one state music educators association's history, with emphasis on three landmark events in its development, will stimulate further research and add to our knowledge in these important areas.
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APPENDIX A

PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE CANDIDATES
PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE CANDIDATES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMEA President</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Bynum</td>
<td>1944-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Maddox</td>
<td>1946-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weldon Covington</td>
<td>1947-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euell Porter</td>
<td>1948-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack H. Mahan</td>
<td>1949-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. H. Buckner</td>
<td>1950-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Cannan</td>
<td>1952-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fielder</td>
<td>1954-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Patrick</td>
<td>1957-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Baker</td>
<td>1958-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Teat</td>
<td>1960-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Taylor</td>
<td>1962-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Junkin</td>
<td>1964-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Lantz</td>
<td>1966-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Sanders</td>
<td>1968-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. R. McEntyre</td>
<td>1970-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. King</td>
<td>1972-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill R. Cormack</td>
<td>1974-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrold W. Longwell</td>
<td>1975-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara F. Eads</td>
<td>1976-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Moore</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bridges</td>
<td>1978-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Schraub</td>
<td>1979-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER
January 14, 1988

Dear

We are doing research at North Texas State University concerning landmark events in the T.M.E.A.'s past. In order to identify the landmark events which will become the focus of our study, Bill Cormack has given us your name, along with the other past presidents of T.M.E.A.. Hopefully this historical research will be a credit to the association and to all music educators in Texas.

Would you please take a moment to answer these few questions, then return them in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, call Ross Grant: 214-223-8884 (home), 214-230-0726 (work).

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Ross Grant

Dr. Hildegard Froehlich
Associate Professor of Music
North Texas State University

Ross Grant
Band Director,
DeSoto High School
1. Please identify what you believe are the three most significant landmark events that helped to shape the history of TMEA during the years 1938-1980.

Check or write in three answers:

   a. The UIL takeover of contests (1947)
   b. Changing from a band organization to a music educator organization (1938 — adding choral, elementary divisions, etc.)
   c. Moving the central headquarters to Austin (late 1970s)
   d. Splitting with MENC (1976)
   e. Reducing the number of All-State participants (late 1950s)
   f. Other: ____________________________
   g. Other: ____________________________
   h. Other: ____________________________

2. During the specific years that you held office in the association, what were the most significant landmark events which involved the TMEA?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

3. Please list the names and locations of those individuals (including yourself) who believe are the best resources for obtaining more information concerning all of these landmark events?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

Please return to:  Ross Grant
                  912 Eagle Drive
                  DeSoto, TX  75115
APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM BILL CORMACK,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TMEA
January 5, 1988

Ross Grant
DeSoto Eagle Bands
600 Eagle Drive
DeSoto, Texas 75115

Dear Ross,

After discussing with you the possibility of your doing research of TMEA, I have the following thoughts:

1. There have been several attempts to write the history of TMEA but none involved much research and were not definitive in nature.

2. The time is quickly running out for research involving the last of many of our original members.

3. The Board of Directors of TMEA would be most happy to have someone like yourself to work on such a project.

4. We are continually looked to for leadership in music education from the rest of the country. I think there would be great interest from other states and from the music industry in a history of TMEA.

Therefore, I request of you that you do all in your power to convince your advisor and committee that the TMEA supports your quest and is most desirous of its success. If I can be of further help please contact me.

Sincerely,

Bill Carmack, CAE
Executive Director

BC:th

enclosure

Southwestern Musician combined with the Texas Music Educator
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Event 1 - "TMEA's Changing from an Instrumental Directors' Organization to a Music Educators' Organization, by Adding the Choral Division in 1938"

1. As you recall the events, what was the situation before the addition of the choral division to the TSBOA, and what was the sequence of events leading up to the change?

2. Who were the principal participants in the decision-making process, and who influenced the outcome of these events?

3. What was the role of each of these participants in the landmark decision?

4. What was the role of the:
   a. TMEA Executive Secretary?
   b. TMEA President?
   c. TMEA State Board?
   d. TMEA Grassroots Membership?
   e. TMEA Elder Statesmen (i.e., former presidents, etc.)?

5. The following three terms describe categories of people who make decisions:
   a. Active Initiator: One who is at the forefront of the development of new ideas, and remains involved throughout the chain of events leading to a final outcome.
   b. Suspensory Veto: One who is not actively involved in the development of a plan of action, but who uses his power of "veto" to greatly influence the outcome.
   c. Passive Bystander: One who does not take a strong position on either side of an issue, and allows others to influence the outcome.

Which of these three categories most closely describes the role of each person that you have already named as being a participant in the decision-making process? Are they any of these participants who do not fit any of the categories?
6. Was there anything about the social, economic, political or other exterior factors that you believe played an important role in influencing the outcome of the decision?

7. What were the arguments for the change?

8. What were the arguments against the change?

9. From my background research, I have prepared a list of the following possible reasons why some TMEA members opposed the addition of choral teachers. As you recall the circumstances surrounding this controversy, please tell me whether each of these possible reasons was used: (1) frequently, (2) occasionally, or (3) not at all.

   a. Fear of a possible takeover in the voting membership.

   b. Fear of a loss of associational "fraternal atmosphere."

   c. Male instrumental teachers resented associating with a predominantly female population of choral teachers.

   d. Fear that the annual convention focus upon the goals of instrumental teachers would become watered-down.

   e. The opinion that instrumental and choral teachers have little or nothing in common.

   f. Fear that the choir department in public schools would gain strength, at the possible expense of some instrumental program's quality.

   g. Some association members just hated "songbirds."

10. Were there any alternatives discussed, and if so, what were they?

11. What positive outcomes were predicted?

12. What negative outcomes were predicted?

13. As you look back, which of these outcomes came true?
14. Did the addition of the choral division lead to a gain or loss in TMEA organizational strength?

15. Organizational researchers have identified certain sources of potential strength or weakness for organizations and institutions. I have a list of six such sources. Please describe which of them, if any, were strengthened or weakened as a result of the addition of the choral division.
   a. Size: Number of members.
   b. Cohesion: Tendency to stick together on significant issues.
   c. Geographic Distribution.
   d. Organization and Leadership: Constitution and by-laws, effective implementation of tasks.
   e. Program and Ideas: The purpose and subject matter that is at the core of the organization's reason for existence.
   f. Status: How the organization is regarded by its many "publics."

16. Did the stereotyped "Texan" attitude of independence play a significant role in the addition of the choral division?

17. With the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, did TMEA make (1) a poor decision, (2) an adequate decision, (3) a good decision, (4) the best decision for its own future?

18. Now that you can view the results of your participation in this landmark event, would you "go back" and make the same decisions, or different ones?
Event 2 - "The University Interscholastic League's Takeover of Contests in 1946"

1. As you recall the events, what was the situation before the UIL takeover of contests, and what was the sequence of events leading up to the takeover?

2. Who were the principal participants in the decision-making process, and who influenced the outcome of these events?

3. What was the role of each of these participants in the landmark decision?

4. What was the role of the:
   a. TMEA Executive Secretary?
   b. TMEA President?
   c. TMEA State Board?
   d. TMEA Grassroots Membership?
   e. TMEA Elder Statesmen (i.e., former presidents, etc.)?

5. The following three terms describe categories of people who make decisions:
   a. Active Initiator: One who is at the forefront of the development of new ideas, and remains involved throughout the chain of events leading to a final outcome.
   b. Suspensory Veto: One who is not actively involved in the development of a plan of action, but who uses his power of "veto" to greatly influence the outcome.
   c. Passive Bystander: One who does not take a strong position on either side of an issue, and allows others to influence the outcome.

Which of these three categories most closely describes the role of each person that you have already named as being a participant in the decision-making process? Are they any of these participants who do not fit any of the categories?
6. Was there anything about the social, economic, political or other exterior factors that you believe played an important role in influencing the outcome of the decision?

7. What were the arguments for the change?

8. What were the arguments against the change?

9. From my background research, I have prepared a list of the following possible reasons why some TMEA members opposed the UIL's taking over of contests. As you recall the circumstances surrounding this situation, please tell me whether each of these possible reasons was used: (1) frequently, (2) occasionally, or (3) not at all.

   a. Concern that contest rules and adjudication procedures would be changed for the worse.

   b. Concern that contests would be de-emphasized, or eventually even eliminated.

   c. Concern that the All-State Organizations would eventually be taken over as well.

   d. Concern that TMEA would suffer, due to lack of interest.

   e. Concern that the UIL takeover of contests would be the first step in a gradual stripping of power from band directors and music teachers.

10. Were there any alternatives discussed, and if so, what were they?

11. What positive outcomes were predicted?

12. What negative outcomes were predicted?

13. As you look back, which of these outcomes came true?

14. Did the UIL takeover of contests lead to a gain or loss in TMEA organizational strength?

15. Organizational researchers have identified certain sources of potential strength or weakness for organizations and institutions. I have a list of six such sources. Please describe which of them, if any, were strengthened or weakened as a result of the UIL takeover of contests.
a. Size: Number of members.

b. Cohesion: Tendency to stick together on significant issues.

c. Geographic Distribution.

d. Organization and Leadership: Constitution and by-laws, effective implementation of tasks.

e. Program and Ideas: The purpose and subject matter that is at the core of the organization's reason for existence.

f. Status: How the organization is regarded by its many "publics."

16. Did the stereotyped "Texan" attitude of independence play a significant role in the UIL takeover of contests?

17. With the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, did TMEA make (1) a poor decision, (2) an adequate decision, (3) a good decision, (4) the best decision for its own future?

18. Now that you can view the results of your participation in this landmark event, would you "go back" and make the same decisions, or different ones?
Event 3 - "TMEA's Separation from the Music Educators National Conference in 1976"

1. As you recall the events, what was the situation before TMEA's separation from MENC, and what was the sequence of events leading up to the change?

2. Who were the principal participants in the decision-making process, and who influenced the outcome of these events?

3. What was the role of each of these participants in the landmark decision?

4. What was the role of the:
   a. TMEA Executive Secretary?
   b. TMEA President?
   c. TMEA State Board?
   d. TMEA Grassroots Membership?
   e. TMEA Elder Statesmen (i.e., former presidents, etc.)?

5. The following three terms describe categories of people who make decisions:
   a. Active Initiator: One who is at the forefront of the development of new ideas, and remains involved throughout the chain of events leading to a final outcome.
   b. Suspensory Veto: One who is not actively involved in the development of a plan of action, but who uses his power of "veto" to greatly influence the outcome.
   c. Passive Bystander: One who does not take a strong position on either side of an issue, and allows others to influence the outcome.

Which of these three categories most closely describes the role of each person that you have already named as being a participant in the decision-making process? Are they any of these participants who do not fit any of the categories?
6. Was there anything about the social, economic, political or other exterior factors that you believe played an important role in influencing the outcome of the decision?

7. What were the arguments for the change?

8. What were the arguments against the change?

9. From my background research, I have prepared a list of the following possible reasons why some TMEA people opposed the requiring of full MENC membership for all TMEA members. As you recall the circumstances surrounding this situation, please tell me whether each of these possible reasons was used: (1) frequently, (2) occasionally, or (3) not at all.

   a. Concern that requiring MENC dues, in addition to the TMEA dues, would cause a large percentage of TMEA's membership to withdraw.

   b. Concern that if MENC gained a stronger voice in the TMEA, then many of the traditional TMEA philosophies would be affected.

   c. Concern that MENC might demand a portion of the revenue from the annual TMEA convention.

   d. Concern that MENC would demand to regulate certain activities which TMEA has always controlled.

   e. Concern that university teachers would gain a strong voice in the leadership of TMEA.

10. Were there any alternatives discussed, and if so, what were they?

11. What positive outcomes were predicted?

12. What negative outcomes were predicted?

13. As you look back, which of these outcomes came true?

14. Did the separation from MENC lead to a gain or loss in TMEA organizational strength?

15. Organizational researchers have identified certain sources of potential strength or weakness for organizations and institutions. I have a list of six such sources. Please describe which of them, if any,
were strengthened or weakened as a result of the separation from MENC:

a. Size: Number of members.

b. Cohesion: Tendency to stick together on significant issues.

c. Geographic Distribution.

d. Organization and Leadership: Constitution and by-laws, effective implementation of tasks.

e. Program and Ideas: The purpose and subject matter that is at the core of the organization's reason for existence.

f. Status: How the organization is regarded by its many "publics."

