to the Chancellor for further investigation. No exact, complete transcript of Dr. Levine's address at Lewistown seems to be available, but the excerpts preserved record the argument between him and Mr. L. O. Evans, counsel for the A.C.M., at the end of which the meeting broke up, probably because of the juggling of net and gross income figures that went on.

In the meantime Dr. Levine with the approval of the Chancellor and Dr. Sisson decided to prepare a bulletin on mine taxation first, other tax problems to be written on later, and was working hard on it that summer and by fall had the manuscript ready for the Chancellor's inspection. The Chancellor replied that it was a "conspicuous piece of work," but added that he was afraid the University could not publish it. But, the Chancellor wanted to publish it because it would be evidence of service by the University to the state. The next step was to submit the manuscript to the State Board of Education for their opinion. Dr. Levine agreed to do this on condition that if they did not approve of the University's publishing it, he would be at liberty to publish it himself in any way or under any auspices convenient.

The Chancellor wrote on November 21, 1913, that he had been unable to carry out the investigation asked for by the Board about the Lewistown speech because Mr. Kemer had failed to supply him with the stenographic report of the speech. This delayed matters further. The Board met in December. The Chancellor wrote Dr. Levine that it seemed best to use much circumspection during the following two or three months (when the legislature met), and that he would confer on the matter soon. Dr. Levine replied that he had better publish the monograph at
his own expense, but was asked to wait, and did so. Later the Chancellor again urged that the publication be postponed till after the meeting of the legislature, because to publish it would antagonize that body. Dr. Levine offered again to publish it independently, but both the Chancellor and Dr. Sisson "insisted that the University was entitled to the credit of having done the service to the people of Montana," finally, however, agreeing that the author should place the manuscript in the hands of a printer for setting up. There was no question raised as to his right to publish independently of the University or the Board's approval. Yet there was the earnest request to wait.

Nothing more happened till January 26, 1919, when Dr. Levine, who had been in Washington a month at request of the war board, was called to Helena by the Chancellor. At this meeting another idea was introduced—that it might be sound policy for the University to avoid active participation in the discussion of all questions which sharply divide the people, including problems of taxation (an echo of German limited academic freedom?). The Chancellor did not claim that this policy gave him the right to forbid the independent publication of the monograph but argued it would be better for the author not to publish it, that since the "interests" were determined to crush out all liberal thought, publication would bring an attack on Dr. Levine and that the newspapers of the state would not give him a fair hearing, that the Board would dismiss him, and that he would be on trial for Socialism, Bolshevism, and other undesirable attributes; that in view
of what historians call the "passion of the time," such a trial would
ruin Dr. Levine's professional reputation and make it impossible for
him to get another position in the country. Dr. Levine asked for a
letter from the Chancellor covering the substance of the conference.
The letter closed with the sentence,

Weighing all the existing circumstances, it seems best for
the larger and permanent interests of the University that any
publication of this bulletin be indefinitely postponed.

On February 4, Dr. Levine replied with a review of the steps by
which the monograph had reached being held in press for word from him.
He closed with the following:

We specifically agreed at our conference in President Sisson's
office December, 1913, that there would be no question of my right
to publish in case the University refused to do so.

In view of the above, I have decided to proceed with the
publication of the bulletin. I sincerely believe that by so doing
I shall best serve the general interests of the State and the cause
of scientific social research as well as the ultimate interests
of the University.

Three days later, February 7, 1919, the legislature still in session,
came a telegram from the Chancellor to President Sisson:

Under the rules of the State Board of Education I have today
suspended Professor Louis Levine from further duty as member of
the faculty of the State University of Montana for insubordination
and for unprofessional conduct prejudicial to the welfare of the
institution. Please communicate this action to Professor Levine
immediately.

There was a general feeling of shock on the campus. Dr. Sisson
said publicly that this was the one decision on which he had disagreed
with the Chancellor in the years they had worked together. He felt
that the question of official control over utterances of University
professors was of serious import. He called the affair a tragic dilemma.
A quotation here from an article on "Segregation and the Professor" by Professor Iredell Jenkins of the University of Alabama in the 1957 Winter number of *The Yale Review* seems pertinent since it analyzes a similarly tragic dilemma.

