

A HISTORY OF
MELBOURNE VILLAGE
1946—1954

by
Alice Normile

Department of History
Guilford College
1956

January 10, 1985

Donor's foreword.

This thesis titled "A History of Melbourne Village 1946 to 1954", was prepared by my daughter Alice Normile (Crownfield) in partial fulfillment for a Bachelor of Arts degree in History at Guilford College, Greensboro, N. C. Alice personally interviewed the principles mentioned in this thesis. Part of this time I was the Secretary of the American Homesteading Foundation. It was during and following this period that discussions were held between Ralph Borsodi, Virginia Wood, Elizabeth Nutting, my wife Margaret Normile and myself and many other American Homesteading Foundation members that eventually culminated in obtaining a charter for the University of Melbourne.

Originally, it was planned that the University of Melbourne be located in Melbourne Village.

This plan for the University was dropped because of considerable opposition by the AHF members. It was then that the approximately 40 acres was obtained on Country Club Road, Melbourne, Florida

In 1954 on this site, the University of Melbourne's first building, a library, was erected.

The opening of the University of Melbourne was celebrated in December 1955 with a seminar titled "Man is the Problem" Leaders were, Ralph Borsodi, Chancellor of the University and author; Willis Nutting, Professor, Notre Dame University; Paul J. Tillich, theologian; Philip G. Wylie, author; and Joseph Wood Krutch, author and philosopher. The University was active for about a year.

Then Ralph Borsodi retired and left the area partially for health reasons. I had been a member of the University of Melbourne Board of Regents and in 1956 I was elected President and Chairman of the Board of Regents. My wife, Margaret was also a member.

Due to conditions beyond our control it was decided in 1961 to transfer on a long term lease, with certain reservations, the approximately 40 acres held by the University of Melbourne to Brevard Engineering College.

Brevard Engineering College later became Florida Institute of Technology.

In 1969 the Board of Regents of the University of Melbourne voted to dissolve the University

Hubert C. Normile Sr.
Hubert C. Normile, Sr.

*20 Melbourne Library (2)
Melbourne Village Library (2)
F.T. Library (2)
Coch Brevard Historical Society (2)
G.S.S. (1)
Melbourne Times (1)*

SENIOR THESIS

A HISTORY OF MELBOURNE VILLAGE

1946-1954

by

ALICE NORMILE

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

GUILFORD COLLEGE

1956

A THESIS

A HISTORY OF MELBOURNE VILLAGE

1946-1954

by

ALICE LOUISE NORMILE

Submitted to the Faculty of Guilford College in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts.

Instructor _____

Department _____

Date _____

OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
 - A. Ideological Background
 - B. Historical Background
- II. First Membership Meeting and By-Laws of 1946
- III. The First Year (1946-1947)
- IV. First Annual Meeting of 1947
- V. Village Growth and Expansion (1948-1951)
- VI. The Proxy Controversy (1951-1952)
- VII. Opposition vs. Founders (1953-1954)
 - A. Borsodi's Speech
 - B. Changed By-Laws
- VIII. Conclusion
- IX. Personal Conclusion

The subject of this thesis, Melbourne Village, is located three miles west of the City of Melbourne, Florida. Melbourne is located on the central eastern seaboard of the Floridian peninsula.

Melbourne Village is a planned community, since it is based on the ideas of several men and women, some of whom have attempted to materialize their thoughts into a community of productive houses and creative living.

