

outbreaks of racial violence in Houston during the 1950s and early 1960s as there were in Montgomery, New Orleans, Little Rock, Nashville, Atlanta, and Birmingham. Nevertheless, Houston went through a subtle but significant change, especially in its neighborhood patterns during the post-war period. Dr. Barry Kaplan, an assistant professor of history at the University of Houston Central Campus, provides a detailed description of these developments in one inner-city neighborhood. As he shows, the process of change in the neighborhoods around the University of Houston was in some ways typical of what had occurred in northern cities at a somewhat earlier time. In other ways, however, the transition of this neighborhood was unique due to such local factors as the absence of zoning restrictions, a liberal annexation policy, and an inadequate public transportation system.

The final article in this issue is an interesting interview with Ralph Ellifrit, a landscape architect who moved to Houston in 1939 as a member of the firm of Hare & Hare and who served as director of the City Planning Department in the post-war years. As a landscape architect, he played a small role in developing Riverside Terrace, one of the subdivisions discussed by Kaplan, although most of Ellifrit's efforts at that time went into the development of Garden Oaks on the city's northside and of Braeswood in southwest Houston.

Among major cities in the United States, Houston is woefully short of public parks, and the Ellifrit interview helps to explain why. As he points out, the world-renowned and impressive Texas Medical Center was built on land originally set aside for Hermann Park. He also details the influence prominent Houstonians and private developers had in determining land usage, sometimes at the sacrifice of beautification and public benefit. His thumbnail sketches of important personalities in the city's history are both interesting and informative. It is a delightful and significant interview and illustrates the value of oral history to those of us interested in recreating Houston's vibrant and exciting past. The Ellifrit interview forms part of the Houston Metropolitan Research Center oral history collection.

McCARTHYISM IN LOCAL ELECTIONS: THE HOUSTON SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION OF 1952

BY DON E. CARLETON

Since the early days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, anti-communist appeals have been an important weapon in the arsenal of American partisan combat. It was the Cold War and the emergence of Joseph R. McCarthy as America's foremost Red Scare spokesman, however, that made militant anti-communism the overwhelmingly dominant theme of partisan politics in the early 1950s.¹

Beginning with the 1950 congressional elections and continuing through mid-decade, political analysts noted with great fanfare that elections were being decided and careers destroyed either by the direct intervention of Senator McCarthy or by his imitators conducting one-issue Red Scare campaigns. Candidates in Florida, Maryland, Illinois, and Idaho won public office by waging campaigns emphasizing Red Scare issues such as communist infiltration of the institutions of government, education, religion, and popular entertainment. Marquis Childs claimed that "... in every contest where it was a major factor, McCarthyism won." This appraisal of the effect of Red Scare tactics on elections became a standard and consensus view among politicians during the early 1950s.²

Many political observers believed these electoral successes meant the majority of average Americans supported the Red Scare. Some even argued that it indicated the dangers of unchecked democracy.³

In recent years these views, both of the apparent usefulness of the Red Scare in elections and its popularity among the non-elite masses, have been

¹Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Roosevelt: The Politics of Upheaval* (Boston, 1960), p. 606; Richard Polenberg, *War and Society: The United States, 1941-1945* (Philadelphia, 1972), pp. 208-209.

²For a discussion of the perceived power of political McCarthyism see Richard M. Fried, "Electoral Politics and McCarthyism: The 1950 Campaign," in Richard Griffith and Athan Theoharis, eds., *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism* (New York, 1974), pp. 192-222.