Now the morality of institutions differs from that of individuals in several notable respects, and especially in this, that institutions must have a high regard for expediency. Institutions must always keep an alert eye on the consequences that their policies and actions are apt to have on themselves, and they must frequently act in a coldly practical manner. The reason for this is simply that institutions are infinitely less expendable than individuals; they are, in fact, literally indispensable. When an institution is seriously weakened, it takes a long time to recover; and in the meantime it leaves a vacuum in which its functions go unperformed and its values unserved. So a university is justified, even obligated, to bow to the expedient and to cultivate prudence in a manner that would be clearly immoral in an individual.

Professors, as members of a university, inherit this obligation. And with this recognition the character of the dilemma that professors confront is exposed in all of its stark and unrelenting harshness. As individual moral agents they feel obliged to serve the right as they see it. As members of an institution they feel obliged to consider its judgment of what is expedient and practicable in the light of its vital interests.

Morally this is dangerous doctrine, practically it seems in cases to be warning against institutional suicide. Caught in such circumstances, some men resign. Many have wondered why Dr. Sisson did not resign, having such decided views on the liberty that should exist in a democracy.

A letter from Dr. Lorwin to Mr. Speer on the occasion of the latter's retirement throws some light on the matter.

As I recall Montana days, our little group (Underwood, the Coffmans, etc.) admired Sisson especially for his kindness and spirit of independence. We used to say that he owed his charming informality and love of individual freedom to his heritage of English non-conformism . . . It would seem . . . that his experience in America strengthened that heritage in him and gave it that steel-like quality of ethical earnestness which was such a marked feature of his personality.
Sisson was deeply disturbed by the fight over my "Mine Taxation in Montana." He had a strong sense of loyalty to Chancellor Elliott, but he felt that I was right and he took my side in the controversy. I went to see him at his home soon after I was suspended, and I saw how agitated he was over the situation. He told me that he had not slept all night thinking over the problem whether he should hand in his resignation. I urged him not to do so as I thought it would be bad not only for him but also for the University. I told him that Underwood had also wanted to resign but that I had dissuaded him from doing so. But Sisson said that if he did not resign, he would leave no doubt in Chancellor Elliott's mind where he (Sisson) stood on the issue, whatever the consequences.

Before considering further the horns of the dilemma it should be noted that in the weeks following, various gossip grew about the University, the most serious to the effect that the school was a hotbed of socialism, that the Department of Economics was the instrument of socialistic propaganda, perhaps because in his preface Dr. Levine had thanked Dr. Underwood for "many helpful suggestions." Hon. J. W. Anderson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education, notified Dr. Sisson of the desire of his committee to investigate the charges. Dr. Sisson replied, offering any material the committee wished and advising that they consult alumni who had studied in the department, specifically Maurice Dietrich (1918) in Helena at the time, who had been an assistant in the department. Dr. Underwood was summoned to appear before the committee and answered all their questions freely. The Senate Committee on Education of course after free and open discussion of the matter found the charges untenable.

In the meantime, Dr. Levine had recourse to the Service Committee of the University for a hearing, and had submitted outline and evidence for his case. This committee had at first been called the Welfare Committee, as a similar one was at Reed College, and was intended as
investigatory and advisory to the president on his request, especially on matters of tenure, teaching load, freedom, and some other items that had to do with the welfare of the faculty.

It is probable that the idea of such a committee originated with Dr. Sisson. Professor Aber was away on sick leave at the time recommendations were being made for appointments and salaries for the following year, and Dr. Sisson, harrassed by a small budget and having noticed the small enrollment in Greek and Latin, both having continued to fall during the long reaction against the classics and the increased demand for other studies during the war, recommended half pay for Professor Aber. Heartbroken letters, and resentful too, came from the victim, with a list of the things he had looked after on the campus besides his regular classes. Protests came in from the alumni. The salary was restored. Dr. Sisson was quite aghast at the storm he had raised and at the result of his so-called scientific method in handling the matter. Personally he had little patience with the American method of teaching foreign languages, convinced that they emphasized structure and memory to the almost complete unawareness of the meaning of the great classics read, and felt that fine published translations would better humanize the readers. He deducted that this view plus his cold statistics on Professor Aber's teaching load had misled him, and he proposed that a committee including some alumni be organized for appeal to in such situations. It seems rather probable that through considerable discussion, both formal and informal, this idea evolved into the finally approved Committee on Service re-introduced some months later by Dr. Lennes, with procedure and powers clearly defined, and in June 1918 sent out in an administrative memorandum from the Chancellor's Office to all the units.
It has been a standing committee ever since. It consists of one professor appointed by the chancellor, or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Board of Education, who is the governor, one by the president of the unit, and one elected by the unit faculty. Its duty is,

