

INTERVIEWEE: MARY ROOSEVELDT
Supervisor of Teacher Education

INTERVIEWER: Samuel C. McCulloch
Emeritus Professor of History
UCI Historian

DATE: April 24, 1990

SM: This is an interview with Mrs. Mary Roosevelt, Teacher Education Supervisor. It's April 24, 1990 and it's held in HOB-360 at eleven o'clock.

I'll give you the first question. Could you tell me how your education and training in Teacher Education at the University of London differs from teacher education in the United States? And I'd like to know what your National Froebel Foundation Teaching Degree is.

MR: Thank you, Sam. My special training at the Froebel Education Institute was a four-year program in theory and practice of education. The first year consisted of methods courses and short teaching practices, student teaching in America, and the second year was more student teaching and much more field work. The third year was a special education program blended in with the regular program and a month or two of student teaching, covering probably six months of the schools. The fourth year was really a year of probationary teaching, but you still had to answer to the college and to the local county council, which would be our districts here.

It's not a National Froebel Teaching Degree; it's a teaching certificate that backed up to university work by the

was awarded based on

University of London, which probably was the equivalent of a bachelor's degree, never called that, highly prized in England because it was such a concentrated specialized teacher training. The background to it, it's . . . *originally a college and training which attracted girls from the British Colonies.*

SM: What grades?

MR: K through six. And then the name Froebel Foundation came from the fact that a German educator, Friedreich Froebel, initiated the whole program in Germany--and that's where we get the word kindergarten--and his whole theory was that children learn through play. So we had a great deal of this. Everything that we asked children to do we were expected to do, so it was very much hands-on, almost what we've got today, which is back to the whole language approach.

Some people confuse the Montessori program with this. And I think to give you the distinction, Madam Montessori really devised her Montessori schools for learning disabled children, blind children, hard of hearing children and emotionally distressed children. She was very determined that her games were used specifically the way she had designed them, to help these children. Froebel would almost take the same materials and the same games and say, "Use them in as many different ways as you can. If you can build the block straight up, now what else can you do with them?" So it was very much getting the child to use the materials and use his mind and build on that into concrete academic experiences.

SM: Well, a question here, Mary. Would you say that you now have a B. A. in Teacher Education? What would they call it in England? Oh, a certificate. The certificate is what it means, doesn't it. I see. I got it now. Well, I understand that. And you then, did you do some teaching in England K to six?

MR: I started my teaching in the ghetto areas of London.

SM: Oh, my!

MR: Which was a very wide open experience. It was just the influx of the West Indians arriving unlimited, quote, unquote, from the West Indies, and most of these children had never been inside a home, never mind a school. It was a completely different environment. So I got some really early training in teaching kids not just to learn but how to sit on a chair and how to use a knife and fork, before they could do all the other things. We also were situated within about ten minutes of Brixton Brickston Prison, so I had many, many children who were involved with parents behind bars. And I tell it with a smile, but I thought I was probably very lucky that in my first class of forty-five fourth graders, five out of the forty didn't have police records. And I learned that they were probably the smartest five and they hadn't yet gotten caught. (laughter)

SM: (laughter) That's wonderful. Well, then you married Jim and came to America?

MR: No.

SM: No?

MR: I'd always wanted to work for the United Nations. So, following my two years in London, with many adventures, I did go back home to my own private school where I had been educated, taught there for one year, and then was lucky enough to be hired by the International School of Geneva in Switzerland. And I think I was expecting Utopia and it really wasn't. So the ten of us who had been there maybe six months decided that we were in an international school that prepared children for national examinations. That meant that the American College Boards was for the American children, British children did the GCE, French children did the Baccalaureate, the German children did the Abitur. And it just seemed rather disillusioning after all of this mixing and matching through school, suddenly to stereotype them into hard core examination courses. So we sat down and we devised, over fondue after a day's skiing, an International Baccalaureate, never imagining that it would take off the way it did. I was responsible for part of the elementary program. The director of the school thought this was a great idea.

