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Dr. Celeste Ulrich served as president of the American Alliance For Health, Physical Education and Recreation (now the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) from 1976 to 1977. She was recipient of the Luther Halsey Gulick Award in 1983.
ALLYS SWANSON: Good morning, Celeste. To begin this interview, I'd like you to tell us where you were born and some of the early childhood experiences you recall.

DR. ULRICH: I was born in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1924. I grew up in a family with one younger brother. When I was about 7, my uncle was killed in an automobile accident, so his son joined our family. He was three years older than I, so in a sense I suddenly had a second brother. I became the middle child. My mother and father were married at the ages of 18 and 19. They were able to celebrate their 49th wedding anniversary before my father's death. In addition, my mother's widowed mother lived with us. Then my father's mother joined us after it became obvious that she could no longer take care of herself. So I grew up in a family which had three generations. Fortunately, although we were a middle class family and the Depression prevailed, causing lots of problems, my father was able to retain his job. We never really worried about that, although as a child I can remember my mother asking him every Friday, which was ordinarily pay day, "You didn't get a pink slip did you?" I didn't know exactly what a pink slip was, but I knew that it would be a
terrible thing to get one. He never did. We were always able to live frugally but quite well.

My father believed that education was the door to opportunity and he was very anxious that his children have that kind of opportunity. Unfortunately World War II came along and my cousin, whom I considered to be my older brother, was taken into the Army. That interrupted his education. It was just at the time that I was ready to go to college. Although there wasn’t very much money to make it possible for me to go to college, my dad and mother did everything they could to support that concept.

One of the interesting things about my family was that my mother worked at a paying job from about two years after my younger brother was born until her retirement. She was a comptometer operator. She used to take great pride in the fact that she was faster than the new computers. Because she was good, she finally became the vice president of a company that manufactured slipcovers. At first my father was a bit embarrassed to have his wife work because her employment was obviously necessary to support our extended family. Then, I slowly saw him begin to take pride in her talents because she was doing so well. I don’t think he would have been able to accept the idea that she could earn a bigger salary than he, but since she did not, he never faced that situation. That would have been very difficult for him, but he took great pride in her accomplishments. I remember hearing him brag to his friends about what his wife could do.

Our family was a very close-knit family. Although they were young when they married, my mother and father believed that children should have responsibilities, so we were assigned jobs. My younger brother probably got off a little easier than the other two of us, but not a whole lot. In addition, we had the opportunity to be a part of the family decision making process. We would have a
family council every once in a while and make decisions. We were part of some rather large decisions, such as whether it would be better to have the roof repaired or to take a jaunt together to Ocean City, Maryland, for the weekend. Our thoughts counted. We had a good opportunity to discuss our ideas and to bring our hopes and dreams to the arguments. As a result of that, I always felt as though my opinions had some merit. In many ways, that has been helpful.

Probably besides my family, the most significant thing that happened to me in my youth was my Girl Scouting experience. I became a Brownie when I was about eight years old. That organization was attuned to many things to which our society has since become sensitized. They were concerned about human welfare. They were concerned about the atypical; Girl Scouts were concerned about ecology. I think that leadership is the key point in any youth serving agency. I was fortunate enough always to be under the guidance of women who were thoughtful and sensitive but at the same time demanding.

I had many experiences that, as I realized later on, helped to formulate what I believed. I was thrown in with atypical colleagues at a time when most of the atypical were being sent to a specialized school. We worked with ethnic minorities and I learned to appreciate that interactional pattern. As far as the ecology was concerned, camping and understanding nature were very important. In addition, I was a part of a group of girls who continued throughout scouting from the time that we were eight years old until we went to college. This nucleus of girls in Baltimore was energetic and driven. We decided that the only person who was capable of leading us was Caroline Lyder, the executive director of Girl Scouts in Baltimore. She very graciously decided to become our leader. I think now of what an imposition it was. We just assumed their "Skipper" would consider it a great privilege to be with us.
Out of that group of approximately ten, one became the president of Barnard; another became a very significant anthropologist; another became a medical surgeon. Betty Cooke became one of the top jewelry designers in the country. Every one of those girls excelled in certain ways. Most of them married. One of them became one of the top aeronautical engineers at the Curtis Wright Company in Baltimore.

All those people were continual role models. I didn't know they were in those days, but I now realize they made it possible for me to believe that you could do anything you wanted to do if you were willing to work hard and, to some extent, suffer social ostracism. As we got older it wasn't cute to be a Girl Scout. But we persisted because we thought it was a good program; we thought what we were doing was right.

My parents always encouraged me. Every once in a while my dad used to worry about what was going to happen to his little girl after he died. I remember thinking that I would always be able to take care of myself. In keeping with his particular era, he decided that surely there ought to be a man to take care of me. He never pushed me though. He never said, "You must do this." I knew he worried about me. But Mom would say, "Don't worry, Frank, she's going to be all right." I felt that they were very supportive and never demanding in what they expected of me.

At the time of my mother's death, when I was 50 years old, an aunt came up to me and said, "You certainly can feel good about your relationship with your parents, because you never gave them one thing to worry about." I had never thought about it in that way, but afterwards I thought that what she had said was true. I was a good kid. I did the right things and I didn't give my parents anything to worry about, but that was because they were good to me. I never did
understand people who were in continuous combat with their parents, because mine were so supportive.

ALLYS SWANSON: What was your father’s profession?

DR. ULRICH: None of the people in my family had gone to college. My dad’s father died when he was very young so at the age of 12 he had to get a job. After my grandfather’s death, the great post-World War II flu epidemic came along. The four children, who were older than my father and his brother, died within a period of six weeks. My grandmother had just lost her husband and now four of her children, all in less than half a year. For her that was extraordinarily traumatic and she decided that she had a great obligation to these two younger boys—my father and uncle.

My dad went to work at the age of 12 in the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company. He still went to school, but he started to work as an errand boy. When he finished his schooling, he became an engineer by taking night school courses but he never got a degree. My father was in charge of a lot of people at the Gas and Electric Company. He was the superintendent of some of the engineers. Every time something terrible happened, like an ice storm, they always turned to Dad because he would get the crews out and repair the damage. Upon his retirement, he had the longest tenure with the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company that there will ever be, because nobody starts at age 12 anymore. My dad always spoke with reverence about "The Company" because it had done a great deal for him and allowed him to have all kinds of opportunities.

There are only two things that I can remember that my father and I had serious disagreements about. One occurred because he realized, particularly in his position of responsibility, that it was very important to earn a good salary. I kept saying to him, "Money is not important." He kept saying to me, "Money is more important than you believe." I thought that was absurd and we used to
argue about that. I guess that he probably cared more about money than I do even to this day. To him it represented security and that was what he was seeking.

The other thing that my dad and I disagreed on was his attitude about black people. Among his maintenance crews, there were several black workmen. He used epithets to talk about them, and he assumed that they were stupid. Meanwhile, Girl Scouts was teaching me quite the opposite attitude. I criticized him as children do and I think that hurt him. I considered my father racist and bigoted towards particularly black men throughout his entire life. In a sense, I was ashamed of that. Then, at his death, one of his black employees came up and told me how sorry he was about my father's death and said, "No one will ever know how much Frank Ulrich did to help me." He went on to tell me all the things that my father had done for the black men in his group. I had never, ever seen that side of my father. It was a real shock to me to find out how supportive he had been. He certainly never indicated to me that kind of softness as I was growing up. I think that he was concerned that people would believe he was soft. He was a man and, by God, you didn’t do that, because being "rough" was the way you approached things. Those were the only two major arguments that I can remember.

My mother was the baby of her family and the only girl. Her father died when she was in her teens. In those days, the female children were supposed to take care of mama. My grandmother on my mother’s side was a lady who was a very physically attractive person. The greatest compliment that people used to pay my grandmother was that she was the beauty of the neighborhood and that my grandfather, who adored her, "carried her around on a pillow." I always thought that my grandmother grew up in a kind of opulence as a child, became one of the beauties of Baltimore, married the right gallant man, produced the right number of children, and did everything right. She was taken care of all her
life. After her husband's death, it became the obligation of her daughter and her daughter's husband to take care of her. She ended her life in the midst of the Depression and of having to work very hard in a family situation for which she wasn't prepared. She really adjusted admirably. But how much better my parents' lives were than my grandmother's. She started out with a lot and ended up with little, whereas they started out with little and ended up in a rather positive way.

Mom, who was apparently the smart kid in high school, had always hoped that she might go into chemistry with the blessings of her father, which was unusual in that era. After his death, her mother was her responsibility. The only positions that were open for women were teaching, nursing and stenographic work. She decided to move into stenographic work mostly in mathematics rather than in typing. She became an auditor and worked with figures. She literally wove her way up to the vice presidency of the company.

I do recall that Mom was not there when I was growing up to kiss my scraped knee. But I never felt neglected because on the weekends we did marvelous things together. My mother would get up very early in the morning and bake us hot corn bread for breakfast. She used to get up early so that she would have a little time to herself. As a kid I didn't appreciate that, but certainly as I grew older I appreciated it.

Things were well-organized and we knew what we were supposed to do, so in spite of my mother's working, I always felt that my family situation was like everyone else's. Quite honestly, I used to feel sorry sometimes for my colleagues who had "housewifey" mothers. My mother was vibrant, alert and alive. When she came home we talked about interesting things that were happening in the economy and what we thought about national problems. My friends' mothers
talked about—which pair of socks they should wear. I used to feel really sorry for them.

The only time I ever envied my friends and their mothers was when I was in the fourth or fifth grade. Apparently something was supposed to happen at school, and my mother stopped by before she went to work to find out what her responsibility was to be. As she came into the classroom to see my teacher, everybody in the class turned around and said, "Who's that?" I said, "That's my mother." And they said, "Oh, she doesn't look like a mother." At the time I thought, "No, she doesn't. I wish she were kind of bosomy and old looking instead of a vibrant business woman." Afterwards I thought, "Gee, I'm glad she doesn't look like Frances' mother."

ALLYS SWANSON: What values do you feel you've gained from your mother?

DR. ULRICH: My mother's major mission in life, and I heard her say this very often, was to serve other people. She believed that she was put on this earth with her God given opportunity to offer service. She served her family well, and when there was sickness in our neighborhood or tragedy or any kind of duress, my mother was the first one there. She was always the first person to make sure that the children were taken care of, that there were meals available, and so on. I grew up seeing her as a role model and I believed that everyone should do what she did. Indeed, people should always put other things before themselves. Later on, I remember having a long conversation with my mother, about this philosophy.

As I got to be a teenager, I realized that my mother was very clever at manipulation. She did not act according to the bad connotation of the word. She saw manipulation as a way to get things done. One time, when I was about fourteen, we had decided to go on a vacation. Mother, my brother Bob, and I had
said, "Wouldn't it be fun to go to Yellowstone Park?" My father had never even thought about that. We decided that that's what we would like to do. I remember saying, "We can talk about this in the family council." My mother must have known that it would be important to soften up my father with regard to this idea. She talked to him and while we were meeting in our family council, my father said, "I've done some thinking and I've decided that one of the places that we should go, and I don't know how any of you feel about it, is Yellowstone Park." I remember saying, "I think that's a great idea." My mother said, "Frank, what a great idea." We decided to go to Yellowstone Park.

Afterwards I said to my mother, "That wasn't his idea; it was our idea; it was your idea. Why did we do that? Why did we let him think it was his idea?"

My mother turned to me, with her eyes darting, and said, "My dear, you learn to manage your life in your way and I will manage my life in my way. I have lived with your father happily for a long time and I intend to continue to live with him happily. Who cares who thought of it. We're going to go to Yellowstone Park." She was right. Who really cared who got the credit for it? We were all doing what we wanted to do.

My mother was continually willing to give away her ideas and give of herself. She was typical of many mothers. She ate the wings of the turkey while everybody ate the rest. But she never felt that she was a martyr when she was doing things for others; she just did them. My mother introduced me to the concept of service and the idea that I was not the most important person.

One time I had a conversation with my mother about her concept of service and she said to me, "The most important thing is for you to serve whatever God it is that you believe. It makes no difference what the concept is, but you should serve that particular concept. You must also serve your job, your family, or
Whatever is most important to you. After that, you worry about yourself. Always put yourself third." That was good advice and I have tried to follow it.

ALLYS SWANSON: You mentioned that your mother worked full-time at a paying job. This was at a time when women didn't have many household conveniences, yet your family always seemed to have fun on the weekends. What made this possible? In other words, how did all the laundry, the cooking, and the grocery shopping get done? That appears to be the conflict that the working woman faces today.

DR. ULRICH: My mother was an extraordinarily well-organized person. For example, she made out the grocery lists, and my brother and I took our little red wagon to the store and did the grocery shopping. In those days you didn't wander up and down aisles. You just went to the grocer and told him what you wanted, and he ran and got it for you. It was our job to go to the grocer's shop. We had the usual jobs that children have, like taking out the garbage and all that. In those days we had ice boxes instead of refrigerators. It was my job to contact the ice man to make sure that the ice was there. Each member of the family had a really specific household job. My mother did the washing and the ironing, but it was our job to get everything down to the cellar. If we didn't do it then we had no clean clothes and that was that. We had to help fold clothes, hang up clothes, and take them off the lines. We did those things as a part of our normal day.

Once again, I never felt put upon because everybody else was also working. That always left us the evenings, which were obviously heavily dominated by our homework during the school months. We had to have our homework done before we were allowed to do anything. We had one radio and my father pretty much decided what we listened to. Bob and I used to sneak in Jack Armstrong, Little Orphan Annie and a couple of those children's programs before dinner as we
were setting the table. As a family we used to sit and listen to Fibber McGee and Molly and other programs.

In whatever free time we had, Bob and I made up games. We were marvelous about that. I had a very active imagination, and he was very good about participating. My cousin Eddie, though not quite as enamored with the games as Bob and I were, did join us in play. We lived in the suburbs and we dug ponds and ditches, played cowboys and Indians and dragons. We had a wondrous childhood because it was all imaginative. We knew that we had only so many play hours, so we packed them full.

In my neighborhood there were only boys, and I was accepted as a part of the gang. I was the one that thought of all the things to do. We were always getting ourselves dolled up and playing roles. Our families were very supportive of our play activities and used to open their homes to us. We used to write and put on what we thought were marvelous plays. We only had "vacation" two weeks of the year which coincided with my mother and father's time off. During the summer months, of course, Bob and I had more time to play just for fun.

ALLYS SWANSON: Do you recall any leadership opportunities during your school years?

DR. ULRICH: I went to a rather small elementary school where everyone knew everyone else. In those days we had to recite in class when we were called upon. We had to stand up beside our desks and answer in a complete sentence. If a teacher asked, "Where is Maryland?", someone had to stand up and say, "The state of Maryland is on the east coast." Anything less than that was unacceptable. As a result, I learned to stand up and talk. I also learned to be criticized.

We used to have what were called "oral compositions." The teacher would give us a topic and then call upon someone. That student had to stand in front of
the class and speak on the given topic. It was almost all extemporaneous. As a result of those assignments, I learned to stand on my feet, to have ideas, and to express them. I didn't mind criticism; I was used to it. That was a good experience.

As I said I was a "good kid" in school, so I really didn't get myself into very much trouble. In those days they allowed students of above average intelligence to skip grades. One of our family jokes was about how I skipped second grade. The school faculty decided that I was going to skip the second grade, although they never talked to my parents about this. Skipping a grade didn't particularly impress me.

The principal told me, "Go home and tell your parents that you skipped." So I went home and said, "Guess what Mom, I skipped home today." She said, "Isn't that nice." I went to my dad and said, "Dad, the principal told me to tell you that I skipped." He said, "Oh honey, that's swell." They didn't realize that I was now in the third grade.

A year later my mother asked, "Aren't you being promoted to the third grade?" I said, "No, the fourth." She called the school to find out about it and they said that they had skipped me. Nobody in the family, including me, knew what had happened. I was ahead of myself and didn't even realize it.

The other thing I remember about elementary school is what was called seat work. If we did what the teacher expected in terms of arithmetic, spelling, and other subjects, and this was a wonderful rule, then we were allowed to go to the window sill and pick up a packet of more assignments. This was called seat work. Anyone who finished a certain amount of seat work got a gold star. I thought that was the living end. I used to work very hard to finish what was needed so that I could pick up my packet of seat work. Most of the seat work was like crossword puzzles and games that improved vocabulary and arithmetic. I spent a lot of my
youth in school excelling, partially because of the gold stars and partially because it was so much fun.

In those days there was differentiation in elementary school ability testing. For example, they might have designated groups A, B, C and D. The teacher had to spend a lot of time with the slower students. As a result, the more advanced students were able to do all kinds of enrichment work. That turned out to be very positive.

Another thing that elementary school did, which probably would be frowned upon today, was to take great pride in the fact that students memorized literature. We were assigned poetry and we went home and memorized it. Each student stood before the teacher's desk and recited the memorized poetry. That challenged me. I thought that was kind of fun, so I always memorized everything twice and put great expression into it. One of my teachers said to me, "Celeste, you do things with such expression!" I thought that was quite a compliment so I emoted all over the place.

My parents reinforced this. They would say, "Well, you have just learned 'Annabelle Lee.' Why don't you recite it before dinner." Often I was reciting "Annabelle Lee" and other poems. I was kind of a ham. On the other hand, even to this day phrases pop out that I had memorized when I was seven years old. I don't even have to think about trying to reach back for some quotation; it's right there. That continued through my junior high school years. There was a great deal of emphasis on memorization for reasons I really don't know. A lot of people didn't like it, but I thought it was fun. I have been continually pleased that I was forced to memorize. Those are the things that I remember about elementary school.
ALLYS SWANSON: What are some of the words that pop out of your memorization skills after which you have modeled your life?

DR. ULRICH: I’m not sure there are any specific words. I remember phraseology more than anything else. Somebody will make a comment about something and all of a sudden, without even thinking, I remember a quotation from Shakespeare or Browning. At one time I could recite all of Coleridge’s "Ancient Mariner." Every once in a while somebody will say something and without thinking I’ll say, "'Out, out damned spot.'" It seems natural to me to do that and then all of a sudden I’ll see that person looking at me as if to say, "What in heaven’s name are you talking about?" Then I realize that not everyone has read MacBeth, nor were they forced to memorize anything about Lady MacBeth as I was. It’s all right there.

Those are the kinds of things that I remember. They aren’t just words. The whole connotation of the richness of our language and our society seems to me to be in the forefront of my thinking. I have to search for some other things, but not for that. I think it was because of my early education.

ALLYS SWANSON: What kinds of physical education experiences did you have in school?

DR. ULRICH: In elementary school we didn’t have any of what I would call physical education. We had a very nice physical education teacher who came once a week to help us play games. She came on Wednesdays and Fridays, and everybody in the class would cheer and clap because she was there. We made up most of our games. She listened and asked what kinds of games we were playing. We would tell her and then she would come the next time with some modification of that idea. I also learned a certain amount of games skills at that age just by being a part of the gang. I learned how
to hit and catch balls. Because I played with the boys, I had all kinds of opportunities. My dad was good about playing catch with me. I even had my own baseball glove.

The first real physical education I had was in junior high school. I was absolutely mesmerized by that opportunity. There was girls physical education and boys physical education. In the seventh grade we were sent to the gym. We had never had a gym before.

We were taught by two very personable ladies, Louise Burnett and Iria Ryssy, who were barely out of college. One of them had gone to Sargent College and the other to Bouve'. I believe they were both from Baltimore. Miss Ryssy may not have been, but I know Louise Burnett was. They were relatively young and sure they were going to do great things for us, which they did.

It doesn't seem possible now, but the women all wore tunics and long black stockings. One day Miss Ryssy and Miss Burnett came to class in socks. I was in seventh or eighth grade, and I couldn't believe that that could happen. I had been running around in shorts and socks because that was an acceptable habit for little girls. Here were my "grown-up teachers" without their long black stockings. They didn't say anything about it. They didn't say, "We've decided to abandon this." They just did it.

In junior high school, a very influential thing happened to me as far as physical education was concerned. One day Iria Ryssy was the only teacher in the gym. I don't know where Miss Burnett had gone. The principal's secretary came running into the gym during our gym class. Something very traumatic must have happened. I saw Miss Ryssy get very agitated and she said, "But I have a class." The secretary said, "But we need you." So Miss Ryssy turned around, took off her whistle, and said to the class, "I have to be gone and while I'm gone we're going to
let Celeste be in charge. She put the whistle around my neck and I felt as if I were being knighted!

She wasn't gone very long, but I had this whistle and I remember thinking, "Should I blow it?" They used whistles all the time in those days. The class was standing there wondering, "What should we do next?" I took the whistle, put it in my mouth, and blew it. Everybody stood at attention. I said, "Now we will line up," and they did it! I loved it. It was like being empowered all of a sudden with this whistle. Up until then I had never realized what it was like to really be in charge. At home I was just one of the gang and nobody really cared very much. But I thought, "Put that whistle around your neck and you can be boss." I liked that concept. I was flattered that she had asked me. By playing on teams we could earn a junior high school letter, and I did that. But, as I recall, that whistle incident was more important. It wasn't really until much later that I realized that I liked the power associated with it.

