

~~NOV 4 1968~~ 11

~~NOV 20 1968~~ 259

6.3

~~MAN 7 1968~~ ✓

~~FEB 4 1970~~

~~FEB 17 1970~~ 60

259 84

~~NOV 26 1968~~ 019

1968
1969

CEL 1968

10615002

ABSTRACT

ERNEST O. MELBY: EVANGELIST FOR EDUCATION

by Robert John Alfonso

Body of Abstract

This study traces the educational career of Ernest O. Melby. It is a record of his contributions to the institutions he served and to American education. Although the study covers all the years of Melby's life, the principal emphasis is on his activity as an educator. It attempts to assess his role in education, the influence he has exerted, and the forces that have shaped his life and thought.

His career in education spans almost a half-century. During this time he has been a high school teacher and principal, a superintendent, a college professor, dean, university president, and the chancellor of a state system of higher education. He is, presently, distinguished professor of education at Michigan State University.

Melby was born on August 16, 1891, near Lake Park, Minnesota. After attending public schools in the local area he received his bachelor of arts degree from St. Olaf College in 1913, his master of arts from the University of Minnesota in 1926, and his doctor of philosophy from the University of Minnesota in 1928.

After receiving his doctor of philosophy degree in 1928, he was assistant professor of education at the Northwestern University School of Education. In 1934, he was appointed dean of the School. Under his leadership the School of Education experienced phenomenal growth. The summer school was expanded, as were off-campus offerings and in-service education programs for nearby teachers. To the School of Education summer school he brought outstanding visiting professors. It became a Midwest center for summer study.

Melby resigned from Northwestern in 1941, and for three years he served as president of Montana State University and for one year as chancellor of the University of Montana. His biggest projects in Montana were, (1) an attempt to unify the University system and, (2) "The Montana Study," an experiment designed to take the University off the campus and use its resources to improve the quality of living in Montana towns.

From 1945 to 1956 Melby served as dean of the School of Education at New York University. It was in this position that he rose to his place of national prominence as a

spokesman for American education. Melby crusaded for an education geared to the times, one which would serve the American people in the struggle for freedom. His speaking and his teaching, as well as his administration, were characterized by his great faith in people. He believed that only by demonstrating one's faith in an individual could the best in him be brought out.

During his career he has traveled extensively, speaking in all but two of the fifty states. He has given over two-thousand public addresses. Because of his wide activity as a spokesman for education he has wielded an influence on education that goes well beyond the institutions he has served.

Melby was not an educational philosopher, in the sense that one opens a new avenue of knowledge. He did, however, take the philosophies of Dewey and Kilpatrick and give them vitality and meaning for the teachers of America and for the faculties with whom he worked. He lived what these men wrote about. In spite of the fact that most of Melby's career was spent as an administrator, it is probable that his greatest contribution has been as a dedicated and articulate spokesman for American education.

Sources for the study include: Melby's speeches and professional writings; his professional diary; his scrapbooks, and personal papers; reports and bulletins from schools with which he was associated; taped interviews with Melby, and research trips to interview friends and former professional associates.

Copyright by

ROBERT JOHN ALFONSO

1963

ERNEST O. MELBY: EVANGELIST FOR EDUCATION

By

Robert John Alfonso

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF APPENDIXES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
 CHAPTER	
I. THE EARLY YEARS.....	5
EDUCATION.....	10
ALEXANDRIA.....	21
BRECKINRIDGE.....	24
BREWSTER.....	26
BLACKDUCK.....	30
II. THE EDUCATOR COMES OF AGE.....	37
LONG PRAIRIE.....	37
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.....	44
NORTHWESTERN.....	49
III. THE MONTANA YEARS.....	100
UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT.....	104
CHANCELLOR.....	126
THE MONTANA STUDY.....	143
IV. AT THE HUB OF THE WORLD.....	161
FIRST IMPRESSIONS.....	164
THE ADMINISTRATOR.....	168
SUCCESSES AND STRUGGLES.....	179
A NATIONAL MISSION.....	196

	PAGE
UNDER ATTACK.....	209
RETIREMENT.....	218
V. THE EARNED REWARD.....	222
IN THE CLASSROOM AGAIN.....	224
AND OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM.....	235
A CONTINUING CONTRIBUTION.....	244
VI. A SUMMING UP.....	247
THE ADMINISTRATOR.....	248
THE EVANGELIST.....	254
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	260
LIST OF WORKS CITED.....	261
CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE WORKS OF ERNEST O. MELBY.....	266
APPENDIXES.....	275

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. William H. Roe, chairman of his advisory committee, the writer expresses sincere appreciation for his encouragement, wisdom, and friendly counsel throughout the course of his doctoral study.

To the other members of the committee -- Dr. Allan J. Beegle, Dr. Roy A. Edelfelt, and Dr. William J. Walsh -- the writer is grateful for the contributions they have made to this study and to his education.

To Dr. Carl Gross, who consented to serve as a special advisor to this dissertation, the writer expresses appreciation for his assistance and advice.

To Dr. Ernest O. Melby a special word of appreciation is due. Without his cooperation this study would have been impossible. For his willingness to devote his time and materials to the writer, for his frankness in answering many questions, and for the difference that the study of his life has made in the life of the writer, the deepest appreciation is extended.

To his wife, Martha, and his children, Allison and Robert Jr., the writer expresses thanks for their patience under trying circumstances.

LIST OF APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A.	Outline of Career.....	276
APPENDIX B.	Article: "A Concept of Dynamic Education"....	278
APPENDIX C.	Selected Speeches.....	285
APPENDIX D.	Sample of Professional Activities.....	308

INTRODUCTION

This study traces the educational career of Ernest O. Melby. He has lived through a period of great ferment and change in American education, and he has been a vital part of this activity. What his role has been, what influence he has had, what the forces are that have shaped his life and thought, and what personal qualities contributed to making Dr. Melby a success are questions that this study attempts to answer. It is not a rounded biography, in that the emphasis throughout is on Melby's career as an educator. The study does endeavor, however, to portray the human side of Dr. Melby--his unique personality and spirit--for without doing so, much of his career and contribution could not be clearly understood. The personal attributes that make him "Ernest O. Melby" are important in the conduct of his career and in the development of his philosophy of education.

The dissertation attempts to be objective and to present as honest and fair a report of Dr. Melby and his career as can be done with a living subject and when so many other living personalities are involved.

Dr. Melby has given his fullest cooperation, but he has in no way attempted to influence the nature or content of the dissertation. He has given freely of his

time and information. He has been willing to answer all of the author's frequent questions; working in the same building together during the research and writing of the dissertation has provided him with an unusual opportunity to draw on Dr. Melby as a source of information. He gave the writer access to his professional diary, dating back twenty years; to his volumes of scrapbooks containing valuable information as far back as the late 1920's; to his speeches and personal letters. He was most generous in making available any material in his files that could contribute to the research. Other written sources include Dr. Melby's books and his journal articles.

Many hours were spent with Dr. Melby during which he discoursed on his life and answered questions. On a tape recorder numerous hours of such discussions with him were recorded. In addition to formal interviews, the writer had many informal talks with Dr. Melby, sat in on his classes, and traveled with him on speaking trips. For this reason much of the information and quotations taken from Dr. Melby is not referenced. A great amount of information was also obtained through formal and informal talks with former and present students of Melby's, as well as faculty members and administrators who have served with him. Whenever possible, information gained in such a way has been referenced.

Dr. Melby has been extremely helpful in suggesting people who might be interviewed. In cases where it was not feasible to personally interview such people, they were, in some cases, communicated with by letter. All of those people who were interviewed and written to concerning Dr. Melby have been, without exception, cooperative and helpful.

The study was limited, to some extent, by the lack of time and funds required to do a depth study of a man's life and work.

In doing a study of this kind one is naturally indebted to a great many people. Without fail, each person who was asked contributed generously of his time and knowledge. Numbers of others volunteered remembrances and evaluations of Dr. Melby; the list of people to whom the writer talked runs into the hundreds. Many faculty members at Michigan State University made contributions. There is no satisfactory way to repay the debts owed to so many people. Therefore, one can only acknowledge them. Among those who have given of their time and provided valuable insight and information, the author should like to list the following: Dean Walter A. Anderson, Professors Christian O. Arndt, Abraham I. Katsh, Ellis F. White, Fritz Borgeson, all of the School of Education, New York University; Professor George S. Counts, Southern Illinois University; Henry T. Heald, director of the Ford Foundation; Professor William

Heard Kilpatrick; Ordway Tead, vice-president of Harper and Brothers; Dean Francis C. Rosecrance, College of Education, Wayne State University; Clifford E. Erickson, provost, Michigan State University; Professor Stephen Dexter, of the College of Agriculture, Michigan State University; Karl Kramer, Michigan State Department of Public Instruction; Floyd A. McCartney, East Lansing, Michigan; Alberta M. Scow and Grace Sargeant, Long Prairie, Minnesota.

CHAPTER I

THE EARLY YEARS

In 1885, Ole Hanson Melby, at the age of 23, immigrated from Norway to the vast, sprawling land of Minnesota, a land laden with promise of all kinds of good things to the man who would work hard. Less than thirty years before, in 1858, Congress admitted Minnesota to the Union. Minnesota was a booming agricultural state; in 1860, it had 22,000 farms and a population of 172,023, while ten years later, with the tremendous influx of Scandinavians and Central Europeans, the population jumped to 439,706.¹ Lumbering and wheat growing fought for dominance. In the larger cities industry sprang up. Sod houses and dugouts began to be replaced by frame houses; village sites were often arbitrarily determined by the railroad as it pushed westward.

Despite all the rapid settlement, Minnesota was still an unsettled land; rough, harsh to its new inhabitants, it offered them heartache along with the promise of success. Just twenty years before Ole Melby's arrival the greatest Indian uprising in the nation's history threatened the people of Minnesota. The entire Sioux Nation of almost

¹Federal Writers Project, Minnesota, (New York: Viking Press, 1938), pp.54-56.

7,000 united in the revolt in which hundreds of white residents and homesteaders met death within a few days. It took many years for hatred and distrust of the Indian to subside.

Strangely, these early, turbulent days of Minnesota history saw at the same time a lively concern for education. The older counties were well provided with ungraded elementary schools while in the larger centers "union schools" offered grade and high school studies.² In the sparsely settled Northern section, however, there was often only the one-room, log school. In the same decade as the great Sioux uprising, three state normal schools were established (Winona, St. Cloud and Mankato), the state university, a state school for the deaf (with a department for the blind added in 1866), and an asylum for the insane.³

In spite of natural and national disasters--financial panic (1873), blizzards, invasions of locusts (1876) and industrial explosions in Minneapolis which cost many lives and laid waste a large part of the milling district--Minnesota population continued to rise. Railroads and grain brought more settlers, and when Ole Melby arrived from Norway in 1885, Minnesota boasted a million people; two years later a state school tax was inaugurated, quickly followed by

²Ibid., p. 56.

³Ibid., p. 56.

compulsory education, textbook legislation and state financial aid to public schools.⁴ All this occurred within just 20 years after a few thousand Sioux Indians stormed across the state in a bloody massacre.

Ole Melby found work as a hired hand on Minnesota farms. Within a short time, however, he had taken 120 acres of homestead land for himself. It was rough, untilled stumpland, covered with brush and trees. He set about preparing his land for farming, clearing it literally with his bare hands. In 1890 he met and married Ellen Caroline Stakke, the daughter of Norwegian parents who had migrated from Iowa to Minnesota where they took a homestead. It was the typically American story of pioneers clearing and settling the land; they were conscientious and industrious people who believed in the earth and were confident that hard work and honesty would be rewarded.

It was into this kind of a home that Ernest Oscar Melby was born on August 16, 1891. The Melby farm was located in the Red River Valley region of Minnesota, about seven miles from the town of Lake Park. Lake Park was sparsely populated in 1885, having been settled only 15 years earlier; even today it boasts just 689 residents. Ernest Melby's own early remembrances of his parents' life

⁴Ibid., p. 58.

was that:

It was like frontier--they were really pioneers; there were a lot of homesteads; the ground was all stump land and forest land--the prairies, where they were, were as yet unbroken. I remember, as a boy, the Indians--there were no massacres or war, but the Indians were very much in evidence where I grew up; they were all around there. I remember that as children we were very much afraid of them--people still believed that a good Indian was a dead Indian.

From his father, Ernest learned lessons about life that were to remain with him throughout his life. A description given of the Scandinavians in Minnesota is representative of the atmosphere in which Ernest was raised:

They came from countries where illiteracy was extremely low. Their traditions were of thrift, respect for both intellectual and physical effort, and interest in government, and they combined to an unusual degree love of individual freedom and talent for cooperating with their neighbors.⁵

Melby describes this concern for helping one's neighbors:

There was a family living across the road from us who were ne'er-do-wells of the first order. They were awfully good-hearted and generous people, but they never had anything and never got anywhere. They were just about starving every now and then, and they would come across the road when it got too bad, and my father would throw a sack of flour into the wagon for the fellow and then they would live awhile again. My father didn't have too much either, but we learned to share what we had even though we didn't have very much. This was the way we grew up, paying our bills, meeting our responsibilities. If you said you were going to be in a certain place at a certain time you were there; you didn't forget about it and not show up. If you worked for somebody you gave him all the work you

⁵Ibid., p. 77.

could in that day, and if you had to work an extra hour to get the hay put up you did it and you didn't get any extra pay for it either.

From his father he also gained some concepts of treating people as human beings. Later on when they were a little better off and could afford it they had some hired help on the farm. These people always ate at the Melby family table--there was no distinction of class. "I can't remember ever being in a situation," says Melby, "where I was taught a class concept either by word of mouth or otherwise; this was absolutely foreign to me and to my experience-- there was never anything like this."

Melby also credits life on the farm and the tasks that a farm boy had to do for teaching him something about responsibility. Although he had little enthusiasm for farming and no desire to pursue it for a career, he still considers its lessons invaluable. He makes frequent reference to the discipline which farm duties develop. He likes to quote George S. Counts, who jokingly refers to a book he would like to write on "The Educational Contribution of the Milk Cow." Says Melby, "You know, maybe he's got something there; a farm boy is given responsibilities of such a nature that they have to be performed. You can have a boy mow the lawn, but if he doesn't do it today, he can do it tomorrow, or maybe even next week, but if you don't milk the cow tonight there's going to be trouble."

Ernest's life as a boy was a typical Minnesota farm

boy's life. Day to day obligations took pre-eminence. He had no great troubles or traumatic experiences; he describes himself as a "very average boy." No trouble-maker, he found little mischief to do around the farm and little to capture his imagination. Instead he found his excitement in the corner book shelf in the rural school library. Books were far more exciting to Ernest than anything else around him. Once he had sampled the book shelf he read every book it contained. Here was a new world, one which took him way beyond the farms and forests of Minnesota.

Melby credits his earlier studiousness not so much to any great inquisitiveness of intelligence as to the fact that there was simply little else to do on the farm. Ernest didn't start school until he was eight years old, but he could read before he reached this point. Sitting in the kitchen of his home, he would plow laboriously through books way beyond his years. When he came to a word he didn't know (of which there were many!) he would ask his mother what it was. Ellen Melby, who had graduated from grammar school and completed one year of high school, had been, for a short time, a country school teacher. So in this tedious, slow way, Ernest learned how to read, asking, repeating, stumbling along. Finally words began to live and have meaning.

EDUCATION

When he was eight years old the time came for his

formal schooling to begin in the one-room country school house. Put in the "chart class" for beginning readers, Ernest found his experience "terrible." Already way beyond repeating such groups of words as "Mary has a cat; the cat is white," he suffered along in silence until his ability to read was recognized. Today Melby reflects on how much he learned in school those first few years by listening to the other students. With his own book propped up in front of him he listened to the older students answer questions and recite their lessons.

School only "kept" five months out of the year-- October through December, and April through May. Ernest and the other students used to joke that they forgot more during the intervals than they learned during the terms. A haphazard system, it meant that students never attended school for more than three months at a stretch. This was the turn of the century, just sixty years ago, yet only five percent of Minnesota youth attended high school.⁶

During his first year in school, eight year old Ernest found a book called Livingston's Travels in Africa. During the winter he plowed his way through it, filled with excitement, not knowing half the words. With help from his mother he got through it. Melby today says this was the first really

⁶Theodore C. Blegen and Theodore L. Nydahl, Minnesota History, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1960, p. 129.

exciting book that he ever read and that he still remembers much of what was in it. To a small boy living seven miles from Lake Park, Minnesota, this book opened new worlds. It is no wonder that he should find from this time on that "there was far more excitement in the corner book shelf than there was anywhere else around me."

The value of education was given high priority in the Melby farm home. Curiously, the great stress laid on the importance of education came not from Ernest's mother, who had been able to get some education, but from his father, who had virtually none. Ole Melby had stopped attending school completely at ten years of age and started to work in an effort to help bring in enough money so the family could live. Perhaps because he had so little education he saw how important it was. He was always working to make more and better schooling available in the frontier area where he lived. He had unbounded faith in what education could do for people and for nations. "I had held out to me constantly," says Melby, "the importance of education, and I recall that my father said to me--I heard him say it repeatedly--that if only people were educated, crime would disappear, political corruption would be decreased, and even world peace would reign. He believed that."⁷

⁷ Ernest O. Melby, "Better Teaching for What?" Address at the NEA Regional Instruction Conference, Toledo, Ohio, April 5-7, 1951.

Ernest kept on attending school, five months a year, not very sure of what he was going to do or where he was going to get because of it. Then in the fall of 1904, when he was thirteen years old, a significant event took place; a new teacher came to the one-room school. One day, the teacher, Miss Emily O'Day, had a serious talk with him. "Look, Ernest," she said, "if you work hard this year you can pass the state exams in the spring and you can go to high school." This seemed to Ernest like the most wonderful thing in the world. But how could he do it! Here he was just thirteen years old, only having started school at the age of eight.

This was a turning point in Ernest's life. A young teacher exhibited great faith in him--"Ernest, you can do it." To Melby the fact that someone like this came along in his life "was a tremendous thing--I'll always remember this girl; she was wonderful." So Ernest applied himself during the year and studied. In Minnesota at this time it was required that any student who wished to attend high school must pass state examinations in specific subjects at the end of the eighth grade. The questions were constructed by the state education department and administered at a given time each year, usually in the spring. Students were also tested during high school by the same method. In the spring the state examination questions arrived. With the usual kind of secrecy and ceremony that surrounds their administration, they could not be opened until the appointed day and hour.

When the time arrived and test packet was opened, Ernest and his teacher found that, by some error, tests for a few high school subjects had been included in the packet, along with those which would qualify one for admittance to high school. The examinations included by mistake covered such high school courses as commercial geography, physical geography, commercial arithmetic, and civics. Miss O'Day said, "Ernest, you might just as well take these because you might pass them, and you can get credit for them in high school." Ernest did take them, and passed them all, including the high school qualifying series. He started high school that next fall with half a year of high school credits--just five years after beginning his education.

The Melbys lived seven miles outside of Lake Park, the location of the only high school in the area. Commuting was out of the question; if Ernest wanted to attend high school he would have to move to town. A room for him was found at the parsonage of Reverend O.G. Dolager, the Lutheran minister in Lake Park. It was here that Ernest heard about St. Olaf College, where he later enrolled; Rev. Dolager had a strong interest in St. Olaf College, where his son was then attending, and talked repeatedly to Ernest about it. This association with the Lutheran minister was primarily responsible for Ernest's decision to attend St. Olaf.

Melby speaks often of his belief that nearly every person who has achieved something outstanding in the educational profession has done so because someone has exhibited great faith in him, that the individual had to carry through because the person believed in him and he couldn't disappoint him. This is the kind of faith that was demonstrated by Miss O'Day when she said, "Ernest, you can do it." It is the kind of quiet confidence exuded by the minister who talked to Ernest about attending college.

Melby is characterized by his great faith in people. When one asks how one acquires this faith, or whether it can be taught, he finds the answer difficult. Perhaps Melby developed his unbounded faith in people because he had the happy experience of coming in contact with people who demonstrated clearly their faith in him. On the topic of imparting faith, Melby says, "I think we could do wonderful things with American boys and girls and American people if we could treat them in a way that manifests our faith in them. If you want to teach a boy to have faith in his fellowmen, show him that you have faith in him. That's the way to teach him the power of faith."

While Ernest was attending school in Lake Park, another influential person entered his life, S.E. Hargis, the superintendent of schools. Hargis took an interest in Ernest, and in the mornings Ernest would catch up with him and walk to school with the superintendent, discoursing with him on a

variety of subjects. His friendship was a big factor in Ernest's development during his high school years. "There's no question about it," says Melby, "the superintendent was an important person in my life." After school Ernest would talk with him in the laboratory. (In addition to his duties as superintendent, Hargis also taught science.) He kept telling Ernest about the importance of going to college and what it could mean to him. Melby felt wanted, felt that he was accepted, that Hargis had faith in him. He still believes that the feeling of being wanted, of being respected, is the most powerful factor in the development of the individual--the really effective teacher cares about students.⁸

As a result of his having earned a half year of high school credits prior to entrance, Ernest found that he had accrued fourteen credits at the end of his junior year in high school. At that time it was not necessary to have a diploma to enter college, providing that one had earned fifteen credits. Ernest went off to St. Olaf without taking his senior year at Lake Park and without a diploma. During his freshman year at St. Olaf, however, he also took one course in the college's academy so that at the end of his freshman year he had met the admission's requirement of fifteen credits.

When Melby entered college he had as yet no clear notion of what he wanted to do; vocational goals were not yet taking

⁸Ernest O. Melby, "Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming," Provost's Lecture, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 24, 1962.

form. Teaching as a career had never entered his mind. The biggest interest for Melby, that which captured his imagination, was debating. In debating work he found himself studying all kinds of topics of a political, economic and social nature. For example, he debated the issue of the central bank (this was before the federal reserve system), and the minimum wage. He was forced to study these questions, to dig for information. He credits this activity for teaching him how to use the library. Melby's courses, which he describes as "mostly textbook courses," did not encourage or develop a wide use of the library. Perhaps even more than that, the debate work focused Melby's interest on vital issues facing the country--an interest which has never left him, but rather, has increased over the years. Melby, himself, feels that he would not have developed these interests if it had not been for debating.

St. Olaf College, when Melby enrolled in 1909, was a small, rigorously run, liberal arts college. Originally founded as St. Olaf's School in 1874 by a group of Norwegian Lutherans who raised \$6000 for the project, it was designed "to keep their young people in contact with the church, while giving them a liberal arts education."⁹ In 1886 the school expanded into a four year college. The first graduating class, in 1890, consisted of three men; twenty-three years later, when Melby enrolled, the student body totaled 200--145 men and 55 women.¹⁰

⁹Federal Writers Project, op. cit., p. 420.

¹⁰St. Olaf College Bulletin, vol. LVIII, April, 1962, p. 169.

Melby's own remembrance of St. Olaf during his undergraduate days was that, "it was a very rigid, highly religious, puritanical, excessively controlled enterprise from my point of view...I think that I, together with 90 percent of the students, felt this way about it."

In spite of some of these feelings about the college, important things happened to Melby there. He says that it was not the college, but people, a few professors, who had great influence on him. One of these influential people was F. Melius Christiansen, the director of the world-renowned St. Olaf College a capella choir. Melby joined the choir shortly after arriving at the college, just six years after Christiansen came to St. Olaf and organized the choir. The excellence of the choir is now an accepted fact. Melby credits Christiansen with giving him two ideas that became important in his life. One contribution was to convince all the students who sang for him that they could accomplish great things if they would only work hard and practice. Melby reflects that "we weren't any good as singers, but we'd drill and drill and work on things over and over again, and then we'd go and give a concert--and we surprised ourselves. People thought we were wonderful." The other thing that Christiansen taught them was what could be done in a little college like St. Olaf. He helped them see that it wasn't necessary to be in a big university to make a big contribution.

Finances presented a problem to Melby at college, but with the help of two-or three-hundred dollars a year that his

parents were able to send, and with the money he earned from doing odd jobs around the campus he managed to eke out enough to pay expenses. There were no extra dimes left over for Melby or for the other students, who came from backgrounds and economic conditions quite similar to his.

Above all the other experiences he had at St. Olaf, Melby's work with debate loomed as most important. It not only stretched his mind, but it helped develop his unique gift for public speaking. In part because of his eloquence in debate, the college faculty urged Melby to enter the ministry. This Melby had absolutely no desire to do. Instead, because of his interest in debate and the issues which had captured his attention, Melby decided that the only sensible thing for him to do was to study law. The only hindrance to his enrolling immediately in law school following graduation was lack of funds. If he wanted to go to law school then he would have to work and save some money. Melby decided to teach for awhile, expecting to put aside enough money for law school. He laughs today at "the foolishness of anyone who thought he could save money on a teacher's salary in those days."

So, in spite of the pressures from certain faculty members, many of whom were, themselves, former ministers, and the fact that it would have pleased his parents, Melby rejected all suggestions that he study for the ministry. Furthermore, in spite of the strong religious purpose of the college, Melby found himself gradually slipping away from the rigid religious

environment in which he had been raised. There was no cataclysmic experience, no sudden intellectual rejection of his earlier orthodoxy. Instead he came out of St. Olaf without any great religious conviction, even though it was the desire of the college to foster such convictions. Melby, in reflecting on it today, says, "Somehow or other I can't say that either religion or a struggle over religion ever was very much a factor in my life...the thing that impresses me today about religion is the teachings of Jesus, not in the sense of Jesus as God...but as the historical Jesus, as a way of living."

Melby, who earned his bachelor's degree in science in 1913, left college with a good academic record but not an outstanding one. He was not heralded as the one most likely to succeed, although there was some feeling that he might do well in politics--most likely this belief was a result of the good work he had done in debate. His assessment of St. Olaf College and what it had done for him was not a very flattering one. After graduation he had the feeling that the college was "pretty limited" and that it had given him a somewhat "myopic view of the world...I was not too enthusiastic about it or the education I got there...on the other hand, I don't rate what I did with it too highly either." It is Melby's own opinion that people looking at him on the day of his graduation would not have predicted any great achievements for him.

With career plans formulated, but without the means at the moment to pursue them, Melby decided to teach as an interim

activity. At graduation time in 1913 he accepted a teaching position for the coming school year at Alexandria, Minnesota.

ALEXANDRIA

— Melby was thrust into an educational world already in the process of a minor revolution and on the verge of major changes in its form and content; the seeds of progressive education laid by Francis W. Parker and by John Dewey in the 1890's were now taking root. The Progressivism of Theodore Roosevelt had stimulated the nation. Cries for social reform echoed across the country, labor unions pushed for rights for the workers, Woodrow Wilson had just been elected president, and the sixteenth amendment granting Congress the right to levy income taxes had just been declared in effect. Conflicting calls bade America to move toward pacifism on one hand and toward the exercise of leadership in world affairs on the other; just around the corner, a year away, was the start of a World War that would eventually entangle the United States.

When the request came from Alexandria, Minnesota, to St. Olaf for a high school science teacher, Melby accepted it. He had also had two other offers at the same time. After pondering the three and asking some advice, he decided on Alexandria, but with little real enthusiasm. After all, it was only temporary, just a short term kind of employment until some money could be put aside. To Melby's surprise he liked teaching from the beginning, and as the year wore on he liked it more. Nevertheless, he still kept insisting to himself that

he was going to go back to college and study law. Melby reflects, "Somehow there must have been a greater and greater unreality about this all along." His suspicion today is that he might have been a very poor lawyer.

Alexandria, when Melby arrived, was a fairly prosperous town; it owed its prosperity to the exceptionally rich farmland surrounding it. Its prosperity might well have been a major reason for Melby's friends indicating that Alexandria was the best of the three job offers. Hired to teach high school science, Melby also found himself in debate work, this time coaching the high school debating team. Melby's salary this first year of teaching was \$85.00 a month; out of this he paid \$20.00 a month for room and board and even managed to save a little money, although not nearly enough to think about going to law school.

Melby's first year of teaching was not the startling kind of experience that it is for some teachers. While an undergraduate at St. Olaf he had done a little teaching in the college's academy, so he was not a complete stranger to the profession. He enjoyed his first year of teaching in Alexandria, but was uncritical of how he taught. Looking back on it in later years he had little idea about whether what he did there was really good or not. Melby says, "I really didn't know much about teaching, theoretically; I guess I didn't realize that there was very much to know."

Slowly, Melby began to see some things about education that he had not been aware of before. Again it was an

influential person who had an effect on the course of Melby's life and career. The superintendent of schools in Alexandria, John B. Hagen, had his "office" on a stair landing in the old and crowded building. He had put a partition across the landing and on Saturdays he would go there to do his letter writing and handle the matters that a superintendent who also taught classes could not do during the week. Melby would come to school on Saturday to work in his chemistry laboratory to prepare experiments and apparatus for his classes, and in the process of going up to the top floor would have to pass the superintendent's office space.

Often when Melby would walk by, Hagen would call out for him to come in and sit down for a talk. Hagen would talk to Melby, the new teacher, about the profession and about teaching, and slowly Melby began to see some things about education that he had not seen before and might not have seen if it had not been for Hagen's interest. Melby says: "I owe him a lot, because we spent a lot of time together. He was a good man and a good superintendent...He wasn't trained like superintendents are today; he wouldn't have known what some of these men are talking about, and he couldn't have put his theory down in words, but he treated me like an equal and we all liked to work for him."

In Minnesota, as across the nation, changes were taking place in education. There was a growing tendency for more support from outside the local district. During Melby's first year of teaching, Minnesota began to distribute state aid to

education. Melby said that in Minnesota, beginning with that period: "...there was a tremendous development of state aid and in the judgment of the people there at that time, the greatest development of local interest and the greatest increase in local taxation for education. I know that in the communities in which I worked, the money that we were getting from the state caused us to raise more money locally, because it now was possible to do things with state help that we could not have done alone."¹¹

BRECKINRIDGE

When his first year at Alexandria was finished, Melby was offered a position, (for \$20.00 more per month), as high school principal in a nearby town, Breckinridge, with a high school of about 200 students. Breckinridge was, and is, the railroad shipping center for the region. Here Melby found new problems. Students in this railroad town were different from those in Alexandria; he found that as principal he had discipline problems that had not existed in Alexandria. Moreover, the superintendent in Breckinridge was by Melby's description a "scared rabbit," a poor administrator who failed to back him up in anything. The contrast between this man and Hagen was astounding to Melby, who decided right then that if he were ever to become a superintendent he would certainly try to be

¹¹Ernest O. Melby, speech at Western New York School Board Institute, November 30, 1961. Speech contained in "The School Board Considers Why Do We Support Public Education?" A Report of the Western New York School Board Institute, p. 21.

like Hagen and not like this new man.

Melby, however, had made no firm commitment yet to either administration or education as a career, in spite of his feelings about what kind of a superintendent he would like to be. Law school, though, was now largely forgotten. In Alexandria he had met Aurora Marie Herbert (who, incidentally, had been working as a secretary to a law firm). On December 29, 1914, while principal at Breckinridge, they were married, and Melby was convinced that now that he was married, going back to law school was a very remote possibility.

The year at Breckinridge did not seem to Melby to be a very successful one. Difficulties arising from an undisciplined student body and the unpleasantness of working with a superintendent whose abilities he could not respect and whose administration he found sadly lacking convinced Melby that if another suitable position were offered to him he should leave. Melby did not seek a job; in fact, in his total career, he never actively sought a position; the jobs were always offered to him. This was even true of his first teaching position in Alexandria. Melby's explanation of his being "offered" even his first job was that at the time work was plentiful but the teachers were few and that all the potential teachers had more offers than they could handle.

So at the end of his first year as principal at Breckinridge when he was offered a superintendency at Brewster, Melby decided that he might like to try this phase of

administration. He had already promised himself that if he ever had the chance to be a superintendent he would be like the first one he worked for, John B. Hagen, and not the one at Breckinridge. With little hesitation, therefore, he accepted the offer from the school board at Brewster, anxious to try his hand at being a superintendent of schools, partly because he thought that he could do a better job than the man with whom he was serving. Even at this point Melby was still not sure of his career goals or that he would even stay in the field of education.

BREWSTER

The period in which Melby began his work as a rural school superintendent was one that was bursting with demands for rural school reform, for making the training in rural schools satisfactory for boys and girls who would spend their lives on the farm. Such people as Liberty Hyde Bailey and Seaman Knapp pioneered in the movement to bring agricultural training into the school and to provide an education suited to the needs of rural youth.¹² In addition, there arose a more generalized concern for improving the life of rural America. In 1908, Theodore Roosevelt, recognizing the direction that the movement was taking and, "Sensitive to a fertile field in which Progressivism might work its uplifting influence...

¹²Lawrence D. Cremin, Transformation of the School, (New York: Knopf, 1961), p. 80.

app

gach

all

na

the

the

ad

in

in

the

the

the

the

a

a

v

v

appointed a Commission on Country Life and charged it with gathering information and formulating recommendations for alleviating rural distress."¹³

Much of the Commission's effort centered on a questionnaire sent to over half a million farmers and rural people throughout the nation. The question concerning education, which asked whether the schools were training boys and girls adequately for farm life, received an almost unanimous "no."¹⁴ Although the Commission's extensive report seemed to bring no immediate change, a flood of literature centering on rural problems followed and, ultimately, legislation. In 1914 Congress passed the Smith-Lever Act establishing a national system of extension work in agriculture and home economics.¹⁵

The year after the passing of the Smith-Lever Act, Melby arrived in Brewster, a town of about 350 people. The consolidated school had recently taken in several rural schools. In Minnesota at this time a consolidated school was in reality quickly becoming a "community" school. Some of the school's special functions and activities, as described by Melby, would sound like an ambitious venture even today: adult education, agriculture, home economics, industrial arts, 4-H Club work, short courses for farmers, a canning operation (utilized by

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 83.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 84.

mothers who brought vegetables and fruit), a sewing room, and classes in sewing for mothers. In Melby's remembrance "the lights in that school burned every night."

Here was an exciting and challenging new experience for Melby--a school that was a vital part of the life of the community. Melby learned much in Brewster: he claims it did more for him than he ever did for it. What he experienced during his two years as superintendent at Brewster was to have a profound effect on his educational philosophy and the direction of his career. In Brewster was the birth of his life-long crusade to take education out of the classroom and out into the community. He was suddenly learning things about education that he had never been aware of before, seeing the potential of what it could do for people of all ages.

These were busy days for Melby. In addition to being superintendent and guiding not only the school's regular programs but its community education programs, he taught courses in the high school: German, science, and history, among others. The school only had six teachers, four elementary and two high school. The first year Melby was at Brewster they had just two years of high school; his second year they added one new teacher and offered four years of high school. Melby says that he taught almost every course in the high school curriculum "except Latin and home economics."

Melby realized early in this first superintendency that he knew "absolutely nothing about the elementary school...as I look back on it it seems impossible." He related an anecdote which demonstrates his lack of knowledge of the elementary school. Even more important, however, it gives a clue into the nature of his administration at this early period in his career; it is clearly part of a continuing pattern:

The first day we opened, one of the primary teachers came in and said, "What system of phonics do you want me to use?" I didn't know what she was talking about. Being a physics teacher I thought it had something to do with sound, but I wasn't quite sure what. I told this teacher something that was very stupid--I said that we would have a teachers' meeting in a week and we would take it up at that time. On the way home I got to thinking about this and I realized that this was a terrible thing to do. It was dishonest, and I'd never be able to get away with it anyway, so I went back again in the afternoon and I called them together to make some announcements and so on, and I told them: "Look," I said, "you've got yourself a superintendent who knows nothing about the elementary school; in fact I don't know much about the high school except the subjects I teach, but if you'll help me I'm going to try." The result of this was that they all descended on me with help and we had a wonderful two years...these teachers undertook my education.

The staff did educate Melby; they worked together and he learned from them as they did it. In looking back at the experience that started with his admission of needing the help of his staff and commenting on its ultimate value for him, Melby says, "I did get a picture of a set of relationships in a school that I carried with me and used in other places and still use; this, I think, was a pretty fundamental thing."

BLACKDUCK

Again the call came to Melby to come to another position--this time to Blackduck, Minnesota, another consolidated school, but in a larger and somewhat better developed district. It was 1917. Just a few months before, the United States had declared war on Germany. A year later Thorndike would write: "Whatever exists at all exists in some amount...To know it thoroughly involves knowing its quantity as well as its quality."¹⁶ The rapid development of educational measurement devices was underway, a movement that would later capture Melby's interest as a doctoral student at the University of Minnesota. Growing influence among the progressives in education would culminate two years later in the founding of the Progressive Education Association.

W.E. Pike, later dean of the College of Education at the University of Minnesota, had been superintendent at Blackduck and was leaving for a different position. He knew of Melby and wrote to him describing the position at Blackduck as a good opportunity and urging him to come and take the position. Here was a new challenge and Melby accepted it.

¹⁶Edward L. Thorndike, "The Nature, Purposes and General Methods of Measurements of Educational Products," National Society for the Study of Education, Seventeenth Yearbook (Bloomington, 1918) p. 16, cited by Lawrence A. Cremin, Transformation of the School (New York: Knopf, 1961), p. 185.

Blackduck was not without problems. It was a poor town in the "cut-over" land of Minnesota. Melby recalls that it had "about the lowest valuation per student in the state of Minnesota and, I think, the highest tax, but it was a community that wanted a good school." The outbreak of the war raised prices precipitously. In order that Blackduck teachers could keep pace, Melby and the school board raised salaries twice in one year, a move which would ultimately cause difficulty for Melby.

Stephen Dexter, who was hired to teach agriculture in Blackduck while Melby was superintendent, recalls that he was not only warmly greeted by Melby when he arrived in Blackduck, just out of the Marine Corps at the end of the First World War, but that Melby took him to his home for the night until he could find a place to stay.¹⁷ He remembers Melby as being "strictly professional...his administration didn't show; this is the best kind." Dexter cites Melby's willingness to have faith in the ability of faculty members to work out their own problems without checking and remonstrance from him. On several occasions Dexter was involved in some disagreements with students and with school board members that he says must have brought down "a hornet's nest around Melby's head, yet he never said a word to me."

Melby's ability to resolve a touchy school problem is pointed out by Dexter in an incident in which he, himself,

¹⁷Statement by Stephen Dexter, personal interview. This and the following observations by Dr. Dexter were made during a personal interview with the author.

was the focus of attention. In this case Melby could not trust Dexter to work out his problem, since it had already been brought to Melby by the students. Dexter was teaching a physics class in addition to his work in agriculture. He felt that the physics students, seniors, were lacking in elementary mathematics; as a result, the students were failing physics, a required course. Dexter recalls that his standards were "pretty rugged."

As a result of the impasse the entire physics class called on Melby about two weeks after school had begun to tell him that they wanted to drop the course, that they "might as well flunk now as flunk it nine months later." Instead of taking one of the two obvious alternatives, either upholding Dexter's position or taking the students' side and sending Dexter back to the physics class with a less rigorous set of standards, Melby found another solution. Dexter had just recently started the short course for farmers. This "extra" work that he had taken on made it legitimate for Melby to offer to take over and teach Dexter's physics class while his short course was in progress. When the short course was over Melby suggested that he continue with the physics course and that Dexter take over one of his courses, geometry. This was perfectly acceptable to Dexter, so the permanent switch was made. Dexter recalls that it was not long after this that Melby suggested to him that perhaps he should look for a college teaching job for he was not sure that he would

ever really be happy teaching in high school. (Dexter did so and has for many years been a professor in the College of Agriculture at Michigan State University.)

In recalling his first year of teaching at Blackduck, Dexter notes that there were many times when as a first year teacher he could have used some help, but that evidently Melby was satisfied to let the inexperienced teachers make mistakes and flounder, feeling that they would learn from their mistakes. "I was impressed," says Dexter, "by the fact that he seemed to have sense enough to do his work and assign things to other people and leave them alone and not continually meddle with what they were doing; and there must have been cases, with me at least, when he must have been sorely tempted to meddle."

Armed with some of the lessons he learned in the highly service-oriented community school at Brewster, Melby started initiating new programs at Blackduck. Soon there was a vocational agriculture program, with federal support, and home economics courses were begun. Soon after this there were short courses offered for farmers, primarily youths who had dropped out of school.

During Melby's third year at Blackduck he incurred the wrath of a few members of the community. Melby and the school board, in an effort to provide adequate salaries for the teaching staff, had raised teachers' salaries twice in one year to counteract spiraling wartime prices. This action began to cause a little trouble among certain segments of the community. Two economy-minded members of the community got themselves elected to the board. Prior to election they

had claimed that Melby had dominated the board and that salary raises weren't necessary, but that Melby had forced the raise through.

According to Melby the two new members induced the board to hold meetings to which he was not invited. "Well," says Melby, "I think I was both hot-tempered and unwise, and I got angry and resigned." The morning that Melby resigned one of the teachers came into his office and asked if it were true that he was thinking of resigning. When Melby told him that he had resigned the teacher replied, "That's all I want to know."

In Blackduck it was the usual practice for the teachers, who were all single, to walk downtown for lunch. On the way, they had to pass the office of the man who was clerk of the school board. At noon on the day that Melby had told the inquiring teacher that he had resigned, all the teachers on their way downtown to eat lunch filed into the clerk's office and handed him their resignation. Now the board was completely without a school for the next year--no superintendent and no teachers. "About that time," recalls Melby, "things really began to happen around there, because then the board members began to come and talk to me and say, 'Look, this is a misunderstanding; won't you reconsider and stay?' I think really that maybe I should have, but I didn't."

This experience taught Melby something--that if you

had the backing of your teachers then you had strength. Melby felt that he had the support of many of the people in town and that the two board members were not representative of community feeling. He is also willing to admit today, however, in reflecting on himself and the board, that "we might have been a little bit peremptory and perhaps we didn't keep the community as well informed about these things as we should have."

Melby's own analysis of his understanding of educational administration during these early days in his career is that, although he operated as yet on no conscious theory, it was beginning to be clear to him that one's human relations were very important. He was beginning to see "what happened to people when you worked with them and put faith in them and gave them a free hand."

Melby was out of work. He had resigned abruptly with not a job prospect in sight; his record of never having to seek for a position remained in tact, however, for again the job sought him. A bookman in Minnesota, and an acquaintance of Melby's wrote to him and told him that Long Prairie was looking for a superintendent. Melby was interested but took no action about it. A few days later he received a call from the school board in Long Prairie asking him if he would come down and see them. Melby did go, and the board hired him. This was a bigger and more exciting job than any Melby had held before. His years in

Long Prairie would be a major milestone in his life, for they would determine the direction of his career. The apprentice years were behind.

CHAPTER II

THE EDUCATOR COMES OF AGE

LONG PRAIRIE

In 1920, the same year that Melby went to Long Prairie, Sinclair Lewis's Main Street blasted the provincialism of small town Minnesotans and gave immortality to "Gopher Prairie;" in actuality Sauk Center, located just 20 miles from Long Prairie. What Lewis found as crude, humdrum, ludicrous and ripe for satire, Melby found challenging and rewarding. Both men grew up in nearby small towns, yet one would become a social critic and the other a crusader. One would despise his rural background; the other would cherish it.

In America in 1920, events took place which were destined to affect the lives of people in every community--large or small: Congress passed the National Prohibition Act; the Nineteenth Amendment provided for woman suffrage; transcontinental air mail service was originated between New York and San Francisco; the Westinghouse Electric Company arranged the first general radio broadcast (for the national election); and Warren G. Harding was elected president.¹

¹William L. Langer (ed.), An Encyclopedia of World History, (revised edition; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952), p. 1050.

Long Prairie, the county seat, was a town of 2000 people. Melby was, and still is, amazed at the way in which the people and the school board supported education in that small town. For Melby this was a stimulating place to work, and he says: "Long Prairie contributed more to me than I did to it. Sometimes when I look back on it today I just can hardly believe that there ever was a place like this, because those people gave me everthing I ever asked for; I can't remember anything they ever turned me down on."

One gets some impressions of the kind of an administrator that the young Melby was by the things that some of his contemporaries had to say about him. Floyd McCartney, an insurance man in the district of Minnesota which included Long Prairie, recalls that his first contact with Melby came in the fall of 1920 when Carroll Paine, a Rand McNally salesman in the area, suggested that McCartney pay a visit to Melby at Long Prairie. "He's a comer," Paine told McCartney. "He's the best young school man in the area, and he's destined for bigger things."²

A few months later McCartney had an opportunity to visit Long Prairie. His first glimpse of Melby was at the local Commercial Club at noon where he was speaking to the businessmen about some of the school's problems. McCartney

²Statement by Floyd McCartney, personal interview. This and the following observations by McCartney were made during a personal interview with the author.

says, "I was impressed by Melby's talk; he was a gifted speaker, articulate and well informed. He was able to tell his story."

McCartney also speaks of Melby as being "a popular fellow...highly respected. He had intellectual curiosity. There was regret when he left...he was liked by the teachers. Long Prairie was lucky to keep him at all. He was community-minded and always willing to help people."

Further evidence of Melby's popularity is cited by Mrs. M.O. Scow, of Long Prairie, whose husband served on Melby's school board and who was herself a board member for nine years. Stating that she has known "many superintendents", she rates Melby as the best Long Prairie ever had: "All that you can say about Mr. Melby will not be enough to do him justice...I wish I could have a part in praising him."³

The years in Long Prairie were happy ones for Melby. He found he had a forward-looking school board and a civic-minded community. Money was given for special projects, teachers' salaries were increased, and a new high school went up. Belying the local Minnesota proverb that when a new school went up the superintendent had to leave, Melby stayed. The accomplishment with which, in many ways, he seems the most satisfied is the professional library that he and the staff were able to develop.

³Letter to the author from Mrs. M.O. Scow, July 12, 1962.

The school board, for whom Melby has nothing but kind words, gave him, at his request, a sum of money to develop a professional library. Melby says now that it was "probably an unreasonably large amount of money," but that "we had the largest and best professional library in that school that I have ever seen in a school--I don't know where I would go to find as good a one today." It not only had professional books and a good collection of textbooks, but boasted a wide array of professional journals.

According to Melby, he and practically all of the teachers made extensive use of these professional materials. "We were constantly experimenting, reading, and discussing," says Melby. "It was a dynamic situation." Partly as a result of the materials in the library, Melby found himself getting more and more interested in aspects of education that had been hitherto unknown to him. He studied statistics, carried out experiments, and worked on test development. The stimulation of this reading and study is what eventually caused Melby to begin his graduate work. It was while he was superintendent at Long Prairie that Melby wrote his first article for publication--a description of the development and operation of the health program in Long Prairie.⁴

With Melby in Long Prairie were faculty members who would later go on to make significant contributions of their

⁴Ernest O. Melby and Melvina F. Palmer, "Health Education in Small School Systems," Bulletin of University of Minnesota, College of Education, (vol. 23) May 17, 1926.

own. It is difficult to assess the influence that Melby and the situation in Long Prairie had on them. It is indicative at least of the kind of faculty that Melby had: Jess H. Lefforge, who taught agriculture, recently retired as professor of agronomy at Purdue University; Shirley A. Hamrin, who taught science, later authored several books on guidance and counseling and served for many years as professor at Northwestern University; Henry J. Otto, who followed Shirley Hamrin as science teacher at Long Prairie, is now chairman of the department of administration in the College of Education of the University of Texas.

The outstanding working relationship that Melby had with the school board in Long Prairie became a significant part of a concept that was developing in his mind of the role of a school superintendent. He had great confidence in this school board and genuine respect for them as individuals. The good relationship that Melby had with the board and the degree to which the board became interested in what was going on in the school and taking part in it and understanding it were important to him. He describes its importance by saying:

The happy relationship we had was quite remarkable... the fact that we could meet in a board meeting during the evening (and argue sometimes) and then walk down the street together and go into a restaurant and get some coffee and be the best of friends. I got a picture of administration and the role of the superintendent that has never left me. If you stay in a place more than three years, then that board is your handiwork--you have made them what they are. Now, I know that not all boards are like this, but I believe that if you will take people into your confidence, and

if you will work with them and respect them, you will not be disappointed. Those kinds of experiences that I have had have been faith-giving experiences to me; they have given me more faith in people and not less.