16. Did the stereotyped "Texan" attitude of independence play a significant role in the separation from MENC?

17. With the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, did TMEA make (1) a poor decision, (2) an adequate decision, (3) a good decision, (4) the best decision for its own future?

18. Now that you can view the results of your participation in this landmark event, would you "go back" and make the same decisions, or different ones?
APPENDIX E

LIST OF TAPE RECORDED INTERVIEWS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TAPE RECORDED INTERVIEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Raymond Bynum, November 30, 1988, his home, Abilene, Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bill Cormack, November 22, 1988, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Weldon Covington, November 22, 1988, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Robert Fielder, November 14, 1988, his home, Plano, Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Robert Maddox, December 8, 1988, his home, Odessa, Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>David McGuire, November 8, 1988, University of North Texas Campus, Denton, Texas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Winston Savage, November 22, 1988, TMEA Headquarters, Austin, Texas.

APPENDIX F

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD CLEARANCE
July 1, 1988

Ross Grant
912 Eagle
DeSoto, TX

Dear Mr. Grant:

Your proposal, "Texas Music Educators Association: A Historical Study of Decisions Surrounding Selected Landmark Events Between 1938 and 1980" has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board and has been approved under the Exemption Category Rules #3 and 6. Your project is exempt from further review under 45 CFR 46.101.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (817) 565-3946.

Good luck on your project.

Sincerely,

Peter Witt
Chairman
Institutional Review Board

SL/s
APPENDIX G

TEXAS BAND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

CODE OF ETHICS
To be a member of the Texas Band Teachers' Association, Inc., one must consider himself to be, primarily, a teacher of music and of wind and percussion instruments. Other vocations or side lines, especially that of selling musical instruments or merchandise, should be considered subordinate, except where one is regularly employed by a music house and has a fixed location. The practice of temporarily locating as a band teacher but ostensibly to sell musical instruments is condemned by this Association.

In cases wherein a band teacher accepts a commission on the sale of musical merchandise, it is unethical to give that commission or a part of it to the purchaser.

A member owes it as a duty to this organization to reserve a reasonable amount of time for serious study in order to keep abreast of current development in music and bands, in keeping with the second object of the Association, which is better bands.

The band teacher should set a high moral standard of speech and conduct. He should be scrupulous in the prompt payment of bills, and careful in the incurring of financial obligations. (If we do not pay our own bills, we cannot expect our pupils to pay us.)

It is unethical for a band teacher to break his contract, whether it be in writing or whether it be oral or verbal, with an institution or community.

It is unethical for a band teacher to take sides with factions in his band or community.

It is unethical for a band teacher to make overtures to or consider overtures from a community, fraternal organization or an institution whose band teacher has not signified his intention of resigning or leaving.

It is unethical for a band teacher to speak ill of the character, ability or work of another band teacher, especially of his predecessor or successor. It is the duty of a member, however, in flagrant cases of unethical conduct, to bring the matter before the proper body.

As members of the same profession, the relation between band teachers should be one of frankness and co-operation.

It is encouraged that the band teacher associate himself with some local civic organization.
APPENDIX H

CHARTERS AND CONSTITUTIONS: 1925-1987
TEXAS BAND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION CHARTER 1925

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Austin
# 42922

THE STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF GRAYSON

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That we, the undersigned citizens of Grayson County, Texas, under the provisions of the revised statutes of the State of Texas do hereby form and incorporate ourselves into a voluntary association for the purposes of the promotion and betterment of municipal bands in the State of Texas and to that end we hereby adopt and subscribe the following:

CHARTER

Article 1: This Association shall be known and designated as the TEXAS BAND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION and by which name it shall contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued and transact all of its business.

Article 2: This Association is formed for the purpose of promotion of music and other fine arts and betterment of municipal bands in the State of Texas.

Article 3: The place of business of the Association shall be the City of Sherman, Grayson County, Texas, which shall be its principal office.

Article 4: Said Association shall exist for a term of 50 years.

Article 5: The business of the Association shall be transacted by the Board of Directors who shall be elected by the Association for two years, the officers and incorporators of this Association
are as follows:

E.A. Lightfoot, President, Sherman, Texas
G.C. Collum, Secretary & Treasurer, Stamford, Texas
J.D. Buster, General Attorney, Sherman, Texas

Article 6: The Board of Directors of said Association are as follows:

E.A. Lightfoot, Sherman, Texas
Bruce McQuaide, Cross Plains, Texas
C.E. King, Weatherford, Texas
H.G. Hunnewell, Stevensville, Texas
R.E. Frazier, Breckenridge, Texas
Ralph N. Beck, Midlothian, Texas
Joel O. Tremble, Corsicana, Texas
J.D. Buster, Sherman, Texas
G.C. Collum, Stamford, Texas

Article 7: That said Association is not organized for profit and that it has no capital stock; that it does not own any goods, chattels, lands, rights or credits.

Article 8: The officers of said Texas Band Teachers Association which are now acting and will desire to act under said charter are as follows:

E.A. Lightfoot, President, Sherman, Texas
R.E. Frazier, First Vice President, Breckenridge, Texas
Bruce McQuaide, Second Vice President, Cross Plains, Texas
Ralph N. Beck, Third Vice President, Midlothian, Texas
G.C. Collum, Secretary Treasurer, Stamford, Texas
J.D. Buster, General Attorney, Sherman, Texas.
IN TESTIMONY whereof witness our signatures this the 16th day of January, A.D., 1925.

E.A. Lightfoot,
G.C. Collum by E.A. Lightfoot
J.D. Buster

THE STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF GRAYSON

Before me the undersigned authority on this day personally appeared E.A. Lightfoot, J.D. Buster and G.C. Collum by E.A. Lightfoot, known to me to be the persons whose names are subscribed to the foregoing instrument and severally acknowledge to me that they executed the same for the purposes and consideration therein expressed.

In testimony whereof, I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of my office this the 16th day of January, A.D., 1925.

(SEAL)

G.B. Ray
Notary Public in and for Grayson County, Texas.

ENDORSED: FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF STATE THIS 19 DAY OF JAN., 1925

Henry Hutchings, Secretary of State.
That we, Ward G. Brandstetter of Anderson County, Texas, Russell E. Shrader of Nolan County, Texas, and Paul M. Riley of Kleberg County, Texas, all citizens of the State of Texas, under and by virtue of the laws of this State do hereby voluntarily associate ourselves together for the purpose of forming a private corporation, under the terms and conditions herein set out as follows:

I.
The name of this corporation is The Texas Music Educators Association, by which name it shall contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, transact all of its business, and own such property as is necessary to carry out its purpose as set out herein below.

II.
The purpose for which it is formed is: (a) The promotion of music education; (b) The maintenance of a co-operative relationship with the State Department of Education for the development of a better program of music education in Texas; (c) To maintain a co-operative relationship with other music education associations.

III.
The place of business of this Association shall be the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, which shall be its principal office.

IV.
The term for which this corporation is to exist is fifty years.
The officers of this Association are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Ward G. Brandstetter</td>
<td>Palestine, Anderson County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st V. President</td>
<td>Charles S. Eskridge</td>
<td>Wink, Winkler County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd V. President</td>
<td>Julian P. Blitz</td>
<td>Lubbock, Lubbock County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd V. President</td>
<td>Miss Cobby de Stivers</td>
<td>Waco, McLennan County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Russell E. Shrader</td>
<td>Sweetwater, Nolan County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Weldon Covington</td>
<td>Austin, Travis County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of the Directors of this corporation shall be twenty-four and the names and residences of the Directors for the first year are as follows:

Charles S. Eskridge                           Wink, Winkler County.
J. Richard Walker                             Borger, Hutchinson County.
Russell E. Shrader                             Sweetwater, Nolan County.
Dean Shank                                     Mexia, Limestone County.
Ward G. Brandstetter                          Palestine, Anderson County.
Weldon Covington                              Austin, Travis County.
Sam Ezell                                      Taft, San Patricio County.
C. R. Hackney                                 Huntville, Walker County.
Julien P. Blitz                               Lubbock, Lubbock County.
W. Gibson Walters                             Denton, Denton County.
W. J. Hurst                                    Texarkana, Bowie County.
Jerome Zoeller                                 San Antonio, Bex County.
Terry Ferrell                                 Corpus Christi, Nueces County.
Jacques Nance                                  Iraan, Pecos County.
Glen Johnson                                   El Paso, El Paso County.
Charles Lindsey                               Houston, Harris County.
Miss Cobby de Stivers                         Waco, McLennan County.
Miss Beulah Dunn
J. Clark Rhodes
Paul M. Riley
James E. Green
Mary Shofer
Roy Johnson
Buel Porter

Lubbock, Lubbock County.
San Angelo, Tom Green County.
Kingsville, Kleberg County.
Austin, Travis County.
Wink, Winkler County.
Commerce, Hunt County.
Bryan, Brazos County.

VII.

This corporation is not organized for profit; it
has no capital stock; and it does not own any goods, chattels,
lands, rights or credits.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF we hereunto sign our names

this 23rd day of July, 1938, at Austin in Travis County,
Texas.

[Signatures]

THE STATE OF TEXAS:
COUNTY OF TRAVIS:

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day
personally appeared Ward G. Brandstetter, Russell K. Shrader,
and Paul M. Riley, known to me to be the persons whose names
are subscribed to the foregoing instrument, and they each
acknowledged to me that he executed the same for the pur-
poses and consideration therein expressed.

To certify which, witness my hand and seal of
office this the 23rd day of July, 1938.

[Notary Seal]

Notary Public in and for Travis
County, Texas.
74104
NO. ............... 

CHARTER OF
THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATORS
ASSOCIATION ............

AUSTIN, TEXAS

Capital Stock .... $ None
Filing Fee ......... $ 10.00
Franchise ......... $
Remarks: ........................................

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF STATE

THE 15th DAY OF October, 1938

EXEMPT
Constitution of the
TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION
Adopted at
Galveston Convention-Clinic, Feb. 1942

PREAMBLE
We, the Music Educators of Texas, in order to form a more coherent mutual cooperative association to sponsor good music, to teach good music, to increase appreciation for good music, to promote the general welfare of music, and to bring the universal benefits of music to ourselves and to others do approve and establish this Constitution:

ARTICLE I. GENERAL ORGANIZATION:
Section 1. Name, purpose, etc.
 a. The name of this organization shall be the Texas Music Educators Association (hereafter referred to as the Association).

 b. The object of this association shall be to promote music education in Texas through the mutual cooperation and close association of the various groups and individuals interested and engaged in teaching music.

c. The Association shall maintain a cooperative relationship with the State Department of Education, with the State and National Educational Associations, and through the medium of its cooperative affiliation with the Music Educators National Conference, shall maintain a cooperative relationship with other State Music educational Associations, National School Band, Orchestra, and Vocal Associations.
Section 2. Membership.

a. Any person actively engaged in Music Education may become an active member of this Association upon the payment of the prescribed dues. Active members whose dues are fully paid shall have the privilege of voting. Only active members who are employed by schools, colleges, or other recognized educational institutions may be elected to any office of this Association save that of Secretary-Treasurer.

b. Any student of music or music lover desiring to become associated with this organization may become an associate member upon payment of the prescribed dues. Associate members may attend meetings and participate in the activities of the organization as auditor, but shall not have the right to vote or hold office.

c. Any firm or institution desiring to contribute to the support of the educational activities of this organization may become a sustaining member upon payment of the prescribed dues. Sustaining membership shall entitle any person from the firm or institution to the rights and privileges of associate membership.

Section 3. Dues.

a. Dues for active members shall be three dollars ($3.00) per calendar year, payable September first (1st).

b. Associate membership dues shall be one dollar and fifty cents ($1.50) per calendar year.

c. Dues for sustaining members shall be ten dollars ($10.00) per calendar year. The foregoing fee will entitle sustaining
members to a complete roster of the Texas Music Educators' Association, which shall be furnished to them by the Secretary.

d. The income from active and sustaining membership fees shall apply only toward the administrative expenses of the State organization. Expenses incurred by Contests, Festivals, etc., shall be provided for by registration or enrollment fees paid by the participating individuals and groups.

e. All competing schools shall pay a school membership fee of five dollars ($5.00) to the State Treasurer of the Texas Music Educators Association.