When I was in the ninth grade, Louise Burnett had a picnic for all the girls. We went over to her home and I met her father and mother. Her father, a very interesting man, asked a lot of questions of all these girls. Twenty years later I found out that this was Louis Burnett, one of our leaders who helped found the Academy and who provided leadership in our early days. He was a physical educator and I didn't know it. So I met Louis Burnett accidentally.

Louise Burnett married and moved out to Washington and wrote to us in general for a long time. I kept up with her until I finished college. I am still in contact with Iria Ryssy. She now lives in Boston. She married and her family has grown. When I was in Boston, she came to hear me speak and said to me, "I knew all along you would stay in physical education." I still get Christmas cards and letters from her. Lucy Hyde has died and I never did know what happened to Miss Journey.
ALLYS SWANSON: What do you recall concerning your high school years?

DR. ULRICH: There were two women teachers and two men teachers. The girls’ and boys’ classes were separate. My high school teachers were not as dynamic as my junior high school teachers. They were much more staid and solid people. I went out for the teams in high school and made all of them. I was a leader in high school in the student government associations and in other endeavors. In a sense, I was an asset to the teams because I was a good student and a school leader, and I was a reasonably good athlete as well.

One teacher, Miss Lucy Journey, was very quiet and, from my point of view, ineffective. She was a good soul but she did not provide the dynamic atmosphere that had been provided in junior high. I never knew her very well and it didn’t worry me that I didn’t. Miss Edith Hyde, who was more influential as far as I was concerned, was personally bitter about the lot that life had given her. She never took her discontent out on the kids, although we realized it existed. She was a fair teacher and a very good coach. I really respected Miss Hyde.

Baltimore had a very interesting high school system. There were two boys’ schools and two girls’ schools. The two boys’ schools were extraordinarily good. In fact, most of the young boys that graduated from “City” or “Poly” were probably moved into the sophomore year in college. They were good enough to skip their freshman year. The two girls’ high schools were also very good. I went to a coeducational school in Baltimore which didn’t have the same history as the sex segregated schools. However, we took great pride in the fact that we went to a coeducational school and were as good as the sex segregated schools. That meant building good athletic teams so that we could beat them.

The head of physical education and the main coach of Forest Park High School was a man by the name of Ernest Marx. To this day I think he was among
the best looking men I have ever seen. He looked like a movie star. The boys called him Professor Marx, or Fess. There were probably seven or eight people with Ph.D.'s in every school in the Baltimore system. Although Mr. Marx did not have a Ph.D., he was a respected teacher so it seemed as though you should call him professor. Fess Marx had sort of a god-like image. He was responsible for the boys and I don't think he thought about the girls very much. Yet he used to bring the boys over to the girls gymnasium and let us practice against the boys in volleyball. The boys could spike much harder, but we could give them a good game. When he brought them over, he helped coach the girls, which in those days was just marvelous. Imagine Fess Marx paying any attention to the girls whatsoever. I was reasonably good in volleyball so Fess came up to me and said, "I think if you change this pattern a little bit . . . ." I thought, "My goodness, I'll probably be an Olympic champion."

Fess Marx was a model Springfield graduate, as so many of the men of that era were. He always insisted that his boys be dressed properly and he didn't allow any kind of profane language. I thought that's the way coaches are; that's the way good physical education teachers are. Fess Marx has since died. I really did not have a close association with him; he was more of an idol than anything else.

There was one other thing that I think was interesting about my background as far as physical education was concerned. Both my father and my mother venerated education, so there would have been no point in coming home and saying, "The teacher is mean." The first question would have been, "What did you do?" There was never any assumption that the teacher could be wrong.

My father's veneration for education made him somehow want to be a part of it. Johns Hopkins University was in Baltimore, and my father used to take us down to every graduation to watch the academic processions and to see all the professors going by in their flowing robes. It was like a parade. Although he
I didn’t know a whole lot about it, he had read books so that he could tell us that this person went to so and so, this gown was from such and such. At one of the Johns Hopkins graduations, a man who was obviously the speaker entered with the president of Johns Hopkins. The speaker was a very tall man with white flowing hair. His robe was absolutely crimson. In those days everybody’s robes were black. I kept asking my dad, “Who’s that, who’s that?” My dad couldn’t figure out who he was and that was the end of that.

When I was a graduate student in physical education, I was doing some reading in the history of our profession. I came upon a statement that said, "Here was R. Tait McKenzie sitting amid the students, looking like a cardinal in the flowing robes of Edinburgh." I thought, could I have seen R. Tait McKenzie at the Hopkins graduation? The next time I was in Baltimore I went down to Hopkins’ library and got out the graduation material. He had been the speaker at that ceremony I remember. He was a distinguished professor at the University of Pennsylvania at that time. Incidentally, I have never heard anybody say anything but wonderful statements about R. Tait McKenzie.

ALLYS SWANSON: Do you recall when you first formulated your career in physical education?

DR. ULRICH: I think it was in junior high school at the time of the whistle incident. I talked with the physical education teachers about requirements for becoming a physical education teacher. They told me about college and other experiences. I thought I could do a lot in this area. First of all, everybody likes it. It’s something that helps people to feel good about themselves. I also remember going home and saying, “I’d like to be a physical education teacher,” and my father and mother both saying, "Oh, really?" Then they said that I would have to find out more about the field. Dad wanted to
know if I was going to be a playground instructor. I said, "I think they do more than that, Dad." He said to go find out about it.

When I got into high school I asked the guidance counselors about the field. I was sure that the only two places to go to college were Sargent College or Bouve'. When I found out that the tuition was astronomical at those schools, I thought that maybe I couldn’t be a physical education teacher. But the guidance counselor said to me, "Now wait a minute, I think there are some other very good institutions."

She researched the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and was very impressed with its program. I went home and said to my family, "I think I have found the place where I can afford to go." My father said, "Do people get jobs when they graduate from there?" Don’t forget these were the post-Depression years. So I wrote to North Carolina to find out what the job placement was and found out that it was high. They placed almost all of their students. That seemed to allay most of my father’s fears.

I had more flack about going into physical education from my teachers than from my family. They kept saying, "You don’t have to go into physical education; you’re bright." "If you want to teach, why don’t you want to teach the sciences or languages?" "Why do you want to go into physical education?" Even my physical education teachers never tried to push me. Miss Hyde sent me to a modern dance group that I thought was a joke. Then I realized that modern dance isn’t ballet and it isn’t flitting around on the stage in a tutu. It’s a whole different pattern. They kept opening up more and more opportunities for me. By my sophomore year in high school I knew what I wanted to do.

A lot of people suggested that women physical educators were sexually strange. One time I said something positive about Babe Didrikson and my father said, "Don’t use her as your idol." I didn’t know what she had done. She had been
an Olympic athlete as far as I was concerned. I asked Dad what was wrong with her and he told me, "Well, I saw her play golf once and she licked her hands before the shot. It was so coarse. That is not what you would want to do." Of course, that wasn't what he was afraid of. He was afraid of the homosexuality accusation. He never could tell me about that, and I probably wouldn't have understood it anyway.

My physical education teachers were quite normal as far as I was concerned. They were attractive women who I thought did marvelous things for kids. They were dedicated people. They seemed to be very good role models. Once I found that I could afford to go to school and that there was a good possibility I would be accepted, I didn't care what the rest of the people thought I should do. I was quite comfortable with my decision. I moved on and never regretted my choice.

ALLYS SWANSON: We'd like to know more about the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. What did they offer in the program and the curriculum? What are some experiences you recall?

DR. ULRICH: I took the train from Baltimore to Greensboro because it was the only way to travel. At that time you stayed at college until Christmas. My family bid me a fond farewell, and, as he did until practically the week that he died, my father came up to me as I left and said, "Honey, do you have enough money?" and he slipped me a five dollar bill. It was an eight hour ride down to Greensboro and I remember being scared. This wasn't the first time that I'd been away from home because I'd been at camp, but I was now grown up and on my way to college. I was at a significant junction in my life.

Besides the fact that Greensboro had been highly recommended, I had looked for an institution that had a broad general curriculum. I was a good student and I enjoyed literature, history, science and mathematics. I wanted the opportunity to have a general education. Greensboro had a wonderful
curriculum that allowed freshmen to major in physical education, but students had to meet all of the general education requirements. Those courses looked marvelous to me. Greensboro offered courses in psychology, sociology, Shakespeare and Chaucer. I really looked forward to my college career.

When I got to Greensboro, there were approximately 2500 students. It was for women only. They had a wonderful history as far as teaching and leadership were concerned. In those days, our roommates were selected for us so I was tossed in with a young woman from North Carolina. We got along very well and liked each other. We were on our own and grown up. Much as I had done throughout childhood, we made our own lives at the university. We would have art exhibits, poetry readings, and book discussions in the residence halls. All of these were outside of class and none of us considered this an imposition. This was just the way of life that we accepted.

I had to work to supplement my income. I worked in the dining room, and then I decided that I could earn a little bit of money by working in the library. I was asked to be a reader to a blind girl majoring in art, which turned out to be a marvelous experience. I read art appreciation books to Ruth so that she could do her work. In the process I was learning art, which I probably wouldn't have chosen. I read books in music appreciation plus all of the texts as far as the liberal arts were concerned.

When I planned my program with the physical education personnel, I was very fortunate that my advisor was a very young teacher by the name of Ellen Griffin. She said to me, "Look, one of the things that you will have to do is take more English and history." I liked that idea. In those days at Greensboro, you took all the courses in physical education without credit. So I had an eighteen hour program in liberal arts. Plus I had another ten hours a week in physical education. Weren't we lucky that we were able to do all this?
The physical education staff was just magnificent. Besides Ellen Griffin, women by the names of Ethel Martus, Marge Leonard, and Dorothy Davis were there. They were very sensitive, supporting people who represented erudition. Towering over them was Mary Channing Coleman, the head of the department, who wasn’t going to brook any nonsense. Miss Coleman was a force to be reckoned with. She was a Virginian originally and a graduate of the Boston Normal School of Gymnastics. She had been Mabel Lee’s roommate, although I didn’t know that at the time. She had high standards and brooked no nonsense at all. If she thought that you weren’t good enough, you were gone. You didn’t have anything to say about it. If Miss Coleman called you in, that was it. As freshmen we didn’t have very much contact with Miss Coleman, other than the fact that she greeted us in a rather austere way and said, "My dears, you are now at the Women’s College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. I expect you to act accordingly. These are the things that we do, these are the things that we don’t do. Goodbye." And that was that. It never occurred to me that anyone would dare to challenge that type of authority.

One of my favorite stories about Miss Coleman concerns her expectations of us. As juniors, students were given their first chance to study with Miss Coleman. She had a class in the morning at eight o’clock. Under no circumstances were we ever late to class, because as she said, "The door is closed." Once we had a swimming practice before class. Almost three-fourths of the class came one minute late. She shut the doors. We couldn’t move. We all stood there with one of us leaning against the door trying to hear what she was saying. Nobody thought about going home. We all stood there waiting. Finally somebody said, "Celeste, she has to understand this. Knock on the door." So I banged on the door and Miss Coleman came to the door. I said, "Miss Coleman, you probably don’t know . . . ." She said, "This door is closed." Smash. We didn’t
move that entire time. Under no circumstances would I have been late again, no matter what was happening.

She was that kind of disciplinarian. Yet underneath it all, she was very soft and took great pride in "her girls." She certainly was very good to me. She made sure that I met Mabel Lee. She sat down and told me all the stories of her own student days. When the time came for me to graduate, she called me in her office and I remember thinking, "Oh my gosh, I've gone through four years and now I'm going be told I can't graduate." My grades were good and I had a sound scholastic record but I thought, "Oh, what have I done?" She said to me, "I want you to pick out a book from my library that will be yours." Then I faced the awesome task of deciding which book it should be! I finally decided on one that Jesse Williams had inscribed to her. She said, "Good choice."

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: What were some of the things that she said students don't do?

DR. ULRICH: Well, we did not walk across campus in our gym suits, which in those days were tunics. Students always dressed appropriately. We worked very hard as far as our academic subjects were concerned, because the reputation of the department depended upon our success. We were as close to being model students as we could possibly be. We were well-respected. She never expected us to be sloppy at anything we did. We had a very difficult schedule ahead of us and she didn't want to hear any complaining. She expected us to be on time and if we weren't on time, that suggested to her that we were slovenly, and, consequently, it was up to us to "shape up or ship out." That was that. Although I don't think she said this, she communicated to us, "Look at the person next to you. She isn't going to graduate with you." And the person next to me was looking at me. I knew from the very beginning that this was going to be
tough. It was a challenge, and that was right in my general ilk of ways to proceed. I thought, "Hot dog, this is going to be more fun than I imagined."

I also had some wonderful teachers at Greensboro in the liberal arts. They were all females except for my Shakespeare teacher. A remarkable woman, Katherine Taylor, taught French. She was the absolute model of an intellectually well-balanced individual. She knew everything, but she didn't parade her knowledge in front of people. It was natural; she knew everything and her standards were high.

Like many women at that time, Katherine Taylor was a counselor in a dormitory and assigned to the one where I lived during my sophomore, junior and senior years. The woman never let students go. For example, she would go by and say, "Oh Celeste, I came across a really interesting book the other day that I thought you might be interested in. It's in my office. Why don't you stop by and pick it up. When you finish reading it at your pleasure, maybe we can talk about it. I would be very interested in some of your ideas." I was flattered to have her think that I might be interested in a book that she had read. I thought, "Katherine Taylor interested in my ideas?" I would practically run to her office to pick up the book. I would get the book and stay up all night to read it so that I could go talk to her about this book. She was always there to talk to me about the book. She would ask some thought provoking questions, and before I left she would always say to me, "Well that reminds me, what we've been talking about is sort of . . . . Have you read such and so?" "No, I haven't read that." "Well, I think that in view of your interest about this, that you should . . . ." That woman piled books on me.

I think it's no exaggeration to say that each year I read an extra 25 books just to talk with Katherine Taylor. She was giving me pats on the head about my reading, but really saying to me, in a nice way, "You stupid idiot, haven't you read this?" I was killing myself to make sure that somehow or another I could keep up
with what I considered to be her base expectations. I didn’t, by any means, even meet what she expected at that level. She was marvelous with regard to motivation. Once again, as I got older I realized what she was doing.

Margaret Endicott was my chemistry teacher. She was a Mount Holyoke graduate, a marvelous chemist, and the most disciplined woman that I had ever met. As a matter of fact, she said to our class one time, "People’s minds are like desk tops. Look at your desk top. What is it like? If your desk top is a mess, your mind is a mess. You have to set up your desk in such a way that it has organization to it. If you don’t do that, you’ll never be able to think well."

I raised my hand and asked, "Miss Endicott, do you have to use just the top of the desk? Can’t you put some of the stuff in drawers?"

She said, "Yes."

I thought to myself, "I could have messy drawers and she’ll never know it. I’ll keep the desk top straight."

Chemistry 101 was a lecture class; we didn’t entertain too much interaction at that time. Miss Endicott would lecture from notes. When the bell rang she would be saying something like, "And oxygen is the most . . ." and she would stop. That was the end. The next time that we met she would start with, "... important element that we have." We had to write down the last words that Margaret Endicott said because that was where she would pick up. I kept up with this woman for a long, long time after college. She wrote to me continually. She later married and moved to Portland. I think she always thought that maybe I’d be a chemist. She was very supportive of me.

I’ve always said to my own students, "If you go to college and you find one or two people who are inspiring, that’s all you can ask." I would say that at Greensboro I was inspired by 20. They were an absolutely marvelous lot of people who cared desperately about teaching and women’s education.
I had opportunities at Greensboro that I never would have had at a coeducational institution. I was editor of the newspaper. I could have, I think, been the president of the student government if I had moved in that direction. Things that women wouldn’t have had a chance to do in that era were just accepted at Greensboro.

ALLYS SWANSON: Can you tell us more about the Coleman-Lee connection?

DR. ULRICH: Yes. Miss Coleman was from Tidewater, Virginia, and had gone to a teacher training school. I think her areas were English and history. She had decided that there was more to life than that. She decided that she wanted a college education and had become enamored with some of the things that were happening as far as health and medicine were concerned. She was told, at that time of her life that there was no way she could become a medical doctor and that physical education was probably a waste of time.

She decided that she would go to the Boston Normal School of Gymnastics. It was very unusual because at that time Mary Hemenway had endowed the gymnasium and Amy Morris Homans was looking for graduate students. She found a bonanza. She found Mabel Lee from Coe College, a little school in Iowa. Miss Lee had a B.A. with an English major and had made her father promise that if she finished in English, then she could become a physical education person in Boston. Miss Homans also found Mary Coleman who had a degree from a teachers college, had taught two years and was going to the Boston School of Gymnastics. Amy Morris Homans accepted both of them. She thought they would be good for each other.

I got to know Miss Lee quite well. The stories of both of them are just marvelous. When Miss Lee came she was a college graduate and wanted a room
to herself. She was also a bit sickly and her father didn’t think it would be good for her to live with anybody else. Miss Coleman, who figured that she knew everything because she had graduated and had been out for a while, also wanted a room to herself. Miss Homans said, "You two girls are going to live together." They were both furious.

The first thing that began to cement their friendship was that Miss Coleman, an ardent Virginian, placed on her bureau a picture of Robert E. Lee, one of the foremost Virginians. All of a sudden she looked at Mabel Lee and asked, "What did you say your name was?" Miss Lee said, "My name is Mabel Lee." Miss Coleman replied, "Lee. Hmmm. You can’t be all bad." Both of them said that this was the beginning of their appreciation for one another.

Miss Lee was almost thrown out of the Boston Normal School of Gymnastics because she was underweight. Miss Coleman used to bring her banjo and would feed Miss Lee malted milk shakes. Miss Coleman would sit there strumming her banjo as Miss Lee rested, so that Miss Lee would gain her ten pounds and be able to stay at the Boston Normal School of Gymnastics.

Both women really appreciated each other, I thought. In many ways, they were the same person. Miss Lee had more of a velvet glove over her iron hand. Miss Coleman didn’t put on the velvet gloves, and her hand was certainly iron. In those days before affirmative action, they used to trade people. They used to say, "Here’s somebody that I want you to take." We always had a Nebraska woman on our staff at Greensboro and somebody from Greensboro was always at Nebraska. Miss Lee would come once every other year or so to talk at Greensboro. Miss Coleman, of course, talked all year with us. Miss Lee was the first president of the Alliance and Miss Coleman was the second woman president of the Alliance. They had great respect for each other. I was able to synchronize their stories and found they were much the same. I think that their early days at Boston were
glorious days, as you know from reading Miss Lee's books. Miss Lee asked me to edit one of those books. I felt that I had a chance not only to see it from her side, but from Miss Coleman's side as well.

Miss Coleman died very unexpectedly from a heart attack when she was just 65 years old. She was still teaching at that time. She was on her way back to the gymnasium from a visit with the chancellor. She was dead within an hour or so after the heart attack. I never got to know Miss Coleman as I got to be an adult, so most of my feelings for and understanding of Miss Coleman are seen through student eyes. On the other hand, I did get to know Miss Lee. I've never considered myself a colleague of Mabel Lee, but a person that she trusted and a person with whom she shared many, many stories.

You asked earlier, "What were you not to do?" One of the things that we were never to do was to call a woman by her last name. You did not say, "Hey, Smith. Hey, Jones." Miss Coleman really pressed that rule. I had a colleague named Dorothy Perry, who we called Perry. I remember going down the hall and somebody yelling, "Hey, Perry, wait for me!" Miss Coleman's door opened up and she snatched this girl into her office. We all stood there trembling. Later on, Ann Richardson, who had yelled, "Hey Perry," came out an absolutely chastened woman. We said, "What did she do to you?" We were sure she would be expelled for that. She said, "She's going to let me stay, but Dorothy, I'll never call you 'Perry' again." Having grown up with that rule, I nearly fainted when Miss Lee said to me, "I was talking to Coley . . . ." I asked her, "Did you call Miss Coleman 'Coley'?" She said, "Oh yes, she called me Lee and I called her Coley." I thought, with love, "You hypocrite." The relationship between those two women was a strong one. They were very supportive of one another. I always felt very warm toward Miss Lee even before I got a chance to know her.
DR. VAN GTEGHEN: Mabel Lee told us at approximately age 98 that Amy Morris Homans did not consider her to be "quite" a lady, coming from the Midwest. Did Mary Channing Coleman ever share that?

DR. ULRICH: Right now I would have to say that the stories are so mixed up between Miss Lee and Miss Coleman that I don't know who told me what. But yes, I think that that was very true. Miss Coleman was not an aristocrat, but she came from a good Virginia family and she had the bearing and the mien of a Virginia aristocrat. I'm sure that Miss Homans would have thought that that was all right. I think that one of the reasons she put those two women together was so that something of the Virginia aristocracy would rub off on Mabel Lee and make her less of the Iowa renegade that she was supposed to be. I don't think there's any question about that. In many ways Miss Lee turned out to be more aristocratic than Miss Coleman.