Long Prairie marked a turn in the road for Melby. His happy experience with the school board, the interest of the faculty in education and the stimulation they provided for him, and the wide reading he did as a result of his new interest and of the professional materials at hand, convinced Melby that education would be his career. Melby says:

There was never any argument after Long Prairie of what I was to do. I was in it for life; there was no doubt about that. I found that I got more and more interested in it, and I studied statistics, and I worked on developing tests and carried on experiments.

In part as a result of his decision to make education a career, and in part because of a new awareness, (as a result of his reading), of how little he really knew, Melby decided to do some graduate work. During the summer of 1925 he went to the University of Minnesota to begin work on his master's degree. Against the advice of his friends and of his advisor, who thought it too heavy a load, he registered for four courses. Melby says that when he ended up getting top grades in the courses that the faculty concluded that he was a good student. He, himself, says:

The amusing thing about it was that I had read most of the writings we used in class, so it was all old stuff to me. As a result I showed up better on the tests...this was true all through my graduate study. I'm not as good a student as my graduate work indicates. I had worked at this for all these years and read those books. We had all the journals in our professional library at Long Prairie, and I had read all of them.

During the summer session Melby met Fred Engelhardt, professor of school administration, a man who was to wield a major influence in his life and career. At the end of the six-week summer session, when Melby was about to return to Long Prairie, Engelhardt spoke to him and asked Melby if he would be willing to assist him in conducting a school survey in Superior, Wisconsin. "Well, there wasn't anything in the world I would rather have done," says Melby. "I'd have done anything just so I could work with him because I was so interested in him."

For three weeks Melby worked with Engelhardt in Superior, scoring buildings, taking a school census, collecting data. When finished with this part of the survey he went back to Minneapolis and spent three more weeks there with Engelhardt writing the report. Throughout the three-week period, Engelhardt insisted that Melby come to the university full-time and work on his doctorate. Melby says that he had no faith at all in his own ability to get a doctorate and thought that Engelhardt's encouragement was only exaggeration, an attempt to make him feel good. He protested to Engelhardt that he "hadn't brains enough to get a doctor's degree."

In the fall when Melby returned to his work at Long Prairie he enrolled for a problems course with Engelhardt. Occasionally, Melby would travel to Minneapolis to visit with him concerning the course, and on each visit Engelhardt would renew the subject of Melby beginning work on a doctorate. In spite of all the urging, Melby was unmoved.

Getting a doctor's degree seemed to him to be almost an impossibility.

When spring came Melby asked Engelhardt to be the speaker for the Long Prairie High School commencement exercise in June. At the end of the ceremony Engelhardt sat down with Melby and Mrs. Melby and had a serious talk with them. Melby says, "He laid down the law to us both and that turned the trick." Melby describes Engelhardt as "a dynamic individual with tremendous personal force. He just swept everything before him...an extremely persuasive fellow. I had so much faith in him that somehow or other I thought, 'I'm not good enough to do this, but if he's that convinced then maybe I'd better try.'" Within a few days Melby had resigned at Long Prairie and was preparing for his move to the University of Minnesota, in Minneapolis, to work toward his doctor's degree. Although Melby did not realize it, Long Prairie was the last position he would ever hold in the public schools.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Shortly after resigning from his position in Long Prairie in June, 1926, Melby enrolled in the summer session. Before he could begin work on a doctorate he had to finish his master's degree. By the end of the fall quarter, with the work he had done during the year, he had completed his course work and written his thesis.

Melby's first position on arriving in Minneapolis was to be a half-time research assistant to Dr. Leo Brueckner in the Minneapolis Public Schools' research department. Melby found within a few months, however, that it was impossible for him to do the work assigned to him in the three days he was expected to work. As a result, he was spending more and more time on his research assistant work and progressively less on his studies. Brueckner, after hearing Melby state his case, offered him a position, instead, as his graduate assistant at the University, in which capacity Melby would have more time for his studies.

During the second year of his doctoral study Melby served as assistant director of the bureau of educational research, which was under the general direction of the dean of the college. From this experience, and from a concern aroused for testing while at Long Prairie, Melby developed an increasing interest in measurement and testing, a fact borne out by some of his early writings, (see Bibliography).

At the end of his first year of doctoral study, in June, 1927, Melby taught two graduate courses in the summer session--a general course in administration and another in supervision. Each course had 125 students. This was Melby's first university teaching and at the outset a rather terrifying experience. "I was scared as the dickens," says Melby, "and I thought, 'if I ever live through this!'." In Melby's classes were fellow superintendents whom he had known

while he was superintendent at Long Prairie, as well as some Minneapolis principals he had met while working briefly in the city school system. Melby credits some of these principals with being of great assistance to him in this first teaching venture. After class the principals would talk to Melby and tell him if they thought he had been effective or not and if there were anything that he should explain more thoroughly.

For Melby, doctoral study was not really a very stimulating experience. He had no compulsive desire to earn the doctor of philosophy title, but it had been made plain to him by Engelhardt that if he wanted to make a career out of education that he had better get a higher degree. Melby became so busy with his formal studies that he found he had no time left for the kind of reading for which he had developed an interest. Melby says that he was "swamped" during graduate school. "I probably did less reading of a social and philosophical nature during my graduate days," he says, "than at any other time in my life. Philosophical and social issues were never raised."

In evaluating his years at the University of Minnesota, Melby feels that it was a rather mechanical process, quite divorced from the world around it. He says:

Doctoral studies didn't really make any profound impression on me; the course content wasn't anything... I don't think it altered my essential outlook in education very much. As a matter of fact, I think, today, I date back more to my early experience as a superintendent than I do to my graduate work.

Of vital importance to Melby, however, were the friendships he developed with faculty members and fellow doctoral students. These contacts had meaning for him, and the personal influence of such professors as Fred Engelhardt, Leonard V. Koos, Leo Brueckner, and John Rockwell, and doctoral students such as Grayson Neikirk Kefauver, (later dean of Stanford) would stay with him throughout his career.⁵

Melby had no visions of grandeur for himself when he finished his studies at Minnesota. Neither did he have any confidence that what he had learned there had been of great and enduring value. He was already developing the conviction that his education had been too severely divorced from the world around him. Later, he would become extremely concerned about this type of education and crusade for a more realistic approach to the training of young people, particularly for those training to be teachers and school administrators. In analyzing his experience at Minnesota, Melby says, "I was still 'in the school house' and I had little understanding of the broader political and social events taking place outside or the importance that these held for education."

⁵Kefauver, in particular, was an enigma to Melby. The antithesis of Melby, Kefauver had ambitious professional goals set for himself. He talked to Melby of these goals constantly and of the way in which he would go about attaining them. Melby was astounded by the tremendous personal drive that seemed to be the motivation for everything that Kefauver did. For an analysis of Kefauver's career see: Harold John Bienvenu, "The Educational Career of Grayson Neikirk Kefauver," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1956.

In June, 1928, Melby received his doctor of philosophy degree in educational administration. His dissertation was entitled "The Organization and Administration of Supervision."⁶ His formal education finished, Melby was now ready for his first full-time university position.

A few years earlier the University of Minnesota had placed one of its graduates, James Monroe Hughes, at Northwestern University. Dean John E. Stout, of Northwestern's School of Education, needed an assistant professor in educational administration and, at the suggestion of Hughes, went to Minneapolis to consult with Dean Haggerty of the University of Minnesota. At Minneapolis, Stout was given Melby's name, interviewed him, and asked him to come to Northwestern for a visit with the faculty.

Melby was impressed by what he found at Northwestern, but in the meantime he had been offered two other jobs as well, one as a full professor at the University of Arkansas. Melby debated with himself a bit about whether he should go to Northwestern or Arkansas. He decided to seek the advice of Haggerty, whose admonition to Melby was, "You'd be a fool if you went to Arkansas." Melby made his decision; he would go to Northwestern University.

⁶Ernest O. Melby, The Organization and Administration of Supervision (Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company, 1931).

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Two months after Melby arrived at Northwestern to begin his teaching duties, Herbert Hoover was elected president. By the time Melby would be at Northwestern for a year, the American stock market would crash and usher in a period of long depression, of unemployment, bank failure, and business disaster. The effects of the depression on the American economy and on the life of the people would ultimately do much to mold Melby's concern for society and his desire to make education the means to a fuller life for everyone.

In education, the seeds of progressivism planted earlier were now coming into bloom under the inspiration of not only Dewey, who had planted them, but of Boyd H. Bode, William Heard Kilpatrick, George S. Counts, Harold Rugg, and John L. Childs, among others. Just a few miles from the University, Carleton F. Washburne was experimenting with the "Winnetka Plan." It was a period of great enthusiasm in American education. This new impetus, coupled with rapid changes in society, provided Melby with a propitious moment of history in which to begin his career in higher education. It would be inaccurate to say that the "times" produced Melby; rather, his philosophy and concern for education arose from his personal reaction and sensitivity to what he saw happening around him.

Hired to teach administration courses at Northwestern, Melby found that as a member of a faculty as small

as ~~that~~ which Northwestern's School of Education had in 1928, he would have to teach many courses. By his count he taught twelve or more different courses in his first two years on the faculty. These courses ranged all the way from "school finance" to "adaptation of instruction for individual differences." The School of Education at this time had only a limited program (Melby was its first professor of administration), but it was in the process of being rebuilt by Dean John Stout. The School of Education had been established only two years before as an autonomous administrative unit. Prior to Melby's arrival it had dwindled into a position of little effectiveness. This was a good opportunity for Melby, for he found that he was able (and expected) to become involved in a great many activities both within and without the university setting.

University teaching was not new to Melby, since he had taught a number of courses as a graduate student at Minnesota, but the environment was. He was basically, in his words, "a country boy," and the Chicago area was a new world. Until he came to Northwestern, Melby had never been out of the state of Minnesota, and he found that he had to adjust to a new community and an entirely different kind of setting in which he would work.

In one of Melby's first classes only five or six students arrived for the first session. Rather than cancel

the class, one of the students suggested that she could get a few more students to sign up for it, which she did. The same woman, a short time later, asked Melby to visit her school. This visit aroused Melby's interest in visiting schools and became the entree for him into schools throughout the area. During his first year at Northwestern he and James Hughes made a study of high school supervision in twenty schools in the Chicago area, visiting each school twice.^{7,8} The most important thing to Melby about his teaching was that it was bringing him into contact with many different teachers and school systems in the vicinity.

Melby became deeply involved in his teaching and enthusiastic about his contacts with students. Clifford E. Erickson, now provost of Michigan State University, enrolled at Northwestern in the fall of 1929 to begin work on his master's degree, and Melby was one of the first people from whom he had a class. Erickson, in describing Melby as he knew him at that time, says:

He was a very popular teacher; his classes were always very large. He was a most unusual teacher, and I never encountered anyone else quite like him. The first class I took from Melby was a class of fifty or

⁷Ernest O. Melby and James M. Hughes, "Organizing the High School for Supervision," American School Board Journal, 81:59 (November, 1930).

⁸Ernest O. Melby and James M. Hughes, "Supervision of Instruction in High School," Northwestern University Contribution to Education, Monograph Series no. 4, p. 191, (1930).

sixty people, and in this class were a group of people who have since gone out to very important positions all over the country. There were some people who had already had a good deal of experience--the superintendent of schools in Elgin, Illinois, for example, was there working on his doctorate. Melby walked into this class every day without a note in his hand and lectured for most of the time without ever referring to a note, without ever repeating an incident, and always with very pertinent information which, seemingly, was very well organized. I've never seen anyone who could do what he could then, nor have I seen anyone since. For two hours he could lecture coherently, to the point, interestingly, and in a well-organized manner. He was amazing!⁹

Additional testimony to Melby's stimulating effect on students is given by Francis C. Rosecrance, now dean of the College of Education at Wayne State University, who began his doctoral study in the summer of 1934. The first class he had was in supervision, taught by Melby. Rosecrance recalls that he had come out of a liberal arts background, and although he had very little formal work in professional education, he had some rather definite ideas about the nature of supervision, since he had been working in the field of supervision in the superintendent's office in Milwaukee.¹⁰ Rosecrance says that "the first course I had with Melby was kind of a shock." Melby had just finished editing the current yearbook (1934) of the Association for Supervision and was using this yearbook as his text for the course.

⁹Statement by Clifford E. Erickson, personal interview.

¹⁰Statement by Francis C. Rosecrance, personal interview. This and the following observations by Dean Rosecrance were made during a personal interview with the author.

Rosecrance says that he had held rather firm ideas about what supervision was and suddenly found out that these ideas were in conflict with those held by Melby. "I woke up one day very sharply," says Rosecrance. Melby read case studies in supervision problems to the class, and in discussing alternative methods of solving the problems, Rosecrance found that Melby took a far more permissive view of the situations than he did. "I began to come alive and think about this," says Rosecrance, "and I suppose I would have to say that Ernest Melby, during that summer of 1934, probably shook the bugs around in my head more than any other single person."

Typical of the kind of relationship that Melby had with his students at Northwestern, is an incident related by Rosecrance in which he and a few other graduate students complained to Melby about what they considered to be the lack of validity and value in a weekly true and false test that they had to take in his class in supervision. Melby's reaction was, "Make me a better one and I'll use it." Rosecrance and another graduate student took Melby at his word and constructed the test. Rosecrance says, "I don't know if it was any better or not, but Melby used it, and it satisfied us."

Melby, who had written almost nothing for publication prior to coming to Northwestern, suddenly became quite productive. Between 1928, when he arrived, and 1934, he had written or co-authored four books and seventeen

journal articles.¹¹ One of his books, Diagnostic and Remedial Teaching, he co-authored with Leo Brueckner, the man for whom he had worked as a graduate assistant in his first year of doctoral study. Most of Melby's writings in this period were concerned with evaluation, testing, and supervision--quite different topics from those with which he would concern himself less than ten years later.

Within a few years after coming to Northwestern Melby began to lose faith in the ability of tests to measure the actual learnings of his students, and he began to move away from his scientific approach. Melby says: "I stopped giving long objective tests to my classes when I found out that some of my 'A' students did the most outrageous things back on their jobs at school. I found that there was no relationship between what they did on my tests and what they did outside the classroom."

The New Dean

These were propitious times at Northwestern, and Melby was a conscientious, energetic faculty member. As a result, he made rapid progress. A year after arriving at Northwestern as an assistant professor he was promoted to the rank of associate professor; two years later he was a full professor. Three years later, in the spring of 1934, the resignation of Dean John E. Stout was announced.

¹¹A complete list of Melby's works may be found in the Bibliography.

Walter Dill Scott, president of Northwestern University, called all the professors and associate professors of the School of Education to his office and announced that Stout was retiring and that they needed to select a new dean. Scott explained that they had no money to go outside the university for a dean and that the new dean would be selected from one of the men in the room with him--much to the surprise of the group. Scott then asked them to vote and decide which one it should be. Melby says that he had no expectations that he would be chosen: "I didn't even have any idea of wanting to be a dean. I was very deeply involved in my teaching and writing and was head over heels in more work than I knew what to do with, and I was enjoying it. I thought Hughes would get the job."

Late that afternoon, President Scott called Melby to his office again and told him that he was the new dean. Melby says, "I didn't know what to think; I guess I was kind of stunned. I went home and told my wife, and I guess she was just as stunned."

If Melby was stunned the rest of the faculty and other people in the area were not. In the Chicago Tribune the next day the news item concerning the appointment read:

Ernest O. Melby author and professor of education at Northwestern University has been appointed dean of the school of education...Regarding Dr. Melby's appointment President Walter Dill Scott said, "Dr. Melby has been one of the most effective members of the faculty of the school of education in cooperating with the public school systems in the vicinity of Evanston. He is well known among the school men of America, and his

appointment has been urged by members of the faculty and school men of the state.¹²

One of the first actions Melby took after being appointed dean was to call the faculty of the College of Education together (they totaled about fifteen at this time) and to talk to them in a manner reminiscent of the initial meeting he held for the faculty in his first superintendency back in Brewster, Minnesota. With, apparently, real doubts about his own qualifications for the job, Melby recalls that he made the following kind of statement to the faculty:

I'm no great shakes; I have nothing special to offer. I see this job as one I've been asked to do; it's a service to render. If I can help you people, then it's worthwhile, and if I can't, it isn't worthwhile. So, if you'll help me I'll do the best I can.

In analyzing the situation today Melby says:

I came to believe that it was my inadequacy that was my salvation. If I had gone in as an experienced person, if I had known what it meant to be a dean and known how to go at it, I would have had a rough time. But since I made no pretense and everybody thought, maybe, that I was a weak reed, they probably figured that I was the kind of person who would try to do his best, and, so, we got along pretty well.

Melby's rather uncomplimentary assessment of his ability is typical of the attitude he took toward himself at each promotion. His self-analysis, however, is highly inaccurate if one is to accept the evaluation of him by Rosecrance and Erickson and the generous words of President

¹²Chicago Tribune, April 25, 1934.

Scott, quoted in the Chicago Tribune. Although it is true that he was inexperienced in the role of a dean, it is, nevertheless, a fact that he did have the support of his colleagues. This support would grow to an unusual degree in the coming years of his deanship.

Melby's promotion marked the beginning of an interesting new direction, in one aspect of his career. He was now called upon, as dean, to address many groups of people. His scrapbook contains almost no clippings of speaking activities prior to April, 1934, when Stout's resignation and Melby's appointment were announced. But immediately following his appointment, the speaking activity that was to be eventually a major part of his career began to consume much of his time. Seemingly, the more he spoke the more he was asked to speak. One engagement led to another. In spite of his doubts about his abilities as dean he devoted much of his time to traveling and speaking, and he spoke with a new authority and forcefulness.

A new Ernest O. Melby was evolving. Gone were the concerns he had once had for testing, evaluation, and measurement. No more instructional articles on supervision and methodology would be written. Instead, he had suddenly come alive to, as he describes it, "the noise outside the school room window." Now his speeches dealt more and more frequently with social and political issues and their relationship to education. In June, 1934, he addressed the commencement of Michigan State College, East Lansing,

Michigan, and decried "fascism in industry and government" and voiced his great concern for "men laboring as machines."¹³

A few months later he addressed a PTA district meeting, and speaking on the topic of "Future Citizens," he said:

You assume too much when you think there might be citizens of tomorrow. With all the travelers from our country who return with new concepts of social relationships, and I mean particularly those who have traveled in Russia, it appears to me that we will not have citizens of the future but rather subjects of a dictator....The dictator recognizes the school as the best agency for his activities and would, if possible, bring about social reconstruction through education. Look at Russia. Communism is taught as religion in their schools. In the German school the instructors extol the glories that lie ahead for all black shirts and in Italy it is even worse....Too many people are trying to change our social order. Let us look at Minnesota. This state has become a hot bed of socialism. They have a state board of education. Until recently this board has been kept free of politics. The state board chooses a commissioner of education. Can you not see the opportunity there for a governor who wishes to change the social order of things? That is just what has happened. The new governor, who is termed fairly radical, has appointed three out of five on the board who follow his political leanings. He has sensed the opportunity of changing the social order of things in his state by using the schools.

And how can the educators teach a new social order when they haven't a clear understanding of the present social order? The teachers are incompetent to charter a new course in social order....This is in direct conflict with democracy itself. In Russia they can tell you the social order for years to come. That is what dictatorship does. It finds it simple to plan the educational system because they assume what is to be the social order of the future but in a democracy you do not know. We have no pattern for the future--social order changes as the individuals change, consequently we do not know but we hope it will be a better pattern.¹⁴

¹³Evanston Daily News-Index, June 11, 1934.

¹⁴Ibid., October 6, 1934.

In spite of Melby's protestations of inadequacy for the position as dean, he began immediately to take steps which he felt would build up the School of Education. The same summer in which he took over as dean he went to New York and recruited E.T. McSwain and Whit Brogan, and from Stanford he brought George Axtelle. There were the immediate questions raised as to where Melby was going to get the money to pay all the new faculty members he was bringing to the School of Education.

Concurrently, Melby, with the cooperation of the Chicago School Board, was laying plans for a massive in-service education program for Chicago school teachers. President Walter Dill Scott in his year-end report in April, 1935, wrote:

At the end of the year the School of Education presented to the University a plan for the in-service training of Chicago high school teachers, with the cooperation of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. Classes during the coming year for Chicago school teachers in educational subjects will be given at Lane, Austin, Smyser, and Leyden High Schools, in the Chicago Normal School, and in the University College. To carry this work the faculty of the School of Education was enlarged. It is probable that between one and two thousand teachers in these Chicago schools will take advantage of these opportunities. The result will be a closer cooperation between the University and the city.¹⁵

In September, at the start of Melby's second year as dean, 1200 teachers enrolled in the centers, which were located on the north, west, and south sides of Chicago. Melby, in discussing the new program at that time, said:

¹⁵"The President's Report," Northwestern University Bulletin, vol. 36, (April 13, 1936) p. 15.

New teachers with modern training are gradually coming into the schools, but the turnover is small and the great hope for improvement lies in training the teachers already at work in the schools. There is also the fact that education as a profession is changing so rapidly that every teacher must be a constant student of her problems.¹⁶

The faculty for the in-service education program consisted of: George F. Axtelle, Whit Brogan, Eldridge T. McSwain, Harold C. Coffman (visiting professor from Columbia Teachers' College), Paul A. Witty, Francis C. Rosecrance, William Gellerman, Josephine Maloney, and Louis U. Newkirk.¹⁷

Rosecrance relates his remembrance of the program:

I doubt that any big city has had a more intimate connection with a university than we had at that time. Going to the public schools was a new thing at that time. It wasn't unusual for teachers to come to Evanston or to attend classes at the downtown center, but for us to go out and teach in schools was a brand new thing. It was very largely Dr. Melby's idea.

We would have dinners occasionally. Superintendent Bogan would be there, some of the 1200 teachers would attend, and Melby and Bogan would speak. It became a kind of wonderful family get-together.¹⁸

Melby battled with the University administration to permit the tuition paid by the teachers in this program to remain under the control of the School of Education and not revert to the all-university budget. Melby won, and

¹⁶Evanston Daily News-Index, September 12, 1935.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Statement by Francis A. Rosecrance, personal interview.

with this new source of revenue he doubled the School of Education budget and paid the new faculty members, some of whom taught in the Chicago program.

Even so, some people were skeptical of the undertaking and considered the in-service education program a "one-shot affair" that would collapse the next year, feeling that teachers would return to classes offered by the University of Chicago. Melby continued to argue. "No," he said. "They will come and take other courses with us, and they will bring others with them." Melby's prophecy proved to be accurate, for the students continued to come. "The development took place so fast we never caught up with it," says Melby.

Following this experimental in-service education program the enrollment at Northwestern's downtown campus soared, after having staggered along rather unsuccessfully for years. Melby, himself, had taught the first course for the School of Education at the downtown campus in the winter of 1928. Only five people were enrolled in that first class, but prior attempts had failed to muster enough students to warrant holding a class at all. Dean Stout told Melby to go ahead and teach the class if he wanted to, because they had to make a start sometime.

The decision proved to be a good one, for the downtown campus offerings in education began to show phenomenal growth: the following year six courses were offered, and

seventy students enrolled; the next year it jumped to fifteen courses and 214 students; by the time Melby became dean in 1934, thirty-four courses were offered with a total registration of 926 students.¹⁹ The growth rate continued, for when Melby left Northwestern in 1941 the enrollment had reached almost 2,000.

Melby had not been dean long before he developed an intense conviction that the summer school in the School of Education should be vastly enriched and enlarged in comparison to its present state. When he became dean in the summer of 1934 the total summer session enrollment in education was 476.²⁰ Melby saw in the strategic location of Northwestern the potential for "a great midwestern summer study-center for education."

During the first summer as dean, Melby went to the director of the summer session and told him that he had some special projects for the coming session and wanted to get enough budget for 800 students. The summer session director, Ernest H. Hahne, was completely amazed by Melby's request and by his belief that he could in some way double the summer school enrollment within a year. "He didn't give me all the money I asked for," says Melby, "but he gave me a good deal, and when we opened

¹⁹"The President's Report," Northwestern University Bulletin, vol. 36 (April 13, 1936), p. 122.

²⁰Ibid., p. 131.

summer school in 1935 we had almost 800 students."

What was not recognized or anticipated by the people who doubted Melby's ability to double the enrollment, was his energy and enthusiasm in rallying the School of Education faculty behind him and his successful effort in wooing outstanding educators from other universities to teach in the Northwestern summer school.

A columnist wrote in the University newspaper that summer:

Latest figures from the summer session office give the School of Education 450 registered students and 380 education students registered in the graduate school....Dean Melby's popularity is demonstrated by the one hundred students that registered for his course....Erickson's course in extra-curricular activities attracted almost eighty...all the courses in Education are up...one of the things you want to remember is that the School of Education doubled its enrollment over last summer....²¹

Melby was not satisfied with the results, however, for shortly after the summer was over he was back talking to Hahne again. After successfully predicting the enrollment, Melby figured that he would find it easy to get the kind of budget he needed for the summer of 1936. This time he wanted a budget for 1,400 students. Melby says:

Now, they were sure I was crazy. They said, "You can never do this again, it's just a freak. You had a lot of special things here and it just happened to strike fire. It won't happen again. You'll probably have fewer than you had last year." Well, we opened that year, and we had fifteen hundred.

²¹George Guernsey, "Old College Notes," Northwestern Daily, June 28, 1935.

In spite of the accuracy of Melby's predictions, the University administration refused to go along with Melby's request and estimates for the next year. Without the budget granted that he needed to definitely hire faculty members ahead of time for the summer session, Melby had to resort to other methods of lining up prospective summer session instructors. He contacted superintendents in the Northwestern area and made a kind of "half-way" verbal contract with them asking that if the summer school enrollment jumped up beyond the budget and faculty that the University had allocated, if they would, in Melby's words, "stand in readiness and come over to teach if needed." If the enrollment was as large as Melby expected, then he would have money to go hire these additional teachers. "I would hire half a dozen people in that way," says Melby, "with sort of a half-way promise."

The unfortunate consequence of the method that Melby resorted to was that occasionally some of the people who were asked to "stand by" in this way mistook the nature of the agreement and considered it to be a far more concrete promise of employment than did Melby.

Contrary to the predictions of the University administration, the summer school continued to grow. When Melby left in 1941, its enrollment was nearly 2,000. Moreover, it grew not only in numbers but in prestige and reputation. To the Northwestern summer session came many of the country's

most effective professors and administrators. This was to be one of Melby's most significant contributions as dean of the School of Education. Not only did he revitalize the summer school, but he built the Northwestern School of Education into one described by William Heard Kilpatrick as "the foremost School of Education in that part of the country. It was superior even to the University of Chicago."²²

During the last six years that Melby was dean, approximately 250 visiting professors from over 75 school systems and universities taught in the summer sessions. In July, 1936, George S. Counts, a visiting professor that summer, said:

I have been tremendously impressed by the school of education at Northwestern this summer...It seems to me that Dean Melby is developing the kind of program needed in American education today. By that I mean that the school of education is getting away from the mere teaching of techniques and trying to give its students an understanding of American background and culture.²³

The bringing of so many outstanding educators to Northwestern was made possible primarily because the summer school had grown so large, although it may be debated which is dependent upon the other. During Melby's deanship most of the leading figures in education at that period spent some amount of time at Northwestern. To name a few:

²²Statement by William Heard Kilpatrick, personal interview.

²³George S. Counts, quoted in Northwestern Daily, July 3, 1936.

George S. Counts, Boyd H. Bode, Fred Englehardt, Carleton F. Washburne, Jay Nash, and William Heard Kilpatrick.

In 1937 William Heard Kilpatrick was retired from Teachers College. He hoped at the time that he could in some way continue to work with students. He could, of course, have all the lecturing work he desired, but he preferred the life of the teacher. Offers came from universities all over the country. North Carolina, Florida, and Georgia all invited him, and Dean Kefauver wanted him for the Stanford summer session. Melby contacted Kilpatrick immediately to let him know that "the School of Education at Northwestern wanted him there on any condition: he could set his own terms. He could come as a full-time professor or for part-time work; he could give one course or two courses; as for financial considerations, that too would be most generous."²⁴

Kilpatrick decided on Northwestern. He arrived for the fall term and taught one large class and conducted a seminar for the faculty. Included in the faculty seminar were people from other departments as well as from the School of Education. His biographer, Tenenbaum, writes that, "At Northwestern University he found a warm welcome and made many friends." Kilpatrick's diary clearly indicates the warm spirit that prevailed in the School of Education in the fall of 1937 when he arrived:

²⁴Samuel Tenenbaum, William Heard Kilpatrick, Harper and Brothers (New York, 1951) p. 301.

At 6:15 Gellerman calls for us in his car to take us to a faculty dinner given to us in my honor at the Orrington Hotel. All the School of Education are there with their wives and some others. I sit between Mrs. Melby and Margaret. Dean Melby presides. Ex-Dean Stout, Dean Beattie of the School of Music and Dr. Anderson speak. The latter presents me with a copy of Van Wyck Brooks' Flowering of New England with the signatures of the faculty on the fly leaf. Just before the speaking began a waiter appeared with a big cake surrounded with burning candles. Those present began to sing, "Happy Birthday to you." And the cake was placed in front of me. It was a pure accident that the dinner was on my birthday. They had not known of the day when the date was fixed. Margaret and I kept it to ourselves, so this was quite a surprise to us. I was called upon to speak when Anderson sat down. As I had not been asked to speak in advance of the dinner, I made no preparation; so when Dean Melby whispered to me a few moments earlier that I should take as long as I wished, I asked him what I should say. He suggested a repetition of the personal reminiscence that he had heard me give, in fact, twice before (the second at his request, Jan., 1936). So I did speak of myself, but avoided practically all that I had previously used. They seemed to like it. All present were very kindly, and we much appreciated the honor of the occasion.²⁵

It is extremely difficult to assess accurately the extent of influence one person exerts on another. Such is the case when discussing Kilpatrick's effect on Melby's thinking. The influence of Kilpatrick in the 1930's was so major and so widespread that it would be reasonable to say that the majority of educators at that time were influenced in some way by the thinking of Kilpatrick. As Walter Anderson points out, Melby was "ripe" for the philosophy of Kilpatrick.²⁶ Melby's great concern for human beings and

²⁵Ibid., p. 303.

²⁶See page 71 of this work.

his quickly developing fervor for using the schools to promote democracy as a way of life, found in the philosophy of Kilpatrick, and others in the progressive movement, the educational substance to which he could tie his deeply felt convictions.

His desire to have Kilpatrick was motivated to a large degree by a belief that Kilpatrick could do wonderful things for the School of Education faculty as well as for the students.²⁷ Melby did use him this way--as a catalyst for the thinking of the full-time faculty in the School of Education.

Kilpatrick's high opinion of Melby and of the School of Education entered into his decision to accept this offer in preference to others. His comments about the School of Education, while important as an evaluation of the institution as he saw it in 1937, demonstrate just how far and fast the School had progressed in the three years since Melby had become dean. Although the School of Education was beginning to emerge as a sound institution in 1934, it has been attested to by those concerned that it was primarily under the inspiration of Melby that it became a major force in education.

²⁷It was Melby's usual practice at Northwestern to involve distinguished visiting professors with groups of regular faculty members in formal sessions, but more often in informal activities. Melby and other regular faculty members comment on the stimulation of these relationships in the summer.

Concerning the role and importance of the Northwestern School of Education and Melby's part in these, Kilpatrick said:

Melby had built a school there at Northwestern that was the foremost center in that whole region. It was superior to the University of Chicago in point of influence and of general acceptance. I spent a year there while Melby was dean, and I found him to be an excellent man in every way. He knew what he was about and he knew how to go about it, and he made people believe in him. He knew how to manage things so that people did believe in him. He had built up the most popular, acceptable school of education in that whole area. Melby was very successful in understanding what a school of education ought to be and very capable in getting people to understand with him and cooperate in making a success of it. He had the ability to move and inspire people to work with him. Each one there seemed to have a vision of what a school of education should be and a willingness to work with Melby.²⁸

In addition to the imposing array of visiting professors, Melby had built up an outstanding full-time faculty. Moreover, they had a unique feeling of camaraderie. They were united by educational and social causes and by the magnetic enthusiasm of Melby. Those who were there with Melby during the 1930's almost unanimously refer to it as an "exciting environment." They felt an almost familial relationship to one another. Many of these people were recruited personally by Melby ;

²⁸Statement by William Heard Kilpatrick, personal interview.

he was looking for the radicals in education. In addition, he wanted creative, enthusiastic faculty members with new ideas. Among those who served with Melby at Northwestern were: William Wattenberg, Theodore Rice, Earl Kelley, Christian O. Arndt, Francis A. Rosecrance, Charles McConnell, Shirley A. Hamrin, William Van Till, Lula Brandt, Harold Fawcett, William Brink, Whit Brogan, Alvin C. Eurick, Walter Anderson, Clifford E. Erickson, James Monroe Hughes, Paul Witty, George Axtelle, and E. T. McSwain.

As important as the bringing of these educators to Northwestern was, in terms of what it meant for the School of Education and for the students, it also made a major contribution to Melby's thinking. "This was the time," says Melby, "when I was learning the most. I was meeting people and having my eyes opened. My sights were being raised, and I was finding out what education was all about."

Walter A. Anderson, now dean of the School of Education, New York University, was a faculty member at Northwestern during this awakening period in Melby's career. He comments on the subject of the degree of influence that the Northwestern faculty had on Melby:

The faculty of twenty-four people at Northwestern had a tremendous effect on Melby. They really educated him about modern education. He came to be the most vigorous supporter of this position. I'm sure he didn't learn it at Minnesota where he did his

doctorate. He was always kind of a radical in his educational views, so he was ripe for the philosophy of Kilpatrick, Counts and others. I think we had a tremendous effect on his outlook on education. He was right up with us, though, and ahead of us in applying this philosophy to administration.²⁹

By 1936, when Melby had been dean for two years, the School of Education had taken on real vitality. It was a new institution. The great success of the in-service education program, the growing enrollment on the downtown campus, and the mushrooming summer school gave impetus to still more programs.

An unusual summer program in instruction was developed in cooperation with New Trier Township High School, where a summer high school was in session. A class of 125 teachers enrolled in a course in the School of Education entitled, "Improvement of Teaching in Secondary School Subjects," would meet each morning on the campus from eight o'clock until nine for a lecture by the staff, which was made up of such faculty members as William Van Till, Lula Brandt, William Brink, Christian O. Arndt, and Harold Fawcett, who had joint responsibility for the course. For the next hour the class broke up into subject area groups where they discussed the application to their own subject matter area of what they had heard. Following this, the entire class then drove to New Trier where they observed

²⁹Statement by Walter A. Anderson, personal interview.

their School of Education faculty members take over and teach high school classes in a live demonstration of what they had been lecturing about.

At Evanston Township the "New School" experiment was underway, a program based on student-teacher planning, in which the faculty from the School of Education taught and demonstrated the emergent new philosophies of progressive education.³⁰

Now, Melby was wide awake and aware of what was going on in education. He began to sense a mission for education and for himself; he felt a strong compulsion to tell his convictions to others. His speaking and writing gained momentum. Gradually he became an evangelist for the cause of education. His message was of a new kind of education, geared to the need of a modern world replete with crucial problems. Democracy and education appeared to him to be inseparable. If one truly believed in democracy, then there could be no place for traditional, authority-centered education. Human relations and the worth of the individual became basic tenets of his fervent appeals, whether he was discussing administration, curriculum, teacher training, or the role of the American school in a culture threatened by totalitarianism from abroad.

³⁰The story of the "New School" is related by Christian O. Arndt, Charles McConnell, and Ernest O. Melby in New Schools for a New Culture, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943).

Melby's circle of influence quickly began to widen, and he found himself more and more frequently away from the campus. The frequency of requests for him to speak increased, and as they did, he was unable to give the same kind of close direction to the affairs of the School of Education that he had in 1934. He had to rely more heavily on his faculty to give continuing direction to the many activities that were underway. As a consequence of his writing and his extensive speaking, however, Melby was by his own actions and personality building up an image and a reputation for the School of Education.

In 1931, Melby had written a journal article entitled, "Problems in the Evaluation of Supervision."³¹ It was a thoroughly documented and factual article with references, discussions of tests and citations of research. However, for the same journal, five years later, he wrote an article entitled, "Training for Instructional Leadership;" in this, the new Melby perspective was becoming evident: "We have turned out a group of educational leaders who are mere technicians. They are familiar with buildings, accounting systems, and sweeping compounds but often lack any real understanding of education (philosophy or procedure). Such administrators are mere managers. They can dictate but not

³¹Ernest O. Melby, "Problems in the Evaluation of Supervision," Educational Method, vol. 10 (June, 1931), pp. 514-518.

lead."³²

Even more typical, however, of his writing of this period is "Creative Human Relations" (1939) in which he discusses the conflict between progressive and traditional education and its parallel conflict in society--democracy and regimentation:

In a true democracy genuine, creative human relationships would prevail in every phase of life, education, business, industry, homes and communities... a creative school and society involve neither chaos nor anarchy. In fact, a chaotic life is not a creative influence. Democratic schools must have a more effective organization than authoritarian schools, but they must be flexibly organized to sense the needs of individuals....Creative human relationships are neither weak, sentimental, nor lacking in definiteness of goals or standards of achievement... It is authoritarianism which is weak. It lacks the spirit of adventure and the youthfulness to experiment. It is the weak teacher who must resort to force. Only the strong one can be creative through freedom. Authoritarianism is the escape of pessimists and the last refuge of cowards. Creative living demands optimism and courage....

Among all the arts that of living creatively with others is the greatest. Such living transcends the painting of pictures, the writing of a poem or the creation of a symphony. Progressive education seeks such living for all pupils. Democracy seeks such living for all human beings.³³

Appended to an article by Melby, entitled, "Authoritarianism: Enslaving Yoke of Nations and Schools," in Clearing House in 1938, was this note by the editor, Forrest

³²Ernest O. Melby, "Training for Instructional Leadership," Educational Method, vol. 15 (April, 1936), p. 343.

³³Ernest O. Melby, "Creative Human Relations," Progressive Education, vol. 16 (May, 1939) p. 307.

E. Long: "Dean Melby, of Northwestern, has a fervor for democracy that is widely acclaimed in the educational world. We believe that every American high school teacher and administrator should read this article."³⁴ In the article itself Melby expressed an overpowering concern for the conflict between authoritarianism and democracy. He spoke of "the titanic struggle in Europe between two ideologies," and described this struggle as "the most important problem facing education today...I believe that the interpretation, teaching, and living of democracy is the all important problem in the coordination of educational efforts."

A few miles away at the University of Chicago another kind of educational ferment was brewing around the person and philosophy of Robert M. Hutchins. Melby saw Hutchins' "new scholasticism" as a threat to democratic living; his growing concern about it led him frequently to denounce Hutchins' philosophy.

In November, 1936, Melby spoke before the Wisconsin State Education Association in Milwaukee and condemned Hutchins' new scholasticism as "a fundamental lack of faith in democracy" and as "the starkest and most sterile medievalism I have ever seen."³⁵ Melby said, in addition: "President Hutchins would have a smug, monasticized, high-walled institution in which he would admit a few geniuses....

³⁴Ernest O. Melby, "Authoritarianism: Enslaving Yoke of Nations and Schools," Clearing House, vol. 13 (December, 1938), pp. 195-199.

³⁵Quoted in Milwaukee Sentinel, November 6, 1936.

The new scholasticism of President Hutchins would rule out of education all but the intellectual phase. You can't succeed in doing this. If you could successfully educate a man to be all intellect, you would have nothing but a monstrosity."³⁶

Melby's frequent rejections of Hutchins' philosophy began to stir up some reactions. In the same issue of the Milwaukee Sentinel that carried the report of his speech before the State Education Association, an editorial lauded him for his remarks:

Dean Ernest O. Melby is evidently more of a poet than a pedagogue. That is why he can see farther than the cold student of science or the cold student of school history. We commend the statement he made: "All students and human beings are significant. All are important. All are precious. All are different. Their significance is different, and the differences are desirable. We must help all of them to grow--not just a few--and leaders will emerge in the natural way that is fitting in a democracy."³⁷

Sensing the mounting interest in the conflict between the beliefs of Melby and Hutchins, the Northwestern graduating class of 1938 sponsored a debate between the two men on the Northwestern campus. The topic was, "Educational Theory in Practice." The fact that all seats for the debate were reserved, at an admission price of 35 cents, is indicative of the degree of interest.

It was agreed that Melby and Hutchins would each make an initial presentation and that after each

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid.

presentation the other man would have the opportunity to ask questions of the speaker. Melby made the first statement of his beliefs; Hutchins questioned him. After Hutchins presented his side of the argument Melby began to probe at his ideas. Hutchins became quite disturbed by Melby's questions and by the partisan applause of the audience; he arose from his seat and, without excusing himself, left the platform. To the highly partial Northwestern student body, it was a clear victory for Melby.

Area newspapers gave considerable publicity to the debate, and shortly after, The Northwestern Alumni News published a major article by Melby based on his debate with Hutchins. The editor's note on Melby's article reads:

Dean Melby's educational philosophy is not mere "bookish theory" but rather has developed out of a sound background of many years of service as a high school teacher and superintendent of city schools. Ten years ago he joined the staff of the School of Education at Northwestern, and since 1934 has been dean. Under his guidance the School has become recognized as possessing one of the most progressive educational programs in the country. Summer registration has pyramided until it is impossible to accommodate the many teachers who wish to register in the school. And the Dean himself is now considered one of the foremost advocates of a sound, modern educational philosophy. During recent months he has received wide acclaim by newspaper editors and educators for his clear, analytical rejection of President Hutchins' scholasticism.³⁸

Back in Alexandria, Minnesota, the following item appeared in the local paper:

³⁸Northwestern Alumni News, May, 1938.

Old timers were interested in an account in the current issue of Time of a debate on education between the president of the University of Chicago and Dean Ernest O. Melby of the School of Education of Northwestern University....Dr. Melby was an instructor in the Alexandria schools, coming here in 1914... and was a member of the local faculty for several years.³⁹

Melby's interests and circle of influence continued to widen. More and more frequently his name would crop up in the newspaper as he took stands on controversial issues. He became involved in many disputes that were unrelated, or, at best, only mildly related to the specific functions and problems of the School of Education at Northwestern.

Following the resignation of Superintendent Bogan from the Chicago school system, a new era was initiated under Superintendent William H. Johnson. Melby was highly vocal in attacking what he considered to be the evils of a school system that was becoming subject to the sway of political considerations. In a speech before 3,000 Chicago school teachers in 1937, he called on them to "unite against the graft and intrigue which threatens to honeycomb the educational structure of the school system."⁴⁰

The meeting itself was called in an effort to unite the four existing teachers' unions in Chicago. Melby told a reporter:

³⁹Park Region Echo, Alexandria, Minnesota, May 5, 1938. (Local pride perhaps leads to certain inaccuracies, for Melby taught in Alexandria only one year.)

⁴⁰Quoted in Evanston Daily News-Index, May 27, 1937.

During the present year I have talked to scores of principals and teachers in Chicago. Not even in the darkest days of 1933 were they in as low a state of morale as they have been during the past few months....During the past four years many tragedies for public education in Chicago have occurred. The schools have been reorganized on doubtful patterns by political forces. Hundreds of thousands of children have been deprived of educational opportunities which were rightfully theirs. Teachers have been given excessive loads and have in numberless ways been frustrated in their efforts to serve the children. Principals have been removed from their positions and transferred to temporary activities, while hundreds of schools in the city were in dire need of vigorous and stimulating educational leadership.⁴¹

When asked what he thought could be done to save the Chicago schools, Melby said:

I am asked that question on every hand by teachers and civic leaders. In my own judgment there is only one possibility at the present time and that is through organization and solidarity on the part of the teaching profession itself. If the teachers of Chicago were organized in a body, they would throw fear into the hearts of politicians who are interested in the schools only for selfish purposes.

Had the teachers of Chicago been solidly organized in 1933, no board of education could have perpetrated the atrocities which then befell the Chicago school system. Thirteen thousand teachers in Chicago organized effectively and acting in a united and professional manner could protect the schools from the encroachment of almost any antagonistic force.⁴²

Earlier, in 1935, Melby had come quickly to the defense of the University of Chicago when it was being investigated by the Illinois Senate to determine if charges that communism was being taught were true. The charges against the University of Chicago were made by Charles R.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid.

Walgreen, drug store magnate, and Illinois State Senator, Charles W. Baker. Speaking before a high school faculty dinner, Melby scoffed at the charges and said: "It makes me smile to hear of these Red charges. I don't know of any place where traditionalism is more entrenched than at a university, or anything that is harder to change than such an institution."⁴³

Melby's conviction about the importance of human relationships continued to grow during these important years as dean at Northwestern. The concepts he had gained from his father and from the experiences he had in some of his early professional relations gained a new perspective for him. He began to see that faith in people was the crux of the foundation of democracy. Human relationships and the worth of the individual were slowly becoming a major part of all his addresses and writings. He saw their application for national democracy. Since the school was a crucial agent in the teaching and continuation of the democratic process, he saw the importance of democratic human relationships within the school, both in teaching and administration. Melby began to preach a doctrine of faith in human beings. What was good for the school was good for other institutions in a democracy as well. Speaking before a Kiwanis Club, in New Orleans, he pled for renewed emphasis on human values in education, business and industry:

⁴³Newspaper clipping, source unknown, May 8, 1935.

The essence of true democracy is a supreme faith in human beings. The attachment of values to individual personalities and the respect for personalities are the fundamental qualities of real democracy. The greatest factor in democracy today is the development of the human touch.⁴⁴

Melby's concerns for education were closely tied to forces that he saw at work in society. This close tie is reflected as one examines his writings and speeches. In the mid-1930's he began to grow increasingly distressed by what he saw happening in Europe. The tremendous emphasis on "education for democratic living", which is evident in his speeches during the late 1930's, is a result of his anxiety about the growing threat of totalitarianism from across the Atlantic. The more he thought about it, the more worried he became.

The disarmament conferences of 1932 were virtually ineffective. In 1935 Germany formally denounced the clauses of the Versailles Treaty concerning her disarmament, reintroduced conscription and announced publicly that her army would be increased to 36 divisions. Within a year Italy occupied Ethiopia, and the Civil War started in Spain. In rapid succession came other crises and the eventual dismemberment of Czechoslovakia as a result of the Munich agreements in September, 1938. Annexation and invasion by Italy and Germany had begun. Melby was greatly troubled. He had to find out at first hand what it was like in Europe. Going abroad soon became a compulsion.

⁴⁴Quoted in The Times-Picayune, New Orleans, May 24, 1937.

Finally, one day in 1939, Melby came home from his office at the School of Education and told Mrs. Melby that he "just had to go to Europe." Her reaction was not entirely favorable. They had just bought a house in Evanston. According to Melby, they had stretched their budget a bit to do it and found that they just had enough money to get along. It was this fact that caused Mrs. Melby to term the discussed desire as "impossible." This problem Melby had already considered. Northwestern had a financial arrangement under which they would advance money to faculty members with the agreement that they would pay it back, so much per month. So great was Melby's compulsion to see Europe that he asked the University to advance him \$1800.

With this money the Melbys spent three months visiting ten different European countries. Melby says:

I guess this was probably the most tremendous experience I had ever had in my life up to this time, and I was never the same again. I saw fascism firsthand and saw the Nazis at work. When I came back, and from then on, I had no burning interest in all the kinds of things I had worked on in education and administration at Minnesota and in my early days at Northwestern. It just didn't seem to me to be important. In fact, it seemed like arguing about what you should have for dinner when the house was burning. Since 1939, I've not been able to see any problem in education except in this backdrop.

Within a month after Melby's return, Germany had attacked Poland, and England and France had declared war on Germany. The Second World War had begun.