³For a summary of this view, see Daniel Bell, ed., *The New American Right* (New York, 1955).

challenged. Scholars such as Robert Griffith and Michael Paul Rogin argue that the Red Scare was not a mass movement, that the elections of the early 1950s were decided by a multiplicity of factors instead of turning on a single issue of communism.⁴

This essay will examine the Houston school board campaign and election of 1952, a local election dominated by the Red Scare and tactics of McCarthyism, and evaluate the results within the context of this historiographical dispute. In the early 1950s, conservative candidates on the local, as well as the national level, acknowledged the apparent usefulness of the Red Scare for acquiring or retaining public office. This axiom was particularly true in Houston, Texas. Caught up in the swirling confusions of rapid, explosive growth, confronted by the contradiction of encouraging economic progress while striving to maintain social conformity and the status quo, many Houstonians actively participated in their own local version of the Red Scare.⁵

While Houston's Red Scare affected many aspects of the city's life, its greatest manifestation was in the public schools. Houston's school system received the close attention of local participants in the Red Scare because it was the one institution in the city that affected nearly every citizen. Since the city government provided a minimum of social services, had little contact with federal programs, and had no control over the public schools, its political campaigns escaped the effects of the Red Scare. Many perceived the schools, however, as battlegrounds for the control of the minds of the young. The school system also had to deal extensively and directly with such controversies as federal aid to education and racial integration, both of which stirred up emotional reactions.⁶

In the decade prior to 1952, controversies relating to free lunch programs and the ideological content of textbooks and curricula had rocked the Houston school board. A debate over the administrative structure of the school system added to the contentious atmosphere. The Houston schools were administered jointly by the superintendent of schools, W.E. Moreland, and the business manager, H.L. Mills, both under the nominal control of the school board. The existence of a powerful machine of school personnel, controlled by the business manager, destroyed the equilibrium within the dual control system. Thus, the superintendent, who refused to cooperate with the business manager's machine, faced continual insubordination and interference from

⁴Robert Griffith, *The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate* (Lexington, Ky., 1970); Michael Paul Rogin, *The Intellectuals and McCarthy: The Radical Specter* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967). For the most comprehensive study of the post World War II Red Scare, see David Cate, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower* (New York, 1978).

⁵For a discussion of Houston in the postwar decade, see Don E. Carleton, "A Crisis of Rapid Change: The Red Scare in Houston, 1945-1955" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1978).

⁶George Fuermann, *Reluctant Empire* (New York, 1957), pp. 142-147.

the business manager's office. The fact that Mills participated in the anti-communist crusade and Moreland did not, further exacerbated the problem.⁷

Eventually, the power struggle within the school administration spilled over into the public. Those who supported the dual system assumed the mantle of "conservative" and managed to label their opponents as "liberals." While the two terms are difficult to define in this local context, the conservative faction strongly opposed federal aid to education, racial integration, non-traditional or progressive education, and actively supported the anti-communist Red Scare crusade in Houston. The liberals, much less homogeneous, embraced a variety of economic and political philosophies. Some opposed federal aid and progressive education as much as the conservatives. All, however, opposed the dual system of control and supported the strong superintendent system. The liberals also conspicuously refrained from encouraging Houston's Red Scare, and, in some cases, vigorously denounced it.⁸

While the dispute between conservatives and liberals originated in the late 1940s, not until the fall of 1952, when four of the seven school board positions came open for election, did these loose coalitions solidify into quasi-political parties with political managers, offices, and slates of nominees for the school board. The liberal or anti-dual control group organized the Parents' Council for Improved Schools and nominated a slate of four candidates headed by an incumbent school board member, Dr. Ray K. Daily. An outspoken critic of the Red Scare and McCarthyism, Daily had served on the board since 1928. One of the first female graduates of the University of Texas medical school, Dr. Daily was a well-known member of Houston's liberal community. The Parents' Council selected Mrs. Olon Rogers, an activist in the liberal faction of the Texas Democratic Party, to run on the slate with Daily. Mrs. Rogers was also an incumbent member of the board. Two lesser known candidates, A.J. Tucker and James Hippard, completed the liberal slate. While Tucker considered himself a Republican and Hippard supported conservative Democrats, they joined with Daily and Rogers in opposing dual control and the power of the business manager's machine.⁹

⁷Ibid., pp. 142-147; David G. McComb, *Houston: The Bayou City* (Austin, 1969), pp. 227-228; National Education Association of the United States, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, *Report of an Investigation: Houston, Texas: A Study of Factors Related to Educational Unrest in a Large School System* (Washington, D.C., 1954), hereafter cited as NEA, *Report*; Research notes, Ralph S. O'Leary Papers (Houston Metropolitan Research Center, Houston Public Library), Box 5, Folder 2, hereafter cited as O'Leary Papers; William E. Moreland, interview with author in Houston on July 20, 1974, (OH 54) HMRC Collection.

