'MR. NOVAK'— Young Man To Watch

Does America have a new culture hero in the making? Can Mr. Novak compete with Dr. Kildare and Ben Casey? How successful were the first shows in the new series, as art and as education? A student of modern communications and image-making gives some of the answers.

James Franciscus as Mr. Novak, Dean Jagger as Principal Albert Vane

By GEORGE GERBNER

BARRING such more or less unlikely emergencies as the end of the world or the demise of NBC, by the time this appears America should have a new Dr. Kildare whose name is Mr. Novak and who is a teacher.

"Mr. Novak" was a commercial success before it ever appeared on the TV screens. Its anxious parents, MGM Studios, offered their offspring with some trepidation but (thanks to Sputnik?) NBC bought it in twenty minutes. This is some feat, as the program is an hour long, minus commercials. It took only forty-eight hours to turn that "minus" into a "plus" of over $10 million. Sponsors welcomed the chance to underwrite the first year of the series in exchange for a few minutes of the time of millions expected to watch "Mr. Novak" each Tuesday night.

If these hopes materialize (and I think they might), American teachers will have their first culture hero, in the strict anthropological sense of the term, in the history of our country. John Novak succeeds where characters like Our Miss Brooks and Mr. Peepers were not even in the running because Novak is not only shyly attractive, boyishly lovable, and winningly bungling, but he is also endowed with a mind, a will, and a strong sense of values. He is not pushed around, much. When he goes wrong, he usually manages to do it the "right way": one feels that he lost a battle but might yet win the war. If he goes wrong the "wrong way" (wins the wrong battle, as I think he has done on the first program), he is a handsome failure, nevertheless.

Judging by what I have seen, read, and heard from other people, "Mr. Novak" will be a popular entertainment success, and I wish him well. But no culture hero can be *only* an entertainment success, least of all John Novak, teacher. In the first year of the series alone, Novak will reach more Americans than will all real-life high-school teachers combined. Most of these Americans will have *no other* intimate contact with teachers and teaching. Munching their pretzels or doing their ironing while mentally engrossed in the taut plot

MR. GERBNER *is associate professor in the Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois. His writings include "Smaller Than Life: Teachers and Schools in the Mass Media"* (PHI DELTA KAPPAN, *February, 1963).*

lines of the drama, these viewers will get their most vivid and realistic images of education from "Mr. Novak": what it looks like *today,* what it feels like on the *"inside,"* what it seems like *from a teacher's point of view.* Here, then, is a professional as well as cultural and entertainment phenomenon to watch with careful and probing attention.

Not "Typical" but Right

I want to dispel any impression that "Mr. Novak" is dramatized pedagogy or public relations image-building. It is much more, simply because it is to be the story of an inexperienced, able, determined young man entering a tough profession, which happens to be high-school teaching.

Complementing and counterpointing Mr. Novak, the novice, is a father-figure, an old pro by the name of Albert Vane, who happens to be Novak's high-school principal. It is conceivable that Novak, a bachelor (but, unmistakably, not a confirmed one), might drop in some night on Vane, and the two might go out to dinner. It is also conceivable that Vane might buy Novak, *horrible dictu,* a drink. Theirs is the relationship of two *men* with minds of their own; it is one of a clashing of wills and sharing of purposes, of the ambivalence of hidden resentments and underlying respect, of inevitable misunderstandings and petty humiliations turning into shared triumphs. It is not "typical," but it seems right. No such character as Albert Vane has ever "happened to be" a high-school principal in movies or television before; no such relationship between teacher and principal has ever been portrayed in American mass drama or fiction.

Birth of the Series

Creation of the series is the work of E. Jack Neuman, now its executive producer. Neuman considers himself basically a writer, but he is also in charge of producing new television series for MGM Studios. His previous "project" was "Sam Benedict," also on NBC, based on the life of lawyer J. W. "Jake" Ehrlich of San Francisco. Before that, Neuman created the "Dr. Kildare" series.

The idea was born when Boris Sagal, the director who worked with Neuman on the Kildare series and "Sam Benedict" (and who now directs "Mr. Novak"), asked him a casual question one day: "Do you think there is a series in the life of a teacher?" Neuman said "No" without hesitation. His friend returned a little later. "Wait a minute," he said. "I was a teacher once. I think there *is* a series in the life of a teacher." Thinking about a "series in the life of a teacher" started Neuman on a process of cogitation, research, writing, and growing missionary zeal. The process resulted in a pilot program in early 1963.