As Melby's concern for larger issues grew, he traveled away from the campus more often. Inevitably, some

aspects of the administration of the School of Education were given less attention. By nature, Melby was not a man who enjoyed administrative trivia. Now he had less time for it. His enthusiasm for new ideas sometimes ran ahead of the administrative machinery required to implement them. In addition, he was inclined to agree to certain things in an informal way, only to find later that the agreement had been quite formally accepted by the other person. As indicated earlier in this chapter, this informal procedure he used in lining up superintendents in the Evanston area as tentative summer school teachers was subject to possible misunderstanding.

Melby's open door policy, as an administrative practice, was a tradition at Northwestern. But more often now the faculty member who came to see him would find that, although the door was open, Melby was gone. Most likely, he would be off to a meeting bringing to it his new message of the importance of human relationships and the need to have faith in people if democracy were to be preserved.

Melby always found it difficult to say "no" to a faculty member who had a new idea. On the contrary, he had gathered a group of faculty about him in the depression and post-depression days at Northwestern who were creative people. He wanted people around him who had an enthusiasm for ideas just as he had. In later years he reminded a group of graduate students in administration that, "When

you see signs of growth or interest in the faculty, nurture it, prop it up, encourage it. When a person has ideas these are the most precious moments of his life."⁴⁵ Holding a conviction like this, Melby hesitated to say "no". As a result, his budget would occasionally be over-committed, and with such discrepancies came the attendant criticism.

Such was the case in an incident which involved Carleton F. Washburne, superintendent of Winnetka Public Schools. Washburne operated a summer teachers college at Winnetka, but under an agreement with the School of Education the students paid their tuition to Northwestern so that they could receive full credit for their work. The teachers in the school were primarily Winnetka faculty members. Long after the summer session was over, Washburne came to Northwestern and presented Melby with a bill for \$1400--the amount of money paid in salary to the Winnetka teachers. Evidently, there was a verbal agreement that out of the tuition paid, Northwestern would reimburse Winnetka for the teachers' salaries. It had not, however, gone through some of the required university channels. Melby, with his characteristic enthusiasm, had probably said, "Oh, sure, we can do it," but had neglected to tell anyone about it. Melby took the bill and presented it to the vice president, whose first reaction of, "We can't pay it; we don't have

⁴⁵Class lecture, Michigan State University, May, 1960.

the money," finally modified itself to, "All right, I'll pay it this time; but it's the last time I ever pay a bill I don't know about."

Rumors began to circulate following this incident that the School of Education was not managing its affairs properly, and that if they did not put their house in order, the business office would put somebody in to do so. The faculty of the School of Education heard about this and decided to elect a secretary of the faculty. Francis A. Rosecrance was elected for the position. He promptly installed a system of accounts, and with the help of Melby's secretary, saw to it that bills were known about and paid on time. The feeling of the faculty at the time was that Melby was a great educational leader but that they had to backstop him with someone who could look after details. This became the job of Rosecrance.

Melby's great strength at Northwestern was his ability to radiate inspiration and enthusiasm. It was not in his nature to be happy or willing to work diligently on details. As a by-product of his great virtues, therefore, arose this administrative shortcoming.

Conflict With Snyder

Under the University administration of President Walter Dill Scott the School of Education prospered. Melby felt he had Scott's blessings, and he enjoyed working under his administration. This spirit of cooperation was to change

rather abruptly, however. In 1939, while Melby was in Europe, the announcement was made that President Scott was retiring. In his place was appointed Franklin Bliss Snyder, who at the time was vice president. Snyder in word and deed was hostile toward the School of Education.

Philosophically, Snyder was the opposite of Melby. A former English professor at Northwestern (and by Melby's description, an "excellent teacher of English"), Snyder's interests for Northwestern lay in the College of Liberal Arts, the School of Law, and the School of Medicine. He had little use for professional education and, more particularly, was in sharp disagreement with the progressive education advocated by Melby. Additionally, the School of Education was establishing a popular reputation exceeding that of other schools of the University.

Snyder detested what he considered to be the "loose" administration of the School of Education. He decried Melby's constant emphasis on human relationships and faculty involvement. Snyder, incidentally, was the vice president to whom Melby had presented Washburne's bill for \$1400.

An unusual development prior to Snyder's appointment sheds some additional light on the rift between the two men. While Melby was in Europe, the campus newspaper initiated a poll among the students of the University to determine who, in their opinion, the new president should be. Several names were at first suggested, but after a few days it was

rather obvious that Melby and Snyder were the front runners. As the poll continued Melby began to pull far ahead of Snyder in the tally of preferences. Suddenly, in April of 1939, the board of trustees announced their decision: Franklin Bliss Snyder was to be the new president of Northwestern University.

Speculation by those who were there at that time was that Snyder had been the trustees' choice from the beginning, but that they had no intention of announcing their decision so soon, preferring to wait until commencement time in June. Seeing that Snyder was falling behind in the poll, they decided to announce his appointment immediately to forestall any mass pressure for Melby as a result of increasing popular opinion.

It is possible that the student poll, and the fact that Melby ran considerably ahead of Snyder in the opinions of the students, might have had an adverse effect on the relationship between the two men, a relationship that was on uneven ground to begin with.⁴⁶

Snyder's appointment was full of foreboding for the School of Education. Kilpatrick, when he visited Melby at Northwestern in 1936, had talked with Snyder briefly. Kilpatrick said:

⁴⁶When the writer asked Melby about the incident of the student poll he replied that it was the first time he had ever heard about it. Snyder, however, was well aware of it.

When I met him and talked to him it didn't take me more than ten minutes to size that man up. And I told Melby, "That man is out to get you." I had sized him up just as he was and as he later proved himself to be when he became president. I thought he was the most outrageous man in education I had ever met. He didn't believe in a school of education. He didn't believe that education should be studied and taught.⁴⁷

Others who were at Northwestern at the time were likewise critical of Snyder. A commonly used description of Snyder was that he was the only man known "who could strut sitting down."⁴⁸

The tide seemed to have run out for Melby at Northwestern. The School of Education still progressed, and it was still an exciting environment in which to work, but it became, according to Melby, "more and more uncomfortable." In Snyder's first report to the board of trustees at the end of his first year as president there were contained some innuendoes and implications for the School of Education. In expressing his concern for a tremendous jump in the number of graduate degrees awarded, many of these at the end of the summer session, Snyder wrote:

The increase in the number of Graduate School degrees between 1938 and 1940 is greater than the total increase for the entire University over the same two-year period. The number of master's degrees recommended by that School has increased almost 50 per cent in these

⁴⁷Statement by William Heard Kilpatrick, personal interview.

⁴⁸This description of Snyder was given to the author in personal interviews by three different people who had served in the School of Education with Melby.

two years. Just what the significance of this may be, I am not quite sure. But I believe we ought to examine our standards for advanced degrees in certain areas, though I recognize that the increase in 1940 may have been largely caused by external influences over which we had no control--for example, the growing tendency on the part of school boards to require every high school teacher to hold a master's degree... the number of Bachelor of Arts degrees shows a corresponding tendency to dwindle, indicative of the regrettable failure of Latin and Greek to maintain their hold upon the imagination of the great public.⁴⁹

Christian O. Arndt describes Snyder as being irrevocably committed to the liberal arts approach; he was interested in the pursuit of knowledge per se:

He could not appreciate the ideas and concerns that Melby had. He didn't appreciate what Melby was doing and he did not understand it. He did not believe in experimentation in education: he thought that it was quite clear that the elementary and, especially, the secondary school and the college should inculcate knowledge. He judged a person's value by his writing and his research and things that were academically laudable.⁵⁰

Tracy E. Strevey, vice-president of the University of Southern California observed that "if Snyder had let Melby go ahead with his plan and hadn't curtailed his budget and otherwise frustrated him, he would have really built a great institution out of the Northwestern School of Education."⁵¹

⁴⁹"The President's Report," Northwestern University Bulletin, vol. 41 (December 30, 1940), p. 8.

⁵⁰Statement by Christian O. Arndt, personal interview.

⁵¹Quoted by Christian O. Arndt, personal interview.

As time went on it became increasingly difficult for Melby to work with Snyder. Whether Melby could have avoided conflict with Snyder is problematical, but in the light of their basic philosophical differences, it appears unlikely. Melby wonders, if, perhaps, he had moved more slowly and had taken more years to do the same job, whether he could have succeeded without antagonizing Snyder. But moving slowly was not in Melby's nature, and in moving slowly other problems might have accrued.

Melby began to feel that it was "uncomfortable" to serve under Snyder. He began to wonder if, possibly, the School of Education would receive better treatment from Snyder if he would leave. By this time Melby had developed tremendous affection for the School of Education. He sensed a "family spirit" that he says never existed to that degree in any other place where he served. Melby was willing, however, to leave, if in leaving it would help an institution and a faculty of whom he was extremely fond. Melby would be proved wrong in this. His leaving would be of no help. Quite the contrary, for if Melby should leave there would no longer be a buffer between the central administration and the faculty of the School of Education. Melby fought doggedly for his programs and in support of the faculty. In reflecting on it Melby feels that in this particular situation he had a lot of "nuisance value."

Under happier circumstances Melby would not have considered leaving a school in which he was so happy and in

which he found so much to do. As it was, however, when he received a call from the Montana State Board of Education urging him to accept a position as president of Montana State University, he began to ponder the results of his leaving. Prior to this he had no intention of leaving. So, in part, hoping his resignation might possibly help the School of Education, he accepted the position in Montana in the late summer of 1941.

When Melby left, the School of Education went downhill almost immediately. Its champion was gone. Kilpatrick states that Snyder set out immediately to undo all the good that Melby had done.⁵² Others testify as well to the change that took place in the School of Education when Melby left. The dynamism was gone. Melby had been the hub of the enthusiasm and experimentation that had marked the School. With him gone, others also began to leave. The faculty that had worked with Melby to build the School into a mid-west power in professional education began to scatter to other institutions and other states. One, Walter Anderson, went with Melby to Montana, where he became dean of the College of Education. The enthusiasm and the insights that these people had gained at Northwestern they took with them to other places.

Melby, too, felt that what was done at Northwestern was not lost. When asked about the statements by Kilpatrick

⁵²Statement by William Heard Kilpatrick, personal interview.

and others to the effect that Snyder undid all the good that he had done, Melby replied:

In some ways it is true, but the greatest good that comes from any situation is the good that comes to the people and the growth that occurs in people. In terms of education in America, Snyder didn't undo what we had done; in terms of Northwestern he undid it a good deal.

The years at Northwestern were years in which Melby took giant steps. He came in as a fledgling; he went out as a distinguished educator. Today, over twenty years since he left Evanston, Melby still looks back fondly at what he says was "probably the most exciting period of my life." Faculty members who served there with him, no matter where they may be now, reflect on their experience with a similarly warm remembrance. In speaking with them one senses a feeling of unity and comradeship. Melby says they were united in a cause greater than themselves. Unanimously, they speak of what the experience did for them.

Most often they speak of Melby's inspiring leadership and of his great energy. They felt that they learned from Melby, although he had never taught them in a class. C.O. Arndt says that Melby always unconsciously "taught" his faculty members.⁵³ To all of these people the School of Education at Northwestern was a testimony to Melby's inspirational leadership. Typically, those involved speak of the "way in which Melby built the School of Education."

⁵³Statement by Christian O. Arndt, personal interview.

Clifford E. Erickson, who first met Melby at Northwestern as a student in his class, served with him as a faculty member during the last few years Melby was dean. He evaluates Melby's contribution to the School of Education:

Melby did something that was truly amazing in American higher education. He took a School of Education that was almost completely unknown--certainly one of the poorest, weakest, most inconsequential university schools of education in America--located in a university which in itself was a conservative one, uninterested in professional education, and he took this school and within a period of ten years built it into one of the half-a-dozen nationally recognized schools of education in America...I think he did an amazing job at Northwestern, and I don't think that job has ever been duplicated in American higher education in professional education.⁵⁴

One of the most significant indices of Melby's success and of the warm, personal relationships that he developed with the faculty is the way in which many migrated to where Melby was--some to Montana and several in later years to New York University. The Northwestern faculty held Melby in high professional and personal regard. In 1938, Melby had been offered a position by Dean William F. Russell at Teachers College as Russell's dean of instruction. This would have been a much bigger salary than Melby was getting at Northwestern, and on the basis of the relative size of the institutions, and Columbia's great prestige, a much bigger job. Melby made several trips to New York

⁵⁴Statement by Clifford E. Erickson, personal interview.

to talk it over with Russell. It became a very difficult decision to make. Back at Northwestern, Melby talked it over with his faculty members. Many of the young faculty members he had just brought to Northwestern urged him to stay, saying, "You just brought us here; you can't go off and leave us now." It was a similar feeling that Melby had--that he had an obligation to the School of Education and to the young men he had just brought to it. That convinced him; he told Russell that he was staying at Northwestern.

In Melby's scrapbook is a piece of poetry written by an unknown faculty member (or members) of the Northwestern School of Education. It was written at the time when Melby was debating whether he should accept the position as dean of instruction at Teachers College. The structure and technique of the poetry itself is not good, nor is the poetic style important. The striking thing is that a relationship developed between Melby and the faculty that made it possible for the faculty to feel this way about him and, even greater still, prompted the writing and the sending to him of the following poem:

Old College pursued its peaceful way,
 Classes in session the livelong day,
 Nothing of special note occurring,
 No events that were rousing or stirring,
 When suddenly to mar the scene,
 And keep our minds from being serene,
 Teachers' College wanted our Dean!

Now we're cleaning house and cutting the grasses,
 Conducting seminars, teaching classes,
 We're playing bridge and serving tea,
 You'll find us the gayest of company,
 For life has resumed its peaceful sway,
 The lines in our brows have cleared away.
 OUR FRIENDS, THE MELBYS, ARE GOING TO STAY!!!

Melby hated to leave Northwestern. This was "home" for him and for Mrs. Melby as well. In spite of the difficulties with Snyder, Melby said that he would not have left had he not been offered the position as president of Montana State University. His inclination was to stay at Northwestern and battle for the School and for the faculty. But when the offer from Montana came he began to wonder if maybe the better thing to do would be to leave.

In the summer of 1941, while Melby was on vacation in Colorado, he received a telegram from the Board of Education in Montana (his first correspondence from them) asking him to come and meet with the Board, which he agreed to do. On his return from meeting with the Board in Helena, Mrs. Melby and their son, Stanley, met him in Fargo, North Dakota. Mrs. Melby's first question was, "Are you going to Montana?" Melby told her he wasn't. First of all, he was not yet ready to give up on being able to help Northwestern. In addition, he not only had no desire to be a university president, but the situation in Montana was not an entirely healthy one. They had just fired the former president, and the high feelings of the partisan groups involved in the struggle had not yet subsided. Melby was not sure that he wanted to leave Northwestern to go to that kind of an environment.

A week later while fishing with Walter Anderson on a lake near Alexandria, Minnesota, Melby was called to the shore to answer a long distance phone call. On the telephone was Elizabeth Ireland, the Montana State Superintendent of Public Instruction. "We've just elected you president of Montana State University," she said. "No you haven't," replied Melby, "I'm not coming to Montana." In spite of the fact that Melby told her he was not interested she asked if he wouldn't please come out and take a look at the University. (Up to this time he had not seen it, having been interviewed in Helena.) Melby agreed to do at least that much.

Governor Sam C. Ford met Melby in his car at the airport in Helena and took him to Missoula to the University. For two days Melby sat in the president's office, interviewing faculty members. "And I guess I lost my heart to those people," says Melby. "I guess I started thinking that it was a darn shame that so many wonderful people were in such a bad mess. I thought, 'Well, maybe I can do some good out here; maybe this is the thing to do.' I don't think that up until that time I really had any idea of taking the position in Montana." The visit to Missoula changed Melby's mind. He told the State Board that he would accept their offer.

Parting from all the friends in Evanston was a major experience for the Melbys. Such close ties are not easily severed. In October, they returned to Evanston for a

farewell dinner at the Hotel Orrington. A warm-hearted crowd paid tribute to the Melbys. From all across the country arrived telegrams from those who could not attend. From Seattle came one from the American Federation of Labor Convention headquarters, saying: "Contacts... indicate that organized labor in Montana will enthusiastically support you as president of Montana State University. Best Wishes."⁵⁵

The Citizens Schools Committee of Chicago, in a telegram, thanked Melby "wholeheartedly for eight years of generous help in our struggle to improve Chicago schools."⁵⁶

And from Wisconsin came this message signed by nine high school teachers. "To Dean Melby, Greetings. Best wishes for your success on your appointment to the presidency of Montana State University, from your friends and admirers at North Division High School, Milwaukee. May the Melby ideals never be lost to Northwestern University."⁵⁷

The Montana years lay ahead. Melby would learn to

⁵⁵Western Union Telegram, Seattle, Washington, October 11, 1941.

⁵⁶Western Union Telegram, Chicago, Illinois, October 11, 1941.

⁵⁷Western Union Telegram, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 11, 1941.

love this huge, challenging state, named by the Indians the "Land of Shining Mountains." Montana also had massive problems to match its size. Joseph Kinsey Howard described it aptly: "Montana, high, wide, and handsome."⁵⁸

⁵⁸Joseph Kinsey Howard, Montana: High, Wide, and Handsome, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959).

CHAPTER III

THE MONTANA YEARS

In Montana, history doesn't go back very far. What there is, has been brief, colorful, explosive, and in many ways tragic. People rushed to Montana with hopes of riches, but in the majority of the cases met with disillusionment and heartache. The economic climate has often been one of boom or bust, exploitation, overexpansion and failure. The political climate has also followed this rather frantic pattern--from fiery gun totin' politics of the late 1800's to apathetic resignation in the middle 1900's.

The first vivid impressions a visitor is likely to get on arriving in Montana are of its great beauty and its vast emptiness. The fourth largest state in the union, it also has one of the smallest populations. It is a huge land with huge promises, all largely unfulfilled.

When Melby went to Montana in the fall of 1941 he found that the state had a population of only 560,000 and a declining population at that. In the 1930 census, Montana was the only state in the nation to have lost more people than she had gained. During the 1930's, 45,000 people moved in, and by 1940, she had a net gain of almost 22,000. In a move that was historically typical for

Montana, however, 90,000 people left the state in the next three years, so that by 1943, Montana had fewer people than she had in 1920. All during World War II, while Melby was in Montana, population continued to decline.

The land itself is a contrast of extremes; rugged and mountainous in the west section, it tapers off to monotonous, flat prairie in the east. It is blisteringly hot and fiercely cold. There seems to be nothing moderate about the state or about her story. Montana was born in violence, and the feuds of early cattlemen and gold seekers were replaced in later years by bitter wars between the "copper kings." Only a little more than fifty years before Melby came to Montana the state's first exploiters "were slaughtering 150,000 buffalo a season on its plains, brawling in its frontier bars, robbing gold laden stages, and swinging from vigilante gallows."¹

The past is a very real part of the present in Montana. The vigilantes are gone, and quick justice has given way to fair trials. But the noose still exists in Montana and the state-approved death penalty for conviction of first-degree murder is by hanging from the gallows on the county courthouse lawn.

It was as recently as 1876 in Montana that General George Custer achieved national immortality by his foolish

¹Howard, op. cit., p. 3.

charge at the Battle of the Little Big Horn. Only sixty-seven years before Melby arrived, the last Indian battle in the United States was fought at Big Hole, Montana, with Chief Joseph and his band of Nez Perce. Montanans have somehow been able to make a national monument of the Big Hole battlefield and a kind of god out of Custer, yet have permitted the descendants of the Indians whom they fought to huddle in misery just a few miles from the scenes of heroism.

After the gold rush of the 1860's, quartz mining took over. This mining called for capital to purchase expensive equipment. In the mines, financed by eastern capital, rich veins of silver were found and, as a result, the city of Butte was born. In a Butte silver mine, the Anaconda, was found the world's richest vein of copper. The discovery of copper in Butte ushered Montana into still another turbulent period of history, the great "war of the copper kings." As the mining giants fought for power, their death struggle rocked the political and economic life of Montana, unstable to begin with. The people were the real victims in the struggle. Money made in the mines went elsewhere, yet the companies controlled the economic life of the state.²

²Richard W. Poston, Small Town Renaissance, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950).

In 1912, the Montana Power Company was formed. It is even today the only financial institution in the state that is in the same league as the Anaconda Copper Company. This economic dominance has had, and continues to have, far-reaching social effects on Montana. Richard Poston says:

...these two companies with independent interests, important common officials, and mutual political and social policies, are in a class by themselves. Together they are referred to by Montanans simply as "the Company." Their combined ownership extends from one end of the state to the other, including mines, timber, stores, dams, power plants and about half of the state's daily newspapers.³

"Montana's growth," says one historian, "has been a series of traumas. There has been a strikingly consistent pattern which, appropriately enough, conforms to the pattern of the land itself. For every pinnacle there is an equally impressive declivity. For every sudden rise, a sudden fall. Optimism has alternated almost monotonously with despair."⁴

Montana's eccentric, swift-moving history has severely retarded the development of stable communities. The economy has fluctuated between abnormal prosperity and severe depression. Montanans, however, are no longer

³Ibid., p. 9.

⁴K. Ross Toole, Montana an Uncommon Land, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959), p. 9.

there to get rich quick and get out as they once were. On the other hand, Montana does not provide for her young men and women the opportunities that some other states do. As a result, many of those educated within the state leave to pursue their careers elsewhere. The forces of recent history loom large in the minds and memories of Montanans.

THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

Melby had been thoroughly briefed on the problems of Montana and of the University by the State Board of Education and by Governor Sam C. Ford before he accepted the position. During the two days he visited with the faculty at Missoula he learned more intimately of the immediate problems of the University. After accepting the position as president, but before he went to take up his duties, Melby acquainted himself with the history of Montana. Among other books, he read C.B. Glasscock's The War of the Copper Kings.

He knew of Montana's turbulence and instability, and he had seen the drabness of small towns that were left to die when the mine closed or the company moved on. Montanans told him that local interests had a strangle hold on education, and he was warned of partisan bickering in the legislature.

It may well be that it was because, and not in spite, of these tragedies that, as he says, his "heart

went out to these people." Melby, the idealist, hoped that he could help.

Melby's appointment was received in Montana with enthusiasm, but along with the cordiality of a Montana welcome went some warnings to him of what he would be facing. With the warnings, some people also sent advice. In a lengthy editorial in the Bozeman Chronicle, Melby was welcomed as president shortly before he was to come and formally assume his duties.⁵ First, the editorial praised him:

Dr. Melby comes in the prime of life, with a distinguished career behind him, from one of the notable educational institutions of the country. His record indicates that he has earned a promotion to a more responsible task....The people of the state will welcome Dr. Melby to his new task with high hope and with cordial expectation of his success.

Having praised him, the editor now "reminded" Melby of certain facts of Montana educational life. First, he reminded Melby that in the absence of a chancellor the success of the state system of higher education depended on cooperation between the heads of the various units. "The people of the state hope that Dr. Melby will join cordially with the older members of the executive group, in a spirit of hearty cooperation."

The final reminder by the editor was that Dr. Melby should be aware of the suspicion with which other departments

⁵ Editorial, Bozeman Daily Chronicle, September 26, 1941.

of a university look on "specialized departments of education." Evidently, the editor felt some anxiety about Melby's views on education as a former dean of a school of education, for he concluded by saying:

Other college departments have a feeling that the departments of education depend too much on methodology and statistics, and too little upon the need of scholarly attitudes, high scholarship, and the imponderables of stimulating and inspiring personality which defy definition and cannot be reduced to figures.

Being aware of this feeling, Dr. Melby will doubtless recognize and make abundant allowance for divergent points of view about the work of teaching, which, at its best, is far more an art than a science. He will head a faculty, including both older and younger men who have given much devoted service to building up a great school. The people of the state believe in them. They want them to have a chance to work at their best. Dr. Melby will be wise to let the dead past bury its dead and to take a forward-looking attitude which will insure stability and progress.

Melby was well aware of the suspicion of which the editor spoke. After his recent experiences at Northwestern, and in particular, his philosophical conflict with President Snyder, he hardly needed to be reminded.

The first issue of the Montana State University News, an alumni publication, expressed great pleasure at the election of Melby. It hailed him as "one of the nation's outstanding educational figures" and urged "all alumni to rally behind this distinguished educator."⁶

⁶Montana State University News, (vol. 4) October, 1941.

Melby entered Montana on Wednesday, October 24, 1941. On the following Monday he was to be on the campus to assume his responsibilities. Between Wednesday and Sunday night he and Mrs. Melby covered over 1,800 miles of Montana territory. In the course of the trip he delivered speeches at Glasgow, Bozeman, and Kalispell, where he addressed district meetings of the Montana Education Association, and at Hamilton, where he addressed the Authors' Club.

At Hamilton, Melby's speech stressed the importance of the art of human relationship. He named faith, freedom, truth and love as the four elements necessary to provide a satisfactory climate for the development of the art of human relationship.⁷

The theme of his talk at the Montana Education Association district convention in Kalispell a few nights later was, again, the importance of "art" in personal relationships:

If you and I touch the lives of other people, these touch other lives, and our influence goes on to infinity touching a myriad others. Greatest of all fine arts is the art of living creatively with other people....You will never be a great teacher until you have faith in all boys and girls and all human beings, because there is not a human being who hasn't something unique to contribute.⁸

⁷Daily Missoulian, October 26, 1941.

⁸Daily Missoulian, November 1, 1941.

On Monday morning when interviewed by the student newspaper's reporters, he told them:

I hope we can make this university a place where the students can live the richest and most productive lives possible....I'd like to know what the faculty and students are thinking about and get their ideas for the school's progress.... I like to talk to students so much that there's a danger I will spend my time talking when I should be doing other things.⁹

The first task facing Melby on campus was that of trying to bring some semblance of unity to a faculty that was split into two groups over the firing of the man who had been his predecessor. Melby's formal inaugural was still a month away, but this urgent problem could not wait. It was in all probability this divisive issue to which Melby's editorial advisor was referring when he admonished Melby that he would "...be wise to let the dead past bury its dead and to take a forward looking attitude."¹⁰

In the eyes of the faculty who had supported the former president, an incoming president who took his place was almost certain to be compared and found wanting. On the other hand, the enemies of the man were almost certain to consider Melby an improvement. Melby's gift for making friends was in this particular instance his most valuable asset. His openness, his warmth, and his practice of involving people in what he was doing broke down the walls

⁹Montana Kaimin, Montana State University, October 30, 1941.

¹⁰Bozeman Daily Chronicle, September 26, 1941.

that had arisen. Melby dealt with all of them in the same way no matter which camp they had belonged to. "Six months after I arrived," says Melby, "I couldn't tell one group from the other."

During the month prior to his inauguration, Melby spent much of his time getting to know the personality of the University and of the state. He traveled about the state considerably, speaking before civic groups, attempting to rally support for education and also to get acquainted with the people of Montana. In Butte, the home of "the company," Melby spoke before civic groups, calling on them, with other civic leaders in the state, to give advice and support to education: "The University will only be as good as you help make it...And I think Montana stands firmly behind its belief in education." ¹¹ He told them that he saw no reason why, with such cooperation, they could not build the University into as good a one as could be found anywhere in the country.

A week later, however, when Melby made his first appearance before the student body he made it clear that he was well aware of the fact that Montanans had indeed not supported the University as he thought they should have. First he emphasized his interest and belief in education as a means of promoting the democratic way of life, but told the students that, "Democracy isn't going to be saved

¹¹Quoted in Montana Standard, Butte, November 18, 1941.

through education unless education gets into the stream of life." Then, turning to the problem of support, he said:

In the month I have been here I have seen nothing very alarming. I am not alarmed, only concerned, because the state of Montana has not supported the university as it should....I have been told that students are not what they ought to be, and told that this is a glorified country club which carries on a few auxiliary educational activities.¹²

In a state with only 500,000 people the inauguration of a new president of their University is an event that assumes a far greater importance for the people than it might in a more populous state. Montanans are fond of all kinds of celebrations, pageants, commemorations, and parades. In typical Montana fashion the inaugural of Melby as president of Montana State University was an elaborate, well-conceived and well-carried-out ceremony.

Elaborate plans were laid for the inauguration. All of the major Montana public officials would be there as well as the presidents of the other five colleges in the state system. In addition, there would be delegates from 110 other colleges and universities in the country who were coming by invitation of the State of Montana. With great significance for Melby, the principal speech at his inaugural would be given by Fred L. Engelhardt, the man who, in Minnesota, had played such a vital role in Melby's life

¹²Quoted in Montana Kaimin, Montana State University, November 25, 1941.

and career. Engelhardt was now the president of the University of New Hampshire. The presence of his former professor as speaker could not help but be satisfying to Melby. And for Engelhardt the occasion was just one additional justification of the faith he had shown in Melby sixteen years before.

Melby, who seldom wrote out his speeches, worked carefully on his inaugural address. He was now more fully cognizant of the problems of Montana and what effect these had on education. He also knew that as president he had an important public relations responsibility. His task was to arouse the state to the need to support higher education; he was keenly aware that the people and the legislature had been all too indifferent. He also needed to state clearly what kind of higher education he believed in.

Another subtle facet of the problem was that it was typical of a lot of Montanans to still look "back East" for their cultural and educational standards. They had little confidence in the standards and merits of their own state system when they compared it to the ivy-covered citadels of learning of the East. This problem was rooted in historical traditions quite apart from educational considerations. The East was still the "source," and it was from the established, thriving cultural centers of the East that the pioneers had come. As a result of this, many people in Montana's "upper class" still sent their children "back East" to get the rough edges knocked off.

Melby took note of all this. He entitled his address, "The Role of a State University." With his speech finished ahead of time, corrections and additions penciled in, he awaited the ceremony. The date set for the inauguration was Monday, December 8, 1941.

The events of Sunday, December 7, the day before Melby's inauguration, need no repetition. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor had almost instantaneous effects on all Americans.

Sunday evening, December 7, Melby got out the typed copy of his prepared speech, typed up an additional paragraph and pinned it to the bottom of the last page. The new paragraph read:

Within the last 48 hours our nation has been plunged into war through ruthless attack by an aggressor nation. The international issue is now clear. The democratic world is engaged in a crucial struggle with forces of international lawlessness, forces that deny practically all of the human values represented in the American tradition. In this epoch making struggle for human freedom our military defenses are no more important than the moral defenses of our nation. Ultimate victory will call for sacrifice and solidarity on the part of our people. We must have a determined will to live as a free nation. In our kind of society we can build these moral defenses only through a thoroughly effective program of education from nursery school to university.¹³

In reporting the inauguration of Melby one reporter said: "The ceremonies...were carried out before a rather strangely tense crowd that filled the Student Union theater

¹³Ernest O. Melby, "The Role of a State University," unpublished speech.

on the University campus. Over the proceedings, seldom mentioned but never forgot, hung the shadow of war."¹⁴

Melby's inaugural at Montana was always remembered by him as a vivid occasion, in a large measure because of the perilous national circumstances which hung over it. Apart from the overwhelming concern in everyone's mind about the consequences of Pearl Harbor which cast the whole inauguration in a peculiar perspective, the ceremony was carried out as planned.

Engelhardt, before delivering his address, first paid tribute to Melby: "There is but one Ernest Melby. To my knowledge there is no other leader in public education today who has so unselfishly and steadfastly dedicated himself to the cause of a better and more democratic form of schooling for America youth...Montana, you have chosen well. Much can come through your choice if you will give opportunity to your president and if you will support his leadership."¹⁵

The theme of Melby's inaugural address was that higher education must ultimately find the justification for its existence in service to mankind. "The university should belong to the people of Montana not only in the sense that it is supported by them but also because it has or should have

¹⁴Quoted in Daily Missoulian, December 9, 1941.

¹⁵Fred L. Engelhardt, Quoted in Montana Kaimin, Montana State University, December 9, 1941.

something to offer all the people...universities have given wings to the mind of man without putting love in his heart."¹⁶

Melby further urged that the university should be brought to the people and that the entire state should be its campus:

The development of a program of higher education which promotes creative living for all of the people of the state is a project which needs only to be understood by the people to win their support. It is an undertaking that will constitute a challenge to the intelligence and cooperative good will of faculty, students, administration, the state board and the people. The short period I have lived and worked at Montana State University has given me a strong faith in the ultimate achievement of our common purposes.¹⁷

Melby, when asked if he were impressed by all the pomp and circumstance of the inauguration, replied that he had never really been impressed by a lot of "ceremony." He feels that there is "an element of sham in it to a certain extent." Melby said:

I think what probably impressed me most in the inaugural was not the ceremony but the fact that I had somehow or other, perhaps without thinking about it too carefully, assumed a responsibility that maybe I couldn't carry out. I was a little floored by the task I saw. On an occasion like this, one gets a little measure of the hopes and aspirations of people, and these people in the University had been through a difficult period.

¹⁶Ernest O. Melby, "The Role of a State University," unpublished speech.

¹⁷Ibid.

Beyond the primary obligation of mending the rift that had developed in the University faculty, Melby felt that he needed to do something immediately about the kind of support, financial and philosophical, that the people of Montana had been giving to the University. Salaries were an urgent problem. When Melby began his work at Montana State University the highest salary paid to a full professor was \$3,600. Melby, himself, had taken a \$2,000 cut in salary in coming to Montana from Northwestern. The physical plant of the University also suffered from lack of funds. It had seen virtually no repairs for a ten-year period; Melby describes it as "being in desperate condition."

Melby, in order to bring the needs of education before the people of the state, spent much of his time in the early months of his presidency traveling and speaking:

In the first 18 months of my work in Montana, I visited almost every section of the state. I held numerous conferences with individual citizens, and addressed large numbers of gatherings of citizens on various educational problems, particularly as they related to Montana State University and the University system. These contacts with the state as a whole and with Montana State University itself, as well as some study of the other five institutions comprising the University system, convinced me that drastic measures would have to be adopted by the State board of education if higher education was to be saved for future usefulness to the young people of the state.¹⁸

¹⁸Letter from Ernest O. Melby to the State Board of Education, March 31, 1945.

He saw little chance of really accomplishing great change in the general support given to the University, unless somehow the people of Montana could have their aspiration level for higher education raised. Local politics ultimately controlled the state legislature. If anything were to be changed it had to start first with the people out in the hinterland.

Since his inauguration, Melby had a new national and world issue to which to tie his crusade for better support for education in Montana. Some reference to the world conflict almost always cropped up in his speeches. Here again was evidence of the "backdrop" against which he viewed all problems in education after he returned from Europe in 1939. With his unique gift for making friends, Melby began to tour the state in an endeavor designed to win friends for the University and for the Montana system of education in general. The fight for democracy, he told them, would not be won finally on the **battlefield, but it** had to be won in every community. Something had to change in the heart of man; he had to see his fellow men in a new way. Democracy for Melby meant faith in people, and he argued that there was no better place for democracy to be practiced than in the school. A community, then, could demonstrate its belief in people and in democracy by supporting public education.

Melby's speeches during this period would often begin by discussing the war, but they would typically conclude with a fervent appeal to the listener to support education as the only final answer to the problems over which the world was in armed conflict.

Early in World War II, during what were, for Americans, very dismal days, Melby spoke to the Missoula Chamber of Commerce. "The war," he said, "is not being fought to preserve democracy but human dignity and worth." He criticized the American people for asking the soldiers to do their part in World War I, while the rest of the nation refused to do its share after the War was over. Next, he traced Pearl Harbor back to 1918 and the end of World War I, "when the allied nations settled into a state of moral and spiritual decay." After this summing up, Melby then delivered his exhortation on education:

...Schools of higher learning must bring about a moral and spiritual renaissance in young people to give them something to work and live for....Only by a genuine, cooperative program of education can we raise a generation with so much faith, so much courage, that never again will a Hitler rise to power; never again will there be such a moral relaxation; never again will there be a Pearl Harbor incident.¹⁹

Melby canvassed the state with his clarion call. The night following his Missoula Chamber of Commerce speech was "Melby night in Anaconda." The local newspaper reported

¹⁹Quoted in Daily Missoulian, January 22, 1942.

that, "he has rapidly won many friends in Montana already by his public appearance.... Anacondans will extend their hospitality--the real western sit-down-to-eat variety-- to one of Montana's newcomers." At a dinner gathering of 300 alumni, teachers, Rotarians, Kiwanians, Activians, and Commercial Club members and other citizens of Anaconda, Melby preached his message: "We have a job to do together.... We want a world in which there could be no Manchurias, Ethiopias, Spains, or Munichs. That is the challenge to all institutions of learning, especially those of higher learning. The project of bringing that kind of world invites the cooperation of all parents and people of Montana."²⁰

Melby delivered his burning message of "war, democracy and education" in Kalispell, in Ogden, Utah, in Great Falls, in Chicago, in Havre--everywhere he went he tried to stir people up with his intense conviction that education held the promise of tomorrow for the world. Often his addresses would ask what the role of the university was in wartime and what its role should be when the war was over--and won. And frequently he would hark back to the statement he used in his inaugural address: "We have given wings to the mind of man, but we have neglected to put love in his heart."

Melby's circle of influence and activity continued to widen. In April, 1942, he attended the Inland Empire Education

²⁰Anaconda Standard, January 22, 1942.

Association meetings in Spokane. The local newspaper reported, "Dr. Ernest O. Melby...may have been a stranger in the Northwest when he arrived in Spokane, but he is no longer. The doctor is listed for some 14 talks on the association programs and is one of the men most in demand. Much comment is made of his interesting talks."²¹

A week later Melby was in Butte, where he spoke before the YMCA Round-up Club. The Montana Standard carried the complete text of his speech, a ringing, evangelical call for the support of education. First, he viewed America in retrospect; then he analyzed the tasks confronting the nation; next he called for national solidarity. Melby's concluding remarks were on the "responsibility of education":

Only a spiritual renaissance can save the world from totalitarianism. Totalitarianism has arisen because fear and cynicism have taken possession of human hearts. We must destroy Hitler's power, but we cannot bomb the Nazi philosophy out of the German heart. The German heart must see hope, it must see love in our hearts, it must experience understanding at our hands. Put hope, love, and understanding in the heart of the world and totalitarianism will fade away as quickly as it arose.

The responsibility of education in war time is to translate our Christian democratic tradition into a living educational program. Such a program, if given to all Americans, adults and children, will give us the faith and strength to win the war. Such a program will help us to make a democracy effective in the post-war period. Such a program will give the whole world a spiritual dynamic which will melt hate, suspicion and brutality from the heart of man thereby destroying the brutal menace which now confronts us.

²¹Spokane Daily Chronicle, April 9, 1942.

An educational program which breathes faith in all humanity, which proclaims by its actions the worth and dignity of man, and which by its own example personifies the search for truth is the only hope for a humane world.²²

The problems back home on the University campus were not being ignored by Melby. Arousing people around the state to the importance of supporting education was a very basic part of his plan for the University. So many of the school's problems were related to poor financial support that Melby despaired of solving many or any of them unless more adequate support were forthcoming. Melby addressed groups of people who could wield influence in getting more support. He began to be a little more blunt with the Montanans.

Speaking before the Helena Kiwanis Club, in February, with the state legislators almost within earshot of his remarks, he praised the faculty and students of the University and reminded the Kiwanians that the students and faculty members had "inadequate equipment, leaky roofs, unpainted buildings and a wretched salary schedule."²³

Just a few days earlier, Governor Sam C. Ford's committee on reorganization and economy had given Melby, according to one reporter, "virtually...a free rein to reorganize the university."²⁴ A list of 41 recommendations for

²²Montana Standard, Butte, April 16, 1942.

²³Montana Herald-Record, Helena, February 9, 1942.

²⁴Butte Daily Post, January 28, 1942.

Montana State University, prepared by a Chicago governmental survey firm (Griffenhagen and Associates) prior to Melby's arrival, had been given to the Governor's committee. The committee adopted a blanket resolution which turned all the recommendations which dealt with administration reform over to Governor Ford and to Melby for further study. The description of Melby being given a "free hand to reorganize the university" is somewhat lacking in accuracy. The committee did, however, approve a specific recommendation that efforts be made to reduce the number of courses offered at the university--especially those with very small enrollments.

In spite of all the long-standing problems which Montana State University faced as a result of the state's frenetic history, isolation and legislative difficulties, the problems of a wartime society also affected it. Students and faculty members were called to serve in the armed forces. It was an extremely difficult time in which to attempt to solve many of the University's problems, to say nothing of rebuilding it into greater respectability and influence. The methods that Melby used at Northwestern to build the School of Education could not be applied here. Now there was war. Faculty members could not be enticed to Missoula. With reduced enrollments few new ones were needed. What was there to offer? No dynamism as yet and certainly no money. At Evanston, Melby had to battle with contentious vice-presidents for his budget, but here in Montana, he had to spar with a legislature, and the financial problems were vastly compounded.

Melby did manage to hire Walter A. Anderson from the Northwestern School of Education and bring him to Montana State University. At Missoula, Anderson became dean of the College of Education. Later, when Melby became chancellor, Anderson became acting vice-president and was asked to assume the direction of a university-wide program of curriculum study and development that was already underway.

One of the big disappointments for Melby, and for Anderson, was that after eleven months of work, and what Melby terms the greatest amount of faculty involvement he had ever seen, the faculty voted down the proposals for curriculum revision. The study was undertaken again for a full year, and at the end of that time, the faculty voted it down again--by a bigger majority than the first time.

When Melby was asked why the proposals were defeated he said, "Faculty people are reluctant to change. There are few places in society where conservatism and the status quo is more entrenched than in the universities. We want to change everybody else, but we don't want to change ourselves."

If Melby's untiring efforts to increase the general level of support for the University did not go unrewarded, they did not go uncriticized either. Misinterpretation is also the common lot of public speakers. In the following newspaper editorial the writer, sharply critical of Melby, obviously missed the point Melby intended--that more money was needed for teachers if Montana wished to keep those she had. The

editorial, entitled, "Who is Kidding Who! reads:

In commenting on legislative action, Dr. Melby, president of the Montana State University, declares that the legislature was more generous than in past years with education appropriations but leaves the inference if more and yet more money is not forthcoming for teachers' salaries Montana folks will have to teach their own children.

Unfortunately there happens to be a World War going on. Maybe the good Doctor is not aware of it. Not only has the war depleted the ranks of teachers but it has also depleted the ranks of doctors, dentists, nurses, and druggists. Maybe soon we will have to treat our own bellyaches. Dr. Melby should prepare himself for such an emergency.

The war has also depleted the ranks of all other trades and vocations. I find that I am fortunate that I can return to the trade and assist in the mechanical department. Other business men are also back in the harness working shoulder to shoulder with their employees. In fact most proprietors of small businesses are working long hours and doing disagreeable jobs to keep their business functioning during the war.

When the war ends the good Doctor will probably be swamped with applications from teachers who have been in the service or working in war industry. Few of us are preparing to teach our own children--few of us could. However, all of us believe with the end of the war there will be little complaint about teacher shortages. At present, money is not causing the shortage of teachers--war is.²⁵

Over all the activities of the University hung the constant cloud of war. To Montana's historical instability was now added this new facet. With the "all-out war effort" of the 1940's, Montanans, as well as most Americans, saw the winning of the war as the most critical and all-consuming task which must be accomplished. It was not a climate in which institutions could expand and experiment. Melby faced

²⁵Newspaper clipping, date and source unknown.

all these very real obstacles in addition to the normal ones, which are germane to the job of a university president.

In September of 1942, Melby welcomed the freshmen. His message seemed to contain an overtone of sadness and concern.

The present school year is being opened under difficult national and international conditions.... Many sacrifices will be in order both in our personal lives and in various phases of our educational program... brave men are risking their lives and losing them in defense of their faith...the least we can do on the home front is to make the most of our educational opportunities.²⁶

Nine months later in a commencement address he sent the graduating seniors off with a rousing challenge:

The cost of education...even when that education is of highest quality, is a low price to pay for developing an empire like Montana...When you take your diploma in your hand today dedicate your life to the winning of a stable peace for mankind. Join us in building for Montana, the nation, and the world, a program of education which lights unquenchable fires in the souls of men, which makes men proficient as builders of a better world. That kind of education will win the war. Only that kind of education can win the peace.²⁷

When Melby was asked what he felt was his greatest accomplishment while president of Montana State University, he reflected, shook his head and replied that, somehow, when he looked back on his years as president that it seemed to him

²⁶Montana Kaimin, Montana State University, September 25, 1942.

²⁷Quoted in Montana Kaimin, Montana State University, May 21, 1943.

that he saw nothing but a lot of unfinished jobs. Then after a moment he continued:

The most satisfying thing was the attitude of the faculty and, very close, the attitude of the State Board of Education. Working with both of these groups was a wonderful experience. The State Board members, and a good many other citizens in Montana, became interested and really worked pretty consistently to get something done about some of the structural things that bothered us. This was very satisfying to me.

On the faculty at Montana State University while Melby was president was a young political science professor named Michael J. Mansfield, now United States Senate Majority Leader. It was to Melby that Mansfield came for advice in 1942 on whether to run for election to Congress. Melby encouraged him to do so. Mansfield has said that the credit goes to Melby for getting him started in politics.²⁸ It is Melby's opinion that Mansfield overstates the case somewhat, and he is somewhat reluctant to take credit for giving the impetus to Senator Mansfield's career. It was true, nevertheless, that Melby strongly encouraged him to run for election and granted Mansfield a leave of absence which assured him of re-employment if he failed in his try.

Melby was riding a crest of popularity by the end of his second year in Montana. His speaking, his willingness to go almost anywhere in the state when people wanted him, his strong presentation of the case for Montana higher education,

²⁸Senator Michael J. Mansfield, address, Michigan State University, June 10, 1962.

and the slow but definite improvements in salaries (six salary increases while Melby was in Montana) and general support for the University had brought him state-wide admiration. He had labored not only in the cause of his University but for higher education in general in the state of Montana.

The problems of Montana higher education were not simply problems which belonged to the individual institution; they were state-wide problems which could only be resolved by state-wide coordination and cooperation. In 1932 the state legislature had amended the bill which provided for a chancellor of higher education and prohibited funds to be used for that position. For ten years there had been no administrative head for the six-unit University of Montana. In 1943 the legislature removed the prohibitive amendment and filled an educational position that had been vacant for ten years. The State Board of Education selected a chancellor for Montana--Ernest O. Melby.

CHANCELLOR

The University of Montana was composed of six separate units: Montana State University, Missoula; Montana State College, Bozeman; Northern Montana Normal College, Havre; Montana Normal College, Dillon; Eastern Montana Normal College, Billings; and Montana School of Mines, Butte. The situation which had developed after ten years of operating without an administrative head was that each unit operated independently of and

in competition with the others. Each unit would make its own appeal to the legislature for support, and legislators, with a political eye peeled for ways in which to win popular support in their home districts, let local interests take precedence over what was good for the state of Montana.

In part, the problems of the Montana system of higher education stemmed from the dubious wisdom of the state legislature in creating six institutions of higher education for a state of only half-a-million people. When the chancellorship plan was originated in 1915, it was hoped that it would help to unify the program, prevent overlap of effort, and coordinate the financial affairs of the six institutions. The plan was abandoned in 1932, by a legislative amendment. Now, ten years later, the chancellorship plan was to be tried again. When the State Board voted to reestablish the position and asked Melby to accept the post, he stated that he would agree to accept the position of chancellor for one year, during which time he would make a study of the problems of developing an administrative organization for the University system and make recommendations with regard to what he felt to be the most desirable pattern of organization.

Melby knew by now, for he had been in Montana for almost two years, what some of the problems were that he would be facing. As university president he had already had to deal with the legislature. He had some understanding of the little real authority possessed by the State Board of Education; he would

find out within the year just how little it really was. With his characteristic desire for a chance to initiate change and to crusade for a cause in which he believed, Melby decided he would accept the Board's offer and attempt to bring some element of rationality to what he considered a chaotic educational structure.