Section 4. Divisions.
The Association shall consist of 3 divisions; namely, the Band Division, the Orchestra Division, and the Vocal Division.

ARTICLE 9. THE STATE CONVENTION

Ultimate governing authority of the Association shall be exercised by a State Convention, which shall meet annually. The dates, time, and place for the annual convention and general meetings of the divisional groups shall be fixed by the State Board of Directors.

General business of the Association shall be transacted at a general meeting of the convention and special business pertaining to the particular divisions shall be transacted at divisional meetings of the Convention. The General Convention shall be presided over by the president, and the divisional meetings shall be presided over by the State divisional chairman.

All matters relative to a change in policy shall be brought before the membership in general session at the Annual Convention.
ARTICLE #. STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1. Organization:
The government of this Association shall be vested in a State Board of Directors, composed of 30 members. Three members shall be chosen from each of the 9 regions into which the state is divided, as provided in Article 6; and the remaining 3 members shall consist of the State Band Chairman, the State Orchestra Chairman and the State Vocal Chairman. The band, orchestra and vocal representatives of the several regions shall comprise respectively the band, orchestra, and vocal divisions of the Board of Directors, each division having as its chairman the Vice-President, as designated in Article 4.

Section 2. Powers:
The State Board of Directors shall function as a general governing body in all matters pertaining to the affairs of the Association. The Board of Directors shall have the authority to decide on general questions of policy within the limits prescribed by this constitution.

The State Board of Directors shall have the authority to fix dues; to set the annual registration fees for the Convention Clinic; to borrow money; to pay debts; to make laws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of T.M.E.A. affairs; to regulate and supervise all matters pertaining to the Region and State competition Festivals and Contests; to provide for State finals in Music events when the best interests of Music education would be served; to designate cities for State Finals; to Prescribe Contest Music; to fix uniform trophies and awards; to make rules for the government and regulations of all contests within the State; to
approve all Contests, Festivals, and Music Events; to carry out all
mandates and commissions passed by the membership in general
session; to make and enter into contracts; to make appropriations
for association expense; to set up a budget; to prescribe the
manner of voting and to designate the time, place and manner for
holding an election; to provide penalties for the violation of any
part of the Constitution, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the
T.M.E.A.; to provide for the common good and general welfare of
Music Education in Texas.

Section 3. Meetings:
Meetings of the State Board of Directors shall be held during
the month of November. Also meetings may be called by the president
at his discretion or shall be called by the Secretary upon written
request of not fewer than 10 members of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE 4

Section 1. State Executive Board:
a. The executive authority of the affairs of the State
Association shall be vested in the "State Executive Board." The
State Executive Board shall consist of the president of the
Association together with the 3 vice-presidents. All action of this
board not specifically authorized by the constitution shall be
subject to the approval of the Board of Directors.
b. A quorum for conduction of business by the State Board of
Directors shall consist of not less than 4/3 of the members of the
board and shall consist of representatives from 2/3 of the regions.
Furthermore 1/3 of those present shall represent at least 3
component divisions of the Association.
c. The executive authority not defined, not delegated, nor
prohibited herein, is reserved to the State Executive Board.

Section 2. The President:
   a. The president shall be elected by secret ballot after nomination from the floor in a general business session of all the divisions of the Association at the annual state meeting. The president shall take office on June 1 of the same year.
   b. To be qualified for president, a person shall be an active member in the Association and shall have been teaching in the schools of Texas for a period of six years or more at the time of his election.
   c. The president shall serve a term of 1 year until his successor shall have been elected and installed.
   d. The president shall preside during all meetings of the State Association Conventions and during all meetings of the State Board of Directors and during all meetings of the State Executive Board. In case of the absence of the president, the order of the presiding officer shall be as designated in Article 4, Section 4, of this constitution.
   e. The State Executive Board may be called together by the president at his discretion or shall be called by the secretary upon written request of a majority of the members of the board.
   f. The president by and with the consent of the State Board of Directors shall have the power to appoint standing and special committees, nominate delegates, and designate official representatives, provided a majority of the Board of Directors concur.

Section 3. The Vice-President:
   a. There shall be three vice-presidents of the Association
namely, The State Band Chairman, The State Orchestra Chairman, and The State Vocal Chairman.

b. These 3 vice-presidents shall be elected by their respective divisions by secret ballot after nomination from the floor at a business session of the division.

Section 4. Succession:
The absence of the president, or in case of vacancy in the office for any reason, the order of succession shall be (1) the Band Chairman; (2) the Orchestra Chairman; (3) the Vocal Chairman; (4) the Secretary-Treasurer.

ARTICLE %. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Section I. Appointment and Duties:
The Secretary-Treasurer, who shall hold office during the term of one year, shall be appointed by the Board of Directors. The Secretary-Treasurer shall keep an accurate record of the membership; collect dues; collect accounts when due and payable; issue checks in payment of authorized accounts; deposit the funds of the Association in a depository approved by the Board of Directors; keep an accurate and true account of all money received and paid out by him in the execution of his official duties; publish in the official magazine or bulletin, before the end of each fiscal year, or at such times as called for by the President, an audited account of the Association's finances; keep the minutes of the annual general Convention; keep the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Directors; keep the minutes for the meetings of the State Executive Board; be custodian of all joint and separate funds and of all property assigned to his office; and otherwise attend to the customary duties of his office.
Section 2. The Secretary-Treasurer's bond, which shall be in the amount not less than the total money received annually by his office, shall be approved by the Board of Directors. The duration of the bond shall be for the term of one year and the expense of executing this bond shall be paid by the Association.

Section 3. All disbursements, not in consequence of appropriations already made, shall first be approved by the President.

Section 4. The Secretary-Treasurer shall receive, for faithful services rendered, a compensation which shall be fixed by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE 6. REGIONS
(Regional set-up, authority, powers and Duties)

Section 1. REGIONAL UNITS.
a. The State shall be divided into Regions, corresponding so far as feasible, the regional units of the Interscholastic League. Annual meetings of the Regions shall be held after Sept. 1, and before November 1, of each year. Special meetings shall be be called by the Chairman of the Region Executive Committee with the approval of, or upon the request of, not less than 10 members of the Region.
b. A quorum for the Regional Meeting shall consist of one-fifth of the members in good standing in that particular Region.

SECTION 2. THE REGIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
a. Each Region, at its annual Fall meeting, shall elect to the Regional Executive Committee the following (1) Band Chairman (2) Orchestra Chairman (3) Vocal Chairman.
b. The Regional Executive Committee shall be composed of the three officers listed under (a) of Article 6, Section 2, plus the following:
THREE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS.
THESE ADMINISTRATORS SHALL BE ELECTED OR APPOINTED BY THE ADMINISTRATORS THEMSELVES FROM WITHIN THE REGION.

(1) THE THREE T.M.E.A. MEMBERS AND THE THREE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS SHALL ELECT ONE OF THEIR GROUP TO SERVE AS REGION CHAIRMAN. THE CHAIRMAN SHALL BE ADMINISTRATIVE HEAD OF THE REGIONAL ACTIVITIES OF ALL KINDS.

(2) All Regional Officers shall hold office for one year, and shall take office immediately upon election.

ARTICLE 6. REGIONS. Continued

c. The Regional Executive Committee may, at its discretion, appoint special committees to serve within the Region; may elect or appoint a secretary-treasurer, or any other office that will help serve the Region.

d. A majority of the members of the COMMITTEE shall constitute a quorum for carrying on business.

Section 3. Representatives on the State Board:

The Chairman of the Band, Orchestra and Vocal divisions of the Region, shall serve on the State Board of Directors.

Section 4. General powers of the Regional Boards:

In all matters pertaining to their Regions, the powers not defined or prohibited to the Region, shall be left to the Region Executive Committee.

Section 5. VACANCIES

Vacancies in any Regional office shall be filled by a majority vote
of the Regional Executive Committee. Such appointment shall be for
the unexpired term, and shall continue only until the succeeding
Regional meeting shall have elected a successor.

Section 6. LIMITATION OF POWER OF THE REGIONS:
a. No Region, without the consent of the State Board of Directors,
shall impose a higher registration fee for competition-festivals
than that fixed by the State Board for all Regions.
b. No Region, or officer of the Region, shall enter into any agreement
or contract, which might impair the common interest and general
welfare of the competition-festivals, Clinics, and Music Education.

ARTICLE 7. RECOGNIZED EVENTS AND BULLETINS

Section 1. Annual Competition-Festivals may be held in each Region,
but these events shall be under the direction and supervision of
the REGION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Section 2. No Competition-Festival, Clinic or Contest, shall be
recognized as an official event until it has been approved by
the State Board of Directors.

Section 3. The location of the Regional Contests shall
be decided by vote of the Music Educators and School Administrators
in the Regular Region Meeting.

Section 4. The Board of Directors shall have the power to
designate the Music events which shall serve as the State
Finals, or the Regional National Competition Festival.

Section 5. The Finance Chairman of each Region shall furnish
the State Secretary-Treasurer with a detailed report on the money
received and disbursed for Region Competition-Festival or Contest
purposes; on the number of soloists participating; on the number of small ensembles taking part; on the number of organizations participating; other pertinent information.

Section 6. No person who is active in the field of Music Education, shall be allowed to take part in or enter any pupil in the approved Contests, Competition-Festivals, Clinics or other events of the T.M.E.A. unless his or her dues for the current year are fully paid.

Section 7. It shall be the duty of the Chairman for each Region to enforce the provisions of Section 6 provided that the Events take place within his Region.

Section 8. Responsibility for the planning and execution of the annual Convention-Clinic Program for each of the Component State Divisions shall be vested in the State Division Chairmen. It shall be their duty to recommend Clinic conductors, the types of Clinic programs and special educational features pertinent to their division. A composite program shall be arranged, under the supervision of the State Executive Board, which shall have a general degree of equality and consideration of merit alike for all Divisions.

Section 9. The National Bulletin for Competition-Festivals and Contests as amended and published from year to year, by the National School Band, Orchestra, and Vocal Associations, is hereby made a part of the Rules and Regulations by which the various Regions of the T.M.E.A. shall operate their Contests.

Section 10. Any exceptions made to the classification of
schools as set out by the National Bulletin must first have the approval of the State Board of Directors.

Section 11. The T.M.E.A. Bulletin of latest issue, together with the Contest Rules and Regulations amended and passed upon from year to year by the Board of Directors is hereby made a part of this Constitution and By-Laws.

ARTICLE 8. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 1. Suspension:
The Board of Directors of this Association shall have the power to suspend from membership any member who violates any part of the Constitution, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations.

Section 2. Removal:
The Board of Directors of this Association shall have the power to remove from office any officer who violates any part of the Constitution, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations, or any officer who fails to enforce the provisions thereof.

Section 3. Oath of Office:
Before beginning the execution of official duties, all officers shall be required to take the following oath or affirmation:
"I (name) fully realizing the dignity attendant upon my office, and responsibility involved as (office) do promise to carry out the duties of this office faithfully and fairly to the best of my ability until my successor has been duly elected and installed. I furthermore promise to uphold the Constitution, By-Laws, Rules and Regulations and to serve as an official in the Texas Music Educators Association always working for the advancement of Music Education in Texas."

(This oath may be administered by any member in good standing.)
ARTICLE 9. AMENDMENTS:

Section 1. This Constitution may be amended at any annual meeting of the State Convention at a general business session by a two-thirds vote of the active members present.
APPENDIX TO VOLUME IV

CONSTITUTION
Adopted and Amended at the
ANNUAL CLINIC CONVENTION
Galveston, February 19-21, 1959

PREAMBLE

We, The Music Educators of Texas, in order to form a coherent mutual co-
operative association to sponsor good music, to teach good music, to increase
appreciation for good music, to promote the welfare of music, and to bring the
universal benefits of music to ourselves and to others, do approve and establish
this constitution.

ARTICLE I
GENERAL ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. Name
The name of this organization shall be the TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATORS' ASO-
CIATION, herein referred to as the TMEA

SECTION 2. Objectives
The purposes and objectives of the TMEA shall be:
To promote the advancement of music education;
To promote interest in music education;
To strengthen the professional standing of music education;
To promote the seven cardinal principles of education: Health,
Command of Fundamental Processes, Worthy Home Membership,
Citizenship, Vocation, Worthy Use of Leisure Time, Ethical
Character.