Basic decisions of approach, format, and focus had to be made before the pilot was completed. Should Novak be a college teacher? Neuman felt this might deprive the series of some exuberance, unpredictability, and community context. Should Novak teach in elementary school? The thought of shooting thirty hour-long films with elementary school children made producers' hair stand on end. So it had to be high school. Just as well, Neuman says. Dramatic and social elements, and the toughest professional problems, are concentrated here. And here is that mixed-up no-man's-land between immaturity and maturity in which Novak the teacher is not so many years removed from his students, but in which he must, and does, struggle to represent the signpost of maturity.

Later, in a memorandum to writers assigned to the series, Neuman introduced John Novak as a "young, under thirty fella who sincerely believes that information and knowledge—education—and not guns is the solution for many of the world's troubles. He figured that out one night during his Air Force duty in the Korean affair—a lonely and dangerous night—and the thought was so profound it changed his whole life—he decided to be a teacher. You may agree with him or you may not, but that's the way Mr. Novak feels about it and that's what this series is all about. Mr. Novak is a practical, hard-working idealist, vital and aggressive, with his feet on the ground and his head in the clouds."

Relations with Schools

When Neuman worked on the pilot for "Dr. Kildare," he spent months in the Los Angeles County Hospital doing clinical work with the interns. When he developed "Sam Benedict," he lived with "Jake" Ehrlich until San Franciscans thought he was another trial lawyer. In preparing the pilot for "Mr. Novak," Neuman found many school people reticent, some defensive, a few even suspicious. Paradoxically, this only strengthened his conviction that he was on the right track. School people have been hurt, he says. They didn't think we could, or would, do anything different.

Neuman took the completed pilot to Washington and screened it for NEA officials. After the showing, Executive Secretary William G. Carr said: "What do you want from us? What can we do for you?" Neuman replied: "I would like you to unlock the door of the high school. We have twenty-nine more programs to do the first year. We need the help of school people."

When the pilot "sold" not only teachers who saw it but, more importantly, the network and the sponsors, the show was ready to go into production. The NEA helped with school contacts, and set up a system of rotating advisory panels consisting of teachers and administrators. Story treatments and drafts of scripts were circulated. Comments and suggestions were relayed to the producer through NEA's Division of Press, Radio, and Television Relations. A high-school principal and a teacher were engaged as full-time technical advisors on the set. With TV star (and Yale '57 graduate in English) James Franciscus as Mr. Novak, Academy Award winner veteran actor Dean Jagger as Albert Vane, and Emmy (Television Academy) Award winner William Froug as producer, MGM Sound Stage No. 22 in Culver City became the interior of "Jefferson High," ready to turn out hour-long films on a six-day schedule.

Now guidelines had to be laid down for the entire series. It had been decided that Novak should be an English teacher with the usual run of "extracurricular" school duties (*except* coaching the football team), simply because these elements provide the greatest flexibility of dramatic materials and situations. He should teach in an unnamed midwestern city. His school is a forward-looking big-city high school with the normal mixture of order and chaos. Various ways of organizing instruction and methods of teaching are considered, tested, argued about. Irate parents and stodgy school board members run true to course, as do their more enlightened counterparts. About 10 per cent of the school population is Negro, another 15 per cent is of identifiable ethnic and other minority background. They come from rich homes, poor homes, and in-between homes.

The problems "Mr. Novak" tackles run the gamut. There is an unusual story of conflict between anti-war sentiment and the ROTC. A boy with genuine creative talent cannot adapt to school life. A hazing turns into a court case. There is the obligatory "sex education scandal" (I am still waiting for a play in which the scandal is about *not* having "sex education" in school). And there is the tender story of a blind girl who falls in love with Mr. Novak and opens his eyes (and ours) to some important things in the life of a teacher. In what I have seen or read so far there are no cheap tricks, no guns, no knives, and no other weapons of fake emotion or hack writing.

Memo to Writers

In the spring of 1963, Neuman (an award-winning writer himself) wrote a 9-page memorandum to other writers who were to assist him in turning out twenty-nine more scripts on a rigid production schedule. "John Novak," he wrote, "is anti-ignorance and he works at it five days a week and you and I are mainly concerned with him and what he thinks and feels and does." He told writers not to be dismayed "when I say that this is not the story of high-school kids. Of course we'll tell their stories; we want their faces and their movements and their youth and their beauty in front of the camera as much as possible; we want to show them validly for the attractive, thoughtful human beings they are; we do not want to continue the stereotyped image of a wacky teen-ager; we *do* want the details of their portrayals included in your writing *but* your script and your story must be constructed for Novak or Vane—or both."