Melby's appointment met with conflicting reactions. To some it seemed the answer to the state's educational problems. Others were bitterly opposed and felt it was unnecessary and a wasteful expenditure of money. The salary of \$10,000 made Melby one of the highest paid public officials in the state. The local newspaper in Missoula said, "Dr. Melby... since becoming president of the State University, has become known throughout the state, and has delivered addresses in every section of Montana. He is familiar with the operation of all units of the Greater University, and with the educational problems in all parts of the state."²⁹

The Western News, one of the few newspapers in Montana not owned by Anaconda Copper, in an editorial entitled, "Let Us Give the Experiment a Chance," expressed its displeasure at the re-creation of the chancellor's post but argued at least for cooperation in the "experiment." The editorial is indicative of some of the attitudes with which Melby would have to cope:

²⁹Daily Missoulian, April 14, 1943.

...The plan of a super administrator was tried out for a number of years and then discarded as a failure. It was found unproductive of desired results and expensive.

This publication felt that the chancellor was unnecessary at the time....We still believe it unnecessary....

Our institutions of higher education are admittedly in a sad condition. Many of the reasons are easily discerned. Some causes can doubtless be remedied. It is certainly desirable that the greater University, in all of its component parts, find itself in a healthier condition. Otherwise we cannot hope for it to do much for our young men and women....

Chancellor Melby is faced with a terrific job. He assumes his duties at a time when conditions for success are poorest. He knows that thousands of his fellow citizens are frankly skeptical of the value of his post considering it just that much more dead-weight for them to carry.

But our legislative representatives have seen fit to again try out a centralized administration of the heterogeneous institutions that compose the greater University. It is up to the rank and file citizens, regardless of the individual views of the matter, to give the Chancellor every support of which they are capable in an effort to make the plan work. This means no one or two or three years trial. It should be given a thorough trial and afforded every opportunity to accomplish the ends to which it is dedicated. Then if the effort is crowned with success it should, of course, be continued. If the reverse is the case it will be time to get rid of the office of chancellor once and for all.

In this connection what are the ends sought? It should not be a mere attempt to reduce expenditures or alter the curriculum. We feel that too much emphasis has been placed in the past upon palatial buildings, beauteous campuses, and similar side-lines which actually are unessential.

Many among us have become somewhat dubious of the value of our institutions of higher education. This is not because we deprecate education per se, but rather for reason we are suspicious of the manner in which it is ladled out....

There are many things worth while that a chancellor can do if he is not tethered too short. We will watch the experiment carefully and hope that Dr. Melby will not find the obstacles insuperable.³⁰

One of the more interesting editorials concerning Melby's appointment appeared in the Bozeman Chronicle. It may be recalled that it was this same editor who in an editorial at the time of Melby's arrival felt compelled to issue some words of advice and warning. Among other bits of proffered information the editor noted that Melby would be somewhat suspect as a result of his background in "professional" education. In general the editor sounded a less than wholehearted, enthusiastic greeting to Melby. It was a restrained welcome.

It is indicative of the kind of inroads that Melby had made into the life of Montana and the kind of acceptance he had gained as an educator within his two-year period as president, to read what this same editor had to say about Melby's appointment as chancellor:

In recent years evidences of disunity and lack of centralized and responsible educational leadership have multiplied. Let it be said again that this is not a charge against the work of various presidents; they were victims of the headless system under which they were required to work.

The selection of Dr. Melby for the chancellorship should be the beginning of a better chapter in the Greater University history....He has been patient and willing to learn. He has not been here long enough to acquire any narrow local loyalty. He has made a good impression in all quarters of the state and with all groups....

³⁰The Western News, Hamilton, April 29, 1943.

And he has a big job. To reconcile the various interests of the state, to work tactfully with the six communities directly concerned with his work, and at the same time to direct their activities and support to the best ends, to represent to the state the highest values of education and win support for them, to establish better cooperation between the various schools and sections, to secure for higher education the financial support which it must have and to see that the funds provided are wisely expended--here are tasks enough to command the best interests of the new chancellor for a long time to come. And he will need and must have the full support of all who can contribute to his success.³¹

At the time that Melby accepted the position as chancellor he recommended to the governor that there be established a Commission on Higher Education, composed of distinguished citizens in the state who could make a study of the state system and assist him and the State Board in developing legislation and in drafting post-war plans for the University of Montana.

Shortly after his appointment as chancellor, Melby began visiting each of the six institutions, visiting with the administrative officials, talking to faculty members and finding out what their problems were. In the minds of some of these people was the lingering worry that, perhaps, Melby, as former president of Montana State, would show favoritism toward that institution in his position as chancellor. Melby tried to allay any such fears.

During the year, Melby visited over a dozen universities located in the East, Middle West and Far West. He discussed the problems Montana faced with people he considered to

³¹Bozeman Chronicle, April 15, 1943.

be leaders in American higher education. He studied the history of higher education in Montana and made an effort to understand what its problems in administration had been over a period of years. Two months after Melby's appointment the State Board of Education asked Fred Engelhardt (at Melby's request) to come to Montana to give them the benefit of his advice. Engelhardt visited four of the six institutions and met with the Executive Council (presidents) and with the State Board.

The work of the Citizens Commission and of Melby and the State Board began to clarify the administrative procedure that would have to be put into effect in order to make the chancellor an effective educational leader and to salvage Montana's system of higher education.

In the meantime Melby was finding out just what the problems of higher education in Montana were. While doing so he was also discovering how frustrating it can be to be a chancellor without any degree of power. Nor could he work through the State Board, for they, too, were a creature of the legislature. The Montana legislature had given the State Board of Education responsibility for education, but they had invested them with no amount of authority whatsoever. Melby, as their executive officer, was similarly powerless to do much about the problems that higher education faced. He says:

The Board was completely dependent on legislative action, not only for its appropriations but for its powers which can be altered anytime at the pleasure of the University. There was the feeling that one could do nothing, that he was helpless. There was really no authority to do anything. One could recommend, but what good would it do to "recommend" if he didn't have the money?

Melby relates an incident that indicates the feeling of helplessness that he had as chancellor. Eastern Montana State Normal School in Billings was a relatively new institution. During the war years its enrollment went down, according to Melby, to "almost nothing." At the end of the year the school had a balance of about \$30,000. Meanwhile, at Montana State College in Bozeman there was an extreme shortage of funds. Certain building repairs were desperately needed. Some buildings had roofs that were leaking. "In the home economics department," says Melby, "the people were setting out dishpans and pots every night when they left to catch the water that leaked through the roof." Transferring money from Billings to Bozeman was impossible. The State Board had no authority to transfer funds from one institution to another. Each institution had its own budget, and each made its own private appeal to the legislature, and their budget was fixed by the legislature. In reality, then, the University of Montana was not a centrally controlled system of higher education at all, but six units operating independently, with separate budgets. Neither students nor faculty were interchangeable.

Melby also discovered very soon that this loose kind of organization had political consequences. Legislators from the smaller institutions (in Billings, Dillon, Havre) located in the eastern part of the state made "deals" with each other for support, with the result that they could roll up political pressures in the legislature that far exceeded anything the two larger institutions could muster. The State Board, of course, could do nothing but sit by and watch, powerless.

This lack of organization also had an unfortunate effect on the college presidents. Melby found that whereas he always enjoyed his work with the State Board, he was less happy when he met with the Executive Council, composed of the college presidents. "These fellows would fight for their individual institutions," says Melby, "and they were very little inclined to see the state's problems; the structure made them this way."

As his year as chancellor wore on it became clear to Melby that unification of the existing system was a prerequisite for any improvement in the quality of higher education for Montanans. It was his belief that the University of Montana should be constituted as a unified single institution with phases of its program operating in different parts of the state. As an example of what he meant, he often pointed out to Montanans that the presence of the Law School in Missoula and the College of Agriculture in Bozeman did not necessarily make these units separate institutions. They were still part

of a whole.

Melby's contention was that under this kind of a unified concept it would be practicable for the president of one of the units to serve as chancellor, or chief executive officer for the board. Among the advantages Melby saw for this procedure were a saving of administrative costs and a unified and effective educational and financial administration.

Melby specifically recommended to the State Board that they seek the passage of legislation that would provide for a unified system of education in Montana, with a unified budget. He urged that such legislation should provide for fiscal independence for the State Board of Education and should provide for definition of the power and responsibilities of the Board. He further recommended that appropriations for higher education should be made by the legislature to the University of Montana and not to the individual units. The State Board would then have some fiscal responsibility and could transfer funds from one institution to another when desirable, in terms of educational and financial considerations.

These changes seemed imperative to Melby. Furthermore, he saw no reason why others, if they thought the problem through and looked at it objectively, could not help but view them as right and reasonable. One year had gone by since his appointment. In his efforts to solve some of the state's educational problems, he had been met by frustration. Political considerations and the dominating force of local interests were an

anomaly to him. Moreover, it was clear to him that as chancellor he had no authority to institute any changes. He could only recommend. The situation was intolerable to Melby. His enthusiasm for innovation and for growth, which was so evident and so effective at Northwestern, could not help but meet with failure under the circumstances that existed. He and the State Board were in a legislative strait jacket.

Because of what Melby considered to be the impossibility of the situation in which he found himself as chancellor, he submitted his resignation to the State Board of Education at the end of a year in office. The final paragraph of the letter which outlined his recommendations for unifying the state system of higher education read:

...Until the position of the State Board is clarified, the educational program of the University is unified, and provision is made for a unified budget, the position of the chancellor is untenable, and in my judgment the expenditure for the office is unjustified. For this reason I am hereby tendering my resignation as chancellor, to take effect July 1, 1944. It is my hope that the State Board of Education will come to grips with the problems raised in this letter and that it will take the necessary steps to secure the recommended legislation in order that it may develop the needed program of higher education for Montana. I shall be glad to assist in this undertaking in such ways as the State Board believes are in the interests of education in Montana. I want to thank all the members of the Board for their devotion to the cause of higher education and for the many kindnesses they have extended to me personally.³²

³²Letter from Ernest O. Melby, to the Montana State Board of Education, April 24, 1944.

When Melby resigned the chancellorship in April, 1944, the State Board immediately reappointed him as president of Montana State University. During the year the former vice-president had been appointed as "acting president," with Walter Anderson moving from his deanship of the College of Education to the position of acting-vice-president. On Melby's return, these men reverted to their former positions. At the request of the Board of Education, Melby continued to assist with the various studies which were then underway. He continued to act as executive officer for the Board and was simultaneously president of Montana State University.

Melby's resignation as chancellor cost him roughly \$3,000 a year in salary. When asked about his feelings in taking this voluntary reduction in income, he said that he couldn't remember how he felt, but that it really hadn't been a major consideration. He actually seemed quite puzzled that this should be raised as an important point in the discussion of his resignation.

Two months after Melby's resignation, the Citizens Commission on Higher Education issued a report. The major recommendations of it provided for clarification of the powers of the State Board and the unification of the educational structure, program, and budget. The State Board gave general approval to the recommendations of the Commission and prepared a bill to be introduced in the Montana legislature. The bill was passed but so amended that Melby says:

They emasculated it--it had no real effectiveness when they were through, so that the situation there was not much better than before we started. The most important section to be deleted was that which would have provided for a unified all-University budget to be administered by the State Board. In addition, the powers of the Board were not clearly established.

The bill, of course, was still subject to the changeable winds of Montana politics. House Bill 214 was nothing more than a statute, and it could be repealed or amended at any session of the legislature. Melby wanted something more permanent--a constitutional provision.

The report of the Commission on Higher Education left the problem of dealing with overlapping of offerings within the system to the State to initiate some coordination of effort. Their experiences in this venture were almost completely unsuccessful. Melby, in describing this attempt to modify the overlapping of programs, said:

...The State Board undertook to develop a statement of policy with regard to this problem....The distribution of this statement and its announcement in the press produced a surprising amount of violent sectional and institutional controversy. It shortly became clear that no one of the six units of the University of Montana would willingly alter its program, if such alteration meant giving up even a small part of its offerings. Moreover, it appeared that a few of the units of the University had sufficient political power to block any effort at alteration of the existing program. All the bills to alter the functions of the various units of the University were defeated. If because of institutional and sectional controversies it is impossible to get the Legislature to alter the functions of the institutions, certainly no chancellor who would undertake such alteration could possibly survive in his position. It is further likely that even if the State Board of Education were to give vigorous support to the chancellor in his position, the next Legislature

would legislate the program back to its former basis.³³

The Commission, itself, differed with Melby on one issue he considered to be extremely important. One of their recommendations was that the chief executive officer, or chancellor, should not be a president of any one of the six units. This, of course, was exactly the opposite of Melby's suggestion. He accused the Commission of making a concession to sectional jealousies. Melby also argued that the conclusion that they reached about the chief executive's position was in conflict with an earlier conclusion of the Commission that the six units of the University were (or should be) one institution.³⁴

Melby was severely disappointed. He saw so clearly, himself, what seemed to be best for the state of Montana and for the education of her young people. It seemed to him that if a project were right that surely people would go along with it. Now he knew better. He had been thoroughly indoctrinated into the vagaries of politics and the great political power of narrow local interests. He did not lose his faith in people, but he took a more realistic view of the forces that caused people to act in ways contrary to what appeared right to him. In later years he was to say,

³³Letter from Ernest O. Melby to the Montana State Board of Education, March 31, 1945.

³⁴Class lecture, Michigan State University, May, 1960.

"Never make the mistake of assuming that people are the way you think that they ought to be."

John Gunther blames "the company" in Montana for much of Melby's defeats. He says:

Like most corporations, the ACM works hard to keep taxes down; this of course means that less money is available for the schools; the pattern is familiar everywhere, and is not peculiar to Anaconda or Montana. But another aspect merits attention, the curious fact that the University of Montana exists in six units in six different localities, though it is all the same organism and institution....All these have separate budgets and separate legislative appropriations, and the students and faculty are not interchangeable. Dr. E.O. Melby, the former chancellor of the university as a whole, thought that such chaotic irrationality might be modified, and suggested in 1945 that at least the six budgets be consolidated....But Melby was defeated; he resigned (and is now dean of the school of education at New York University) together with several of his professors. The legislature insisted on retaining the old six-way system, in part because a university in six parts makes for good lobbying. A lobbyist could always go to a legislator from Dillon, say, and promise some improvement to that particular community, in exchange for support of a company bill that might be coming up.³⁵

Melby began to feel that there was little immediate hope for any considerable degree of improvement in Montana's higher education. It was frustration, coupled with the feeling that he might not accomplish much more if he stayed on any longer, that led to his resignation as president of Montana State University in 1945, just a little over one year since resigning the chancellorship. All too often,

³⁵ John Gunther, Inside U.S.A., (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 172.

appreciation comes only after the prophet has left his country. It was also true, in some measure, in Melby's case. The following editorial, written when a new chancellor was appointed, is quoted here in its entirety. It indicates that Melby's crusading was not in vain. It is, in part, a testimony to Melby, and it demonstrates the kind of impression he made on at least some of the people of Montana:

We were disappointed at the speech delivered by the University of Montana chancellor when he addressed the county high school graduating class recently. The chancellor is new to Montana, however, and perhaps was not yet in a position to be acquainted with the educational problems of the state when he spoke at Choteau.

Our wish was that the chancellor would have made some reference to the plans which his office might effect in attempting to improve the standards of our state college and university. His predecessor, Dr. E.O. Melby, quit the same job and returned to the post of university president when he found the position untenable and without real purpose because of the controls exercised over it and because of the weak executive power. These conditions were said to have been partially corrected before the new chancellor took over. If so, we would have liked to hear about it.

The truth of the matter is that the office of university chancellor is one of the most important in the state and needs a hard-fighting, determined crusader at its head who will let the people know what must be done. And that is no small item. The university and state college, by comparison with other states, are in a DEPLORABLE condition and will continue to be until someone like Dr. Melby, who had the fortitude to openly express his views in public before any group, can tell the people what must be done.

First, a booklet prepared by one of the state university economists tells of the appropriations which the university and college receive from the state as compared with poorer Wyoming, Idaho and the Dakotas.

Per capita and by a wealth total basis, the Montana schools sickly lag behind ANY of the nearby states. Any reasonable citizen would know that to be true if he read the material to which we refer. The point here is that Melby was not afraid to talk about it. If we were operating either the university or college, it would baffle us to know how to keep the doors open on the puny appropriations the schools now receive. Only last month the state college was said to be in danger of losing its engineering accreditation for just this reason. Yet little can be done unless someone tells others about these conditions. The Great Falls Tribune is the only newspaper in the state we have ever read which even approached the problem.

Secondly, is the factor of the Greater University being broken up into six parts like a spineless jellyfish. Dr. Melby as chancellor attempted to have all courses of one type, such as in the field of education, taught at one school only, rather than at Dillon, Havre, Bozeman, Missoula and Billings--which weakens ALL of the schools. He tried in other ways to integrate the Greater University system but was for the most part blocked by the irreconcilable forces. He gave up the job voluntarily because he knew he was accomplishing no good and accepted the lesser salary of university president. It takes a man to do that.

These are just some of the conditions which must be corrected with the assistance of a real leader. Will Dr. Selke risk his job to publicize these needs as did Dr. Melby? Such candor is refreshing in this age of back-slapping politics. We hope Dr. Selke is not just another weak sister who ripples right along with the stream rather than be a captain of an upstream battleship with the courage to lay the right course and to be damned for it, yet be convinced he is doing the right thing by the people of Montana rather than for his own personal gain.

Dr. Melby finally resigned the presidency of Montana State University to accept a higher salary as dean at an Eastern university. But that is not the only reason he left. Many in the state were glad to see him go, just as they would be glad to be rid of a stubborn hornet. Will the same people be happy with Dr. Selke? We hope not--for the

good of Montana and for the students who yet will attend college in the state.³⁶

THE MONTANA STUDY

Of all the projects and problems that Melby concerned himself with while in Montana, none remain more important to him in retrospect than a project designed to improve the quality of living in small towns in Montana. It was called, simply, "The Montana Study." Encompassed in The Montana Study, however, are many of the basic elements of Melby's beliefs about the nature of society and about how education should contribute to the creation of a better life for all people.

The whirlwind history of Montana was dealt with briefly in the beginning of this chapter. The instability and heartbreak described there have left their mark on communities throughout Montana. Melby traveled much in Montana. He saw the drabness of life in small towns that were 50 and 75 miles distant from the next settlement. There were ghost towns and others on their way to becoming such. Isolation seemed to breed insulation. In his inaugural address he had proclaimed that the university should make the entire state its campus. Melby wanted to find a way to bring vitality and culture to the small towns he saw. An emotion grew in his heart about what he saw in these towns

³⁶Editorial, "The University Chancellor and the Task Ahead," Choteau Acantha, May 30, 1946.

long before he had a firm idea of how he might help them. His emotion developed into a vision of extending the program of the University into these dying communities; he saw in it also the opportunity for the University to help fulfill the reason for its existence--to endeavor to help man build toward a more perfect society.

Shortly after Melby had become chancellor he attended a faculty meeting at Montana State College in Bozeman. The State College had been the leading institute (other plains institutions were involved) in a cooperative program known as "Northern Plains in a World of Change." The Rockefeller Foundation had provided enough money to finance publication of a book, bearing the same title as the experimental program, which described the Northern Plains region, its problems and possible solutions.³⁷

The project ended, but many faculty members were desirous of continuing parts of it or were thinking in terms of further programs aimed at greater development of the plains region. At the time Melby visited Bozeman they had as their guest David H. Stevens, then director of the Humanities Division for the Rockefeller Foundation. The aim of the gathering at Bozeman was to endeavor to get more of the Foundation's money. The "Northern Plains"

³⁷ Carl Kraenzel, Watson Thomson and Glenn H. Craig, The Northern Plains in a World of Change, (Toronto: Sponsored by The Rockefeller Foundation, Northern Great Plains Agricultural Advisory Council, and Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1942).

project interested Melby, but it was not quite what he had in mind. The faculty at Bozeman may well have misinterpreted the new chancellor's interest, for Melby was already thinking way beyond Bozeman. He began to see the possibility of doing something bigger--a project that would include all of the University of Montana, which would bring all the resources of higher education out into the small towns which dotted the sparsely-settled state.

Stevens told Melby that the Foundation had gone as far as it would with the Bozeman project, but that if he could offer a new proposal within the range of the Foundation's Humanities Division that they might be able to help out. This conversation started a period of correspondence between Melby and Stevens.

Melby sought advice from the faculty of both the Bozeman and the Missoula units. Shortly after New Year's Day, just five months after taking office as chancellor, he sent his proposal to New York. The opening sentence read, "The University of Montana wishes to undertake a research program to determine the contribution of the humanities to a program of higher education designed to improve the quality and living in the State of Montana... ."38 The grant was given--\$25,000 for a three-year project. What Poston calls "Melby's

³⁸Quoted in Poston, op. cit., p. 20.

Great Dream" was to become a reality. Unfortunately, misunderstanding on the part of the State College faculty led to some animosity between them and the faculty of the other institutions. A few of the State College faculty at Bozeman had an uneasy feeling that, perhaps, Melby had pulled the rug out from underneath them. This difficulty was partially a result of the constant internal rivalry within the greater University.

Melby tried to convince the faculties that the project could be a much bigger thing if the scene of the operation were transferred from Bozeman to the state as a whole and get all the institutions working in it. Again the same fierce competition between the institutions made cooperation difficult. The state had too many institutions, too few students and too few resources. Each school wanted all it could get for itself.

The Montana Study was the kind of activity that Melby had missed since coming to Montana. At Northwestern he had more than enough experimental projects to consume his energy. Now Melby had a new project into which he could pour his enthusiasm. And, as in the past, he wanted people around him with ideas. Melby had been able to sell his dream to the Foundation, but now he needed people who could work out the details of how the dream was to be translated into action.

Melby and David Stevens then turned to Baker Brownell, professor of philosophy at Northwestern University, who believed that "traditional American democracy finds its richest

environment in the small communities and rural areas where people meet each other as neighbors, where they have a sense of belonging, and a feeling of personal responsibility toward each other."³⁹ Rough plans for finding "ways to enrich the quality of living in Montana" were devised by Stevens, Melby, and Brownell at a meeting in Chicago in April, 1944. To Brownell fell the tasks of developing specific objectives, finding the means of carrying them out, and directing the program.

The Montana Study was foreordained to face a multitude of difficulties. University rivalry, political sniping, and general indifference to any plan of social welfare all militated against the Study. Other developments further clouded the Study's potential for success. The grant had been awarded to the University of Montana to be administered through the chancellor's office, but six months after the grant had been awarded, Melby resigned the chancellorship. Montana had no chancellor. Who was to administer the program? The State Board appointed Melby to be responsible for the progress of the Study. It looked to the opposition that now Missoula would surely have something that the other five units did not have. Melby tried to convince the emergent opposition that such was not the case, but he was not successful. Asked now what he could have done differently that might have staved off this split, Melby says that he doesn't know if anything

³⁹Ibid., p. 22.

would have helped. He admits that he could have moved more slowly, but even so, he is not sure the split could have been avoided.

Added to the staff to assist Brownell in directing the Study was Joseph Kinsey Howard, author of Montana: High, Wide and Handsome, and editor of the Great Falls Leader, a newspaper whose number one target for criticism was "The Company." Howard knew and loved Montana, but with his appointment to the Study staff came a whole new array of enemies.

The third staff member was Paul Meadows, a Northwestern University sociologist. In addition, it was expected that by involving faculty members from the six institutions, the Montana Study would be able to expand its operation far beyond what the small staff could do by themselves.

Melby, no longer chancellor but back in the president's office at Missoula, established offices for the Montana Study on the State University campus. The schism which had already developed now widened. It could be argued that the offices should have been set up elsewhere, but Melby had been appointed as administrator of the program and its funds; to him and to the Study staff it seemed illogical to locate the offices anywhere else.

Still another misfortune hit the Study. Joseph Kinsey Howard had written an article for Harpers Magazine entitled "Montana Twins in Trouble." The same month that the Montana

Study began its formal operations in Missoula the issue of Harpers containing Howard's article appeared on the news-stands. The article itself was bitterly critical of the "twins"--Anaconda Copper and Montana Power. In addition, a Helena newspaper which represented labor reprinted thousands of extra copies of Howard's article and distributed them all over Montana.

The month after Howard's article appeared, Brownell was in Butte explaining the purposes of the Montana Study to officials of Anaconda Copper and inviting a company official to serve on the Study's state-wide advisory committee. During the course of the discussion the name of Joseph Kinsey Howard came up. The invitation to serve on the advisory committee was rejected. There was no more official contact with the Company, and there was no active cooperation.

In spite of these and other besetting problems, the Montana Study did get underway. It aroused suspicion and was beset by criticism, but by Christmas of 1944, they were ready to move out to Montana's small towns and organize community study groups. Poston, who meticulously chronicles the history of the Montana Study in Small Town Renaissance, describes the community study group:

Patterned along the lines of an old New England town meeting, the community study group was designed as a technique to help people find out exactly what made their town tick--or what kept it from ticking. It would be strictly nonpartisan, and nonpolitical. It was not to support or condemn any political issue, and it was to include a cross section of all the

people in the community. Following the carefully worked out course of community self-analysis, this democratic group of people would sit down together around a large table once each week to study and discuss in an objective way the economic, social, and cultural problems of their own community as they affect day-by-day living. Key objectives of the study group would be to bring about a common understanding of community problems, to find ways of stabilizing and improving the local economy, and to help people make life in their town more enjoyable and more secure. This was not to be an action group, but the fun of getting together to study their own problems and the causes behind them would stimulate new interest in the town and prepare the people for intelligent action on their own initiative after the study was finished.

.....

There was nothing new or unusual about adult study groups....But never before had an American university undertaken a program of community-centered education in the humanities as interpreted by The Montana Study. Never before had community study groups been used as a technique for gathering information on human values by which a university might better adjust its program to the needs of people.

Traditionally, education at a university has been designed for individual students on the campus, the purpose being to help those individuals improve their lives and thus raise the general level of knowledge. The Montana Study was another form of education designed for communities rather than individuals, and instead of specializing in a certain subject as the student does in college, it was to cover a general study of human life as it goes on from day-to-day in the small American community....

Improvement might come in the form of new sources of income developed by inspired local initiative, it might involve town beautification, projects in community recreation, adult hobby groups, efforts to solve specific local problems such as juvenile delinquency, a need for better medical facilities, or any other form of community improvement. Or it could result simply in a richer and more enjoyable community life, creating greater local pride, enlightened attitudes of mind, and giving each local citizen the recognition and feeling of personal dignity to which all human beings are entitled. But whatever form this

improvement might take, The Montana Study had to begin its program with a group study of the local community by home-town people.⁴⁰

Coincident with the development of the Montana Study raged an intense political controversy over the Missouri Valley Authority, with all the charges of "socialism and communism." Flung back were counter charges of "power monopolies." Into the fury, (and unfortunately for Melby and The Montana Study), stepped Howard and Paul Meadows. Howard was commissioned to do an article about the M.V.A. proposal by Harpers Magazine.⁴¹ In it he hurt the feelings of most of those in Montana who opposed M.V.A., including Governor Ford.

Meadows became bitter in his attacks on the Company and increasingly vocal as he carried on a vigorous campaign in support of M.V.A. Inevitably the Montana Study and the Missouri Valley Authority became linked in the minds of many Montanans. The Miles City Daily Star said:

One of the major projects of "The Montana Study" would seem to have been to sell the Missouri Valley Authority scheme, with all of its socialist trappings, to the unsuspecting people of this state...we learn that thirty-three study-group sessions were held in certain communities of the state. Four of the sessions were led by Meadows....what chance did the "spiritual level" have in those meetings...."⁴²

To many people in Montana the M.V.A. took on a decidedly pink color. By association The Montana Study also

⁴⁰Poston, op. cit., p. 33-35.

⁴¹Joseph Kinsey Howard, "Golden River," Harpers Magazine (May, 1945).

⁴²Quoted in Poston, op. cit., p. 69.

assumed the same color and eventually was called a "communist front."

In actuality, The Montana Study itself took no stand either for or against the Missouri Valley Authority, and the political activities of Howard and Meadows in this regard were not in any way supported by The Study. There was, however, guilt by association, and the label of "communist" did prove to be a handicap to The Study.⁴³ The charge would also attach itself to Melby, to be raised almost ten years later in New York.

The lack of cooperation which the state institutions gave to The Study was probably the most serious setback the project had. If it had been able to enlist the genuine support of faculty members in each of these institutions, some of the other obstacles and criticism might have been more easily overcome. Instead of labeling the Study as a "communist front" because of the liberal political viewpoints of Paul Meadows, the potential critics would have had to analyze and criticize it knowing it had the true support of the state system of higher education. It was this generalized kind of support that Melby had envisioned.

Poston analyzed part of the difficulties as "inevitable," saying that it was just a repetition of the age old situation

⁴³Poston, op. cit., p. 69.

of the idealists, absorbed in a great scheme to help mankind, who come into conflict with practical executives who are concerned first with administrative details.⁴⁴

Melby had a great dream. He had explained it to the heads of the units of the University and had received their promise to cooperate. To Melby this was enough; he took them at their word. Cooperation to Melby and to the deans and administrators to whom he had talked, evidently meant different things. Cooperating did not mean assurance of help. Melby had described the program in a broad outline, but had never told them very clearly what each institution would be expected to do.

In addition to all of the Study's other problems-- some of its own making and some foisted upon it-- Melby resigned and prepared to leave Montana. The Montana Study was a year-and-a-half old at the time of Melby's resignation. In spite of all the vilification and strife it was not a failure. It was making progress. It did operate successfully in small towns, and it became the model for community study groups in other parts of the nation. Its potential effectiveness was diminished, however, when Melby left. Poston calls his going "the loss of a champion," and says:

But standing squarely between The Montana Study and its enemies was the powerful figure of Ernest O. Melby, ... he was idolized by thousands, and because of his dynamic

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 118.

leadership he commanded support from the State Board of Education. Men could deny The Study their cooperation, they could slander its program and its personnel, yet as long as Melby remained in Montana they could not tamper with its operations.⁴⁵

The continuance of The Study after Melby left is recorded by Poston. Other people did rise up to help. The State Board itself called for unreserved support of The Montana Study. Much of what Melby had done in promoting The Study was slow in taking roots, but slowly it began to approach the promise that Melby had envisioned for it. He had hoped that the program to help communities help themselves would go on for years. It didn't. At the end of the three-year period the Montana legislature, in July, 1947, turned down a request for \$50,000 to continue The Montana Study.

Although Melby was somewhat disappointed in that the Montana Study did not rise to the heights that he had anticipated for it, he feels that if it had been able to continue, "it would not only not have come short but would have gone way beyond our fondest expectations....At the end of three years I think the results were phenomenal, but it was just chopped off."

Melby says that the "great thing that The Montana Study did" for him was to make him "aware as never before of the resources in American communities...never realizing before just how many resources there are for education." Continuing with this analysis of what The Study meant to his own

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 122.

development, he says:

It made me aware, too, of the narrow attitude that we in education often have when we think only of how much we can do in school houses and don't realize how many voluntary associations and how many good people we have out in the community, and how many jobs there are to be done, and how the doing of those jobs will be an educational process for the people who take part. I never sensed this. So in a personal and a professional way I feel very indebted to The Montana Study as one of the really great learning experiences of my life. It was a very significant thing.

Melby always seemed to learn from his experiences. In discussing The Montana Study he made the rather typical "Melbyan" comment, saying, "maybe The Montana Study did more for me than it did for Montana." He had earlier made an almost identical comment about his work as superintendent in Long Prairie.

The Montana years were a period of battling and disappointment. Yet in spite of it all Melby remains extremely fond of Montana and her people. He was happy while there and would have stayed if he thought he could have really been a help. As it was, he saw no prospects of changing the organizational structure of the University. Apart from his battles with the legislature and the carping criticism he drew from the Company and other groups in Montana, he had developed what he considered very satisfying personal relationships with faculty members and citizens of the state. He had a very kindly feeling toward the people of Montana and even toward many of the legislators as individuals.

For the State Board, Melby had nothing but the very

highest praise. He terms his relationship with the eleven members as a "wonderful experience." He says,

I think I can count all of them as friends. I had been through all those battles with the legislature and the Anaconda Copper Company and had been there for four years, during a very difficult period....I met with them to tell them that I was leaving to go to New York University, and they sat there for two hours trying to argue me into staying. There wasn't anybody at that table who didn't make a speech. I felt so bad when the meeting was over that I left with a lot of sadness. This experience was a faith giving one to me. I have more faith in people today than I ever had before.

Melby's warm feelings for Montana were not without reciprocation. Certainly there were his critics, such as the newspaper man in Havre, who, at the news of Melby's leaving, wrote: "Give Dr. Ernest O. Melby...credit for the old college try, which in his case wasn't good enough. No person is doubting the ability of the good doctor as an educator but as an administrator he didn't pan out...."⁴⁶ On the credit side, however, the majority of Montanans were sorry to see Melby leave. In Missoula, at the State University where Melby was once again president, the campus newspaper, Montana Kaimin, came out with a one page "extra" announcing Melby's resignation to go to N.Y.U.⁴⁷ The banner headline said, "Melby Resigns!" Also on the page, in addition to the news article announcing his resignation, was an editorial note entitled "Goodbye Dr. Melby." It read:

⁴⁶Daily News, Havre, quoted in Poston, op. cit., p. 126.

⁴⁷Montana Kaimin (extra), June 1, 1945.

We are sorry to see you go, Dr. Melby. We have enjoyed publishing under your tolerant administration. We hope the future president of MSU will follow in the work that you have started. The state of Montana will suffer from your leaving but New York will be to the good. New York's gain is our loss.

The Great Falls Tribune had this to say:

The resignation of Dr. Ernest O. Melby as president of Montana State University to become dean of the school of education at New York University brings into focus again the basic problem of Montana's higher educational system. Fundamentally that problem is whether with six units in our university system Montana can afford to continue in the direction of setting up six separate universities. The alternative and the solution is a system unified educationally and administratively under a state board of education with powers commensurate to its responsibilities....

Dr. Melby perhaps feels his efforts in Montana have not been sufficiently successful. Probably this has much to do with his resignation. The Tribune believes, however, that his service has been valuable. The situation when he came was verging toward hopelessness. If he has aroused the people of Montana to the realities of their higher educational system, his work here will prove to be far from futile. He has we believe accomplished more than he thinks he has.

The problem Dr. Melby has emphasized is as old as the university system itself. Largely through his initiative the attention of the people of Montana has been re-directed to that problem. Is it too much to expect that the people of Montana will ultimately fail to meet the challenge?

The Tribune is quite ready to join with those people of Montana who wish to thank Dr. Melby for the work he has done here to benefit higher education. His energy and enthusiasm we think will merit success in a new field of endeavor.⁴⁸

Melby had decided to leave Montana, (in spite of what the Tribune had to say) partially because he had begun to wonder

⁴⁸Great Falls Tribune, June 3, 1945.

whether he could really accomplish anything in the state if he stayed. It looked to him like a long term project. Melby was already almost 54 years old, and he thought that at his age he might not be the kind of person needed to lead Montana education out of the wilderness. There were other considerations as well. He didn't like political skirmishes. Moreover, he missed the close association with programs of teacher education.

It was early in 1945 with such thoughts running through his mind that he was approached at a convention by Alonzo Myers, professor of higher education at New York University, who told him that the dean of the School of Education, George Paine, was retiring. Myers wondered if Melby might be interested. Melby heard no more about it until March, when he received a letter from Harry Woodburn Chase, chancellor of New York University, telling him that the faculty of the School of Education had been involved in selecting a new dean and had narrowed the choice down to three men, including Melby.

Mandatory retirement, at that time, at age 65 was a consideration for Melby in his decision to accept the position at New York University. Since he felt he had only eleven years left, he decided that it might be wiser for him to spend it in teacher education work.

In his statement at Missoula about his resignation, he said:

I am giving up my work at Montana State University with great reluctance. The faculty and student body have been most cooperative. The State Board of Education

has been outstanding in its united support and in its devotion to the improvement of education in Montana. My experience in various educational activities, however, has convinced me that I can be of greater service in working directly with students and faculty members on educational problems than in political and financial activities. Most of my professional life has been spent in the work of educating teachers and other leaders for American education. My position at New York University will give me an opportunity to work directly with students and faculty in the area of my greatest interest. I want to express my appreciation to Montana people for the cordial good will they have shown both to me and to the University.⁴⁹

Two days after Melby made this statement of resignation to the local newspaper he stood before the graduating class of 1945 at their Baccalaureate Service and made what was to be one of his final public appearances in Montana as president of the State University. His Baccalaureate address, entitled "Christianity, Social Justice, and World Peace," was a stirring appeal to the student body to put the Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man into action to help create a new and better world. In speaking of the Christian-Democratic tradition, he said:

Essentially it is a philosophy which gives first place to the worth and dignity of all men. It is based on faith in the common man--on faith in the capacity of the masses of people to develop their own criteria of what is good, beautiful, and true. It holds to the idea of the brotherhood of man. It maintains man must be free to be truly human. Unselfishness, service, sacrifice for others, these have paved the road to what human freedom now exists. In the words of Jesus, "He who loses his life shall find it." These words emphasize the worth of man and the

⁴⁹Quoted in Daily Missoulian, June 2, 1945.

glory of the service of man....Inspired by a consciousness of the worth and dignity of individual man, motivated by a humble and earnest search for truth, supported by a faith in the improbability of the common man, purified by self-sacrifice for his brothers, man has almost infinite potentiality for good....When man pins his faith in and dedicates his life to the brotherhood of man, he becomes more God-like. The way of Christianity, of democracy, is the way of life. But the brotherhood of man must work to live. If it does not work it will die. And if it dies man dies with it.⁵⁰

In New York Melby would find great stimulation and magnificent opportunities. Before long he would enthusiastically proclaim the virtues of teaching and living in New York, a city, he says, "where all the resources of the world are at your finger tips and half the teachers in America within 50 miles." It would be a startling change to move from Missoula to Manhattan.

⁵⁰Ernest O. Melby, "Christianity, Social Justice and World Peace," address at Montana State University, Missoula, June 3, 1945 (unpublished).

CHAPTER IV

AT THE HUB OF THE WORLD

When Melby was inaugurated at Montana the United States had just been dealt a devastating blow at Pearl Harbor. During the four years while the country fought its way back in the Pacific and defeated the Axis powers in Europe, Melby labored in Montana. Throughout the war he preached his doctrine of education for democracy. He emphasized the important role that higher education must play if the brotherhood of man were to become a reality.

At the time that Melby announced his resignation as State University president, in June, 1945, the United States air forces were carrying out the greatest air offensive in history against the Japanese mainland; a month earlier the Germans had capitulated to the allied forces in Europe. Two months later, while preparing to assume his duties in New York, an atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan; within four days, Japan had surrendered. World War II was over, but a new era had been ushered in--the "Atomic Age."

The post war problems were yet to come. The "cold war" was still an unknown term. There was as yet no House Un-American activities committee. And the rush of G.I.'s

to college, followed by the population explosion after war-delayed marriages, were only being hinted at. The United Nations was only in the process of birth. The Korean War was still five years away.

Thoughtful people were concerned about the role of education in the post war era. What could education contribute to the making of freedom a reality? What kind of education would make it impossible for a Hitler and a Mussolini to come to power again? What kind of education could bind up the wounds of America and the world and lead man into true brotherhood?

While some people pondered these questions, others attacked the public schools. Though the attacks would reach their peak in the early 1950's, they had their origin right after the close of World War II. A great hue and cry was raised for a return to the "basics." The Essentialists, led by William C. Bagley, made the accusation that in progressive schools children did not learn the fundamentals well enough.

Progressive education, as an organization, was in a state of decline. By 1955 it would be dissolved, and two years later the magazine Progressive Education would cease publishing. The publication of this journal, and the life of the organization itself, almost paralleled Melby's career: the Progressive Education Association was formed in 1918, and it disbanded in 1955. Melby's career in education spanned

the same period. He retired from New York University a year after the Progressive Education Association dissolved. Good says it was the "strident, irresponsible and effective attack" of the 1950's that led to the dissolution of the Association.¹ There was still a progressive movement, but the Association was dead.

The P.E.A., however, had done its work, and this may in part be a reason for its demise. What it had stood for had come to be accepted by the majority of professional educators and by many other people in all walks of life. Much of what it had fought for had now been won; to be truly progressive means to be well ahead of the common thought. Cremin describes the general kind of acceptance of progressive education which had come to pass:

There is a "conventional wisdom" to borrow from John Kenneth Galbraith, in education as well as in economics, and by the end of World War II progressivism had come to be that conventional wisdom. Discussions of educational policy were liberally spread with phrases like "recognizing individual differences," "personality development," "the whole child," "social and emotional growth," "creative self-expression," "the needs of learners," "intrinsic motivation," "persistent life situations," "bridging the gap between home and school," "teaching children not subjects," "adjusting the school to the child," "real life experiences," "teacher-pupil relationships," and "staff planning." Such relationships were a cant, to be sure, the peculiar jargon of the pedagogues. But they were more than that, for they signified that Dewey's forecast of a day when progressive education would eventually be accepted as good education had now finally come to pass.²

¹H.G. Good, A History of Western Education, (second edition; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960) p. 591.

²Cremin, op. cit., p. 328.

With the attacks on progressive education came other attacks, against colleges of education, teachers colleges and "communist" teachers and administrators. A concomitance of the McCarthy era, in which one's devotion to the democratic way of life became subject to investigation, was the loyalty oath. States passed teacher oath laws. There were battles over books, pressure groups intimidated school boards, and schools were put on the defensive. And in 1954 the Supreme Court declared segregation in the public schools unconstitutional.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS

The initial reaction Melby had on arriving at Washington Square to take over his duties as dean of New York University's huge School of Education was, "Where is the University, I can't find it?" New York University is lost in the city. For Melby, who had for twenty years been associated either as a student or a faculty member at a campus university, it was a confusing place. He could not tell where the University began and ended in Washington Square. Besides, part of the University was uptown, in the Bronx, and still other divisions, the Medical School for example, were located in other parts of the city.

This was certainly different from Montana--and different from Northwestern too. There was no campus at all. The University was surrounded by lights, traffic,

congestion, and the ebb and flow of humanity in the world's biggest city. Eventually Melby would be fascinated by all this, but in the beginning it only mystified him. Furthermore, he could not find the faculty of the School of Education.

Where were they? They were located in different buildings. Getting to see many of them required one to ride the elevator to the street, walk around the corner, and ride up in another elevator. Or it might mean walking two blocks to another building. Melby was puzzled about how he would ever be able to get to know the faculty intimately and be able to know what they were doing as he had at Northwestern.

At the end of his first year as dean of the School of Education he reported to Chancellor Chase:

At the end of my first year...I find it very difficult to prepare a report of the more usual sort regarding the achievements and problems of the School. I have used most of my time my first year in an effort to become familiar with its previous contributions, present problems, and its future promise.³

Although it is true that Melby felt some apprehension about finding the University and the faculty in the maze of the city, he also felt a sense of exhilaration as he viewed the setting in which he was to work:

It had a quality of excitement around it always.... The people I talked to had a high level of alertness and the students were exciting. I found my community

³"Report of the Dean of the School of Education," A Digest of Reports of Officers to the Chancellor of the University, 1945-1946 (New York: New York University, 1947), p. 35.

contacts stimulating. As a matter of fact I thoroughly enjoyed New York from the very start. I never felt ill at ease or out of place. I took to New York like a duck to water.

An incident which occurred shortly after Melby's arrival in New York is indicative of one of Melby's early reactions to the University. More interestingly, it throws some light on him and the variety of concerns he had. With the war just ended, the veterans were coming to college in droves, financed by the G.I. Bill. Melby looked out of his office window one of the first days of registration and observed a long line of students winding around the corner. Some time later he looked again, and it appeared to him that the line hadn't moved. Finally Melby asked someone what the line was for. "Oh," came the reply, "those are the veterans lined up waiting to get into the bookstore to get their supplies." A little later Melby looked again. There was the same line, and as far as he could see, the same people standing in it. Melby had had enough. He picked up his telephone and called the University Book Store. "Look," said Melby, "can't you do anything about that line of veterans? I've been watching them stand out in the hot sun for an hour and the line hasn't even moved. This is terrible, it's no way to treat human beings. Isn't there something you can do about it?"

The person on the telephone asked Melby to say again who was calling. Melby identified himself. "Oh," said the voice, "you're the new man from Montana, aren't you? Well,

this is New York, and we do things differently here."

"Well, if this is New York," said Melby, "then I don't like it."

Fortunately for Melby, there was more to New York than this, and he learned to love the city. It became, as he knew it better, a city of never-ending opportunity and excitement. He was extremely fond of the cultural opportunities it provided and became a habitué of New York's concerts, operas, and theaters. In his words, "New York is the capital of the world." In his second report to the chancellor he wrote:

Because the School of Education...is one of the largest in the world, its responsibilities are correspondingly heavy. Because our school is located in New York City, in a complex metropolitan area, it has simultaneously great opportunities and great obligations....The location of the United Nations in New York City is one more step in the direction of making this city a world capital. The strategic importance of New York in the United States, its cosmopolitan population and wide range of cultural institutions and activities, give our faculty and student body at New York University one of the richest educational opportunities in the world.⁴

During these exciting days in New York, Melby also found additional social and political themes against which to view the problems of education. The shrinking postwar world had ushered in a host of them. "We have won the war on the battlefield," he said, "but we have not won the war for men's minds." Freedom, for Melby, was something

⁴"Report of the Dean of the School of Education," A Digest of Reports of Officers to the Chancellor of the University, (New York, New York University, 1948) p.56-57.

within people; it was not so much something one talked about as something one lived. In addition, there were broadside attacks against the public schools. These, too, Melby was concerned about and responded to. Later, Time typified him as a "kind of senior defense counsel for the U.S. public school."⁵

Even a cursory inspection of the writing that Melby did during his eleven years at New York University provides insight into the kinds of problems with which he became concerned. Among the many articles he wrote during this period are: "Education is the Ultimate Weapon"; "Attack on Our Schools: Crisis in American Faith"; "Collectivism is Not Democracy"; "Five Fallacies About Modern Education"; "Education for Renewed Faith in Freedom"; "Leadership in an Age of Anxiety"; "Will Freedom Win Out?"; "Our Responsibility in Germany"; "Challenge to the Critics of the Schools."⁶ Such political, social, and educational issues quickly began to command a tremendous amount of Melby's time and energy.

THE ADMINISTRATOR

Melby found that being a dean at the School of Education was not like being a dean at Northwestern or a president

⁵"Goodbye Messrs. Chips," Time, vol. 68, July 16, 1956, p. 65.

⁶A complete list of Melby's works will be found in the Bibliography.

at Montana. At Northwestern he had an intimate family relationship with the faculty. At Montana everybody came right to the president with his problems. New York University was entirely different. Yet, in spite of the difficulties of numbers and physical facilities, Melby worked to establish the kind of warm relationships he had at Northwestern. He even brought in some of the same people-- Arndt, Axtelle, and Anderson, among others.

With his firm conviction that an administrator should have an open door, he attempted to continue this policy at New York University. His aim was not simply to have an "open door" but to use it as a vehicle to the establishment of the kind of faculty unity he desired. Later he was to tell a group of graduate students at Michigan State University that "it's not just 'my door is always open' that matters...it's what happens after the person walks through the door that really makes the difference...what is the relationship that you have established?...that is what matters."⁷

With a faculty the size of that of the School of Education it would have created some serious problems of time and efficiency for Melby if everybody had come to his door with their problems and ideas. In addition, the question of whether his door was equally open to all people is open to speculation. That Melby had faith and interest in all people is true. Nevertheless, there were some in whom, because they

⁷Ernest O. Melby, class lecture at Michigan State University, May, 1960.

were creative, dynamic people, he had a great deal of interest, and to these people his door was opened more frequently. Those who served with him speak of certain people who were "Melby-men"--individuals whose philosophy and aspirations for education beat in tempo with Melby's.