ALLYS SWANSON: Celeste, I'd like for you to elaborate on the role models and the leadership opportunities provided by a women's college.

DR. ULRICH: As I've already mentioned, I had certain leadership opportunities that I probably would not have had if I had gone to a coeducational undergraduate college, particularly in terms of student government and publications. I also had a tremendous number of role models. For example, the dean of students at the University of North Carolina at that time was Harriet Elliot. She was appointed to what was known as President Roosevelt's Kitchen Cabinet. He had the regular cabinet and then what was called the Kitchen Cabinet. Her job was to advise the president of the United States with regard to higher education and women. She was my political science teacher. One day I went into her office to get an assignment with regard to my class, and there sat this absolutely handsome man. Miss Elliot said, "Celeste, I'd like you to meet a
friend of mine. This is Edward Statinius." This was two weeks before Edward Statinius was appointed Secretary of State. I knew how important she was to have such a visitor. I knew that women could be important. Once I was working on the switchboard for additional money and the President of the United States called Harriet Elliot. I heard Franklin Roosevelt's voice. He didn’t talk to me, but I heard him say, "Hello, Harriet." I thought, "Holy Mackerel!" Isn’t this marvelous to be able to do that sort of thing.

From my point of view, the best thing I could have done was go to a women's college. It gave me additional confidence. I might have made it at a coeducational school, but it would have been a different kind of struggle. We were not worried at that time about popularity. First of all, it was during the War and most of the men were not around. No one payed attention to whether or not Johnny would still like her. At the same time, I never felt that we were inhibited. There were lots of social opportunities. We never grew up hating men or feeling that men were holding us down. In those times, we knew that being female meant that there were certain limitations to our opportunities. However, being female inhibited me more in the fact that my mother and dad wouldn’t let me sleep in the backyard in my sleeping bag than in anything that happened to me educationally.

There were continual role models who were the epitome of good people. They were making important decisions. They were erudite, fascinating individuals who traveled and who believed that women could do anything that they wanted to do. All of that came to bear on my consciousness without anybody making a point of it. I can’t really remember whether we used the term feminism or not, but it would never have occurred to me that I was a feminist. I would have said that I was a "strong woman." I don’t think that I had any great social conscience to come home from college and make life better for women. I always felt that women should have the opportunity to be a part of the athletic picture. I used to
chafe every once in a while when they wouldn't let girls do certain things because we were "weak." But for the most part, I just don't think that I felt like a feminist.

Another teacher at Greensboro, Lydia Gordon Shivers, was the first woman to graduate from the law school at "Ole" Miss. Dr. Shivers was my sociology teacher. She was a wonderful person. She would come in and say, "Now I'm going to present a case to the class. I am going to defend the plaintiff. You are going to be the lawyers on the other side, not the jury. You're going to have to show me why my arguments aren't sound." She came in with bizarre cases about blacks, whites, and women who weren't allowed to do certain things. She was protecting criminals and we were the lawyers on the other side. It was exciting and marvelous.

One day she said that we should be the jury. She presented a case involving a woman who had stolen food to feed her family. Dr. Shivers was protecting the defendant. She presented this case with such pathos that it was just impossible to believe that this woman could be guilty. As the jury, we found in favor of the woman. Dr. Shivers turned on us and said, "You have defied the law of this land. How dare you do that? You have been persuaded by my influence and my sad stories. I have taken you for a ride and you have agreed to it. How can you say you believe in the jury system and being tried by your peers when you don't even care about the law?" Then, of course, we started to see things in a slightly different way. She had convinced us wrongly. She was after us continually; she wanted us to think.

I can't say that these things wouldn't have happened at a coeducational college but they happened with intensity at Women's College. All those people were unfettered by research expectations. Some of them wrote books, mostly textbooks. However, they did not have research expectations, and they spent all of their energy and time being superb teachers. They weren't all superb; I had a
few poor ones, too. But for the most part, they were a sure cut above what I saw later on.

ALLYS SWANSON: You mentioned earlier that you took all of the physical education classes for no credit. Was that reflected in the status of the physical education department?

DR. ULRICH: I never felt second rate as far as the physical education department at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro was concerned. In my opinion, the department was well-respected throughout the University. Miss Coleman was certainly well-respected. From high school on, I was aware of a hierarchy of values that suggested that liberal arts was better than any of the professional schools. In those days, business majors were lowest on the totem pole at the University of North Carolina Women's College. Physical education students had to be academically sound so we were always at least average and usually above average in all of our academic work. Therefore, we never got the name of "dumb jocks." In addition to that, there were no jocks. There wasn't an athletic program. We played games and had intramural opportunities. Our teachers and colleagues had a great deal of respect for physical education.

There is another story about Miss Coleman told to me by several people so I believe it to be true. Apparently a professor in the English department, when registering a student, called up one day and said to Miss Coleman, "I would like to get this student excused from physical education."

Miss Coleman said, "Upon what grounds?"

He said, "She has a horse that is stabled near Greensboro and she rides continually. She will go out and we will have it confirmed that she has been at the stable. She will ride at least one hour every day. In addition to that, she is willing
to take some-instruction from the stable master with regard to jumping. I would think that that would substitute for a physical education class."

Miss Coleman didn't bat an eye and said, "That certainly sounds reasonable and Dr. Friedlander. While I have you on the phone, let me also tell you that I have a student in my office right now who has read extensively. She has promised me that every day she will do at least an hour's worth of reading. I will personally guarantee you that she will read at least ten books of any subject of your choosing. Can she be excused from English?"

And he said, "I understand your point Miss Coleman." And that was the end of that.

Miss Coleman had that kind of demeanor and was well respected for it. Apparently she was a good leader on campus. The physical education faculty were on important committees, and they were consulted about important things. My colleagues in other fields always felt very good about the fact that I was a physical education major. As a matter of fact they used to say, "I don't know why you do all that work!" That was partially because of the great emphasis on the liberal arts. You couldn't be an "A" student in chemistry and be a dope. Our people were always among the top scholars. They made the dean's list and graduated cum laude. The dumb jock stigma could not be applied to the people at Greensboro.

Despite the academic reputation of physical education students, there was still a hierarchy of values in what was considered the most intellectual subjects; physical education was certainly not at the top. Throughout my undergraduate career, my teachers in the subjects in which I did well said to me, "Have you ever thought about majoring in French?" "Have you ever thought about majoring in history?" "Have you ever thought about majoring in something else?" I would say, "Heavens no! Let me tell you about what I'm doing." By the time I was a
junior, I took such questions as a challenge. I thought, "Hot dog; now I’m going to be able to convince this person about physical education."

At that time, at least in my thinking, physical education hadn’t emerged yet as the art and science of human movement. It was more oriented toward fitness and sports skills. I sometimes think to myself, "How on earth did I defend that?" I honestly had begun to suspect that people did not become fit through physical education classes. Biology was teaching me that. Yet to a certain extent, I think we were very successful in convincing people that physical education was a serious major. My biology, chemistry and physics teachers all thought that physical education majors were their best students. And they were! I enjoyed literature and the people in physical education were always in the top of the class. I think that Miss Coleman’s standards said that either you did this or you didn’t make it.

That stood me in great stead after I left Greensboro. I didn’t realize at that time how high our standards were. Graduate school was a breeze. Like anybody else, I was worried about going to graduate school. But my biology and other subjects were far in advance of what they expected. That kind of background has been marvelous.

ALLYS SWANSON: Why did you decide to go on to graduate school upon graduation rather than teach?

DR. ULRICH: Miss Coleman called me into her office and said to me, "You’re a bright young woman and you should have a future. The only way in today’s world that you’re going to be able to move is through graduate work. I will arrange where you will go to school." I told her that I didn’t have enough money and she said, "I will find you a scholarship and we will do it." It never occurred to me to say no.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: She didn’t think that you needed some experience first?
DR. ULRICH: I had a lot of experience in camping. Every summer I counseled at eight-week camps. As I recall, a number of my term papers and assignments were on experiences which she equated to those of a first year teacher. I did a lot of counseling and teaching. I acted as a substitute teacher in the Greensboro public school system during certain types of emergencies. I think that in her thinking, it was important for me to get a master's degree. She probably also felt that she had better get me started on this right away, or I might deter and do something horrible like get married. That would ruin everything.

ALLYS SWANSON: Where did you do your camping?

DR. ULRICH: I was first a camper with the Girl Scouts at Camp Whippoorwill in Baltimore. Then during college I went to Camp Barge, a Girl Scout camp in Pennsylvania. It was a very primitive camp; in those days camping was real camping. I also did some work at the Joy Camps, which literally put the counselor and several of the girls out in the middle of the wilderness with a knapsack and a little bit of food. We did everything from there.

Then I worked one summer at a Salvation Army camp for indigent, needy waifs who had gotten into trouble in the Washington, D.C. area. It was not a very pleasant experience. I knew ten times more about camping than anybody else in the camp. I appreciated some of the good things that they did, but I didn’t realize that the Army really meant the Army. I was able to identify sexism by that time. I felt it was impossible to endorse that sort of behavior.

I did the majority of my administrative work at Camp Robin Hood, a camp in Bear Mountain, New York, run by the Brooklyn YWCA. I was the assistant director there for about five or six years.

For another summer I worked at Camp Walden, a girls camp in Maine. I did that to earn money because the "Y" didn’t pay much and I needed enough
money to do my doctoral work. It was a horrible experience. It wasn’t camp; it was a resort. I resented it and probably never should have gone. On top of that, the director was possessive and felt that she owned the camp. She wanted all of her people to do just what she said. Her philosophy was wrong; she was doing bad things for the girls, so I told her that her philosophy was awful.

The director and I came to real blows because one of their traditions was that one unspecified day, chosen by the director, was kids’ day. The kids could do anything they wanted to the counselors, such as throwing us in the lake. I thought, "I am not going to put up with this." So I went to the director and told her, "I will not be a part of this. I think it’s wrong. I think there are other ways that we can allow kids to be in charge and have power but this kind of physical violence is not right." The woman had enough sense to send me shopping in Portland on kids’ day. The final blow was when the parents would come and give us tips. It was the antithesis of everything I thought was right about camping. But I learned a lot in the process.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: We couldn’t accept tips at the camp where we counseled in New Hampshire.

DR. ULRICH: To this day I think it was awful. I was continually trying to bring the camping spirit to the group. The kids at Camp Walden came from very monied families. I had worked with kids who came from monied families before, but they had been campers. These kids just thought they were going to a resort.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Did World War II influence you personally or professionally in any way?

DR. ULRICH: I certainly think it influenced all of us personally. All the boys we knew were being sent to a real war where terrible things were happening. I remember wondering if I should start thinking
about my personal life instead of my professional life and make some decisions
about marriage. I decided then that it really was not a good time. Everything was
tenuous and my decision would not be based upon reason and logic, but upon
emotional factors over which I had very little control. At that time, the young
man with whom I was involved and I decided we weren’t going to go get married.

However, my roommate at college married her childhood boyfriend and
became pregnant. In those days pregnant women weren’t allowed to live in the
dormitories even if they were married. We hid her pregnancy for as long as we
could so that she could finish school. When her pregnancy became apparent she
was asked to leave.

Yes, the war influenced all of our lives personally. We had one telephone
on each floor in the dormitories. Therefore, when I got a personal call, they
would call over the loud speaker. "Celeste Ulrich, you have a call." If someone
got a personal call, she was petrified. My room was about two doors down from
the telephone booth. The cries of people who heard that their brothers,
husbands, boyfriends, or fathers had been killed still haunt me. I would hear the
sobbing. That happened about ten or fifteen times when I was at Greensboro. It
was devastating. Everyone lost people at that time. Of course it changed my life
but I had already made up my mind about certain things so the changes were not
devastating.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Were you inclined to want to join the Red Cross?

DR. ULRICH: Yes, as a matter of fact, I had a strong inclination to join
the WAVES. I felt it was my duty to humanity.

Katherine Taylor, the teacher that I told you about, had joined the WAVES. She
came and talked to me. She said, "I think it’s more important that you finish
college than anything else. I know it doesn’t sound very glamorous. And if the
War is still going on when you’re finished, you can still consider the WAVES. But
I think that right now your job is to finish school." That was the main reason why I didn’t pursue that idea any further.

There were all kinds of limitations that occurred in our lives because of the War. We certainly couldn’t travel very much. One time a friend from North Carolina invited me to her home for Thanksgiving. That was about as far away as I could possibly get. Dr. Shivers, the sociology professor that I mentioned, felt that it would be wonderful for her class to observe mentally disabled people in institutions. She wanted us to understand how lucky normality was. There wasn’t any way we could get to these institutions because of the travel restrictions. We finally ended up bicycling about 50 miles so that we could do what Dr. Shivers believed we should do. It turned out to be a very meaningful experience.

There were many impediments to what our lives might normally have been. We had certain social responsibilities that we would not otherwise have had. Many of the men being sent to Europe stopped at the Overseas Replacement Depot (ORD) near Greensboro. We had a dance every Saturday night to which the men from ORD would come. It was sort of our responsibility to go to the dance. We met hundreds of boys who were all on their way to be killed. They would show us pictures of their mothers, girlfriends or sisters. There wasn’t really time to get too romantically involved with them. Yet every one of them became more important to us than if we had never met them or danced with them because some of them would never come back. They would be at ORD for a month or so, and we would establish some sort of bond. Then we would hear that something had happened or that their whole regiment had gone. All of that haunted us continually.

In addition to that, the student communist front was organizing at that time. Students for Democratic Action came to me as a leader and said, "We need you." I sat down and thought about their ideals. I talked to several people, including
some of my professors, about whether or not I should exert my energy for this cause. They were doing some neat things. I finally decided I would not become a part of the SDA. That turned out to be the right decision. I would have been in terrible trouble had I decided to join them. Those were the kinds of things that were continually impinging upon us.

I remember the Cuban situation when Kennedy was president. I had traveled to give a talk and was coming through Atlanta. All of the top brass from Atlanta were being sent to Florida because the leaders thought they were going to invade Cuba. I looked at the Atlanta airport like a deja' vu and thought, "It's just like it used to be." All of a sudden here were all these men in the armed forces. For example, every time we had left Greensboro to try to go home for Christmas, there was an absolute jam because of the men trying to get home from ORD for Christmas, or their wives and sweethearts were trying to come to them.

ALLY'S SWANSON: What do you recall about Chapel Hill, your master's and your first job at James Madison University?

DR. ULRICH: I went to Chapel Hill because Miss Coleman thought that would be a good place for me to go and they gave me a scholarship. At that time, Oliver Cornwell was the head of the physical education department. Miss Coleman and Dr. Cornwell were very good professional friends and she had said to him, "Here is a young woman who needs your institution."

I went to Chapel Hill, which is an absolutely charming place. It was one of the few cities in the United States where the University was the city. It's tucked away in a lovely part of North Carolina, near enough to Raleigh and Durham so that there is access to the "big city." It was during the war, so, in many ways, Chapel Hill was not exactly like an institution should be. When the war ended, the boys started to come back, except they were no longer boys; they were now 26
and 27 year-old men. All of a sudden, instead of an institution with a collegiate atmosphere, we had an institution with a pretty grown up atmosphere. I was going to teach boys who were my age and older and who had seen a lot more of the world than I had. They saw the world in a much more sophisticated way than I did. They were very, very demanding. I was scared and I thought, "Oh boy, I'm not ever going to be able to handle this situation." However, it turned out to be a marvelous experience. They asked good questions and did all the right things.

It was physically very crowded at Chapel Hill. There were three women living in the graduate dormitory rooms where there was hardly room for one or two. One of my roommates was in mathematics and the other one was in sociology. I had an undergraduate major in sociology as well as physical education and biology. I got to meet the renowned professors in sociology at Chapel Hill. I had an extra entre because of my roommate, Charlotte, in addition to my own interest in that field.

As I mentioned earlier, the academic rigor of Chapel Hill, which I had fully expected to be demanding, was a snap. That wasn't a reflection of Chapel Hill; it was because I had such a strong academic background. I had never realized how rich my background was until I got there. People were talking about learning things that I had learned when I was a junior in college.

I must have appeared arrogant in sociology class when something had happened and I said, "Well, goodness, surely we know that."

The professor quite rightfully said, "Well, Miss Ulrich if you know so much about this, I will be glad to ask you some questions."

I said, "Go right ahead."

He did and I was able to answer the questions. That was undoubtedly a very awkward situation for him, and I probably didn't help it any. However, he
was teaching what I considered to be undergraduate work. Since my colleagues had not really known the material I guess that it wasn't undergraduate work.

I had to begin to temper my expectations. My master's degree was not as challenging as I thought it would be. I had a marvelous time at Chapel Hill, but I was never intellectually challenged. I had the chance to work with people whom I considered to be great sociologists: Howard Washington Odum, Rupert Vance, and Harold Meyers. It wasn't so much that they challenged me intellectually, but their style was quite different from what I had known.

Dr. Odum was an absolutely miserable lecturer and he used to do what he called "conditioning" students. When we came into Dr. Odum's room, we assumed a position in our chairs and we sat that way for the entire 60 minute session. If anyone moved once, he asked her to leave. He called it scrimmaging. He said that we had to listen to what was going on, rather than being concerned with our discomfort. It taught me discipline, but I thought it was dumb.

Another thing that he did was schedule three interviews with each one of his students. I always thought that was a good idea, although I never had the nerve to do it with my own students. He told us ahead of time that he would answer any question we had about sociology, but that he would not initiate the conversation. Each student had to be prepared.

When I walked into his office, I punched a timer's clock and had ten minutes with him. When I sat down he said, "Miss Ulrich, how do you do? I'm glad to be seeing you. What questions do you have?" The first time I went there I asked, "Do you think that the society is more influential than genetic background?" He said, "Yes." That's all; he had answered my question. I was through. I was going to have ten minutes of this marvelous person's time, but in a minute and a half, I had exhausted all of my questions. He had answered all of
them with—"Yes," or "No," or "Perhaps," or something like that. That taught me not to ask those kinds of dumb questions again.

The second time I said to him, "What do you think society's place should be in the education of an individual?" He couldn't say yes, and he couldn't say no. I got very sophisticated in being able to ask the right kinds of questions, which is what he wanted us to do. I can still hear that darn clock ticking.

By the third interview I had my questions really well established and I was fascinated by what he was saying. I kept thinking, "Stop, stop, stop." I wanted it to go on, but ten minutes was all I had with him.

I recall one other wonderful experience. The president of the University at Chapel Hill, Frank Porter Graham, was selected by the President of the United States to represent the United States at negotiations in Indo-China. Dr. Graham was small in physical stature but great in psychological stature. He was about 5'4", a real Southern gentleman and a delightful human being. The negotiator who preceded Dr. Graham was Cabot Lodge. He was about 6'4" or 6'5" and a very austere looking man. Ironically, all of the negotiations had broken down. Cabot Lodge, the esteemed politician from a wonderful family, had been a miserable failure at that particular venture. When Frank Graham went over, he pulled off the negotiation in two or three days.

One of the wonderful things that Chapel Hill sponsored in those days was Sunday afternoon student and faculty visits. Faculty were supposed to stay home and students could come and visit from four to six. If any faculty had to be away, they posted notices on their houses. Students visited, and left their cards and a quarter to pay for cookies and Coke. We sat in the front room and talked to the professor. It was a super opportunity.
I took the opportunity to visit the president, Dr. Graham, and ask him, "Dr. Graham, to what do you attribute your success in being able to carry out these negotiations when people of the ilk of Cabot Lodge were unable to do that?"

He said, "That's very easy. I have one attribute that Cabot Lodge doesn't have. I'm 5'4". Do you realize that every person in Asia had to look up to Cabot Lodge and they looked me straight in the eye. That differential in our statures made the difference." Up until that time, I had never thought of how physical stature influences politics. Frank Graham helped me see that.

As a result of that, I became very interested in Dr. Graham and visited his house more than I did others. We became friends. To get to my classes, I had to go through a wonderful place in Chapel Hill called the Arboretum, where the people in agriculture and geology grow things. Dr. Graham would come from his house through the Arboretum and I would come from the women's dormitory through the Arboretum and we would meet fairly often and say hello.

Once I was invited to a reception honoring Eleanor Roosevelt, of whom I was greatly enamored. By chance, Mrs. Roosevelt stopped every third or fourth person in the receiving line and talked to them. I happened to be one of those people. She asked me where I was from, what I majored in and other salient questions. I thought that was wonderful. As we finished the receiving line, I realized that I had shaken the hand of the First Lady and that she had chosen to ask me questions. She was a much more attractive woman personally than her photographs suggested and I was starry-eyed. As I turned around to take one last glance at this marvelous person, I walked backwards and bumped into someone. I turned around and it was Dr. Graham. I said to him, "Oh thank Goodness, it's only you."

Dr. Graham never forgot that. When he saw me after that he would say, "Hi there, Celeste. Don't worry, it's only me."
ALLYS SWANSON: How did you choose your first job?