SM: Were you in Geneva then?

MR: I was in Geneva at that point, yes, and sent to the States to look at New Science and New Math. That dates me, that's the sixties.

SM: Oh, yes.

MR: And all over Europe, back to England to see the Nuffield Science Project, and then I spent time going from West to East Africa and to North Africa, just looking at what the international schools needed in those territories, so that we could come up with a curriculum that could really satisfy all these schools. It was the days when, believe it or not, there was still money for education; and the Ford Foundation came through with some funding and they founded an International Baccalaureate Office in Geneva. And the examination and the courses were funded and founded. And, of course, today many high schools in the United States use them.

SM: That's absolutely fascinating, Mary. I got into the New Math because I was on the California State Curriculum Commission in 1961 to 1967.

MR: Yes.

SM: Ken Bailey was on it. He taught me at UCLA, believe it or not, and I lost touch with him when I went back east teaching. I figured he'd be just right for here. Three names finally went in the finalists. I was the chair of the selection committee, three people came on and he was by far the best, so he got the job. And we went through the New Math and we had the very great privilege of Richard Feynman, Dick Feynman, the great Cal Tech professor, and he was brilliant. Well, the New Math wasn't exactly successful, as you know.

MR: (inaudible) *I think it created more problems than it solved?*

SM: Well, I won't say any more about that, but we did our best.

(laughter) We did our best. Now, the second question, Mary, did you have problems adjusting when you came? Well, tell me what happened then. Where did you meet Jim?

MR: I originally met Jim in Geneva, Switzerland. I was teaching a second grade class for the few months that I was actually at home there, and Jim arrived at my classroom door one morning with a small seven-year-old, his son, who was to be in my second grade class. I think we lasted about two weeks together, when they took off to go to the States on vacation, and by the time they came back, I was off traveling again. So it was a very fleeting meeting. But over the years after that, our paths did cross and eventually I left the International School of Geneva, probably eighteen months later, and went to be principal of the Junior House of the United Nations International School in New York, re-met Jim in New York, and my poor furniture just seemed to concertina back and forth across the Atlantic, because he took me back to Geneva.

SM: (laughter)

MR: So we were there for two years and, at the end of the two years, back we came again. So, I think, 1972 found us here in California.

SM: We were very happy that you came to California, too. We were happy you came, and Jim gave a course in Extension here and Sally, my wife, took it. It was very good, on the legislature and the executive . . . (inaudible) And that was really a fascinating course. He was very much of a gentleman, too. Elliott had written his book at this time, you know, his miserable book. And somebody asked him about it and his comment was, "Oh, Elliott." That's all he said.

MR: (laughter) I agree.

SM: And then someone said, "Is it true that your mother ate raisins," or some odd thing, "for her memory?" And it was very odd, but Jim said, "My mother would do anything to improve herself." (chuckling) That's the way to say it.

MR: Oh, yes.

SM: Now what about adjusting to America? You really, by flipping back and forth and being in the United Nations, would really adjust to the American system of education. So what is your specialty as a Supervisor?

MR: Well, let me go back a smidge to: Did I have any difficulty adjusting to American education? On the one hand, Sam, no. Part of my training as a Froebelian, and that's what they called us from the National Froebel Foundation, was really to be adaptable. Many of the girls who went to that college came from in the good or the bad old days, depending on how you look at it, of the colonies. Saying that to an Australian,

I should be very careful. (chuckling) But many of them were going back overseas to their own home territories to stay there, so we had to be flexible, we had to be adaptable, and we were supposed to take our cue from the child. So, wherever the child was, is where we started with our teaching. And I think probably that gave me a very good grounding for coming over here. But I had some real misconceptions. I imagined America would be much freer in its schools because we were progressive, and yet the English are not supposedly as outgoing as Americans are. And I could not believe that there were twenty-six textbooks for twenty-six children. I was used to having sets of six and we shared them around and got more variety that way. So, yes, it was an adjustment for me, in that I really did think that there would be much more going on in the classrooms than there was, as far as individual children, meeting their own needs and having their needs met.

