

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Letters should not be more than 300 words. The author in submitting such letter should specifically give the Editors the right to select excerpts of the letter and the Editors shall further not be responsible for any views set forth in this communication.

'A WORD OF PRIDE'

Dear Editor:

The view has been expressed that Watergate and similar incidents will cause the legal profession to suffer a loss of esteem in the eyes of the public. The reasons for this point of view are sound, and I would not be surprised if most practicing lawyers have not wished that the legal profession enjoyed a better reputation when it came time to consider the amount of their fees.

But I think it is worthwhile to consider that some of the finest moments for some members of the legal profession have occurred at times of public crisis. If there were no sickness there would be no need for physicians.

Even though the average lawyer is not in a position to solve the problems presented by certain recent events, when the confidence of any particular person in the wisdom and honesty of those who hold the reins of government has suffered a jolt, to whom could he better turn for rational philosophy and psychological support than his lawyer? The more that certain evil tendencies of human nature manifest themselves, the greater will be the need for lawyers. And the greater the need—the greater the respect.

JAMES M. BOND
Fort Worth

Dear Editor:

The President's Page (Sept. 1973 TBJ) so well expresses the views of most of the Bar I wanted to extend to President Jeffers my special commendation.

CARL ILLIG
Houston

Dear Editor:

I have read and reread, and have devoted much thought to (President Jeffers') well-structured and luminous essay, entitled "A Word of Pride." (He) speaks on this subject in the most elegant rhetoric; in words that are cogent, meaningful, constructive, incisive and inspiring. The illuminating metaphors not only embellish but emphasize, as well as buttress, all that (he) says. I would not change even one word of the essay, nor would I diminish by one iota the sound, logical views which (President Jeffers) is promulgating from (his) lofty station as Prime Minister of the Texas Bar. More power to (him) and the principles (he) entertains!

ED. ARNOLD
Houston

Dear Editor:

I have read and re-read the President's Page. Something therein about pride bothers me in the light of Proverbs Chapter 8 Verse 13* and also bearing an admonishment to the writer of this letter found in Proverbs Chapter 14 Verse 3. I am venturing the following personal observation.

CBS and network television broadcasts of the Senate Select Committee have educated the public of this country. Truth should not be a mortal foe of the Bar.

The Chairman of the Senate Select Committee is a member of the Bar, a great American in my opinion and appears to this writer to be really concerned about the basic rights of all people. I am grateful for Sam Ervin.

Rather than Pride—we as members of the Bar need wisdom, then we will have the insight and sound judgment our leadership requires.

**To fear the Lord is to hate evil; I hate pride and arrogance, evil ways and false words.*

PRESTON POOLE
Post

Dear Editor:

In my twenty-six years of the practice of law in the 300 block of Pearl St., Beaumont, Texas I have never seen a President of the State Bar of Texas take such a bias (in this instance the Republican Party and Nixon Administration edict or strategy) position on the act of burglary, theft, domestic spying, perjury, bribery, massive interference with the judicial process by coverup on a massive scale. I, ALONG WITH A MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, think that the Senate Committee hearing has done much to show the American people what is going on in this country. This was not being done by the grand juries, Attorney General, FBI and the Courts during the many months after Watergate because of the massive coverup by the Nixon Administration.

It appears to me that those powerful forces of the Nixon Administration including the V.P., John "the jumper," the corporate interest "which generally run the country," most of TV and much of the press which is subject to money pressure, have been on the offensive to "turn Watergate around." I assume that President Jeffers has fallen prey to this strategy. It appears that he is appealing to "saving the legal profession" where Nixon appeals to "National security" or getting on with the government.

I take my hat off to the Senate Committee. It is fulfilling a very useful purpose.

I am sorry that our Bar president would use "my money" to espouse the stand he has taken. Shame on him!