DR. ULRICH: I'm not sure that I chose it. There were some opportunities available. I knew that I wanted to go into college teaching. At that time Greensboro told me there was a job at Madison College and that I should go interview. It seemed right. I had all the credentials so I went for an interview.

That was an interesting night of travel. I took a Greyhound bus from Chapel Hill to Harrisonburg and on the bus was Louis Horst, Martha Graham and their dance troupe. They had been dancing at Duke University and were on their way up to their next encounter, which was some place north of Madison College. I literally spent the night with the great music dance critic Louis Horst, who I sat next to, and Martha Graham, who sat in front of us and kept turning around saying, "Louis I want you to do this," and "Louis I want you to do that," and the dance troupe. That's my claim to fame.

At the time that I interviewed at Madison, the head of the department was Elizabeth Rodgers. She was and still remains an enigma to me. She was not a well-adjusted woman and no one knew very much about her. She was a small, compact woman who wore her hair in a very mannish style and wore tailored clothes. Miss Coleman had said not to do any of that. However, she was the head of the department and in charge of the job that I was considering.

When I arrived for the interview, Elizabeth Rodgers led me into her office. She had on her desk two pictures and said, "Who is that?" I told her that it was Jesse Williams. Then she said, "Who is that?" I said, "C.H. McCloy." She said, "Tell me the difference between these two men." Fortunately I knew a lot about them so I talked to her about the differences between the two men. Then she asked me a lot of questions which seemed unrelated to the job. She didn't ask me at all about my training or my strengths. She kept asking me about the profession.
Because of my background I knew all the answers. Miss Coleman had sent us to conventions when we were juniors at a time when students did not go to conventions. We went to the conventions and lined up and made sure we looked right. When we got there, she gathered us like chicks around her and she would say to Williams, "Jesse, I want you to meet my girls." She then would introduce every one of us to Jesse Williams. Then she would say to us, "Dr. Williams is speaking at such and such a time. You go hear him." Of course we all did that. As a result, I had had a lot of experience with the leadership. Although I didn't know the leaders intimately, I could identify them, I knew them and I knew what they thought.

You asked about the influence of women. The women directors of the Seven Sisters were a powerful lot on the East Coast. They compared everything about students with each other. They knew everything about the promising students. For example, someone would say to Miss Howard at Holyoke, "I'm interviewing Celeste Ulrich. What do you know about her?" And Miss Howard would know plenty about me. There was a very strong network of all of the women in physical education who headed departments. That worked to my advantage because I had met them and, as an awestruck student, I had met most of the prominent leadership. Miss Coleman told us what was going on so we knew who liked who, and who didn't like who. We knew all of the inner politics of the Association. We didn't learn it in a class; we learned it because we were there.

When Miss Rodgers asked me about the profession, she must have been "snowed" by all that I knew. I never realized that she was in a sense trying to trap me. She was trying to figure out what I didn't know. I knew all the answers. Finally she said, "If you want the job, it's yours." I thought that it looked like a nice place, so I went to Madison College.
Miss Rodgers was a very difficult woman. Although I can't say this as an expert, I believe that she had paranoid tendencies. It was my first job, so I thought that maybe every boss was supposed to be like her. She was very possessive about the students. She lied to them about certain things and did things that I did not believe were right and good. Being brazen, I told her so, which certainly didn't help our relationship very much. She thought that I had no right to do this since I was just a young teacher. This was true. I probably didn't have any right, but I have never been able to watch what I considered really immoral things go on without saying something about them. I just decided at that time that it was more important to be true to oneself than to have a job.

ALLYS SWANSON: What kinds of things did you consider immoral at that time?

DR. ULRICH: First of all, there were several young teachers at the institution at that time whose names you may know. One was Mary Beyrer, who was later one of the presidents of the Alliance and Betty Hartman, who also held leadership roles within the Alliance. We were all young teachers who wanted very much to do the right things. We had women students who had been in the armed forces and, although they were not as sophisticated as the men at Chapel Hill, they were certainly not average college students. One of the leaders was a 27 or 28 year-old woman who was still just a junior or a senior. Miss Rodgers treated her like a child and wouldn't listen to some of what I thought were very reasonable requests. Then she started to pick on people she didn't like, particularly students. I thought that was wrong.

Miss Rodgers became absolutely furious at anyone who disagreed with her. One day she asked me a question and I knew that I was not giving the answer she wanted, but I decided to give her the real answer anyway. She got very angry. She picked up a paper weight from her desk and threw it at me. Fortunately it
didn't hit me, but I couldn't believe anybody would do that. This was my boss. She was obsessed with making charts and the charts were to no avail. It seemed to me that some of her immoral actions, particularly her treatment of the students, were vindictive. I thought that was wrong.

I can now view Miss Rodgers with more compassion and see that she was a troubled person who needed more help than we were able to give. Instead of helping her, the staff challenged her. This was precisely the wrong thing to do. However, our own sanity was resting on our reactions to her. Some days I thought that something must be wrong with me, because I didn't think anything like my boss. Meanwhile, she was feeling very persecuted. The situation finally reached such a head that she was asked to leave. She attributed her dismissal to the fact that we would not support her. The staff and I had said, "Either she goes or we do." It was an unhappy time.

In the midst of all that, I learned a lot from my colleagues. I learned to be a little more compassionate about illness. I certainly learned to operate with students in a more mature way than I might have otherwise. As a result, I consider my days at Madison College to be very good ones. Some of the students I taught there certainly have made their mark. It was a good school. I don't think it was as fine as the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, but it was in that league. The main reason it wasn't as fine was because the staff wasn’t as rich as the one at Greensboro or they hadn't earned the reputation that the Greensboro group had earned throughout their history. There were some very difficult days there, but there were also some wondrous days as far as my learning experience was concerned. During one particular era when things were not going well I thought to myself, "If I can live through this, I can live through anything. It will never be this bad again." And it never was.
ALLYS SWANSON: How did this experience lay the foundation for your future career experiences?

DR. ULRICH: I realized that I was programmed to go on to graduate work. In those days, although not all women had doctoral degrees, I saw the handwriting on the wall. I first decided to go to school when I picked up a copy of the JOPHER and saw that Mabel Lee was going to be teaching a graduate course at the University of Southern California. I had always thought that I would like to take a course from Miss Lee. She had retired from Nebraska and never taught graduate courses. I thought that this would be my only chance. Besides that, the opportunity was in California and I could make a trip out of it.

I decided to go to school in California because of the course with Miss Lee. Then I noted the names of Eleanor Metheny, Aileene Lockhart and Craig Davis on the S. C. convention roster. I knew all of those people because of their writings and research. I wanted to go hear these people speak. Eleanor Metheny was speaking to a group about kinesiology. I was interested in and taught kinesiology so I thought that would be fine. I'll never forget that experience. The room was too small and people were packed to the walls because of the high regard for Eleanor Metheny's speaking ability. At the moment that I sort of squeezed myself in to get a look, I could hear her and see that she was climbing on top of the table. She pointed to her leg and said, "You will notice this muscle when I stand on tiptoe." I thought, "Holy Mackerel. I've never seen anything like this before." I became absolutely captivated with what she was saying. I thought, "This is icing on the cake. I'm going to Southern Cal for the summer to study with Miss Lee and I'll have a chance to take a course with Dr. Metheny as well."

When I got to Southern Cal that summer, Eleanor Metheny was a different kind of Katherine Taylor but with the same aura. She started off by telling us that
we knew nothing; then she started helping us learn everything. The course with Miss Lee was everything that I expected it to be. Metheny challenged me continually and I thought, "This is where I'd like to go to school." Little did I know that they were looking me over as much as I was looking them over.

After that summer experience, I decided to do my doctoral work at Southern Cal. I was just assuming, of course, that they would be glad to have me. Interestingly enough, I thought about the possibility of going to Iowa because the program was extraordinarily well-known. By that time, New York University and Columbia were on the downgrade. From my point of view, there were no other real graduate schools except Illinois. I was not interested in Indiana; I thought their degrees were worthless because they were not Ph.D.s.

When I went to listen to Gladys Scott, she didn't turn me on at all. I thought she was a very erudite woman. I thought, "I don't fit. I don't fit with her; I don't fit with Margaret Fox and C. H. McCloy. Better that I go some place where I fit." Immediately I felt that Eleanor Metheny was a kindred spirit, that she would help me accomplish my goals and that she was going to challenge me. When I met E. C. Davis I felt the same way about him. Unfortunately, Aileene was very sick with hepatitis, but I had great respect for her. I knew her through our work with the National Section on Women's Athletics (NSWA), the women's sport organization at that time.

By then it had become solidified in my mind that I wanted to attend Southern Cal. However, I needed money to get there. Even working at Camp Walden I didn't earn enough money to get there on my own. I had to wait to find out whether or not they would accept me. As I said, it never occurred to me that they had a choice. I just thought that since I had good grades there would be no trouble. But a lot of good people wanted to go there. They didn't have to take me.
At the same time, because I had never done a stint with the Navy as I had once planned, I still felt the responsibility to serve my country. I decided I would join the Peace Corps, which was then called the Exchange Fulbright Scholarship. I had applied for a Fulbright Scholarship to India. I heard on Friday that Southern Cal had accepted me and they wanted to know if I was going to come. I wired them back and said that I would be there. On Monday I got the Fulbright. I thought to myself, "I've already made a promise. I cannot go back on it." Then I thought, "But I'll never have the chance to go to India on a Fulbright again, but I will have a chance to go to Southern Cal again." I thought, "No, that isn't fair. That wouldn't be right." I knew that they had done a selection process with me and I had not hesitated to say yes. So I never went to India.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: How did Eleanor Metheny and Jesse Williams influence you?

DR. ULRICH: I have a principle called cascades of heritage that I sometimes shared with my graduate students. I think that a person can trace her professional heritage through the lineage of her teachers. Most of my background came from two sources: Columbia University and Boston Normal School of Gymnastics. Therefore, all of the people who were influential in those two institutions in a sense became my grand-fore-parents. Fortunately I was of the age that I got to meet some of them. I told you how I inadvertently saw R. Tait McKenzie. But I got to meet and talk with Jesse Williams. I didn't know Miss Homans personally, but I saw her once. I knew Miss Lee and Miss Coleman and all of Miss Homans' graduates quite well. Most of the women directors had come out of the Boston Normal School of Gymnastics. As I grew older, I found myself literally saying some of the things that these leaders said because that was where my indoctrination had been. I
always felt very close to Dr. Williams because our philosophies were alike. When I heard him talk he said all the right things as far as I was concerned.

Jay Nash was slightly different because he was from NYU. I was not particularly influenced by any of the NYU people. However, Dr. Nash was an eloquent speaker. When I left his speeches I felt that I could change the world, not tomorrow, but right now! On one occasion, I heard Jay Nash speak and I came out absolutely stupefied. The next day someone asked me, "Did you hear the Nash lecture? I didn’t get there, could you tell me about it?" I realized that I hadn’t heard what Nash had said. Instead I had been completely sensitized to the way in which he said it. I would have jumped off the Empire State Building at that moment if he had said to do it, but I didn’t remember any of the substance.

With Williams, I could always remember what the speech was about. He, too, was a very compelling orator. To that extent I always felt very close to Williams. All of my teachers had worked with Dr. Williams and they talked about him often. So I trace my cascade of heritage from those two institutions.

The saga of Eleanor Metheny is a fascinating one. She came from an entirely different background. First of all, she was a mathematics major. She had been at Wellesley and was slightly conditioned by the Wellesley group. However, she was a C. H. McCloy person; she had done her doctoral work with Dr. McCloy. When I met Miss Metheny I was really taken by her style and erudition.

I had known C. H. McCloy’s work and had heard him speak, but he was a very pedantic man who didn’t have the flamboyance of Williams or the charm of Nash. I respected McCloy as a scholar, but he was not anyone who I particularly wanted to be like. Dr. Metheny made me see C. H. McCloy in a different way. She talked about some of his idiosyncratic behaviors. Those behaviors had contributed to her own growth, so I became a bit more interested in and sensitive to the C. H. McCloy influence.
Eleanor Metheny was certainly the single most important professional influence on me. She always challenged me. She had a knack for making students better than they were. I had an opportunity to teach a class with her at Southern Cal. They had had a lot of problems on the S. C. staff: LaPorte had died unexpectedly, Lockhart was sick and Davis had had a gall bladder operation. Metheny was left to run the department. Graduate fellows were employed in many ways, including to teach undergraduate majors. Teaching with Miss Metheny--I saw how she worked methodologically with undergraduate students. She was able to make some below average students into above average students because of the way she handled them. She challenged them but she also slapped them down. She was mean when she wanted to be, but it was for the right reasons. I became more and more enamored with Dr. Metheny.

From my point of view, Dr. Metheny was on the cutting edge of everything new that was happening. I was there when Metheny and Eldfeldt started to think in terms of movement education, and the meaning of movement. She invited me to join their small circle to do some exploratory creative thinking about movement. Dr. Metheny came up with a vocabulary that nobody understood, words like kinespect. I was there on the ground floor making some small contribution to it.

By that time I was studying stress physiology. I was trying desperately to find evidence that physical education was affected by or had some effect on psychological behavior. I was trying to show the mind/body relationship in my own small way. I thought that Selye’s stress theory was the key. When I approached Dr. Metheny about a dissertation in the area of stress physiology, particularly concerning Selye’s theory, she looked aghast and said in a nice way, "But Celeste, you can do so much more than that. Why go off on this toot?" The rest of the staff was just appalled and said, "Good Lord, this has nothing to do
with us." I was convinced by that time and Miss Metheny said, "Convince me." I garnered my arguments well and we had a four-hour conference during which I told her why I thought Selye's stress theory was important to our field, what the questions were that had to be asked and how they could be asked. I convinced her.

She became my most ardent supporter and my dissertation advisor. She was willing to take a chance with a kid who didn't really know all that much. That made a lot of difference. At times I felt that it was us against the world, but our progress was like the opening of a rose. The blossom was appearing and no one knew it was there, including myself.

I worry that when my generation dies, none of you are going to know all of the fun things about people because it's all in our heads. It's not going to be in history books. The Eleanor Metheny story is a fascinating story and there are not too many people who know it. There will be even less in another 20 years.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: We've asked many people about C. H. McCloy and most of the people who tended to respect him were males. In what way did Eleanor Metheny respect C. H. McCloy?

DR. ULRICH: You have to understand how Eleanor Metheny got to know C. H. McCloy. Eleanor Metheny was a bright University of Chicago graduate in mathematics and had decided to teach math in the public schools. That was at the beginning of the Depression. Illinois didn't have any money to pay its school teachers so it paid them in script. As Miss Metheny used to tell me, that bought some of the groceries but not very much. Meanwhile, her father had died and she was the sole support of her mother. She decided that she could not earn enough money to take care of her mother and herself by teaching school, so she looked in the newspapers for available jobs. The only jobs that were available were secretarial typing jobs. She and her
mother cashed in her father's meager insurance policy to buy her a typewriter, and Eleanor taught herself how to type.

Once she had gotten her speed up to a certain level and taught herself shorthand, Eleanor decided that she could look for a job. Her mother said to her, "Eleanor, while we're looking for a job, we might as well look for a job close to a university. Maybe you will be able to do some work." C. H. McCloy, the father of statistical research in our field, was looking for a secretary so he hired Eleanor Metheny. What a bonanza he had with her. Not only was she taking his dictation and typing his letters, but she knew mathematics. She helped him with a lot of his statistical research and became very interested in the whole area of child welfare and child development.

She decided that she would like to do her graduate work in child development at the Child Development Center at Iowa. She didn't get a master's degree; she went right on to her doctoral work. In order to get in, she had to have an undergraduate major in physical education. McCloy sent Miss Metheny to Elizabeth Halsey. Of course the men's and women's departments were separate. McCloy and Halsey didn't get along very well and here was the secretary of an enemy and a woman who had never had any experience in physical education. On top of that, Miss Metheny was, by her own definition, a klutz.

Miss Halsey decided that Miss Metheny was not going to get an easy degree out of physical education; she was going to find it entirely different. In those days, physical education majors had to take all of the activity courses. Miss Halsey put Eleanor Metheny in hockey, tumbling and basketball, none of which Miss Metheny did very well. She worked very, very hard because she needed that degree in order to do doctoral work.

Some of the stories that she tells are marvelous. I don't know whether you knew Eleanor Metheny, but she was kind of big bosomed. One day she was
practicing tumbling during her lunch hour; she still had to work at this time. (Incidentally, her mother became custodian in the animal laboratory to help out. She fed the rats and cleaned the rats’ cages. The times were really tough.) During this lunch hour, Miss Metheny was working hard to learn to do a headstand, but she was not too successful in her endeavors. As she was working on this, Dr. McCloy came by and said, "What in heaven's name are you doing?" She said, "I'm practicing standing on my head and I'm not very good at it. But I'll tell you, I'm going to stand on my head or bust." And he said, "Your head, please." Through Eleanor Metheny's eyes I saw a more humane C. H. McCloy than I had seen before.

When Eleanor Metheny finished her undergraduate degree, Elizabeth Halsey called her into her office and said, "You will earn your degree, but I do not know what you are doing in this field. You have nothing to offer the field."

**DR. VAN OTEGHEN:** Did she have to write a thesis at some point? She never could have gone on for a doctorate at Iowa without having written one.

**DR. ULRICH:** I don't really know the answer to that. Her doctoral dissertation was on the refinement of the Johnson Motor Ability Test. Today this doesn't seem like very much, but Johnson had devised that test with something like 64 items on it. Through statistical patterns Metheny tapered it down to 12 or nine, so it became quite a reasonable test. She proved its validity mathematically through statistical means and theory, and came up with the same correlations and the same validity as the original. She must have done some sort of a paper between her bachelor's and doctoral degrees. If she did a master's degree, I don't know what it was on.

**DR. VAN OTEGHEN:** Was her doctorate in physical education?

**DR. ULRICH:** It was in child development.
DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Did she take some courses under Dr. McCloy then?
DR. ULRICH: Oh yes. She took almost all of McCloy’s courses in addition to her own coursework. She was his full-time secretary throughout her whole graduate experience.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: The departments were so separate there that usually the women did nothing in the men’s department and men did nothing in the women’s department until later on.

DR. ULRICH: I saw McCloy through different eyes. I got to know McCloy a little bit better because I taught with one of his daughters, Emma McCloy Layman, at Greensboro. She told me many stories about her dad. I got to know him second hand in a slightly different way than I had known him as a rather pedantic, boring person.

ALLYS SWANSON: Tell us about the McCloy-Williams debate on the meaning of physical education.

DR. ULRICH: The debate took place in New Orleans when I was an undergraduate. We were told to go to conventions. We didn’t have very much money and the war was on, but we got there. At that convention, one of the main programs was a debate between Jesse Williams and C. H. McCloy on the meaning of physical education. McCloy’s thesis was "How About a Little Muscle" and Williams’ thesis was "How About a Little Culture."

The two speakers were at podiums on opposite sides of the stage. Dr. McCloy was dressed in a gymnast’s costume. In those days, male gymnasts wore white ducks with straps under the feet, shoes like white ballet slippers and a white t-shirt. Although he wasn’t a handsome man, he was continually in training with weights so he had a good physique. He was very vain about his appearance. He lectured about the meaning of fitness and muscle. Then they pushed in a side horse and McCloy started to do pommels and leaps. The man was about 55 and
did them very well. He also lectured as he did this. Here was one of our great leaders leaping around as a gymnast and not even panting.

After McCloy finished, Williams stood up. Dr. Williams was never fat, but he was a little rotund. He wore his hair a little bit longer than was the custom in those days. He looked like an orator, like Liberace. He came to the podium, kind of held onto it, reared back and let go. He had a marvelous, resonant voice that just sang. He started talking about meaning and people's lives. What good is it to be fit? What are you fit for? He was absolutely wonderful. He never moved from the podium, just stood there and roared. At the end of the debate, Williams sort of patted himself on his tummy and said, "Well Mac, we both started out in the same place. This is what you have become and I admire it. This is what I have become and maybe you don't admire it. But we'll have to wait, won't we, to see what happens as to who is right." That's the way it ended.

About 20 years later, when Ruth Abernathy was the president of the Alliance, McCloy and Williams met again at the convention in Chicago. In those days the women presidents looked like a million dollars. They wore hats and gloves. Ruth had a good figure and was aristocratic. Dr. Williams, who had retired, was her mentor and had promised that if she won the election he would give the opening session speech. Just by chance, C. H. McCloy won the Gulick Award so he was on stage during that particular session. All of a sudden I thought, "My God, there they are. And now we'll see who won." Meanwhile, Oberteuffer, Harry Scott and others whom I call Williams' boys were lined up in the front row. They were going to see the old man one last time. First came the Gulick Award presentation. Dr. McCloy had had a serious heart attack that probably would have killed another man, but because of his conditioning he had gotten through it. But he was furious with his body and thought it had betrayed him. He walked forward very slowly to accept the Gulick Award and he was in a
properly humble position. He said to the group, "Thank you very much. I appreciate this." He then shuffled back and sat down.