You asked me about my job as a supervisor.

SM: Yes.

MR: It's an interesting one. I have grades between K and six, and I actually work in anything from two to three districts. That can be Irvine Unified, Newport-Mesa and Santa Ana, and I have approximately . . . In the days gone by, I've had everything from twenty-four student teachers. Right now I have eighteen. And they work between, at the moment, eight different schools. But if I'm really lucky, I could get six and six and six and

six, which would be four schools. That's the ideal, is to have them concentrated in one school so I can spend a block of time and go from classroom to classroom and then meet with them as a group.

SM: Does each group go through the six grades or what?

MR: Each group has to do two experiences: a K-3 and a 4-6. And they must do one multi-cultural experience. So sometimes it means moving them from district to district, or sometimes it just means moving from one part of the school to the other. I think for them it's beneficial to see two districts and two schools, because it's experience with two different principals, two different sets of curriculum and two different sets of teachers. But there's pros and cons for both ways.

SM: Let me ask you this question, Mary: At what point in the school year, which is coming towards the end now, do these students get graded by you and then sent? And then that all goes into a file, I suppose, and the file goes to the school that he or she is going to teach in? Would that be right?

MR: Well, more or less. There are two intake groups. I take a group in September that go through March, and then a group that comes on in March that goes through June. That's the norm. We do have variations on that theme. There are students on emergency credentials who are teaching on a salary out in the school districts, but they still need the university supervision. But by and large, it's those two

separate groups. They are evaluated very carefully. One of our main goals working with them is to be sure that they know where they are and how they're doing at all times. So we do three formal clinical observations on each student during each part of their student teaching, and we do a halfway evaluation where they know exactly where they are and what they need to work on for their final evaluation. So they come out with two experiences and, really, two grades, one for the lower level and one for the upper level of the elementary experience.

And then at the end of that, yes, they do have a letter of recommendation. They set up a placement file here on campus and the letters are released if they give us a waiver, and the placement file then goes to the district. And there's a lot of informality about the hiring of them, too. Principals will call and sometimes they're hired from the school that they're teaching in. It's not always the formal, pull the file and go for the interview, but that is the process.

SM: Interesting, interesting. Now, question three you've really answered: What is your specialty as a Supervisor? And number four, your field is the elementary field. Now, I'd like this five question to be a very important one, because I've followed our teacher education and I really feel personally that Ken Bailey did a great job. And I was on a committee

that sort of helped to advise the program. But do you find our teachers improving? Or what is your opinion?

MR: Yes, Sam, I think they are. I think for two reasons, one is that I think the training is better. I think we know more about how children learn and I think we're getting a very dedicated group of people into teaching. So, hopefully, the profession is going to go onward and upward. I think we're also realizing, particularly in California, that we're dealing with a very diversified group of people. And I don't really think the philosophy is anymore that they'll go away. And I think we've taken a leaf out of the book which says this isn't a melting pot anymore, it's a salad bowl.

SM: Yes. (laughter)

MR: And I like that. I think we are a coming together of different nationalities for different reasons. Of course it has its problems. In teaching people like the Southeast Asian group, they're here to stay, they have no place else to go, are very anxious to be a part of our culture and learn our language and do well. I think your Hispanic has a real problem in adjusting because they have two homes. Many of them are just a hop and a skip across the border and they're home again. And to come back here for the advantages of living in the United States, I think for some of them, is quite a challenge. It's certainly a challenge teaching. But I think for the first time we're encouraging our student

teachers to learn Spanish, so that they can converse. And I think the term bilingual has been very badly used and maligned and misunderstood. I think with my background working with the United Nations and certainly working with children of many, many different languages and cultures, was that we always look on the mother tongue as the primary language and any other language is a second language. So here, I think we should have called it from day one English as the second language, and we might not have run into some of the problems that we have.