JACK M. CARSON
Beaumont

Dear Editor:

Surely Mr. Jeffers is not so out of touch that he actually feels that the public will or should separate us from the Watergate lawyers on the ground that they are only people with law licenses engaged in political or governmental activities. That is a long step backward from Ferris, Texas. Even if it were true, I don't believe I would have told it.

I think of the Watergate lawyers much the same way as "Shoeless" Joe Jackson's fans must have felt when they cried, "Say it ain't so, Joe."

JEROME W. KIRBY
Littlefield

Dear Editor:

Your statement on the President's Page in the September *Texas Bar Journal* was outstanding. I was inspired by it and reassured after having had my confidence shaken by so many shallow statements of well known and apparently respected lawyers.

Thank you for exhibiting your courage. I hope I will have the opportunity to meet you personally, and in the meantime, if I may be of any help, in any form, please call on me.

JAMES F. MENEFE
Dallas

Dear Editor:

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Jeffers' observation that "it is time for the Bar to stand tall and to live true to the most majestic traditions of this highest calling of free men." The "sharp line of distinction between the great body of lawyers engaged in the active practice of law and the people with law licenses engaged in political and governmental activities" however, blurs a bit when we look at the facts. Mr. Jeffers' editorial shows a paranoid reaction which leads him to blame imaginary "foes" and "mortal enemies" for the shortcomings of the Bar.

Who are some of these "people with law licenses engaged in political and governmental activities?"

1. *Mr. John Mitchell*—entered government service after long years of private practice with a prominent Wall Street law firm. Now under criminal indictment by a federal grand jury.

2. *Mr. Herbert Kalmbach*—the President's personal lawyer. Alleged to have handled illegal campaign contributions among other things.

3. *Mr. Charles Colson*—who allegedly proposed fire-bombing a research firm to make it appear the work of leftist radicals, and

who allegedly approved the falsification of government documents to make it appear that a previous president had engineered the assassination of a foreign head of state. Mr. Colson is now in "private practice," reportedly receiving a \$100,000.00 per year retainer from the Teamsters Union.

4. *Mr. John J. Wilson*—Mr. Erlichman's attorney who publicly referred to a distinguished U.S. Senator as a "little jap."

And what about Richard M. Nixon who earns his living between stints of "public service" as a practicing attorney?

No, Mr. Jeffers, it is not "the mortal foes in and out of the media" who tarnish the armour of our honor. It is not the "enemies of the Bar" who seize upon causes to defame lawyers. It is the conduct of these men themselves that defames the legal profession.

I too am proud to be a lawyer, but I am not proud of all lawyers. I am not engaged in the private practice of law, and I do not believe that the private practitioners have a monopoly on virtue. I fervently hope that our Bar can rise to the task of cleaning up its own ranks without attributing its shortcomings to outsiders.

RAYMOND R. BROWN
Houston

Dear Editor:

It is with a great deal of pride that I congratulate (President Jeffers) on (his) article styled "A Word of Pride" in the September issue. Frankly, this masterpiece impressed me so greatly that I have read it more than one time.

(He) was splendid in the manner in which (he) expressed (his) mind and discussed (his) subject. I know a great deal of lawyers in Texas, but few, if any, who could have done the job (he has) in presenting this great article to the members of the Texas Bar. I am 100% back of (him) in everything (he has) said. The principle which (he) discussed could not have been a better one nor come at a more appropriate time.

It is rather silly to see would-be statesmen conduct themselves on television in the sense of third or fourth-class individuals and when these same people with the tactics they use and the imposition upon our constitution which they committed would lead us to realize that they are simply just that.

I hope (his) article is read by every lawyer in Texas and I wish it could be read by every individual in Texas.

I think it was great and personally feel the same way he does, because it was so impressively written and called to the attention of our Bar and spelled out in such a way as there would be no misgiving or indecisive opinion.

Let me congratulate (him) again upon writing one of the finest articles which touches our jurisprudence that has ever been written.

AARON A. STURGEON
Pampa

From the November 1973 Texas Bar Journal