I am citing this memo at some length because it gave writers, the school advisory panels, and us, some standards and goals set by the creator of the program himself. The final impression of Novak, Neuman wrote, must be an authentic picture not only of what a high-school teacher does, but also of his professional attitude. And he continued:

> At some time or other all of us have been guilty of making (for instance) Dr. Kildare something of a psychiatrist or a surgeon when all of his charm and all of his characterization lies in the fact that he is an inexperienced young intern trying to gain experience. As a matter of fact, Novak is much the same sort of person along those lines. He has a master's degree; he went to a teachers college and he has had experience as a student teacher, as a cadet teacher, and as a substitute. In our series, Novak is "wearing his first long pants" so to speak, with a full schedule and full responsibility of the classroom and his inexperience shows up just as frequently as his good sense and his good training.

Neuman expressed some of his own professional attitude toward his work and that of the teacher when he wrote:

> High-school teachers are quite accustomed to hostility outside the classroom—not from students but from parents and non-interested parties in other professions. The teacher in our society seems to be accepted as only "half" professional and is often limited to the company of other teachers whether he likes it or not. Novak does not like it and he resists it for as many episodes as the traffic will bear. Novak is the kind of man who if he does not break some of the rules will bend them badly, since he is blessed with uncommon good sense and independence. Albert Vane admires this quality in Novak—since it is one of his own qualities.

Breaking the Rules

One unwritten rule of "show business" Neuman himself broke is that classroom scenes, being inherently dull and undramatic, should be done only for suspense or for laughs. "Don't avoid classroom scenes," Neuman wrote. "This is where Mr. Novak can show his value—or lack of it. Don't evade your chance to show faculty and other meetings, testing, calls from parents, correcting homework, preparing and planning for the classroom. Don't avoid anything a teacher does, the good and the bad."

There is another assumption to which Neuman took strong and welcome exception. The assumption implicit in much popular writing about teaching and schools is that since every writer was once a student, every writer is an expert on schools and teachers; all he has to do is recall his own experience. "What you and I remember of our own high school days," Neuman warned his writers, "is almost valueless in light of the quickly changing scene today. . . . So don't trust your memory—use your eyes and your ears—at a high school.

"The best thing to do," added Neuman, "is *research*. Use our technical advisor—ask us—or by far the best—go out and find out yourself. Make arrangements to visit the high school in your neighborhood (or we'll make them for you), and I guarantee that whether the visit lasts a half hour or a half day you will see or hear something that can be translated directly onto the film that you are going to write.

"Lastly, and most importantly," Neuman told his writers, "say something in your story—something definite, positive, and informative. For years all of us have wanted a vehicle that would go beyond and behind the scenes of human behavior. This is your chance. Use it."

The Advisory Process

Did they use it? The panels of school people reading and commenting on the scripts thought they did. Advice and criticism were freely given, seriously considered, often accepted, and, at times, freely rejected. Such is the prerogative of those who must take final responsibility for the product in the light of dramatic, technical, and commercial —as well as professional—considerations.

There seems to have been a sincere desire on the part of producers to benefit from professional advice, and a genuine respect on the part of school people for what the writers and producers tried to accomplish. The shows which go on the air this year (with the exception of the first program, which was the pilot prepared before the system of advisory panels was set up), will have gained in authenticity of detail and soundness of approach because of this cooperation.

The professional advisory process rarely needs to—or can—tamper with the basic story line of a program. In one of the early drafts of one script, panelists complained that a school "inspector" charged into a classroom "like a rhinocerous across the African veldt." The solution offered to the problem of another program was, according to the panelists, "too pat." Commenting on the second program in the series, panelists raised a question about the old-fashioned disciplinarian Miss Phipps turning to Novak with "I suppose you're another one of those teachers college products?" The comment was: "Should teachers colleges be attacked without letting the public know why? Incidentally," the panelists added, "according to Mr. Neuman's memo to writers, the mythical Mr. Novak did attend a teachers college."

The replies of William Froug, the show's first producer, were equally good-natured and candid. Responses to panelists' comments ranged from "Have been followed almost 100 per cent" to "Aw, come on!" Some compromises were made. On the question of teachers colleges, for example, the producer's comment indicated a minor but revealing retreat from principles enunciated for the series. "We think," he wrote, "Miss Phipps' comment about teachers college products is quite germane to her character and is certainly not likely to offend too many people. We have decided Mr. Novak should have a liberal arts education, since it gives us a broader base from which to work."

