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DR. JAMES M. MOUDY, named to the executive post of chancellor of Texas Christian University on July 1, was inaugurated in a formal ceremony on Nov. 19, 1965, in Daniel-Meyer Coliseum on the campus of the 92-year-old institution.

The public ceremony, before an audience of several thousand persons, was the first inauguration of a chief administrative officer at TCU since 1916, when Dr. Edward McShane Waits was installed. Dr. M. E. Sadler, executive chairman of TCU's
Board of Trustees, began his administration in 1941, following the late Dr. Waits, by "hanging up his hat and going to work."

Dr. Moudy, unanimously approved to succeed Dr. Sadler, who retired from the chancellorship to his current position on June 30, became the University's seventh executive administrator, the first alumnus and the first Texan to hold the post.

The inaugural event opened with an academic processional which included representatives of 346 colleges and universities from throughout the United States and Mexico, delegates of 51 learned societies and organizations, TCU faculty, members of the Board of Trustees and the chancellor's party, all in full regalia.

Dr. Sadler presided over the ceremony, and the invocation was given by Dean Jerome A. Moore of TCU's AddRan College of Arts and Sciences.

The installation of the chancellor was administered by Lorin A. Boswell, chairman of the trustees. Dr. Granville T. Walker, minister of University Christian Church and TCU board member, offered the dedicatory prayer.
Following Chancellor Moudy's address and the singing of the Alma Mater Hymn, Dean Elmer D. Henson of Brite Divinity School gave the benediction.

Dr. and Mrs. Moudy were honored with an inaugural luncheon for delegates and representatives in the ballroom of Brown-Lupton Student Center.

This address was delivered by Dr. James M. Moudy on the occasion of his inauguration as chancellor of Texas Christian University, Friday, November 19, 1965, 10 o'Clock A. M., in Daniel-Meyer Coliseum, TCU Campus, Fort Worth, Texas.
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There is a distinct possibility that our nation is expecting too much or is expecting the wrong thing from education. Congressmen, schoolmen, parents, and even our young people seem infatuated with it. It has become the nation's rabbit foot, thought to cure all ills and to guard against all evils.

It is my purpose today to sound a note of caution and to say that we are in danger of building our expectations unsoundly and too high. There is no magic in education. Those whose expectations are too high will be disillusioned; it is quite possible that a wave of anti-intellectualism will follow this disillusionment. I repeat: There is no magic in education! What we need is a view of education that is crisp, clear, sure, unmagical.

Before pursuing this general point, let me affirm that I do believe in education and that I am not in it against my will. I believe it is one, even if only one, of the principal answers to the fulfillment of man's potential and purpose. My only fear is that we will depend upon it too much, expect more than it can ever offer, and unthinkingly neglect the other ingredients of man's potential and purpose.

Though I feel we are expecting too much from education, I do not believe that we are about to invest too much in it. Not even the recent large local, state, and federal appropriations for education put us in
danger of over-investment. Only in the last decade or so have we had substantial expenditures for education in this country. Our increased investment is good on the whole, and we may yet see the amount expended for education reach and surpass amounts spent for tobacco and alcohol, though hardly for automobiles.

My main point today is neither under-investment or over-investment, but, rather, that our rapidly increasing investment in education gives rise to the uneasy feeling that we are beginning to attach some magical quality to education and to think unclearly about its conduct.

Close at home we find many school administrators, particularly at the college and university level, who are becoming overstimulated if not overwhelmed in the battle to maintain a rational view of educational purpose and function. School administrators are now handling "big business"; they know it will get bigger. Their cry is, "Money is available; let's get it." And because no schools are sufficiently financed, every school administrator would have to wrestle with his conscience before turning down any opportunity to increase the financial under-girding of his own. With money available for varied programs, schoolmen endeavor to create or adjust their programs to obtain the money. In some instances an eligible program is already in process; in other instances an existing program can be adapted to meet requirements, but a great deal of fund-seeking activity these days puts the administrator in the position of designing new programs to win the approval of fund sources.

A television show, in which Steve Allen caricatured education in reverse by donning cap and robe and giving questions to answers which were sent to him, was entitled, "What Is The Question?" Instead of starting with questions to which someone would attempt answers, an announcer read out answers for Professor Allen to guess the questions in reply. On TV it was good fun, but it is not nearly so funny when practiced by educational administrators. When money is made available to them as the answer, they set about finding out whether they have the question. This may be an oversimplification and a misinterpretation of what is intended in Washington in the large sums recently appropriated, but the effect in educational circles is not altogether different.