Their belief was that living as man does in our large metropolitan areas, man is denied many of his basic needs. Life's activities have become so centralized that the individual is soon lost in mountains of data and whirlpools of statistics. Man's economic security has been subjected to the policies and actions of Federal Governments and Big Business. It is out of the reach and beyond the control of the individual and is hence full of many insecurities.¹

The proposed cure for these social ills is decentralized living and more of life's activities centered around the home and in a small community. Only in a small

¹Ralph Borsodi, Education and Living, I, 198-203.

group can an individual be known as an individual and yet be a vital part of the group. Also in a small community one's economic security can be free of governmental and stockholders' control if one has a plot of land and becomes once more a part of the earth and in harmony with the systematic control of nature.²

The founders of Melbourne Village hoped to fulfill this ideal by having modern family homesteading in a small community with as much local government and jurisdiction as possible. Modern family homesteading implies several things: (1) The home and land is owned by the family and is of itself a basis of security. (2) The economic life is centered around the family as much as possible with commodities produced by the home for use of the home. (3) Modern machines, equipment and methods are used for production.³

In the early years of our nation it was the opinion of many leaders that democracy would work if men were properly educated and that men would be responsible citizens if they owned their own property. This was the basic belief of Thomas Jefferson, who was opposed by Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton, who felt that the masses were incapable of caring for their economic and political needs, thought that a strong central government was needed to operate these affairs.

²Ibid., I, 203-204.

³Conversation with Ralph Borsodi on Sept. 3, 1956.

Cities and industries were what he considered to be ideal for the growing country.⁴

As Ralph Borsodi cleverly put it, "We have talked about Jefferson's ideals while we have been following Hamilton in practice." Modern family homesteading is an attempt to return to the early American ideal of individual initiative and democracy, but at the same time not lower one's standard of living.⁵

I believe that to better understand the history and any significance of Melbourne Village one should have an understanding of the basic ideology that caused its original movement and the historical content of its growth.

The crisis that the American people had to meet as a result of the crash of 1929 caused many Americans to re-evaluate the workings of our economic system. Ralph Borsodi was one of these thinkers. In his book, This Ugly Civilization, he expressed his concern over the moral and social problems that were created by the economic crisis. And, to not only solve but to prevent such a crisis in the future, he advocated a program of productive homes on a modern family homestead, in which each family would create its own security by becoming self-sufficient by producing its own life necessities.⁶

Meanwhile Dayton, Ohio, a typical industrial city, was

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Mildred and John Loomis, Introduction to Flight from the City.

struggling for existence. Relief agencies gave the unemployed families enough relief to exist on. But the accompanying feelings of pessimism and frustration that were caused by idle hands are enough of an indication to convince one that man does not live by bread alone even in our modern society.⁷

In 1934 the Community Chest of this city became interested in a self-help movement for the unemployed. Ralph Borsodi was consulted from the beginning. Plans were made and a small community of productive homes were organized on a homesteading basis. This movement was led by Mrs. George Wood, Margaret Hutchenson and Dr. Elizabeth Nutting.⁸

As a result of this experimentation these people became even more convinced that in time of crisis, there is no actual security without direct access to the land and an added note that decentralized activities are not only in the end more sufficient but also full of more human satisfaction. As a means of more research and experimentation Ralph Borsodi founded the School of Living in Suffern, New York. The theme of the school was: The New American Culture Based on Normal Living.⁹

All of this led to a desire for setting up a similar community on a more stable and permanent basis. In 1946

⁷Ibid.

⁸Melbourne Village, Purpose, Plans and Present Progress, 1950, p. 2.

⁹Ibid.

a site was proposed near the city of Melbourne, Florida. Several interested people drove down to look the site over and they gave it their hearty approval. Soon thereafter a meeting of all interested people was called at Dayton, Ohio, in July 1946. Here they organized a non-profit corporation under the laws of Ohio. From the Ohio Securities Commission they were given approval for the sale of Florida land.¹⁰

The non-profit organization was named The American Homesteading Foundation, while the new community was to be known as Melbourne Village. A board of trustees was elected and the sale of membership was begun. Pierce Wood, a Dayton attorney, was named as legal adviser. Ralph Borsodi gave advice as consultant. Louise Odiorne, who had had past experience as a community planner and landscape architect, visited the site and laid the future plans of the community. This consisted of a road system, a home plat plan and a park system plan. Emphasis was put on preserving the natural beauty of the site.¹¹

In 1946 in Dayton, Ohio, the first membership meeting was held. Here they decided upon a formal purpose:

To establish homesteading groups and provide therewith opportunities for these and other groups to study the principles, practices and further possibilities of modern homesteading.