At the direction of the president and upon the request of any administrative officer or any member of the staff whose appointment is not to be renewed, or who is under suspension, to examine fully into the circumstances or charges, and to submit a report of its findings to the officer or member involved, and also to the president of the institution. The president shall transmit such report to the Chancellor for the consideration of the Board of Education. At the time of such consideration the officer or member involved shall have the right to appear personally before the Board in his own defense.

In the case of Dr. Levine, the committee appealed to the AAUP, who sent a representative to Missoula to talk with those concerned there and with the Chancellor in Helena. It was thought by them that some compromise might be effected. The Alumni Association after putting the matter before its members by mail sent a letter of protest and interrogation to the Governor, the Board, and the Chancellor. The last two points made in this letter are as follows:

We believe that the University and its administration should be forever divorced from politics. To this end we advocate the bringing about of a permanent tax for higher education purposes in this state by which ample funds may be provided for the conducting of the University of Montana along proper and recognized lines of growth.

As long as the present system of government by a Board of Education remains in force we believe it only right and proper that we should demand and have representation on the State Board of Education. We would recommend that the Governor of the State appoint as a member of the State Board of Education the alumnus or alumna of the State University who has been designated by the State University Alumni Association.
The report of the Committee on Service was transmitted to the State Board of Education, the final statement being, "The Committee finds that the charges are not sustained." The Board met in April, and on April 10, 1919, President Sisson received the statement of its action:

It was moved and carried that the action of the Chancellor in suspending Dr. Levine as a member of the faculty of the State University is approved.

It was further moved and carried that Dr. Levine be re-instated as a member of the faculty of the State University and that he receive salary for the period of suspension.

This is not so funny as it sounds. The Governor had been insistent that the brochure on mine taxation should not be published at the time, and the Board had told the Chancellor that if Dr. Levine published it then, they would dismiss Mr. Levine at their next meeting. The question after suspension arose whether the Chancellor had the right to suspend Dr. Levine without a meeting of the Board to order the action. According to the administrative memorandum of the previous June, the Chancellor did have the right to act in this way; but the committee questioned his right to define insubordination and unprofessional conduct.

The Chancellor knew what the Board wanted and would do, and, with the Governor's urging, suspended Dr. Levine at once. Dr. Levine knew what the Chancellor and the Board did not want him to do, and he did it. Neither had he received a direct command. The Chancellor had been "informed" urgently of the Board's wishes. Dr. Levine had been similarly informed. The Chancellor had acceded. The economist had not. The case was aired in the New Republic, the Nation, the New York
Evening Post. The findings of the committee, Dr. Morton J. Elrod, Dr. Paul C. Phillips, and Walter L. Pope, later Judge of the 9th Judicial District, were published in the March 1919 number of the AAUP Bulletin and highly commended for their fairness, restraint, and pertinence to the general question of academic freedom in the United States.

With all due respect to interest from far places, it should be noted that in spite of Upton Sinclair's slanted and inaccurate account in The Goosestep and of H. J. Laski's statement in his The American Democracy, and similar language in letters to editors of Eastern publications that editorialised on the case, Dr. Levine was never dismissed from the staff of Montana State University. He would have been dismissed by the Board if the Chancellor had not suspended him, and if alumni and other citizens had not protested. Suspension is a quite different status from dismissal. The Legislature made the requested appropriations. Dr. Levine was without salary for two months. The Chancellor moved about his duties grim and taciturn while protests came in. The dilemma became strictly the Board's. They could do but one thing, put a knob on each horn.

Dr. Levine continued to teach at the University until the fall of 1919 when in October he accepted a position with the New York World to do special work for them in economics. He asked for leave of absence for a year, but because of the inconvenience the University would be put to in finding a replacement after the school year had already begun and the
uncertainty of his return even at the end of a year, he himself suggested that if he could not be given leave, he would offer his resignation in order to pursue the other work as long as it might be necessary. This suggestion was accepted.