When a faculty member did come to Melby with an idea it was almost impossible for Melby to turn him away. Arndt, who served with Melby at Northwestern and at New York University, says that "the measure to which one is creative is an important factor in one's relationship with Melby, because that is when he opens up--when there is a possibility of building something new."⁸ Arndt says further that it is very hard for Melby to say "no" to a faculty member and that he would probably go farther than most professional administrators toward letting a faculty member carry out his request.⁹ It is Melby's faith in the ability and integrity of people that makes it so extremely difficult for him to say "no". This is in keeping with his statement that "when a person has ideas these are the most precious moments of his life."

Melby was concerned about the size of the faculty and their separation from each other and from himself. In addition, he pondered the problem of what kind of organization

⁸Statement by Christian O. Arndt, personal interview.

⁹Ibid.

could make the most of the talents of all the staff members and also provide the opportunity for them to share in the determination of policies and administration of the School of Education. During Melby's first year as dean he asked a special committee of the faculty to study the problems of organization and make recommendations. In May, 1946, at the close of his first school year in New York, a new plan of organization went into effect.¹⁰

Under the new plan the faculty elected a General Committee of fifteen members. The General Committee was given the responsibility for creating other committees of the faculty. Five such standing committees were created immediately: The Committee on General Policy, Committee on Graduate Study, Committee on Undergraduate Study, Committee on Alumni and Public Relations, and Committee on Business Management. Each committee elected its own chairman.

Melby himself maintained a liaison relationship with the General Committee of fifteen and with the Committee on General Policy. The associate deans were the liaison officers to the other committees: Francis C. Rosecrance (whom Melby had brought to N.Y.U. to be his associate dean of instruction), with the Committees on Graduate and Undergraduate Study; and Associate Dean Ralph Pickett with the Committees on Alumni and Public Relations and on Business Management.

¹⁰"Report of the Dean of the School of Education", 1945-1946, op. cit., p. 66.

This new organization was a help in bringing Melby into contact with the problems of the faculty and in involving the faculty in the administrative process. A year later, however, he was fighting still more battles related to size in his effort to bring unity and organization to the School of Education. In his 1947 report to Chancellor Chase, Melby wrote:

Instruction...has been highly departmentalized. At present, there are twenty-eight separate departments in the school. Those departments have functioned with a degree of autonomy not very different from that of individual schools in a somewhat smaller university. The result of the program has been considerable overlapping in course content, too much interdepartmental competition and confusion in the program of students.... It is in the face of the current challenge to education, however, that this highly fragmented organization reveals its most striking weaknesses.... There is no single agency in the School of Education to which public school leaders can appeal for aid with their problems....

Rigid departmental lines interfere with communication and co-operation among staff members of different departments.... If high morale and desirable faculty attitudes are to be achieved, the feeling of loneliness and separation, created by the departmental system, must be broken down. Staff members must feel that their services belong to the whole School of Education, not to a single department. The School of Education, its goals, its objectives, its program, its student body, must command first loyalty.¹¹

In essence, then, while Melby was tremendously impressed by the talents and potential of the faculty of the School of Education, he was somewhat perplexed about how to administer such a large and highly complex organization. He could, and did, provide inspirational leadership by the

¹¹"Report of the Dean of the School of Education", 1946-1947, op. cit., p. 59-60.

magnetism of his own personality and enthusiasm, but he was at a loss to recapture the personal kind of administration that he had been able to develop at Northwestern.

The criticisms that Melby received from the faculty members at the School of Education were to a certain extent a product of the diversified nature and size of the school. Understandably, individual faculty members wanted Melby to know what they were doing in their teaching and in their departmental activities. They complained that he did not always know. On the other hand, Melby complained about the same problem, and worried because he couldn't seem to keep his finger on all the activities and interests of the staff.

Communication in the School of Education was subject to the same structural and physical deterrents as was personal administration. Melby, who can be extremely impatient when he sees something that obviously has to be done, believed heart and soul in the democratic process but found it difficult to wait for the length of time the process would sometimes consume. He was accused a few times of bypassing some of his subordinates. His virtue of being able to identify promising faculty members and interest them in joining the staff was objected to by department heads who felt that Melby, in a few cases, had presented them with faculty members without their having been involved in the selection process, and as in the past, there were some who mistook interest on Melby's part as a promise of cooperation, or funds, or employment.

In an effort to promote interaction and communication, Melby made increasingly strong and frequent attempts to involve faculty members. He also made more use of faculty committees. Henry Heald, who became chancellor of New York University in 1952, said that faculty involvement at the School of Education almost went to extremes."...there were so many committees and so much faculty involvement that even Melby seemed to get fed up with it after awhile!"¹²

Although Heald's remark was made partially in jest it indicates the length to which Melby did go in attempting to develop the understanding and unity of purpose among the faculty that he felt were so vitally important.

Melby, in addition to providing inspiration for the faculty, also was open in his acknowledgment of their abilities and of their contributions, to the extent that he was aware of them. He had spoken of the great talent of the faculty and of their keen interest in everything going on around them. For him this was part of the vibrance that was New York. He supported the faculty when they were attacked and was quick to promote their cause within the University. To the chancellor, in 1949 he wrote: "I think we now have a faculty that for stimulating character and wide variety of talent and interest is second to none in the country....Our staff members are in demand on a nation-wide basis to assist

¹²Statement by Henry A. Heald, personal interview.

with new educational movements and the solution of educational problems."¹³

In addition to vocal praise for the faculty, Melby fought battles for salary increases and other benefits. At the end of his second year as dean he reported to the chancellor that, "Arrangements with regard to compensation, retirement annuities, and other factors affecting faculty welfare should be such as to promote professional growth and development...In the School of Education there are a number of problems in this area that need attention."¹⁴ Two years later he criticized the University administration for not giving him more freedom in the matter of salary increases: "Each year...the dean's office is informed not only of the amount of money that will be available, but we are also told how much of it we can spend for such purposes as salary increases..."¹⁵

Francis C. Roscrance, Melby's associate dean at New York University, says that Melby took "terrific verbal beatings for other members of the staff and for faculty members." He recalls that during a period of curriculum revision, in which attempts were made to bring order out of the chaotic nature of twenty-eight departments and overlapping courses, some departments felt that they had been attacked by Melby.

¹³"Report of the Dean of the School of Education", 1948-1949, op. cit., p. 49.

¹⁴Ibid., 1946-1947, p. 62.

¹⁵Ibid., 1948-1949, p. 48.

Rosecrance says, "It was terribly unjust, but Melby never retaliated; he stayed calm, thanked the person for his contribution and went on with the meeting."¹⁶ Walter A.

Anderson, who observed some of the same incidents, says that "it is not in Melby's nature to get back at people; he just doesn't seem to have in him the instinct to retaliate."¹⁷

What Melby tried to create as dean of the School of Education was an atmosphere that was so dynamic, so charged with enthusiasm, that the faculty would be bursting with ideas and projects. And there were a good many. With twenty-eight departments and 12,000 students in the School of Education alone--and all this contained within a huge University which was swallowed up in turn by the city--it is understandable why projects which have great visibility elsewhere would have less of a noticeable impact here. Things were happening, however, and the faculty was stimulated by Melby's presence. Those who served with him there testify to a great sense of freedom and encouragement.

Just as he had at Northwestern and Montana, Melby had the ability to bring out the best in the faculty. He was able to give some of them renewed faith in themselves. C.O. Arndt describes the way in which Melby could get faculty members to take on a responsibility of which they were not sure they were capable. First, Melby would involve a faculty member in a discussion of the task and involve him in such a way

¹⁶Statement by Francis C. Rosecrance, personal interview.

¹⁷Statement by Walter A. Anderson, personal interview.

that he would sense the importance of it to the institution or to education. Then, he would ask the person if he would take the responsibility for it. Arndt says that a person usually ended up saying yes, not because Melby pressured him, for he didn't, but because he was convinced that Melby felt it was important and, in addition, that he also believed that Melby had faith in his ability to manage the task. As a result, says Arndt, "When you once went into it you felt 'how wonderful' to have a chance to do this, and you were at once belonging to a movement or a team."¹⁸

Once the decision was made, Melby seldom followed up on people. He saw it as his job to open up opportunities, to involve faculty members in them, to instill confidence in people, and to get the project started. After that they were on their own.

He had a similar feeling about the details of administration. He often expressed a great abhorrence for administrative trivia--referring to it as "housekeeping." At New York University, Melby had associate deans to do much of what he considered housekeeping. "I suppose it's important," says Melby, "and I know it has to be done, but, somehow, I can't get very interested in such matters." Administration, to Melby, is working with people and providing leadership so that faculty as well as students "may become all that they are capable of becoming." He was happy, then, to be able to turn

¹⁸Statement by Christian O. Arndt, personal interview.

at least a part of the administrator's chores over to the associate deans, something he had not been able to do at either Northwestern or Montana.

There is another facet of Melby's administration at New York University that should be recorded. It was true here, just as it was in his earlier positions, that he always thought of himself as a teacher as well as a dean--and he always taught. Even during these extremely busy days in New York, Melby continued to teach classes in "supervision" and in "contemporary problems and education." This was not a sideline for Melby, for he considered it an important part of his job. Undoubtedly, some people thought it was unnecessary for him, as dean of such a large institution, to carry a teaching load in addition to all of his other heavy responsibilities. Melby, on the contrary, thinks it is important that an administrator maintain his contacts with the students. Faculty members who were with him at New York point to his teaching as a real contribution to the School of Education. Literally thousands of students passed through his class during the eleven years he served there.

It could be argued that Melby's teaching was part of the plan he used in administering the School of Education--partly because it had a good effect on him and partly for the good effect it had on the faculty.

SUCSESSES AND STRUGGLES

A summary of what Melby accomplished as Dean of the New York University School of Education must of necessity boil itself down to certain identifiable elements. There is a larger kind of influence of which one gets a feeling, and it is described with fondness by people who served there with him, but it is not reducible to words which can be placed on paper. Certain rather obvious things were accomplished while Melby was dean--and these will be dealt with. The other aspect is less tangible. That is, what happened to the people who were involved as new plans unfolded and new projects were started.

In describing some of the developments of the School of Education one gets some understanding of the range of Melby's interests. It should be remembered that, in the case of specific projects, it was Melby who provided the inspiration and the impetus, just as it was he who found the proper people to carry the idea through to completion.

One of Melby's first projects, and one for whose success he is largely responsible, was that of increasing the budget for the School of Education. Melby disliked the School's being put into the position of what he called a "milk cow." The School of Education was one of the big money-making Schools of the University. Melby objected to the fact that a considerable amount of the revenue that the School of Education brought in was redistributed to other units of the University. He did

not argue that they should have all of it, but he did think that the School of Education should be allowed most of it.

In his report to the chancellor in 1949, Melby complained about what he felt was the inequity between the tuition a student paid and the amount he received back in instruction. In his report he stated:

...Among the various types of educational institutions those devoted to teacher education have been, in most instances, "poor relations." Their salary schedules have been lower....Within large universities, schools of education have usually been the last to secure new buildings and facilities.... For some reason the field of teacher education has not challenged the imagination of either leadership in higher education or of those with large sums of money to invest in the educational future of our nation. Our own university is a case point. When the student pays his tuition in our medical school he receives back in instruction \$1.80 for every dollar he pays in tuition, whereas in the School of Education the impoverished teacher who takes our courses receives back in instruction only \$.55 for every dollar she pays in tuition.¹⁹

It was a source of satisfaction to Melby that he had managed to get the University administration to gradually increase the budget for the School of Education until, shortly before he left, they were spending almost as much as they brought in. Part of the difficulties in increasing the budget stemmed from a lack of agreement between Melby and Rufus D. Smith, who was the University provost during Melby's first few years. Melby was an idealist and this characteristic bothered Smith. It became quite a seesaw battle in which Melby made proposals and the provost turned him down. The

¹⁹"Report of the Dean of the School of Education," 1948-1949, op. cit. p. 43-44.

difficulties between the two men, although not understood completely, were well known by the faculty of the School of Education.

Furthermore, Melby's associate dean in charge of the School of Education budget was Ralph Pickett. Dean Pickett was more sympathetic toward the views of Smith than he was toward those of Melby. Some of the faculty who were there at the time have said that it appeared to them that Pickett had a kind of liaison relationship with the provost so that, in essence, instead of working cooperatively with Melby, as his associate dean, he at times attempted to block Melby. One faculty member said that he suspected that Pickett occasionally warned Provost Smith ahead of time about what kinds of things Melby would be asking for so that the provost could be forewarned and prepare his answers in advance.

Melby himself has not commented on this difficult relationship, but those who served with him have stated that "it must have been an extremely distressing situation for Melby." In addition, Melby would occasionally make financial proposals to the chancellor only to find that Provost Smith would enter the discussion and point out to the chancellor why he didn't think the proposal was feasible and why it was in opposition to University policy. Melby's plans would be squelched.

The difficult situation was somewhat assuaged after about five years. An assistant dean, Peter Agnew, was appointed to Melby and given responsibility for the School of Education

budget. The responsibilities of the associate deans were then further clarified: Rosecrance was in charge of the program for general teacher education; Pickett was responsible for all specialized programs of education (art, music, nursing education, etc.); and a new appointee, Associate Dean Alonzo Grace was in charge of the division of advanced graduate study.

The School of Education at New York University was a well established institution when Melby came. It had a good faculty as well. But it was not a faculty that was willing to change very rapidly. The size of it alone made change a rather slow process, and the fact that they were divided into eighteen departments, each with a department head and its own minor administrative structure, made it even more difficult, and Melby's plans for such met with much consternation. One department chairman told Rosecrance, "You know, there isn't any regulation that you fellows up here on the fourth floor can set up that I can't find a way around."²⁰

It was during the period of curriculum revision that Melby underwent some of the bitter personal attacks mentioned earlier in this chapter. The truth of the matter is that the curriculum revision plans were made not by Melby or by any of his associate deans or administrative officials, but by a separate group of six faculty members given complete freedom to develop a new curriculum plan which they were to

²⁰Statement by Francis C. Rosecrance, personal interview.

present to the faculty. The six faculty members were relieved of all other responsibilities, given a secretary and a private place in which to meet and this charge by Melby: "In six weeks time I want you to have a new curriculum."

During the six weeks, faculty members were "heard" individually, including Melby and the other administrative officers, and at the end of the six weeks the committee came up with a curriculum. When the report of the curriculum revision was distributed "hearings" were held on it at which Melby would preside. It was at these hearings that the faculty attacked Melby and accused him of trying to destroy their departments. The report was not Melby's, and it was his willingness to absorb the abuse of certain faculty members and department heads who felt they had been discriminated against that protected the curriculum committee.²¹

Walter Anderson, who had been involved in the unsuccessful attempt to revise the general education curriculum at Montana, was also with Melby at New York University when the curriculum revision, in spite of some of the bitterness, was approved by a large majority of the faculty. Anderson feels that the curriculum plan in New York (which is still in effect) was successful while the revision in Montana wasn't, primarily because of a far more extensive involvement of the faculty in New York.²²

²¹See Arndt's appraisal of this criticism on page of this dissertation.

²²Statement by Walter A. Anderson, personal interview.

It is impossible to assess to what degree the acceptance of the new curriculum plan was a result of the influence of Melby himself. Fritz Borgeson, a professor in the School of Education at the time of the curriculum revision gives much credit to Melby for the success of the revision plans but says that the kind of leadership he gave in the venture was not so much direct as it was " a general, stimulating leadership...inspirational in nature." This procedure was and continued to be typical of Melby's technique in starting new projects and making changes. He would build the enthusiasm and provide the impetus, and he would inspire all those involved to real accomplishment, but the intricacies of planning would be worked out by someone else or by a committee. At New York University he had a large, diversified, and talented staff, and this procedure apparently worked well. There are other examples of his unique ability to inspire people to creative effort.

Melby was very much impressed when he arrived in New York, not only by the resources of the city, but by the great variety of resources within the University itself. He was particularly impressed by the large number of foreign students who were enrolled. With his growing interest in international affairs and concern for the development of better understanding between cultures, he felt that the School of Education and the University should do something more specific for the foreign students. During his first

year, courses in international education were established and an advisory service to foreign students was begun. This was not enough for Melby, however; he felt that the international program needed better organization and more direction.

Drawing again on the former faculty of Northwestern, he telephoned Christian O. Arndt, who was serving in the Office of Education as senior specialist in Far Eastern Affairs. Melby had the inspiration. He turned to Arndt as the man he hoped would put it into action. When looking at Melby's accomplishments, one must also look at the artistry with which he was able to enlist the services of people who could transform his ideas into reality.

Arndt says that he really had no desire to leave his position in Washington, but left solely because of Melby's influence:

It was a desire once again to be in association with a person who would stimulate new ideas and build something. I had the realization that something would be built here at New York University. I get such a stimulus out of conversation with him and having him in a group. You can literally feel the presence of a person with ideas and dedication to the basic principles of American democracy. This is life to him.²³

As a result of Melby's bringing Arndt to New York there was established the Center for International Affairs, with Arndt as director. Melby's inspiration and interest

²³Statement by Christian O. Arndt, personal interview.

did not stop with the organizing of this center, for in August of 1949 he and Arndt traveled to Western Europe to investigate the possibility of developing a truly international program in education, a summer program in Western Europe. They had not been in Europe long before Melby was convinced that a program should be started. To Arndt he said, "It's up to you to set this up and organize it." Arndt says, "He gave me the work of doing it, but he also gave me the inspiration and confidence that was necessary to move ahead, and this was one of the qualities that he had uniquely--the ability to bring out the best in a person."²⁴ The result of the trip was the birth of a program called "Seminar in Western Europe." The program has been running continually since that time and has had over 500 registered students.

Other projects also sprouted shortly after Melby's arrival. In the same year that Melby brought Arndt to New York to begin work in inter-cultural education, two other centers for special services were established within the School of Education. One was the Center for Human Relations Studies. At the time it was approved by the University, Melby said: "The Center will do fundamental research, field consultation and service, and training of leaders in inter-group education. As the work in inter-group education

²⁴Ibid.

gets underway, attention will be given to other human relations problems."²⁵

A second center, established at the same time, was The Center for Field Service and Research. In discussing the functions of the Center as an integrating agency for school surveys, off campus courses, and field consultation, Melby said:

Ideally, every staff member in the School of Education should have a consulting relationship to a school or school system. In such a school or school system the staff member should do research, clinical work, or other field studies. Such field experience should be looked upon as a prerequisite for effective classroom teaching on the campus. It should be viewed as a part of the staff member's total professional assignment. A staff member should not expect additional compensation for such service but should look upon it as one of the privileges of his professional post. In no other way can the staff member really continue to grow and the School of Education really vitalize its program.²⁶

Another overseas program was also started in 1949, in addition to the Seminar in Western Europe. At New York University prior to Melby's arrival was Abraham I. Katsh, who occupied the chair of Hebrew culture and education. It was Katsh's idea that as another part of the University's expanding summer program the School of Education could conduct a workshop in Israel on Hebrew life and culture. Again, this was the kind of project about which Melby could get excited. Extremely interested in human relations, brotherhood,

²⁵"Report of the Dean of the School of Education", 1946-1947, op. cit., p. 61.

²⁶Ibid., p. 61-62.

and cross-cultural experiences, he gave Katsh the approval to go ahead. And it was Katsh, of course, who worked out all the details. The official title of the program became "Workshop in Israel Life and Culture."

Melby's great pleasure in the workshop is evident in a description of it which he wrote in 1953. In part, he said:

....The workshop takes the course on modern Israel out of the four walls of an American classroom right into its natural setting 6,000 miles away. Crossing two oceans and a continent, students from nearly every state of the Union learn of this youngest democracy in the Middle East, not from maps, but from the hills of Galilee and the wastelands of the Negev; not from books, but from the people themselves.

It is no exaggeration to say that life in Israel today is the most dynamic social and educational experiment in the world. In Israel, students get a microcosmic view of humanity. Here are all the struggles and strivings of humanity as a whole. Here, too, is the most striking example of resurgence of faith in a world torn by war and ideological conflict....

....Its object was to provide the participants with something beyond formal classroom experience. Knowledge was to be acquired direct, at first hand, entailing the creative participation of the students themselves. At the same time, it was hoped that the members of the workshop would forge a cultural link between the United States and the new State of Israel, bringing to Israel an American point of view and returning as "ambassadors of good will," thus strengthening American-Israel relations in a small way.

.....
The workshop does far more than provide a conducted tour through Israel, although the field trips throughout the country are an important feature of the program....

The days of study, which begin with courses in modern Hebrew, continue with lectures covering all the major phases of life in Israel: political, social, economic, cultural and religious.²⁷

²⁷ Ernest O. Melby, "N.Y.U. Workshop Goes to Israel," Hadassah Newsletter (New York, May, 1953) p. 10.

After the workshop in Israel had got underway, Melby paid it a visit. It was as a result of the stimulation of his visit to Israel that he wrote the description of it just quoted. Katsh relates an anecdote about Melby that provides a glimpse at Melby's reaction to what he saw in Israel as well as what he saw as a major benefit of the workshop. While traveling through Israel in a bus with Katsh, Melby suddenly turned to him and said, "How I wish I could bring them all over here; I don't see any Jews here." What Melby wanted to provide for people was a broader view of the world. He felt that if American students could have seen the people of Israel, as he had seen them, in their natural setting, they would feel as he had, that there were "no Jews," just people.²⁸

The same "broad view" that he argued for in this discussion he also attempted to apply, at least in a small way, back at the School of Education. For a long time he had felt that graduate programs in education were woefully lacking in their ability to equip doctoral students for real leadership in a complex world. In the spring of 1948, Melby announced plans for the establishment of a Division of Advanced Study which was intended to be a departure from the traditional nature of graduate studies. His complaint was that most students who proceeded through the doctoral level in schools of education had done so through the medium of just more

²⁸Statement by Abraham I. Katsh personal interview.

hours of education courses on the masters level. "We need a new and reconceived program of preparation on the doctoral level," he said. "The new curriculum will delve deeply into educational philosophy, into the social sciences, various aspects of the fine arts, into science and particularly the sciences which are basic to human relations."²⁹

Melby further contended that much of what was presently a part of the doctoral program should be relegated to the masters and undergraduate programs. He wanted to "confine the doctoral work to fundamental approaches to the solution of educational problems calling for a high level of analytical and constructive thinking."³⁰

Melby's interest in making higher education a vital force in the American community continued to manifest itself while he was in New York. His appetite for it whetted by his experience with the Montana Study, he attempted to originate a program in New York that would approximate in an urban area what had been done in Montana's small towns. First, Melby tried to get New York University to put money into the project. Meeting with failure in convincing the University that the project would be worthy of their support, he turned to foundations for help. He tried to enlist the help of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations among others. A short time later the Ford Foundation was organized and Melby tried again.

²⁹Ernest O. Melby, unpublished speech before Annual Dinner, New York University School of Education, Atlantic City, February 25, 1948.

³⁰Ibid.

The result of a meeting with Paul Hoffman of the Ford Foundation was that a conference was called in Louisville, Kentucky, of people from all over the United States who were interested in community development programs, with the expenses for the conference paid by the Foundation. Out of the conference in Louisville came a proposal for a nationwide program of community development to work in all the states of the union. It was presented to the Ford Foundation and was turned down.

In the meantime, Melby had become interested in the New York State Citizens Council. Melby, who served as president of the organization found in it some outlet for his desire to use the university to help communities help themselves. The goal of the organization was to help communities improve their local organization, and by so doing, enrich the life of the community. The council endeavored to help communities utilize the resources they had in meeting their needs. Part of the solution rested in helping the communities interest and train citizens for community leadership.

One important phase of the work of the council was the involving of the state's colleges and universities in a community cooperative program. Melby was tremendously interested in furthering this aspect of the Council's work, which was just beginning to develop at the time he retired from New York University. In 1954 he addressed the Council's annual board meeting on the topic. A summary of his remarks was later included in a Council publication. Melby said:

Today's hazard to freedom grows out of our failure to sense the hazard. We are in danger because we don't know we are in danger.

It isn't more education we need (the Germany that tolerated Hitler was remarkably well educated and you could recruit an entire faculty from our prisons) but a different kind of education.

The test is not what people know but what they are and what they do. Knowledge is not power unless it is used for the common good.

The way our schools can do what so desperately needs doing is to use the teeming laboratory surrounding each one--the community. The key to what kind of education is needed is in participating, living experience.

There isn't any way of saving Western civilization apart from this kind of education. We cannot do it if we stay on campus.

Freedom never stands still. The moment it ceases to be dynamic it decays. The only way we can stop the decay of freedom in this country is to have a renaissance in the idea of freedom. The way of faith in freedom is working on common ideals.

I am convinced that what could be done in this country through education if we mobilized the totality of our communities would go far beyond our wildest dreams. This can be the beginning of Western civilization, not the end. Somehow we must recapture the faith that made our country great. The place to recapture it is in our homes, our churches, our communities.

Someday we are going to discover how to vitalize the community and at the same time give vitality and meaning to the whole process of education. This is the future of the Citizens' Council. It is the future of education in this country. It is the future of freedom. This is the importance, this the opportunity, of our University-Community Cooperation Project.³¹

³¹Ernest O. Melby, address, summarized in Helping Communities Help Themselves, (New York State Citizens Council, Inc., 1956).

The complexity of the New York University School of Education organization and the talent of the faculty provided a stimulating atmosphere in which Melby could work, but it also was largely responsible for what he considered one of his "defeats" as dean. In response to a question of how with this large and diverse faculty he managed to bring about unity, morale and organization, Melby said:

I don't know that we ever did really. I think that this is one of my defeats in that I never could achieve at N.Y.U. the unity of purpose and the morale that I wanted to achieve. I think that I could relate well, or at least satisfactorily, to faculty individually, but I could not produce the kind of climate in which I think that the optimum growth can take place, where there is a real unity of purpose. I never could get, for instance, at N.Y.U. the kind of spirit we had at Northwestern, even though I brought to N.Y.U. some of the same people, hoping this would help.

In the first years I was there I doubled the size of the faculty, so I had a lot of people I had brought in myself and who, I think, were backing me strongly. We all felt, and I think they feel today, that we were not able, ever, to create at N.Y.U. the same kind of atmosphere that we had at Northwestern. There was too much dead weight there already, too much inertia....I was never able to create quite what I had hoped.

One method Melby used to help achieve a measure of faculty solidarity was to invite them to his home for social evenings. Members of the faculty recall that what would start out as a social evening would end with Melby off in the corner with one or more of them, discussing a crucial problem in the college or trying to interest them in a new project.

Despite Melby's feeling of defeat in his effort to achieve unity, he worked diligently to improve the quality of the faculty. He drew heavily on his former faculty at

Northwestern. Approximately half of the faculty changed during the years Melby was in New York. He brought primarily "Melby-men" to the School of Education, men who were sympathetic to his educational viewpoints. Some of the faculty members who had been at the School of Education prior to Melby were somewhat resentful of the many new faces. There was a fear that perhaps a new group closer to Melby than they were, would come into power in the School.

This was not an issue for Melby at all. He was simply looking for creative people, and when he found them he hired them--or tried to. Some came, as Arndt stated, simply because they wanted to work around Ernest O. Melby. They were sure it would be a stimulating atmosphere. In this kind of an atmosphere there was experimentation and faculty growth.

How much a faculty member "grows" cannot be subjected to measurement, but this is the kind of influence that faculty members say Melby had on them. Those who worked near him say they learned from Melby. Walter Anderson in discussing what Melby did for the faculty gave a personal example of what he meant: "I learned a lot from William Heard Kilpatrick. He was one of my teachers at Columbia, and he was a great one. But I learned from Ernest Melby in a different way. I learned from what he did. I learned from watching his life."³²

³² Statement by Walter A. Anderson, personal interview.

Another intangible but very significant contribution that Melby made at New York University was in the inspiration he provided for the faculty. Those who served there with Melby comment on the courage he inspired in the faculty by his own courage in standing up against attacks. It was a period of book banning, investigations, name-calling, and bitter attacks on the public schools. Melby not only stood firm in all these things but carried the battle to the people who voiced the criticism. Because of his conduct as dean and the firm stand he took when attacked from either within or without the University, he built up a tremendous loyalty among the faculty. Fritz Borgeson recalls: "It was dynamic leadership that Melby provided... he is a man of vision. It was Ernest O. Melby that really put the New York University School of Education on the map nationally and, to some extent, internationally."

How Melby did this is difficult to say exactly. It was due in a large part to the faculty he brought to the School of Education and to the leadership that he gave. He fought for his programs, and he supported the faculty. Facilities and salaries were improved. New projects and centers were organized and programs of study were revised. Melby gave the faculty tremendous opportunity and tremendous freedom.

These things alone, however, did not put the School of Education as Borgeson says, "on the map." There was

something more. Melby was in demand all over the country; he was becoming a national figure and as such he was, to many people, "the School of Education at New York University." The image of Ernest O. Melby became the image of the institution. The range of Melby's activities and interests during these years are a testimony to his energy and a widening circle of influence. Like an evangelist for education, Melby took his message wherever he was asked to go. Having delivered his exhortation he left to carry it somewhere else.

A NATIONAL MISSION

The eleven years that Melby spent at New York University was in many ways a high water mark in his career. While it is true that he led Northwestern to a position of prominence, and that he met with a modicum of success in Montana under extremely difficult conditions, his influence while at New York was so widespread that he became a significant figure nationally.

Melby was in demand all over the country; his professional diary records a fantastic variety and frequency of activities and speeches. When one discusses what Melby accomplished for the School of Education at New York University this impressive volume of outside activity must be taken into consideration. To a great extent these activities contributed to the educational life of a nation, but in the process of his wide traveling and frequent speaking

and writing, Melby also created an image of the School of Education. To those who had no personal acquaintance with the institution, and in some degree for those who did, Melby represented the philosophy of the School of Education. Moreover, the School of Education began to absorb much of Melby's personality so that even today it still, to some extent, bears the stamp of Melby.

Melby was away from the School of Education so much of the time that it would have been impossible for him to carry on his outside activities and also minister to the needs of the School had he not had associate and assistant deans. Melby explains that one reason he took on so many outside responsibilities was that when he came to New York he felt the University was "awfully isolated" and that its influence "was not felt much beyond the Hudson River." Melby says, "I felt that if I went to conventions, made speeches, and took part in conferences...that through this I would get other people into it, and we would begin to have more of a national influence, and I think we did get something accomplished in this respect."

Just as he had done in Montana and in Northwestern before that, Melby geared his message to the times. At the end of World War II he found more than enough crucial issues to spark his interest. Melby wasted little time in plunging into a round of activities that, even today, has not slackened considerably. His first month as dean at New York he

took on only a few outside engagements, but in October, 1945, his professional diary lists twelve outside appearances, including eight speeches, which required traveling to (in addition to local points): Chicago; Evansville, Indiana; Lexington, Kentucky; and Wilmington, Delaware. The titles for a few of his eight speeches show the kinds of national and international issues with which he dealt and for which he felt education had the responsibility. Among other speech titles of Melby's that month were these: "Educational Planning in the Post-War World"; "Education and World Peace"; "Administering the Post-War Schools"; and "Education for a Free Society".³³

Melby's activities, speeches, and writings during the period of his deanship at New York University are of such a large number that they must be dealt with almost as a totality rather than on anything approaching an individual analysis. Furthermore, most of the speaking and writing that he did addressed itself to a few major concerns. It is impressive to note the staggering volume of public appearances and publications, for example, but it is not necessary to investigate more than a little of it to detect the few dominant issues about which Melby continually sermonized. He was still interested, of course, in all phases of education, but in his role as a major spokesman for American

³³Ernest O. Melby Diary, October 3-27, 1945.

education he had themes to which he related the problems of whatever group he might be addressing. He could and did speak on more narrow topics than "freedom and "human relations," but such issues as these far superseded all others in importance. Running throughout all his exhortations was his belief in the integrity of people and the concomitant belief that we need to have and demonstrate our faith in and love for humanity. This belief was basic.

One of the primary issues around which Melby grouped much of his speaking was what he considered the vital role of American education in the preservation of freedom. For him, the problems of the war and the post-war period had highlighted the importance of education to human progress. Melby felt that the freedom in the world would not survive unless changes could be made in the people's value systems. He was distressed by what he believed to be the lack of effectiveness of democratic institutions, and to education he accorded the responsibility for salvaging freedom. "Education," he said, "has the major responsibility in bringing about the required changes in the thinking and feeling of our people."³⁴ A year later in his second official report as dean he expressed his desire for the School of Education to "build something of substantial value for American education and world peace." He then concluded

³⁴"Report of the Dean of the School of Education," 1945-1946, op. cit., p. 63.

his report by saying, "The task ahead is extremely difficult and will call for continued sacrifices on the part of staff members and administrative officers, but we cannot fail American education at the very moment when it has the rescue of freedom on its hands."³⁵

The next year in his report to the chancellor Melby opened with an equally urgent appeal for American education to lead in the battle for freedom.

In both of my other reports I have stressed the crisis in freedom which in the postwar years has been enveloping our world. The subsequent developments of these years have been frightening in character.... If freedom is to survive in the world the United States of America must lead in ensuring its safety, for no other country in the world has simultaneously the tradition of free institutions and the resources to make them a living and successful reality on a large scale.³⁶

In 1949, with the topic of the "teacher shortage" a current one, Melby was asked to write an article for the New York Times Magazine. Melby, his first year as dean coming to a close, submitted an article entitled, "We Must Have More and Better Teachers." He did discuss the teacher shortage and identified what he thought were the reasons, but even in such a topic as this Melby saw a more basic problem which needed to be included in his discussion.

In our own country and all over the world people are seeking some kind of spiritual dynamic to which they can give their lives.... Here in America we have an opportunity to translate our tradition of free institutions into a reality, and in the process

³⁵Ibid., 1946-1947, p. 63.

³⁶Ibid., 1947-1948, p. 55.

challenge the best thought and feeling of our people.³⁷

In April, 1949, Melby went to Germany as part of a committee, supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, who were to observe German education. Melby didn't like what he saw. In a news article he expressed concern because many former Nazis were getting their former school posts back, and he advocated continued close supervision of German schools.³⁸

Melby's speaking and writing assumed a furious pace. Everywhere he proclaimed his message that education was the ultimate salvation of freedom. In Birmingham, Alabama, he told an audience that the American way of life is doomed unless the nation fosters an educational program which "lives and breathes freedom."³⁹ In Santa Barbara, California, Melby challenged teachers to teach the things that they felt should be taught regardless of the cost, if freedom and democracy were to survive, stating that "human freedom throughout the world is in a precarious position."⁴⁰ In Worcester, Massachusetts, he told his audience that America didn't need more education but a different kind of education--one which would teach moral and spiritual values--if we were to "assume the mantle of world leadership."⁴¹ In an article entitled "We

³⁷Ernest O. Melby, "We Must Have More and Better Teachers," New York Times Magazine, (May 12, 1946) p. 55.

³⁸New York Times, April 27, 1949.

³⁹Quoted in The Herald, Birmingham (date unknown).

⁴⁰Address, Santa Barbara City-County Teachers Institute, Nov. 12, 1948.

⁴¹Quoted in Worcester Daily Telegram, October 21, 1950.

had Better Freedomize Society" he lamented: "No generation of Americans has talked as much about freedom as the present one and none has shown a greater readiness to abandon it. We give our lives to defend freedom abroad and injure it through fear and confusion at home."⁴² Melby then argued for a different kind of education, saying that "facts had not brought freedom"; he stated the need to change society and to organize communities for education and changed behavior.

Journal articles and speeches on the relationship between education and freedom seemed to gush from Melby like a flood. With such extensive visibility eventually comes criticism. Melby condemned educators and the American people for moral laxity and lack of dedication. He had not lost faith in America or in her people, but he believed that the world could be made better and that America with its free institutions held the last hope for success in the battle for men's minds. Some people in society are sensitive to such blunt criticism as Melby sometimes proffered. After such a speech in Spokane, Washington, before a meeting of the Inland Empire Education Association, the editor of the local newspaper retaliated in an editorial captioned, "Talking to the Wrong People":

A sobering and thought-provoking charge was made against the American people Wednesday by Dr. Ernest O. Melby, dean of education at New York University.

He emphasized the role which education must play and said America had lost its great opportunity in Germany. In principle he was right on that matter, but his charges should not be leveled at the people of this country.

⁴²Ernest O. Melby, "We Had Better Freedomize Society," School Executive, (vol. 60, Feb., 1951) p. 66.

Speaking of ideals he did not make clear how they were to be implemented in Europe, where America faces a barrier of ignorance and violence and insincerity. He said communism is an idea, and cannot be fought with force. Communism is more than an idea, as it exists in Europe today. It is blockade, trouble-making, intrigue, bullying and force.

If Dr. Melby wishes education and idealism to succeed in Europe he should talk to the politburo. He should talk to the Russian statesmen who walk out on United Nations delegates every time the latter try to accomplish something toward world peace. He should address his remarks on abuse of minority races to the powers behind the iron curtain which have reddened the pages of history with pogroms.

Dr. Melby was right in saying that the European situation has been shamefully handled, but he was talking to the wrong people. 43

Melby seemed to be relatively impervious to personal criticism. The observation made earlier by Walter Anderson concerning Melby's total absence of vindictiveness toward those on the School of Education who treated him unfairly, could also be applied to criticism he received from outside the University. He would defend his ideas stoutly, but he never appeared disturbed by personal attacks. Melby was (as he thought others should be) lost in a cause greater than himself.

He chided his fellow educators for their timidity and lack of fervent dedication:

In academic circles there is also a curious fog of insecurity, fear, and confusion. Somehow the ground does not feel solid. In many, perhaps most, institutions of higher learning one could hardly

⁴³Spokane Daily Chronicle, April 7, 1950.

prove in court that it is dangerous to express oneself candidly. Yet most people do not so express themselves. Those who do, exercise great care, and no small number of former liberals seem anxious to attach themselves to a safe orthodoxy....How long can we put freedom on ice and still recover it? Or will we ever recover it?⁴⁴

One of Melby's most effective appeals for a different kind of education, a speech given in 1951, was entitled, "Better Teaching--For What." His argument in this speech is that just more education guarantees nothing, and elementary school teachers who have only a few years of preparation beyond high school behave "at least as well" as university professors who have many years of post high school training. In the speech Melby says:

If you ask me this evening, "Better Teaching for What?", one of the first things I would like to mention is that of building into our behavior the idea of the importance of people--all kinds of people....If you ask me again...I'd like to say teaching for a great faith in the American way of life, increased faith in human values, in the common man.⁴⁵

In 1952, Melby was asked by Edward R. Murrow to prepare a statement of "This I Believe" for Murrow's nightly radio presentation by the same name. In this statement, Melby speaks as a citizen, not only as a university dean. Yet throughout it is the same devotion to freedom and faith both personal and universal:

⁴⁴Ernest O. Melby, "Cultural Freedom and Release of Creativity," Education Digest (vol. XIX, March, 1954), p.14.

⁴⁵Ernest O. Melby, "Better Teaching-for What?", address, Toledo, Ohio, April 5, 1951, (See Appendix for complete text of address).

I believe each individual human being is unique, precious, and sacred. He is the only entity of his exact kind and quality in the universe. He can think, feel, act, and create as no other human being can think, feel, act and create. This uniqueness of the individual is the primary reason for a free world. For if we are to make the most of the creative potentialities of all the individual human beings in the world each must be free to become what he is capable of becoming. Such a process of becoming is possible only in a free society.

But freedom is not merely a negative--merely the absence of external controls. It is positive. Only an individual who loves and is loved can really be free. Only one who receives fully and freely from his fellow men can benefit his uniqueness and make the most of his freedom. Similarly only as he is free to give--in fact, only as he does give in love and understanding to his fellow men can his own spirit grow and flower. One is not free when one is cut off from other human beings. One grows in freedom as one increasingly belongs to others, as one develops a sense of belonging. This sense of belonging reaches from our immediate circle of family, friends, and associates to all mankind as one increasingly sees oneself as identified with humanity as a whole. Finally, all humanity, all nature reaches a universality in God.

I believe in the power of faith. Great achievements are possible only for those who believe they can be accomplished. In the same way, the faith of our associates inspires each of us to do our best--in many cases to do more than we ourselves think possible. The great teacher is thus one who has faith in his pupils, affection for them, understanding of them, and wisdom enough to permit each pupil to be himself. What is true of the teacher is true of leadership in every area of human relationship.

I believe in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. This brotherhood reaches its finest expression in a vital community in which all can share and contribute, without limitation because of race, color, creed, or social status. As an educator I must necessarily project my private beliefs to embrace the broader patterns of community life. As an individual I reject Communism and Fascism and all extremes, including the excessive centralization of power, whether in government, business, labor or

education. I believe that free individuals are more important than any system. Therefore to me, the purpose of all political, social and educational administration must be to give citizens freedom for creative living and effective group action.

Since I believe we can build a society in America and in the world which is based on freedom, faith, love, understanding, and human brotherhood, I have confidence in the ultimate triumph of the human spirit.⁴⁶

Although Melby was critical of the kind of education the American schools were offering, he was also quick to defend the schools against what he considered ill-founded and destructive attacks from the outside. In the early 1950's the attacks increased in volume and intensity and American educators were hard pressed to defend what they were doing and resist the pressures from groups who wished to change the curriculum of the public schools. The essentialists argued that the three R's were being neglected, and other dissatisfied citizens joined in with them to urge a return to the teaching of the fundamentals.

Progressive education was blamed by some for the ills of the nation. Progressive administrators found their job security threatened, and in one notable case in Pasadena, Willard Goslin lost his. Melby rushed to the defense. Here was a great principle he could defend--part of the great cause to which he was committed. He was quick to speak in opposition to those who wished to turn back the educational clock.

⁴⁶Ernest O. Melby, "This I Believe," Printed in New York Herald Tribune, March 10, 1952.

In Atlanta, he lashed out at the critics of the schools and labeled them "enemies of public education."⁴⁷ Three years earlier he authored a pamphlet, "American Education Under Fire,"⁴⁸ and in an article based on this booklet he declared, "Dishonest and unjustified are most of the attacks being made on public education."⁴⁹

In 1953, Melby and Morton Puner edited a collection of writings concerned with the current attacks on the schools, called Freedom and Public Education. The book contains over forty writings related to the current attacks on education. Articles were contributed by, among others, such people as William Heard Kilpatrick, Henry Steele Commager, Willard Goslin, John Foster Dulles, John Hersey, James Conant, Theodore Brameld, and Earl J. McGrath.⁵⁰

Melby, who in addition to vigorously defending the schools, pleaded continually for better education, one more closely allied with American democracy and a belief in human beings, was himself caustically denounced for "attacking" the schools. Here was a turn of events: Melby being criticized for what one editor thought was his destructive

⁴⁷Quoted in Atlanta Constitution, November 21, 1954.

⁴⁸Ernest O. Melby, American Education Under Fire, (New York, 1951, Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.).

⁴⁹Ernest O. Melby, "Dishonest and Unjustified," National Education Association Journal (October, 1951) p.441.

⁵⁰Ernest O. Melby and Morton Puner, Freedom and Public Education (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1953).

excoriation of the American system of education. The editorial was entitled, "More Haziness":

It would seem like a vacuum week if somebody didn't mount a platform and excoriate "the American system of education." That is a subject, like politics, on which almost everybody can and does speak with passionate authority--and if it isn't grade school education which is being flayed, it is college education professional training, job-vocational tutelage or something else.

Seldom do public critics of educational procedures bother to point out specific flaws or propose detailed substitutes. Most of the tirades about education--or, for that matter, about almost any other subject on which glib persons can become vocal quickly--are too generalized to be interpretable, too vague to pin down.

Even titular experts in the educational field can be just destructive and hazy when they strain for a headline in a public utterance. Dr. Ernest O. Melby, dean of the School of Education of New York University, rose up in Chicago the other day and pleaded with teachers to come down from their ivory towers of theoretical and academic erudition, and get closer to students, the community, actual living. He made quite a talk in that strain, according to press reports, without once pointing a specific finger or otherwise meating-up his sermon. He mentioned "Our great heritage of freedom," and otherwise made a splendid oration. No doubt he was warmly applauded when he sat down.

He was "convinced we must scrap much that is in our books on administration and many of our time-honored attitudes and practices," but anybody looking for brass tacks in such lamenting needs a microscope. This sort of thing happens almost every day. One of these days, oratorical denunciation of "our system of education" as a common indoor sport will lose its audience, already bored.⁵¹

⁵¹Valley News, Lebanon, Illinois, December 14, 1954.

UNDER ATTACK

In the early 1950's, the constant criticism of the public schools found an ally in the fear that was engendered by the investigations into alleged communistic activities. America's schools, and many of her educators, were accused of being pink or having leftist leanings. Melby, much to his great shock, came under fire as a "communist." He says, "If anyone had told me in 1940 that ten years later I would be labeled as a communist, I would have told him it was the craziest thing I'd ever heard of." Melby, who for years had been stumping the country preaching freedom and democracy and human dignity, suddenly found that he was a controversial figure and an alleged communist sympathizer.

Where did the basis for such an accusation come? In 1943, two years before he left Montana to take up his duties at New York University, Melby had received a telephone call from the president of Smith College asking him if he would be interested in being vice-chairman of the Education Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. It seemed to Melby that if anything was needed in the world it was more activities to develop friendship between nations. Certainly, when the war was over there would be a need for such. Besides, other well-known educators, presidents of well-known universities, would also be members. Melby, a humanitarian and an inveterate joiner, consented to have his name used as vice-chairman. In the rush of

activities in Montana and as dean at New York University, Melby never gave much more than a passing thought to the membership he held. Furthermore, he had never attended one of the Council's meetings. Shortly after arriving at New York University, an acquaintance of Melby's, who was also a member of the Council of American-Soviet Friendship, asked him if he had ever attended any meetings of the organization and suggested to Melby that if he hadn't then he thought he should, for he would be interested in what went on.

Melby did attend the meeting and was extremely surprised and displeased at what he saw. He found that, first of all, there were "an awful lot of Russians present." And the program, according to Melby, "consisted mainly of an exposition and defense of Soviet foreign policy." Melby was so upset by what he saw that evening that the next morning when he arrived at his office he telephoned all the friends he knew who were also members of the education committee of the Council, told them of his experience, and urged that they dissolve the education committee. The committee was dissolved, and Melby considered the association ended. As far as Melby was concerned it was.

But these were the days of investigation and accusations. Those who were too open in expressing liberal points of view were exposing themselves to attack. And unfortunately for Melby and for the other distinguished educators who were likewise involved, the U.S. Attorney General

listed the organization as subversive.

Melby suddenly found himself attacked by certain groups as being a controversial figure, a "pink," or a sympathizer. In addition to attacking his brief association with the Council for Soviet-American Friendship, his accusers also dug into his recent past and turned up "The Montana Study" to which they managed to attack the name tag of subversive activity--or in the proper jargon, "a commie front." The condemnation which Paul Meadows had unwittingly brought onto the Montana Study now also attached itself to Melby.

It is incongruous that anyone who crusaded so long and so fervently for American democracy could be accused of having "communist leanings." Walter Anderson relates an anecdote concerning one of the early New York incidents in which Melby was attacked. For some time the American Legion as well as other groups in Scarsdale had been hunting for communists in the Scarsdale School System; the much publicized "battle of the books" was one result of their activities. Melby had been included in the accusations primarily because of his former association with the Council on Soviet-American Friendship.