In furtherance thereof; it is proposed to buy,

¹⁰Ibid., p. 3.

¹¹Ibid., p. 4.

sell, mortgage, lease and otherwise deal in real and personal property; to establish and maintain schools; to publish relevant literature; and to do all other things necessary and convenient to the accomplishment of the forgoing purpose.¹²

Also at this first membership meeting by-laws were presented, worked over, and were adopted.

Articles I and IV are summarized as follows: Meeting of the total membership shall be of two types, Annual and Special meetings. The entire membership shall meet at least once annually. At these meetings three new members shall be elected to the Board of Trustees for a three-year term. They shall fill the vacancy of three retiring members making a total of nine members. Immediately thereafter the Board shall meet and elect its own officers. A Special meeting of the total membership can be called by an Annual meeting, the Board or by a petition of one-fifth of the total membership.

For both the Annual and Special meetings the President shall give a one-month notice prior to the dates of the set meeting; and shall also give the agenda, resolutions, legal documents, etc. which shall form the main business of the meeting.

Since, as stated in Article IV, "The management of this corporation shall be invested in the Board of Trustees . . . , " the action of the Annual and Special meetings

¹²The 1946 "By-Laws" and "Purpose" were found in the files of the Melbourne Village Office.

shall be limited to that of policy-making. (It is understood that problems of a strictly operational nature shall be limited to the actions of the Board.)

Article II states that "thirty percent of the membership shall be deemed a quorum for meetings of the corporation."

Article III deals with the privileges and responsibilities of each member. "Members of the Corporation shall subscribe to the purpose of the Corporation as stated in the Articles of Incorporation and in addition to this he must be socially and financially responsible." Later it is also stated: "A member in this Corporation assumes responsibility for the understanding and promotion of the purposes and policies of the Corporation. This will entail attendance at the Annual and Special meetings of the Corporation, voting for the Nomination Committee, and such other matters as shall be presented by the Board of Trustees from time to time."

Maintenance dues shall be recommended by the Board at any Annual or Special meeting of the Corporation and voted upon by the total membership.

If members fail to live up to these responsibilities to the extent that they become "a threat to the primary purpose of the community as established in the Articles of Incorporation," such a membership can be cancelled by a three-quarters vote at a Special meeting, called at the

request of one-third of the total membership.

Application should be made to the Membership Committee and be accompanied by a check for \$50. This would be the first payment of a membership fee of \$750. If the application is not accepted, the fee will be returned immediately. On the date of his acceptance, each member is entitled to select a homesite from those available.

Each member shall be entitled to participate in the educational and recreational activities of the community and to use all community buildings and parks, subject only to such rules and regulations that shall be applied to all members.

Article VIII says in effect that any member of full standing may exercise any of his rights as a member by means of proxy voting.

The Board of Trustees, in Article IV, are given the right to make all contracts and to conduct all business of the Corporation. They shall serve as officers of the Corporation as well as the community and without any compensation.

The last paragraph is concerned with the powers and duties of the officers of the Board:

The Secretary shall handle correspondence while the Assistant-Secretary-Treasurer shall keep the minutes and do the Corporation bookkeeping. The Treasurer shall receive and disburse all money and shall be bonded for \$5,000; and shall secure the deposit of the same in the name of the Corporation in the Bank designated by the Board; shall present to the Trustees at a regular meeting or by mail every month a statement of the report covering the receipts and expenditures of the year. The Treasurer or his authorized representative shall pay the bills of the Corporation upon authorization of the Executive Committee. The Treasurer and the Executive

Committee shall be responsible for the adoption of an approved method of accounting for this type of Corporation. At the close of the fiscal year, the Treasurer shall see that the books are examined by the Auditor, appointed by the Board of Trustees and that a certified financial statement is presented at the Annual Meeting"

Article V is concerned with the various committees. The standing committees are enumerated as such: Membership, Building and Grounds, Budget, Educational and Recreational and Village Industries. There is also the Nominating Committee, and the Executive Committee, which consist of any three members of the Board.