SM: I agree. A very good answer, Mary. It's interesting to think that this year's freshmen that came in in October, it's the first time we've ever had Caucasians in the minority.

MR: Yes, yes, sure.

SM: And what you're saying about this salad bowl is, I think, very good. (chuckling) I'll tell you, Mary, in teaching, the one problem I get with the Eurasians and Southeast Asians is that they do well in the sciences, marvelously, often very brilliant in some, but their problem ^{is} ~~in~~ writing . . . We give essay questions. We never give true or false or multiple choice in history, and I sort of have to coach them a bit, you know. And as you say, they're interested to learn and they feel very unhappy when they don't get a grade that they expect, and they normally expect an A. (chuckling)

MR: You know, Sam, I think it's true of any nationality. They do function better in the math and the sciences. It's something that they can just carry over from their own culture. The language is a highly personal thing. There is a great deal of skill in speaking and writing another language. I don't think you're going to see this in the next generation of the Southeast Asians. As these children grow up and produce their own children, they've been educated here and their children are starting here. I think this is a transition period, from the original Boat People who came in the late seventies. Once they've grown up and once they've settled down, married and had their own children, I think the next generation that comes along will be much more fluent and much more at ease with English.

SM: That's a very good point. That happened in Australia, and they're called the New Australians.

MR: Yes.

SM: Because they are not British. And it used to be all British before the Second World War; now, of course, over 60 percent are not British. They started out the way I mentioned, but what you said, when they became parents, then everything was fine, they were Aussies. (chuckling)

MR: (laughter) (inaudible)

SM: How did you like the administration of Teacher Education when you arrived? And what year was that?

MR: Well, Sam, I saw it from student teacher through to faculty member, because I arrived in 1974. And, really, thanks to Jim, when he first came out here, the one person that he wanted to meet was the Chancellor of this new university at Irvine, Dan Aldrich. And he very much prized his friendship with Dan and misses him. But he arrived down here and Dan interviewed him, or they met together, not necessarily for Jim to do anything on the campus. It was just his way of finding out what was going on in Orange County. Ultimately, Jim did teach the course, and out of Social Ecology--and, of course, in those days Dr. Arnie Binder was very much involved with Social Ecology--and he talked me into (really) coming . . . I suppose he thought I would just come and take a teaching position here, and I wasn't sure that that was what I wanted to do. So I did go to talk to Dr. Bailey. And to my devastation, he said, "I don't care what you've got, where you've come from, you need to be retrained, because this is the State of California, and Sacramento isn't going to understand all these credentials that you've got."

SM: Oh, no!

MR: So I joined the student teacher program and actually went through. And at the end of it, put my credential in my pocket, ready to go home, and he offered me a job. And I have to say I turned it down. I had no intention of working in those days. I went home and explained to Jim that I'd got

lucky and had been offered a job, and Jim said, "Well, when do you start?"

SM: (laughter)

MR: And I said, "No, I turned it down."

SM: That's jolly!

MR: And so I did start part-time. I was a student in 1974 and a supervisor in 1975 until today, which is what? 1990.

SM: From 1975 . . . fifteen years.

MR: Yes, fifteen years.

SM: Well, now, tell me about the administration.

MR: Well, I've always enjoyed teacher ed[ucation] and I think Dr. Bailey, like Chancellor Aldrich, was unique. They were both men with real vision, they've both left wonderful legacies at this university.

SM: Yes, you're right.

MR: And they've built something that has gone on. You know, Dr. Bailey has retired and, unfortunately, Dan has passed away, but I think they were the right men at the right time. And for Dr. Bailey, nothing was impossible. He knew how to bend everything, the rules, the regulations, and got away with it.

SM: Yes. (chuckling)

MR: I don't think he could do that today. We've grown up as a campus and I think we're being held accountable.