SECTION 3. Relationships.
A close cooperative relationship shall be maintained with state agencies
set up for the purpose of developing and aiding music education.

The TMEA shall act as the Music Section of the TSTA and maintain a close
working affiliation with the T.S.T.A.

An affiliation shall be maintained with the Music Educators' National
Conference and its Southwestern Division

SECTION 4. Membership

ACTIVE
Membership of any kind shall be limited to white persons only. Any per-
son actively engaged in teaching or supervising some phase of music education
shall become an active member upon payment of the prescribed dues. Active
members shall have the privilege of voting. Only active members may be elected
to office, excepting the office of Executive Secretary.
ASSOCIATE

Any person interested in music or music education may become an associate member upon payment of the prescribed dues. Associate members may attend meetings and participate in the activities of the TMEA as auditors, but shall not have the right to vote or hold office.

STUDENT

Any high school student or college student of music may obtain a student membership upon paying the prescribed dues. A student membership shall carry the privileges of associate membership.

SUSTAINING

Any firm, business, or company may become a sustaining member upon payment of the prescribed dues. Sustaining membership shall entitle the firm, business or company to the rights and privileges of associate membership together with a complete list of the TMEA members.

SCHOOL, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY

Schools, colleges, or universities located in Texas may become institutional members upon payment of the prescribed dues. Institutional membership shall carry the rights and privileges of associate membership.

SECTION 5. Dues

All membership dues shall be payable in advance.

Membership year shall be September 1 to August 31.

The dues of any kind of membership shall be determined by the State Board of Directors. Dues shall be fixed on a school year basis in amounts sufficient and ample to maintain a balanced budget for administrative expenses including a subscription for each membership to the Southwestern Musician-Texas Music Educator.

DUES FOR:

Active membership not less than $4.00. NOTE: Now fixed at $10.00.
Associate membership not less than $4.00.
Student membership not less than $4.00.
School, College, University membership not less than $8.00. NOTE: Now fixed at $18.00.
Sustaining membership not less than $10.00. NOTE: now fixed at $25.00.

SECTION 6. Income from Dues

Money derived from dues shall be spent only for administrative expenses and official publications.

SECTION 7. Convention-Clinic Expense

Expenses incident to the annual Convention-Clinic shall be provided by registration fees and enrollment fees.
SECTION 8. State Music Divisions.

The Texas Music Educators' Association shall consist of five divisions: the Band Division, the Orchestra Division, the Vocal Division, the Elementary Division, and the College Division.

SECTION 9. Official Year

The official year shall begin immediately with the installation of State Officers and shall continue in effect for twelve calendar months, more or less, depending upon the meeting dates of the annual convention-clinic and the installation of newly elected State Officers, next following.

ARTICLE II

THE STATE CONVENTION

SECTION 1. Ultimate Governing authority shall be exercised by the state convention which shall meet annually. The dates, time, and place for the annual convention, together with the general business meetings of the TMEA; and the state divisions' business meetings, shall be fixed by the Executive Board.

SECTION 2. Agenda of Business

General Business, for consideration of the convention in session, shall be submitted to the Agenda Committee not less than three hours in advance of the general business session.

Business peculiar to or pertaining to the affairs and interests of a particular Music Division shall be transacted at the Divisional business meetings.

SECTION 3. All matters relative to a change in policy shall be brought before the State Board of Directors.

SECTION 4. A decision of the State Board of Directors may be appealed to the Convention in business session.

ARTICLE III

THE STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SECTION 1. The government of the TMEA shall be vested in a State Board of Directors composed of the Region Chairman; the Region Vice-Chairman; and the Region Secretary-Treasurer from the established regions of Texas together with the State Chairman for each of the State Music Divisions, the State President, the Immediate Past President, and the State Executive Secretary.

SECTION 2. Duties.

The State Board of Directors shall function as a general governing body in all matters pertaining to the affairs of the TMEA and shall have authority to decide on questions of policy within the limits prescribed by the constitution,
to fix dues, to set the registration fees and enrollment fees for the annual
convention-clinic, to borrow money, to pay debts, to make rules and regulations
governing the conduct of TMEA affairs, to regulate and supervise all matters
pertaining to TMEA sponsored Music for Marching events, to set up Music Festi-
vals and Music Clinics when the best interest of Music Education will be served,
to approve all music Contest Festivals, and other music events where the in-
terests of the TMEA or its members are concerned, to carry out all mandates or
commissions passed by the membership in general session, to make and enter into
contracts, to make appropriations for TMEA expenses, to set up a budget, to
prescribe the manner of voting, and to designate the time, place and manner for
holding elections, to provide penalties for the violation of any Rule or Regu-
lation of any part of the Constitution and By-Laws, to interpret the Constitu-
tion and By-Laws, to install officers, to designate official publications, to
fix Region boundaries, to provide for the common good and general welfare of
Music Education in Texas.

SECTION 3. Suspension of Members.

The State Board of Directors shall have the authority and the power to
suspend from membership any member who violates any part of the Constitution,
the By-Laws, the Rules, or Regulations.

SECTION 4. The State Board of Directors shall have the authority to deny mem-
bership to any applicant.

SECTION 5. The State Board of Directors shall have the authority and the power
to remove from office any State Officer or any Region Officer who violates any
part of the Constitution, the By-Laws, the Rules, the Regulations; or, who
fails to enforce the provisions thereof.

SECTION 6. Quorum.

A quorum for conducting official business by the State Board of Directors
shall consist of not fewer than one-third of the duly elected members; and,
shall consist of representaives from not less than one-third of the Regions.
Furthermore, one-third of those present shall represent at least three com-
ponent divisions of the TMEA.

SECTION 7. Meetings.

The annual meeting of the State Board of Directors shall be held during
the time of the annual convention-clinic. Meetings may be called by the State
President, or by the State Executive Secretary upon written request of twenty
members of the State Board of Directors.

ARTICLE IV
THE STATE EXECUTIVE BOARD

SECTION 1. The State Executive Board shall consist of the State President,
the immediate Past-President, the State Vice-Presidents, and the State Execu-
tive Secretary.
SECTION 2. The Executive Board shall have authority to pass upon all matters referred to them by the convention in general session, by the President; and, by the State Board of Directors.

SECTION 3. The State Executive Board shall have the authority to appoint the State Executive Secretary, to fix bond for the State Executive Secretary, and to set forth specifically his duties, which duties shall be in accord with the general provisions of ARTICLE VIII of the Constitution.

SECTION 4. A majority of the members of the Executive Board shall constitute a quorum for conducting official business.

SECTION 5. The executive authority not defined, not delegated, nor prohibited herein is reserved to the Executive Board.

ARTICLE V

THE PRESIDENT

The President shall hold office during the term of one official year. The time, place, and manner of voting for President shall be prescribed by the State Board of Directors. (See Article XIV, Section 1, Article XVI, Sec. 9)

To be eligible for election to the office of President a person shall be an active member in good standing; and, shall have taught music or supervised some phase of Music Education in Texas for a continuous period of time not less than six years immediately prior to the election date. Military service may be counted if served after becoming a TMEA member.

The President shall have the authority to appoint special committees, standing committees, and, with the approval of the State Executive Board, shall have the authority to fill any vacancy that may occur in the State Division offices—the appointee to serve until the next regular convention of the association.

The President shall preside at business meetings of the annual convention-clinic, the State Board of Directors; and, the State Executive Board. (Note: Also see Article IX, Sec. 8)

ARTICLE VI

DIVISION CHAIRMEN-VICE-PRESIDENTS

SECTION 1. Each State Music Division shall elect a chairman who shall hold office during the term of two years.

SECTION 2. Each State Division Chairman shall hold office as Vice-President. The term of office for Division Chairman and for Vice-President shall run concurrently.
SECTION 3. Each State Division Chairman-Vice-President shall be a member of the State Executive Board, and the State Board of Directors.

ELECTION TO OFFICE—Time of Election

SECTION 4. Elections for Chairman of the Band Division, for Chairman of Vocal Division, and for Chairman of the College Division shall be held during the years ending with 0,2,4,6,8.

Elections for Chairman of the Orchestra Division, for Chairman of the Elementary Division, shall be held during the years ending with 1,3,5,7,9.

ARTICLE VII
SUCCESSION IN OFFICE

During the absence of the President or in case of vacancy in the presiden- tial office for any reason, the order of succession shall be: (1) the Band Division Chairman, (2) the Orchestra Division Chairman, (3) the Vocal Division Chairman, (4) the Elementary Division Chairman, (5) the College Division Chairman, (6) the Executive Secretary.

ARTICLE VIII
DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

SECTION 1. Appointment and Duties.

The Executive Secretary, who shall hold office during a period of time designated by the Board, shall be appointed by the State Executive Board. The Executive Secretary shall keep an accurate record of the membership; collect dues; collect accounts when due and payable; issue checks in payment of authorized accounts; deposit the funds of the TMEA in a depository approved by the Board of Directors; keep an accurate and true account of all money received and paid out by him in the execution of his official duties; publish in the official magazine or bulletin, before the end of each fiscal year, or at such times as called for by the President, an audited account of the TMEA finances; keep the minutes of the annual general convention; keep the minutes of the meeting of the State Board of Directors; keep the minutes of the meetings of the State Executive Board; be custodian of all joint and separate funds and of all property assigned to his office; and otherwise attend to the customary duties of his office. The Executive Secretary shall also serve as Editor-Manager of the magazine (Southwestern Musician - Texas Music Educator), and shall be coordinator of Exhibits for the Convention-Clinic.

SECTION 2. The Executive Secretary’s bond, which shall be in the amount not less than the total money received annually by his office, shall be approved by the Board of Directors. The duration of the bond shall be for the term of one year and the expense of executing this bond shall be paid by the TMEA.
SECTION 3. All disbursements, not in consequence of appropriations already made, shall first be approved by the President.

SECTION 4. The Executive Secretary shall receive, for faithful service rendered, a compensation which shall be fixed by the State Executive Board.

ARTICLE IX
THE REGIONS

Texas shall be divided into Regions as fixed and determined by the State Board of Directors of TMEA and the director of Music Activities of the University Interscholastic League.

1. Each Region shall elect a Region Chairman, a Region Vice-Chairman, and a Region Secretary-Treasurer.

2. All Region officers shall hold office during the term of one year.

3. Region elections shall be held before the dates of the annual TMEA convention-clinic.

4. Region meetings may be called by the Region Chairman or by the Region Secretary-Treasurer upon written request of ten members of the Region, and in good standing.

5. A quorum for conducting official business at Region Meetings shall be one-fifth of the Region members in good standing.

6. The powers and authority not defined nor prohibited shall be left to the Regions.

7. No Region or Region officer shall enter into any agreement, contract, or bargain which might impair the general welfare and common good of Music Education; or, in the general interest of the TMEA or any of its members.

8. Vacancies in the Region office shall be filled by the TMEA President; but such appointment shall be for the unexpired time of the office term or until the Region can meet and elect a successor.

ARTICLE X
THE CONVENTION CLINIC

1. The Executive Board shall have the authority to designate and to approve the types, kinds and numbers of musical organizations, music classes, and educational features which shall comprise the annual convention-clinic program.
2. Under the direction of the President, the Executive Board shall arrange and carry out a composite program which shall have a general degree of equality, merit and consideration alike for the Music Divisions represented.

3. The Division Chairmen shall keep expenditures within the allotted budget allowed for their Division; they shall recommend clinic conductors and class conductors; and shall be responsible for the planning and the execution of their Division program.

CONVENTION-CLINIC REVENUE

4. All convention-clinic money derived from membership fees, registration, student registration fees, advertising displays; or, from any source shall be paid to the State Executive Secretary.

ARTICLE XI

The Southwestern Musician-Texas Music Educator shall be the official publication. Official notices, rules, and regulations as amended and passed upon from year to year by the convention and by the State Board of Directors, shall appear in the Southwestern Musician-Texas Music Educator, and is hereby made a part of this Constitution and By-Laws.