Then Williams got up. This was going to be his last hoorah. Once again he gripped the podium and his speech was centered around all the things that the Association had not done and for which we had an obligation. I remember that they were certainly involved with some of the social problems of our time. He felt that the Association had not taken any stand on affirmative action. Why hadn't we done that? And why hadn't we taken any stand about the ecology? He defined the problem, then he turned, almost accidentally, and with his arms sweeping, said, "And what have YOU done?" and he pointed to the boys. I recall at first, they were sitting up straight and then slowly, they began to sink down.

Afterwards, when I got to know Dr. Oberteuffer much better, I asked him how he felt about that incident. He said, "Oh, it was awful. Everything he was saying was the truth. We had betrayed the old man. We had not done what he had said. After that, I like to think we did some of the things." From my point of view at that time, there was Williams and there was McCloy. I thought to myself, 'I'm not sure if there's a winner, but if there is, I think it's Williams.'

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: In that Williams had the opportunity, did he put McCloy down?

DR. ULRICH: Oh no, he was very complimentary. As a matter of fact, I think the Big Three men, Nash, McCloy and Williams, respected each other. I don't know if they were bosom buddies, but they were all respectful.

ALLYS SWANSON: Let's go back a bit and talk about your experiences at the University of Southern California and the people with whom you worked.
DR. ULRIC4: Besides working with Dr. Metheny, who was obviously the primary influence on my professional life while I was there, I had the opportunity to do a number of things that I thought were very exciting. I went to Southern Cal one summer and then took a year off and went for a whole year, and then returned for another summer. That term was my residential stay. I have already mentioned the fact that Aileene Lockhart was ill while I was there. She was the incoming chair of NSWA, or NSGWS at that time, and I was secretary of the NSWA Board. When I got to California, I learned that she had gotten hepatitis and had to resign from NSWA. As a result of that, it became my responsibility to pull together all her files and send them to Mabel Locke, who would take her place. I had to try to let Mabel Locke know what was happening as far as NSWA was concerned.

My actual interaction with Aileene was kind of peripheral, but I always felt like I knew her better than I did because I was going through her files and pulling out this and that. One of their staff members, a doctoral candidate by the name of Waldean Robichaux, had promised Aileene that she would take care of her house while Aileene was hospitalized or recuperating. Deanie Robichaux became one of my personal friends, so we spent a lot of time studying German and French together for our examinations. I was living in a ghetto-like apartment and she was living in Aileene Lockhart's home, so we studied there. Through all of this, I felt very close to Aileene. I was always very impressed with the substance of Aileene Lockhart. I did not know her as well as I knew Dr. Metheny. I saw her mostly through the eyes of her students and they all spoke very well of her.

E. C. Davis was a very interesting man. As a teacher, he enjoyed tweaking the tiger's tail. He continually put students in positions in which they had to argue their cases. I was fairly used to doing that, so I wasn't as astonished by it as some of my colleagues were. I always took Dr. Davis on as kind of a fun venture. He
didn’t get malicious. For example, if he was on a doctoral oral committee, he
would give a Lifesaver to the candidate when he or she came in. Then he would
watch to see what this student would do with the Lifesaver. If you put it in your
mouth, you would have to eat it while they were asking you questions. If you kept
it in your hand, it would get all hot and sticky. So what was a candidate to do?
Dr. Davis used to say he could find out a lot about candidates by what they did
with their Lifesaver. He did all kinds of little things like this that I thought
worked just fine.

When I was at Southern Cal I was of the impression that Dr. Metheny and
Dr. Davis did not get along well. I don’t think they were enemies or anything like
that, but they were just of different makes. Dr. Davis did not appreciate strong
women, although he had been a mentor to a number of them. I think it was a
little rough for him to be Metheny’s colleague. She was outspoken and bright,
and she never hid that.

One of the things that Dr. Metheny once said about intelligence always
impressed me. She said, “You have to make sure that you don’t hide your
intelligence. It’s wrong. Let me use this analogy. Suppose I had six functional
fingers instead of five, which gave me greater dexterity than the average person.
If someone came up to me and said, ‘Why are you so good at picking up this
stuff?’ I would have three possible responses. With my hands behind my back I
could say, ‘I don’t know. I’m just good.’ Or I could put my hand in the
questioner’s face and say, ‘I’ve got six fingers and you’ve only got five and that’s
why I’m better.’ Or I quietly could say, ‘You see, I’ve got six fingers and they’re
all functional and I guess that’s why I’m better.’” She said to me, “You must
always choose to do the third. Tell the truth and don’t be ashamed of it. Don’t
hide it and don’t flaunt it.” She did that herself. There was no question that
Eleanor Metheny was brilliant. I don’t think that Dr. Davis always enjoyed that in
a colleague.—He felt better in the position of being a helper. Dr. Metheny needed no help.

On the other hand, the students didn't ally themselves in camps. I thought Dr. Davis was wonderful. However, I would not have chosen to do my dissertation with him because I liked the way in which Dr. Metheny worked. Dr. Davis certainly was a dominant force out there and many people adored him. I knew many who were literally his slaves because they thought so highly of him. I think that very early Dr. Davis acceded that I "belonged" to Dr. Metheny. He challenged me and he was good, but I certainly was not an intimate friend of Dr. Davis.

The most important thing to me at Southern Cal besides Dr. Metheny was my colleagues. I went through Southern Cal during a really golden era. I'm sure most doctoral people feel that way. My colleagues were Roger Burke, who became a great kinesiologist; Francis Coleville, who unfortunately died too early but was very good as far as motor learning was concerned; John Nixon, who graduated a little before my group and was an eminent force in pedagogy at that time. The individuals who surrounded us were all wonderful graduate students, obviously poor and struggling in varying degrees. I think most institutions have highs and lows and that was one of the high periods at Southern Cal.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Was John Cooper there at that time?

DR. ULRICH: John Cooper was there and I always laugh when I think about him. He and I are personal friends. John's demeanor is sort of bumbling and cute. I had had a lot of experience in kinesiology and so had Roger Burke. We thought John didn't know much more than we did. In many ways he was a more practical man. He had been a University of Missouri All American basketball player. He would stand in the middle of the floor, and he would lay the shots in. He wasn't well organized and
he wasn't a good teacher, but you couldn't help but like him because he was such a nice guy. He used to bring to class a soap box with his notes in it and he was always thumbing through stacks of paper looking for his notes.

We used to do all kinds of horrible things to John; we were like children in his class. He would take off his watch and put it down so that he would have some idea of the time. One day Roger Burke said, "I'll keep him distracted if you'll take the watch and change the hour." I said, "Okay." Roger got him off by the blackboard and started giving him a hard time about a mathematical formula. I took his watch and set it a half hour ahead. Then, like a dope, Cooper put it down backwards so it read just about the time it really was. So he never even knew we had changed it. All of our cleverness was a waste.

Just yesterday John said to me, "You probably don't remember saying this to me, but four years after you graduated, when we were both on the program speaking some place, you said that you enjoyed my speech and you thought I had really matured well." I thought to myself, "Oh my God, did I really say that?" I probably did because while I was there I did not consider John to be a mature person. I think that he began to mature when he left Southern Cal, came to Indiana and did some work with Glassow.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: I think he respected Eleanor Metheny.

DR. ULRICH: Oh yes, he did. She was not loveable, or cuddly by a long shot.

ALLYS SWANSON: Your recollections of John Cooper are interesting. In his oral history, he emphasized the virtue of organization. He said a person with academic talent will be undone without good organizational skills. You also mentioned John Nixon. In 1972 you and John Nixon co-authored the book, *Tones of Theory*. What do you recall about him?
DR. ULRICH: I knew John more as a colleague than in any other role. My first professional interaction with John was in writing that book. We were doing it for NASPE. As I knew him, John always seemed to be trying very hard to be all that he could be. He never had what I call the supreme self-confidence. He was always looking for ways in which to be reaffirmed of that particular confidence. He was very bright. His father was Nixon of professional stature. I think it worried him that he had to live up to his father's reputation. I enjoyed talking with him. Even then I continually felt I had to reassure John that everything was all right. At times he felt that the world had not gone exactly as he had wished. He had a retarded son and that worried him a great deal. His wife, who is wonderful and tremendously supportive, was in a sense taking care of him in a generation when he thought he should be taking care of her, and that hurt him.

In all honesty, I did not picture John Nixon as one of the giants in our field, but he has certainly achieved a lot of distinction. I think that my evaluation is not correct. He's always been a very supportive, loving and sensitive man. My intellectual interaction with him was prosaic. I always knew that he would do what he said, but I never felt, "Hot dog, we're off on a new toot." When we were writing Tones of Theory, he supported any innovative ideas I had, but he demanded that I convince him first. I wasn't allowed to go off on one of my own "toots," which I think was very good practice. I respect John a great deal, but he has not been a light in my professional existence.

ALLYS SWANSON: We've talked about emerging trends and issues of your experience at Southern California. What other areas of specialization did you find emerging for you and for the profession in the late 1950s and the early 1960s?
The role of women in sports was much more important than it appears to me now. It governed almost all of our lives at that time. Most women in physical education had been partially drawn to it because of their own experiences in sport. Most of us were a little above average as far as our skills were concerned, and most of us coached and officiated.

If I had any kind of feminist consciousness at all, it was through sports. I really did believe that girls and boys should have the same kinds of opportunities in athletics. We were getting that in physical education, but we were not getting it as far as athletics were concerned. So that became an ongoing issue.

I remember hearing Minnie Lynn make a prophetic statement to the National Association of Physical Education for College Women (NAPECW), an important organization for women then. We were talking about women in sports and what women should be allowed to do and not be allowed to do. She stood up and said, "We cannot back into our own future. That's what we're doing. We've got to take forward steps along that line."

I worked very closely with NSWA, NAGWS and NAPECW, all women's organizations. The social consciousness regarding women had already begun. I've already talked about the very strong network that our foremothers had. They knew each other well and, for the most part, supported each other. However, they were a bit jealous of each other's fame. Nevertheless, the support was there and I was a part of it.

I was second generation. In a sense they used us. We were "their girls" and they pushed us in some ways that turned out to be wonderful for me. Elizabeth Halsey pushed Gail Hennis, who turned out to be one of my closest professional friends. The people from Michigan and Iowa pushed Katherine Ley. Tyke and I got to be good friends. It was almost like a family situation in which your parents were saying, "Come on you kids, you've got to get along together." You found
surprisingly enough that you liked the kids. They all became the significant others with whom you worked.

If I have any advice for undergraduates, it is not to underestimate the kinds of relationships that they are forming with their peer group. For me, they turned out to be as important, and perhaps even more important, than relationships with my teachers. They were certainly more important than my relationships with my own students. To this day they remain my best confidants and my best advisors.

Women's issues were beginning to emerge in various ways, mostly through the athletic picture. All of us were heavily involved in that. At that time, women's athletics were in the departments of physical education. There were no women's athletic departments. I was at Greensboro when Ellen Griffin and Gladys Palmer literally formulated the first Collegiate Women's Golf Tournament. You can't imagine the ruckus that caused. How dare we have a national championship for women. When Greensboro decided to support it, we got letters from all over the United States saying, "You've gone out of your mind." Gladys Palmer practically lost her job at Ohio State over it.

Our successors will never know how large of an issue it was. The feminist movement wasn't as carefully delineated as it is today. There was no National Organization for Women (NOW) at that time. We were caught up in the problems of being considered different and perhaps sexually deviant. At the same time, we really believed that girls should have opportunities. We wondered how much we should push. We had been socially conditioned to believe that women had a different destiny than men. We didn't hate men. Inherent in the feminist ethos was the idea that somehow or other you had to blame men for everything. It was a complicated time and none of us were so smart that we could sit down and figure it out.
One of Dr. Metheny’s first non-professional books was *The Trouble With Women*. It never achieved the fame of Betty Friedan’s work, but it was about that era. It is a very interesting book that talks about the problems that women faced. For me anyway, that was the first time that I had a chance to put together what all this mess meant with regard to women’s sport. I was working very hard to try to increase opportunities for women. I was puzzled at why the important women in physical education had never taken a stand. We didn’t have any leadership. I didn’t think I was a leader. Neither did any of my colleagues assume they were leaders. We were floundering around in a morass of unintelligent responses guided only by the fact that we honestly did believe that girls should have a chance. Therefore, Metheny’s book was important.

Meanwhile, new discoveries about the meaning of movement were thrusting me into a brand new light. I saw physical education in ways that I had never seen it. As I mentioned earlier, I was very personally interested in trying to bring together the psychological and the physiological and I chose Selye’s theory as a medium. When I was a young professional there were no women researchers in the field. Gladys Scott might have qualified. She had written a couple of books and had done a limited amount of research. At the invitation of Bruce Dill, Dr. Metheny was the first woman to go to the Harvard fatigue laboratory. She was only asked because she was on the Wellesley staff at that time.

The only way women reached the pinnacle was to become administrators. Women could be department heads. That supposedly gave them rank and better salaries. We didn’t even think about the possibility of women in research. I began to see the handwriting on the wall. Women were not going to get anywhere as department heads. We had to make our marks as people of knowledge. Even being great teachers wasn’t enough. We had to write, make public appearances and conduct research.
We began to create that split between the practitioner and the theoretician. I am not very indulgent of people of my generation who say, "It wasn't fair. I was hired to do this and then they changed the rules." That's true. They were hired to do something and they did change the rules. But it was obvious that the rules were changing. Tyke Ley, Gail Hennis, Rosemary McGee and I saw the rules were being changed. We decided we were going to change with the rules instead of sitting around saying it's not fair.

ALLYS SWANSON: We missed Katherine Ley's oral history because of her early death. What should we know about Katherine Ley?

DR. ULRICH: Tyke was a wonderful person. My first knowledge of Katherine Ley was through a book that she had written. When I did my doctoral oral examinations, I had read every book about physical education that was written in English; others had been written in German and French. I had read only 70 books. As undergraduates, our bible, Team Sports for Women, was a book about teaching sport methods by Meyer and Schwartz. All of a sudden I discovered a new book by Miller and Ley. I thought, "Who are they?" First of all, how dare they challenge Meyer and Schwartz? What would they have to say? I didn't know Miller or Ley, and I assumed that they had to be venerable old gals to dare think that Meyer, Schwartz, and Ainsworth could be supplanted.

During that era, NSWA would meet in Chicago because it was the most central location. We paid all of our own expenses. We went the day after Christmas and holed ourselves up in some hotel that had a meeting room until New Year's Eve night. There we planned the future of sport for girls in America. When I met Tyke Ley she was chair of team sports for NSWA. She had been to Iowa and knew a little bit about statistics and research design, so she started to collect data on women's sport. She came to the NSWA meeting and went over
the charts that she had built showing us that there were inconsistencies in our regulations. She reported on the number of games that were held and who should play in them.

In those days, girls weren’t allowed to play a full basketball tournament. They could only play for so many minutes because they weren’t strong enough and they might wear themselves out. The one women’s sport that was pure and unadulterated was women’s field hockey. There were no substitutions in field hockey; we played for one hour of hard running. Women playing on national and international levels were really putting out. Tyke had measured the number of minutes played in field hockey. We all had played, so we knew about it. There was a woman on the committee who was very influential in field hockey by the name of Jo Fiske from Goucher College. So Tyke took field hockey as her base. She reported what they do, how long they play and what the energy expenditure is. Then she drew our attention to basketball, in which women were doing one-sixteenth of what they do in field hockey. So Tyke said, "How dare this association forbid girls to play basketball and encourage them to play field hockey."

Tyke’s report was mind boggling as far as the board was concerned. The older women just couldn’t believe this. This was the first time I’d seen Tyke and I thought, "Hey, I like this gal. She’s with it." She wasn’t nasty about what she knew. She shared her knowledge in such a nice way that most of the women felt they ought to take care of her. That’s how I first met Tyke; then our lives crossed continually. She was playing a very influential role in women’s athletics, particularly at the governing level. She was well liked. She was a good athlete herself and had a lot of good qualities that I thought made her a very appropriate person for that role. When the first women’s sport organization, Collegiate
Athletics for College Women (CACW) asked who should lead us, we all said, "Tyke Ley." As far as I was concerned, she did everything right.

I got to know Tyke best when she was president of the Alliance. She and I were on the executive committee at the same time. Katherine and I said to each other, "This is only going to happen once in our lives." We got along well. To save money for the Alliance, we roomed together very often. We said, "No matter what happens, no matter how many problems we have in the Alliance, let's have a good time." And we did.

Things were a challenge. Many times we spent our own money to get to Washington for a weekend to work on women's sports issues, which I don't think the women particularly appreciated. We did it because we really believed in it. So it turned out to be a marvelous opportunity. Tyke was a very compassionate, understanding, and likeable human being. She could be tough, but she did it in such a nice way that people never realized she was being tough.

Tyke was a superb role model for people like Micki King, who became the Air Force diving coach. Micki once said to me, "The best teacher I ever had in my whole life was Dr. Ley." I can believe that with ease. She was a really super person. Later on Tyke and I went to Greece together and had a really marvelous time. We were guests of another colleague, Cal Papatsos, whose family lived in Greece. Tyke and I toured the Greek nation and it was wonderful. Her very rapid death from cancer was a terrible loss to the profession and to us personally.

It was years before I met Miller. Donna Mae didn't like to fly, so she only appeared at conventions in Las Vegas or cities near her in the Southwest. Katherine used to say to me, "I think you'd like her. She's a good person." I was about 40 years old when I finally met her. Then she, too, became a good friend.
ALLYS SWANSON: Let's continue discussing the role of women in sport and how that played out, not only in the profession with Title IX but also in society as a whole.

DR. ULRICH: Since about the 1920s, society has felt that women should have opportunities for sport experiences beyond that of recreation. I don't think that the concept of women in sport was a new one. It had been a part of our general cultural unrest for a long time.

As a school girl in the Baltimore sector, I had opportunities to be a part of interscholastic teams. We played a schedule. We had uniforms, paid officials, and a coach. We very often went to a game on a street car instead of a bus, but we were taken care of. We didn't have quite the kind of help that the boys did. For instance, we had to buy our own hamburgers. For the most part, I had a very good experience.

When I went to North Carolina I was surprised to find out that the experiences that I had had were no-no's. My teachers were appalled that I had participated in this kind of interscholastic experience even though it had been done under the aegis of very finely developed women physical educators.

In the beginning of my professional work, the whole concept of what was happening in women's sport was convoluted by a lot of problems. I had to contend with the attitude of my college teachers, which differed greatly from that of my high school teachers. As a group, we were concerned with NSWA activities and with defining who our leaders were and what we were and were not allowed to do. As I said before, many women of my era saw women's athletics as one of our missions.

I found out very early that I was expected to learn how to officiate. That was one of my responsibilities as a physical education teacher. Then I found out that there were ways to become an accredited official. I could even earn money
Therefore, I became a basketball official and a field hockey official. Also, I learned a lot about how to coach. By today's standards, the word coaching is much too sophisticated for what I was doing, but in those days I thought it was coaching. It meant working with a group of more talented individuals than you might ordinarily have in a class and giving them your undivided attention. The great emphasis was still on teaching the players to get along with one another, to love one another, to cooperate, and that winning was very, very low down the scale. If you won that was swell, but nobody really cared.

That was the kind of atmosphere in which I grew up, so it seemed to me that it should be extended. However, any talk of extending it always included the idea that women weren't strong enough to do certain activities. The restrictions were concentrated in the area of team sports, as Katherine Ley's research had shown. Women were allowed to do certain things in tennis, badminton, golf and other individual sports that nobody even thought they could do as a part of team sports. For example, many people believed that if we allowed women to play basketball on an interscholastic, intercollegiate level, it would unleash the "hounds of fury." As a result of that, we would all be doomed to purgatory for the rest of our lives.

I never quite knew why that was true, but I believed it because that was what my respected mentors were telling me. Every time I challenged that concept I was told, "You don't really understand how bad things are and how they could be. Do you want us, horror of horrors, to have the problems the men have?" As I looked at the men's problems, which were increasing, I really didn't want us to have their problems. I said to myself, "I think we could set a new model. We wouldn't have to follow the men's model. We could follow a model of women's sport."

I gave as much time and energy as I possibly could to that effort. Initially I worked through NAGWS, NAPECW and the Athletics and Recreation
Federation for College Women (ARFCW), the recreation group led by the
two women from Michigan. We all got together to try to figure out ways to enhance
sport opportunities for girls and women. I was teaching at Greensboro at that
time and I engineered it so that we would meet at Piney Lake, a camp run by the
University. At the Tripartite Piney Lake Conference we drew up what we thought
were going to be some really definitive ways in which to organize girls athletics.
This was at the collegiate level; there was no organization for women's athletics at
that time.

We worked very hard. June McCann represented NAGWS, I represented
NAPECW, and Ellen Griffin and some others represented ARFCW. We drew up
a very cumbersome plan. At the time it seemed like the only thing that we could
do. According to our plan, event coordinators had to apply to us to hold an
intercollegiate sports activity. We went through the application to make sure they
had done everything correctly. We gave it something like the Good
Housekeeping Seal of Approval. All of this was supposedly going to be done by
volunteers. We formulated the National Joint Committee of Extramural Sports
for College Women (NJCESCW). You can tell my age because I'm probably one
of the few people in the United States who can say that with fluency. Unless that
falls trippingly from the tongue, I won't allow you to be a member of our group.