'First Year, First Day'

My information about the circumstances and policies of the series came from conversations with production and school people involved, and from written materials and correspondence they were kind enough to send me. My impressions of the program itself are based on previewing the pilot program, telecast September 24 as the first in the series. I have read the scripts of some other programs, and I know that in certain respects the pilot may not represent them adequately. Still, I think it is fair to compare performance with promise, even at this early stage in the series, if for no other purpose than to provoke the kind of public and professional discussion needed to do justice to this extraordinary effort.

"First Year, First Day" (the opening program) presented a skillful picture of a day of major astonishments and minor embarrassments for a group of new teachers (including Mr. Novak) at Jefferson High. The school year was launched, and the towering figure of Albert Vane at the

helm inspired confidence, even if not tranquility. Novak met his master, and they promptly struck a relationship which will bend, coil, sparkle, and stretch—but never break—before they're through.

Novak met his fellow teachers, and they were refreshingly recognizable human beings. Even the "characters" among them stopped just short of being caricatures. Novak met Miss Scott, the new home economics teacher (WOW!) and, before the day was out, obtained a date for Saturday night. And Novak met his students.

The Problem

In this last encounter, or series of encounters, the problem of the play was developed, posed, and, in my opinion, fumbled. Herein lies the problem of my criticism: This was a good show, and, on the whole, well acted and well directed. But the very virtues of the play served to hide the fact that when you got right down to it, Mr. Novak was decisively defeated in the battle which was supposed to be his forte, and defeated without realizing what the battle was all about.

How did this happen?

A number of minor scrapes with a student who drives a sports car and wears an arrogant-diffident air, punctuates Novak's first tense morning at school. One of these is so literal that it leaves Novak with a dented fender (perhaps the ultimate insult to a virile American male). At the morning assembly, as new teachers are introduced, we learn that this student, Paul Christopher, set something of a scholastic record for failures at Jefferson High. We also find him obtrusively rise and saunter out of the hall while Novak makes a feeble attempt at a little speech. Next, he shows up late in class—Novak's class. Finally, at the right moment, with studied calm and surgical precision, Christopher flings the challenge which knocks Mr. Novak, the program, and us, for a loop. It is a good, vital challenge: the trouble is we never know what hit us.

The challenge comes when Christopher announces to Novak and the class that "I came to school today to see if someone could give me one good reason why I shouldn't drop out." Another student picks up the gauntlet, mock politeness hiding his serious intent: "It is quite possible, sir, that the inclination to 'drop out,' as the magazines call it, is secretly lurking in the minds of more than one of us here today." There is a scattering of laughter. The student drives on: "Therefore, sir, it might be helpful to *all* of us to hear the 'one good reason' you intend to give Christopher."

Disappointingly, and (to me) inexplicably, Novak shrinks from the challenge. Instead of seizing the opportunity to drive home a lesson about the meaning and relevance of his teaching to *anything* of genuine human concern, Novak imposes military discipline and plunges into his Lecture Notes No. 1. Christopher picks up his things and walks out. Novak continues to plow through Lecture Notes No. 1. A few innocuous scenes and then the commercials flash on to signal, as it were, the finality of disaster; we begin to realize, with sinking heart, that something has gone wrong *the wrong way*.

Lunch Hour

Lunch hour is next on "First Year, First Day." Disregarding Vane's stern warning not to get "personally involved," Novak sets out to find Christopher. It is clear by now that Novak interpreted the challenge as a personal one (personal to him, personal with the student) rather than a vital and almost desperate demand from a *student* to a *teacher*. The pretext for Novak's search for the student is that he wants his fender repaired. The real reason seems to be that he wants his dented ego fixed.

Novak finds Christopher at home, and now we learn more about *him*. Paul Christopher is a bright boy with an honest and fairly accurate diagnosis of his situation. He has a well-internalized system of conventional values. His father, a successful contractor, gives lip service to education but *respects* money, power, and big, tangible, concrete accomplishments (like the skyscrapers he builds). Paul's private prescription for life—given this set of circumstances—is both sensible and useful. He and a friend opened a body repair shop. They work hard, make good money, and feel constructive. Eventually, Paul wants to follow in his father's footsteps.