To start with, this new community had a plot of eighty acres that had no roads and was a wilderness of pine and palmetto. Under the American Homesteading Foundation, it had a system of By-Laws which provided for a democratic government through elected Trustees. Probably the uniqueness of Melbourne Village stems from its ideology of decentralization in the form of modern family homesteading which had caused the founders to plan such a community as Melbourne Village. Last but by no means least, Melbourne Village had prospective settlers who wanted to see this thing work and be successful.

During the winter of 1947-48 Mrs. George Wood, the Jessephs, the William Newcombs, Mrs. Marshall, Mr. Mansur, Alice Carr, Katherine Smith and the Hutchinson-Nutting combination all built and moved into their new homes; several other homes were also started.¹³

Within the first year thirty-two memberships had

¹³Melbourne Village, Purpose, Plans and Present Progress, 1952, p. 2.

been accepted and thirty-two lots had been spoken for. Dr. Elizabeth Nutting had spent much time and effort to attract new members to the Village.¹⁴

In 1947 the First Annual Meeting was held in Dayton, Ohio. It was the first official gathering of Melbourne Villagers. Normand Lund was reappointed as Village Manager. At this meeting he presented plans for buying additional land and other plans for supplementing Village income. Elizabeth Nutting was reappointed as Membership Director.

A temporary Board of Trustees were replaced by an elected Board that consisted of Lewis Jesseph, a former lawyer who was elected as President; First and second Vice-Presidents were Elizabeth Nutting and Richard Odiorne respectively. Mrs. George Wood was elected Secretary; Margaret Hutchenson, Treasurer; and William Newcomb, Assistant Secretary and Treasurer. Other members were Don Werkheiser, Barton Myers and Willis Nutting.

Other business was that the By-Laws and Deed Restrictions were discussed and clarified. Both documents were adopted unanimously by the meeting.

As a climax to this First Annual Meeting, Willis Nutting gave a talk on "Why We Homestead." In the minutes of the meeting it was carefully summarized:

¹⁴ Minutes of the First Annual Meeting of the American Homesteading Foundation, 1947." Data in the next five paragraphs are from the same source.

He emphasized the values in this way of life for individual development, real and satisfying family life, and a richer and more stable community set up. He stressed the greater security families may enjoy when they live in their own homes where they can raise most of their own food the year round and where in case of depression, members of the community can barter their various skills, thus maintaining a high standard of living regardless of the value of the dollar. He also stressed the importance to our natural life of a leavening of people who are independent and secure because as he put it, "Each would become increasingly his own boss."

In 1948 the Village expanded and bought forty acres of additional land. In this year a building that was bought from the Navy was moved into the village and was immediately put to use as a Village Hall. This hall became the center of many Village meetings and activities.

In 1949 a School of Living was chartered at Melbourne Village. This School was a branch of the original School of Living in Suffern, New York. The object of bringing the School to the Village was to make it an education-centered community.¹⁵ Within a few years the original interest and enthusiasm in the Village School of Living had died out. Many villagers believed that the philosophy of the School of Living, basically that of Borsodi's decentralization, was being pushed down their throats and they resented the pressure of the whole thing. Since many villagers did not support the school by attending meetings and were unwilling to support it financially the School of Living was dissolved in 1952.

¹⁵This charter can be found in the Melbourne Village office.