ARTICLE XII

THE OATH OF OFFICE

1. Before beginning the execution of official duties, all officers, both Region and State, shall be required to take the following oath or affirmation:

"I (Please repeat your full name) realizing the dignity attendant upon my office and the responsibility involved as (please state the office for which you were elected) do promise to carry out the duties of this office to the best of my ability until my successor has been duly elected and installed. I, furthermore, promise to uphold the Constitution and By-Laws, Rules and Regulations and to serve faithfully as an officer of the TMEA, always working for the advancement of Music Education in Texas.

2. The oath of office may be administered by any member in good standing.

3. All officers shall be installed at the meeting of the State Board of Directors during the annual convention-clinic.

ARTICLE XIII

AMENDMENTS

1. The Constitution and By-Laws may be amended at any annual meeting of the State Convention in general business session by a two-thirds majority.
vote of all active members present in good standing.

2. No ex post facto amendment shall be passed.

ARTICLE XIV
VOTING - NOMINATING - ELECTIONS - VACANCIES

Only active members in good standing shall have the right to vote and to hold office, save that of State Executive Secretary.

A majority of votes cast shall be necessary for election of office.

1. Nominating the President.
   The President shall be nominated by secret ballot. Active members upon full payment of the annual dues and the annual convention-clinic registration fees, shall be given a nominating ballot. The two persons receiving the highest number of votes shall be nominees for the office of President.

2. Election of the President.
The President shall be elected by secret ballot. Active members, upon full payment of the annual dues and the annual convention-clinic registration fees shall be given a ballot.

3. State Music Division Chairman-Vice Presidents.
   Nominations shall be made from the floor during a business session of the Division. The Division Chairmen shall be elected by secret ballots provided by the State Executive Secretary upon full payment of the annual dues and the annual convention-clinic registration fees.

4. Region Officers.
   Region officers shall be nominated from the floor during a business session of the Region. The manner of voting shall be left to the Region.

ARTICLE XV
VACANCY IN OFFICE

In case of vacancy, the appointment, or the succession, or the election to any office shall be for the duration of the unexpired time of the regular term only.

ARTICLE XVI
COMMITTEES

The President shall have the authority to appoint both the Special and the Standing Committees.

The Special Committees and the Standing Committees shall consist of three or more active members who shall serve during the term of one official year.

The President is an ex-officio member of all committees.
STANDING COMMITTEES

1. Ways and Means. The duties of this committee shall be to recommend methods, ways and means of achieving the purposes and ideals of the TMEA.

2. Publicity. The duties of this committee shall be to get news and information to periodicals and publications relating to clinics, festivals, concerts, special music events; and, other pertinent information concerning the activities of the TMEA, its Regions and its members.

3. Music Education. The duties of this committee shall be to advise and to counsel with authorities of the Interscholastic League in matters pertaining to the School Music Competition Festivals.

4. Membership. The duties of this committee shall be to interest and to encourage music teachers, music educators, and music supervisors in becoming active members; to invite all persons interested in Music Education to become associate members; to interest and encourage music students in Texas schools, colleges and universities in becoming members; and, to solicit music houses, music firms, instrument dealers and manufacturers to become members in their respective categories.

5. Hospitality. The duties of this committee shall be to develop a spirit of good will and friendliness among members and guests; to greet and to receive guests and members at convention meetings.

6. Resolutions. The duties of this committee shall be to put in writing for record the acknowledgment, gratitude, and appreciation on behalf of the TMEA of all favors, courtesies, compliments, extra work, time and efforts and valued assistance provided by either members or friends.

7. Public Relations. The duties of this committee shall be to create good opinion, fine respect, genuine esteem and state-wide interest in the TMEA and its program of Music Education.

8. Agenda. The duties of this committee shall be to recommend the agenda of business to be brought before the convention in business session. All items of business shall be submitted in writing to the Agenda Committee not less than three hours immediately prior to the time fixed for the convention business session.

9. Ballot--

Nominating the President

It shall be the duty of the Ballot Committee to receive the secret ballots cast for nomination of the President; to make an accurate count of all
valid ballots cast by active members only; and, to certify to the convention the names of the two persons receiving the highest number of votes.

Electing the President

It shall be the duty of the Ballot Committee to receive the secret ballots cast for election of the President; to make an accurate count of all valid ballots cast by active members only; and, to certify to the Convention in business session the name of the person receiving the highest number of votes.

ARTICLE XVII

SUGGESTED ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. The Convention
   Call to Order
   Reading and Approving the Minutes
   Report of the Agenda Committee
   Report of the Special Committees
   Report of the Standing Committees
   Old Business
   Unfinished Business
   New Business
   Good and Welfare
   Adjournment

2. The State Board of Directors
   Call to Order
   Installation of Officers
   Reading and Approving the Minutes
   Report of Special Committees
   Report of Standing Committees
   Old Business
   Unfinished Business
   Good and Welfare
   New Business
   Adjournment

3. The Executive Board
   Call to Order
   Reading and Approving the Minutes
   Committee Reports
   Old Business
   Unfinished Business
   Adjournment
The CONSTITUTION of the Texas Music Educators Association

We the Music Educators of Texas, in order to form a mutual cooperative Association whose purpose and objective shall be the advancement of music education, do approve and establish this Constitution and By-Laws for the Texas Music Educators Association, hereinafter referred to as TMEA. We pledge a cooperative relationship with other agencies which are set up for the purpose of developing and aiding music education.
1987 Constitution

Preamble

We, the Music Educators of Texas, in order to form a mutual cooperative Association whose purpose and objective shall be the advancement of music education, do approve and establish this Constitution and By-Laws for the Texas Music Educators Association, hereinafter referred to as TMEA. We pledge a cooperative relationship with other agencies which are set up for the purpose of developing and aiding music education.

Article I

MEMBERSHIP AND DUES

TMEA membership shall be defined in the following categories: Active, Retired, College Student, Institutional, Sustaining, Honorary Life and Booster, except as hereinafter provided in the By-Laws, dues for membership shall be determined by the State Board of Directors.

Article II

STATE GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. THE PRESIDENT. The presiding officer shall be the State President who shall assume office in a manner prescribed in the By-Laws. He shall be concurrently employed in an administrative or teaching capacity in the field of music and shall reside in the State of Texas.

SECTION 2. THE PRESIDENT-ELECT. When the President has completed his term of office as prescribed by the By-Laws, this officer shall ascend to the office of President. He shall be elected in a manner prescribed in the By-Laws, and shall concurrently be employed in an administrative or teaching capacity in the field of music and shall reside in the State of Texas.

SECTION 3. VICE-PRESIDENT · DIVISION-CHAIRMAN. The residing officer of each of the five Divisions shall be the Division Chairman who shall also serve as a Vice-President of TMEA. The Vice-President-Division-Chairman shall be elected as provided in the By-Laws. He shall be concurrently employed in an administrative or teaching capacity in the field of music and shall reside in the State of Texas.

SECTION 4. IMMEDIATE PAST-PRESIDENT. Upon completion of a term or terms of office, the State President of TMEA shall hold the office of Immediate Past-President. He shall be concurrently employed in an administrative or teaching capacity in the field of music and shall reside in the State of Texas.
SECTION 5. THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY. The execution of TMEA activities shall be vested in the office of Executive Director and Executive Secretary.

SECTION 6. STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. The State Executive Committee shall consist of the State President, the State President-Elect, five Vice-Presidents, the Immediate Past-President, the Executive Director and the Executive Secretary; the latter two to serve as non-voting members. The Executive Secretary shall act as the official secretary of the State Executive Committee. One representative of the University Interscholastic League and one representative of the Texas Education Agency may serve as ex-officio members.

SECTION 7. THE STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS. The State Board of Directors shall be composed of the State President, the State President-Elect, the five Vice-Presidents, the Immediate Past-President, and the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Secretary-Treasurer of each Region. The Executive Director and Executive Secretary shall serve as non-voting members. The Executive Secretary shall act as the official secretary of the State Board of Directors. One representative of the University Interscholastic League and one representative of the Texas Education Agency may serve as ex-officio members.

SECTION 8. DIVISIONS. TMEA shall be composed of five Divisions: Band, Orchestra, Vocal, Elementary, and College.

SECTION 9. THE COUNCIL OF PAST-PRESIDENTS. Upon completion of his term of office, each State President shall become a member of the Council of Past-Presidents.

SECTION 10. STANDING COMMITTEES. Standing Committees shall be: The Agenda Committee, Public Relations Committee, Advocacy Committee, Resolutions Committee and Elections Committee. Each committee shall consist of three (3) or more members who shall be appointed by the State President for the term of one year. The State President shall be an ex-officio member of all committees.

SECTION 11. ELECTIONS. Election of State officers shall be held in the manner prescribed in the By-Laws.

Article III

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. REGIONAL BOUNDARIES. Texas shall be divided into geographical sub-divisions called Regions to carry out TMEA objectives at the local level.

SECTION 2. REGION OFFICERS. Each Region shall elect a Region Chairman, Region Vice-Chairman, and a Region Secretary-Treasurer. At least two Divisions must be represented in these three offices. In addition, a Region Division Chairman for each Division represented within the Region shall be elected. All Region Officers will assume duties as set forth in the By-Laws.

SECTION 3. REGION STEERING COMMITTEE. The Region Steering Committee shall consist of the Region Officers.

SECTION 4. REGION MEETINGS. Each Region shall hold at least two meetings each year, one prior to October fifteenth and the other at the annual Convention-Clinic.

Article IV

FINANCES AND ASSETS

SECTION 1. RESPONSIBILITY. Except as provided in the By-Laws, fiscal responsibility for the operation of TMEA shall rest in the State Executive Committee.

SECTION 2. SPECIAL FUNDS. Special Funds shall be under the administration of the State Executive Committee subject to review by the State Board of Directors.

Article V

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION-CLINIC

SECTION 1. (a). TMEA's ULTIMATE AUTHORITY. The ultimate governing authority of TMEA shall be exercised by its membership in the Business Session at the annual Convention-Clinic. Decisions of the State Executive Committee and the State Board of Directors may be appealed to the general membership in the Business Session.

SECTION 1. (b). The dates, times, and place of the annual Convention-Clinic shall be fixed by the State Executive Committee.

SECTION 2. PROGRAMS. The State Executive Committee shall have authority to plan and execute educational activities, such as the presentation of musical organizations and classes at the annual Convention-Clinic.
ARTICLE VI
PUBLICATIONS
The State Executive Committee shall have full supervision and control of TMEA publications. It shall appoint a staff and prescribe the duties and compensation for such service.

ARTICLE VII
THE OATH OF OFFICE
Prior to assuming the duties of his office, each Regional and State Officer shall take the Oath of Office listed in Article VII of the By-Laws. Any Active TMEA Member may administer the Oath.

ARTICLE VIII
RULES OF ORDER
Roberts Rule of Order, Revised, shall be the authority whenever correct parliamentary procedures are required.

ARTICLE IX
AMENDMENTS
This Constitution may be amended by a vote of two-thirds of the voting members present at a Business Session of the annual Convention-Clinic. Written notice of proposed amendments shall be given by mail or shall appear in the official organ at least two weeks prior to the opening day of the annual Convention-Clinic.

By-Laws
ARTICLE I
MEMBERSHIP AND DUES
SECTION 1. ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP shall be open to any individual engaged in music activities or any person who wishes to support Music Education and the purpose of the Texas Music Educators Association. Payment of the prescribed state dues will allow the individual the following privileges: participation in TMEA activities, the right to vote and hold office; admittance to meetings upon compliance with registration requirements. Each member shall be entitled to receive ten consecutive issues of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR.

SECTION 2. HONORARY LIFE MEMBERSHIP shall be conferred by vote of the TMEA in recognition of distinguished service to music education. Nomination for Honorary Life Membership shall be approved by the Board of Directors. Honorary Life Members who qualify for Active Membership shall be extended the privileges of Active Membership without further payment of State dues. All members of the Council of Past Presidents shall be Honorary Life Members. Each member shall be entitled to receive ten consecutive issues of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR.

SECTION 3. COLLEGE STUDENT MEMBERSHIP shall be open to individual college students in Texas. College Student Membership, upon compliance with registration requirements, shall include the following privileges: admittance to TMEA meetings and the right to participate in the activities of the Student Section of the College Division. Each member shall be entitled to receive ten consecutive issues of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR.

SECTION 4. SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP shall be open to organizations or business firms who wish to contribute an amount prescribed by the State Board of Directors. Sustaining Membership shall include an individual membership assigned to a person designated by the Sustaining Member organization or firm. Sustaining Membership shall entitle the organization or firm to a complete list of TMEA members and to receive ten consecutive issues of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR.