The Parent-Teachers Association in a small school system near Scarsdale invited Melby to be the speaker at one of its evening meetings. Anderson says that no sooner had the name of Melby as speaker been announced but pressure

began to be exerted on the board of education (of which Anderson was a member) to forbid the P.T.A. to have "this radical" speak. The board refused to submit to such demands and upheld the association's right to bring in "a distinguished educator." Anderson, in describing what took place the night of the P.T.A. meeting, says:

Well, the night that he spoke many people came, including those people who had been urging the board to cancel Melby's appearance. Melby gave one of his most wonderful talks; it was of an almost religious nature. There was nothing in it that anyone could criticize....It was a talk about the importance of human beings; it was just a magnificent talk! Even Melby's critics who were present there seemed to believe it in the end. They came up after the meeting and said, "I almost had to agree with you tonight."⁵²

In spite of all the attacks on him, Melby very seldom spoke in his own defense. Arndt and Anderson say that it disturbed many of the faculty of the School of Education that he did not defend himself more often. Melby would argue in defense of a principle, but he would only on rare occasions reply to attacks made on him personally. One such reply came in November, 1951, when he was under fire by the William Bradford Turner American Legion Post for having, according to them, "communist leanings." Melby was scheduled to speak before the Parent-Teacher Association in Garden City, Long Island. As had happened in Scarsdale, the objectors attempted to persuade the Garden City P.T.A. to cancel Melby's appearance. They also presented their objections to the Board

⁵²Statement by Walter A. Anderson, personal interview.

of Education. The cancellation did not take place. Melby did speak, only this time he also defended himself. The headline of a news item reporting the meeting blared:

"NYU Prof Rips Critics, Denies Red Leanings." The article said:

...Setting aside his planned speech to state his position, Dr. Ernest O. Melby...blasted "witch hunting" in the form of calling people in the U.S. "communists" without backing such charges with facts. He won a standing ovation from the audience...

"In 1932 I began to tell the American teachers of their responsibility to oppose totalitarian concepts whether left or right," Melby asserted. "The teaching of knowledges and skills is not enough to combat communism. I have long urged the teaching of moral principles and strength to equip our society to function in a free world."⁵³

Melby admitted that he had been a member of the Council for Soviet-American Friendship but reminded the audience that in 1943, when he belonged to the Council, American and Soviet soldiers were fighting on the same team. He told them that he worked to bring about the disbanding of the Council when he "realized that it was not concerned with promoting friendship between the Soviet and American peoples."⁵⁴

Ten days later the controversy had not yet died down--not as far as the Legion post was concerned. They decided that they should clarify their position, and in so doing again reiterated their contention that Melby should not have been allowed to speak:

⁵³Newsday, Garden City, New York, November 20, 1951.

⁵⁴Ibid.

The post in a statement to "clarify" its position said yesterday that after the request was denied "we decided to do nothing to embarrass the speaker or otherwise mar the dignity of the occasion. In fact we...announced that we would ask no questions bearing on the speaker's record....At no time did the Legion consider nor even discuss picketing this meeting.... We regret that a forum was made available for this speaker to attack citizens of our village who have demonstrated over many years their genuine interest in the welfare of the public school system....Your committee (the executive committee of the legion) made no charges against Dr. Melby save that he was a controversial figure. We believe that we have proved it." 55

This was the result of responding to one's critics, for then they refuse to let the incident die but insist on firing the final volley. Melby knew this and for this reason, plus a reluctance to dignify their accusations by a response, he usually refrained from any defense. Strangely, though he could be hailed in one city, he could also be damned in another. In Denver in 1952, he was praised for exposing "the red threat to the U.S. School." 56 One of the most bitter assaults to which he was subjected occurred in April, 1953.

Melby was scheduled to appear as a panel member in a forum series in Yonkers, sponsored by the Yonkers Council for Community Understanding. The topic for the forum was "Worlds in Collision." Three days before the meeting was to be held, The Yonkers Record, in a bold two-line head that stretched across the front page declared, "Many Protest Melby's Appearance at Forum." The bulk of the "major" news items in the paper, in addition to the editorial, were devoted either to

⁵⁵Newsday, Garden City, New York, November 29, 1951.

⁵⁶Denver Post, June 29, 1952.

a denunciation of Melby or of the Yonkers Council of Churches, which sponsored the forum. The lead article on the front page said:

All veteran groups are being alerted with representatives of the Irish Unified Society, the Knights of Columbus, the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the Catholic Holy Name Societies along with representatives of the Villa Nova Club to attend the opening of the Forum series entitled World in Collision which starts off on Wednesday evening, April 13th at the YWCA.

Many see in this Forum the hand of Osie Reichler of the H.S. and Stanley Wynstra, School Superintendent, for Dean Melby a panel speaker is a close pal, they say of Wynstra and the B'nai B'rith has been pushing him all over the county.

...The panel discussion is headed by Ernest O. Melby who has been identified with communist fronts but has adroitly stated on numerous occasions that he is against Communists.⁵⁷

The Yonkers Record also brought up Melby's association with the Council on American-Soviet Friendship and similarly attacked him for his affiliation with the American Education Fellowship. Other subversive faults of Melby's which the newspaper identified were his being a "backer of Progressive Education and a supporter of Professor Goslin who was dismissed from the Pasadena School System."⁵⁸

This was low level journalism, to be sure, but it is indicative of the kind of irresponsible, destructive attacks to which Melby was subjected. Melby's reaction to this kind of onslaught was not to retort and strike out at the writers of it but to carry the fight to a larger battleground. He

⁵⁷The Yonkers Record, April 12, 1953.

⁵⁸Ibid.

would stand for a principle instead--the defense of freedom. He felt far more free, evidently, in defending the rights of American citizens than in defending himself.

He felt that the congressional investigations that were being carried on were, in a large measure, responsible for a climate of fear and distrust that was spreading throughout America. Melby's strong stand and willingness to speak out boldly during this period endeared him to the faculty at New York University. C.O. Arndt (and others) stated that "it was during this very trying period that Dean Melby, by his great courage, gave inspiration and courage to the rest of us."⁵⁹

An example of the kind of defense Melby promoted is evident in an address he gave, entitled, "An Educator Looks at the Current Congressional Investigations." Three days after he had been maligned by The Yonkers Record and one day following his appearance on the panel in Yonkers, Melby received a distinguished service award from Kappa Phi Kappa. In his acceptance speech he said, in part:

I suggest that we lay aside our silly fears...that we finally take our position in defense not only of our freedom as a whole but of the kind of education which will give meaning and purpose to that freedom.

Let us make every school in America a living example of the meaning of freedom. Let us encourage every teacher in America to be an outspoken interpreter and exponent of freedom and go to his defense if he is attacked. Let us attack every inroad upon the historic meaning of our freedom including the methods of irresponsible investigations, the evils of the McCarran Act, and the blundering of our past loyalty programs.

⁵⁹Statement by Christian O. Arndt, personal interview.

If we have any teachers who betray their sacred trust, let us be the first to remove them....We can turn the present education crises into one of triumph for both freedom and education.⁶⁰

Melby's years at New York University were filled with a constant round of speeches, panel appearances, and attendance at civic functions. A typical month's activities, as he records them in his diary, appear to be an impossible task to carry through. During this period he made at least 1,000 speeches or other public presentations. At the same time that he was so busy with this activity and with the administering of the 12,000 student School of Education, he somehow found time to write. During this extremely busy period of his life he had three books published and contributed over 65 articles published in magazines and educational journals. It is true that only one of his books during this period was a major piece of work (in terms of size) and that some of the journal articles were based on speeches he had written; it is also true that some of his journal articles have a similar theme and tend to say the same things over again; in spite of all this, the record is an impressive monument to Melby's boundless energy. His combined record of speaking, writing, traveling, and administering while at New York University may not be matched or approached by any other educator in America.

The frantic pace did not seem to wear Melby down. On the contrary, it seemed to be more vital to his existence than

⁶⁰Quoted in Square Daily, New York, April 17, 1953.

meat or drink. But University retirement systems have policies geared to average circumstances, and in the summer of 1956, Melby would be 65 years old--retirement age.

RETIREMENT

On February 18, 1956, the news of Melby's retirement was announced. The New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune had the same caption for the article--"Melby Retiring, To Take Post at Michigan State."⁶¹ ⁶² Other announcements of his retiring appeared the same day in The Village Voice (Greenwich Village), The White Plains Dispatch, The Scarsdale Inquirer; and 1,300 miles away in Alexandria, Minnesota, where Melby had his first teaching position 43 years before, the Park Region Echo said, "Friends of Mrs. F.O. Herbert and her son-in-law Dr. Ernest O. Melby will be interested to learn that he plans to retire August 31 from his duties as Dean of New York University School of Education."⁶³

The last few months of Melby's stay in New York were filled with banquets and testimonials. In May, the School of Education alumni and faculty turned out 350 strong to bid goodbye to Melby at a banquet at the Hotel Biltmore. The local chapter of Phi Delta Kappa also sponsored a banquet in his honor. The Jewish Culture Foundation held a reception in his honor. The New Lincoln School and the Anti-Defamation

⁶¹The New York Times, February 18, 1956.

⁶²New York Herald Tribune, February 18, 1956.

⁶³Park Region Echo, Alexandria, Minnesota, February 18, 1956.

League of B'nai B'rith did the same. From Elizabethtown College and from New York University he received honorary degrees.⁶⁴

In an article captioned "Goodbye Messrs. Chips," Time magazine paid its tribute to Melby:

Each year U.S. colleges and universities must say goodbye to many a famed and favorite figure. Among those retiring in 1956:

New York University's Ernest O. Melby, 64, for eleven years dean of the School of Education. A Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota, Melby rose from small town teacher and school superintendent to be dean of Northwestern University's School of Education, president of Montana State University and finally chancellor of Montana's higher educational system. But it was not until he got to N.Y.U. that he came into his own as a kind of senior defense counsel for the U.S. public school against those who insisted that it had sacrificed its intellectual content. He set up N.Y.U.'s Center for Human Relations Studies and its Center for Community and Field Services, stumped the country for a school that would be merged with the community. "In this human-centered universe," said Melby, "there is no perfect heirarchy of truth, there are no criteria beyond the realm of experience...Anything to be learned must be lived...The building of a bridge may be more effective in teaching Johnny Jones to think than the study of Plato.⁶⁵

As Melby approached retirement age at New York University he began to think about what he might do next. Retirement in the technical meaning of the word was out of the question for him. He had no intention whatsoever of, as he says, "putting myself on the shelf." It would have been a difficult task, even if he had tried, to curb the energy and

⁶⁴Ernest O. Melby, Diary, May, 1956.

⁶⁵Time, (vol. 68, July 16, 1956) p. 63.

momentum that had been built up during an extremely active career, but especially during the eleven years at New York University. Melby knew that he had to be a part of something, but he had no definite plans about where he would go or what he should do.

Numerous organizations in New York, principally voluntary organizations and Jewish associations, asked Melby to serve on their staff; there was also the possibility suggested that he might expand his work with the New York State Citizens Council. Henry Heald talked to him about the possibility of doing some teaching at the University on something other than a regular appointment.

In 1951, five years before Melby's retirement, he had been visiting in East Lansing with Clifford E. Erickson, dean of the Michigan State University College of Education. During their visit together Erickson asked Melby when he would retire from New York University. When Melby told him "five years from now," Erickson responded by saying, "Five years; I'm going to remember that." And he did remember it. In the fall of 1955, Erickson wrote to Melby asking him if he would like to come to the College of Education as a visiting professor. On December 1, Melby flew to East Lansing and spent all day talking with Erickson and with Robert L. Hopper, head of the department of administrative and educational services. Erickson, who had been a graduate student and later a faculty member at Northwestern while Melby was dean, strongly urged him to come to Michigan.

After his meeting with Erickson, Melby was joined on a flight to Cleveland, Ohio, by Floyd Reeves who, since having retired, was on the staff at Michigan State University. Melby says, "Dr. Reeves spent the whole time on the plane on the way to Cleveland telling me all the wonderful things about Michigan State, and, of course, I was excited about it already."

The College of Education at Michigan State University appeared to Melby to be a spirited, growing institution. He decided to accept Erickson's invitation, and in the fall of 1956, he joined the College of Education as a visiting professor. Two months later Erickson asked him if he would accept, instead of a visiting professorship, a three-year appointment. Melby agreed.

Melby was granted almost complete freedom in the charge that Erickson gave to him. If he wanted to teach, he could, but if he didn't want to, he didn't have to; he could write; he could hold seminars; he could travel and continue to speak if he wished. With this generous charge Melby felt a new kind of freedom. The responsibilities of administration were gone. Now he could spend his time doing those things he loved most--teaching, working with students, and speaking. In the opinion of Erickson and others, Ernest Melby had earned his reward of freedom and his new title--"distinguished professor of education."

CHAPTER V

THE EARNED REWARD

While Melby's years at New York University paralleled a period of social and educational history which was exploding with problems and change, the same can also be said for his tenure at Michigan State University. The attack against the schools of the early and middle fifties continued.

In 1956, the Council for Basic Education was founded with Arthur Bestor, author of Educational Wastelands, as one of its first directors. The purpose of the Council was to promote the view that "schools exist to provide the essential skills of language, numbers and orderly thought, and to transmit in a reasoned pattern the intellectual, moral and aesthetic heritage of civilized man."¹ Battle lines were sharpened between the academicians and the educationists, who began to be blamed for most of what was "wrong" with the schools.

A year later, in the fall of 1957, the Russians launched the first space satellite, and a shocked nation, used to being first in the world, looked for something on which they could vent the bitterness born of their injured pride. The schools became the scapegoat. Surely they must have failed,

¹Quoted in Cremin, op. cit., p. 346.

went the argument, or we would have had the engineers and scientists to thrust our own satellite up before the Russians had done it.

Out of the miasma of what Cremin calls "a bitter orgy of pedagogical soul-searching"² arose a new and caustic critic of progressive education--Admiral Hyman G. Rickover. In the months ahead, Rickover would become one of the most volatile, bitter and effective critics of professional educators and the public schools. Shortly after Sputnik "beeped" its way into the educational consciousness of Americans, Rickover wrote:

But now that people have awakened to the need for reform, I doubt whether reams of propaganda pamphlets, endless reiteration that all is well with our schools, or even pressure tactics will again fool the American people into believing that education can safely be left to the "professional" educators....The mood of America has changed. Our technological supremacy has been called in question and we know we have to deal with a formidable competitor. Parents are no longer satisfied with life adjustment schools. Parental objectives no longer coincide with those professed by the progressive educationists. I doubt we can again be silenced.³

The incongruous situation developed in which great numbers of Americans clamored for changes in the form and content of the public schools which would make them more like the Russian schools; meanwhile, in Russia a steady movement was underway in the public schools which was adopting certain characteristics of the American educational system. So, while some Americans declared that our schools should be more like the Russians', their's were becoming more like

²Ibid., p. 347.

³Hyman G. Rickover, Education and Freedom, (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1959) pp. 189-190

our's.

While education critics warred and worried over the contribution of the school to America's failure in the space race, other far-reaching developments were affecting education on the national scene. The 1954 school integration decision by the Supreme Court was slowly and painfully being implemented; the issue of federal aid for education asserted itself with greater strength; an increasing number of older people created new problems for society; the "new technology" was relegating the unequipped to the ranks of the unemployable.

Over all these problems lay the shadow of the "Cold War," a frustrating, diplomatic stalemate that most Americans were learning to live with, and some despaired of ending or winning within their own lifetime.

Melby had no shortage of crucial social and international issues to which he could relate the role of education. The backdrop against which he "viewed education anew" in 1939 was still present and, if anything, more vivid than ever. At Michigan State University Melby would concern himself less and less with the "running of the school house" and more than ever before with the ideological struggle in which he saw education--the right kind--as the determining force of victory for America.

IN THE CLASSROOM AGAIN

It was because of Melby's compulsive desire to tell students and teachers about his concern for American education

that he went to Erickson a short time after he had arrived at Michigan State and told him that he wanted to teach. On a small scale, then, Melby began teaching. The only teaching he did in his first quarter at Michigan State University was a seminar he conducted for school superintendents, who came by invitation, and for some of the College of Education faculty members. The seminar was called "Frontiers in Administration."

Much of his time in his early months was spent visiting the classes of others as a guest lecturer. Between such guest appearances in classes and his usual outside speaking activity, Melby, in his first full month at Michigan State University, gave nineteen talks and addresses; and in the following month he duplicated this schedule.⁴ Gradually, Melby's teaching load increased until after two years he became, in actuality, a full-time teacher.

Although most of Melby's teaching at Michigan State was in the graduate program, he also worked with undergraduates. He taught "School and Society," one of the first education courses taken by prospective teachers. The majority of his assignments, however, were at the master's and doctoral level, teaching such courses as: Supervision of Instruction, Administrative Theory, Administration of Higher Education, Crucial Issues in Education, and conducting seminars in administration.

Erickson's description of Melby's teaching methods at Northwestern (see Chapter II) is still quite an accurate

⁴Ernest O. Melby, Diary, October-November, 1956.

description of his classroom technique 30 years later. At Michigan State, Melby lectured in the same way. Walking into the classroom, without a note in his hand, he somehow seemed to lecture coherently and in an organized fashion. More often than not, however, a recent development in world affairs would be the spark for his lecture. To a current crisis, such as the "U-2 incident," and the United States government's ambiguous stand concerning it, he could relate the importance of education.

The underlying themes of Melby's class lectures were the same as those which had dominated his speeches and writings for the past twenty years, but more frequently than ever he was heard to say that one must "have faith in people." It was this lesson in his classes that he attempted to drive home to teachers and to administrators. For the teachers, he would attempt to show why it was important for them to have faith in their students and respect for them. "Nearly every great teacher is excited about learning," he told them; "nearly every great teacher is excited about people--the love of people."⁵ And to administrators in his class he gave similar reminders on the subject of having faith in the faculty: "A person's usefulness in an enterprise depends largely on what he thinks other people think of him...It's not just 'my door is always open' that matters; it's what happens after the person walks through the door that really makes the difference. What is the relationship between you?"⁶

⁵Ernest O. Melby, class lecture, Michigan State University, April, 1962.

⁶Ibid

Increasingly, Melby took stands in class on national issues and, of course, found that there were those who disagreed with his positions. Still the students flocked to his classes, for whether they agreed with him or not, many said they wanted to sit in class with a professor who did take a firm stand and let it be known what he believed. A doctoral student in speech, in fulfilling a requirement in a speech class at Michigan State University, made a brief evaluation of Melby as a "great teacher." His analysis of Melby's teaching is not only an accurate description of Melby's method but an example of how students react to it:

.....
 Professor Melby is not objective in his viewpoint, nor does he make a pretense of so being. He has a point of view and it is his right--indeed, his duty--to make that view as clear and forceful as he can. Melby does not address students; he speaks to potential converts. He preaches rather than expounds; his views are not extreme nor are they conformist, but he has that wonderful characteristic, which age and experience often imbue in man, of not being concerned about what peers or superiors may think or care about what he says. He is an individual speaking out as an individual, dedicated unequivocally to that in which he believes on the basis of his own reasoned evaluation of his long experience.....

....What he says is not derived from research results or psychological or pedagogical theory, but from the life and times of Ernest Melby, and in this regard he is virtually unique.

He is optimistic towards life, his subject, and his students. He feels somewhat less so towards his colleagues. He maintains an air of venerable cordiality towards the individual who questions or addresses him, but, though he professes to a personal interest in his students, and readily grants appointments..., he is a much better talker than listener, and really "knows" very few of those whom he teaches. He is tactful, self-controlled, and respectful of the student, however, in the classroom, believing in the inherent "potential" of

being right of each individual. He does not argue, if opposed, but generally circumvents the exception and proceeds on his own tack.

He has an abundant enthusiasm for Education, and, coupled with his dedication to the service of this discipline, a vivid imagination and a storehouse of colorful and illustrative anecdotes....Above all, Ernest Melby is a man of deep personal conviction and integrity....

As to the techniques this man uses, they are simple: he lectures. Each lecture is followed by questions. Each question usually provokes another short lecture. Dr. Melby involves the group, certainly, with his keen wit and illustrative manner, but he does not establish any sort of relationship with individual students, except his questioners, and that is perfunctory....

His lectures are amiable and only slightly, if at all, structured. The one point of each is available on the printed syllabus for the course. What he provides is not information (what little occurs is broadly generalized) so much as a point of view expressed in vividly imaginative terms. There is little animation or technical support (Audio-Visual devices, blackboard, etc.) but there is a flood of feeling and personal dedication in his words. He is a revivalist without the artifice of technique.

Is Ernest O. Melby a "great" teacher? Probably he is. I learned few, if any, facts from him. And yet I am grateful for having been exposed to the man, simply for having heard his views, clearly and feelingly expressed....⁷

Many faculty members in the College of Education feel as William H. Roe does about the importance of a student taking a course from Melby. Roe said: "If you haven't had a course from Melby you really should take one; it doesn't matter much what one you take from him, but you should have Melby for something."⁸

⁷John F. Price, unpublished paper, Michigan State University, July, 1962.

⁸Statement, William H. Roe, private conversation.

Melby, himself, when asked by students whether he thinks they should register for a certain course he will be teaching, is likely to ask them immediately if they have ever had a course from him before. If the answer is "yes" then Melby suggests that they not take the course he is teaching. "If you've had one course from me," says Melby, "there's no sense in taking another--you've heard what I have to say." Melby is, perhaps, a little overly critical of his ability to provide something new for a second-time student in his class, but it is true that, basically, he expounds a human relations-centered approach to education and to administration. He argues that love for humanity, faith in people, and the principles of the brotherhood of man should govern our actions within the schoolhouse and outside as well. This point of view will surely be expounded in every class he teaches, regardless of the title of the course.

At the close of Melby's first year as distinguished professor in the College of Education, a significant event transpired for Melby and for the College--they were to move into the new Education Building, just being completed. The faculty had been scattered about the campus, some of them lodged in highly inadequate offices. Melby relates an anecdote about his own experience in this regard when he joined the College of Education faculty in 1956. He was assigned to an office in the basement of Morrill Hall, one of the older buildings on the campus. Running through his office was some

of the building's plumbing, and on one large pipe in his office there hung the sign "Main Drain." Melby laughs about his first reaction to the sign: "Here I was, just retired from N.Y.U. because of my age, and when I report to my office at Michigan State I find a sign in it that says 'main drain.' I thought to myself, 'has it come to this? I must surely be on the way out!'"

Two years later, however, the new building was ready for occupancy. Just a few days prior to moving into it, an article by Melby (based on an earlier talk) entitled "Thoughts on Moving Day" appeared in The College of Education Quarterly. In the article Melby reflects on some of his past experiences in the light of the impending move. He says:

Monday we are to move into the new Education Building. To me this is no routine move. For the first time in my 33 years of university work, I am to have an office in a new building. Hitherto, the Schools of Education which I have been associated with have been housed in old firetraps unsuited to modern educational purposes. Some critics see a connection between this poor housing and the importance some universities attach to the education of teachers. If there is a connection, Michigan State University holds the preparation of educational personnel to be very important, for it has provided not only a fine building, but an annual budget of considerable size.

.....
Our move comes at a time when colleges of education are entering upon a new phase of their history. I began my teaching at the time when colleges of education were taking form. I lived through the years of rapid growth in public education. I read Dewey's books as they were published, used the first mental and educational tests devised in this country, and saw departments of pedagogy become schools of

education. In a half-century, we have pretty well exhausted both the enthusiasm for teaching methods and the measurement emphasis on whose wave crest our colleges of education rode to size and influence.

Today colleges of education are under fire. It is their success which has brought the attacks. More than any other single agency, they have made possible the education of all the people. But because the enterprise has not made highly literate adults out of all our people, "educationists" get the blame because some of our tasks are unfinished. We do have great unfinished tasks, and many new ones arise out of uses of atomic energy, new world problems, and great social changes. To deal with all of these new challenges, we need an educational effort of new power and creativity.

.....
We must join hands with our colleagues in other colleges and departments. The problems for which we seek solutions call for contributions from many areas of human knowledge...We should seek to do now for teacher education what Abraham Flexner and his followers did for medical education a generation ago.

.....
 In the beginning we were the liberals, the radicals of the university. Now we are the conservatives. We have changed less, nationally, in the last 25 years than our colleges of liberal arts. In the current heated battles over American education, we are not showing up well. The reason is not that we lack ability, but rather that our programs lag behind the challenges of the period we are moving into.

.....
 And how will we actually use our splendid new building? In the past, whatever we accomplished seemed striking because our facilities were so meager. But it will take a great achievement to be even noticeable in this new setting. How will we share the building with other people on the campus? What will we do now that we did not or could not do before? I almost fear moving--maybe because it is the first time I am to have an office that leaves nothing to be wished for. Suddenly I realize that I have always been surrounded by practical deficiencies that could be used to formulate comfortable alibis, and they are to be taken away from me. When I have space, light,

cleanliness, and functional furniture in the perfect office, and have only to lift my telephone in order that a genie can write my letters--what am I going to do for an alibi?⁹

.....

One of the activities that Melby enjoyed most during his early years at Michigan State was an opportunity to serve on the University "Committee on the Future," a group of faculty members appointed by President John A. Hannah to attempt to point out directions for Michigan State University's future. Melby found himself caught up for a time in the pleasures of looking for new dimensions for higher education. The committee members, who had been relieved temporarily of all other duties, met together twice every day and occasionally three times a day. After a few planning meetings they decided to devote two weeks to "brainstorming" to get each other's ideas. They did not consider whether an idea was practical; they simply dreamed. Melby says, "It was exciting; we were asking ourselves what a university like this could do if they set out to do it."

After two weeks of such dreaming one of the committee members said that they really didn't know enough about what the University was already doing. As a result, the committee split into groups to study the present status of the University. Melby, as one might guess, was unhappy about this new direction, and he says:

⁹Ernest O. Melby, "Thoughts on Moving Day," College of Education Quarterly, (Michigan State University, Fall, 1958), p. 34-36.

When we began studying the present we got lost in the complexity of the huge operation; we lost our way and became tired, irritable and confused....When finally we caught ourselves, we decided we must stop and look ahead again at what "should be" and not what "is." Looking at what "is" has a built-in process of defeat--inventory is not creative. You get bogged down and burdened by what "is," and you lose energy to ask, "what can be done."

Sometime later, the College of Education was undertaking a curriculum study and revision involving a large number of the faculty. Speaking to a doctoral student seminar in administration on the process of change, he said:

For a long time at Michigan State we've been talking about reducing the number of courses from a few hundred to forty or so. I guess I'm for it--the catalog is a forest--but what are we doing? We're taking the wine out of small bottles and putting it in big bottles, but it's the same old wine. What we need is some new wine. We need to look out of our building and out into the world. What does it mean--what does it mean for our program in education?¹⁰

To this same class of students he also commented on the lack of stimulation he found in certain faculty activities:

One of the things I miss is a real interchange of ideas. I like a climate in which there is controversy, people taking a stand, looking ahead. I get involved more often in discussing whether we should offer a course in Alpena--just housekeeping! I'm interested in the future, but we don't have enough discussions like this. We need to raise the sights of our college faculties....Caution characterizes our profession far more often than I wish it did; we need some boldness in education. The quality of adventure does not characterize the education profession.¹¹

¹⁰Ernest O. Melby, class lecture, Michigan State University, April 19, 1962.

¹¹Ibid.

On the same subject, that of the caution that he says typifies college faculty members, Melby also told a class of students: "The world changes. How do we move fast enough to keep up? How do we keep alert and 'shake ourselves up' like a pillow? Maybe every university should have a course in 'futureology'." ¹²

It was not only the future that troubled Melby, however, for he also found strong implications for education among such current pressures as the continuing battle of the Cold War, the struggles over school integration, the political climate, and the technological revolution. One of the worries that he expressed concerning the nation's rapid technological development was that the schools were not doing their part to provide some kind of usable training for people who would otherwise be lost in the ranks of the perennially unemployed.

Melby hit at what he considered to be an incongruity in our treatment of the handicapped, pointing out that if a person loses a leg or an arm, society helps to fit him with a new one and teaches him how to use it. And if a person is crippled in other ways, he notes that there are institutions that help him find work. He says:

Let me then try out a notion. If you are culturally depressed or educationally deprived, you're just as crippled as if you had lost your legs, and yet we do very little for such people. If we said everybody has to learn to read, to work with numbers, to develop character, and so on, perhaps we might somehow learn

¹²Ernest O. Melby, class lecture, Michigan State University, May, 1960.

how to do it. Perhaps we would turn out more useful citizens than we do now. Doctors must keep on trying until a person is dead. Suppose we had to keep trying until a person was dead--or "alive." Doctors can't throw the patient on a scrap heap if the first attempt is not a success. But we do; we say to the world, "Here is our program; if you can't fit it and take it, you can't have it; we have nothing else for you."¹³

AND OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM

One of the roles that Erickson hoped Melby would be able to fill at the College of Education was as that of a senior statesman of education to whom faculty members could turn for consultation, advice, and the benefit of his long years of experience. Erickson thought that perhaps Melby would help stimulate growth and enthusiasm among the faculty. It was, in part, for this reason that he was not overly concerned about whether Melby taught or not; he anticipated that young faculty members, especially, might take advantage of Melby's freedom and visit with him and learn from him.

The fact is, the faculty did not fully "utilize" Melby in the way that Erickson had expected and hoped that they would--nor did they do so with the other distinguished professors on the staff with Melby (Floyd Reeves, George S. Counts, Carleton Washburne). In commenting on the failure of the faculty to use him as a source of stimulation for their own thinking, Melby says, "I was not quite so sanguine about this as Dean Erickson was."

¹³Ernest O. Melby, address before Montcalm County School Board Association, Michigan, April 17, 1962.

In analyzing why the relationship between himself and the faculty failed to develop to the degree that Erickson had hoped, Melby says that it is not a reflection on the faculty members here, "because the same thing would have happened if I had moved to Michigan, Ohio State, or any other place."

There is a facet of the kind of self-image that college professors hold that makes it very difficult for them to do what Erickson had hoped they would. Faculty members who have gone through the regimen of training for their doctor's degree and are on the way toward establishing themselves as authorities in their fields, feel that it is in some way an indication of their lack of ability if they should go to someone, especially someone much older, to ask for help. Asking for help becomes an admission of some degree of inadequacy, and young faculty members just beginning to make their way, are, with a few exceptions, unwilling to project any image of themselves as "needing help." When Melby was asked about this situation he noted that when the procedure was reversed and he asked faculty members to help him, they were only too willing to be of assistance.

It would be inaccurate if the impression were given that the faculty did not benefit from or make use of Melby in this way at all, for they did. Some have used Melby in just the way that Erickson had hoped they would, and both formally and informally Melby has had an effect on the thinking of many of the faculty members of the College of Education.

Many faculty members have spoken of the inspiration it has been for them to have had Melby on the staff with them. Young faculty members, particularly, to whom Melby had been primarily a "great name," testify that "it was a real shot in the arm for me to work side by side with Ernest Melby." This is an intangible but a very definite influence.

Others have mentioned that simply knowing that Melby was on the staff, knowing what he stood for, and knowing that he would support them if they asked him to, became a source of strength.

When Melby first arrived at the College of Education he exerted a very immediate kind of influence on faculty and students alike. He was in great demand to visit other faculty members' classes and to sit in on planning sessions with the faculty; he quickly became very much involved in the life of the College. Moreover, his influence extended beyond the College and into the larger University because of his speaking activity before quite diversified University groups. Quite naturally, the activity slowed down somewhat as his years at Michigan State increased, but he is still asked to speak frequently before a variety of campus organizations ranging from the Housemothers Association, to the International Club.

In addition to Melby's speaking at the University, the busy round of outside speaking which he had followed at New York continues unabated. He always receives far more requests than he can possibly fill.

Melby seldom refuses when requested to speak, unless it is virtually impossible to fit it into his schedule. Since the time he started speaking frequently, in the early 1930's, he has given over 2,000 addresses or other formal presentations as a panel member or consultant. Without doubt, Melby could turn the demand for his presence as a speaker into a profitable venture, but he has no fee of any kind for his appearances, nor has he ever had one. If he receives a gratuity he accepts it graciously, and if none is given, he accepts it in the same spirit. When asked by the person requesting him to speak what his fee is, he tells him to do as he likes about any financial arrangement, but that he has no fee which he expects to be paid.

As before, crucial, contemporary issues in education and society formed the backdrop which Melby used in his addresses. Speaking in 1961, Melby scorned the Russian super-bombs as being the real danger to the American people. Instead, he said:

A system of high ideals and values will fall to an evil, destructive system, because they are working with zeal and dedication, while we are unconcerned.... Education is our first line of defense, not nuclear warheads. Yet educators, too, are indifferent to the crisis. If we had to depend on our universities to lead us to victory one couldn't be very hopeful... We say we believe in education, but half of our high school graduates do not go to college. The Russians boast free university education, but here in Michigan we seem to be only concerned with making it more expensive and inaccessible.... We are living in a new world. The world you were born in is dead, yet many people, like some legislators, are still living in the old world, trying to revive it, trying to prevent

the birth of the new world, refusing to acknowledge that it is here. If we would but re-examine our heritage, and truly live it in this world which is groping for ideals, there would be a renaissance in America and we would achieve a victory heard around the world.¹⁴

Three weeks later Melby appeared before the Western New York School Board Institute, and again he spoke on major educational and national issues. On the topic of federal aid, he said, "Do you know why we do not have the federal government harnessed to education in this country? It is because we do not think education is very important. If we thought it were important we could have harnessed the federal government to it in a major way a long time ago."¹⁵

He then reproved the school board members for their lack of faith in teachers and in education, and he blamed them for the small numbers of their communities' young men who go into education. Melby said:

It is because they think people like you, the leading citizens of their community, do not think teachers are very important people....Teaching is not for your son; teaching is for somebody else's son. I admonish you that not until the American community begins to celebrate teaching, to celebrate education and to see that leadership in education is the most sacred, productive, and creative thing that a boy or girl can do are we going to get plenty of qualified people in teaching....You can raise the salaries all you want to, however, you are not going to get the cream of the crop until these youngsters

¹⁴Ernest O. Melby, speech before Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, November 3, 1961, Michigan State University, Information Services, news release.

¹⁵Ernest O. Melby, speech at Western New York School Board Institute, November 30, 1961, Speech contained in "The School Board Considers: Why Do We Support Public Education?" A Report of the Western New York School Board Institute, p.21.

are convinced not only by what you say but by what you do that you believe in education and that you would be proud of your son if he would go into teaching.¹⁶

In the past there were some individuals who looked askance at Melby's full speaking schedule and felt that he might better have stayed around the university and attended to its administration. Now, Melby had a new freedom in this respect. He could accept or reject requests to speak, according to the ability that he felt he had to comply with them, but he no longer needed to fear that administrative tasks were being neglected as some had charged.¹⁷ Melby was deluged with requests to speak when he first arrived in Michigan; there were far more requests for him to speak than he could possibly accept, in spite of his willingness to make twelve or fifteen addresses and talks a month. A separate file of requests for him to speak was kept his first year at Michigan State, and at the end of the year, even though he had traveled and spoken extensively, the pile of requests that he could not accept was bigger than the pile of those that he had accepted.

Melby's speaking was in itself a major contribution to Michigan State University. When Erickson was asked whether

¹⁶Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁷Walter Anderson says that administration was a worry to Melby and that today, relieved of it, Melby is more like he was when they first met in the 1920's.

he felt Melby's speaking was a contribution to the College of Education, he replied: "Very definitely. If he did just that and nothing else, it would be worth every cent we pay him. How could you find a man who could to around and represent us any more effectively than Ernest Melby?"¹⁸

Melby's writing slackened its pace considerably-- only a trickle of articles by him appeared in professional journals now, whereas while at New York University he produced an imposing number (see Bibliography). Those that he did write, however, still had the familiar ring in their titles. Among them were: "Education and Opportunity," "Do We Really Want Russian Education," "Education is the Ultimate Weapon," and "Citizen Action in Education-Centered Communities."

In addition to his journal articles while at Michigan State, Melby also wrote, Education for Renewed Faith in Freedom, the thirty-first volume in the Kappa Delta Pi lecture series.¹⁹ What Melby did in the book was, really, to compile into one treatise many of the concerns for education, and the solutions he proposes, that he already touched on in earlier writing and speaking. This explication of them was a great deal more lucid and carefully done, however,

¹⁸Statement by Clifford E. Erickson, personal interview.

¹⁹Ernest O. Melby, Education for Renewed Faith in Freedom (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1959).

than those in some of his speeches and articles. In his preface, he said: "In this brief volume I have tried to put down a view of the current status of freedom and free education, of how we lost our way, and of what the American heritage and the state of world affairs mean for education, plus a few observations on the kind of education we need and how we can get it."²⁰

The element of faith is a major tenet of his point of view in the book: faith in the historical promise of America, faith in education, faith in freedom, faith in people. It is Melby's fear, as he expresses it in this work, that Americans have lost some of their faith in freedom. He cites our dependence on force rather than ideas in foreign policy, excesses of McCarthyism, our feelings of lost prestige around the world, and our tendency to blame education for most of our ills, as evidences of our loss of faith in freedom.

Melby says:

Here is the key to the problem of recovering our faith: both as individuals and as a people, we must have something outside us and beyond us that can serve as the focus of our affections. People who think only of themselves have bad mental health. People who seek money and power wind up poor in things of the spirit. Our tradition of freedom, respect for individual human beings, and human brotherhood gives each of us, as well as our nation, something to live for, something "outside us and beyond us" to which we can give ourselves. It becomes a primary purpose of education to teach these values not only by word of mouth but in action through the life of the school, the living example of the teacher, and the total influence of the community.²¹

²⁰Ibid., p.X

²¹Ibid., p. 80.

The "total influence of the community" as an integral part of the education process was a belief of long standing for Melby. Part of his reason for coming to Michigan State University was his understanding that the University was one which was vitally interested in extending the University into the communities of the state. Melby's hopes for making higher education a vital force in the community were successful in Montana but were chopped off short of fulfillment; every plan he had come up with in New York had been hopelessly dashed because of lack of interest or funds. "Now," he thought, "at last I shall be in a place where something can be done about community education."

Not long after his arrival at Michigan State, Melby, after being invited to a meeting with President John A. Hannah and the vice-presidents to discuss the community development program, found out that the University's projects in community development were not at all what he had in mind--to Melby it involved a lot more than "helping a community get a new sewer system." Not only was Melby disappointed in what was discussed about the University's program for community development, but he found that after this initial meeting he was never consulted or asked for his advice. Once again, Melby's great desire to move the university off the campus had been met with frustration.

Meanwhile in Flint, Michigan, Melby found a partial outlet for his interest in community-centered education.

The Flint Community School Movement quickly drew Melby's interest and support, and he has played an active role in Flint as a consultant and a participant in the various activities related to the movement.

As a by-product of his interest and work in Flint, Melby was instrumental in helping organize the Mott Foundation Project of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. The program is an inter-institutional workshop in educational administration, involving the seven state-supported colleges and universities in Michigan: University of Michigan, Wayne State University, Michigan State University, Eastern Michigan University, Western Michigan University, Central Michigan University, and Northern Michigan College.

Sponsored by the Mott Foundation, in cooperation with the Flint Community Schools and the seven state institutions, the workshop's purpose is to provide a unique kind of training for school administrators by bringing to Flint outstanding speakers from the various disciplines and relating their concepts to the Flint Community Schools and to school administration in general. Students from each of the seven state schools participate in the workshop and become acquainted with the community school philosophy and program in Flint.

A CONTINUING CONTRIBUTION

Melby seems to need constantly a project of some kind to which he can lend his support. In his days as an administrator he had no shortage of projects, but in his "retirement"

years, while enjoying the reward of personal and professional freedom, he has had fewer projects on which he could expend his energy.

A shortage of energy, even though Melby is now over 71 years old, is not a noticeable problem for him. His teaching is still performed with the same zest and conviction that characterized it in his days at Northwestern. His traveling and speaking have continued unabated, and he remains today, as he has always been, a voracious reader. There has really been no retirement for Ernest Melby; furthermore, he has no plans for retirement. It is incomprehensible to him that some of his acquaintances have been able to retire to a life of total inactivity. For Melby, there are still battles to be fought--and won.

He continues to make a contribution to American education. At Michigan State University, as at Northwestern, students still flock to his classes, for Melby is no ordinary instructor. His method, his speech, his concerns, his conviction, and his great humility make him an unusual and effective teacher.

A final description and assessment of Melby's years at Michigan State University cannot yet be given, for as a current member of the staff his activities and influence continue. In the meantime, his contributions to education through the years do not go unrecognized. The Alumni Association of the New York University School of Education has instituted the "Ernest O. Melby Award" for outstanding

contributions in the area of human relations. It's most recent recipient was Abraham I. Katsh, for his work in inter-cultural and inter-faith activities in New York City.

Just six months ago in Atlantic City, New Jersey, the American Association of School Administrators presented Melby with the Association's distinguished service award-- another reward after almost 49 years in education. The citation reads:

As small town superintendent, as dean of a great university, and as chancellor of a state system of higher education, Ernest O. Melby demonstrated over and over again the integrity, kindly humanness, moral earnestness, and special spirit of one leading his colleagues toward a destiny only man can dare claim. For forty years his powerful voice has been heard throughout America. Without quavering or faltering in peacetime and in war, this man begs public education to neglect not one single boy or girl. Thus he has achieved a special skill in human engineering so essential to superior school administration.

The American Association of School Administrators is honored to present him this award for distinction in school administration. ²²

Forty-nine years earlier, on graduating from St. Olaf College, Ernest Melby accepted a high school teaching position in tiny Alexandria, Minnesota, because he needed to earn money to go to law school. It was an inauspicious and unpromising beginning for such a rich career.

²² Citation by American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 19, 1962.

CHAPTER VI

A SUMMING UP

Ernest O. Melby will soon have completed his fiftieth year of service in American education. His career parallels a period in history marked by rapid and startling changes, turmoil, great technological advancement, much tragedy and yet, in some ways, real triumph. When Melby's career began, people scoffed at air travel as a kind of pipe dream; the automobile had only recently become an accepted part of the American scene. New modes of transportation and communications shrunk the world overnight. There is no longer any such political policy as "isolationism", which some Americans once propounded. A remarkably small world has magnified the problems between nations; the brotherhood of man is of more urgent concern today than it ever was before.

Education in the last half-century has also been characterized by great change. When Melby began his teaching, the benefits of a high school and college education were denied to many. Today American education is edging closer to the time when the principle of "education for all" will become a reality. Melby's own span of years of professional education coincides closely with the birth and

demise of the Progressive Education Association. Melby, himself, wonders if there will ever be a period in America as exciting as the one he lived through in the 1920's and 1930's. The past half-century of education has been a period of ferment, dissatisfaction, experimentation, innovation, and controversy. The events, and the people who shaped them, have become a part of educational history, but their influence goes on.

During these fifty years Melby has been a high school teacher, principal, superintendent, college professor, dean, college president, and chancellor of a state system of higher education. He has served as a teacher or administrator in ten schools or universities, in five different states: Minnesota, Illinois, Montana, New York, and Michigan. His speaking has taken him to every state in the Union, except South Carolina and Nevada.

It is impossible, of course, to measure the amount of influence that Melby has had on American education. He has made significant contributions to the institutions he has served; he has had a major influence on many of the people who have served with him. He has, however, had criticism along with praise.

THE ADMINISTRATOR

Certain criticisms of Melby's administration have already been cited in the previous chapters of this work. Some

of his critics have said that Melby was really not a good administrator in terms of the details of administration-- budgeting, records, submitting reports on time, getting the catalog out to meet a deadline. To Melby this is "housekeeping"; he knows it has to be done, but he would rather have somebody else do it. These kinds of details held no interest for him whatsoever. He tended at times to carry on business by "gentlemen's agreement." Because he did not always spell things out clearly, encouragement from him was sometimes misconstrued as a promise. In his enthusiasm for an idea or a project, Melby would sometimes not realize that what was clear to him was not always clear to his associates.

If one places his highest premium solely on these more mechanical aspects of administration, then Melby may be measured as an administrator and found wanting. There are, however, other dimensions of administration. Melby had a great capacity for leadership, and he has demonstrated this at each institution he served. He had unique ability in rallying people around a cause.

The School of Education at Northwestern during Melby's tenure as dean was a living monument to his industry and inspiration. By his persuasiveness and enthusiasm he convinced people that Northwestern was an exciting place to teach, and he granted people the freedom to help make it so. He had a keen eye for faculty members who could make contributions. Henry Heald, who was chancellor of New York University while

Melby was dean, says that Melby's biggest contribution to the School of Education was the faculty that he brought to it.¹ While Heald takes note of Melby's dislike for administrative details, he pays credit to his inspirational leadership as a dean. Melby saw it as his job to identify people who could make contributions, bring them to the institution, convince them that he believed in them, and then free them to be creative. Some people have criticized him, however, for bringing not so much creative men as "Melby men."

There is no question but that Melby had shortcomings in the area of administrative details. It was true at Northwestern, at Montana, and at New York University. (At New York, however, Melby had a good-sized staff of associate and assistant deans who bore part of the load of details.) It could be argued that it was Melby's ability to concern himself less with details and more with ideas and inspiration that made him a successful administrator and, in the final analysis, made the greatest contribution to the institution. It is far easier to find people who can care for administrative details than it is to find those who can truly exert dynamic administrative leadership. It is possible to find a high degree of both in one person, but it is not probable that it will be found often. As important as a tidy administration is, it is not tidiness but creativity and enthusiasm that move people and that build colleges.

¹Statement by Henry Heald, personal interview.

Melby would never have been considered as a great college dean or university president if he had been measured on the basis of the attention and efficiency with which he dealt with details. If he had concerned himself more with details and less with inspiration, he might have left a small mark indeed on the places he served; in retrospect, it would have been noted that he was an efficient administrator--but nothing very exciting happened.

Melby's administration was built on a concept of human relations. Fritz Borgeson, a professor at New York University, says that as an administrator "Melby lived what he preached...he injected democracy into the administration." ² In speaking of his own relationship to Melby, Borgeson said that he found his personal experiences, while working with him "gratifying," and that Melby gave him "tremendous freedom." The "faith in people that Melby preached about," says Borgeson, "he actually demonstrated in practice."

Faculty members who served with Melby developed an intense loyalty to him. He had his enemies, of course, but in the main he had the support of his faculty. And Melby fought battles for his faculty; he demonstrated this in his early days at Blackduck and Long Prairie; and again at Northwestern, Montana, and New York. Walter Anderson says, "Ernest Melby had a record of standing behind his faculty--whether he agreed with them or not...he had the

² Statement by Fritz Borgeson, personal interview.

courage to stand up and be counted when needed...he is genuinely loved--he generates affection--while people will point out his shortcomings, they don't want to talk about them."³

Melby demonstrated to an unusual degree the ability to develop warm, human relationships with the staff. Ordway Tead says that Melby, as much as anyone he knows, has grasped the meaning of and used the "art" of administration about which he (Tead) has written.⁴ Melby, himself, comments frequently and favorably on the work of Tead and believes that administration is an art and not a science.

In the only sizeable piece of writing that Melby has done on administration as a profession, Administering Community Education, he puts a heavy emphasis on the human relations side of the enterprise.⁵ In this text, however, he does not really apply himself to the question of "what is administration"; it becomes, instead, a part of the whole fabric of belief in democracy, in people, a dedication to freedom, and the promotion of the concept of the community school. Melby, with his unbounded faith in people, argues that the key to successful administration lies in one's belief in the value and integrity of the staff and in

³Statement by Walter A. Anderson, personal interview.

⁴Statement by Ordway Tead, personal interview. See Ordway Tead, The Art of Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951).

⁵Ernest O. Melby, Administering Community Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1955).

the communication of this belief to them by the way you relate to them.

Melby's philosophy of administration and of education are both based on his strong belief in people. He has been criticized by people who have heard him express his views as being a visionary; he has been criticized for not being practical enough, in that what he says sounds good, but he does not follow and explain how his point of view should be put into practice. He was not always able to translate his deep convictions into operational terms.

Melby has also been criticized for being an idealist. His boundless faith in humanity leaves some people a little bewildered; he is accused of being naive in the ways of the world. Not everyone can share Melby's belief in people, and those who cannot do so find his faith idealistic and impractical. For Melby, a deep faith in people is practical. He has no doubts that people will respond properly if they are treated as having worth and dignity.

Melby is not known as a great scholar, nor is he known primarily as a philosopher in the sense that some of his contemporaries such as Dewey, Counts, and Kilpatrick were. Ordway Tead, however, while agreeing that Melby did not make the same kind of philosophical contributions that these men did, says:

Melby took their democratic points of view and gave them life, meaning and vitality...he was a great and gifted stimulator. His integrity, democratic conviction and purpose show through in an appealing way. ⁶

⁶Statement by Ordway Tead, personal interview.