In 1949 the Village bought eighty acres of land and again in 1951 the Village bought another eighty acres bringing the total acreage up to two hundred and eighty acres. This included three hundred and seventy-five house lots, plus roads, ditches, and seven park areas, one of which contained an artificial lake. Another park area had a village swimming pool that was completed in 1950.¹⁶

In 1950 a Village Credit Union and a Village Coop Store were set up. In 1951 the use of the Honor System was introduced¹⁷ at the suggestion of David Stry, who went so far as to guarantee any losses of the first year. There were no losses and up to the present time there have been no major losses reported. In 1952 the library was also put on the Honor System.

In 1950 the Recreation Committee sponsored a square dance group. This group, which has called itself "The Promenaders" since 1951, has become the most active group in the Village,¹⁸ and perhaps exemplifies the Village spirit more than anything else. Villagers of all ages get together once weekly and do folk and square dances.

The Annual Meeting of 1951 voted to assess each member \$1.50 per month in order to pay the expenses of maintenance.

¹⁶"Fifth Annual Meeting Minutes, 1951." Hereafter called "1951 Minutes."

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid. The next five paragraphs have the same source.

The first Village controversy of major importance was the Proxy question, which was brought to a head during the Annual Meeting of 1951. A group of villagers had become dissatisfied with the existing By-Laws, especially Article VIII, which was concerned with the method of voting that was employed by non-resident members. Such a member could appoint another member to represent or vote for him at any corporation meeting.

At this Annual Meeting a revision of Article VIII was proposed. This proposal was in actuality an unqualified elimination of proxy voting and substituted for it "Voting by mail on all predetermined issues."

Discussion followed in which an unusual number of members took part. Each side claimed for its preferred method of voting: proxy or no proxy, strong basic rights and was quick to point out inherent dangers and possible abuses involved in the other method of voting Those wishing to eliminate proxy voting feared a concentration of proxies in the hands of a few people, who by pooling their proxies could control decisions. Others were equally afraid of the dangers presented by the necessary reduction of the quorum if proxy voting was eliminated, because elections could then be decided by a bare majority of the small percentage of members.

No action could be taken in this matter since it did not have the necessary thirty-day notice to all members which is required for all major questions that are to be acted upon at an Annual Meeting. Not being able to vote upon the matter naturally caused an increase in tension between the two groups.

As would be expected, the proxy question was again

brought up at the 1952 Annual Meeting. Since there were at this time so many non-resident members, the importance of the proxy question can best be illustrated by these figures. At this Annual Meeting thirty-eight voting members were present while fifty-eight others were being represented by proxy holders. The proxies held a wide majority of the votes.¹⁹

A proposed compromise was offered. Referendum voting was to replace proxy voting except on any issues involving: dissolution of the Foundation, permanent changes of the plats and grounds, contracts or debts involving more than five thousand dollars. This proposed By-Law change was defeated.²⁰

The Village President, Cap Fick, reported that approximately seventy-five homes have now been completed in the village. The total village membership now consisted of one hundred and seventy-five families.

The value of the home and improvements and land encompassed in our Village is well over half a million and we owe only a few thousand dollars. . . . We have enough readily available assets to offset this.²¹

By 1953 the founders, who up to this time had controlled most of the proxy votes, were naturally resented by the non-proxy group, who considered this practice to be undemocratic. And this group came to oppose many of the

¹⁹"Sixth Annual Meeting Minutes, 1952."

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid.

policies of the founders.

In 1954 village affairs had reached a point of high tension. In the past year the opposition group had gained much power in village politics and they had a chance to put many of their policies into action. These policies consisted of (1) elimination of any refund to members if they wished to leave the village, (2) curtailment of staff in order to cut expenses, (3) putting the management of the village on a more business-like manner, since the founders were too idealistic to do this.

As is customary, the president gave his Annual Report. It is interesting to note that, unlike all precedence, this report was of a strictly financial nature.

Immediately thereafter Ralph Borsodi arose to speak to his motion to amend the report of the President.