We had very sound and high standards, but they were too cumbersome. For
example, let's say you were at the University of Illinois and decided to have a
badminton tournament to which you were going to invite people from the
University of Michigan, Ohio State and the University of Indiana. To apply to the
NJCESCW, you would have to fill out this long questionnaire about what you
were going to do, who was going to be there, how it was going to be officiated,
what the transportation was, what your health standards were, and other such
questions. When you sent it back, a committee of three would look it over, and
then write to you: "You have the approval of the NJCESCW to do this." We would put our little gold stamp on it so that the teams you invited could feel very comfortable because you had our stamp of approval. They wouldn't have to ask, "Will it be run right?" Instead of that, they would just come.

Our first problem was that people didn’t know very much about our organization so we didn’t have any way of publicizing that this was going to be done. AAHPERD attempted to help us with that. The rest of the organizations met once a year and they had no communication with their membership. The second problem was that once the word finally got out, people realized that they had to plan for tournaments at least six months in advance. They wanted to use the approval to attract people, so they had to do all the planning before they sent out the invitations. The application would come to June McCann, our liaison, and she had to find a committee to review this lengthy document. By the time she obtained three people to review it, received their reviews and sent it back to the applicant, six months had passed. Finally, we just decided that our organization wasn’t of any use. The weight of the mechanism was just so great that it wasn’t working.

Although our application process was a failure, the Piney Lake Conference gave us an opportunity to see if we could streamline the process and establish a national sport organization that would be attentive to collegiate women in collegiate sport. That was when Betty McCue, Phebe Scott and I literally concocted the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW). We requested that Tyke Ley be the first head. The central office of AAHPERD decided to have a news conference. It announced the CIAW, and although it was a big deal to us, it didn’t make quite the national splash that we expected. We still thought it was a big step. One of the first things that the group did was to decide that the name was wrong. It was important to have athletics prominent, so
they renamed themselves the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). So the CIAW never truly existed for any meaningful time. The AIAW was Tyke’s and went on.

Up until that time, we had no support other than emotional support from anyone. Then Title IX was adopted. Today, most people think that Title IX is all about athletics; yet it wasn’t about that at all. There were several bills in Congress about higher education and the way in which contracts were to be let. Congress wanted to ensure that there was no discrimination with regard to institutions that got money, particularly concerning blacks and other minority groups. There was a group in the Senate that thought such legislation was for the birds and that didn’t want the non-discriminatory clause written in. All men of good will would naturally do the right thing anyway. This, of course, also gave them permission to do the wrong thing. In their endeavor to stop Title IX, which was with regard to discrimination, they laughingly said, "or sex." Somebody said, "Let’s put that in, too." So they put that in and it was a fluke. It was never set up as a sexual discrimination preventative at all. It was actually stuck in to try to ensure that the bill wasn’t passed. However, it was passed.

At that time, Margery Blaufarb was working in public relations and publications for AAHPERD. She was a very sharp woman. She went to listen to some of the higher education legislation because she thought that it might have impact upon AAHPERD. When they read Title IX, immediately Margery said, "My gosh, this is about how men and women could have equal opportunity." Her first thought was, "What does this do as far as athletics are concerned?" She didn’t say anything at that time. She decided that she would talk to AAHPERD about it first. She went to Ross Merrick and Rachel Bryant, who was at that time the head of NAGWS, and said, "Do you think this has anything to do with sport?" They said, "I doubt that very seriously." But Margery still believed that ultimately
it would. She kept talking to people, and more and more people said, "Yeah, I think that has something to do with it."

I was in some elected post of AAHPERD at that time. One day as I entered the NEA building, a woman whom I had never seen before came towards me. She said to me, "Are you Celeste Ulrich?" I said, "Yes." And she said, "You work with AAHPERD don't you?" I said, "Yes." She said, "I want to tell you something. Do you know about a higher education bill and what Title IX says?" I said, "Sure, I know something about it." She said, "You and your organization and people like you are going to become closest to this because the easiest way for us to suggest that there is sexual discrimination is through physical education and athletics programs. They are divided; they are not equal, and we're going to use you as our focal point. I want you to know that and don't say you weren't warned." And she walked off. I never saw her again. I have no idea to this day who she was. She was just somebody from the NEA.

At headquarters, I said to Ross, "Let me tell you what just happened to me. It was really strange." I told him and he asked, "Who was she?" I said, "I don't know, I've never seen the person." He said, "I'll talk with Rachel about it." Ross and Rachel talked and they were worried that perhaps Title IX might actually come into effect.

When it became apparent that Title IX was going to become a focal point, the emerging AIAW began to see that it held possibilities for its equality demands. First of all, Title IX would help to acquire equality for women's athletics. They hoped also to use it to force some other issues. In the NJCESCW we had been very adamant about the fact that there should be no athletic scholarships for women. Part of the trouble with men's athletics was who got them and who didn't. We didn't want our athletic structure all mucked up with the athletic scholarship issue. When girl student-athletes found out that boys had
these opportunities, they immediately said, "The boys get scholarships, why don't we? That is unequal." As a result, the AIAW was caught in a very interesting situation. They philosophically didn’t think there should be scholarships, but at the same time they philosophically believed in equality. The girls were saying that equality in scholarships was a good thing. They thought they were being denied a good thing. AIWA couldn’t have it from both sides.

Then they did something that, from my point of view, was tragic. Lee Morrison and other AIAW personnel began looking for a lawyer. They wanted to find a woman lawyer. For the most part, women knew very little about sport. By that time NOW and some of the other women’s organizations had been formed. I had often talked about sport and they just looked at me like they knew nothing and cared less about it. AIAW was trying to find a female lawyer who understood sport and was willing to take the case cheaply. Apparently they literally wandered up and down the streets of Washington until they came upon the firm for which a young woman in it by the name of Margot Polivy worked.

Margot had been a physical education teacher at one of the colleges in New York. She knew women’s sports quite well. She knew about NCAA and NAIA policies, was a very strong feminist, and was a lawyer. She was a natural. This is purely my own bias and I’m sure there are people who completely disagree with me, but I think Margot Polivy was a disaster. I think she was after fame, status and money. When Margot became the AIAW lawyer, she was going to push more opportunity for women. I thought that was good and sound, but I was torn over the scholarship issue.

I recall a small incident, one which probably I’m building out of context. I talked with Margot for some time about her qualifications. I got along very well with her personally and decided she was a fighter. I thought that was good. I knew something about legal issues, but I certainly was not a lawyer and didn’t
know very much. I was quizzing her about some of the legal patterns and she was quizzing me about the history of women's athletics. She said to me, "The next time you come to Washington, why don't you come up here a little bit early. We'll have dinner together and just sit and chat." I said, "Sounds swell."

I was in Washington about once a month, so the next time I was there I gave her a call. We met at a restaurant and literally spent the whole evening talking about the legal implications and the history of women's sport. It was a marvelous conversation. I enjoyed it and my impression was that she did, too. That was the end of that. I felt like I had a better understanding of her, and I hoped that she had a better understanding of the Association.

The next time I went to Washington, George Anderson, executive director of the Association, said to me, "Celeste, what have you done? We have a bill here from Margot Polivy for $200 for consultation." I said, "What?" He said, "Did you consult with her?" I said, "No, when?" He cited the time we had dinner together and she claimed a $200 fee for consultation. I had asked her a lot of questions. I was horrified. I said to George, "Fine. I think we should bill the firm of Polivy, et al., for consultation for educational services from me. Don't pay the bill until either they call you or they pay theirs." I believe George did that and we never heard from the firm. After that, any time I talked to Polivy I asked, "Is the meter running?"

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: I understand they charge for everything, including phone calls.

ALLYS SWANSON: They do, but it's up front.

DR. ULRICH: We definitely did not set up a business meeting. But even then, some of the expenses put upon the Association by Polivy, et al., were absolutely incredible. She was paid for every
AIWA meeting she attended, plus a retainer and all of her expenses; she certainly
never tried to live cheaply.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Did they retain her during the entire time?

DR. ULRICH: Yes, until AIWA dissolved. Then an interesting thing
happened. The colleges that were joining wanted very
much to make sure that their leadership was composed of people who understood
them. The people in the leadership roles had never had the experiences that
AIAW was offering. There had been no intercollegiate athletes. The closest to
that sort of experience were Tyke Ley and Carol Ogilve, who was also an athlete.
The person to follow Tyke in a leadership role was Carol Gordon. There wasn’t a
more delightful human being than Carol, but she certainly was not as tough as
either Tyke or Carol Ogilve. AIWA wanted people who truly represented them.

It seems that the leadership of AIAW skipped an entire generation. It
moved immediately to those people who had hands-on experience in athletics.
They let go their natural leaders, the Tyke Leys of this world. They should have
used people of the ilk of a Phebe Scott and Betty McCue. They skipped them
completely because they had not had the right playing experience. They didn’t act
maliciously or for the wrong reasons. AIWA had a group of very young
leadership that, to them, represented their concerns. However, they had no
concept of the history whatsoever and they cared very little about it. Therefore,
instead of having a smooth and natural transition, we found ourselves plopped in
the middle of a high powered women’s sport organization that was faced with all
kinds of possible lawsuits. We were being strongly conditioned by a law firm.

If I could send a message to women, I would want them to know that the
people who helped the AIAW the most were men. Ross Merrick, LeRoy Walker,
and C. D. Henry did more to help AIAW than any woman I know. They made it
possible for women to have representation on the Alliance committees. They also
made funding possible. LeRoy Walker literally, at some economic risk, went to a number of radio stations and television stations and sold AIAW’s tournaments to them. In that way, AIAW could earn some money from media. In return for their good deeds, horrible things happened to them in terms of the remarks women made and the allegations they suggested.

With its new leadership, AIAW plunged itself immediately into a very aggressive role of women in sport. At that time, Judith Holland from UCLA was the president of AIAW. She is a very strong feminist, but an even stronger egocentric individual who was determined to make her name. As a result, and I have some very good evidence about this, she informed the NCAA Board of Directors that she would "deliver" the AIAW to the NCAA.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Who were some of the other younger leaders?
DR. ULRICH: The other leaders were Peg Burke, Bonnie Slatton, Chris Grant, who was still coaching, Carol Ogilve, who was a transition person, and Charlotte West, who had her head screwed on a little better than most. Judy is still the assistant athletic director at UCLA.

When I was president of the Alliance, president-elect LeRoy Walker, past president Roger Wiley, Katherine Ley and I spent three-fourths of our time concerned with women’s athletics. At that time, and I’m still not sure whether or not this was wrong, I thought that AIAW should stay with AAHPERD. They were anxious to get away. They were sure they were going to make it on their own. They saw me as a deterrent. Katherine was gone by then. I think I became their greatest deterrent primarily because I had some clout in the field of women’s athletics. I had worked in it for such a long time that people couldn’t say I knew nothing about it. Secondly, I was asked to speak publicly in many places and they were furious that I talked about women’s sports. From their point of view I wasn’t the elected AIAW, so I didn’t have any right to talk about that.
Thirdly, my views did not always coincide with theirs. Therefore, they were very angry with me.

I didn’t handle that situation very well either. (It was sort of like Elizabeth Rogers’ situation.) I probably should have been a little softer and a little more giving than I was. But I was incensed with what they were saying about LeRoy and Ross, both of whom I knew had been a great help. They were perpetrating what I considered untruths regarding AAHPERD. We had knocked ourselves out to make money available for them. Once they started to make a little bit of money and we started to charge them overhead fees, they became incensed.

Margot Polivy was doing things that I really felt uncomfortable about. Then Lee Morrison said to me, "You treat us like children." I think maybe I did. I was probably saying, "Ladies, you don’t want to do that." She was president of AIAW at the time, and I made her very angry.

Finally I said to LeRoy, "Let’s let them go. It’s just not worth it. I think they are spelling their own demise." I was the first woman ever to speak on the floor of the NCAA. Tyke and I were there as delegates. We carried those little paddles which are so important. In addition to that, I made friends with the presidents’ group of the NCAA because they thought that the women’s model was the right one. They were trying to move towards a more ethical pattern for the NCAA.

Perhaps the greatest and the only contribution that I made to the whole sports picture was to establish our association with NCAA. They had never followed Robert’s Rules of Order. They followed general NCAA rules of order. That meant that if they didn’t want you to talk, you didn’t talk. I put on the agenda, which has to be done five months in advance, that henceforth NCAA would follow Robert’s Rules of Order. At those conventions they had 200 resolutions and this was resolution 199. They never finished the agenda. They
put the rules of order resolution at 199 because they knew it would never come up. I didn't know enough to understand that although some of the men there did.

As the end of the convention approached, we were discussing Resolution 150. There wasn't a chance that we were going to get to 199. Then a law professor from the University of Texas came up to me and said, "I understand that you introduced a resolution about Robert's Rules of Order." I said, "Yes." He said, "I am going to move that it be brought forward on the agenda. I think it's absolutely essential that this organization use Robert's Rules. Do you have any objections?" I said, "Oh good heavens, no." He held some clout because he was from Texas. Darrell Royal was also from Texas so he got him to stand up and make a motion from the University of Texas that Resolution 199 be moved to Resolution 152. Before the quorum got away, there was a vote and it was passed. Walter Byer was stuck forever after with Robert's Rules of Order.

That's the only really significant change that I did as far as athletics are concerned. Then, of course, I saw the demise of the AIAW. It was like a Greek tragedy to me. I knew it was going to happen and there was nothing I could do. I tried to insulate myself. I decided that my days of working with women's athletics were over and that it probably didn't make any difference anyway. By now AIWA had been caught up in the NCAA swell.

Tyke and I had talked about the creation of what we called the "scholar coach." There are some men who are scholar coaches. Probably the most outstanding one is "Doc" Dougherty in swimming from Indiana. We always thought women would be scholar coaches. Instead they became recruiter coaches like 99% of the men.

The foolish thing is that the ethos of sport is such a powerful male-oriented model that there is no way women can break into that. It wasn't so much that women were trying to be like men; they were just trying to be good basketball
players or whatever kind of players they are naturally. The NCAA literally was willing to adopt that.

When the NCAA changed its logo and put on it two heads, one of a girl and one of a boy, I knew we were lost. They never would have done that unless they were absolutely sure that they would capture AIAW. I'm not sure whether or not AIAW could have done any better than the NCAA is doing. By that time, my educational concept had long since flown out the window. I still think that women athletes as a whole are more attentive to their educational goals than male athletes are. However, I don't think that's going to continue for long. The women's basketball tournament is going to be televised. Next Sunday the national finals are on cablevision. The more this kind of media attention occurs, the more the ethos of sports will carry women. From my point of view, the educational model is lost. I just hope that the people who are left can salvage enough at least to bring to it some respectability.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Do you see more and more separation in physical education departments with respect to teaching versus sport and athletics, be it regarding men or women?

DR. ULRICH: The split is definitely increasing. Any university or college is foolish to try to keep women's physical education responsible for women's athletics. Even to this day, although we have good relationships in our college with the department of athletics, their personnel are not on our staff. Sometimes we hire some of them to do extra jobs. The athletic director is a very nice man and is running a reasonably good program as far as women are concerned. I wake up three days a week feeling guilty that I am not providing any kind of leadership for women's sports any longer. I wake up four days of the week thanking God.
DR. VAN OTEGHEN: At Memphis State University, the women coaches still teach on our faculty. However, some of the women teachers would like to see that dissolved. Because the coaches are gone so often, they hardly teach their classes.

DR. ULRICH: I think that the policy at Oregon is the best solution. The athletic department hires and fires its coaches. If the physical education department needs someone to teach basketball, and the coach would like to teach, then arrangements for salary and scheduling are made through the athletic department. The coaches usually do this as an overload. If we don’t like them, we don’t hire them again.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Do you pay them more than you do your other faculty?

DR. ULRICH: No, but they might earn more money ultimately because they’re being paid a coaching salary and an additional stipend.

ALLYS SWANSON: I’d like you to say more about the educational model for women in sport. Do you think we have lost a lot of leadership positions for women coaches and women officials even at the high school and junior varsity levels?

DR. ULRICH: I’m not sure I can answer that question because I have largely divorced myself from that particular issue. I tend to ignore things that I see and don’t like in order to preserve my own frustration at not being able to do anything about them. One of the things that has happened, which I’m not sure I anticipated, is that a lot of women no longer want to coach and officiate. Coaching athletics is hard. Coaches are with the student players a lot of the time, including many weekends. They have to act as counselors, big sisters or brothers, mother or father. It’s very demanding.
addition to that, they have to think about recruiting. There are a lot of women who don’t want that kind of life and won’t make that kind of sacrifice.

From my point of view, athletics is a dead end street for a young professional woman at the present time. There are a few exceptions, but for the most part there are not too many administrative jobs available beyond coaching. A superb example of a young woman who was in athletics and obtained a certain degree of mobility is Chris Voltz. She was the assistant athletic director at Oregon before moving to Minnesota.

A lot of what I anticipate to be leadership roles just are not materializing as far as athletics are concerned. Many women's teams are coached by men who are willing to make that kind of sacrifice. Some of those men choose to work with women; others didn’t get chosen to work with men so they use women as a second source. Some of them become absolutely converted to the fact that women’s sport is exciting and good. Others of them do not and hope to be able to move on.

Athletics is a difficult field to be in. From my point of view what is happening to collegiate athletics overall is not good. There needs to be a change. We won’t ever get rid of collegiate athletics, but we need to try to straighten out the increasing mess concerning transgressions, students, student athletes, and coaches. I don’t pretend to know the answer to that, but I know that we are reaching a crisis point.

ALLYS SWANSON: Another impact of Title IX was the merging of men’s and women’s departments. How did that affect you personally and what are your perspectives on that issue?

DR. ULRICH: I was a strong proponent of the merging of men’s and women’s departments. I thought it made absolutely no sense to have two departments in colleges and universities that sometimes
replicated programs and always combatted each other. I just didn’t see that it did anybody any good. For the most part, the merge has been advantageous to our field. It has also caused some problems. There are certainly still chauvinistic men as well as women who are aggressive, strident feminists and who aren't comfortable with the change. There still remain some special discrimination patterns that, for the most part, do not favor women. However, we're working through those things. In my career I have seen evidence that there is greater strength in unity than there is in divisiveness, which was true before.

Personally, I rather enjoyed the merging of men's and women's departments because it was like introducing me to a whole new cadre of colleagues. In my early days, I had worked primarily with females. I now had the chance to work with males and to find out that a lot of them were wonderful human beings who shared my philosophical beliefs. I've appreciated that kind of opportunity. There are still problems for woman administrators, but I think they are solvable.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Do you believe the advantages are equal at the undergraduate and graduate levels for teaching men and women together in skill classes, for example?

DR. ULRICH: Most undergraduates are only looking for the teacher’s ability. They don’t really care if you’re a man or a woman, if you have the ability. I was reasonably good in badminton. If there was ever an arrogant young male in my class, I just slammed the bird down his throat once or twice. After that he was my friend because I had proven myself. A teacher has to learn different types of teaching techniques.

One of my favorite stories is about fear case swimming, a course I used to teach for kids who were petrified of swimming. I had always taught women. Literally, they would cry because they were so frightened. I would sit down beside them in the pool, put my arm around their shoulders and talk to them like a big
sister. I had a great degree of success. All of a sudden I had coeducational fear cases. I couldn’t use my standard method with a boy. It would have been absolutely devastating to have some woman, whom he knew wasn’t afraid, see him afraid. He couldn’t cry, and putting my arm around his shoulders would have created a terrible situation. I had to learn a new technique.

I went to the men’s classes to find out how the male instructors encouraged their boys. I found out that one of the things they did involved the most affectionate of all male gestures. They patted the male student on the behind and said, "Get in there John, I think you can do it." I thought, "How am I going to do that?" There is a limit to what I could do, so I devised my own technique; I hit myself. I said, "John, I think you can get in there. I know you can do it." Bang, bang, bang, I banged away at myself. That was acceptable and it was almost like hitting John. He got in. I tried to use techniques that would challenge him and appeal to his masculinity. It worked. It just meant that I had to make some changes.

When a woman teaches graduate students, she has to prove herself, particularly to some of the young men who say, "What’s this woman doing in here?" Once they find out what her experiences are and what she knows, that’s the end of that.

ALLYS SWANSON: Relate your experience with NAPECW and discuss how the structure of that organization changed with the merger. Are the organization’s goals for women being met today under the current structure?

DR. ULRICH: I was moved into NAPECW work when I was teaching at Greensboro. The head of the department felt her staff should be a part of it. I was sent to some meetings but had not done anything really definitive. As I joined that group, I became very enamored with some of
the things they were doing. I was mostly enamored with the women who were a part of it. They were very powerful women who were achieving exciting and good things. As I moved up in the governance rank of that association, and ultimately became its president, I felt very strongly that it was an important group. They were very dedicated individuals who were on the cutting edge of the discipline.