⁸Fuermann, *Reluctant Empire*, p. 144; Reporter's notes, O'Leary Papers, Box 5, Folder 2; Mrs. Albert M. Ball, interview with author in Houston on July 6, 1971; Mrs. Dallas Dyer McGregor, interview with author in Houston on August 1, 1974, (OH 114) HMRC Collection.

⁹Clippings, unidentified newspapers, no dates, Ray K. Daily Papers, (HMRC); Ray K. Daily, interview with author in Houston on December 18, 1970, (OH 44) HMRC Collection; A.J. Tucker, interview with author in Houston on December 18, 1970; James Hippard, interview with author in Houston on March 16, 1972.

The conservative, pro-dual control group organized the Committee for Sound American Education to campaign for their own slate of candidates. Most active in support of the organization were members of a militant anti-communist society known as the Minute Women of the USA, Inc. Founded in Connecticut in 1947, the Minute Women fought against anything they perceived as socialistic in national and local institutions. Conservative women in Houston, mostly residents of the exclusive, elite River Oaks area, formed a local chapter of the Minute Women in 1950. Spawned by the Cold War and supported by the conservative establishment, the Minute Women soon became the most powerful Red Scare group in Houston.¹⁰

The support of other militant anti-communist organizations contributed to the Red Scare outlook of the Committee for Sound American Education (CSAE). The Doctors for Freedom and the Committee for the Preservation of Methodism, small groups of local origin, joined with members of the Americanism Committee of the American Legion in working for the election of the CSAE's slate.¹¹

The conservative business establishment gave the CSAE crucial financial support and community legitimization. Supporters included such members of Houston's unofficial ruling elite as Judge James A. Elkins, senior partner of a powerful law firm and head of the city's largest bank; Douglas B. Marshall, partner and son-in-law of Hugh Roy Cullen, one of Houston's wealthiest citizens; Hines Baker, president of the Humble Oil Company; W. Alvis Parish, head of the Houston Lighting and Power Company; J. S. Abercrombie, an independent oil millionaire; and Glenn McCarthy, controversial oil man and owner of Houston's largest hotel. In addition, the *Houston Chronicle*, the city's largest newspaper, owned by Jesse Jones, generally acknowledged as the most powerful of all Houstonians, gave the conservative CSAE slate strong support and extensive publicity.¹²

In its attempt to maintain the status quo for the business manager's group and insure the continuation of ideological orthodoxy, the CSAE selected four candidates with solid anti-communist credentials who would appeal to the patriotism of Houston's voters. The CSAE chose Dr. Henry Peterson, an incumbent, to head its slate. Dr. Peterson, company physician to the Houston Lighting and Power Company, was closely allied to the business manager's machine. Aubrey Calvin, an insurance salesman, joined him on the slate. Both Calvin's and Peterson's wives belonged to the Minute Women. The other CSAE candidates, Dallas Dyer and Bertie Maughmer, were Minute Women

¹⁰For an in-depth discussion of the Minute Women see a series of articles written by Ralph S. O'Leary which appeared in the *Houston Post*, October 11-21, 1953; also useful is Ralph S. O'Leary, "Daughters of Vigilantism," *Nation*, CLXXVIII (January 9, 1954), pp. 26-28; Mrs. Ross Biggers, interview with author in Houston on January 16, 1972.

¹¹*Houston Post*, October 14, 21, 1953.