Melbourne Village is a microcosm of which the world is a macrocosm. The problems of the world are larger, it is true. They are more menacing, they threaten the very existence of freedom and civilization. But while they are different in form, they are the same in essence. They have their roots in the fact that people differ--about religion, about politics, about economics--and the additional fact that they do not know how to differ.²

It was Borsodi's opinion that the village was split by two sides of opinion or "blocs." One group was supported by the majority of the Board, which he called the Board bloc. The other was supported by the founders, which included two of the original founders, Elizabeth Nutting

² "Eighth Annual Meeting Minutes, 1954."

and Virginia Wood. Another original founder, Margaret Hutchenson, became a member of the Board bloc or opposition.

The Wood bloc consisted of many people who were interested in maintaining the original ideals of the village. Some who were with the original movement felt a moral obligation to non-resident members who had joined on these grounds. They were also alert to anything that would put the village on the level of a country club suburb type of community.

Clare [his wife] and I tried to bring the two blocs together. . . . The Wood bloc joined enthusiastically in every effort; we ourselves tried toward effecting a reconciliation but every effort was incontinently rejected by the Board bloc."

Later he says:

The Board bloc boasted of being business-like. They were going to put an end to the impractical and visionary activities of Elizabeth Nutting and Virginia Wood.

It is this fact which makes this Annual meeting so important. It is this hidden and concealed attack upon the ideals of the Village to which I would like to call your attention. Melbourne Village stands at a crossroads. If this meeting supports the Administration, . . . it will be deliberately deciding to abandon the ideals and intentions which brought us all together, and deciding instead to transform Melbourne Village from a planned community into a mere suburb of the City of Melbourne. If, on the contrary, it supports the recommendations I shall propose, it will be reaffirming its devotion to those ideals and recording its determination to work for their realization.

Stated below are the four recommendations that Borsodi suggested that the Annual Meeting adopt as amendments to the President's report.

I That Elizabeth Nutting be authorized to extend to Dr. Stella Boyd in the name of the Foundation, the

regrets of the Annual Meeting for the manner in which her application for membership was handled, and to extend to her on behalf of the Annual Meeting a cordial invitation to reopen her application.

II That all reference in the minutes of the Foundation to accusations directed at Virginia Wood, even though she is not named in them, be crossed out from the minutes and that the minutes record the regrets of the Annual Meeting that such an indictment had been made without giving her an opportunity for a hearing before they were accepted by the Board.

III That in order to avoid as far as possible any repetition of abuses of power by the Membership Committee and by the Board of Trustees, the By-Laws of the Foundation be amended at this meeting so that the powers of the Board, of the officers and committees, and of the meeting of the membership as a whole, are clarified.

IV That the Annual Meeting adopt a motion that no member and no committee can appoint himself or nominate himself, or appoint or nominate any member of such a committee, to any position or office of the Foundation.

The latter two amendments were proposed in order to avoid in the future the squeezing out of the power of one officer by another officer or committee member. In this particular case it was the squeezing out of the Secretary of the Board, Virginia Wood, and the Membership Director, Elizabeth Nutting.

Concerning the first proposed amendment, Dr. Stella Boyd's application was not accepted on the grounds that she could not appear personally before the Membership Committee. The requirement had been recently adopted by the committee. Dr. Boyd could not leave her medical practice in Indiana but from all evidence she seemed to be both financially and socially responsible and she believed wholeheartedly in the principles of Melbourne Village.

The final upshot of the meeting was that four Board members who were members of the opposition group resigned as

trustees of the Foundation. Also the membership voted to accept the proposed By-Law changes.²³ The main effects of these changes were:

1. To have the Annual Meeting adopt an annual budget to govern future developments.
2. To separate policy-making from administration by having the Board of Trustees limited to executing those policies adopted by the Annual and Town Meetings, and the Annual Budget.
3. To legalize Town Meetings in which only those present could vote.