Just as I had been very much in favor of the merger of the departments, I was very much in favor of the merger of the two organizations. However, I didn’t know the men’s organization as well as I knew NAPECW. As a matter of fact, I spoke publicly in favor of the merger.

The merger brought about many changes. For instance, they changed the time of the convention. Traditionally, NAPECW met in June, at the end of school. The new organization began meeting in January, immediately following holiday break. As a result, I couldn’t get to the conventions anymore. It was almost impossible for me to add another week to my Christmas break.

In the beginning, I felt that the women’s program turned out to be stronger than the men’s program had been. I didn’t feel as comfortable with the new organization as I thought I would. I have not played a significant role in the new organization, but I have great respect for the women who have. The National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education (NAPEHE) still has potential. I don’t know whether or not it has yet achieved its potential to be what it once was. It lacks the comradeship that we once had.

I still go to the district meetings of NAPECW. I belong to the Western Society, which is still all female. I have been a bit troubled because there are a group of rather strident feminists who believe that it would be disastrous ever to meet with the men. I don’t feel that keenly about it. I honestly do not believe that I am any longer in the mainstream of NAPEHE, so I’m not sure if I have really sound ideas.
DR. VAN OTEGHEN: During your years of leadership in NAPECW, what did you believe to be the advantages of that organization?

DR. ULRICH: It provided a common meeting ground for women of like ilk. We were all interested in higher education. We were particularly interested in what was happening as far as women were concerned. NAPECW provided women the opportunity to speak and to organize. NAGWS was the only other organization that offered such an opportunity.

The National Association for Girls and Women in Sport (NAGWS) had taken a turn with which I didn’t feel comfortable because I strongly felt that the NAGWS would have been better as a part of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE). They decided to keep this sex-loaded group to look at women’s sport and not to look at sport for boys and girls/men and women together. I thought that was too bad, particularly after AIAW fell apart. At its zenith, NAPECW provided that common ground for comradeship as well as for some very significant understandings. Most of my opportunities to interact with the top women in our field came through NAPECW.

ALLYS SWANSON: Do you think NAGWS is a springboard for the next female president of the Association? Does it see itself as a real power structure?

DR. ULRICH: I don’t know how the organization views itself. It certainly is not a springboard for the next president. It has had its share of good people, Tyke Ley and Doris Corbett among them.

Women have always had a chance in the Alliance and, since 1932, have played a part in its government. I’ve always been very proud of the Alliance’s relationship with women in their presidential role opportunities. We don’t have a law that there should be a woman president every other year, but that is a
generally accepted tenet. The women who have been presidents of AAHPERD have been strong and have given good guidance to the Alliance.

I don’t like the NAGWS pattern. I believe it perpetuates sexuality and holds on to something that I hope we do not wish to hold on to. Although I understand, one young woman once told me, "Your era had the fun of being together and now you don’t want us to have that fun anymore." I said to her, "It wasn’t all fun." Some of the women who have had no chance to be together feel cheated. Therefore, NAGWS is important to them. I just hate to see the national association endorse that kind of pattern. I haven’t been convinced that NAGWS is really doing anything different from what NASPE is doing.

ALLYS SWANSON: Part of your era that comes across is the dedication and the unusual time commitment, such as the meeting in Chicago between Christmas and New Years, the Sunday afternoons, evenings and extra-curricular activity responsibilities. Do you see that changing for women today?

DR. ULRICH: Many of the women of my era had to make some choices in their lives. It was pretty hard to merge family and marriage with a profession. Some people did that very well. They had supportive spouses and children. But for the most part, the women of my era who made a choice to be professionals remained single. At that time a woman’s work became her life, but that’s no longer necessary. I look around now and see that many people are married with families. It’s an expectation in the same way that men have always had to meet that kind of expectation. Women are finding ways to identify support systems. They hire people and do some other things that I had never thought possible, in terms of either money or what society allowed and approved of.
I see that situation changing a great deal with some accompanying problems. The hardest group I ever had to deal with in higher education was faculty wives. In those days, faculty wives were not allowed to teach in the same institutions as their husbands because of nepotism. Consequently, many of them who were highly qualified women had to give up their professional lives to become wives and mothers. They made the choice and, theoretically, it was their choice to make. As a result, they didn’t like me very well. They weren’t afraid that I might steal their husbands from them. They resented my getting some of the perks he might have gotten had I not been there. They would say to me, "You’re willing to work all weekend, and poor John has to spend some time with the children." That was true. I was willing to work all weekend. I got more done because of that, and I gained more credentials to move on to more career opportunities. However, John had his children, and I didn’t have any children. There were times when I might have been jealous of John, and I’m sure he was jealous of me, but that’s how things work out.

I have always believed that if a person makes a decision thoughtfully, then she or he will be able to live with that decision. Women who now have to make choices and who are trying to do everything aren’t going to be able to do it all. Those who are not willing to do it all must make choices or think they are a failure. They are setting themselves up for failure. I keep trying to advise my own graduate students to know the limitations of their abilities.

ALLYS SWANSON: Are there any other gender issues that you would like to discuss, whether it be about competition for women, academic discrimination for women or professional opportunities that you felt were either enhanced or hindered?

DR. ULRICH: I think we still have sexual discrimination. It’s much more covert now than it used to be. People used to say,
"You can’t do this. You can’t do that. Women don’t do this." People don’t say that anymore, but they make it tough for a woman to do certain things. Personally, I’ve never minded being a token woman, keeping in mind that if I do a good job, never again will anyone be able to say women can’t do it. They might say most women can’t do it, but there was one that somehow or another got through. However, once one woman makes that crack, overcoming sexism is easier for the next generation. That’s the kind of transition that I think is part of my responsibility.

Covert discrimination still exists. Just the other day I was talking to a male colleague of mine, a dean for whom I have great respect. He told me that one of his faculty members had come to his office with a request. He said that he would not be able to provide for the faculty member. The faculty member said, "Well, maybe I’ll just go see the provost. What would you do then?" The dean said, "It is your right to go see the provost but I will make life hell for you." As I left there, I thought to myself, "I never would have said that." I might have felt it; I might have wished I had said it; but I never would have said it. I wouldn’t make life hell for the person because I think it was his right to see the provost. I realized that my belief put me in a weaker position. People who will not defy Bob will defy me because they know I will not be vindictive. It may sound as though I’ve done the right thing and Bob’s done the wrong thing, but I’m not sure that’s true. That person had the right to go to the provost, but the results would have been destructive to the college. If the same man had talked to me, he would have seen me as weak in comparison to the power of his maleness. I think I would have been weaker because I would come up with a fair, compassionate approach, as women are supposed to do. I don’t think that approach works as well in terms of power.

ALLYS SWANSON: Celeste, I’d like to recap your professional experiences. In 1956, after you completed your Ph.D., you went back to
Greensboro and became a professor. You stayed there until 1979. Then you went on to become a dean at the University of Oregon. Highlight your experiences at Greensboro and follow with your decision to move to Oregon where you were faced with new challenges.

DR. ULRICH: I had always thought that I would like to teach graduate students but there was no opportunity to do so at Madison College. I hadn’t ever thought of returning to Greensboro although I have a feeling now that they kept their eye on me as a possibility. When Ethel Martus wrote and asked, "Would you be interested in a job," I realized I would be. I had met Gail Hennis and Rosemary McGee, Greensboro’s top bright lights. I felt very comfortable with those two women. All of a sudden I had an opportunity to work in graduate programs as well as at a place I loved. I had some hesitation because I think it is very hard for someone to return to an institution at which she was a student. Some of my teachers were still there. Having grown up on the East Coast within Southern tradition, I did not move very easily into familiarity patterns. As a result of that I always thought of Miss Martus as Miss Martus. Miss Coleman had died by that time, but I certainly would never have thought of her as a colleague. It took me years to move into a pattern of professional comfort with Dorothy Davis, Ellen Griffin, Marge Leonard and all of those women. They were much more generous than I was. I think they felt more comfortable than I did.

I was at Greensboro for 23 years. I had marvelous opportunities there. The women that I worked with were all that I expected; they were excellent colleagues. We had the chance to work with wonderful students. Many of them are now in very significant roles in our profession. It was a magic time in many ways. I always thought that I would stay at Greensboro until I retired. I progressively moved up in terms of my professorial life, and I made a reasonable
salary. I had done all of the things that are important to one's personal life, such as buying a home.

I had a unique opportunity that not everyone has. Very often I was asked to teach at another institution during the summer. I taught at the University of Oregon for three summers. Art Esslinger was the dean at that time. It never even occurred to me that I would ever teach full time at Oregon, let alone be in an administrative position. I had great respect for the University because of its historical impact and the people it hired. After Art retired, there was a dean in recreation by the name of Rodney. Someone told me that he was retiring. One of my friends from Oregon asked, "Have you thought of applying for this job?" I thought, "Why on Earth would I want to go to Oregon when I'm perfectly happy where I am?" Then one day I thought to myself, "Celeste, sit down and really think this through. What can you do at Greensboro now?" Ethel Martus had just retired. We had gone through an era with Margaret Mordy, who I thought did not do a good job at Greensboro. I thought, "I could aspire to be in administration." However, I had never wanted to be an administrator, so why suddenly would I want to be one? At Greensboro I would be administering my friends. If there was anyone who could do that job well it was Gail Hennis. Therefore, I didn't really want to do it.

Then I began to wonder what I would do. I could continue to be a good teacher, to influence young women, and to serve the university in many capacities. I worked best when I was challenged by people and situations. I realized that there was little left to challenge me at Greensboro. I had met all of the challenges, even though I hadn't been successful at all of them. I didn't see anything else coming along that needed me or that I really needed. As a result, I decided to visit Oregon. I knew full well that there was no chance that they would hire a female dean, but they were nice to ask me.
When I went to Oregon, I was absolutely taken by the central administration of the University of Oregon. The president and the provost were superb human beings. I thought that it would be kind of fun to work with Paul Olum and Dick Hill. I believed that they would never hire me, especially since there were two other male candidates. I returned to Greensboro, glad that I had had a chance to meet those people. I was ready to accept whatever the outcome would be. I was stunned when they called to offer me the job. Then I was faced with the difficult decision as to whether or not I would say yes.

At that time my mother was sick. I saw that she might not be able to make it for another year. It was a miserable time for me to leave. She had been independent up until her last six months. She was living with me, although my brother was very supportive, compassionate and helpful.

At that time my mother said, "Do you want to go to Oregon?"

I said, "I don't know."

She said, "If you're hesitating at all because of me, that's the wrong reason. You have your own life. We will find ways which I will fit in or not fit in. So I think you have to eliminate consideration of me."

When I did, I decided that I really did want to go to Oregon. I went to Oregon a second time to make sure I wanted to accept the position and to check on housing. I decided that I was making the right choice. I'm sure it wasn't by mere accident that my mother died. I think she decided that I was settled and that I knew in which direction I was going. She had an aneurysm of the heart; there was no way she was going to get well. She just decided that it wasn't necessary to live any longer. She died before I went to Oregon, and in a sense, she relieved me of all that responsibility.

The move turned out to be the best professional decision I could have made. President Paul Olum and Provost Dick Hill, the people I worked with for
almost a decade, were as wonderful as I thought. Working with those men was a real challenge. The council of deans at the University consisted of outstanding supportive people. I was disappointed by the fact that, although they tried very, very hard, they were never able to hire another woman dean. The council remained "all men and me." However, there are many women in Oregon who serve in important roles, not just within the university but throughout the government. The ambience is very different from the Southern atmosphere I knew.

I consider myself fortunate to have ended my professional career working with Olum, Hill, and my fellow deans. It has been a wondrous experience. Paul Olum was a physicist who had worked on the Manhattan Project. He was a compassionate humanist and a marvelous person. Dick Hill was a sociologist who understood professional education. He was a thoughtful, demanding, compassionate man who, much like my early mentors, kept challenging me to do things. My position at Oregon has been a marvelous opportunity for me.

Throughout my career, I always had a lot of ideas. I would go to my department head or the dean and say, "Look I have a great idea about how to do this. Let's do one, two and three." The person would always say, "Hey, that's a real good idea. Neat! O.K.!!" I would go away thinking, "That worked out fine." However, we never got to do it. It wasn't because the persons to whom I presented my ideas were trying to turn me off. It just wasn't one of their priorities. They had six or seven other things ahead of my ideas. We never got to accomplish my proposals. When I became the dean, I set the priorities. Therefore, I had the opportunity to do some of the things that you might not ever have done.

Administration has been exciting to me because, first of all, it is so varied. Every day is different from the last. Secondly, it allows the individual to set
priorities. Thirdly, it’s not unlike working with students except the students are now the faculty and they will be with the dean for more than just four years. A dean also has some liabilities, such as working with a mature staff which doesn’t always agree with her. Consequently, I had to do a convincing job. I couldn’t get too far ahead of them in terms of thinking. Some of them didn’t like me because I was in a power position and in control of their lives. Such power is a scary proposition. It’s not always easy to be an administrator.

Administration also has its negative side. I remember an incident that happened in my office two years ago. I looked up from my desk and a student I had taught at Greensboro was at my door saying, "Hi, Dr. Ulrich. How are you?" I said, "Where did you come from?" She replied, "Oh, we were on a bicycle tour up and down the Oregon coast. I looked at the map and saw that it was only 50 miles over to Eugene so I just pedalled over. I’m going to meet the other riders down at Goose Bay a little bit later on." I thought to myself, "There is not a single faculty member here who would pedal 50 miles to see me!" As I recall, this student hadn’t been that great a student. Whatever I had done made enough difference in her life that she was willing to bike 100 miles to see me. I thought that I would never get the kind of satisfaction from administration that I had gotten from teaching.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: You shared your leadership style on the video. Would you also do so for this tape recorded interview?

DR. ULRICH: I think that all administrators want to believe that they are democratic and that they have an open door policy. Yet regardless of who individual administrators are, many people react to them in terms of their position rather than in terms of who they are. That’s a given.

Administrators are in a powerful position. They have the opportunity to change people’s lives, sometimes in ways that people don’t want them changed.
That endows administrators with great responsibility and an awesomeness with which some people are not comfortable. As a matter of fact, sometimes I am not even comfortable with it myself. For the most part, I believe that administrators must value the intellectual and personal integrity of the people with whom they work. They have to recognize that these people are not underlings; they are colleagues who see things from a slightly different point of view.

I try to surround myself with my "enemies" rather than my friends so I can hear and better understand what they are saying. They may have some points that I neglected. Also, by being with them, I know where they are. My friends will always be there to support me. I have tried to negotiate in ways that at least I hope are fair. I try desperately, as dean, to keep my hands out of faculty hiring and firing except as asked. Departments have control over that. Although it's hard, I try to keep my hands out of the curriculum. I don't think that is my job as dean, though it certainly is as a teacher.

I have to keep in mind that my position changes the tenor of meetings. Therefore, I don't go to some faculty meetings that I would surely go to if I were a faculty member. Just having the dean sitting there changes the meeting. As I shared with you on the videotape, I explained to our new faculty that I see myself somewhat as the admiral of a fleet. All of the components within our college have their own captains and their own ships. Each has the right to run its ship as best it may. Together all the captains and I decide the course that we're taking. It is my job to make sure that the course is taken with expediency and well run. If there are problems aboard any of the ships, it is my responsibility to be able to straighten them out before they scuttle the whole fleet. I wish that the simile didn't have such a military focus, but in general that is what I believe.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: You are known by former students and colleagues as a dynamic, scholarly speaker. Other than your early
elementary experiences and influence that Nash and Williams had on you, how did you happen to get into speaking?

DR. ULRICH: This is the product of what I call "the hockey ball syndrome." When I was a student, I wanted to do important things and to help others. I was very interested in women's field hockey and played a lot of tournament hockey. They always needed someone to paint the hockey balls, which is kind of a messy job. In those days there were no plastic balls so someone had to paint the leather balls before each game. I always volunteered to do it. I always felt that if I volunteered for a job, then I would try to do the best I possibly could. So, I painted hockey balls well.

Someone later said, "Gee whiz, we need somebody to help with the registration and they said that girl who paints hockey balls is available. She's really dependable, so why don't we ask her to take care of registration?" In this way I became a registrar for tournaments. Hopefully I did well so that later on someone would said, "We need a person to take care of the fields and to set up all of the games. Do you remember that person that does the registrar stuff? She's done well on that." Through these steps, I became an administrator, then the assistant director of a hockey tournament. Eventually I was asked to give people instructions about hockey tournaments. When they needed someone to talk about the meaning of field hockey, they said, "Do you remember that assistant director who did a good job in talking to the kids? Maybe we'll ask her." That's what happened. I moved from one opportunity to the next.

I liked talking because of my elementary school experience. I love to play with words and ideas, to build themes and then to have a reasonable amount of positive feedback. I have always liked putting ideas together. A very special outcome, which I hadn't planned on, occurred when I made speeches. It organized my thinking. Speaking made me address a topic in ways that otherwise
I would have been sloppy about. I had only 45 minutes to tell everyone everything that I knew. That turned out to be good. However, it was a disadvantage at times. I remember one particular instance when I had done so much thinking and talking about women's athletics that I knew all of the problems. I could outline them. One day at Greensboro someone remarked on what was going to happen to women's athletics. I said, "Let me tell you . . . ." My statement was all organized. This person glared at me and asked, "Why do you think you know so much?" I said, "Well, it just seems to me this is logical." She said, "You know, nobody else has been able to put it together like that." I thought, "It's no wonder. They haven't been forced to think about it."

I realized then that organized thinking could also be construed as arrogance. I had to be very careful. After a successful speaking tour, I always benefited from going back to Greensboro and having a couple of my colleagues say, "Who do you think you are?" It always brought me down to earth. I like words and I like to put ideas together. I usually hung most of my speeches on a theme or analogy. I tried to use analogies with which I was familiar. I didn't build a boat in analogy because I have never built a boat in reality. I was surprised that people enjoyed my style.

Very early in my career I had been subjected to many prosaic speakers who talked on how to hit the softball harder or something along that line. I thought to myself, "The topic wasn't so bad, but why didn't they give the talk an interesting title like 'Wham Bang'?" I decided people would never know what I was going to talk about; I would make the titles interesting so they wouldn't know what was going to happen. When people started to invite me to speak, they would say, "Would you please come and talk to us?" I would ask, "About what?" They would answer, "Anything you want." At times I thought, "I'll come and talk about calculus. That'll show them!" I never have done that.
DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Was it through your speaking that your visiting professor opportunities came about in the summers?

DR. ULRICH: I'm sure it was, because that was the only way people would know or hear of me. I did a limited amount of writing in the early years and a lot more later in my career. That too helped.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: You've done it all, so to speak, including research. What were your major areas of research? Can you recall any significant findings?

DR. ULRICH: My research mainly was in stress physiology. I primarily concentrated on psychological stress or its effect upon the homeostatic patterns of the human being. The most important contribution I made along that line was to introduce to the profession the fact that stress could be managed. My findings showed that we could start to look at how sport changed people. We could do this "in a scientific way" instead of just making claims about how sports help people. Also, it certainly was a powerful platform to suggest that women were capable of performing at high levels in sport. More and more research was indicating that women were not as weak as they had been characterized to be. For instance, they didn't drop dead during their menstrual periods.

All of those things were rather startling at the time. They are no longer startling in today's world. When I started to do more administration and service within the profession, I had to let some of my research go. I try to keep up with the current thinking and reading about stress, but I haven't done what I consider highly credible research for fifteen years.

ALLYS SWANSON: What were the titles of the summer courses that you taught at various universities?
DR. ULRICH: Many were courses on the philosophy, history, significance and meaning of physical education. I taught usually in the sociological and behavioral bases of physical education. I particularly enjoyed a course that I taught called His, Hers, and Ours, in which we talked about gender discrimination in sport. I taught kinesiology for a long time. That was before kinesiology became biomechanics. In my early days, I also taught physiology of exercise.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: What were the concerns of the profession when you were president of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance from 1976-1977?

DR. ULRICH: We were always concerned about money. We had bought the land in Reston but we hadn’t decided how we were going to build or if we could afford to build. Roger Wiley had initiated what I thought was a rather exciting program to raise some additional money. I felt that it was my obligation to follow his lead. We spent a lot of time just thinking about the fiscal health of the Alliance.

The Alliance had been reorganized at that time. I was concerned that only NASPE had done what it had been instructed to do in terms of reorganization. Everyone else just shored themselves up. I have continuing concerns about the relationship of the associations to the districts, particularly in the governance structure. I think that the Alliance is heavily swayed by district concerns while, from my point of view, the real nitty-gritty work is being done by the associations. There doesn’t seem to be a proper balance of governance between those two groups, or at least one with which I feel comfortable.

I have already discussed the issues of women in sports, which consumed a gigantic amount of time on the part of all of the presidents of that era. Leroy, because of his propensity towards the athletic picture, and I were particularly
concerned to see if we could bring some enlightenment and some organization to that area. During my presidency, AAHPERD was a sleeping giant which had never been awakened. It had more power than we envisioned and we weren't utilizing it, particularly in the athletic circles. Therefore, I called a meeting of the representatives of all the sport groups. They flocked. They came like they were just waiting for this to occur. I thought that AAHPERD had never really assumed the leadership role that it might have. Perhaps that happened by chance or for reasons we have yet to define.