¹²*Houston Chronicle*, October 31, 1952; Reporter's notes, O'Leary Papers, Box 5, File 1; Mrs. W.N. Allen, interview with author in Houston on January 20, 1972.

leaders and aggressive, vocal supporters of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in his national anti-communist campaign.¹³

Thus, by October, 1952, two opposing slates of candidates for the school board prepared for an acrimonious and controversial campaign. Because of the importance Houstonians attached to the school board, however, nine other candidates soon filed as independents. Their entrance into the campaign brought a total of seventeen candidates to the ballot.¹⁴

The Committee for Sound American Education knew that the Parent-Teacher Council would campaign against the dual control administrative system and the power of the business manager's machine in the schools. They feared a campaign that would focus on such problems as teacher salaries, overcrowded classrooms, and an inadequate operations budget. Such a strategy would place the conservatives on the defensive since they represented the group that had controlled the schools for years. Clearly, the conservatives needed an issue with which their candidates could wage an aggressive attack. In 1952, at the height of the Red Scare, with Senator Joseph McCarthy filling the newspaper with charges of treason, and political writers declaring the omnipotence of McCarthyism as an electoral tactic, the CSAE found a ready-made strategy. The leaders of the conservative faction quickly identified the real enemy for Houstonians: "Creeping Socialism."¹⁵

The CSAE opened its campaign with a deluge of circulars, pamphlets and newspaper advertisements to warn Houston of the threat to their children

STOP CREEPING SOCIALISM!!!

Are You Aware

That there is a conspiracy spreading throughout the length and breadth of America which bodes evil to YOUR CHILD? That this conspiratorial plot is for the purpose of eradicating the fundamental principles of learning and the spiritual concepts upon which America was founded?

Do not permit this conspiracy to take root in the Public Schools of Houston!

KNOW WHAT YOUR CHILD IS BEING TAUGHT!!

¹³*Houston Post*, October 14, 21, 1953; NEA, *Report*, pp. 14, 18-19; Mrs. Albert Ball, interview with author in Houston on July 6, 1971; Mrs. Dallas Dyer McGregor, interview with author in Houston on August 1, 1974.

¹⁴*Houston Post*, October 15, 1952.

¹⁵Fuermann, *Reluctant Empire*, p. 143; Mrs. Dallas Dyer McGregor, interview with author in Houston on August 1, 1974, (OH 114) HMRC Collection; *Houston Post*, October 14, 21, 1953; Margaret Bleil, interview with author in Houston on July 11, 1971.

VOTE FOR MEN AND WOMEN WHO BELIEVE IN AMERICA AND ITS PRECEPTS!! VOTE FOR THE COMMITTEE FOR SOUND AMERICAN EDUCATION!¹⁶

The CSAE told the voters that anti-American thoughts, either deliberately or through carelessness, had infiltrated the curriculum and literature of the schools. The CSAE also warned the city that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO, a favorite Minute Women target, would aid the spread of socialism in Houston's schools. Creeping socialism could only be defeated by refusing federal aid to education, attacking UNESCO, and cleansing the school libraries of subversive literature. The Parents' Council responded that the school board should always be alert for subversives in the schools, but they denied that any tendency toward socialism existed. Instead, the Council charged the CSAE with creating a false issue in order to undermine public faith in the Houston schools.¹⁷

Throughout the month of October, Houstonians witnessed one of the most controversial school board campaigns in the city's history. The national presidential contest between Dwight Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson barely eclipsed the school board struggle in voter interest in Houston. Almost daily, conservative candidates grabbed newspaper headlines with sensational charges and countercharges, most of which dealt with school literature.

Dr. Henry Peterson attacked a sixth grade teacher's science curriculum booklet produced by the Houston schools' own science department. After a close perusal of the conservation section, Dr. Peterson found the statement "Minerals do not rightfully belong to any one group of people or to any one nation." Peterson charged "socialism," and the school district agreed to order its science teachers to ignore the allegedly subversive statement.¹⁸

Aubrey Calvin, Peterson's running mate, found another suspicious text in the sixth grade curriculum. Calvin charged that *Lands Overseas*, a geography book, "eulogized" and tended to show Russia in a favorable light. He also alleged that his son had checked out of a junior high school library a book published in 1934 titled *Land of the Soviets*. That book, according to the

¹⁶Committee for Sound American Education Campaign Circular, October 29, 1952, O'Leary Papers.