After this work in New York he went in 1920 to Beloit College to teach, under President K. A. Brannon. This same year he married Rose Strunsky, translator of Tolstoi's Diary and of Gorki's The Confession, one of the Arthur Ballard group who visited Russia in 1906, and a cousin of Simeon Strunsky of the New York Evening Post. Dr. Levine, now Dr. Louis Lorwin, is a brother of the late piano virtuoso, Levinsky, who gave a concert in Missoula in the late twenties and played Mozart and Chopin with an individual effect like quicksilver running over velvet.

It was felt at the time that the suspension had done the University untold harm. But not all the advertising was harmful. The alumni turned their attention to some form of permanent tax that would leave legislation less open to political pressure, and to representation on the Board. Many who had thought little of it before began to think about academic freedom and what the civil rights of a teacher really could be. The book sold well and went into a second printing that same year so that the expediency of publishing under protest seemed good timing for the author. The corporation license tax bill was finally passed and signed by Governor Dixon in 1921. Moreover the difference between propaganda and scientific information was for a time realized, and in 1920 the people supported measures 18 and 19 that
provided a ten-year mill tax for higher education and bonds for
$5,000,000 for necessary building at the four units.

Among the other young members of the faculty who came in at about
the same time (1916 on) as Dr. Levine, either just before or just after,
were Anders Orbeck, Dr. Helen Sard Hughes, Rufus A. Coleman, Howard
Mumford Jones, Dr. George R. Coffman who had followed Dr. Reynolds as
chairman of English, and Dr. Joseph Ward Swain, son of Dr. H. H. Swain,
for many years executive secretary of the Chancellor's Office. Mr.
Orbeck left a memento in the shape of an English manual prepared for
freshmen and printed by the University under his copyright, in 1919.
Revisions of this were printed by Mr. Merriam, the next chairman of English.
The general scheme of the required service courses in composition has
not changed much in over thirty years. Students still have to hand
in themes and have teachers to read and comment on them and sometimes to
require a third revision. Students still have to become acquainted with
sources in the library, indexes, documents, pamphlets, periodicals,
and books. At the time, the library had only 40,000 books in comparison
to the figures for a recent year, of over 400,000. The list of supple-
mentary readings, covering 13 pages, includes some magazines no longer
published, the old Literary Digest, the Unpartisan Review, Mademoiselle,
Miss, (probably the present Mademoiselle) the Outlook, Scribner's,
and the Century. Max Eastman was writing on The Enjoyment of Poetry,
and objecting to the imagists, Empson was too young yet to have figured
out as many as seven types of ambiguity that a lad might use to make his
meaning clear. Euripides, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Plato, Homer, Aristotle,
and Dante, in translation (but not Tasso or Virgil) were listed. Tessa
and The Return of the Native balanced The Doll's House and The Wild Duck.
Vachel Lindsay was having adventures while spreading the gospel of Beauty.
Masters had come in with Spoonriver Anthology. Bertrand Russell was
explaining why men fight, and Carl Sandburg was celebrating Chicago, hog
butcher for the world. Yeats's controversial The Countess Kathleen was
on the list, and Zangwill's The Melting Pot and The War God. With woman
suffrage still a new thing, there were among others listed: Women as
World Builders by Floyd Dell, Women of Belgium by Charlotte Kellogg,
J. S. Mill's The Subjection of Women, Olive Schreiner's Woman and Labor,
and Gilbert Stone's Women War Workers. There were also of course books
on the labor problem and on the state of affairs in Russia and a good
many foreign novelists in translation. Many who were writing at the
time were not listed, but on the whole there was an attempt to include
contemporary expression along with the classics.

Mr. Coleman, originally a Canadian, had come from the chairmanship
of English in the Butte high school to take over speech and debate at
the University. He still recalls with pride the fact that Bill Jameson
was one of his star debaters. Mr. Coleman left at the end of his first
year, taught that summer in the Lewis and Clark High School summer
session in Spokane, and then went on to work in the shipyards on the
west coast during the war. After some restorative work on a farm
afterwards, he applied for a graduate scholarship and went to the
University of Toronto. He came back to the University in 1927 and in
1934 on leave of absence finished his work for the doctorate at Boston
University.
He tells that in 1918, he and Miss Hughes and Dr. Coffman and Mr. Jones were all housed in one office on the second floor of the old library, and in a niche around the corner was Miss Corbin, in another niche Dr. Underwood. Mr. Jones was an assistant professor, and Miss Hughes who had taken her Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, where Mr. Jones had taken an M.A. the year before, felt bitterly discriminated against as a woman by being employed as a mere instructor, especially since she had already published a book on the English novel. The following year she was promoted. She wrote protesting articles to the Dial and the New Republic when Dr. Levine was suspended.