The private grounds for Novak's unusual and uncalled-for visit collapse one by one. Unbeknownst to him, Paul had reported the accident to the principal's office, and the smashed fender is to be fixed at his "Heavenly Body-Shop." Christopher has heard all the lectures on finishing high school. He has nothing against the general principle. But just now he is useful and he feels respected; he is *somebody*, since he makes money and drives a sports car. He is impressed with Novak's personal interest, but he is not buying anything Novak has to sell.

Novak now confronts the father, probing for a chink in the family armor. His audacity earns him a job offer with Christopher, the elder, presumably to work on (and for) something that really counts.

Later, back at school, Vane gets wind of the affair and summons the teacher. Novak explains

that Christopher "caused a disturbance by asking me why he should not drop out of school; I refused to allow that to become a topic for general discussion in the class; he left." Vane muffs *his* chance to tell young Mr. Novak (and us) what a teacher might do when the significance and the relevance of his teaching is challenged. Instead, he rebukes Novak for getting "personally involved" and not relying on "the system." "The system" seems to be one of treating a "private challenge" to one teacher as a threat to all. "We have a faculty to deal with that kind of thing," he storms. "Don't you like our system?" "No sir, I don't," Novak retorts, with reason. But now the teacher is forced to justify his action on the grounds that it wasn't just a personal matter after all: " . . . There was something else, too. They asked me a question that seemed important to them . . . I didn't feel I could just dismiss it." Why *did he* dismiss it, then, as an important question for a *teacher* to *tackle in class?* We'll never know. Vane washes his hands of the affair, convinced that Novak is wrong (but for the wrong reasons!). Novak rushes off equally convinced he is right (but also for the wrong reasons).

No Real Answer

After a short breathing spell for a message from the sponsor, night falls on "First Year, First Day." Novak, now in sweater and slacks, drives his car with the dented fender to the "Heavenly Body-Shop." In the course of this confrontation, Novak tells young Christopher that he wants him back in class tomorrow morning. Christopher tells Novak that "you're a phony. . . . And I bet you don't even know it. You want me back in that classroom because it'll make you look great in front of the other guys. Am I right?"

That does it. Now Novak is *really* angry. He is forced to deliver a lecture in the privacy of the bodyshop that he should have delivered the first time in class. But perhaps it's just as well that he didn't.

I asked three people (all of whom liked the show) why Paul Christopher should go back to school *except* to make Novak look good. None could remember an answer.

The fact is that "Mr. Novak" had no real answer. Of course we assume that we all *know* just why Paul Christopher should return to school; therefore, any answer supporting our assumptions sounds good. But I am not so sure we really know the answer, individually or collectively. And I am convinced that finding the answer is a much more searching process than we have been asked to undergo in this program.

The climax of the play comes and goes as Novak gets worked up over nothing. He holds forth for about four minutes, occasionally tapping his temple to show where *he* has his "bank account." He argues that the wisdom certified by a high-school diploma "can never be taken away," while any calamity such as a fire, depression, or even competition can wipe out material possessions overnight. Permit me, please, not to submit this little homily to any exegesis.*

Blind Alley

We're in a blind alley from which there is no way out except backwards. This happens when, early next morning, Mr. Novak sits in his classroom, dejectedly. Suddenly—surprise, surprise—Paul Christopher saunters in and sits down with proper expressionlessness. Mr. Novak just gazes. The students exchange significant glances. The audience is relieved of any further responsibility for the matter.

Why did Paul Christopher come back to school? There are three reasons. (1) My reason is that Paul returned because Novak is our hero. (2) The purported reason of the play is that his return is due to Mr. Novak's dedication and persistence. More specifically, as Novak was reaching the end of his oratorical rope at the body shop, old Mr. Christopher appeared just in time to be turned into an example of futility (against all visible evidence) for his son's edification. It turned out, to nobody's surprise, that Senior had no high-school diploma himself. Furthermore, he was too busy building things to have time for regrets or for anything else. Aha, Novak pointed his finger in desperation, "you get bored just living with yourself." Turning on Paul, compounding the non-sequitur, Novak exclaimed: "You asked for one good reason—that's it." Shattered by all this, we presume, Paul Christopher returned to school next morning. (3) The third reason might be Paul's himself, if we can take the liberty of attributing reasons implicit in the play's context. He is flattered by the personal attention, and, although he has no strong new reason, underneath it all he is chicken.