¹⁷Houston Press, October 29, 1952; Houston Post, October 29, 1952.

¹⁸Houston Post, October 15, 1953.

outraged Calvin, "paints a wonderful picture of Russia." The school district answered the charge by announcing that *Lands Overseas* would be replaced by a more current text adopted by the state. *Land of the Soviets*, according to the district, had been removed months before from the library shelves.¹⁹

Having demonstrated to their own satisfaction that school literature provided a haven for leftist thought, the CSAE candidates hurled new charges against the schools. Aubrey Calvin declared that socialism "is coming in [to the schools] at a dead gallop. Americanism and American history are not being stressed enough." Dr. Peterson called for a better system of selecting textbooks, possibly using a rigid process of censorship, and promised such action if re-elected with his CSAE colleagues. Peterson emphasized that censorship was necessary in order to eliminate subject matter "calculated to infect the fertile minds of youth with foreign isms."²⁰

The Minute Women candidates on the CSAE ticket also managed to earn their share of the headlines. Bertie Maughmer specialized in attacking federal aid to the schools. Mrs. Maughmer joined with Peterson and Calvin in seeing "socialistic trends in textbooks." Dallas Dyer, chairman of the Minute Women publicity committee, concentrated on warning the voters of the dangers of UNESCO. Mrs. Dyer quoted a former FBI agent, Dan Smoot, as saying that, "UNESCO is the most evil scheme ever fastened upon the American people." Mrs. Dyer charged that UNESCO principles were subversive and that they might reach Houston children through their teachers. "The danger of UNESCO," argued Dyer, "is that it teaches children to think, not as citizens of America first, but as citizens of the world."²¹

Despite the efforts of the Parents' Council, Red Scare issues dominated the campaign. The Minute Women held public forums before the election for the purpose of conducting discussion groups about "Reds" in the schools. "Letters-to-the-Editor" sections of Houston's newspapers became daily debate forums for both sides in the campaign. One CSAE supporter wrote to the Houston Post that many of the parents supporting Dwight Eisenhower for President because he would cleanse Washington of "Reds" also supported the CSAE because they would do the same thing for Houston.²²

¹⁹Houston Press, October 29, 1952.

²⁰Houston Post, October 29, 1952; Reporter's notes, O'Leary Papers, Box 5, Folder 2.

²¹Houston Chronicle, October 28, 1952; Mrs. Dallas Dyer McGregor, interview with author in Houston on August 1, 1974, (OH 114) HMRC Collection.

²²Houston Post, October 21, 1952.

As election day drew closer, the campaign for the school board intensified. Jim Hippard, a candidate on the liberal slate, opposed Dr. Peterson, the incumbent. His decision to challenge Peterson brought weeks of harassment to Hippard and his family. Anonymous opponents tried to force him out of the race by constantly harassing him at home with telephone calls at all hours of the night. Every telephone ring threatened his family with another message of hate or personal threat. Automobiles stopped in front of his home late at night and shined spotlights through bedroom windows. Whenever friends visited the Hippards' home, cars would stop and persons inside of the automobiles could be seen taking down the visitors' car license plate numbers. The Hippards began escorting their child to and from school for fear that she might be harmed by one of the candidate's unknown enemies. Hippard later recalled the campaign of 1952 as one of the most frightening things he had ever witnessed in Houston. Despite the threats, the liberal candidate stayed in the race to the finish.²³

Houstonians watched the school board campaign with intense interest. Charges and countercharges filled the daily newspapers. The closer election day came, the more heated became the accusations and tensions. The campaign placed a tremendous strain on the staff of the Houston school district's curriculum department. They constantly had to spend time tracking down allegedly subversive materials in the schools and defending their curriculum programs. Two weeks before the election, the curriculum department received dozens of telephone calls from people denouncing something titled "Toward World Understanding." No one, including the protesters, knew if it was a book, essay, short story, or poem. The department held conferences and feverishly searched for the item. Staff members called Rice Institute and the Houston Public Library for help in the search but to no avail. The next day, the staff learned that "Toward World Understanding" was the title of a series of UNESCO pamphlets. Dallas Dyer had charged at a public meeting that the pamphlets discouraged the teaching of patriotism and indoctrinated children with "socialistic and one-world ideas." She also inferred that teachers in the school district had been exposed to the UNESCO literature. The superintendent's office responded that not only did they not use the pamphlets, but no one had even heard of them before Dyer made her charges.²⁴