SM: (laughter)

MR: But it was very creative and I think some of the strength of Teacher Ed and maybe some of the weakness of Teacher Ed was founded on his philosophy. I don't know if you know the story that the students used to say, that between Dr. McCullough, Jack McCullough, who was his assistant, and Dr. Bailey, they used to call them God and the Devil. Bailey was God and McCullough was the Devil; and if you didn't get what you wanted from one, you went to the other.

SM: I love that! (inaudible)

MR: And that persisted for many, many years, and I really enjoyed those times. I think, for me, it was a fun job. It was not strictly a career in the sense that I had a career. Before this was my hobby, and I think I treated it as such and enjoyed it as such. It has become a lot more serious in the years in between.

SM: Well, you've done a terrific job. My daughter ^{said,} as I said confidentially and off the record, that she thinks you've done a great job. And she's been happy and that's very important. And I think you're right about Dr. Bailey and also Dan. When you came in, I was answering the telephone from the Senate office. They want me to draft ^{an obituary} a statement for our ^{senate} graduation. And Sherry Rowland and Jim McGaugh will help, you know. They'll chip in and we'll all have a ^{go}. But I personally greatly miss Dan Aldrich. I've been quite depressed walking around, because you see Dan everywhere, you know. Every

building is a monument of his. And every time I would get ~~up~~ here early, sometimes at seven, he'd be tramping around the campus. And it's sad. I was appointed . . . now I'm by far the senior [faculty] ^{member.} I was appointed December 13, 1963. And you know, when I came for my interview, which was the previous October, we couldn't get into the center of ^{the} campus. We bumped along University Avenue and went back to the old North Campus. I'm really shook up about Dan. You know, I thought he'd beaten it [cancer]. He beats most everything, you know. And I don't know whether you read Joe Bell's article in yesterday's L. A. Times.

MR: Yes, it was wonderful.

SM: Wonderful, yes. I just wrote him a letter of congratulations. He had an office down on the first floor for all these twenty-five years, ~~he taught~~, and Dan's sort of ^{not} is bigger than life. But he came down to Australia. It was ^{not} Brisbane, as I pointed out to Jim (inaudible) it was Melbourne, and I was there directing the Teacher Ed Overseas Program.

MR: Oh, that's right, yes.

SM: And Dan threw that darn thing and got a silver medal, and he'd unhook this chemotherapy, you know, and away he'd go.

MR: (inaudible)

SM: And he was well and he was happy. Now, I don't want to miss anything, Mary, that you've got there that we'd like to have. I'd like to know, you say things were happy. And so, on the

seventh question, what's your opinion of the possible forthcoming changes in Teacher Ed?

MR: I think in every field you need a change, and sometimes you need to reorganize. I think we've gotten to the point with Teacher Ed where we're not just a small office anymore. Being good neighbors in the community and providing them with a few teachers, we're really on the pulse of something that's very important to the United States of America today. Education is in a serious crisis and we are looking for a new leader. In fact, I have just come from meeting one of the candidates that we've been interviewing for the last two days. I think at this stage we do need a leader with vision, capable of pioneering research in this field and interacting and interfacing with the professional talents campus wide, and a director who has the latest resources at his or her fingertips, and who can also strengthen the credential program.

The best theories and discussions in the world are wasted without a tangible, practical application, and I think that's probably going to be our challenge: how we marry the research and all the things that are going on in the cognitive field with the practical application out in the schools. It's not going to be easy. I think we face a real challenge here, but it's an exciting one and at least we've been given the opportunity to move forward. And I think with the support of

Chancellor Peltason and David Gardner, I think they both feel very strongly about the Office of Teacher Education. Of course, those of us who work there dream that one day it will be a school with a dean. And who knows? You know, there's the possibility.