In the face of these and other pressures, we are going to have to work very hard to keep our directions. We need to understand the question before we seek an answer; that is, school administrators must clearly ascertain needs before they propose solutions. And not only should they ascertain needs; they should also consider whether a particular need is within the competence and/or the mandate of their institution. Some of us are in serious danger of being diverted from our main purpose, which is educational. Our purpose will remain so unless we change our character to something different from colleges and universities. Even when we are being called upon to furnish new services, sometimes on a crash basis, this pressure should not be mistaken for necessity. On this point I am reminded of a recent remark by Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education. He said, "An institution must ask such questions as: Is this service important or merely urgent?" No institution can do everything, and its main call is to do its important work well. To be sure, any institution needs to be alert to changing needs, but it should also be on guard lest it forfeit its own reason for existence by forgetting to do its main task. Many administrators, in danger of losing sight of their main purpose and the main purpose of their institutions, unconsciously are losing control of their situation as they spend their energies on secondary matters and leave uncreated, unfinanced, and unoperated those functions of most importance in their institutions.

The present attention being paid to education in the halls of Congress, in the board rooms of industry, and in the private thinking of individuals should not inflame either the egos or the consciences of school administrators to such a point that they think their product is the answer to all the world's problems, nor that money alone will guarantee our product.

The public, too, shows signs of expecting something magical from its rising investment in education. Actually, these unsound expectations go back to a time prior to the recent large increases in educational investment. More and more the education of our children has been turned over to the schools. The schools are expected to teach a varied set of curricula and to furnish a vast extracurriculum. The social life of our children has tended to become more and more centered in the schools. Fewer obligations are met at home. At home we not only can't help our children with their new math; we can't seem to speak their language on manners, morals, obligations. Part of this can be laid to irresponsibility of parents, but another part of it is simply that we felt the schools could do a better job. Because most of us have felt the schools could do the job, and all of us have hoped that they could, we have voted larger and larger bond issues for the lower schools and more recently for junior colleges. Here in Texas the legislature has just voted such large increases for expenditures in higher education that most of us have not yet understood the magnitude of what has been done. The public evidently supports whole-heartedly the recent higher education act passed by our national Congress, for there was little public opposition to the proposed act. There seems to be no limit to the public expectation on the matter of education.

To compound the problem, we have slipped into an attitude in
which we believe that every child must have college preparation in high school and then college afterwards, despite the fact that there is no evidence whatsoever that every child needs, is equipped for, or even wants college preparation and college credit. I think this is one of the places where it is most evident that we have attached a magical quality to education. We claim to be a nation of individualists and private enterprises, but we seem to be doing our best to make our children all alike by expecting the same for all of them.

**MOST DAMAGING OF all, however, is the national assumption that filling Johnnie’s brain will make him a good boy. It won’t. There is not even any evidence that it will make him a better boy. There is no proven connection between informing the mind and moving the heart; information shows small correlation with conviction; level of educational achievement bears little relation to level of moral aspiration. Among the poor and illiterate, as well as among the rich and the educated, behavior ranges from the criminally immoral to the near saint. What is the difference? It would be hard to prove that any differences are the result of education alone. Yet we give vast attention in this country to education, while doing little study of what makes a good man. The belief of most people that by accomplishing the one we will produce the other is a demonstration of how poorly educated we are, how little attention we have paid to the evidence, and how much we have to learn.**

Part of our problem in this matter is traceable to our ready acquiescence to catch-words and half-truths. One of the most common of these half-truths has been lifted from the New Testament. We have been both pious and comfortable in depending upon that half-a-line from the words of Jesus, “and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” This line from John 8:32 has been badly misused. A misquotation, it is simply the last half of a longer statement which begins a verse earlier. When you say “you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free,” you are quoting something that was never true and which never will be. Truth by itself has never yet been proved to be the source of freedom, nor education the source of goodness.