A week before the election, a public debate between all the candidates revealed the emotional tensions of the campaign. The audience clearly divided into two groups, evenly split between supporters of the two major slates. Speeches by the candidates brought violent verbal reactions from the audience.

²³James Hippard, interview with author in Houston on March 16, 1972.

²⁴Houston *Post*, October 21, 1952; William E. Moreland, interview with author in Houston on July 20, 1974, (OH 54) HMRC Collection; Mrs. Dallas Dyer McGregor, interview with author in Houston on August 1, 1974, (OH 114) HMRC Collection.

Speakers were interrupted by booing; shouts of "Name names or shut up" and "let's get this out in the open!" followed the candidates speeches. One candidate's husband had to be physically restrained from attacking a speaker. At one point, the meeting's moderator waved what he alleged to be a subversive book and shouted that he had discovered it in the library of a local elementary school. The book's title remained unrevealed as the meeting quickly broke up in turmoil with shouting on all sides.²⁵

Carl Victor Little, a columnist for the *Houston Press*, aptly described the situation with his own penetrating sarcasm. Little wrote that the citizens of Houston had become so upset by the activities of "candidates who are breaking their necks to serve the community for free, that we wouldn't be surprised if many voters go out on election day and get cock-eyed drunk instead of voting."²⁶

On November 5, 1952, voters of Houston went to the polls and made their decision. The results of the election suggest that more complex factors motivated voting behavior than just the simple issues of creeping socialism or the dual control system. Dr. Peterson and Dallas Dyer, two active manipulators of Red Scare issues, won seats. Yet Mrs. Olon Rogers and A.J. Tucker, two vocal opponents of the Red Scare, also won. Everyone voting in the election could vote on all four positions so there was no factor of voting by district. The presence of nine other candidates not on either of the two slates complicates an analysis of the results. The other nine candidates, however, divided equally between conservative and liberal positions. The personal popularity of individual candidates was probably more important than other factors. For example, the CSAE's Peterson, who won easily, benefited from his incumbent status and was much more widely known than his opponent, a newcomer to school politics. On the other hand, the other successful CSAE candidate, Dallas Dyer, narrowly defeated a well-known incumbent, Ray K. Daily. Dyer's victory may be explained by the fact that, unlike the other CSAE candidates, she emphasized other issues than the threat of "creeping socialism." Dyer aggressively attacked Dr. Daily's poor attendance record at school board meetings. Daily later admitted that the absenteeism charge probably contributed to her defeat. A skillful and clever campaigner, Dyer also may have benefited from her status as the only former school teacher in the race.²⁷

The two winners on the liberal slate won despite being opposed by the two most outspoken Red Scare participants. Mrs. Olon Rogers, an easy victor, enjoyed the obvious benefits of being an incumbent. Unlike Dr. Daily, her

²⁵Houston *Post*, October 29, 1952; Reporter's notes, O'Leary Papers, Box 5, Folder 2.

²⁶Houston *Press*, undated clipping, O'Leary Papers, Box 5, Folder 2.