A strikingly similar observation was made by C.O. Arndt: "Things that Kilpatrick and Dewey wrote about, these Melby lived himself, and he talked about them in such a way that you understood them. In this he was a great educator. He could make these principles understood and popularize them."⁷

THE EVANGELIST

For many years Melby has been a gifted and dedicated spokesman for American education. In this role he may well have made his greatest contribution. Things which he did for institutions are part of the record. One can list programs, names of faculty members whom he brought, curriculum revisions, and other such activities. The contribution he made as spokesman is not so easily identified or described. In this role he had an effect on people and on their understanding of education and of the world around them. Henry Heald believes that Melby's biggest contribution to American education has been "his ability to talk about education... his ability to inspire people about it...I always look forward to hearing Ernest Melby speak, and I always come away with inspiration."⁸

⁷ Statement by C.O. Arndt, personal interview.

⁸ Statement by Henry T. Heald, personal interview.

Melby has been an inspirational figure; he has the ability to generate enthusiasm in his listener. He does this for his students, and this is one reason his classes are so full--students want the stimulation of his lectures, a refreshing break from the sophistication and colorlessness of much of the teaching to which they are exposed; he captivates his audiences in the same way. Curiously, Melby's speeches and lectures seem to have a meaning and power far beyond the words that are used to convey his message.

Melby, in his own person, seems to convey an ethical appeal that gives a special quality of sincerity to what he says. The peculiar emphasis he gives to certain words and phrases in his speech and the meaningful pauses and toss of the head are a vital part of his message. He communicates with his listeners when he speaks just as much because of what he is as what he says. A rhetorician analyzing Melby's speeches would find that many of them are not profound, that they do not "read" well, and that occasionally they seem to be lacking in organization. The heart of the speech cannot be found in this way; Melby, by the impact of his own personality, imparts to the speech the missing quality.

Not all of Melby's speeches take people to the heights. It would be impossible for anyone lecturing as often as he does to produce a masterful address every time. The amazing thing is that he can do so as consistently as he does. At

his best he can move an audience deeply and call forth new commitments to education from students. His speeches appeal to reason and to common sense, but they also make a strong emotional appeal. Melby has the unique ability to sense the tenor of an audience, to sense it and to sway them.

Ellis White, formerly president of Fitchburg State College, Massachusetts, credits an address by Melby as the starting point in a new era of success for the State College. Melby was the featured speaker at White's inauguration as president of Fitchburg, and in his speech he jibed at Governor Dever (who was attending the inauguration) concerning the governor's highway construction signs reading, "Pardon the delay...." Melby said he wondered if some day someone would have the courage to say, "Pardon the delay, but on this site will be built a great new educational institution." White says that he was relieved that all laughed, including Governor Dever. "Then," says White, "Melby went on and gave a rousing talk on the need for citizens and legislatures to see their responsibility to support education....This, in part, led the Governor and the legislature to act...Fitchburg got appropriations for alteration and repairs for one year that exceeded all the amounts of previous years since 1895. Melby's talk was the start for this."⁹

⁹Statement by Ellis White, personal interview.

Melby came on the educational scene at a propitious time. Education needed spokesmen. Melby has filled this role since 1930, both within the classroom and across the country. Clifford Erickson, who knew Melby at the beginning of his career, and then thirty years later brought him to Michigan State University, analyzes Melby's role in education thusly:

Melby came on the educational scene in America when we were moving into a rapid development of the American high school...with the popularization of secondary education came the popularization and development of higher education to the practical, productive and economic improvement of our society....

Melby's contribution came concurrent with these developments; it was his great ability to verbalize the important role of education in a democratic society in terms of providing an educational experience appropriate for every student, for a constructive, productive role in society. Melby's ability to verbalize these things at this time played an important part in the evolution of our educational system.

If, for instance, Melby had been a Bestor and started out 30 years ago saying "restrict educational opportunities, don't build high schools, don't have vocational education, don't make education practical," he could have played a very negative role in American higher education. But here came a strong and powerful voice, a voice that was beating in sympathy with certain cultural, economic, and political social developments in America, and he was able to verbalize this. You can say, 'it didn't take a Melby to do this,' but it took somebody to do this, and it took somebody who was beating in sympathy with his times, and Melby was.

I think Melby's great contribution was his ability to respond in an enthusiastic, understanding, sympathetic, and feeling way with the development of the culture in which he is living. This is best attested to now by the fact that he doesn't talk so much anymore about vocational education or about education being useful. His concerns now are with the international field and about how we are going to get along with each other.

Here again is the same voice talking again about the needs of our culture and in tune with our culture.... Melby's great strength has been his ability to put into words these ideas and concepts that were developing in our culture and to give them coherence, visibility and, in a sense, to take the American people where they were and help sell them on what they were trying to do. He helped the American people verbalize their own aims and ambitions; this, it seems to me, is Melby's great contribution.¹⁰

Melby was the kind of a voice that Erickson describes because he became, as he suggests others should, lost in a cause far greater than himself. Throughout his life, education, other people, and the welfare of humanity took first place; Ernest Melby came next. His admonition to the graduating class in Montana, that they should find a cause to which they could devote themselves, came to pass in his own life. People are different because they have known Melby. To this author, faculty members who served under Melby made such statements as: "He has been an important person in my life"; "He has meant more to me in my life than any human being"; "I feel deep gratitude to Melby for making my life better-- I shall never forget him." Melby frequently quotes the words of Jesus: "He that loses his life shall find it." This has become a reality to Melby, for he gave himself unstintingly to the cause of education and humanity without thought of prestige or praise, and he has received a full measure of both.

Melby has preached his message of faith wherever people have been willing to listen. What he has preached and lived in his life-time needs to be repeated again and again:

¹⁰Statement by Clifford E. Erickson, personal interview.

Faith in people, faith in freedom, faith in America, faith in education. The need for such today is as great as ever before, and the powerful voice of an evangelist like Melby is still needed to rouse people to action. Melby, himself, lives the faith that he advocates, and it is by his life as much as by his words that he has influenced and continues to influence American education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. LIST OF WORKS CITED

1. Books

Arndt, Christian O.; Charles McConnell; and Ernest O. Melby. New Schools for a New Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Blegen, Theodore C. and Theodore L. Nydahl. Minnesota History. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Cremin, Lawrence D. Transformation of the School. New York: Knopf, 1961.

Federal Writers Project. Minnesota. New York: Viking Press, 1938.

Good, H.G. A History of Western Education. Second Edition. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960.

Gunther, John. Inside U.S.A. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Howard, Joseph Kinsey. Montana: High, Wide and Handsome. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Kraenzel, Carl F.; Watson Thomson and Glenn H. Craig. The Northern Plains in a World of Change. Toronto: Sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, Northern Great Plains Agricultural Advisory Council, and Canadian Association for Adult Education, 1942.

Langer, William L. An Encyclopedia of World History. Revised Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952.

Melby, Ernest O. Administering Community Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

_____. American Education Under Fire. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1951.

_____. Education for Renewed Faith in Freedom. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1959.

_____. The Education of Free Men. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1955.

_____, and Morton Puner (eds.). Freedom and Public Education. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1953.

_____. The Organization and Administration of Supervision. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1931.

Poston, Richard W. Small Town Renaissance. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Rickover, Hyman G. Education and Freedom. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1959.

Tead, Ordway. The Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Tenenbaum, Samuel. William Heard Kilpatrick. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Toole, K. Ross. Montana an Uncommon Land. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959.

2. Bulletins, Periodicals, and Yearbooks

"Goodbye Messrs. Chips," Time, 68:65, July 16, 1956.

Helping Communities Help Themselves, New York State Citizens Council, Inc., Syracuse, 1956.

Howard, Joseph Kinsey. "Golden River," Harpers Magazine, May, 1945.

Melby, Ernest O. "Authoritarianism: Enslaving Yoke of Nations and Schools," Clearing House, 13: 195-99, December, 1938.

_____. "Creative Human Relations," Progressive Education, 16:307, May, 1939.

_____. "Cultural Freedom and Release of Creativity," Education Digest, 19:14, March, 1954.

_____. "Dishonest and Unjustified," National Education Association Journal, October, 1951.

_____. "Problems in the Evaluation of Supervision," Educational Method, 10:514-18, June, 1931.

_____. "Thoughts on Moving Day," College of Education Quarterly, Michigan State University, Fall, 1958, pp. 34-36.

_____. "Training for Instructional Leadership,"
Educational Method, 15:343, April, 1936.

_____. "We Had Better Freedomize Society,"
School Executive, 60:66, February, 1951.

_____ and James M. Hughes. "Organizing the
 High School for Supervision," American School Board
 Journal, 81:59, November, 1930.

_____ and James M. Hughes. "Organizing the
 High School for Supervision," Northwestern University
 Contributions to Education. Monograph Series No. 4.
 Evanston, 1930.

_____ and Melvina F. Palmer. "Health Education
 in Small School Systems," Bulletin of University of
 Minnesota. College of Education. May 17, 1926.

Northwestern Alumni News, Evanston, May, 1938.

"The President's Report," Northwestern University Bulletin,
 36:, April 13, 1936.

_____, 41:, December 30, 1940.

"Report of the Chancellor," New York University, 1945-1946.

"Report of the Chancellor," New York University, 1946-1947.

"Report of the Dean of the School of Education," A Digest
 of Reports of Officers to the Chancellor of the
 University, 1945-1946, New York University.

_____ 1946-1947.

_____ 1947-1948.

_____ 1948-1949.

St. Olaf College Bulletin, Northfield, Minnesota. 58:169,
 April, 1962.

Thorndike, Edward L. "The Nature, Purposes, and General
 Methods of Measurements of Educational Products,"
 p. 16. Seventeenth Yearbook of the National Society
 for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois:
 Public School Publishing Company, 1918.

3. Letters and Telegrams

Melby, Ernest O., Letter to the Montana State Board of Education, March 31, 1945.

_____. Letter to the Montana State Board of Education, April 24, 1944.

Sargeant, Grace. Letter to author, July 19, 1962.

Scow, Alberta. Letter to author, July 12, 1962.

Telegram to Ernest O. Melby from American Federation of Labor Convention Headquarters, Seattle, October 11, 1941.

Telegram to Ernest O. Melby from Citizens Schools Committee of Chicago, October 11, 1941.

Telegram to Ernest O. Melby from North Division High School, Milwaukee, October 11, 1941.

4. Newspapers

Atlanta Constitution, November 21, 1954.

Bozeman Daily Chronicle, September 26, 1941.

_____, April 15, 1943.

Butte Daily Post, January 28, 1942.

Chicago Tribune, April 25, 1934.

Daily Missoulian, October 26, 1941.

_____, November 1, 1941.

_____, December 9, 1941.

_____, January 22, 1942.

_____, April 14, 1943.

_____, June 2, 1945.

Denver Post, June 29, 1952.

Evanston Daily News-Index, June 11, 1934.

_____, October 6, 1934.

_____, September 12, 1935.

Great Falls Tribune, June 3, 1945.

Guernsey, George. "Old College Notes," Northwestern Daily, Evanston, June 28, 1935.

The Herald, Birmingham, date unknown.

Melby, Ernest O. "This I Believe," New York Herald Tribune, March 10, 1952.

_____. "We Must Have More and Better Teachers," New York Times Magazine, May 12, 1946, p. 55.

Milwaukee Sentinel, November 6, 1936.

Montana Herald-Record, Helena, February 9, 1942.

The Montana Kaimin, Montana State University, Missoula, October 30, 1941.

_____, November 25, 1941.

_____, December 9, 1941.

_____, September 25, 1942.

_____, May 21, 1943.

_____, June 1, 1945 (extra).

The Montana Standard, Anaconda, January 22, 1942.

Montana Standard, Butte, November 18, 1941.

_____, April 16, 1942.

Montana State University News, vol. 4, October, 1941.

Newsday, Garden City, New York, November 20, 1951.

_____, November 29, 1951.

Newspaper clipping, source unknown, May 8, 1935.

New York Herald Tribune, February 18, 1956.

New York Times, April 27, 1949.

_____, February 18, 1956.

Northwestern Daily, Evanston, July 3, 1936.

Park Region Echo, Alexandria, Minnesota, May 5, 1938.

_____, February 18, 1956.

Spokane Daily Chronicle, April 9, 1942.

_____, April 7, 1950.

Square Daily, New York, April 17, 1953.

Times-Picayune, New Orleans, May 24, 1937.

"The University Chancellor and the Task Ahead," Choteau Acantha, Montana, May 30, 1946.

Valley News, Lebanon, Illinois, December 14, 1954.

The Western News, Hamilton, Montana, April 29, 1943.

Worcester Daily Telegram, October 21, 1950.

The Yonkers Record, April 12, 1953.

5. Unpublished Materials

Bienvenu, Harold J. "The Educational Career of Grayson Neikerk Kefauver." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, San Francisco, 1956.

Citation of Ernest O. Melby by American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 19, 1962.

Mansfield, Senator Michael J. Commencement address given at Michigan State University, June 10, 1962.

Melby, Ernest O. "Better Teaching for What?" Address at the NEA Regional Instruction Conference, Toledo, Ohio, April 5, 1951.

_____. "Christianity, Social Justice and World Peace." Address, Montana State University, Missoula, June 3, 1945.

_____. Diary, 1945-1961.

_____. "The Role of a State University." Inaugural address given at Montana State University, Missoula, Montana, December 8, 1941.

_____. "Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming." Provost's Lecture, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 24, 1962.

_____. Scrapbooks, three volumes, 1930-1956.

_____. Address before Montcalm County School Board Association, Michigan, April, 1962.

_____. Speech contained in "The School Board Considers Why Do We Support Public Education?" A Report of the Western New York School Board Institute, Buffalo, November 30, 1961.

_____. Address before Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, November 3, 1961.

Price, John F. "Evaluation of a Great Teacher," graduate paper, Michigan State University, July, 1962.

B. CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WORKS OF ERNEST O. MELBY

1. Books

Diagnostic and Remedial Teaching (with Leo J. Brueckner).
Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.

The Organization and Administration of Supervision.
Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1931.

New Schools for a New Culture (with Charles M. MacConnell and Christian O. Arndt). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Mobilizing Educational Resources for Winning the War (ed.).
New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

American Education Under Fire. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1951.

Israel: Problems of Nation Building (with Emil Lengyel).
New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1951.

Freedom and Public Education (ed.) (with Morton Puner).
New York: F.A. Praeger, 1953.

Administering Community Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

The Education of Free Men. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1955.

Education for Renewed Faith in Freedom. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1959.

2. Periodicals, Bulletins, and Yearbooks

"Health Education in Small School Systems" (with Melvina F. Palmer), Bulletin of University of Minnesota, College of Education, May 17, 1926.

"Practicable Technique for Determining the Relative Effectiveness of Different Methods of Teaching" (with Agnes Lien), Journal of Educational Research, 19:255-64, April, 1929.

"Supervisory Organizations in Cities of 10-20,000 in Population," American School Board Journal, 78:57-8, April, 1929.

"Problems in the Training and Selection of the Superintendent of Schools," American School Board Journal, 79:38, November, 1929.

"Organization of High School Supervision in Certain Cities," School Review, 37:736-46, December, 1929.

"Superintendent and the Organization of Supervision," Educational Administration and Supervision, 15:641-54, December, 1929.

"Critical Study of the Existing Organization and Administration of Supervision," Northwestern University Contributions to Education, School of Education, 1929.

"Some Current Practices in Music Supervision," Music Supervisors National Conference Journal of Proceedings, 1929, pp. 564-72.

"Organizing the High School for Supervision" (with James Monroe Hughes), American School Board Journal, 81:59, November, 1930.

"Supervision of Instruction in High School; a Study of Techniques and Organization," (with James Monroe Hughes), Northwestern University Contributions to Education, Series No. 4, 1930.

"Cross Section of Teaching in Terms of Classroom Activities" (with James Monroe Hughes), Educational Method, 10:285-9, February, 1931.

"Is Administration Keeping Pace with Educational Advancement?" (with H.J. Otto), Educational Administration and Supervision, 17:183-90, March, 1931.

- "Evaluation of Graduate Teacher Training Programs" (with James Monroe Hughes), Journal of Educational Research, 23:394-403, May, 1931.
- "Problems in the Evaluation of Supervision," Educational Method, 10:514-18, June, 1931.
- "Place of the Special Subjects." Curriculum Making in Current Practice, Northwestern University, pp.37-46, 1931.
- "Teacher Evaluation of Supervisory Procedure." National Conference of Superintendents and Directors of Institutes, 2nd Yearbook, pp. 237-51, 1931.
- "Can We Be Creative in Supervision?", Educational Method, 12:129-33, December, 1932.
- "Indispensible Services in Supervision," National Education Proceedings, pp. 692-4, 1933.
- "Attempt to Evaluate the Threat of Failure as a Factor in Achievements" (with H.J. Otto), Elementary School Journal, 35:588-96, April, 1935.
- "Some Problems in Measurement," Education, 56:170-4, November, 1935.
- "Changes in Organization, Administration and Supervision." Application of Research Findings to Current Educational Practices. Official Report, American Education Research Association, pp.162-4, 1935.
- "Training for Instructional Leadership," Educational Method, 15:339-43, April, 1936.
- "Supervision," Review of Educational Research, 6:324-36, June, 1936.
- "Building a Philosophy of Leadership," School Executive, 56:17-19, September, 1936.
- "Needed Changes in Secondary Education as a Result of Compulsory Education." Education for Dynamic Citizenship. Pennsylvania University School of Education, pp. 146-9.
- "New Concepts of Educational Leadership." Education for Dynamic Citizenship. Pennsylvania University School of Education, pp. 13-20.
- "How Can the Association Best Sense the Needs and Interests of its Membership Institutions?", Secondary Schools North Central Association Quarterly, 11:381-5, April, 1937.

- "Authoritarianism: Enslaving Yoke of Nations and Schools," Clearing House, 13:195-9, December, 1938.
- "Elementary School of Tomorrow." New York (state) University. Proceedings of the Seventy-fourth Convocation, 1938, pp.18-24.
- "Business Education as General Education: Its Relation to Personality Growth and Social Progress." National Commercial Teachers Federation Business Curriculum Sixth Yearbook, pp.152-6, 1938.
- "Administrators and Academic Freedom," American Teacher, 23:20-1, February, 1939.
- "Creative Human Relations," Progressive Education, 16:305-7, May, 1939.
- "Comprehensive Concept of Evaluation," Curriculum Journal, 10:300-3, November, 1939.
- "Critique." National Society for the Study of Education 38th Yearbook, Part 1. p. 439-42, 1939.
- "Portrait" (with F.E. Baker), Nations Schools, 25:34, March, 1940.
- "Can a Creative Secondary School Be Developed?", Educational Trends, 8:3-4, March, 1940.
- "Progressive Education and the World Crisis," National Parent-Teacher, 35:18, August, 1940.
- "Progressive Education and the National Defense," Educational Trends, 8:8-14, November, 1940.
- "Theses on the Internal Control of Education." National Education Association Proceedings, 1940, pp.182-3.
- "Leadership and Control within the School System." Mobilizing Educational Resources. John Dewey Society, pp. 205-22, 1940.
- "Needed: New Conception of Educational Control" (with K.D. Benne). Mobilizing Educational Resources. John Dewey Society, pp.16-35, 1940.
- "Teacher Education Comes of Age," Educational Trends, 9:1-2, January, 1941.
- "Art in Human Relationships," Montana Education, 18:3, January, 1942.

- "Education Needs Leaders," Frontier Democracy, 9:62-3, November, 1942.
- "The Role of a State University," American Teacher, 26:10-15, February, 1942.
- "The Responsibility of Education in Wartime," Frontier Democracy, 8:176-7, March, 1942.
- "Responsibility of Educational Leadership in These Times," Education, 63:330-2, February, 1943.
- "International Good Will," Nations Schools, 33:32, February, 1944.
- "Major Problems of Transition," Educational Leadership, 1:261-6, February, 1944.
- "Problems of Teaching in Secondary Schools and Colleges." Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Education Conference, Kentucky University, 1945.
- "Public School Program to Meet the Needs of America's Youth." Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Education Conference, Kentucky University, 1945.
- "We Must Have More and Better Teachers." New York Times Magazine, p.7 , May 12, 1946.
- "Problems of the Professional Personnel/" American Association of School Administrators. Official Report, pp. 225-9, 1946.
- "Neighborhood School: Home Base for Teaching Children, Headquarters for Adult Education," Nations Schools, 36:34 , July, 1945.
- "Educational Leadership--the Postwar Imperative," Education, 67:205-11, December, 1946.
- "Democracy and Human Freedom," Educational Administration and Supervision, 33:149-51, March, 1947.
- "Education Can Save Freedom," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 33:314-21, May, 1947.
- "The Place of Outdoor and Camping Experiences in American Education," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 31:109-11, May, 1947.
- "Education for the Atomic Age," School Executive, 66:39-41, June, 1947.

- "Education Must Save Freedom," Survey Graphic, 36:635-6 , November, 1947.
- "Don't Lose Sight of Individuals," School Management, 17:2 , December, 1947.
- "The Business Teacher in a Democracy," National Association of Business Teacher-training Institutions. Bulletin No. 48, pp. 18-24, 1947.
- "Emerging Issues in Secondary Education," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 32:245-9, March, 1948.
- "World Understanding, The Community's Job," Adult Education Journal, 7:121-6, July, 1948.
- "Leadership is Release of Creativity," School Executive, 68:43-6, November, 1948.
- "Education for Freedom," New Era, 30:178-9, September, 1949.
- "Our Responsibility in Germany," Journal of Educational Sociology, 23:68-77, October, 1949.
- "Creative Education in a Democracy." Eastern Arts Association Yearbook. Art in General Education, pp.13-16, 1949.
- "Economic Education is a Must," Journal of Educational Sociology, 23:378-88, March, 1950.
- "The Teacher in a Free Society," Nation, 170:495, May 20, 1950.
- "Education and the Defense of America," Saturday Review of Literature, 33:9-10, September 9, 1950.
- "Economic Education is a Must," Journal of Educational Sociology, 23:378-88, March, 1950.
- "Challenge to Social Education," Educational Leadership, 8:134-8, December, 1950.
- "We Had Better Freedom-ize Society," School Executive, 70:66-7, February, 1951.
- "Forward Look," Journal of Educational Sociology, 24:361-7, February, 1951.
- "Teacher-Student-Parent Co-operation in Secondary Schools," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 35:129-36, April, 1951.
- "Education in Connecticut" (with T.D. Rice), Educational Record, 32:186-93, April, 1951.

- "Will Freedom Win Out?", National Parent Teacher, 45:30-1, May, 1951.
- "Community Participation in School Administration," School and College Management, 20:3, June, 1951.
- "Teacher Education for a Free Society," Vital Speeches, 17:698-701.
- "Education and the Point Four Program," School Executive, 71:76-9, November, 1951.
- "Challenge to the Critics of the Schools," New York Times Magazine, p. 9, September 23, 1951.
- "Needed: A New Teacher Education." American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Yearbook, 1951. 127:37.
- "William Heard Kilpatrick: Master Teacher," Teachers College Record, 53:263, February, 1952.
- "Fighting Answers to Six Charges Against Our Schools," Parents Magazine, 27:24-5, September, 1952.
- "Teaching Health for Freedom," American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Journal, 23:20-1, October, 1952.
- "Tomorrow's Administrator Will Be Community Engineer," Nations Schools, 50:61-2, November, 1952.
- "The School's Responsibility for Economic Education," Virginia Journal of Education, 46:14-17, December, 1952.
- "Progressive Education, U.S.A.," Yearbook of Education, 1952, pp. 64-82.
- "Strengths of Freedom," Child Study, 29, No.3:9, 1952.
- "Pressures on Public Schools," Childhood Education, 29:204-8, January, 1953.
- "Community Participation in Building Educational Programs," North Central Association Quarterly, 27:267-72, January, 1953.
- "Freedom is Indivisible," School Executive, 72:70-2, February, 1953.
- "What's Behind the Attacks on Education?", Education Leadership, 10:451-3, April, 1953.
- "Education, Freedom and Creativity," Music Educators Journal, 38:14-17, June, 1952.

-

2

3

4

.

- "Dynamic Teachers for a Dynamic Education." Middle States Association of College and Secondary School Procedures, 1952, pp. 47-54.
- "Leadership in an Age of Anxiety," Phi Delta Kappan, 34:381-6, June, 1953.
- "Education for Renewed Faith in Freedom," Education Forum, 18:286-94, March, 1954.
- "And the Future of School Administration?", School Executive, 73:101-5, January, 1954.
- "Cultural Freedom and Release of Creativity," Education Digest, 19:14-16, March, 1954.
- "Attack on Our Schools: Crisis in American Faith," Child Study, 31, no. 4:19-22, 1954.
- "Safeguarding American's Freedom Through Education," School and Society, 80:193-96, December, 1954.
- "Collectivism is Not Democracy," Nations Schools, 54:35-7, December, 1954.
- "Five Fallacies About Modern Education," New York Times Magazine, p. 13, November 27, 1955.
- "One Big Problem of Education in 1956," Nations Schools, 57:43-7, January, 1956.
- "Where and What are the Educational Wastelands?", School and Society, 83:71-5, March 3, 1956.
- "Education is the Ultimate Weapon," Education Forum, 21:45-54, November, 1956.
- "Improvement of Teaching in the Social Studies," National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, 1956, part 2:285-305.
- "School Administration has Changed to Meet the Demands of the Community for Broader Service from Public Education," Nations Schools, 59:42-5, January, 1957.
- "Teaching is Not Baby Sitting," National Education Association Journal, 46:46-7, March, 1957.
- "Citizen Action in Education-Centered Communities," Phi Delta Kappan, 39:2-5, October, 1957.
- "Role of Evaluation in Improving Teaching," Educational Leadership, 15:218-20, January, 1958.

"Do We Really Want Russian Education?", Michigan Education Association Journal, 35:229, February, 1958.

"New Quarters; New Challenges," School Executive, 78:58-9, October, 1958.

"Education and the Evolving Nature of Society" (with Floyd Reeves), National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, 1958, part 2:15-40.

"Keynote to the Theme," Journal of Educational Sociology, 3:170-8, December, 1959.

"Education and Security," Michigan Education Association Journal, 37:456-7, March, 1960.

APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF THE CAREER OF DR. ERNEST O. MELBY

Birth:	Lake Park, Minnesota; August 16, 1891	
Education:	A.B. St. Olaf College	1913
	M.A. University of Minnesota	1926
	Ph.D. University of Minnesota	1928
Experience:	High School Teacher, Alexandria, Minnesota	1913-14
	High School Principal, Breckinridge, Minnesota	1914-15
	Superintendent, Brewster, Minnesota	1915-17
	Superintendent, Blackduck, Minnesota	1917-20
	Superintendent, Long Prairie, Minnesota	1920-26
	Graduate Assistant, University of Minnesota	1926-27
	Assistant Director, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Minnesota	1927-28
	Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Northwestern University	1928-34
	Dean, School of Education, Northwestern	1934-41
	President, Montana State University	1941-43; 1944-45
	Chancellor, University of Montana	1943-44
	Dean, School of Education, New York University	1945-56
	Distinguished Professor of Education, Michigan State University	1956-

APPENDIX B

A CONCEPT OF DYNAMIC EDUCATION¹

The real problem in developing a program of education, whether it be in the kindergarten or the college, is to provide for dynamic and creative living. The organisms we are trying to educate are dynamic, therefore their educational living must be dynamic. All of these individuals are unique and creative, hence their life and education must be creative. It must respect their personalities. It must make provision for their uniqueness. It must stimulate them to make the most of their unique potentialities. It must help them to be themselves rather than to regiment them to predetermined patterns.

If education is creative there is no one panacea for all of its ills. We want not one curriculum but many; in fact as many as we have people to educate. We want not one type of school, but many. No one pattern of educational organization, no one body of subject matter, no one method of teaching, and no particular type material is the answer. Rather we shall follow the method of science, somewhat after the procedure of medicine. We shall carefully and constantly study each child from birth to the end of life. Simultaneously we shall study the society in which he lives and should live. Also we shall study the learning process.

We shall use all of these studies in helping each individual to live most creatively at every age and level of experience. What content is best for education? We cannot tell until we know for whom. What experiences are desirable? We cannot say unless we know for what boy or what girl. No subject has a vested interest. If we can use mathematical material we shall use it. If literary material is effective we shall use it. If technology is more effective we shall use it. The building of a bridge may be more effective in teaching Johnny Jones to think than the study of Plato. The practice of medicine may be more effective in humanizing some students than a prolonged immersion in the great books of the Western World.

If human beings react as totalities, if in effect they learn with their whole organism, it follows that education must concern itself with the whole organism. No education which singles out some phase such as the intellect, the body, or the emotions, can be a true education. To hold to this view is not anti-intellectualism. On the contrary it is merely to set forth the only conditions under which the whole organism can be educated, including the intellect.

Were it possible to educate the intellect alone (which is perhaps nearly impossible) we should have some sort of monstrosity, hardly human in its totality. As it is

¹Ernest O. Melby. "A Concept of Higher Education," Northwestern Alumni News, May, 1938. Article based on presentation made during debate with Robert M. Hutchins.

we have many persons with highly developed intellects, immature emotional status, and poorly developed bodies. Schizophrenia is becoming one of the chief concerns of the psychiatrist. If we agree that effective living is dependent on the exercise of intelligence the only way we can be assured that intelligence will be exercised is to educate the whole person.

The education of the whole human being means a school life which is teeming with the realities of life.

It means a curriculum which comes to grips with the life problems and concerns of students. Emotional growth, physical growth, social growth, are as important as intellectual growth. All around personality development becomes the major objective of the school. Teachers will be selected because of their interest in the welfare of students. We shall in such a school choose teachers as much for their warm hearts as for their brilliant intellects. The entire life of the campus will be organized for creative living.

Such a campus life will not be anti-intellectual. On the contrary it will stimulate intellectual interests, arouse curiosity, and further intellectual achievements in their appropriate setting.

If human beings are essentially social organisms, they should have an essentially social education. This means that education should have a social purpose and a meaningful social orientation. Germany is a Fascist state today in large part because for decades it fostered an education which concerned itself with techniques divorced from social objectives. A people educated in social vacuum falls ready prey to the propaganda of the dictator. On the other hand a people schooled in social thinking, in social living, educated in schools which are vital parts of society will be likely to have the scientific method, a philosophy of human values and a pattern of social behavior so thoroughly built into their own organisms that unscientific propaganda is ineffectual.

But the important part about the social aspect of education is that educational institutions cannot operate within four walls. They must, to be effective, be identified with their supporting communities. They must utilize these communities in their work. There is probably not a subject taught in a university which could not be enriched through greater utilization of the community. If such a subject exists it should probably be dropped from the curriculum. The more closely an educational institution responds to the need of its community, the more effective that institution will be.

Since every human organism is in constant process of change and growth the school should also be in constant process of change and growth. It is unthinkable that a school can teach science, in effect teach change and itself remain

unchanged. By what mysterious process does the school remain unchanging in a changing world? Shall it claim that it alone is to escape the scientist's scrutiny and criticism? Is it not strange that universities which apply science to everything under heaven should be so loath and tardy to apply it to their own activities? We can expect that ultimately we shall apply the scientific method even to our universities and that under this impact they will change and that all education will change.

GENERAL EDUCATION

Let us now turn to a closer consideration of the educational system itself. In appropriate pre-school and kindergarten agencies our children will take their first steps in creative, socially significant living. Here we shall have relatively little difficulty since our early primary education is vastly superior to our efforts in educating older children and youth. Primary education is effective because it makes the creative growth of each child its major objective; because it gives each child the freedom and affection so important to growth. Nowhere else does the teacher exhibit as much faith in people as in the kindergarten.

Our problem is to extend this kind of education to the higher grades, the high school and the college. To do this our emphasis must be taken off of subjects and placed on boys and girls. Creative achievement will be sought rather than mastery of the achievements of others. In all these years of general education we shall seek social sensitivity through an education which brings the student into vital contact with as many aspects of our social scene as possible. Preferably we should see that he has a chance to work on a farm, in a factory, in a home. He should know what it means to earn his living at hard labor, how laboring people live, what are their struggles, their hopes, fears, joys and sorrows.

Our students should have a vital part in the development of the curriculum, in the selection of their own educational experiences, and in the appraisal of their own growth. If we wish to teach students the significance of intelligence in daily living we can do this best by ordering our own behavior as teachers on a scientific basis. It is possible for a student to have a doctor's degree in physics for example and yet fail to make the scientific method function in the everyday aspects of his life. This man has learned about science but he does not live scientifically.

But, you say, what is the content of your education? One field of knowledge is the student himself. He wants to know about himself, and he wants a system of values. Personal life is a complex thing. Into its development will enter music, art, literature, psychology, religion, biological science, human relations, sports, hobbies and many other things.

Another field is the area of making a living. Our general education may not succeed in preparing all youth

to make a living but it can make them intelligent about the making of a living in an industrial society, about the problems which arise because millions have no opportunity to make a living, about the conditions under which men labor and their significance in our society.

A third field is home and family. The vast majority of people who fail in their professions, vocations, or as home makers, fail because they do not know how to get along with other people. A knowledge of human relationships on the part of our people would reduce divorce rates, insanity, and add immensely to the peace, the joy and the satisfaction of living. People who know how to live together would succeed in releasing large amounts of human energy for creative achievement, energy which is now wasted in conflict and discord.

A fourth field is that of social relations, social understanding and social sensitivity. Here our materials should not be books alone, but the total program of living in the school and community.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

What then is the program of the university in addition to general education? In this area the total of the university's program is definitely professional. It makes no difference whether the student proposes to become an industrial chemist, a college professor of English, a doctor, lawyer or engineer, he is in effect preparing for a profession. Therefore professional education is the primary business of the university beyond general education. You may argue that the function of the university is to produce scholars, but scholarship is a profession. You may say the university should produce scientists, but research is a profession.

Professional education as here broadly conceived faces three major problems that are intimately related and must be solved in relationship to each other. In each profession new knowledge is needed in order to improve practice or carry forward research or teaching. Existing knowledge must be effectively applied to improve practice in the profession and finally we need professional workers who are human beings as well as professionally competent.

Perhaps the most successful professional education today is that of doctors. This is true because medicine has elaborate facilities for research and carefully worked out plans for education through living and doing. A prospective physician learns surgery from surgeons, diagnosis from diagnosticians. He is taught not only by theorists but by skilled practitioners. He works and lives with sick people in hospitals and homes. When he is given his sheepskin the medical school not only is informed as to what he knows but also as to what he can and does do.

Contrast the education of teachers with that in medicine. We have for practical purposes assumed that all there is to teaching can be learned through a general education and experience. No, I will not even except the

teachers colleges and schools of education because even in professional courses we merely talk about good teaching and read about it. We do not do it ourselves as teachers of teachers nor do we see to it that our students learn by teaching under the supervision of expert practitioners. What is the result? Our teachers go out to teach. They do what has been done to them and forget what they were told. If a good education of the traditional sort would make good teachers we should expect liberal art professors to be good teachers for they certainly know their subjects if anybody does. Yet we know that among them are many of the world's most ineffective teachers.

If a knowledge of methods of teaching would produce good teachers, teachers of education should be good teachers but I doubt if on an average they are better than their colleagues in the arts college.

What we need is a university which functions in all professions as does medicine, namely by having the prospective practitioner learn by doing and living.

You may argue that we do not have the facilities for such a system of professional education. My contention is that we have the facilities, only we lack the imagination and the courage to attack the problem. Take teaching again as an example. Every university which educates teachers is surrounded by schools. These schools need the services of interne teachers just as badly as the hospitals need the medical internes. Moreover the teaching profession is made up of more than a million teachers who are now inadequately prepared. Why do we not attack this problem vigorously? Because to do so we must go off the campus and in so doing are evidently degraded. Why is it that the Egyptologist can go to Egypt, the physician to the hospital, but if the teacher of teachers carries his work to the place where teachers are teaching and children are learning, he somehow compromises both himself and his institution?

The problem of a general education for professional workers seems as serious as in any other area. Here too we are misled by the mysterious virtues of tradition. We often hold mathematics to be the supreme trainer of the mind. If this is true we should expect mathematicians to be our best thinkers. We think the study of Plato and Aristotle to be the road to a good general education. Do the professors of mathematics and of classical languages think more effectively than the professors of physiology, of law, or of engineering? Nothing in my own experience with these people indicates that they do.

My own belief is that we shall not have really great universities until these institutions achieve a vital relationship to the society of which they are a part. In such a university teachers and research workers in sociology should study, work in, and serve the community. They should be free to carry their studies and teaching wherever the needs and the problems are, whether in South Africa or Maxwell

street. The professors of education should study children and learning where children are learning. The professor of history should study not only the history which was made but that which is being made.

Such a plan would render great service to society but this is not our major reason for proposing it. Rather the plan should be followed because of what it would do for the professors. Their teaching and research would take on a vitality, a freshness, and a social consciousness that is rarely found at present.

SUMMARY

Generally speaking the experimentalist is concerned with dynamics rather than statics, with creativity rather than regimentation, with faith in human beings rather than in absolute truth, with respect for personality rather than respect for tradition or authority. He asks not who is right but what is wise. Accordingly he sees education as a process of creative living, in which the ultimate attainments of students are unpredictable. Since this is true he treats every child as if he had unlimited potentialities. To him becoming is more important than being, and a boy is worth more than a book. The pupil always has the potentiality of being greater than his teacher and it is more important for him to be able to discover a new planet or write a great book than to know all that others have discovered or written.

The orientation of the experimentalist is human and his values are human values. Hence he looks always for the human element in education. He wants teachers who have faith in humanity, faith in the capacity of human beings to determine their own criteria of truth and value. He wants teachers who seek creative development of each individual. He holds that in so doing leadership will emerge in the natural setting. Where all make the most of their potentialities, we shall have leadership for every area and every human purpose. It is the function of the higher education as of all education to help all students to attain their maximum creative development and to place each student in position to make the greatest possible contribution to society.

Human growth is a continuous process. Education must therefore be continuous without sharp horizontal breaks. Our essentially human orientation is as significant in the college as in the first grade. Thus the scientific method, the democratic way of life, and the findings of science concerning the nature of the human organism all have application on all levels of education whether in the kindergarten or the graduate school. The education of the whole organism, and a vital relationship with the community, are as important in professional as in general education. Creative living is everywhere the essence of education.

APPENDIX C

THE ROLE OF A STATE UNIVERSITY¹

Like all other social institutions higher education must ultimately find its justification for being in service to mankind. This is especially true of state universities. Private institutions may conceivably serve the special purposes of those who endow them even though these purposes do not represent major educational goals for the people in general. State universities, however, derive both their support and their purposes from the stream of life of the state and nation. In the long run these institutions must serve real needs on the part of the supporting population or they will ultimately weaken and leave the stage of activity to other agencies better equipped and disposed to meet the needs of a complex and changing society. It is therefore of greatest importance that all state universities examine both social needs and the nature of their present offerings and activities in order that they may command public approval and serve public needs.

It is a common place to say that universities advocate the method of inquiry. They want business investigated. They want government studied. Everything should be studied, except the university itself. This tendency for higher institutions of learning to find reason for being in mere existence as bearers of a tradition is responsible for much of their failure to meet the needs of the modern world. Thus in proposing self-examination universities would merely be taking their own medicine by applying to themselves the same techniques of inquiry that they have for decades insisted should be applied to what they sometimes feel are more mundane areas.

Montana State University is 46 years old. What a different world confronts the university at the present moment from that which the university faced in the early years of its development! A half century ago higher education was still the privilege of the wealthy and the academically inclined. Primarily higher education was professional. It was preparation for the ministry, for teaching, medicine or law. In 1900 only five years after this university was opened there were only 237,000 students enrolled in all institutions of higher learning in the nation. This represented only four percent of the population in the 18 to 21 year old age group. By 1938 the enrollment in higher education was 1,350,000 or 14 per cent of the 18-21 year old age group. So far in the present century enrollment in higher institutions of learning has increased more than 400 per cent.

¹Ernest O. Melby, Inaugural Address, Missoula, Montana, December 8, 1941.

Paralleling the rapid increases in college registration have come striking changes in the social, professional and vocational life of the nation and of the world. When this University was established agriculture (for the masses at least) was viewed as an unskilled endeavor. Success in business was thought to be dependent upon hard headedness and acquisitiveness. Homemaking was a field of activity learned from mothers and older sisters in the home. Teaching in public schools called for little more than literacy. In the lifetime of the University (one of the youngest) agriculture has become a vocation of greatest complexity calling for scientific knowledges and skills of the broadest and most involved character. Business men cannot read the financial pages intelligently without knowledge of economics, statistics, and marketing. Homemaking on creative levels calls for almost the entire range of those knowledges which bear upon human life and human relations. Labor has not only organized but has become a dynamic force in the life of the nation. Leadership in the labor movement calls for the most complicated knowledges of our social and economic life. Teaching from nursery school to university is now a profession with involved techniques and demands for broad understandings. Today a miner who is to be an intelligent member of his union has need of the offerings of higher institutions of learning.

Montana State University thus should belong to the people of Montana not only in the sense that it is supported by them but also because it has or should have something to offer to all of the people. Here, then, is no cloistered ivory tower, maintaining a disdainful aloofness from the mundane pursuits of the workaday world. On the contrary, here is an institution whose field of activity is as broad as life itself and whose sympathies encompass all of humanity.

But even greater than the educational changes of the past half century are the world wide social changes that have occurred. In 1895 American Democracy was everywhere taken for granted. Bank stocks and farm mortgages were good investments. An economic order based upon an individualistic conquest of a frontier was still in process of vigorous development. There was little or no unemployment. There were no really dangerous international complications and the average citizen felt himself a member of a rather stable world which he would pass on to his children with improved stability and comfort.

In 1895, no one, even with the most facile imagination could have conceived of a world like the one in which we are now living. Our much discussed free enterprise economy has been so widely and variously altered that he is both a wise and courageous individual who will attempt to characterize it accurately. Unemployment is a tragic national

problem only partially and temporarily alleviated by an expanding war or defense economy. The frontier of the nineties is gone. The American way of life is threatened from within by unsolved economic and social problems and from without by opposing ideologies terrifying in their military strength and ruthless in their attack upon human values. An ever-expanding and evolving technology has literally revolutionized economic production, transportation and communication. Intelligently employed for the satisfaction of human needs the world's productive resources could before long maintain the entire human family in comfort. Technology has made that whole family interdependent and given it the tools with which it could meet its every need. But the lamentable fact is that science has so far given human beings neither the disposition towards each other nor the social implementation which would insure comfort, security and happiness.

Not only have universities changed, not only has the world about them changed, but the role of universities in society has changed. Once viewed as the exponents of the frontiers of knowledge, universities have been failing to keep pace with advancing knowledge and social practice in the world about them. In the field of research vast commercial and industrial agencies have made inroads on the research function. Public elementary and high schools have carried their curricula, instructional procedures and equipment beyond the levels of corresponding areas in higher institutions. The economic structure of the nation has moved beyond the thinking of the classical economist. It is doubtful if schools of business and engineering have advanced to the frontiers of current professional practice. In any case the function of advancing the frontiers of knowledge is now one which the universities must share with many other agencies and institutions.

Universities are thus in an awkward position. They have given nurture to a science which has remade the productive world but they have not equipped man to live in that world. They have given wings to the mind of man without putting beauty and love in his heart. Primarily the reason for this failure lies in the preoccupation of the university in the academic and the abstract, leaving the problem of application to other forces and agencies. As Hogben has aptly said, "The tendency of modern youth to act without thinking is the legitimate offspring of an educational program which emphasizes thought without action". Living is the essence of learning. This is true for faculty members as well as for students. The modern world is spinning new problems with the passing of every hour. Awareness of these problems is indispensable to vital education efforts everywhere. Only as universities leave their cloistered towers and enter the varied stream of American life will they preserve intellectual vitality and render adequate service to their supporting constituency.

I am well aware that when one advocates that universities get into the stream of life he will be viewed with alarm in certain academic circles. But such circles should be warned that a retreat on their part to ivory towers will set loose forces in our society which will ultimately destroy even the ivory tower itself. If academic circles remain aloof from the labor movement they should be neither surprised nor dismayed if this movement takes turns or follows practices out of harmony with the views of the academic mind. If the farmers do not behave as we think they should, certainly university men have no right to criticize if in the preceding decades they have looked down their noses at the farmer and his problems. If universities fail to help business men solve the baffling problems now facing them they have no right to point a finger of scorn at business practice. If democracy is to survive the problems of all groups in that democracy must find solution. Democracy like all other concepts and theories of life and government must stand the test of time and experience. It must work for the betterment of human life or its place will be taken by other patterns. In our national life we have stressed the importance of education to democracy and rightly so. But we should stress with equal fervor the importance of democracy to education. In fact there can be no real education without democracy. Totalitarian societies have made a travesty of higher education and have made a mockery of the method of investigation and the search for truth. When democracy falters and dies the ivory tower disintegrates and its occupants become pathetic, deceiving apologists for that monstrosity called the state.

We are now in the position to view the obligations of an institution like Montana State University in the face of the developments which have taken place in its history and with due account for the social scene of which the University is a part. The university belongs to all of the people. It is supported by the people and it has potential services for them and obligations to society as a whole. Moreover the crucial problems of our society lie in the areas of human living and human relationships. They are going to be solved largely as the universities identify themselves with the life of the state and the nation. Broadly speaking, a university should seek to raise the level and quality of living in the state. Such a role for the university carries with it definite implications in regard to the scope of the university program, the nature of its offerings, its internal life and administration and its support.

The university can have no part in partisan endeavor, nor can it recognize or participate in class struggle. It owes much to labor, but it also owes much to capital, to the mines, to professional men, to stockmen and to farmers. Its facilities should be available to all of these groups in order that each group shall be in a position to increase its social contribution and its quality of living. Similarly the university must not confine its activities to any one section of the state. The mere fact of its location in the western part of the state does not relieve it of its obligation to serve the other sections even though these may be hundreds of miles distant. The university should keep in constant touch with the state as a whole and be constantly alert to the needs of all groups of people and all areas to be served.

In a state like Montana the need for extension and field service is readily apparent. In all of the outlying communities there are teachers, lawyers, doctors, dentists, business men, homemakers, leaders in labor movements and in community organizations. All these have need of better preparation for their work. In many cases the facilities for study in these outlying communities are as good or better than on the campus of the university. Field courses in education have the use of local public school facilities for plant purposes and laboratories. The students have the motivation of every day contact with the realities of school life. The same can be said for work in community organization and business practice.

We have yet to mention, however, one of the best reasons for a strong extension program. The university professor who goes to an outlying community to offer courses is thereby educated and better equipped to teach his campus courses. He acquires an understanding of the life of the community and of the state. He is in some measure protected from isolation and impracticality.

There is at the same time a need for campus activities of a short course nature made available to people in the state at very low cost. The university needs a center for continuation study in which short courses and conferences can be held and in which visiting students can be housed at low cost. Such a program of short courses and conferences would make the campus facilities open to a large number of people in various lines of work not now served by the university. Simultaneously it would bring about better understanding of the university and its problems and needs on the part of the citizens of the state.

Strength in the work of the professional schools of the university is of vital importance to the welfare of these professions and the welfare of society. The instructional problems to be faced in professional schools vary greatly from school to school and differ from those in a college of liberal arts. The professional schools are in competition with their own professions for staff and must at all times maintain a program which commands the confidence of their professional constituency.

But the membership in all professions is made up of men and women. They have the same need for a general liberal education that students in an arts college present. As a result general education is a common need for all students. Accordingly the university's program in general education is of utmost importance. Music, art, literature, knowledge of home and family life, social studies, some appreciation of the role of science in the modern world and the significance of the method of science in the solution of human problems are all important elements in a general education for all. Instruction on an individual basis in art and music should be available to all students at no more cost than instruction in history or mathematics. In a real democracy individuals should not be penalized for the nature of their interests or aptitudes.