If education does not even come close to guaranteeing right thinking and acting, we must alter either our system or our views. Either we must include in our educational system something that will help our people not only know right from wrong, but that will encourage them to choose and do the right in preference to the wrong; or we must revise our expectations of our educational system so as to take into account the limits of education, then give our attention to other ways and means of producing men whose goodness matches their education. Unfortunately to discover the secret of the former and unable to agree on what kind of good man we want to produce, our only course of action is to correct our views on education, recognizing that it has severe limitations and that a large task remains even when education has been well handled. Until we do this, the public will be expecting more from education than it has the right to expect.

**Another group that has developed some excess or slanted expectations concerning education is composed of teachers and prospective teachers, particularly of colleges and universities. There are some glaring indications of these incorrect expectations. One indication is to be found in the current rush into college teaching and into preparation for college teaching.**

**Greatly by some massive programs of graduate school fellowships instituted to stimulate graduate enrollments and to foretell the predicted shortages of teachers, graduate enrollments have increased more rapidly than anyone predicted. The output of Ph.D.’s will now increase rapidly and will soon assume large proportions, so large that a few administrators are suspecting, although I have not heard anybody mention it in public, that we may soon face a glut of persons presenting themselves for positions in college and university teaching. Not to be overlooked is a noticeable desire on the part of some to shift from industry to faculty positions. This is also true of military personnel; indeed, there is some evidence that the military is encouraging early retirement on the part of many officers by describing to them the possibility of their filling some of the many vacancies assumed to be pending on the educational horizon—a job transition which makes only slightly more sense than for faculty members, upon retirement, to seek commissions in the services.**

**A NUMBER OF THINGS are attracting these people to our campuses.** Life on most campuses is wonderful; it is a great privilege to work with and around so many young people and with so many fine fellow teachers. The prestige of faculty positions is increasing, and their pay in recent years has advanced nicely if not sufficiently. I think the “war on poverty” is being won so far as faculty are concerned. Scholar squalor is almost a thing of the past. There are even some signs of faculty affluence. I do not object to this; in fact, I am dedicated to seeing that there are more signs of it, for the role of the faculty member is an extremely important one, and the laborer is worthy of his hire.

Besides the financial advantages, there are other good points about faculty positions. At most campuses there is little pressure toward conformity, little pressure to work with student groups, and none at all to work with parent groups. So-called “teaching loads” have declined recently so that faculty members now have more time for the important non-teaching duties of a campus and more opportunity for study, re-
search, or other creative expression. Finally, most faculty members have good job protection by way of permanent tenure.

As more and more persons from outside are seeking faculty positions, we may be approaching a time and a condition when college teaching will become super-attractive, and partly for wrong reasons.

The principal "wrong reason" is the assumption which some persons make in believing that faculty positions are easy and that they have done all that is required when they have met their classes and completed some articles for publication. Some seem to believe there is something so magical about curriculum and teaching, and latterly about research, that their jobs have been fulfilled when this narrow range of assignments has been performed. The evidence does not support this, and they ought to be the first to sense it. None more than faculty have been trained to look for evidence, to weigh it, to draw conclusions, and to take corrective action. Yet among college faculties they are probably a minority who know how to teach well, who know how to evaluate the results of their teaching, who know which of their efforts and qualities make the most productive impressions on students, and who appreciate how much of the learning process takes place outside of the formal class hour.

An educational journal recently printed a remarkable juxtaposition of two articles by faculty members, both dealing with the same subject: "What students look for in a good teacher." One of the authors lined it up this way: Students, he wrote, first want the teacher to have a deep knowledge of his subject, to have an attractive personality, to be a supplier of value to collegiate life and a guide to value, and, finally, they want him to be truly involved in the life of the college.

The other author based his article on results of a survey in which student opinions on these points were solicited. This survey produced a rank order of desirable teacher traits almost exactly opposite to that assumed by the author of the first article. His poll showed that the students prized most those faculty members who have close relationships with their students and whose relationships are marked by sincerity, patience, understanding, and respect. Next most important they listed the teacher's ability to communicate and his ability to organize his material. Knowledge of subject matter ranked well below the most frequently mentioned traits, where the first author assumed it was the most important factor.

Research indicates that there is frequently a vast difference between what the faculty member thinks students look for and what students actually affirm they want. The faculty member who believes that his knowledge of the subject is the critical factor in his role as a teacher and that his appointment certifies him as an adequate teacher is not yet ready for a faculty position. On him, educational television would be a profound improvement.