SECTION 5. INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP shall be open to schools, colleges, and universities who wish to support TMEA activities by payment of the prescribed dues. Institutional Membership shall include an Individual Active Membership assigned to a person designated by the institution and to receive ten consecutive issues of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR.

SECTION 6. BOOSTER MEMBERSHIP shall be open to organizations who wish to support the activities of TMEA. Payment of prescribed State dues shall include one Active Membership assigned to a person designated by the Booster Club. This person shall receive ten consecutive issues of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR, along with a Booster newsletter. Booster Club members shall have the same privileges as Active Members except for the right to hold elective office.
SECTION 8. MEMBERSHIP YEAR shall be July 1 through June 30.

Article II

STATE GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. (aa). DUTIES OF THE STATE PRESIDENT. The State President shall be the presiding officer of TMEA meetings, of the State Board of Directors, and of its State Executive Committee. He shall appoint members to committees and, with approval of the State Executive Committee, fill by appointment any vacancy in the State Division offices and in the office of the Immediate Past-President, the appointee to serve the unexpired term. He shall represent TMEA, or appoint an alternate, at relevant meetings of the State Board of Education, meetings of the UIL Legislative Council, public hearings of Policy-making bodies, and any other National meeting deemed pertinent to the welfare of TMEA. He shall be responsible for the overall program at the annual TMEA Convention-Clinic, and shall perform all other duties pertaining to his office. He may appoint a Parliamentarian and shall be an ex-officio member of all committees.

SECTION 1. (ab). DUTIES OF THE STATE PRESIDENT-ELECT. The State President-Elect shall attend all Executive Committee and State Board of Directors meetings as a member of these two groups. Under the direction and guidance of the State President and State Executive Committee, he shall be responsible for promoting the enrollment of booster clubs as sustaining members of TMEA and preparing materials for publication and/or distribution to these clubs.

SECTION 1. (b). PRESIDENTIAL TERM OF OFFICE. The State President shall serve a term of one year and may not serve 2 (two) successive terms. The term shall begin immediately following the close of the annual Convention.

SECTION 1. (c). NOMINATION. At the Fall Area Meeting, each Region may submit one name for the office of President-Elect. Region Officers, or their proxies, in attendance at the area meetings are obligated to vote for the person selected from their Region. However, in case of a tie, or if no candidate is submitted from a given Region, the Officers are then free to vote as they choose. The candidate receiving the most votes shall be that area’s nominee.

The presiding officer of each Area shall file the name of the candidate with the headquarters office following the Fall Area Meeting. The Executive Director shall request permission from each of the persons placed in nomination in order to announce their candidacy in the January issue of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR. If such permission is not received by December 1st, the names will be deleted from the list of candidates.

Individuals nominated at the Fall Area Meetings for President-Elect, and who authorize permission for such candidacy by December 1st are official candidates. Additional nominations of other individuals for the office of President-Elect may be made from the floor during the first General Session.

SECTION 1. (d). ELECTION AND TERM OF OFFICE. The general membership of TMEA will be notified of the candidates nominated for President-Elect through the January issue of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR. Active Members, Retired Members, and Honorary Life Members attending the second General Session at the annual Convention-Clinic will be issued a ballot for the purpose of casting their vote for the office of President-Elect. If a run-off is necessary, the election will be held immediately by secret ballot during the second General Session. The announcement of the winner will follow the conclusive ballot.

Members who cannot attend the annual Convention-Clinic may petition the headquarters for an absentee ballot after the announcement of candidates has been printed in the January issue of the magazine. Such a request must be postmarked no later than January 15th. The completed ballot must be returned by mail to the headquarters office, postmarked no later than seven (7) days prior to the opening day of the convention.

All ballots cast for President-Elect shall be received, tallied, and certified in writing by the Elections Committee. Such records will be filed with the Executive Secretary.

The State President-Elect shall be elected for a term of one year after which he shall become President. His term shall begin immediately following the close of the annual Convention-Clinic.

SECTION 1. (e). VACANCY IN OFFICE. During the absence of the State President or in the event of vacancy in the Presidential office for any reason, a President Pro tem shall be elected from and by the Executive Committee. The succeeding President shall serve for the unexpired term.

SECTION 2. (a). DUTIES OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT-DIVISION-CHAIRMAN. The Vice-
President-Division Chairman shall preside at all meetings of his Division. He shall appoint special committees necessary to the operation of his Division and shall prepare a program for the meeting of his Division at the annual Convention-Clinic. He shall be responsible for implementing the overall program of TMEA within his Division. He shall be a member of the State Executive Committee and the State Board of Directors.

SECTION 2. (b). NOMINATION. At the Fall Region meeting, each Region may suggest one name for the Vice-President-Division-Chairman up for election at the forthcoming Convention-Clinic.

The presiding officer of each Region shall file the name of each divisional candidate with the headquarters office following the Fall Region meeting. The Executive Director shall request permission from each of the persons placed in nomination by three or more Regions in order to announce their candidacy in the January issue of the SOUTHWESTERN MUSICIAN COMBINED WITH THE TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATOR. If such permission is not received by December 1st, the name(s) will be deleted from the list of candidates.

Individuals nominated at the Fall Region meetings for Vice-President-Division-Chairman by three or more Regions who authorize permission for such candidacy by December 1st are official candidates. Additional nominations of other persons for candidacy may be made from the floor during the divisional meetings held at the annual Convention-Clinic.

SECTION 2. (c). ELECTION AND TERM OF OFFICE. Each of the five Divisions shall elect a chairman who shall hold office for a term of two years. After being elected to a term of two years, a Division Officer may not immediately succeed himself, in office. Elections shall be conducted in the Divisions as follows: Band Division and College Division, years ending with 0, 2, 4, 6, 8; Elementary Division, Orchestra Division and Vocal Division, years ending with 1, 3, 5, 7, 9.

Active Members, Honorary Life Members, and Retired Members attending the Divisional Business Meetings at the annual Convention-Clinic will be issued a ballot for the purpose of casting their vote for the Divisional Office. Ballots will be tallied by the Divisional Elections Committee. If a run-off is necessary, such election will be held during the same divisional meeting. The Vice-President-Division-Chairman shall begin his term immediately following the close of the Annual Convention-Clinic.

SECTION 3. (a). DUTIES OF THE IMMEDIATE PAST-PRESIDENT. The Immediate Past-President shall serve as a member of the State Executive Committee and the State Board of Directors. He shall preside over the Council of Past-Presidents and he shall act as a liaison between TMEA and other state organizations and shall perform other duties as may be requested by the President.

SECTION 3. (b). TERM OF OFFICE. The Immediate Past-President shall serve until such time as the State President who succeeded him assumes the office.

SECTION 4. (a). DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR. The Executive Director shall be a non-voting member of the State Executive Committee and the State Board of Directors. His office shall serve as Secretary to the members of the Executive Committee and Board of Directors in the execution of TMEA business. The Executive Director shall: (1) keep a complete record of all TMEA business meetings at the State level, and shall have the proper records available at such meetings; (2) keep an accurate record of the membership; (3) receive all monies due TMEA, countersign all disbursements, and keep an accurate and true account of all money received and paid out by him; (4) be custodian of all TMEA property and publish an audited account of TMEA finances in the official magazine at the end of each fiscal year; (5) serve as business advisor for official publications; (6) be coordinator of Exhibits for the annual Convention-Clinic; and (7) fulfill other duties customarily assigned to his office or directed by the State Executive Committee or State Board of Directors. The Executive Director shall conduct the business of TMEA in accordance with the Constitution and By-Laws and in all matters shall be under the direction of the State Executive Committee, he may engage an assistant or assistants, to whom he may delegate authority in the execution of TMEA business.

SECTION 4. (b). DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY. The Executive Secretary will assist in the execution of TMEA duties as requested by the Executive Director and the State Executive Committee. His office shall serve as (1) official Secretary of the State Executive Committee and State Board of Directors; (2) keep an accurate record of membership; (3) be Office Manager; (4) be responsible for the maintenance of the TMEA headquarters building; and (5) fulfill other duties as assigned by the Executive Director and the State Executive Committee.

SECTION 4. (c). APPOINTMENT AND BOND. The Executive Director/Secretary shall be appointed by the State Executive Committee and shall receive, for faithful service rendered, a compensation which shall be fixed by the State Executive Committee. He shall be bonded in amount not less than the total money received annually by his office. The expense of executing this bond shall be paid by TMEA.
SECTION 4. (d). EXPIRATION OF SERVICE. At the expiration of his term of service, the Executive Director shall turn over to his successor all monies, books, and properties of TMEA.

SECTION 5. (a). DUTIES OF THE STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. The State Executive Committee shall: (1) be responsible for the business management and operation of TMEA and for the management and control of the funds thereof; (2) fix the time and place of meetings and cooperate with the State President in planning and details of such meetings; (3) represent and act for the State Board of Directors in the intervals between the meetings and that body; (4) adopt the annual budget; (5) provide for an annual audit of TMEA accounts by a duly qualified accountant; (6) appoint a custodian of all TMEA assets and order an annual audit thereof; (7) appoint an Executive Director/Secretary, prescribe his duties and compensation, and have full supervision and control of his acts; (8) appoint an editor, editors, or an editorial board for official publications and have full supervision and control of their acts; (9) approve Presidential appointments filling vacancies in State offices; (10) supervise and control the Life Membership Fund; and (11) have authority to pass upon all matters referred to it by TMEA in annual Convention-Clinic, by the State Board of Directors, and by the State President.

SECTION 5. (b). MEETINGS OF THE STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. The State Executive Committee shall meet on call of the State President or on request by two-thirds of its membership. A majority of its voting members present shall constitute a quorum.

SECTION 5. (c). The executive authority not defined, not delegated nor prohibited herein is reserved to the State Executive Committee.

SECTION 6. (a). DUTIES OF THE STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS. The State Board of Directors shall function as a general governing body and administer the business and educational affairs of TMEA. It shall have responsibility for its general policies and program of activities. The State Board of Directors shall: (1) fix the amount of Dues for membership; (2) fix Regional boundaries; (3) interpret the Constitution and By-Laws; (4) review the annual budget as adopted by the State Executive Committee; (5) approve nominations for Honorary Life Membership; (6) install officers; (7) carry out all mandates or commissions passed by TMEA at its annual Convention-Clinic.

SECTION 6. (b). The State Board of Directors shall have authority to deny membership to any applicant and may suspend any member or officer who violates a part of the Constitution and By-Laws or rules and regulations.

SECTION 6. (c). APPEAL. A decision of the State Board of Directors may be appealed to TMEA at its annual Convention-Clinic.

SECTION 6. (d). MEETINGS OF THE STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS. The State Board of Directors shall meet during the time of the annual Convention-Clinic and may meet at the call of the State President. Upon request of not less than twenty members, the Executive Director shall call a meeting of the State Board of Directors. A majority of its voting members present shall constitute a quorum, provided not less than one-third of the Regions shall be represented. The State Board of Directors shall receive written notification of meetings.

SECTION 7. DIVISIONS. Each applicant for TMEA membership may designate one or more Divisions with which he wishes to be identified.

SECTION 8. DUTIES OF THE COUNCIL OF PAST-PRESIDENTS. The council of Past Presidents shall serve as an advisory body to the State Board of Directors, the State Executive Committee, and the State President and shall be represented by its chairman. It may elect its own officers and recommend educational policies. It shall discharge such duties as may be assigned by the State Board of Directors and the State Executive Committee. At least one member shall serve on the Resolutions Committee at the annual Convention-Clinic.

Article III
REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. REGIONAL BOUNDARIES shall be fixed by the State Board of Directors in cooperation with the Director of Music Activities of the University Interscholastic League.

SECTION 2. (a). REGION OFFICERS: each Region shall elect a Region Chairman, Region Vice-Chairman, and a Region Secretary-Treasurer. At least two Regions must be represented in these three offices. In addition, a Region Division Chairman for each Division represented within the Region shall be elected. All Region officers must be employed full-time within the Region and will assume the duties as set forth in the By-Laws.