SM: Well, Dr. Bailey and I often talked about this. What I didn't want to see was faculty who were teaching towards the M.A. in Education or the Ed.D. and that they would be paid at a different level and would sort of make the supervisors second-class citizens. I never wanted to see that, and I pushed and supported Dr. Bailey all the way along the line. Now, I've told you what I don't want to see. Is there any chance that such a dichotomy or sort of . . . just a dichotomy is set up?

MR: You know, Sam, it's interesting you would raise this, because one of the problems that I think we've gone through in the last two years with some of the turmoil in Teacher Ed has just been this very problem, that the faculty . . . we're separated from the supervisors, we're separated from the staff. And probably, off the record, I think one of the things that was brought home very strongly to me last year was when we were trying to decide office space. It surprised me that a bunch of supposedly well-educated adults could really come to blows over who sat in which desk in which office, and I think that's sad.

Probably we're looking to a new leader to solve some of this. And the gentleman that we've been talking to the last two days has got some very interesting ideas about marrying the research with some of the student teaching with some of the supervisors, so that we almost have a revolving door situation where there's an opportunity for everybody to do a little of everything. Now, this might not sit well with everybody, but at least the thought is going in the right direction, that there should be some equation of responsibility, of idea sharing and the research. And I think we'll just have to see what happens.

SM: Well, I can see the question of research. I mean, that doesn't bother me. A lot of you people do research. But what I'm concerned about is this dichotomy set-up where you're teaching students to go for the Ph.D. or the Ed.D. and they think their work is more important, or their courses are more important, and the dissertations are really more important than you people out in the field who really are doing the tough work. I don't want to see this happen, and it was held off for all these years. (chuckling) You talk about space, we have a real problem of space. And Jaime Rodriguez, bless him, who was the Graduate Dean for five years? Jaime Rodriguez has given me . . . is sharing his office. Thank heavens he's not here a lot of the time and I've got my own phone. I don't have to go and answer his.

Question eight, Mary, do you have any comment on how state wide tries to control developments on each campus? I've never been clear on this and we always managed . . . They'd tell us, "We don't like your Teacher Education." And thank heavens, Carl Hartman who I'm so sad, you know, has had that stroke and is not there, he understood what Ken was doing.

MR: Well, you know, Sam, sometimes I'm overwhelmed by the sheer numbers involved in the people and the resources on the campuses. It's an unwieldy number of people and policies. And I suppose if you look at each of the UC campuses, each one is unique and each one has its strengths and its weaknesses. I think probably the goal should be to have an overall basic conformity to what is the University of California, while at the same time capitalizing on the natural and unique aspects of each campus. And I suppose in some ways, OTE [Office of Teacher Education] has been able to do that. We've built, I think, some very strong relationships out into the barrios of Santa Ana and with the professorships out in the city of Irvine, and, hopefully, we can continue that. I think there has to be some standardization, but I hope that any standardization doesn't mean autonomy and control that we're teaching to those up there instead of those out here. So I agree with you, I think it's a problem.

SM: It is a problem. I ran into it, Mary, in Australia as director of our program overseas, and it's a reciprocity. We

try to get students to match the numbers that are going to Australia; we want the same ones to go back to the University of California. And the same thing happens in England, France, Germany and all around. Well, I found that each of the admissions offices were little fiefdoms, little castles, running their own show, and they wouldn't let one of our students in, you know. And I tried to explain that a distinction [in Australia] meant a very high grade in the University of California. Oh, well, they didn't . . . And I had telephone calls and my successor who--I don't know whether you know her--she's in Education, her name is Clifford, Geraldine Clifford, and she's at Berkeley in Education, and she's really an historian of education, written a couple of books now. But she succeeded me down there and she had the same problem. And she, luckily for Berkeley, was able to shake Berkeley up and make them admit some of the Aussie students.