Mr. Jones did not always agree with Dr. Coffman, arguing for Longfellow against Tennyson. He was, they say, rather cocky and quite independent in his conceit that he knew where he was going. He went to Harvard by way of Texas. Like V. Stefansson in his undergraduate days, he would not wear a hat, and at the time such non-conformity was suspicious. One night when he and Mr. Coleman had gone walking down town to find a cool glass of beer, they were, on leaving the saloon, accosted by a policeman, even though Mr. Coleman wore a hat. The group started among them a reading meeting in a class room on the first floor of the old library—Law was at that time in the basement—to which they invited students, faculty and others interested. Perhaps because he would not wear a hat, Mr. Jones sometimes had a cold and could not take his part. One Kamin announces that he will read a play by Oscar Wilde. The next Kamin announces that because of illness Mr. Jones will not read the play The Importance of Being Earnest. Mr. Jones
was also a musician and played the piano with more than amateur ability. There was someone on the faculty with a soft tenor voice, and Mr. Coleman was a fine baritone. So they planned a take-off on Carmen. Mr. Jones caught cold, but the rest under Mr. Coleman's whimsical fancy with perhaps Dr. John X. Neuman at the piano presented a night of sweet sounds and good fun on a stage in the old gymnasium. Dr. Coleman still chuckles over what fun they had being funny.

For exercise they took hikes up hill and down dale, adding others to their nucleus, and walking joyfully distances that would astound the present day student whose instinctive way of finding exercise seems to be to drive as near as possible to the campus and go on foot from there to his classroom. Mr. Jones even, in the ebullience of his no-hatness, is said to have played leap-frog all the way across Van Buren Bridge.

In 1919, after the resignation of Dr. Coffman, Professor Merriam joined the staff. He had a B.A. from Wyoming, and a B.A. and an M.A. from Oxford where he had gone as a Rhodes Scholar. During the First World War he had been with the Y.M.C.A. in Europe, and like Mr. Coleman had on his return to the United States taken some leave from study and teaching by living on a farm, and then after teaching at Whitman and Beloit Colleges, studied at Harvard and again taught, this time at Reed College. He came as chairman of his department. During sabbatical leave he spent part time at Columbia and the rest in England working for his doctorate and gaining it from Columbia for a study of Edward Moxon,
publishers of Tennyson and the Brownings.

end of President Simmons' administration. He was a very stimulating
and inventively wise chairman of the department until his retirement
in 1954, a service of 35 exciting years. This same year, 1919, Sidney
Hayes Cox came as an assistant professor, with an M.A. from the University
of Illinois, and Edmund L. Freeman with a B.A. from Missouri Wesleyan.
Mr. Freeman took over speech and debate and helped with everything on
the campus as he still does, not only on committees but personally with
student-faculty relations, a real scholar in that he has preserved an
open mind. Mr. Cox in 1926 went on to Dartmouth where he died in 1951,
regretted by friends both there and here.

In an old notebook are found the following remarks by two of
these men. By Mr. Merriam:

Three things every student should know before leaving
college: evolution, pragmatism, and Freud's psychology.
Form does not make poetry and never can, but honest feeling
makes poetry.

By Mr. Cox: (on the devil)

No devil, no sympathy; no devil, no conscience; no devil,
no struggle; no devil, no use; and, if there is no devil, no fun.
We must have for morals some concept of value and of right and
wrong. So it becomes necessary to accept for moral purpose the
existence of relative evil, and therefore of a devil.