No magic attends the appointment of a man or woman to a college faculty; his academic credentials are no more than of third or fourth importance to the success of his position. The crucial element in teaching is intellectual and personal leadership. What is required is more than just being an adequate lecturer, or a friend, or a counselor, or a guide. Perhaps we have been misled by the word "teacher" itself. Although it is such a simple word, when one examines the teaching and learning process he finds that the most crucial elements in it have frequently little to do with what the teacher teaches, knows, or says. What he teaches is of less effect than how he teaches. What he knows may be of less importance than what he believes. For the goal of the teacher is not so much to teach as to open up the student, cause him to think, to evaluate, to choose, to act. And it seems that this goal is not reached except the teacher display what he believes, what he values, and what he hopes.

We should watch far more carefully the student flow toward certain professors and away from other professors. If nobody wants a certain teacher's classes, that teacher is in the wrong profession, and, though he may be a scholar or a scientist, if no one wants his classes there is little reason for his being at the campus. Fortunately the number of these is small, though never small enough.
If one is a teacher to whom the students tend to flock, we need to find out why they come to him. If he is a professor that attracts the better students, we should compliment him and pay him well, but all should admit that he has a rather easy job. It isn't hard to teach good students. It may be hard to keep up with them, but it isn't hard to teach them. If he is the kind of faculty member who attracts the campus loafers, we should encourage and help him, for he has the greatest challenge of anyone on the campus; but we should also watch his performance very carefully.

If there is any magic in education at all, it is in its people, not in its process. The more education is de-personalized, the less well it works; the more it is personalized, the more results it shows. Yet few educational decisions seem to be based on this knowledge, few administrators seem to act as though they believed it, few faculty members seem to use it as their guide. We have all placed too much dependence upon formal academic qualifications. We need to pay far more attention to the personal qualities of our teachers, far more attention to encouraging those personal leadership qualities without which good teaching will seldom be found, and to make far more provision for the reinforcement and vitalization of the teaching process outside the classroom.

This nation will buy greatly increased amounts of education in the years to come. If educational administrators believe that some magic lies in the dollars afforded by this new purchase of education, the entire American educational system is in danger of being diverted toward unknown futures. If the public believes that dollars spent on education will magically cause moral as well as intellectual problems to vanish, their disappointment is certain and their revenge is probable. If college and university faculty believe that credentials and position bestow a magic which negates attention to the quality of their product, they will perpetrate a great fraud on themselves and on the generations they will influence.

A great task has been given to us. Let us examine it rationally, evaluate it clearly, and promote it modestly. Then, as partners in a great enterprise, let us work hard to do it well.

JAMES M. MOUDY was named chancellor of Texas Christian University effective July 1, 1965. The seventh chief executive of the institution, he is the first TCU alumnus and native-born Texan to hold this position.

After early rearing in Greenville, Texas, he was graduated from McKinley Technical High School in Washington, D.C., and was employed in the U.S. Treasury Department for six years before entering TCU in the Fall of 1939 to prepare for the ministry.

Active in campus activities, he received his B.A. degree "with distinction" in June, 1943, and went immediately into the U.S. Army as a chaplain. After serving with combat units in England and Europe from 1944 to 1946, he was discharged with the rank of captain and returned to TCU for seminary study. While working toward his B.D. degree, he served as assistant minister of University Christian Church in Fort Worth and as minister of the A&M Christian Church in College Station.

Dr. Moudy, after receiving his B.D. degree in 1949, was awarded a Kearns Fellowship in religion for doctoral work at Duke University, where he won his Ph.D. degree in 1953 and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

He served as dean of instruction at Atlantic Christian College in Wilson, N.C., for the next four years, returning to TCU in the Spring of 1957 as dean of the Graduate School and professor of religion. In a major administrative reorganization in 1962, Dr. Moudy became vice-chancellor for academic affairs, assuming supervision of the scholastic work of all divisions. During the year prior to beginning work as chancellor, he served as executive vice-chancellor.

Under his leadership, TCU's program of advanced studies was reorganized and expanded. First programs leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree were inaugurated in 1960, and Graduate School became the fastest-growing University division.

A member of University Christian Church and the Fort Worth Rotary Club, he has traveled extensively in Europe. In 1964, he was awarded the honorary L.L.D. degree by Atlantic Christian College.

Dr. and Mrs. Moudy, the former Lucille Lauritzen of Fort Worth, have two daughters.