²⁷For election results, see Houston *Post*, November 6, 1952; for information about positions taken by each candidate see Houston *Post*, October 19-21, 1952; Mrs. Dallas Dyer McGregor, interview with author in Houston on August 1, 1974, (OH 114) HMRC Collection; Ray K. Daily, interview with author in Houston on December 10, 1974, (OH 44) HMRC Collection.

liberal colleague, Rogers' record provided her opponent no other issues which she could easily exploit. A. J. Tucker, the other successful liberal candidate, handily defeated Aubrey Calvin. Interestingly, Calvin leaned more heavily on the use of Red Scare tactics than any other candidate. Incumbency played no role in this race since the incumbent declined to run for reelection. Calvin's exploitation of the "creeping socialism" issue was clumsy and less subtle than his running mates' tactics. Calvin also suffered from his ineptness as a campaigner, particularly when compared to his more politically-talented opponent.²⁸

In conclusion, the results of the Houston school board election failed to support assertions that a majority of Houston's citizens encouraged and supported the Red Scare. Nor do the results give credence to the belief that the use of tactics and issues commonly associated with the Red Scare assured electoral victory. The Committee for Sound American Education and independent conservative candidates, with their "creeping socialism" issue, polled only 41 percent of the total vote while liberal candidates attracted 59 percent. These results are particularly interesting when one considers that a Red Scare did occur in Houston in 1953. An examination of the 1952 school board election does suggest, however, that the Red Scare in Houston was a phenomenon of the press and community elites, with doubtful appeal at the grassroots level. The Houston example also lends support to those who challenge the assumption that the campaigns of the early 1950s had single-issue instead of pluralistic determinates.²⁹

Whatever the election results reveal about the operative complexities of the Red Scare in Houston, the campaign itself indicated that conservative elites readily exploited and manipulated the Red Scare issue because of its perceived power to enforce conformity and, hopefully, win elections.

Finally, the campaigns of 1952 played an important role in legitimizing the future activities of Houston's Red Scare groups by raising public consciousness about the possibilities of subversives being close to home. Encouraged by the inevitable "where there's smoke there's fire" syndrome, feeding upon the fears of a community undergoing rapid urbanization in a framework shaped by the confusions of the Cold War, this legitimization helped prepare the way for Houston's much more traumatic Red Scare year in 1953.³⁰

Don E. Carleton is Director of the Barker Texas History Center at the University of Texas at Austin.

²⁸Houston *Post*, November 6, 1952; A.J. Tucker, interview with author in Houston on December 18, 1970; for typical examples of Calvin's campaign tactics see Houston *Post*, October 19, 1952, Houston *Chronicle*, October 31, 1952, and Houston *Press*, October 29, 1952.

²⁹Houston *Post*, November 6, 1952.

³⁰For a discussion of the Red Scare in Houston, see Don E. Carleton, "McCarthyism in Houston: The George Ebey Affair," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, LXXX (October, 1976), pp. 163-176.

RACE, INCOME, AND ETHNICITY: RESIDENTIAL CHANGE IN A HOUSTON COMMUNITY, 1920-1970

BY BARRY J. KAPLAN

Local history is more than just "history with the brains left out," as Alexander Callow has labeled it. Through local studies we may be able to see "the process of urbanization over time." With coordinated neighborhood studies, scholars can examine the increase in urban scale, the centrifugal force of modern urban technology, and the relationship of physical mobility to income, race and status. One result would be a better understanding of the critical interrelationship between the suburban ideal and transportation technology. The process of change in the neighborhoods around the University of Houston, including Washington Terrace, Riverside Terrace, and Riverside illustrates major themes of residential change and urban growth in the twentieth century. These changes serve both as a study in local history and as a case study of the role of race and income on neighborhood ecology.¹

Despite the recent "gentrification" of American cities, the dominant historical trend has been centrifugal expansion coupled with the physical decline of older neighborhoods. Pre-industrial cities had their elites in the center of the city and the lesser classes on the urban fringes, but the trolley and later the automobile reversed this pattern. The needs of a growing middle class in the closing decades of the nineteenth century were met by the creation of "streetcar suburbs" on the periphery of the old "walking city." Once fashionable areas in the old city became the repository of vast numbers of immigrants. In the twentieth century, the adoption of the automobile as the major conveyance of urban Americans further increased centrifugal forces and expanded the city's scale; the car turned once hallowed "streetcar

¹Alexander Callow, ed., *American Urban History*, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973) p. 638, in which Callow paraphrases Asa Briggs. Roy Lubove, "The Urbanization Process: An Approach to Historical Research," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (January, 1967), pp. 33-39.