Among others Dr. John A. Neuman and Owen G. Humphrey both in
biology, Harriet Gardner (Mrs. H. J. Lennes) and Bernice Berry (Mrs.
J. H. Ramskill) in public school music, voice, and piano, and Madame
Arnoldson in French were added. Mrs. Ramskill is still on the staff.
During all these complicated years, the problem ever in the back of Dr. Sisson's mind, as in the minds of all thoughtful educators, concerned the goals of education and how they might be reached. In Kansas he had become an American citizen a-flame with admiration of the opportunities open to every American for education. At Chicago, he had begun to question the efficiency of some teachers who showed no power to apply the ideas taught in the classics to present day problems. In Germany he had felt that war instead of education was the first concern of the state. In his winter quarter off in 1920 he would be at leisure to repair his health and to some extent give his mind again to a way to reach the goals he had set his heart on for the youth of the country. This attraction, added to his dislike of administrative work, was no doubt what led to his resignation in 1921, to return to a light load of teaching and lecturing and a study of how and what to teach.

While he was away, the campaign for the Initiative and Referendum measures 18 and 19 reached state-wide proportions, and on his return in the spring he joined it with new vigor. All the units of the Greater University were vigorous in the work, and probably no other measure was ever so widely discussed, opposed, supported, and carried.

Dr. Dunlavy had worked hard for such a measure. Other public men had urged it. The Chancellor and various committees with the expert assistance from Dr. Levine had begun steps for such a campaign in 1916. The victors could rest a while on well-earned laurels, and the alumni of all the units feel a common bond from their assistance and strengthen
it when it would become necessary to work for an extension of the support in ten years. Supporters in Butte gave special credit there to the efforts of Professor Arthur Adam of the School of Mines who, as President Clapp of that school said, had really swung the vote by clear, incontrovertible mathematics. The mills of the people grind slowly indeed, but exceeding fine, when truth flows into the hopper.

On October 30, 1917, on a cold, foggy morning, Dr. Sisson had without any public ceremony broken ground for the Natural Science Hall, the only permanent building to be erected during his years and the only one since the library in 1908. Nobody probably has ever thought of the barracks and hospital and the old YMCA hut as permanent in spite of the variety of work and interests they still house. Dr. Sisson did not like administrative work, especially under war conditions when people's money was being drained into military and charitable needs, and educational needs were nearly backed out of sight. At first he said it was a philosophical challenge to him. Later it became a "burden like personal destitution, crushing and enervating." In 1918 Natural Science Hall was completed, and was occupied by part of the Museum, Biology, Botany, Physics, and Home Economics, leaving Old Science Hall temporarily free for Chemistry and Pharmacy, and freeing University Hall of the class and storage room some of these departments had needed, thus making place for Geology in the basement.

The YMCA hut was built that year also and housed the student store till the old Forestry building became its home after the present Forestry building was erected during Dr. Clapp's administration.
Till after the war the YMCA was a growing public benefit, providing social interest of various kinds for boys and young men. During the war it provided in the United States and in Europe the service developed in World War II by the USO. Its unfortunate ruling early in the century that neither Jews nor Catholics were Christians and hence could not be members was a rather scandalous reflection on its own Christianity. Except for its extensive and pleasant centers in the larger cities it had faded back in the picture by the thirties, especially on this campus where the University made first quarter contacts for students with their preferred religious affiliations, and the churches prepared welcome for them. After the moving of the University store, the YMCA hut became the University-carpenter shop, a pleasant center for the work, with its varnished field-stone fireplace and later a bright new green fire-resistant roof. It stands on its original site, back and east of the R.O.T.C. headquarters where at the end of the First World War it ministered genially to S.A.T.C., to R.O.T.C., and to veterans housed temporarily in Cook Hall, and for a few years longer to the whole campus.

By the spring of 1921, with the lift in spirits that came from the possibility of new buildings on all the campuses of the Greater University, and the accompanying ideas of what might be done to offer a larger opportunity to all students in Montana, the faculty at the University were moving alertly to a definite and perhaps newly reasoned policy for the administration of their institution. Many things might
be done now that had never been possible before. On March 17 they submitted a memorial to President Sisson, drawn up on request of a group of the faculty by Dr. Kerriam and transmitted to the Chancellor on that same day. It called for a statement of policy to be made frankly to the public at large:

... that a statement of the reshaping and redefinition of the policy of the institution, demanded by the changed conditions, be made in clear terms and in as much detail as possible by the officers of administration to the faculty, these two statements to be made with a view first to enlisting and centering and crystallizing public interest in the institution, and secondly, to rallying and putting to use student interest and loyalty, and thirdly to centering and consolidating and directing toward intelligent co-operation the efforts of the faculty, in its plans, executive functions, and instruction. The positive statement of aims and ideals, especially when clearly conceived and above the average in quality and depth of insight, together with the gradual performance, which is necessarily a slow process, give to an institution that individuality which not only arouses the interest of the outside educational world but directs the enthusiastic planning and labor of students and faculty, of alumni and citizens, insofar as they are involved, into such definite channels as assure quality and progress. Action then travels concentrically in widening influence.