MR: I can relate to that. Back to my days in International Schools, we would look at reams of applicants. Everybody wanted to teach in an International School. And we really did have to do our pay scale on years of experience, because occasionally there'd be a third-class degree from Oxford, England, but there'd be a first-class honors degree from some little university--let's take a country like India. We had no way of measuring who had the substantial degree. I assume,

rather naughtily, that maybe the Oxford degree third-class was a better degree, but then the Indian would contest that. So we ended up with having to do a lot on interviews, a lot on letters of recommendation, and then simply how long have you been teaching and this is what you get. Not the best way, but it was a practical way.

SM: Well, you have to be practical in these matters, Mary. Now, are there any comments you have for me for the history of UCI? And I'm going to have a section of a chapter on Teacher Ed. In fact, I may make a whole chapter because I've been so keen on it.

MR: Well, I want to move away from Teacher Ed for a minute. And I have two comments I'd like to make. First of all, I think it's wonderful that you, and people like you and Suzy Peltason, care enough and have the commitment to preserve something that we've all lived through, but is really so recent that we're maybe not aware that we are going to be history. Sometimes, dealing with the daily trivia that, to us, is really very commonplace, one day is going to really enlighten somebody who looks back on these years. I suppose this is the time now to preserve some of this history, and you're doing it in a very, very thorough way. I think my one recollection of the campus is I remember the days when you couldn't find people on the campus after five o'clock. Now, we're in a phase where you can't find parking after five

o'clock. And I think, I hope, somewhere someone has used the quotation: "UCI, you mean Under Construction Indefinitely."

SM: (chuckling) Right. That's right, Under Construction Indefinitely. I can remember, Mary, when we first came, when I knew half the students, and I know I'd run into them, talk to them and so on. But I'm really, myself, who loves teaching the most. I mean, I write my books and so on. By the way, have you ever been in Australia?

MR: Yes.

SM: Oh, you have? Well, then I shall give you a copy of my book because it's about river boats in Australia.

MR: Well, I took a disastrous trip in Australia, to the Great Barrier Reef.

SM: Oh, yes.

MR: I mean, out from a little town to the Great Barrier Reef in a catamaran that had . . . first trip.

SM: Cairns? You went out from Cairns?

MR: Yes. And the water was . . . It was sunny, but the swell, they'd had a hurricane or a tornado or something. The swells were like this and the boat got soaked. And that new hotel that they have anchored out in the bay that they brought from Singapore, all the bottom floor had gone.

SM: Oh, yes.

MR: I think they towed it back to Singapore (inaudible).

SM: (laughter) Sally was telling me, we're going to go back to Australia in November, mainly to see my relatives, because although my main family, my brother died and my father died when I was sixteen and my mother died when I was one, but we're going to fly into Cairns. And they say that there's a lot of first-class hotels. We don't want to worry about those very fashionable ^{ones}. We don't care for the very expensive ones. But Cairns, you went ^{to sail} out to Green Island, probably, where you rent a catamaran.

MR: (inaudible)

SM: Well, there was a swell, I remember, when we went out in 1970. I had a Fulbright. I was lecturing up there.

MR: (inaudible)

SM: Well, back to the ^[new Director of] Teacher Education. I like teaching the very best. And what I really want to see happen is that we get a good person in; as you say, he should have an imagination and really dare to do things, although it's harder . . . Ken Bailey was wonderful. He (inaudible) anything. (laughter) He was wonderful. So this is the crucial situation. Rita [Peterson] carried on very much in the Ken tradition, but now it looks as though you say things are going to be different. But I sure hope that all those of you who are out in the field, who do the tough work, are going to be properly recompensed and recognized. That's what I'm concerned about. I shall follow it because . . . You'll be interested about

this history, Mary. I'll send this tape today over to Fullerton. They have a very fine Oral History Program, and Jack Peltason is funding this history of UCI. He's paying for these sixty-five interviews and he wants them to do it because they're so good. And then it comes back to me and I correct it. Then it goes back for final typing. It won't come to you for about a month or something like that. But I want you to know I appreciate this interview. It's one of the best I've had, and very carefully thought out by you. And I don't have anything more to say, except to say thank you very much. Don't forget to tell Jim that I voted for his dad in 1944. (chuckling)

MR: I will.