The trouble with all this is not so much that Mr. Novak turns out to be a pretty poor teacher, despite superficial impressions and repeated allegations to the contrary. We have been promised the good with the bad, and Novak's trials and errors may turn out to be the best dramatic ingredients of his role. Also, anyone writing a good

*Can I suggest anything better? I certainly hope so, as I am just now preparing my first class of the new school year and have decided that if I can't do any better I shall ask for a job with either one of the Christophers. But I will not be trapped into expounding *my* answers here, now, and—in this context—under guild scale for script doctors.

play about good teaching must embody some qualities of *two* arts, either one of which is rare enough.

Nor do we want a sociological treatise instead of good drama. After all, this is a one-hour television play about a conflict between a smart kid who wants to blow school and an inexperienced young teacher. The basic trouble is the play's (rather than John Novak's) inability to illuminate the dimension and urgency of the problem raised. The trouble is that there was no attempt (or time or talent) to dig deeply enough (yes, down to the social roots and facts of the case) to come up with a credible, memorable, *and* truly dramatic insight into why Paul Christopher quits and what alternatives both school and teacher must offer to convince him he shouldn't. Consider, for example, that the vast majority of our 7.5 million "dropouts" quit school under such *less* favorable conditions than did Paul Christopher. Consider, also, the startling fact that a large and growing proportion of our high-school graduates are not only unemployed but *unemployable* under present circumstances. A more profound and more dramatically gripping answer to the question "Why should Paul Christopher go back to school" than was given in "First Year, First Day" would have to include a convincing demonstration (in the classroom, as well as on the outside) of the plain truth that Mr. Novak, Jefferson High, and all the rest of us have at least as much to learn about wasted lives and wasted resources as does young (and old) Mr. Christopher.

Promising Pattern

Where do the chips fall then? On the whole, I still think they fall into a promising pattern. Mr. Novak's trials and tribulations have only begun. You can't win them all, the first ones and the tough ones. "First Day, First Year" happened to be both.

Filming of the first year's series is just about at the half-way mark. Neuman took over active production when, after the eighth show was filmed, Froug shifted to another program. The high aims, hopeful auspices, and creative honesty of the whole conception of the series make me hopeful. But, at the same time, every program must stand on its own merits.

"Usually reliable sources" on the production side confided to me that of the first ten episodes in the series three are "outstanding," four are "good," two are "lousy," and one is an "absolute embarrassing bomb." If true, such quality rating is considered way above par for the television course. But more to my point than any quality rating is the basis upon which we arrive at judgments and expressions of opinion. Let us watch and see the quality of insight as well as the entertainment and production qualities of each program and of the series as a whole, with the thoughtful and serious attention that this significant event in public education—and popular culture—deserves.

Wyatt Belittles UFT Contract

► Speaking at a Los Angeles Teachers Association meeting on September 9, Robert Wyatt, president of the NEA, said that bargaining methods used by the United Federation of Teachers in New York to win salary increases "did not seem very effective." Total increases for two years would be, he said, $330.*

"I have some suspicion," he added, "that this two-year agreement, even with fringe benefits, is not a very satisfactory agreement and might be regretted." Wyatt stressed his belief that all teachers should unite in a single organization for more effective representation. "When any group is divided, as teachers are, obviously their program is damaged."

And Megel Responds for AFT

► Replying to Wyatt at KAPPAN request, Carl Megel, president of the American Federation of Teachers, said: "It is unfortunate that the president of the NEA should succumb to an impulse to downgrade positive teacher gains made by the AFT to smokescreen NEA failures in Utah. The undeniable fact is that through collective bargaining by their union, the New York teachers received an average salary increase of $995 last year and $580 for the coming two years, a total of $1,575 for the three-year period. Equally important are other improvements obtained: lower class size, self-directed preparation periods, and release from hallguard, playground, cafeteria, and other baby-sitting duties.

"Democratic elections among classroom teachers to determine collective bargaining representatives will produce effective single unit representation. Through their AFT organization, built upon free, voluntary membership obtained without administrative recruitment or coercion, union teachers are speaking with the single voice of democratically elected teacher representatives. It is now time for the teacher whose salary, status, and students have been neglected for so many irredeemable years to assert himself."

---

* Under the New York City agreement, most teachers will receive increases of $330 over a two-year period as a result of adjustments in salary scales. In addition, however, teachers who qualify for a "promotional increment" will receive $725, effective Jan. 1, 1965, instead of the present $475. About 27,000 of the city's 43,000 teachers now qualify for this extra amount, which would give them total increases of $580.