Since our educational system seeks to further the ends of a democratic society it is imperative that the life of the university and all the human relationships connected with it be conducted in a spirit of good will and human sympathy and understanding. The most important thing about the university is the quality of living that goes on in it. It is through the process of living that qualities of character, of personality and of citizenship are developed. More than anything else this quality of living is inherent in the human relationships of university faculty members, students, and community.

A university should be a thoroughly creative undertaking. It can be creative only as it liberates the creative capacities of faculty members and students. Thus administration in a university is not primarily a task of physical, financial or accounting management. These types of management are important only as they serve educational aims. Primarily university administration should seek to liberate creative talents and to provide stimulus to greater effort and achievement. The administrative problem is one of finding those ways of living and working together which provide greatest security, freedom, and incentive for effort.

Obviously an enterprise with such a creative goal has no place for devastating personal conflicts, selfishness, and personal or professional nearsightedness. On the contrary the administrative relationships and activities should go on in the spirit of the scientific method and in mutual good will. Members of the university faculties have the rare privilege of association with gifted minds and rich personalities. A community of such minds and personalities should be able to achieve a quality of human relationships which would be an example to students and the university community.

The problem of university organization, however, is very complex. While the faculty should have a large share in policy determination the faculty cannot dominate the university since the university does not belong to it. Students have much that is valuable to contribute to the management of the university but students cannot control the university. The board of education has an important contribution to make but it must be advised by the faculty and administration. The problem of university administration is one of securing from all concerned their best contributions to educational policy and of translating these contributions into that education program best designed to serve the people of the state. To be sure, we have as yet neither the organization nor the techniques for this kind of university management. We shall develop techniques largely through experience in working and living together. Administrators can help by being humble, tolerant and open-minded in their dealings with faculty and students. The faculty and student body can help by assuming responsibility and by being generous and tolerant in their relationships to each other. The development of democratic and creative administration in higher education is an undertaking beyond the power of any administrator alone. It calls for whole-hearted cooperative effort on the part of they people of the state, the board of education, administration, faculty, students and community.

No one of the groups just mentioned has a heavier responsibility than the state board of education. The people of the state expect it to establish sound educational policies. The faculty expects it to show educational insight and to protect educational values and freedom for students to learn. The faculty and the administration must supply the board with complete information. The board has a right to assume that the administration is sensitive to and representative of faculty thinking and feeling. Simultaneously the faculty and the administration must be sensitive to the problems and needs of the state. In this complex process there is no royal road to success but complete communication and understanding between the university and the state board are essential if the state board is to be in a position to meet its responsibilities.

One of the most difficult problems confronting universities is that of adequate support. Taking the long run view in American education the state institutions have the soundest basis of support. The American people believe in education. It may safely be assumed that they will adequately support the educational institutions which they understand and by which they are well served. The institution must really serve its constituency and it must furthermore maintain such a program of public relations that the people understand the institution and its needs.

The 46 years since the opening of Montana State University have been miracle working years in the history of both education and society. Higher education has now a contribution to make to almost every human endeavor. The university may soon be as truly the people's college as the high school. Democracy having held out the promise of a creative life to humanity now seems in sight of making good on its promise by opening all the doors to knowledge, individual development and social effectiveness to all its members. Having helped to release to society a technology which has remade the productive world, universities now find their greatest challenge in the application of this same science to the task of so equipping and influencing the minds and hearts of men that our mastery of productive forces may enrich the lives of all. Change and development in the world outside of universities is proceeding so rapidly that unless the universities leave their ivory towers and find their stage for action in the stream of life itself they will lose their strategic role in advancing the frontiers of knowledge. Aloofness to the world of the man in the street will ultimately undermine both our democracy and the educational structure it has nurtured. The university must serve all the people of the state without itself becoming subservient to any individual or group.

The university must be brought to the people and the people must be brought to the university. The entire state must become the campus of the university. In-service education is as important in the professions and to the lay adult as preservice education. In professional education the demands of the profession, social and individual needs must take precedence over academic traditions in the determination of professional curricula. But all students and all citizens have need for the most complete personal growth and the utmost social effectiveness. Here lies the challenge of general education. The life of the university must itself become creative. Rich in the beauties of the fine arts and strong in its understandings of the modern world the life of the university should foster harmony and good will in human relationships. Personal relationships of faculty, students

and community should be fine examples of creative living. The internal organization and administration of the university must be harmonious with the democracy it seeks to nurture and preserve. From the best thought of all concerned must be developed that program of education best designed to meet the needs of the people of the state.

The development of a program of higher education which promotes creative living for all of the people of the state is a project which needs only to be understood by the people to win their support. It is an undertaking that will constitute a challenge to the intelligence and the cooperative good will of faculty, students, administration, the state board and the people. The short period I have lived and worked at Montana State University has given me a strong faith in the ultimate achievement of our common purposes.

Within the last 48 hours our nation has been plunged into war through ruthless attack by an aggressor nation. The international issue is now clear. The democratic world is engaged in a crucial struggle with forces of international lawlessness, forces that deny practically all of the human values represented in the American tradition. In this epoch making struggle for human freedom our military defenses are no more important than the moral defenses of our nation. Ultimate victory will call for sacrifice and solidarity on the part of our people. We must have a determined will to live as a free nation. In our kind of society we can build these moral defenses only through a thoroughly effective program of education from nursery school to university.

CHRISTIANITY, SOCIAL JUSTICE AND WORLD PEACE ¹

Probably no graduating class ever left Montana State University to face a world as troubled as the one which confronts our graduates tonight. We are winning the war which we maintain is a struggle for human freedom and human values. At the same time we know that human values cannot be made secure merely by winning a war. Following the last world war the peace ushered in the worst period of moral and spiritual decline in modern times. It was this eclipse of moral and spiritual values that brought world war number two.

Those of us who are engaged in educational activities are constantly pointing out that education is the only solution for war and social injustice. The events of recent years should certainly give us pause in a naive acceptance of the power of education. If mere education, if knowledge alone, will produce desirable social behavior, we should expect college communities with their large numbers of highly educated people to present exemplary social behavior. I doubt, however, that such highly educated people exhibit any better social action than skilled laborers, or business men, or for that matter people in any other area of endeavor. The leaders of our democratic world who brought us to Munich and World War II were often people who possessed the erudition of Oxford and the Sorbonne. If education is to give us social justice and world peace, both its content and method must be changed in the direction of a greater emphasis on moral and spiritual values.

We hear reports these days of an increased interest in religion as a result of the war. While these reports may be heartening to those engaged in educational or religious work, I believe we shall be wise not to be misled into the belief that such interest in religion has large social significance. Too often this interest in religion is a purely personal and emotional reaction with no particular thought of social concerns. It is, of course, a pity that controversies of creed and doctrine have obscured the social message of the teachings of Jesus. The emphasis which has been placed on beliefs has minimized the importance of Christian teaching on living the good life. The vast majority of professing Christians probably see little relation between their religious beliefs and the world about them. A dangerous dualism has thus come into being, namely, that religion is one thing and practical everyday life is another. Thus, we can pray for victory and hate the Japanese in the same breath. We can piously go to church on Sunday and callously exploit our fellow men on week days. We can be leaders in the church, yet work to deny the black man his rights under both our Constitution and the teachings

¹ Ernest O. Melby, Baccalaureate Address, Missoula, Montana. June 3, 1945.

of Christianity. We can simultaneously profess both Christ and isolationism. In all of these instances we are somehow convinced that we are saved by our abstract beliefs rather than by a good life. We seem to feel no need for translating our beliefs into reality.

This dualism between our professed faith and our daily acts is, of course, not limited to the religious realm. It is equally characteristic of our behavior in the area of social thought. We say we are fighting a war for freedom, yet we are unwilling to grant freedom to our 10,000,000 dark-skinned citizens. We talk about free enterprise, while we ourselves do all in our power to destroy it for all but ourselves and a powerful few. We prate about our high standard of living, while millions in our cities live in squalor. Today the dualism in our thought and the hiatus between our faith and our behavior threaten the very foundations of human society. We are in the process of defeating the legions of hate and brute force on the field of battle. But the ideas of hate and totalitarianism cannot be destroyed by this means. Unless the brotherhood of man is made to work, it will not survive as a functioning ideal.

I believe few people recognize the critical choice which humanity faces in the years to come. Technology has deprived us of the enjoyment of isolated realms. There are no longer any islands of refuge-- no mountain fastnesses to which we can ascend. Our world has become one world to such a degree that there is no asylum for our war criminals. There is no exile. One must belong to some part of this one world or die. In a similar fashion humanity must choose between death and the acceptance of the idea of brotherhood of man. Either our one world will be dominated by the idea of brotherhood of man or by brute force with a resulting death for the human spirit.

If our modern interdependent world is to be dominated by brute force, man will cease to be human. The atrocities of Nazi Germany are but previews of the world of horror we shall enter. You may, of course, tell me that Americans and Englishmen and Frenchmen are not as sadistic and cruel as the Germans and the Japanese and that even if we became totalitarian it would be a more benevolent realm of power and brute force. This is a naive view for which there is little if any evidence. The Germans and Japanese are no more cruel by nature than we are. Give us the same international position, the same education, the same ideology, the same fanaticism, and we shall be an inventive in the realm of cruelty as any people on earth.

It will help us at this point to examine our Christian-Democratic tradition. Essentially, it is a philosophy which gives first place to the worth and dignity of all men. It is based on faith in the common man-- on faith in the capacity

of the masses of people to develop their own criteria of what is good, beautiful, and true. It holds to the idea of the brotherhood of man. It maintains men must be free to be truly human. Unselfishness, service, sacrifice for others, these have paved the road to what human freedom now exists. In the words of Jesus, "He who loses his life shall find it." These words emphasize the worth of man and the glory of the service of man.

In contrast to this Christian-Democratic view is the Nazi totalitarian doctrine of super race, brute force, horror and treachery. In the editorial words of the Christian Century, "The horror of the Nazi concentration camps is the horror of humanity itself when it has surrendered to its capacity for evil....In the Nazis and beyond them we are looking into the very pit of hell which men disclose yawning within themselves when they...deny the sacredness of human personality." "Buchenwald and other memorials of Nazi infamy reveal the depths to which humanity can sink and has sunk in these frightful years." "Those camps spell doom. But it is not simply the doom of the Nazis; it is the doom of man unless he can be brought to worship at the feet of the living God."

Man is intrinsically neither good nor bad. Inspired by a consciousness of the worth and dignity of individual man, motivated by an humble and earnest search for truth, supported by a faith in the improvability of the common man, purified by self sacrifice for his brothers, man has almost infinite potentiality for good. But when he is dominated by fear, misled by prejudice, blinded by intolerance, brutalized by selfishness, he has almost infinite potentialities for evil. When he pins his faith in brute force and devotes his life to the worship of super men, he sinks to bestiality and courts death for himself and his fellow men. When man pins his faith in and dedicates his life to the brotherhood of man, he becomes more God-like. The way of Christianity, of democracy is the way of life. But the brotherhood of man must work to live. If it does not work it will die. And if it dies man dies with it.

The problem then of San Francisco, of the United States and of Montana is just this simple: Are we willing to order our individual lives, our communities, our business activities and international relations on the principle of the brotherhood of man? Are we willing to lay aside selfish gain, struggle for power, and quest for special privilege and devote ourselves to human welfare in a spirit of self sacrifice?

Social justice and world peace cannot be made realities through Dumbarton Oaks or through any single economic pattern. Nor can we secure world peace without

social justice at home and in the internal affairs of all countries. It was social injustice in England and America that enabled Franco to come to power in Spain and that enabled Hitler to advance to power unharmed and unimpeded in pre-war Germany. Holders of special privilege in Allied countries were more afraid of the influence of Russian Communism than of Hitler. They helped him come to power -- only to find they had helped create a Frankenstein monster.

It has been said that this is the Century of the Common Man. All over the world men who labor are on the march. They have read about freedom. They have been told of the glories of liberty, equality, fraternity. They mean to share in these glories. Often these marching men are misled by charlaton leadership. Again they are blinded by ignorance, deceived by words, and occasionally defeated by treachery. But they cannot be turned back!

In the ranks of these marching common men will be found 11,000,000 American veterans. They will have jobs. If they don't get jobs by the democratic way, they'll have them the totalitarian way. I have no panacea to suggest. But the Christian philosophy is the common denominator of all measures. Capitalism must operate with respect for the worth and dignity of individual man or it will wither and decay. Free enterprise will neither live nor remain free unless it proceeds on the principle of the brotherhood of men. If labor becomes selfish it too will lose its birthright of freedom.

Our Christian-Democratic tradition is sound after 2,000 years of life and experience. But it has never been made a reality even for millions of our own people. Other nations will not be attentive when we extol it and all the while deny its benefits to great sections of our own people. Nor can we wholeheartedly play our part in international affairs while failing to practice what we preach.

Christianity is not merely something in which to believe. More essentially it is a philosophy to live by. Applied in our community and business activities it will give us social justice. Applied in the international realm it will give us world peace. Failure to apply it will ultimately surrender us to brute force and its horrors.

In this task of establishing the brotherhood of man college men and women have a special responsibility. They have been signally favored with the fruits of freedom. They have been specially equipped to serve their fellow men. Their capacity to lead is further developed. Their knowledge and self discipline should make them a power in the great task of helping man to be more human. Will you and I as college men and women be unselfish enough - will we sacrifice enough to help mankind to approach his almost infinite potentiality for good? The whole course of human history depends on our answers to these questions.

BETTER TEACHING--FOR WHAT?¹

Trying to run a school of education and at the same time go out and talk about how schools should be run, is an utterly impossible combination. Nearly every day things happen to me that convince me that I ought to stop lecturing entirely. It would be so easy at a convention of this kind, particularly with the subject that was given to me, to take off to the deep blue sea and talk of the teaching profession. But I am daily involved in the realities of this profession and its various inter-relationships and these days the realities are very, very sobering in character. So, much as I would like to be a little Pollyanna and talk about the accomplishments of our profession, I just must be realistic this evening and turn our attention to the sober and serious realities we face.

Never in the history of our profession has education faced as many tasks as it is facing today. Sometimes it seems to me that every critic in the nation, every potential enemy of freedom, and of democracy in education, has decided to take a shot at our profession and at education. It would be much more comfortable if we could shrug off these attacks and assume a completely defensive stand in the full confidence that we don't deserve to be attacked and that we are fully meeting the responsibilities that are ours today. Unfortunately, nothing like that is true. If we think seriously about the situation we confront in the international scene, here at home in America and in our profession, I think we would agree that we are in need of some very careful soul searching if education is to measure up to the responsibilities and to the opportunities that we have often marked out for it.

I grew up in an environment in which people in the main were very poor, in which the opportunities of an economic sort were extremely limited. In my own home for example, I had held out to me constantly the importance of education, and I recall that my father said to me--I heard him say it repeatedly--that if only people were educated, crime would disappear, political corruption would be decreased, and even world peace would reign. He believed that. A lot of years have gone by since he talked that way to me and I am older and sadder and, I hope, just a little wiser. I don't believe it. I think he was utterly mistaken. I see no evidence at all that just more education

¹Ernest O. Melby, Address at the NEA Regional Instructional Conference, Toledo, Ohio. April 5, 1951.

of the kind we have had is a solution to crime, to political corruption, or to the problem of world peace. In fact, I can't see that just more years of education contributes very much to the solution of any problem of human relationships. On the whole, the elementary school teachers of our country, who probably have less than four years of preparation beyond high school, behave at least as well as university professors who have seven years of preparation beyond high school. I think a little better on the whole. In fact, I would just as soon not take my chances on the behavior of groups of people in our society who have the very highest levels of academic preparation when it comes to any problem in human behavior.

From the world's point of view, we have had many times as much education as in any previous century. We have in that half century now gone by, already killed many times as many people as in any previous full century. A man from UNESCO was in my office recently and told me that UNESCO had studied the world's educational problem and they had decided that the crucial problem was literacy, that if only people were literate, then all the rest of it would come out all right. I asked him how he could explain the fact that Germany, which was certainly the most academically literate nation in human history, exterminated 6½ million people in cold blood. No, our solution isn't more education--just more education--it's a different kind of education. And the more I look at the nature of the problems that we confront in the international scene, in the domestic scene, and inside the profession, the more confirmed I become in that conclusion, because the problems that we face in those three areas, in the main, are not problems that lend themselves to solution through mere knowledge, mere skills, in the academic sense. They are problems that are going to be solved only as our people have a different outlook, a greater faith, a greater social competence, and a greater dedication to the values for which we stand. And all of these areas have only a little to do with knowledge of facts or the possession of skill in the academic sense. There is, I believe, even some evidence to indicate that too much concentration on the areas of knowledge and skill, as such, may injure one's perspective and may destroy the warmth of one's contact with other human beings and thus limit one's effectiveness on the human relations front.

I would like to refer to the nature of areas of human conflict and concerns with life and try to relate those very briefly to the topic "Better Teaching--For What?" Perhaps the most disillusioning period in American history is the present moment. I don't think anybody either in or out of America, during the last World War, would have expected or could have possibly imagined that within the first six years following the end of hostilities, we in America would disappoint as many people in as many parts of the globe as we

have in this six-year period. Sometimes when I see it in retrospect, it seems to me almost as if the devil himself has planned the policies and the program whereby we have so disappointed those who struggled for freedom and liberty in different parts of the globe. When one thinks about this, he naturally asks himself "What is the cause?"

We are probably the best intentioned nation in the world and we probably have the richest ideological and cultural heritage of any nation on earth. To me it was an almost unbelievable thing that we, in present civilization, with the whole French Revolutionary tradition, with the English rich, old tradition, the founding fathers in this country, two thousand years of Jesus Christ, and the whole Judo-Christian tradition, that with all that great richness of the mind and the spirit, we should have allowed the Russians to beat us to the minds and the hearts of men--the Russians, of all people, who have only dialectic materialism and Karl Marx. It seems almost unbelievable that it can have happened and yet it did. And it happened, because of two major errors on our part. Our first error is that we have failed to sense that in the international scene, it is not only what we say that counts--we failed to sense the importance of practicing what we preached. We have the most beautiful philosophy in all the world, but we don't bother to carry it into effect either at home or abroad.

You don't need to walk out of your school building to find examples of the way in which our human values are violated. I know I don't need to leave Washington Square to find some of the best example of the violation of every human value for which we stand. People in China, India, Indo-China, and other parts of the world where men and women struggle against oppression and limitation of opportunity, aren't interested in our glittering generalities; they want bread, a place to live, something to wear, and some kind of an opportunity for their children. We have no real program for delivery of those kinds of things to these people, and until we get that kind of program, nothing that we do in an effort to defeat Communism is going to avail us anything in the long run because Communism is not our fundamental problem. Communism is not a basic cause, it is a symptom. We are never going to defeat Communism unless we first can overcome oppression, human want, misery, and suffering. Until we in America sense that, we can continue to witchhunt and to prepare for wars and to appropriate money to be spent abroad for military expenditures, but in the long run we shall be defeated unless we see that it is our responsibility to meet the human need which is everywhere so clearly shown. Now, this matter isn't really as far off as China. If we had an adequate realization of the importance of people, nobody

would need to lecture to us about the importance of feeding the Chinese and the people of India, but we don't have an adequate realization of the importance of people. And you don't need to go to China or to India to see it. All you need to do is look around you.

When I hear that we are going to draft people and put them in the Army on the basis of their scores on tests and on the basis of whether or not they are in college, I wonder how long the young men and women of this country are going to believe that we mean what we say when we talk about the worth and dignity of every human being regardless of race, color, or creed, or economic status.

If you ask me this evening, "Better Teaching--For What?", one of the first things I would like to mention is that of building into our behavior the idea of the importance of people--all kinds of people, regardless of color, creed, or economic status. You and I know (and certainly the administrators here best take this to heart) there isn't a school in America, or college in America, or a school system in America, that is really democratically operated. If we are honest, we'll have to admit that. Yet we think that we can educate for freedom in schools that are not democratic. We believe somehow in the theory of learning how to live in a democratic society by living in an authoritarian atmosphere. How we believe that I am sure I don't know, but anyway, that's the case.

Now there is something else. I had a man call me up from Louisville, Kentucky, the other day and tell me that he had just called Mark Ethridge and said to him: "I want you to write an article to be syndicated in this country." He said: "I want you to entitle this article, 'What the Hell are we Afraid Of?'" It struck me as being a wonderful idea because, it seems to me, that a great deal of the difficulty that we face grows out of our lack of faith in our own way of life. Why is it that the people in England are so much less afraid than we are? And they most assuredly are. They are not as afraid about Communists. They are not as afraid about war. They are far more confident in the stability of their way of life. They are not as jittery. I think a great deal of our bad behavior in the international scene grows out of this feeling of being jittery.

We have seen a great procession of gloomy books, "1984", "The Plague", "Darkness at Noon", "The Twenty-fifth Hour". Somehow these shockers don't seem to move us any more. We've been shocked and re-shocked until we don't shock any more and we seem to be insensible to that kind of thing. In the last six months or so, I've begun to

wonder whether we wouldn't move the American people faster with a testimony of faith. If, somehow, it were possible for us to take stock of the great tradition of human values, of the tremendous resources which are ours in American communities, of the productive power of American industry, of the creative talents of the American people, of the power of the whole western tradition of freedom and human values, maybe we could inspire people's action better thru that than thru one gloomy book and one shocker after the other.

If you ask me again, "Better teaching--for what?", I'd like to say teaching for a great faith in the American way of life, increased faith in human values, in the common man. In my class the other night, somebody said, "In view of the Kefauver investigation, how can I have faith?" You know, I think the Kefauver investigation has done some good but if we aren't careful, it may also do some harm. If we tell the American people that we are all racketeers, that we are all dishonest, that we are all crooked, that we are all lacking in ethical and moral fibre, that is bad, because I just don't believe it's true. I think the great mass of the American people are very decent and I think that the worst thing that could happen to us now would be for us to reach the conclusion that nobody can be trusted, that we are all crooked, because I don't think it's so. It seems to me that this whole question of faith in our way of life and faith in people is one of the most important things that we can confront.

I'm getting more and more skeptical about lectures. Somebody said to be the other day, "If you feel that way, why do you lecture so much?" And I think he's got something, but I don't have anything like the faith in the spoken word that I once had. How do you produce faith? Children are wonderful. I'm having a new experience with children because I have three grandchildren. I notice they pay little attention to what I say but how carefully they watch everything I do! And I think we could do wonderful things with American boys and girls and American people if we could treat them in a way that manifests our faith in them. If you want to teach a boy to have faith in his fellowmen, show him that you have faith in him. That's the way to teach him the power of faith.

Occasionally, I make something of a nuisance of myself by asking people a great many questions about the factors that led them to do certain things professionally. Nearly every person that I know who has achieved something outstanding in our profession has done so under the power of the faith of some person--some person who believed in

him and whom he just couldn't disappoint. He just had to carry thru. We are that way. If we are really in earnest about teaching for democracy and freedom, perhaps the most important thing of all is to make sure that we teach for that kind of faith, that we are not going to do it by talking about it, but by expressing that faith in action.

In the beginning, I said something about a different kind of education. All over this country people are concerned about the attacks that are being made on education and some of the people who are attacking it are people who have selfish and bad purposes, but some of the people who are criticizing us are people who are genuinely worried about what they believe to be a fact--that education is not doing what we had once hoped it would do. And I come more and more to the feeling that we in the profession have labored under two very devastating illusions. We have believed that we could carry on inside the schoolhouse a program that was going to save democracy, and we have believed further, and this may be worse still, that we could do something to children that would so change them they in turn would change the community in which they live. Then we as teachers are saddened when we see that it is the community that takes hold of these children after they get out of school and makes out of them something that we had never dreamed would be made out of them. Dewey told us long ago that the community in its totality--its homes, its churches, and all its agencies--is a far more powerful educational agency than the school ever was or ever will be in and of itself. If that's true, then we are never going to get anywhere unless we move out of the four walls of the schoolhouse and into the community. This business of getting into the community is quite a problem for all of us. I have had some pretty rough experiences myself. I want to tell you a story that may illustrate the change of heart and attitude that many of us will have to go thru if we ever effectively mobilize the resources of the community for education. Some of you know that I spent four years in Montana and during that time we tried in a small way to mobilize some of the resources in that state. I'll never forget one afternoon in my office when one of the professors came in and said, "Next week on Friday night, I want you to go with me to Ronan." If you've ever been in Montana, you know what Ronan is. It's a little town of maybe two or three hundred people. I said, "What do you want me to do in Ronan?" He said, "Never mind, I'll tell you on the way out." And so the time came and this professor, three others and I, climbed into one of the university cars and we went out to Ronan. On the way out the professor told us what we were to do. He said, "None of you must make a speech, including the President. No speeches. And another thing don't sit in the front of the room. We've

got to sit in the back of the room. Don't talk unless you are spoken to. Don't say anything in the discussion unless you are asked." He said "You are resource persons. You are not speakers. You are not big shots. You're just ordinary people." He talked practically all the way out about that. In six months this English professor had learned how to deal with people in the community, and he had learned it thru experience. We had a wonderful time. Two men reviewed Sumner Welles' book, "Time for Decision." They did as good a job of reviewing a book as I have heard in a long time. If you could have listened to the discussion that night, you would have rubbed your eyes and wondered how in that little, seemingly, forsaken town in Montana, there could be so many resources; how could there be so many wonderful people? How could there be in that little town, people who seemingly knew so much? Who had so much to contribute?

Well, I can make a long story short by telling you that dozens and dozens of experiences of that kind told me as nothing else in the world could have told me, of the powerful resources that there are in American communities all over the country that are going unused. People like you and I deplore the concentration of power in Washington in the Federal Government. We deplore the weakening of local and state governments. We condemn the concentration of power in big business, in big labor. We view with alarm the cracking of the cement that welds human beings together to give us a society that has solidarity and unity, and we think somehow that we are going to overcome these trends. You are never going to reverse those trends completely, but you can strengthen local government and make it a more vital force in America. You can at the grass roots give the average citizen a vital relationship to his fellow men and you can put in his hands instrumentalities that make him genuinely effective in influencing his community, his nation, and his world. The only way in which you are going to overcome the difficulties that grow out of the concentration of power is to vitalize the democratic process at the grass roots, and if you do that, you simultaneously accomplish two great goals. You vitalize the democratic process and give meaning to the community as a place in which to live and you educate the people to take part in that process as nothing else could educate them. It's notable that in America, with all the dedicated adult education workers--no one who knows workers in adult education can doubt that they are a sincere troupe of people--but with all that, adult education in the formal sense, has not fired the imagination of the masses of people in America. Somehow people who are invited to go into adult education classes suffer a loss of ego in the process, but the person who is asked to do something to improve his community does not

suffer a loss of ego. On the contrary, his ego is built by that kind of participation and he learns by doing far more than he would ever learn out of a book alone.

I, therefore, believe that my father in one sense was right when he said that education could eliminate crime, eliminate political corruption, and bring about world peace, but not through the education that we carry on in the schoolhouse. Only a completely mobilized community which in its total functioning is an educational enterprise can give us the kind of education that can really save freedom. And if we ever learn how to do that, we are going to do something in the spiritual aspect, too, of our society because we can't work in a community and see people doing things to the community and to themselves without realizing more and more the importance of people. You can't see them do these things without having your faith in people and in our free way of life increased. You can't participate in this kind of enterprise without having your social effectiveness increased. You can't take part in all of this without changing your outlook. Almost always when I talk about this community, someone comes up later and says "Yes, that's all right for Ronan, Montana, in that little town, but how about world peace and how about international relations?" Do you know that we could not stay in any of these Montana groups for as much as an hour but what they talk about Argentine beef and Australian wool. By that route we found ourselves discussing South American relations and world affairs. It happens everywhere. The stage is broadened almost immediately, and thru your community approach, national affairs, world affairs, come into the picture.

Better teaching yes, but not only for arithmetic, writing, reading, skills, facts. How did we ever get the idea that these things are so important? Have you ever noticed the anachronism of the situation presented by people who simultaneously talk about going back to the three R's and also better character education? If you want to, you can find lots of people in penitentiaries who know their arithmetic very well. There are some people who suspect that that's one of the reasons they are there; they knew their arithmetic too well. People who read--how do you know the person who reads well isn't going to read himself into becoming a Communist or committing a crime of some sort. We have no guarantee that the possession of the skills is going to mean a good character.

Isn't it perfectly obvious that the problems that face us in the world are the problems that throw us into the whole world of moral and spiritual values? We can achieve these things not through talking about them

primarily, but through doing something about them. It doesn't do any good for me to say to the Negro student in New York University, "I like you." He knows whether I like him or not. He can tell by the way I treat him. A student came up in my class some months ago and said, "I can treat some children well. I can love some children, but some children I just can't love, but I don't let them know that." I said, "That's what you think. Every look in your eye, every expression on your face, the tone of your voice, the manner of your moving around the room, every day, in hundreds of ways, you tell the people with whom you live and work, show them whether or not you have faith in them, whether or not you think they are important, how you feel about all of these things--they know." That's what makes the teacher's job difficult, but it is also true that it is this particular situation that gives us faith and hope and confidence because you and I have reason to believe in our way of life.

We have reasons for faith in people. Every day the work that you and I do, testifies to the power of the human spirit. But more than that, if you and I know that if only we believe these things and translate them into realities, we are going to be accepted. Then we have reason for accomplishment. Something more than a year ago I was in Israel and I saw those wonderful people traveling from one corner of the earth to the other, having endured endless suffering, privation, insults, and injury. I saw these people facing almost every kind of difficulties, privations, and limitations that you could think of, but I saw them triumph.

Do you ever feel that as the famous song in South Pacific that says, "The human race is about to fall on its face?" You'll never believe it again after you visit Israel because there you will see one of the great upsurges of humanity of all time that tells you in a powerful drama of human achievement that the human spirit is indomitable, that mankind is ultimately going to become the master of its own destiny. It's our faith in that ultimate mastery of its own destiny that I think should inspire us as teachers.

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES¹

1949

Aug.

- 11 New Education Fellowship, International Summer Conference, Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, England

10:00 p.m. "How are Attitudes Changed?"

- 14 NYU Workshop, Beth Berl Katznelson Institute, Kfar Saba, Israel

Sept.

- 30 Editorial Board, EDUCATIONAL FORUM
Kappa Delta Pi. Hotel New Weston
E.I.F. Williams

Oct.

- 7 Fulton County (Georgia) Workshop. Atlanta Georgia.
Floyd Jordan, Coordinator The Atlanta Area
Teacher Educ. Service Emory University, Ga.

Speaker: Education for Responsible Citizenship.

- 8 Educational Conference, Teachers and Officers
Washington Public Schools. Mayflower Hotel.
9:30 a.m. Miss Margaret Moore, Chairman,
Program Committee

Speaker: Improving Relationships through Administration

- 11 Founders' Day Program, State Teachers College, Trenton,
N.J. Roscoe L. West, President.

Speaker: John Dewey's Influence in Education.

- 13 98th Annual Convention, Vermont Edu. Assn.
Burlington. Walter F. True, Pres.

Speaker: Education and the Future of Democracy

- 18 St. Teachers College, Jersey City. Forrest A. Irwin,
Pres. Assembly, 10:50 a.m.

Speaker: John Dewey's Contribution to Education

¹The following samples of professional activities are representative verbatim excerpts from the professional diary of Ernest O. Melby.

- 20 35th Annual Conference, The National League to Promote School Attendance. Hotel New Yorker (Grand Ball Room) John A. Cummings, Chmn. Program Committee. 11:00 a.m.

Speaker: Respect for Personality in Pupil Personnel Services.

- 20 Carbon County Teachers' Institute Palmerton, Pennsylvania, High School Auditorium

Speaker: Education for Responsible Citizenship

- 21 Consultant: How Can We Improve our Educational Program this Year? 10:45-12:00

Closing comments, Final General Session: 2:00-4:00- Facing our Responsibilities

- 21 North Atlantic Regional Conference of Soroptimists Clubs (N.Y., Pa., Dela., Penn.) Wedgwood Room, Waldorf Astoria 1:30 p.m. Dora Lewis, Chmn. Program Com.

Speaker: World Affairs are Your Affairs

Nov.

- 12 Annual Luncheon Meeting, Department of Music, New Jersey Educational Assn. Atlantic City, Hotel Traymore. Violet Johnson, President

Speaker: "Democracy and Creative Teaching"

- 13-14 Executive Committee, Amer. Assn. of Col. for Tchr. Educ. Stevens Hotel, Chicago Warren C. Lovinger, Asso. Sec'y.

- 17 Sophomore Chapel, Interfaith Council at University Heights, 12 noon. Sidney Lindenberg, Faculty Advisor.

Speaker:

- 17 Maywood (N.J.) Citizens meeting. Maywood School Auditorium. Charles D. Swaim, Supervising Principal.

Speaker:

- 19 Workshop Convention, Classroom Tchrs. Assn. of N.Y. State. Hotel Utica, Utica, N.Y. Kevin L. Coons, Chmn. Organization Com. 6:30 p.m.

Speaker:

- 22 NYU Jewish Culture Foundation. Sidney Lindenberg,
Director. 3:00 p.m.

Speaker:

Dec.

- 1 Louisville Ed. Association, Louisville, Ky.
Robert Allen, Pres.

Speaker: The New Concept of Leadership

- 8 Cancer Research and Hospital Foundation Annual Dinner,
Starlight-Roof, Waldorf-Astoria. 7:00 p.m.
Ben Freedman, Chmn.

Speaker:

- 9 Dinner meeting and Installation of Officers and
Initiation of New Members. Alpha Chapter, Delta
Pi Epsilon. Hotel Holley 6:30 p.m.

Speaker: Palestinian Situation

- 10 Annual Meeting, Cooperative Bureau for Teachers.
Town Mall. 11:00 a.m. Mary Watson, Director

Speaker: "Education and America's World Responsibility"

- 10 Fifth Annual Higher Education Conference Dr. Myers.
Education Auditorium 2:30 Panel member, General
Session.

- 10 5:15: Carnegie Hall, T.E. Program; Boston Symphony
Orchestra

- 12 P-TA, Central School, Long Beach, N.Y. Cyrus O.
Levenson, Principal. 8:00 p.m. Central School Aud.

Speaker: The Art of Living Together

- 27 Temporary Committee, Federal Aid to Public Education,
Conference on the Scientific Spirit and Democratic
Faith, Inc. 2 West 64 Street, N.Y. 23. Jerome
Nathanson, Chmn. 4:00 p.m.

- 31 National Council on Family Relations, Hotel Park Sheraton,
N.Y. Earl Lomon Koos, Program Chairman.

Speaker: Contribution of Education to Family Life

1951

Apr.

- 5 Regional Instructional Conference sponsored by NEA.
Toledo, Ohio, April 5-7, 1951. Lyle W. Ashby,
Assistant Secretary for Professional Relations,
NEA. 10:00 a.m.

Keynote Address: "Better Teaching--For What?"

- 9 Elementary Teachers Association Forum Lectures.
Richmond, Virginia. Eleanor L. Douthat, Program
Chairman. 3:30 p.m.

Speaker: "Education and the Preservation of Freedom"

- 10 University of Houston. Group meeting, luncheon, and
conferences. Esther F. Gibney. Lecture.
- 12 Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos
10:30 a.m. Dr. J. G. Flowers. Address to the faculty.
- 14 Little Red School House, New York City. 10:30 a.m.
Dr. Randolph B. Smith. Speaker. Panel discussion
following speech.
- 16 League of Women Voters of Danbury, in co-operation
with several other groups. Methodist Church,
Danbury, Connecticut. 6:30 p.m. Mrs. Wm. Goodman

Speaker: "The Schools in Community Life"

- 20 Michigan State College, East Lansing. Convocation
of students in education. 9:15 a.m. Professor
George Myers.

Keynote Address: "The Challenge of Teaching as a
Career"

- 20 State Conference of Elementary School Principals,
East Lansing, Michigan. 12:30 p.m. Question and
answer period following talk. A. Raymond Ebaugh,
Program Chairman.

Address: "Values and Responsibilities in Elementary
Education"

- 22 Dedication of Rocky River High School. Rocky River,
Ohio. 3:30 p.m. Thoburn Davis, Superintendent
of Schools.

Keynote Address.

- 23 Womens' City Club of New York, Hotel Sulgrave
Luncheon Meeting, 12:30 p.m. Mrs. Stanley
Isaacs, Program Chairman.

Speaker: "The Threat to Progressive Education"

- 26 Yonkers Workshop in Public Education. Professor
Borgeson, Coordinator. 4:00 p.m.

Consultant: "Utilization of Community Resources"

- 27 Off-Campus Program. Hotel Breevort. 2:00 p.m.
Meeting of representatives of schools and other
groups working with the School of Ed. through
Field Services. Dr. Rice

Speaker: "The Field and the School of Ed"

- 28 Fourth Annual Conference of School Administrators and
Supervisors. 9:00-3:45 La Guardia Hall. Dr. Bruner,
Chairman.

Speaker: "Mobilizing Community Resources for the
Support of Public Education"

1956

Sept.

- 14 Address to faculty; Eastern Michigan College
"Higher Education for a Dynamic America"

- 24 Address to Michigan School Administrators, Mackinac
Island.

- 28 Address to State Department Workshop, St. Mary's Lake.

Oct.

- 4 Address to Maine Teachers Association, Lewiston, Maine.

- 5 Addressed Troy Stearns' Class.

- 8 Met with staff in Vocational Education.

- 9 Met with Frontiers in Administration Seminar.

- 10 Met with George Myers' Class 10:00 a.m.

- 10 Addressed A Students, Dinner 6:00 p.m.

- 11 Addressed Allegheny County Teachers, Syria Mosque,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

- 15 Talk to Critic-Teachers, Kellogg Center 10:00 a.m.

- 15 Troy Stearns' Class 9:00 a.m.

- 17 Dean's meeting.

- 18 Met with staff in Teacher Education.

- 19 Met with Myers' Class.
Luncheon Group, Kellogg Center.
- 20 Addressed Beginning Superintendents, Higgins Lake.
- 22 Planning Session with AES Dept. Shepherd's Class
1:00 p.m.
- 24 Addressed Detroit District Michigan State Nurses
Association, Detroit 8:00 p.m.
- 25 Met with staff Teacher Education.
- 26 Addressed Critic Teachers, Kellogg Center.
- 29 Addressed East Lansing Kiwanis Club.
- 30 Met with School Board Association, Flint, 7:30 p.m.
- 31 Met with selected Michigan Educators to discuss
Community Education 5-11 p.m.

Nov.

- 1 Met with Roe's Class.
- 2 Met with President Hannah et al breakfast 7:00 a.m.
- 2 Luncheon Meeting Kellogg Center with Lansing Superintendents.
- 7 Addressed Faculty, Central Michigan College 4:00 p.m.
Addressed Teacher Education Faculty, Central Michigan
College 7:30 p.m.
- 8 Addressed Junior and Senior Students, Central Michigan
College 9-11:30 a.m. Addressed an additional group
1:30-3:30 p.m.
- 9 Addressed Tri-State Guidance Association, Kellogg Center
11:00 a.m.
- 12 Addressed faculty Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point,
Wisconsin 8:00 p.m.
- 14 Addressed Critic Teachers, Kellogg Center, 10:45 a.m.
A.E.S. Dept. Seminar 2:00 p.m.
- 15 Addressed Students in Education Western Michigan College
3:00 p.m.

- 15 Addressed Home Economics Teachers Dinner meeting
Kellogg Center
- 16 Addressed Phi Delta Kappa, Union Building 6:30 p.m.
- 19 Addressed faculty Bowling Green State University,
Bowling Green, Ohio 4:30 p.m.
- 19 Addressed Students Bowling Green University 8:00 p.m.
- 20 Met with Frontiers Seminar at lunch, Kellogg Center
- 26 Addressed Teachers in Southwest Michigan, Niles
4:00 p.m.
- 27 Addressed Kappa Delta Pi Union 6:30 Dinner
- 28 Luncheon Kellogg Center, Michigan Deans, Principals
- 29 Spent day in Flint, addressed supervisors and community
leaders.
- 30 Addressed Michigan Secondary School Association at
luncheon Olds Hotel

1957

April

- 1 Addressed Youth Bureau Annual Banquet, Flint, Michigan
- 4 Addressed Michigan Elementary Principal's Association,
Dinner meeting at Kellogg Center
- 5 Addressed Michigan College Agreement Group Higgins Lake,
keynote presentation
- 9 Addressed faculty Wisconsin State College, River Falls,
Wisconsin 4:00 p.m.; address to Superintendents in
River Falls area - Dinner meeting
- 10 Address - discussion, Lansing teachers, Seminar Frontiers
in Administration
- 13 Address to Texas Elementary Principal's Association,
Austin, Texas
- 15 Address to ASCD Directors of Instruction Group,
Kellogg Center - Dinner Meeting
- 17 Speaker, Annual Meeting Chicago Citizen's School
Committee, Eleventh Street Theatre, Chicago

- 23 Address to School Faculties, Pontiac Public Schools.
Panel member and summarizer at end of day. Meeting
with Horowitz Seminar Citizenship Study

- 25 Faculty meeting 4:00 p.m.

- 26 Frontiers of Administration Seminar

- 30 Meeting with Nebraska Group and Kellogg Officials,
Hart Hotel, Battle Creek Dinner Meeting

May

- 2 Address on the occasion of Centennial Celebration
San Jose State College, San Jose, California

- 8 Frontiers of Administration Seminar

- 9 Meeting with Physical Education Seminar

- 10 Addressed teachers of Jackson, Michigan 9:00 a.m.;
Addressed Michigan Schoolmaster's Club, Ann Arbor,
Michigan, 1:30 p.m.; addressed Curricula Workshop

- 14 Met with Elementary Education Club, 7:30 p.m.

- 15 Addressed AAUW at Birmingham, Michigan

- 16 Address at dedication of Kimball Young High School
8:00 p.m.

- 17 Addressed National Conference on Leisure, Washington,
D.C., 9:00 a.m.; address to Human Relations Con-
ference, University of Maryland 10:30 a.m.

- 24 Met with Board of Directors National Society for the
Study of Education, Chicago

- 28 Addressed Honors Convocation, Western Michigan Uni-
versity, Kalamazoo, 10:30 a.m.; Commencement
Address Allegan High School, 8:00 p.m.

June

- 3 Commencement address, Shepherd's College, Shepherdstown,
W. Va.

- 5 Commencement address, Greenville Public High School,
Greenville, Michigan

- 6 Commencement address, Grand Ledge, Michigan

- 9 Commencement address, Okemos High School

- 12 Commencement address, Flint High Schools
- 13 Commencement address, Port Huron High School
8:00 p.m. address to Rotary 12:00 noon

1958

Jan.

- 7 Addressed Faculty Women's Association, Union
- 9 Addressed Flint Adult Education Faculty, Ballenger Field House
- 10 Lectured to Television Experimental Groups
- 11 Planning Luncheon Kellogg Center for Hotel Managers Conference
- 12 Lectured to Grand Rapids High School Teachers, South High School, Grand Rapids
- 15 Addressed P.T.A. Council, East Lansing Junior High School
- 17 Addressed Hotel Association, Kellogg Center
- 20 Met with Hotel Management Seminar, Kellogg Center
- 22 Radio Program Student Station
- 24 Consultant to Faculty and Administration of Anderson College, Turkey Run, Indiana
- 25 Consultant to Anderson College
- 27 Addressed Faculty of Parma, Ohio Schools 10:00 a.m.;
Addressed Cleveland Area P.T.A. Council, Board of Education, Auditorium, Cleveland, 7:30 p.m.
- 29 Addressed Administrators and Teachers District M.E.A. Meeting, St. Johns Luncheon Session
- 31 Attended International Studies Seminar, 7:00-10:00 p.m.

Feb.

- 3 Addressed Lansing Teachers, 4:00 p.m.
- 5 Spent entire day in Flint. Addressed teachers from seven schools at one school in morning, teachers from eight schools at 1:30 p.m.
- 8 Attended International Studies Seminar, 9:00-12:00 a.m.
- 12 Consultant to Community Project, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska

- 13 Addressed Fiftieth Anniversary Luncheon, Teachers College, The University of Nebraska
- 14 Appeared on WKAR-TV, 7:30 p.m.
- 17 Addressed Annual Pledge Convocation, Music Building, 7:00 p.m.
- 19 Spent Day in Flint. Addressed teachers from Central High School and five elementary schools at Pierce School in the morning, teachers from two junior high schools and four elementary schools in the afternoon at Cummings School
- 22 Attended Board Meeting of National Society for the Study of Education at St. Louis, Missouri
- 26 Addressed school men in Phoenix, Arizona area, Dinner Meeting
- 27-28 Consultant to Arizona State College, Tempe, Arizona, Met with University Administrative staff. Met with School of Education faculty. Held one day's conference with individuals and groups reviewing problems and projects

March

- 1 Addressed Arizona College Association, University of Arizona at Tucson, Arizona
- 3 Addressed Livingston County Institute, Pontiac, Illinois
- 5 Addressed teachers of Corpus Christi, Texas
- 7 Addressed Oil Belt Teachers Association, Abilene, Texas. Addressed Elementary Teachers Luncheon. Addressed Principals and Supervisors dinner
- 10 WKAR-TV Program
- 11 Addressed State Federation of Women's Clubs, Kellogg Center
- 12 Met with Extern group in Administration
- 26 Addressed Administration Conference, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

April

- 3 Luncheon meeting with D.P.I. Representatives, Kellogg Center

- 8 Meeting at Educational Television and Radio Center,
Ann Arbor, Michigan. Consultant on Radio Program
Series on Crisis in Education.
 - 9 Addressed East Lansing High School student body, 1:45 p.m.
 - 10 Addressed National Conference, Delta Sigma Phi, Kellogg
Center, 10:00 a.m.
 - 10 Addressed Curriculum Conference, St. Mary's Lake, 7:30 p.m.
 - 15 Addressed Menominee, Michigan, County Institute, 10:00
a.m. and 2:00 p.m.
 - 16 Addressed Ishpeming County Institute, 9:30 a.m.
 - 16 Addressed Dinner Meeting of Faculty and School men,
Duluth Branch University of Minnesota, 6:00 p.m.
 - 17 Addressed Student Convocation, Duluth branch
 - 17 Addressed Duluth Teachers, 1:30 p.m.
 - 20 Addressed Alumni gathering, School of Education,
New York University, Biltmore Hotel, New York City
 - 28 Addressed Extension Seminar, Anthony Hall, 3:00 p.m.
- May
- 1 Addressed Precinct Chairman Student Group, Brody Hall
5:30 p.m.
 - 3 Gave talk to A.E.S. Externe Class at Gull Lake
 - 6 Addressed Bohemian Dinner meeting, all Lansing P.T.A.
Olds Auditorium, 6:00 p.m.
 - 7 Addressed Personnel services group, Kellogg Center
Luncheon
 - 8 Addressed Indiana College President's Association,
Indianapolis, Indiana
 - 9 Addressed Michigan Health Association, Detroit, Michigan
 - 13 Addressed Extension Conference, Home Economics, Flint,
Michigan, 8:00 p.m.
 - 14 Addressed Inter-Residence Council at 6:30 Dessert,
Brody Hall
 - 18 Addressed Student Banquet, Kellogg Center, Big Ten Room,
11:30 a.m.

- 27 Addressed Lansing High Schools Honors Banquet,
Otto Junior High School, 6:00 p.m.
- 28 Gave High School Commencement talk, Bemidji High School,
Bemidji, Minn.
- 29 Gave High School Commencement talk, St. Cloud High School,
St. Cloud, Minn.

June

- 2 Gave Commencement address, Roberts Wesleyan College
near Rochester, N.Y.
- 5 Gave Grand Haven High School Commencement Address
- 6 Attended Board Meeting, National Society for the Study
of Education, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
- 7 National Society Board Meeting continued
- 8 Addressed Unitarian Fellowship, Lansing, Michigan

ROOM ~~USE~~ ONLY