SM: Now, Mary, I forgot to ask a question that I thought about this morning, and that is the question of teacher unions. One reads about these things in the papers and so on, but I'd like to have your firsthand comment, please.

MR: Well, Sam, I have to talk from personal experience. I was a very newly hired teacher in London, thrilled with the job that I had got, and four weeks into it the union that I had joined called a national teachers' strike--very, very unusual in the British Isles. And I think I had been raised in a very ideological way and my theory was: no strike. This was not professional and I wasn't going to do it. So I'm afraid out of about a staff of maybe eighteen or twenty teachers, I was

the only one, along with the principal, who went to school every day. I crossed picket lines, I had my car tires let down, it was a miserable experience. The union threw me out before I had a chance to resign.

SM: (laughter)

MR: I cannot belong to a union in England. I've never tried to rejoin one, nor would I; and, of course, working with the United Nations that never arose, it was a different situation. And I've never been asked to join one here, to the best of my knowledge. Or, if I have, you know, official paperwork to me is to be dealt with hopefully by putting it in the trash basket.

SM: Very quickly, the faculty and staff are unionized here.

MR: (inaudible)

SM: It's not compulsory, as far as I know, and it hasn't been very effective, as far as I know.

MR: Well, there may lie the answer. As far as I know, I am not a union member. (chuckling)

SM: Have you paid your dues?

MR: No, I don't think I signed the dotted line or paid dues. I have some concern and, you know, I can see both sides of this. I don't believe that somebody in a professional capacity should strike. I don't believe that doctors, teachers, with a service to perform, should really take it out on those that they are treating or teaching. But at the same time, I hear

the response is, "Well, how do you get the public attention?" I suppose I would rather see a binding arbitration and a mechanism in place that would take care of this, and we don't have that; but that's something that I think should be looked at and, hopefully, one day that will be.

SM: In many ways, you can look to the examples in New Zealand and Australia for how arbitration did certainly for a time work and work very well.

MR: Yes.

SM: It didn't later. I mean, in about the 1970s when Hawke became Chair of the Australian Teachers' . . . ACTU, Australian Commonwealth Teacher Union . . . Anyhow, it's all the unions together.

MR: Australian Commonwealth Teachers' Union?

SM: No, that's not quite right. Well, now there's whatever. They always would finish up with binding arbitration. But now they keep pushing, and if the arbitration goes against the union they keep striking. And that's not cricket. It's supposed to be binding. The arbitration court, when we were down there two years ago, wasn't doing too well, but there is a model and it has worked and I agree with you. It was like the students here when they were racing around about Vietnam. "You have to teach about Vietnam," they'd say. And I'd say, "Look, I'm teaching a course in the Constitutional and Legal History of England. And that's all right, you can go and take

your course, this extra course you're taking over there on Vietnam." They'd leave and go off a little. I said, "And if you want to come, I'm here to lecture. And I'm not going to strike and I'm not going to leave the class." So I had about 80 percent at least that would stay and listen to the lectures. But it's a very interesting thing, Mary. I don't know what the future holds if the union gets very strong in teaching.

MR: Well, I think maybe one solution is to have a state body that looks at the issues and tries to anticipate problems that are going to arise.

SM: Yes.

MR: I think education has been so topsy-turvy. You know, it probably is the most important aspect of anybody's life, worldwide, and yet there are not too many countries that really have it high on the expense list and the priority list. And we're paying the price in this country today for not paying attention, and maybe one of the things we need to do is really look at the whole picture, of the teachers, the students, the curriculum. Really spend some time and attention on it, and out of that evolve a system whereby people are comfortable with what they're being offered and what they're doing. That may be a little idealistic, but if you're not idealistic, you might as well forget it.

SM: Well, I think that is the way to go. Well, thank you very much again, Mary.

END OF INTERVIEW