SECTION 2. (b). DUTIES OF THE REGION CHAIRMAN. The Region Chairman shall be the presiding officer of the Region and of the Region Steering Committee. He shall be a member of the State Board of Directors and the Region Steering Committee. He shall call Region meetings, appoint committees as he
may deem necessary, and perform other duties pertaining to the presiding office.

SECTION 2. (c). DUTIES OF THE REGION VICE-CHAIRMAN. The Region Vice-Chairman shall assume the duties of the presiding officer in the absence of the Region Chairman. He shall be a member of the State Board of Directors and the Region Steering Committee, and shall encourage, solicit, and enlist membership within the Region.

SECTION 2. (d). DUTIES OF THE REGION SECRETARY-TREASURER. The Region Secretary-Treasurer shall keep accurate minutes of Region meetings, receive and disburse TMEA Region Funds, if any, and perform all other duties pertaining to the office of Secretary-Treasurer. He shall be a member of the State Board of Directors and the Region Steering Committee.

SECTION 2. (e). DUTIES OF THE REGION DIVISION CHAIRMAN. The Region Division Chairman shall be the presiding officer of the meetings of the Division (Band, Orchestra, Vocal, Elementary, and College) within the Region. He shall be a member of the Region Steering Committee, and shall be responsible for implementing the Region program of TMEA within his Division.

SECTION 2. (f). ELECTION AND TERMS OF OFFICE. In a manner prescribed by the Region, the Region Chairman, Region Vice-Chairman, and Region Secretary-Treasurer shall be elected at the first meeting of the membership year and shall hold office for a term of two years. The Region Chairman and Region Secretary-Treasurer shall be elected on years ending with 0,2,4,6,8; the Region Vice-Chairman shall be elected on years ending with 1,3,5,7,9.

Each Region Division Chairman shall be elected for a term of one year at the Spring Region Meeting.

SECTION 2. (g). VACANCIES IN REGION OFFICES. Vacancies which occur in Region Offices shall be filled through appointment by the Region Steering Committee. This appointment shall be for the unexpired term, or until the Region or Region Division can meet and elect a successor.

SECTION 3. DUTIES OF THE REGION STEERING COMMITTEE. The Region Steering Committee shall determine the means and methods of executing the overall program of TMEA within the Region, and shall coordinate the programs of the several Divisions. It shall serve as an instrument through which the State Officers may implement and inform the membership of the general policies and program of activities of TMEA. It shall fill, by appointment, vacancies which occur in Region offices. Executive authority on the Region level shall be reserved to the Region Steering Committee.

SECTION 4. REGION MEETINGS AND QUORUM. Region Meetings shall be called by the Region Chairman or, upon request of ten active members, by the Region Secretary-Treasurer. Twenty percent of the Active Members of a Region present, with more than one Division represented, shall constitute a quorum. Notification of Region Meetings shall be made in writing.

Article IV

FISCAL YEAR AND SPECIAL FUNDS

SECTION 1. The Fiscal Year shall be from July 1 through June 30.

SECTION 2. LIFE MEMBERSHIP FUND. Income from the payment of Life Membership dues shall be deposited, under the direction of the State Executive Committee, in an interest-bearing account. Each year, there shall be transferred from this fund into the General Fund, Active Membership dues for each of the Life Members of record. Upon the demise of a Life Member, his name shall be removed from the roster of memberships. Should the Life Membership Fund be unable to meet the payment of the Active Membership dues for each Life Member of record, the State Executive Committee shall determine an equitable amount to transfer; which decision shall in no manner jeopardize the active participation of the Life Members in the affairs of TMEA.

Article V

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION-CLINIC

SECTION 1. (a). Business for the consideration of TMEA’s general membership shall be submitted to the Agenda Committee not later than 9:00 p.m. (OR AT SUCH TIME DESIGNATED IN THE CONVENTION PROGRAM) of the day prior to the time fixed for the first Business Session of the annual Convention-Clinic. Upon adoption by the first Business Session, the report of the Agenda Committee becomes the Agenda for the second Business Session. Twenty-percent of the Active, Retired and Honorary Life Members who are registered at the annual Convention-Clinic being present at the meeting shall constitute a quorum.

SECTION 1. (b). Business pertaining to the affairs and interests of a particular Division shall be transacted at a business meeting of the Division.
SECTION 2. PROGRAMS. Under the direction of the State President, the Executive Committee shall plan and execute a composite program which shall allow equal consideration for the Divisions represented. The Division Chairman shall recommend clinicians, teachers, and performing organizations, and shall be responsible for the planning and execution of his Division program.

ARTICLE VI
PUBLICATIONS
SECTION 1. OFFICIAL ORGAN. The Southwestern Musician combined with the Texas Music Educator shall be the official organ of TMEA. Notices, rules, regulations, and policies appearing in the official organ thereby become official.

SECTION 2. OTHER PUBLICATIONS. Books, brochures, pamphlets, or other publications pertaining to TMEA shall be approved by the State Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VII
THE OATH OF OFFICE

I, (repeat your full name), realizing the dignity attendant upon my office and the responsibility involved as (state office for which you were elected,) do promise to carry out the duties of this office to the best of my ability until my successor has been duly elected and installed. I furthermore promise to uphold the Constitution and By-Laws, rules and regulations, and to serve faithfully as an officer of TMEA, always working for the advancement of Music Education in Texas.

ARTICLE VIII
RULES OF ORDER

Roberts Rules of Order, Revised, shall be the authority whenever correct parliamentary procedures are required.

ARTICLE IX
AMENDMENTS

The By-Laws may be amended by a vote of two-thirds of the voting members present at a Business Session of the annual Convention-Clinic.

Amended 2/13/87

ARTICLE X
SUGGESTED ORDER OF BUSINESS

SECTION 1. THE CONVENTION

Call to Order
Invocation
Reading and Approving the Minutes
Reports of Special Committees
Reports of Standing Committees
Unfinished Business
New Business
Adjournment

SECTION 2. THE STATE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Call to Order
Invocation
Installation of Officers
Reading and Approving the Minutes
Reports of Special Committees
Reports of Standing Committees
Unfinished Business
New Business
Adjournment

SECTION 3. THE STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Call to Order
Invocation
Reading and Approving the Minutes
Committee Reports
Unfinished Business
New Business
Adjournment
1987 - 88 TMEA Officers

President — David Pennington
President-Elect — Charles Nail
Immediate Past-President — John Scarcella
Band Vice-President — Robert McElroy
Orchestra Vice-President — Kathy Fishburn
Vocal Vice-President — Betty Roe
Elementary Vice-President — Betsy Henderson
College Vice-President — Margaret Hudnall
Executive Director — Bill Cormack
Executive Secretary — Sandra Glover

Dates of Future Conventions

February 11-13, 1988 - San Antonio, Texas
February 9-11, 1989 - San Antonio, Texas
February 8-10, 1990 - San Antonio, Texas

Texas Music Educators Association
P.O. Box 49469
Austin, Texas 78765
Phone 512/452-0710
APPENDIX I

LISTING OF STATE OFFICERS: 1920-1988
TEXAS BANDMASTERS ASSOCIATION

1920

President: James E. King
Vice-President: Admire Lewis
Secretary-Treasurer: J. N. Crawford

1921

President: James E. King
Vice-President: Ralph W. Beck
Secretary-Treasurer: J. N. Crawford

1922

President: James E. King
Vice-President: Ralph W. Beck
Secretary-Treasurer: G. Ward Moody

1923

President: Conway E. King
Vice-President: Joel Trimble
Secretary-Treasurer: G. Ward Moody

1924

President: Conway E. King
First Vice-President: Ralph E. Frazier
Second Vice-President: Bruce McQuade
Third Vice-President: Ralph W. Beck
Secretary-Treasurer: G. C. Collum

TEXAS BAND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

1925

STATE:

President: E. A. Lightfoot
Secretary-Treasurer: G. C. Collum

DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: Ralph W. Beck
Vice-President: Ed N. Riley
Western:
President: Ralph E. Frazier
Vice-President: M. Sam Goldman

1926

STATE:
President: G. C. Collum
Secretary-Treasurer: E. A. Lightfoot

DIVISION:

Eastern:
First Vice-President: Paul A. James
Second Vice-President: D. G. Hunewell

Western:
First Vice-President: George T. St. Peter
Second Vice-President: George Farleigh

1927

STATE:
President: E. A. Lightfoot
Secretary-Treasurer: G. C. Collum

DIVISION: None

1928

STATE:
President: Ralph E. Frazier
Secretary-Treasurer: Ralph W. Beck

DIVISION:

Eastern:
First Vice-President: R. J. Dunn
Second Vice-President: Nat. H. Hayes

Western:
First Vice-President: Paul A. James
Second Vice-President: Earnest Pogue

1929

STATE:
President: Ralph E. Frazier
Vice-President: Paul A. James
Secretary-Treasurer: Ralph W. Beck
DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: R. J. Dunn
Vice-President: Nat H. Hayes
Secretary-Treasurer: Everett M. McCracken

Western:
President: Paul A. James
Vice-President: Earnest Pogue
Secretary-Treasurer: D. O. Wiley

STATE:
President: Paul A. James
Vice-President: R. J. Dunn
Secretary-Treasurer: Ralph W. Beck

DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: Everett M. McCracken
Vice-President: R. A. Dhossche
Secretary-Treasurer: H. G. Munden

Western:
President: Earl D. Irons
Vice-President: Y. P. Kuhn
Secretary-Treasurer: D. O. Wiley

Southern:
President: H. J. Neichans
Vice-President: J. J. Haughn
Secretary-Treasurer: William Evans

STATE:
President: R. J. Dunn
Vice-President: K. T. Goetze
Secretary-Treasurer: Ralph W. Beck

DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: R. A. Dhossche
Vice-President: N. J. Whitehurst
Secretary-Treasurer: Orin L. Lantz
Western:
President: Earl D. Irons
Vice-President: Earl R. Ray
Secretary-Treasurer: D. O. Wiley

Southern: None

1932

STATE:
President: Everett M. McCracken
Vice-President: Orin L. Lantz
Secretary-Treasurer: R. J. Dunn

DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: Joel Trimble
Vice-President: Walter S. Hunnecutt
Secretary-Treasurer: Dean Shank

Western:
President: Earl D. Irons
Vice-President: Earl R. Ray
Secretary-Treasurer: D. O. Wiley

Southern:
President: Joe Barryman
Vice-President: Warren Reitz
Secretary-Treasurer: A. A. Tampke

1934

STATE:
President: D. O. Wiley
Vice-President: R. J. Dunn
Secretary-Treasurer: George Royster

DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: C. R. Hackney
Vice-President: Weldon Covington
Secretary-Treasurer: George Royster

Western:
President: Earl D. Irons
Vice-President: Raymond T. Bynum
Secretary-Treasurer: J. C. Burkett
Southern:
    President: Lloyd Reitz
    Vice-President: Ward G. Brandstetter
    Secretary-Treasurer: E. Vergne Adams

Northern:
    President: C. W. Beene
    Vice-President: John L. Hathaway
    Secretary-Treasurer: Ralph Smith

TEXAS SCHOOL BAND AND ORCHESTRA ASSOCIATION

1935

STATE:
    President: D. O. Wiley
    Secretary: R. J. Dunn
    Treasurer: Dan Martin

DIVISION:

Eastern:
    President: Joel Trimble
    Vice-President: Francis Cox
    Secretary-Treasurer: W. T. Botts

Western:
    President: Earl R. Ray
    Vice-President: Raymond T. Bynum
    Secretary-Treasurer: Clyde Rowe

Southern:
    President: Ward G. Brandstetter
    Vice-President: Warren Reitz
    Secretary-Treasurer: Sam Ezell

Northern:
    President: C. W. Beene
    Vice-President: John L. Hathaway
    Secretary-Treasurer: Ralph Smith

1936

STATE:
    President: Lloyd Reitz
    Secretary: Ward G. Brandstetter
    Treasurer: Dan Martin
DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: Otto Paris
Vice-President: Ralph Beck
Secretary-Treasurer: Lyle Skinner

Western:
President: Joe Berryman
Vice-President: H. A. Anderson
Secretary-Treasurer: Clyde Rowe

Southern:
President: Warren Reitz
Vice-President: Ray Sims
Secretary-Treasurer: Sam Ezell

Northern:
President: Glen Truax
Vice-President: J. R. Walker
Secretary-Treasurer: Pete Martinez