Certain questions immediately come to mind: What shall be the policy toward development of professional schools and the so-called liberal college? What branches of study is it the intention of the institution to strengthen, establish, or re-establish, and with what objects in view? What encouragement is to be given to research work as distinct from teaching, and to what extent? What development, if any, is to be given to correspondence and extension work? To what extent is the faculty member to be kept in touch with advancement in his particular branch of endeavor, through attendance at meetings of scientific bodies, etc? To what extent is the faculty to be kept in touch with the community, meaning the state? What policy does the administration expect to assume toward teaching load, committee load, and other labors of the faculty? To what extent is the library to be made, through adequate support and through establishment of seminar rooms, the center of studious work on the campus? What is to be the attitude of the institution toward numbers as opposed to quality of work that can be successfully
accomplished with the resources at hand? . . . Is the present student
government satisfactory? To what extent and how is student life
to be recognized (for example, by provision of buildings for student
activities, by building of an auditorium with dance-floor and well
equipped stage and pipe organ, by provision of funds for bringing
to the institution artistic and scientific and spiritual influences,
such as exhibits of art, music, lectures, both singly and in series,
by great men)? What is to be the function of certain administrative
officers, such as deans? What relation is to exist between faculty
and executives, (for example, is action of the faculty to be merely
advisory)?

Some additional questions were added in an appendix as having been
submitted too late for incorporation in the original memorial. They
reflect the conditions immediately following the war and the problems
of quality versus quantity. They show that the bulk of the energy of
the faculty as a whole, because of the increasing freshman classes, is
expended on freshman courses, elementary largely. They ask if for this
reason must social, scientific, philosophical and artistic studies wait?
They show that vocational demands from freshmen have virtually changed
the nature of the University by centering demands for money on the needs
of technical training, although the University is the only unit of
the four then existing that was founded as a University. The State
University should be carrying on distinguished research and publication,
but is not. It is clear from other questions that many of the faults
indicated came from the financial status during, and right after, the
war, coupled with the sudden increase in attendance from increasing
high school classes and returning veterans. The importance of library
support is also urged in comparison with expenditures for expensive
apparatus for departments and schools, for the library is the laboratory
for studies in the liberal college.
In its discussions of the relation of faculty to administration, a faculty group had evolved an idea, probably from a somewhat similar one in use at Reed College and appealing to President Sisson, who often longed to be back there. On April 12, 1921, Chancellor Elliott addressed the faculty and gave opportunity for discussion of the questions raised in the memorial. At the same meeting Dr. Underwood introduced the idea referred to above, under a motion that seven members be elected to a committee concerning policy and distribution of the budget. By a substitute motion made by Dr. Rowe, a committee of three was appointed to study the matter and make recommendations to the faculty concerning the original motion. Dr. Underwood, Dr. Rowe, and Dr. Elrod were appointed, and then on the president's suggestion, Dean Leaphart; Mr. Merriam called notice to the fact that of course the president would be an ex-officio member. On May 17, 1921, the recommendation for a Committee on Policy and the Distribution of the Budget was presented to the faculty as follows:

1. That seven members be elected;
2. That two of these be elected from the Science group;
3. That two of these be elected from the Arts group;
4. That two of these be elected from the Schools group;
5. That these groups separately elect each two members of the committee;
6. That the seventh member of the committee be elected at large.
On May 31, 1921, the first committee under this name was elected. The first inclusion of it as a standing committee in the catalog is in the 1921-22 catalog under the shortened title, Budget and University Policy Committee, and the members listed are, Underwood, Coon, Kirkwood, Leaphart, Merriam, Merrill, Scheuch.