In general, an attempt was made to give the local residents more say-so in village matters. The Town Meetings have no restrictions as to what policies they want to discuss or vote upon. They also elect most of the various committee members. At these meetings no proxy votes shall be used. The limitation of the Town Meeting is that all questions can be petitioned by ten percent of the total membership to a referendum vote.

The Committees are basically limited to those powers of an advisory group. Their decisions must be ratified by the Board. Any decision by the Board which is taken on any committee action can also by petition be submitted to a referendum vote of the total membership.²⁴

²³"Eighth Annual Meeting Minutes, 1954."

²⁴1954 "By-Laws."

Conclusion

In 1954 the village had been a reality for eight years. The village of 1954 was a far cry from the pine and palmetto wilderness that it had been in 1946. In size the village had grown from the original eighty acres to three hundred and sixty acres. Through most of this area roads were made, ditches and other drainage apparatus were put in; and as homes were built the land was cleared. Up to this date almost one hundred homes had been built or started. The village had a small Coop Store, a Village Hall, a swimming pool, a small duplex guest house and eight park areas, which included an artificial lake and two picnic areas.

Personal Conclusion

In studying the development of a planned community it is necessary to view its development by seeing how far the community has lived up to its original ideals. The basic ideals as they were expressed in the Purpose were to set up homesteading group and to provide opportunities for studying the principles and practices of homesteading. Interpretation of this depends upon one's meaning of homesteading. If by homesteading one means that each family unit becomes an economically self-sufficient unit, then Melbourne Village can be considered more of a failure than anything else. But if one means by homesteading the process of having individuals being more self-sufficient

and independent than the average citizen, then Melbourne Village can take pride in its achievements, even though it has not been completely successful. Its aims in practical terms were to accomplish these things:

- I. Have a small rural community with self-government.
- II. Have the home and lot owned by each individual family unit.
- III. Have an education-centered community.
- IV. Have most of the family needs produced by the family.

The first three items have been fully accomplished. The School of Living was an attempt to make Melbourne Village an education-centered community. This failed but informal lectures have been given at frequent intervals with great success. And small informal study groups have also been successful.

It is the last item which the village has failed to fulfill the most. Although many families do have small gardens and fruit trees, and there are some small workshops and businesses, these certainly did not provide for the family needs. However, one must look at the community as a whole to see that community cooperation has led to making individual families more self-sufficient. This, I believe, has been done by such things as the Village Coop Store, which has also become a "Trading Post" for various goods. The Village Credit Union enabled families to take out small loans at a small interest rate. Family opportunities for recreation are practically unlimited

with the availability of square dancing, movies, community parties, suppers, the swimming pool, and the near-by ocean.

As a result of local self-government, Village politics have given many people a chance to express themselves and to use their various talents. Sometimes heated discussions have caused harmful friction. But with time most of the wounds are healed. Melbourne Village is an experiment and like all experiments as long as something has been learned it is worth the try.

Melbourne Village is more self-sufficient than any average suburban type of community and it is in this area that the village has had its greatest success.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BORSODI, RALPH. Education and Living. Parts I and II. New York: Devin-Adair, 1948.

-----, This Ugly Civilization. Suffern, N. Y.: School of Living, 1939.

-----, Conversation with him on September 3, 1955, in Florida.

BROWNELL, BAXTER. The Human Community. New York: Harper, 1950.

- * "By-Laws of the American Homesteading Foundation and Melbourne Village." 1946.
 - * "By-Law Changes of the American Homesteading Foundation and Melbourne Village." 1954.
- LOOMIS, MILDRED and JOHN. "Introduction" to Flight from the City, by Ralph Borsodi. Third ed. Suffern, N. Y.: School of Living, 1947.
- * Melbourne Village, Purpose, Plans and Present Progress. 1952.
 - * "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the American Homesteading Foundation." 1947-1954.
 - * "Purpose of the American Homesteading Foundation." 1946.

* This material can be found in the files of the Melbourne Village Office in Melbourne Village, Melbourne, Florida.