1937

STATE:
President: Lloyd Reitz
Vice-President: Ward G. Brandstetter
Secretary-Treasurer: Dan Martin

DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: Otto Paris
Vice-President: Ralph Beck
Secretary-Treasurer: Lyle Skinner

Western:
President: Charles S. Eskridge
Vice-President: Raymond T. Bynum
Secretary-Treasurer: Russell E. Shrader

Southern:
President: Sam Ezell
Vice-President: C. W. Macune
Secretary-Treasurer: Donald Hatch

Northern:
President: Glen Truax
Vice-President: J. R. Walker
Secretary-Treasurer: C. H. Leeds
1938

STATE:
President: Ward G. Brandstetter
Secretary: Russell E. Shrader
Treasurer: Weldon Covington

DIVISION:

Eastern:
President: C. R. Hackney
Vice-President: E. Vergne Adams
Secretary-Treasurer: Lyle Skinner

Western:
President: Charles S. Eskridge
Vice-President: Clyde Rowe
Secretary-Treasurer: Robert L. Maddox

Southern:
President: Sam Ezell
Vice-President: C. W. Macune
Secretary-Treasurer: Donald Hatch

Northern:
President: J. Richard Walker
Vice-President: Winston Savage
Secretary-Treasurer: Fred Bettan

TEXAS MUSIC EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION

1939

STATE:
President: Ward G. Brandstetter
Secretary: Russell E. Shrader
Treasurer: Weldon Covington

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Lyle Skinner
Orchestra Chairman: Jerome Zoeller
Vocal Chairman: Paul N. Riley

1940

STATE
President: Russell E. Shrader
Secretary-Treasurer: Charles S. Eskridge
DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Weldon Covington
Orchestra Chairman: W. Gibson Walters
Vocal Chairman: Paul N. Riley

1941

STATE:
President: Lyle Skinner
Secretary-Treasurer: Charles S. Eskridge

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Carl Cochran
Orchestra Chairman: Raymond T. Bynum
Vocal Chairman: J. Campbell Wray

1943

STATE:
President: Charles S. Eskridge
Secretary-Treasurer: D. O. Wiley
(Wiley continued in the office of Secretary-Treasurer until 1952)

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Carl Cochran
Orchestra Chairman: Raymond T. Bynum
Vocal Chairman: J. Campbell Wray

1944

STATE:
President: Carl Cochran

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Lyle Skinner
Orchestra Chairman: Raymond T. Bynum
Vocal Chairman: H. Grady Harlan

1945

STATE:
President: Raymond T. Bynum

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Tirey A. Lee
Orchestra Chairman: Gilbert Waller
Vocal Chairman: H. Grady Harlan
1946

STATE:

President: Robert L. Maddox

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Alto Tatum
Orchestra Chairman: Jerome Zoeller
Vocal Chairman: Archie N. Jones

1947

STATE:

President: Weldon Covington

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Jack H. Mahan
Orchestra Chairman: Pete C. Martinez
Vocal Chairman: Euell Porter

1948

STATE:

President: Weldon Covington

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Jack H. Mahan
Orchestra Chairman: Pete C. Martinez
Vocal Chairman: Donald W. Morton

1949

STATE:

President: Jack H. Mahan

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: L. H. Buckner
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Euell Porter

1950

STATE:

President: L. H. Buckner

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Robert Fielder
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Euell Porter
Elementary Chairman: Rena McQueary
1951

STATE:

President: Estill Foster

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Robert Fielder
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Rueil Porter
Elementary Chairman: Edna Marie Jones
College Chairman: Clarence J. Best

1952

STATE:

President: Ed Cannan

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Robert Fielder
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Ed Hatchett
Elementary Chairman: Edna Marie Jones
College Chairman: T. Smith McCorkle

1953

STATE:

President: Ed Cannan

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Robert Fielder
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Ed Hatchett
Elementary Chairman: Sara Dunn Sistrunk
College Chairman: T. Smith McCorkle

1954

STATE:

President: Robert Fielder

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Ed Lumpkin; James Murphy (Lumpkin resigned soon after election to assume administrative position)
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Ed Hatchett
Elementary Chairman: Sara Dunn Sistrunk
College Chairman: T. Smith McCorkle
1955

STATE:

President: Ed Hatchett

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: James Murphy
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Charles Nelson
Elementary Chairman: Charlotte Dubois
College Chairman: T. Smith McCorkle

1956

STATE:

President: Ed Hatchett

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Nelson G. Patrick
Orchestra Chairman: G. Lewis Doll
Vocal Chairman: Charles Nelson
Elementary Chairman: Charlotte Dubois
College Chairman: W. H. Hodgson

1957

STATE:

President: Nelson G. Patrick

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Robert Renfroe
Orchestra Chairman: Louis Kromminga
Vocal Chairman: Charles Nelson
Elementary Chairman: Mrs. J. T. Lovett
College Chairman: W. H. Hodgson

1958

STATE:

President: Phil Baker

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Joseph Frank
Orchestra Chairman: Louis Kromminga
Vocal Chairman: Herb Teat
Elementary Chairman: Mrs. Mary Buchanan
College Chairman: Donald W. Morton

1959

STATE:

President: Phil Baker
DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Joseph Frank
Orchestra Chairman: Dale Brubaker
Vocal Chairman: Herb Teat
Elementary Chairman: Sylvia Ostrow
College Chairman: Donald W. Morton

1960

STATE:
President: Herb Teat

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Bryce Taylor
Orchestra Chairman: Dale Brubaker
Vocal Chairman: Carl Best
Elementary Chairman: Sylvia Ostrow
College Chairman: J. Campbell Wray

1961

STATE:
President: Herb Teat

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Bryce Taylor
Orchestra Chairman: Harry Lantz
Vocal Chairman: Carl Best
Elementary Chairman: Leta Spearman
College Chairman: J. Campbell Wray

1962

STATE:
President: Bryce Taylor

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Fred Junkin
Orchestra Chairman: Harry Lantz
Vocal Chairman: Robert Buchanan
Elementary Chairman: Leta Spearman
College Chairman: Lawrence Hanley

1963

STATE:
President: Bryce Taylor

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Fred Junkin
Orchestra Chairman: Harry Lantz
Vocal Chairman: Robert Buchanan
Elementary Chairman: Mildred Sage Roach
College Chairman: Lawrence Hanley

1964

STATE:
President: Fred Junkin

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: L. M. Snavely
Orchestra Chairman: Harry Lantz
Vocal Chairman: Robert Buchanan
Elementary Chairman: Mildred Sage Roach
College Chairman: Lawrence Hanley

1965

STATE:
President: Fred Junkin

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: L. M. Snavely
Orchestra Chairman: George Webber
Vocal Chairman: Hugh Sanders
Elementary Chairman: Eddie Lake Bunton
College Chairman: Lawrence Hanley

1966

STATE:
President: Harry Lantz

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: J. R. McEntyre
Orchestra Chairman: George Webber
Vocal Chairman: Hugh Sanders
Elementary Chairman: Eddie Lake Bunton
College Chairman: C. Edward Brookhart

1967

STATE:
President: Harry Lantz

DIVISIONAL
Band Chairman: J. R. McEntyre
Orchestra Chairman: George Webber
Vocal Chairman: Hugh Sanders
Elementary Chairman: Elinor Montandon
College Chairman: C. Edward Brookhart
1968

STATE:

President: Hugh Sanders

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Gene Smith
Orchestra Chairman: George Webber
Vocal Chairman: Cloys Webb
Elementary Chairman: Elinor Montandon
College Chairman: Paul R. Roe

1969

STATE:

President: Hugh Sanders

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: Gene Smith
Orchestra Chairman: George Robinson
Vocal Chairman: Cloys Webb
Elementary Chairman: Ruth Red
College Chairman: Paul F. Roe

1970

STATE:

President: J. R. McEntyre

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: J. W. King
Orchestra Chairman: George Robinson
Vocal Chairman: Cloys Webb
Elementary Chairman: Ruth Red
College Chairman: Warren George

1971

STATE:

President: J. R. McEntyre

DIVISIONAL:

Band Chairman: J. W. King
Orchestra Chairman: Weldon Wendland
Vocal Chairman: Bill Cormack
Elementary Chairman: Kenneth Howard
College Chairman: Warren George

1972

STATE:

President: J. W. King
DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Eddie Galvan
Orchestra Chairman: Weldon Wendland
Vocal Chairman: Bill Cormack
Elementary Chairman: Kenneth Howard
College Chairman: David McGuire

1973

STATE:
President: J. W. King

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Eddie Galvan
Orchestra Chairman: Barbara F. Eads
Vocal Chairman: James A. Moore
Elementary Chairman: Ruth Merrill
College Chairman: David McGuire

1974

STATE:
President: Bill Cormack

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Bill Dean
Orchestra Chairman: Barbara F. Eads
Vocal Chairman: James A. Moore
Elementary Chairman: Ruth Merrill
College Chairman: George Umberson

1975

STATE:
President: Jerrold W. Longwell

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Bill Dean
Orchestra Chairman: Ron Wells
Vocal Chairman: Tom Jennings
Elementary Chairman: Charlene Watson
College Chairman: George Umberson

1976

STATE:
President: Barbara F. Eads

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Jim Vanlandingham
Orchestra Chairman: Ron Wells
1977

STATE:
President: James A. Moore

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Jim Vanlandingham
Orchestra Chairman: Karrell Johnson
Vocal Chairman: Milton Pullen
Elementary Chairman: Donna Wilson
College Chairman: James H. Kincaid

1978

STATE:
President: John Bridges

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Robert Floyd
Orchestra Chairman: Karrell Johnson
Vocal Chairman: Milton Pullen
Elementary Chairman: Donna Wilson
College Chairman: Dr. Richard R. Bentley

1979

STATE:
President: Henry Schraub

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Robert Floyd
Orchestra Chairman: Bill Porter
Vocal Chairman: Nick Boltz
Elementary Chairman: Bill Young
College Chairman: Dr. Richard R. Bentley

1980

STATE:
President: Milton Pullen

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Bill Woods
Orchestra Chairman: Bill Porter
Vocal Chairman: Nick Boltz
Elementary Chairman: Bill Young
College Chairman: Sam Miller
1981

STATE:
 President: Robert Floyd

DIVISIONAL:
 Band Chairman: Bill Woods
 Orchestra Chairman: Joe Frank
 Vocal Chairman: Sally Schott
 Elementary Chairman: Marjorie Lawrence
 College Chairman: Sam Miller

1982

STATE:
 President: Charlene Watson

DIVISIONAL:
 Band Chairman: Jim Van Zandt
 Orchestra Chairman: Joe Frank
 Vocal Chairman: Sally Schott
 Elementary Chairman: Marjorie Lawrence
 College Chairman: Wesley Coffman

1983

STATE:
 President: Bill Woods

DIVISIONAL:
 Band Chairman: Jim Van Zandt
 Orchestra Chairman: Karan Pitts
 Vocal Chairman: John Scarcella
 Elementary Chairman: Saundra Ashworth
 College Chairman: Wesley Coffman

1984

STATE:
 President: Sally Schott

DIVISIONAL:
 Band Chairman: David Pennington
 Orchestra Chairman: Karan Pitts
 Vocal Chairman: John Scarcella
 Elementary Chairman: Saundra Ashworth
 College Chairman: Hunter C. March

1985

STATE:
 President: Jim Van Zandt
DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: David Pennington
Orchestra Chairman: Charles Nail
Vocal Chairman: Joe Irwin
Elementary Chairman: Linda Price
College Chairman: Hunter C. March
1986

STATE:
President: John Scarcella

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Robert McElroy
Orchestra Chairman: Charles Nail
Vocal Chairman: Joe Irwin
Elementary Chairman: Linda Price
College Chairman: Margaret Hudnall
1987

STATE:
President: David Pennington

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Robert McElroy
Orchestra Chairman: Kathy Fishburn
Vocal Chairman: Betty Roe
Elementary Chairman: Betsy Henderson
College Chairman: Margaret Hudnall
1988

STATE:
President: Charles Nail

DIVISIONAL:
Band Chairman: Scott Taylor
Orchestra Chairman: Kathy Fishburn
Vocal Chairman: Betty Roe
Elementary Chairman: Betsy Henderson
College Chairman: Will May
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