The establishment of this committee was the first formal step so far as known towards faculty participation in administration in higher education in Montana. After its transmission to the Chancellor it had been minutely discussed by him with President Clapp of the School of Mines and with President Sisson. It stood the discussion, and was welcomed especially by President Clapp, who liked to work with his colleagues, and who felt it would afford opportunity for a real evaluation of conditions and answers to the problems they presented. Several years later President Atkinson wrote for information about it, its working at the State University having aroused attention. President Sisson welcomed it as another step toward the implementing of Democracy in action. The Chancellor who at first mistrusted it, finally approved it as a means of harmony in an increasingly variegated faculty, and its advisory recommendations as a source of real information.

In May the resignation of Dr. Sisson was announced and the appointment of his successor, Dr. Charles H. Clapp of the School of Mines at Butte. The Commencement of 1921 was held outdoors on the green between the old Craig Hall and Maurice Avenue, at ten o'clock in the morning. This was in accordance with the custom at Reed College where Dr. Sisson had enjoyed it, the steps of the main building there used as a stage and
the audience seated on the lawn in front of it. The day was sunny and quiet, branches of the weeping birches barely moving, quiet shadows from the evergreens reaching the last row of folding chairs that accommodated the audience. With the Chancellor and the Commencement speaker, George Greenwood, '04, on the temporary rostrum bravely facing the light, on either side of President Sisson were Dr. Clapp and Professor Scheuch, the latter to assist the president elect during the summer while the former was attending to Bureau of Mines field trips and closing out his affairs at the School of Mines in Butte and moving his family from there to Missoula. The general expression on the rostrum was pleasant. Dr. Sisson was truly glad to go. Dr. Clapp had convinced himself that he was glad to come. Dr. Scheuch was probably happy that there would be no two-year interim to burden him at this change. None of them wore academic costumes, which to Dr. Sisson were un-democratic.

Dr. Sisson and Dr. Clapp had become good friends during their acquaintance on the Executive Board. They had expressed to each other their warm admiration of Wilson and their grief at the fiasco his ideals and hopes had come to. They had both met the problems of administration during war time, the controversy over R.O.T.C., the inroads of the flu, and the arguments pro and con over measures 18 and 19, and both had given their best endeavor to the needs of Montana education and what it might to for the society and economy of the state. The one was confident that his successor would build on whatever was stable and good in the University's past, and the other was grateful for what his
predecessor had accomplished. The one was a philosopher and liberal; the other was a scientist and engineer, a liberal in that the scientific mind will always question sweeping statements, a philosopher in that the goal of investigation was truth. The one was discouraged over Montana with its labor and capital antagonism, its materialism, its far from classless society. The other was in love with Montana so that his voice was richer when he spoke the name, so that in times of trial his spirit revived when he lifted his eyes to her hills, so that he was sure a way could be found through human engineering to help students on the way to that ideal of honor and integrity his Massachusetts forebears had held to, and the new-old goal of the brotherhood of man.

Dr. Sisson left in July, with his wife and their adopted son and daughter. He went back to Reed College where there were no fraternities or sororities, no inter-collegiate athletics, and none of the student and faculty heart-aches that these organizations sometimes cause. He felt that independence of thought was fostered there, and the direct contact with his students was stimulating and inspiring. He was happy there. In 1923-25 he was a visiting professor at the University of California and met again the challenge of large classes in a course for teachers in methods of civic education, an exploration, as he called it, of American democracy in action. In 1927 he taught in the summer session at Harvard. The previous year his book, *Educating for Freedom* had been published by Macmillan. His articles appeared during these years in the *Atlantic* and various journals of education and philosophy.
In Carmel, where he lived from 1939 on, he found a congenial circle of friends who were a consolation to him when his wife died in 1945. On July 3, 1947, he married Astrid Honoria Seron, who, with her invalid scholar husband, had been of the circle at first but had been in retirement for several years after her husband's death. The last years of his life were fruitful and serene in writing and lecturing. He died in his sleep, January 24, 1949, at the age of 82 after a very short illness. Astrid Seron Sisson says of him, "He never grew old. He never knew the aimlessness of the old."

Dr. Sisson's years at the University, and the efforts of his faculty left their marks: The Service Committee, The Budget and Policy Committee, his defense of Dr. Levine, his concern for the place of education in the changing world to be faced in order that the youth of the state might be helped to face it, and the contribution of all, students, alumni, and staff, as at the other units, to the success of Initiative and Referendum measures 13 and 19.