Those were the major issues. I continued to be concerned about and to devise programs for students. It was my responsibility; I worked to establish the research consortium. I believed research should be highlighted. We tried to initiate a program that would give students a chance to meet the leadership. We instituted the Alliance scholar lecture while I was president. I was in favor of bringing to the Alliance a scholarly image rather than maintaining the image that we were just a group of people who made things possible. I hoped also to bring to it a sense of mission concerning the future.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Have there been any disappointments in your career?

DR. ULRICH: I have already talked a little bit about my disappointment with regard to women's sport. It hasn't been a major disappointment because I realize that my hope was not realistic. A person can't be disappointed if she was wrong. The world is not a perfect place. Consequently, some of the things I might have hoped for just didn't work out. There is almost always a good reason why they don't work out, so I don't feel the world turned against me. Given an opportunity to replicate my life professionally, I would do exactly what I have done. I have no regrets at all.
DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Celeste, what do you believe that you have given students and colleagues over the years? In other words, how would you like to be remembered by them?

DR. ULRICH: If I could choose just one word, I'd like people to say that I was fair, that they honestly believe that I tried to listen to different points of view and that I tried to act objectively. I would like them to realize that obviously I favored some things and not others, but I tried to minimize that bias rather than elevate it. When I was a young woman I thought that it would be nice to be thought of as a great guru of intellect and to be surrounded by a bunch of adoring graduate students who looked up to me wide-eyed and wondrous saying, "Tell us, Oh Master, the truth!" My perception of that has changed! I think I am lucky if people will think of me more positively than negatively.

There have been some disappointments within administration. One general disappointment comes from supporting people who then won't reciprocate that support. It always hurts. At times I wasn't able to read people very well; they turned out not to be the people I had hoped they might be. I am always hurt to see people misuse the truth, the ethics, and the morality of a situation. Once again, that is life itself, and I don't feel responsible for it.

The overriding delight in my career has always been the students. However, I have been just as close to my colleagues as I have been to students. I have had opportunities to meet with our leaders and to be a part of our leadership. I also have belonged to a peer group of caring people who were willing to serve and who did not put themselves first. One of my concerns for the future is that I see a large number of people who believe that they are the center of their own universe. I don't believe that I am the center of my universe, and I don't believe...
you should be the center of your universe! I would change that egocentric thinking if I knew how.

Right now there are young assistant professors who come and make demands that are far in excess of anything reasonable. They don’t care too much about the institution or the profession; they care more about what it is going to do to them. I don’t mind that happening, but the individual should be number three instead of number one.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Briefly indicate the sports or activities in which you participated during high school, college, the years that you taught, and on into administration.

DR. ULRICH: Primarily I worked with team sports for women in my scholastic days: field hockey, basketball, and volleyball. I always played tennis. I learned badminton in high school and went on to be an above average player. There were no interscholastic sports in college, but I always participated in the sports I mentioned. In addition, I took up a few other recreational activities, such as bowling. I have always enjoyed being outdoors, so I’ve done a lot of camping and hiking. I still do a lot of outdoor activities, but I don’t participate in any sports.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: What will you continue into retirement?

DR. ULRICH: I don’t know. I haven’t put that question to myself. I’m sure my activities will be partially conditioned by the availability of companions. I will continue to camp. I don’t think I’ll pick up golf, tennis, or badminton.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Do you do anything special in the way of nutrition and/or stress management?

DR. ULRICH: It’s awfully hard to keep myself attuned to nutrition when I’m in the middle of doing all of these things. I’ve always
had a tendency towards gaining weight. I have to watch myself very, very carefully. Consequently, it gets away from me very easily.

Having been a scholar of stress, I think stress is good as long as a person can handle it. I do not try to avoid stress. I just try to make sure I can handle whatever stress I have. If stress becomes so great that I can’t handle it, I very fortunately have a mechanism that alerts me to this fact. My eye starts to twitch, and that says to me, "Cut it out, and do something else!" I then, deliberately, avert my activity from whatever it is that’s the potential stressor to something that isn’t a stressor. I don’t necessarily "go play"; I might work or do something else. I learned a long time ago that the Cannon Theory of Fight or Flight has two sides to it. One is fight, which is the one we venerate. The other is flight, which we think is not too good. However, I believe flight is good. There are certain times when to flee from a situation is the best thing that one can possibly do. In such cases, I flee from the situation in the most socially acceptable way I can.

As long as I can keep stress in balance, I am all right. I can also tell that I am under a great deal of stress when I become irritable in my behavioral patterns. When people say to me, "My goodness, I never expected to hear you say that," I realize that things have become too much.

As I get older I find that my capacity to handle stress is not as great as it used to be. I used to laugh when people would say, "I can’t do this because I’m getting old." Yet there have been certain changes in my life that I can’t believe. Knee surgery made it impossible for me to do some of the exercise that I once considered a common cause. In addition, I’ve found that when I get home in the evening, I’m often too tired to do the things I had planned to do. I’m not tired enough to go to sleep, but I’m too tired to expend the psychic energy that I need. Although I hope to be able to keep stress in balance, I expect to make some mistakes.
DR. VAN OTEGHEN: What advice might you give to a young person who aspires to a teaching or research career in physical education?

DR. ULRICH: My first advice is to do it. I think there is every reason in the world for a person to believe that she or he can be successful. I think it's a great field with tremendous potential. It may change in terms of the format as we now know it, but the basic elements always will be correct. From my point of view, the movement of human beings is as important as the intellectual activities of human beings. That is our major responsibility.

My second piece of advice is that people going into the field should try to get positions in which they can serve the profession, their beliefs, other people and then ultimately themselves.

ALLYS SWANSON: What do you see as future trends for the profession? Do you see any particular pitfalls or opportunities?

DR. ULRICH: This is a gigantic subject. I can speculate but, as a colleague, you have to recognize that my speculation is based upon intuitive feelings that are not necessarily factual. I think the profession, in higher education, is a point of crisis. A lot depends on what we do. Our emphasis on specialization has hurt as much as it has helped. Some individuals no longer see themselves as physical educators. They see themselves as exercise physiologists, sports psychiatrists and so on. That specialization has added a great deal of richness to certain areas of our field. However, much like the case of the general practitioner in medicine, this specialization has made us forget the totality. That worries me.

I also see that some universities and colleges are seeking consolidation because of the economic conditions in higher education. Physical education is an applied, soft field, so it is always low on the totem pole. Therefore, we are always
susceptible to mergers and grabs, even to dissolution. I worry because we're working with a generation of people who see the world through different eyes than my generation did. Theirs are not worse eyes or better eyes; they are just different. Those eyes suggest, "As long as I can do my thing I don’t care what really happens to the field as a whole." And I do care! Obviously, I am past the point where I am going to influence this attitude. All I can do is care. I worry about what is going to happen as far as our field is concerned and whether or not we will be able to promulgate the kinds of things in which we will always believe.

I am concerned in general about the whole athletic picture. I see its impact upon the scholastic picture, not just at the collegiate level but upon children as well. That worries me a great deal. I find it confusing and a bit frightening. I think that unless there is a return to some generalist concepts, we're going to spell our own doom. I'm concerned about the relationship of researchers and institutions of higher education. The theoretician is rewarded and the practitioner is not rewarded. This system is wrong and unfair. I have ideas on how to correct that, but it would mean that the whole professoriate would have to do as I say. I feel very uncomfortable with what has happened in higher education. In addition, teaching doesn’t have the same kind of priority in the public schools that it once had. I don’t like the fact that we have demeaned teaching.

I have great faith in our leadership. When I look at the scene, I see young people in their forties who I call "commers." They seem to have their heads screwed on well. I don’t think they would make the same decisions that I would make, but I trust them. I believe that their decisions will be sound and good. So, I am not discouraged. I don’t think it’s all going to evaporate. However, I do believe we will have a different framework of organization.
DR. VAN OTEGHEN: What is your philosophy concerning continuing to be active in the profession upon retirement versus not continuing to be active with respect to holding office, serving on committees and the like?

DR. ULRICH: I would never even consider holding an office when I am retired. I had my turn. I think it's somebody else's turn. I will continue to do whatever I am asked to do in terms of work. If they need someone to speak and I can do it, I'll speak. If they need someone to gather material, I'll do it. If they need someone to act as an advisor, I will. However, the office holding belongs to those who are coming along and should not be hampered by me.

I see myself still as a contributing member to the profession. I am an elder citizen who has to remember that the golden days weren't all that golden.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: You were president of the Alliance from 1976-77, received the Gulick Award in 1983, received a North Carolina AAHPERD and Southern District AHPERD Honor Award, and the research award for Delta Psi Kappa National Fraternity. These must have been special times and moments in your life. Of what significance were these or other awards to you?

DR. ULRICH: I reveled in the Alliance presidency. I had some problems, but it was all a part of the challenge that I enjoy so much. I didn't work for the honor awards and the Delta Psi Kappa award. They just happened. After I received them I thought, "That's nice that everybody had thought I did a good job." I felt good about those awards. The Gulick Award was different. It made me a part of a long string of human beings who had received that award. I felt truly humble because I don't consider myself anywhere near the ilk of the previous Gulick Award winners. I thought, "How
could that have happened?" To the best of my knowledge I certainly didn't politic
for the award. I felt that I had a tremendous obligation to Dr. Gulick and to all of
the people I had known, including Delbert Oberteuffer and others like him. I
thought, "My heavenly days, how could I ever possibly approach the stature of
those individuals?" I thought then, as I still do, that all I can do is to continue to
live a life that emulates their beliefs.

Concerning any award that I've received, I've always thought, "Wasn't that
interesting?" I view what I have done as what I would have done in any
circumstance. It's nice that people recognize my work, but, except for the Gulick
Award, the recognition doesn't mean that much to me.

ALLYYS SWANSON: You mentioned your work with Dr. Delbert Oberteuffer.

DR. ULRICH: I first met "Obie," as we called him, at the Portland
conference of AAHPER. I was a very young and poor
assistant professor at Madison College, and I didn't have enough money to go to
the conference. Although I had been carefully schooled in the idea that I should
go to conventions no matter what, I didn't see how I was going to make it to
Portland. Financially I just couldn't afford it. I had sort of given up on the idea
when Edwina Jones called my department head, Caroline Sinclair, and said, "I'm
looking for a woman who knows something about physiology. We have already
invited a male psychologist to talk for our program. I think that it is essential that
we have a woman who is in physiology. I don't know any women in physiology, do
you?" Miss Sinclair said, "Oh, there is a young woman on our staff who knows
about that and she's had some speaking experience." Edwina Jones agreed to
have me come and speak. It was late and I'm sure I was sort of a shot in the dark for her. I didn't know her at all.

After that phone call, Miss Sinclair said to me, "Celeste, I want you to go to Portland, and I want you to do a good job. I want you to talk about what you have learned with regard to stress and what has happened in terms of physiology of exercise." I could do that, and I felt good about it. However, I still didn't have enough money to get to Portland. Out of her own pocket, Miss Sinclair loaned me a hundred dollars and I was able to scrape together the rest to get to Portland.

It rained for the duration of the conference. The convention center was out of town and we were staying in town. The situation was a mess. Then, to top things off, Miss Jones said to me, "Guess what? Oregon state Senator Neuberger has decided that he wants to talk to our profession. The only time he can talk is during our session. You're going to have to cut your speech short." The psychologist was from outside so she couldn't ask him. I was 33 years old so I did as I was told.

When we arrived to hear Senator Neuberger speak, we were all drenched. The rain was coming down in torrents. There we sat, an audience of two or three thousand people, to hear Senator Neuberger talk about the health of our nation. They told him that under no circumstances could he have more than ten minutes, and he honored that. That ten minutes gave everyone a chance to dry off. No one listened much to Senator Neuberger's talk. He was boring! We were able to shed our wet clothes, and set our umbrellas to drain. Now the audience was ready to listen.

They decided to let me speak first because I was the female. I launched into my diatribe about what was going on. It went well. Then the psychologist did something that used to be very common among speakers from the outside. They would come unprepared, thinking that anyone could talk to an association of
"dumb jocks." The psychologist didn’t have any notes, and he was terrible. He was so awful that I looked like a shining light in comparison! With Senator Neuberger on one side of me and this jerk on the other, I rightfully appeared well prepared and excited with the new ideas I was generating.

Oberteuffer came up to me at that time. Of course I knew who he was. He said, "I’m about ready to revise my textbook on principles. I know nothing about physiology. I think it would be very useful to have a woman who understands physiology to work on this edition. Would you be interested?" Now I can hardly believe my arrogance. I said, "I’ll think about it."

After the conference, I went home and talked with Miss Sinclair. I said, "Do I really want to do this?" She said, "I think it would be a marvelous experience." As the senior author, Obie decided very wisely that I should go to Columbus, Ohio for four weekends. He and I would spend those weekends talking: to find out what we believed and what we didn’t believe. Mary Beyrer, who had been a colleague of mine, was then at Ohio State in Columbus. I called her and said, "Hey Mary, I’m going to come and visit you. You don’t have to do very much with me because Obie’s going to pick me up Saturday morning, deliver me on Saturday night, pick me up on Sunday, and then I’ll leave.

My experience during those weekends was like taking a class with Obie all by myself. Kathryn Oberteuffer, Obie’s wife, was very gracious. While we talked in Obie’s little den, she would bring us sandwiches and Cokes. We literally talked for two days during those four weekends. We went through every subject imaginable. It was wonderful, and I found that I was very much in "cahoots" with his thinking.

The only thing we really disagreed about was the way in which to handle disobedient children. I had grown up in a home where there was discipline. My father always felt strongly about his desk; it was his, and children didn’t play with
it. If my young nephews picked up granddad’s pencil, I’d say, "No, you can’t have that." They would ask, "Why not?" I’d reply, "Because it’s your grandfather’s desk, and he doesn’t want you to have anything to do with it." If they continued, they got their hands slapped. That was that. They learned not to put their grubby little hands on their grandfather’s pencils. The boys seemed to be rather well-adjusted and didn’t seem to hate me in the process. I thought it was good for them to know what they could and couldn’t do.

Obie believed that it was my job to sit down and explain to the boys that grandfather was very particular about things. How would they feel if grandfather moved in on their quarters. I said, "These kids are five and six years old. They deserve to have their hands banged!" Obie kept saying, "No, no, no you must explain it." I finally decided that since he was the senior author I wouldn’t argue the point about discipline.

After our initial discussions, all the writing that we did was joint. It was fascinating. We agreed that I would write on one subject and he would write on another. Then we would send it to each other. I worked particularly hard on one chapter and thought it was extraordinarily good. I sent it to Obie and he returned it to me edited in ways that I didn’t believe possible. I remember one paragraph that I had thought was an absolute gem. He replaced the entire paragraph with one sentence. I thought, "By god, if you do that to mine, I’m going to do that to yours!" We were ruthless in our editing. As a result, I have no idea what I wrote and what he wrote. It was both of ours. I think that it turned out to be a marvelous experience for both of us.

Obie was extremely gallant. At conventions, he would take various colleagues to dinner. The host would walk backwards showing Obie and his guests to the table. I always felt, "Oh my heavens, I have never had that kind of gallant treatment." He was a kind man and a stupendous orator. I saw Obie in
some dramatic situations, and I really just love the guy. And although he was kind, he was also tough. He didn’t let people get away with very much and would argue masterfully about ideas.

On one occasion, I had the opportunity to introduce him. I used some sort of a dog analogy. I talked about his bulldog tenacity, his terrier yapping and his fidelity. He thought that my analogy was the greatest thing that anyone had ever done for him. He requested a copy of it, framed it, and hung it on his wall. He was a real delight, but he was not an easy man. I was fortunate to have worked with him toward the end of his career when he was sweet. We respected one another a great deal. That was one more of my lucky experiences.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: You’ll be retiring in June of 1990. Have you made any special plans for retirement, financial or otherwise? Is there anything you might recommend to others as they prepare for retirement?

DR. ULRICH: When I was about 45, I realized that I was going to remain single and be ultimately responsible for my own life. I then started to make some financial plans. I won’t be able to live “high on the hog,” but I’m certainly not going to have to worry. My advice is to start to plan as soon as you can afford to. When you’re 30 you don’t think you’re ever going to be 50; then at 50 you’re not sure you’re ever going to retire. Then all of a sudden it’s time.

I’m not worried about retirement. I might have to adopt a different lifestyle and I might not be able to do what I’ve been able to do. I’ve lived through severe austerity so what is ahead doesn’t seem too severe at all.

I have personal plans that I hope to materialize. I’ve always felt very guilty that I’ve never been able to make a contribution to the community in which I’ve lived. My life has been so filled with my professional work that I’ve had very little time for volunteer work. I’ve been on the Girl Scouts board of directors, but I
really want to do some volunteer work. I have special talents that an organization may be able to use. I would like to be able to set up a position whereby I might work two days a week at a reasonable hour. At the same time, I would want to know that my volunteer job wouldn’t fall apart if I chose to take a trip.

In addition to that, our institution has a plan called 600 hours. For the next five years I can teach the equivalent of one quarter. I don’t think it’s a good idea to have the former dean in the college where the new dean is trying to take her place. Therefore, I am trying to negotiate with the dean of the College of Education to become a part of his college. If the provost agrees to that, then I’ll probably conduct inservice work with his staff, in terms of the enrichment of their careers, promotion, and tenure. I will probably teach a course on the physical development of aging in the department of gerontology.

I am also planning to give a series of seminars on what I consider important subjects adjacent to education. One such subject obviously is athletics. I am also interested in the medieval model of the university. I have another in mind, called Tomboys, Hoydens, Patsies, and Pansies, in which I want to look at the effects of athletics on gender roles and on girls and boys. Women in administration is another topic I’d like to explore. So far I have gotten through to the dean of education. He is excited by the proposal and thinks it would be a marvelous opportunity. Now all I have to do is convince the provost.

I’ve always traveled and will continue to travel during my retirement. Dr. Gail Hennis and I plan to visit New Zealand next year. We travel together almost every summer. As long as my health stays good, I intend to keep that up.

DR. VAN OTEGHEN: Would you like to share any aspects of your personal or professional life that you haven’t had an opportunity to talk about today?
DR. ULRICH: I could tell you dozens of stories about people. As I told you earlier, I am worried that no one is going to know these stories when I'm not around. To select one is really tough, but I do remember a particular incident when Ruth Abernathy was president of the Alliance, or the Association as it was called at that time. She wanted to convince what was then the National Section of Women’s Athletics (NSWA) to become a division. Mabel Locke was the chair of that section, and she was absolutely against us becoming a division. Mabel was a very self-sufficient woman, and she thought we were doing very well on our own.

Ruth said, "I'd like to come and talk to the board." By this time Mabel Locke had convinced us that becoming a division was unnecessary. Ruth Abernathy arrived at the board meeting looking like a million dollars. She, too, had been in the middle of athletics. She had refereed, umpired, coached and played. She shared a few little stories with us to put us at ease, to be one of us. Then we exchanged some girl talk about her experiences as president.

Here was a woman, one of us, who had become president of the Alliance. She told us that when she came to Chicago, she was taken up to the Hilton’s presidential suite, where she was to stay. To her horror, there were all nude women on the walls. She just knew that she could not entertain and be comfortable in the midst of these languid females leaning against Greek pillars. She said that she did not feel comfortable in that suite, and that she wanted another suite. The only other suite available was the deluxe honeymoon suite. She walked into the honeymoon suite only to find naked cherubs on the walls. She thought she could tolerate naked cherubs better than languid naked women. She agreed to accept the suite. Then, with her eyes twinkling, Ruth said, "All went well until after my first night there. The maid came in the next morning to straighten up the suite, looked at me and asked, 'Where is Mr. Abernathy?'"
By this time we were mesmerized. She has shared with us the intimacies and the difficulties she had finding a hat to go with this suit, and other similar concerns. Then she stopped rather dramatically and she said, "Ladies, you know why I’m here. I’m here to convince you that you should become a division. I know that Mabel believes that it’s not necessary, and it really probably isn’t necessary. I think you’ll do the same job whether you are a division or a section. But I think it’s important to the Association that you become a division so that women’s place becomes more assured. Then she uttered the magic word that everyone in my generation would do anything for. She said, "I’m asking you to serve." We said, "Oh, of course, we didn’t realize that." At that Mabel Locke jumped to her feet and proclaimed, "I propose we become a division immediately!" All of said, "Oh yes, yes, yes!" Ruth smiled benignly and said, "Thank you very much. I knew you would understand," and walked out.

Afterwards I thought to myself, "What a masterful play." I knew Ruth well after that, so one day I asked her, "Did you do that on purpose?" She said, "Celeste, how would you dare even think that!" And I said, "You did, you did. I know you did!" She simply responded, "You can think what you please." Now I’m sure she did it on purpose. She was a marvelous reader of the psyche of an organization. In many ways she pushed that kind of concept.

I remember so many things about some of our leadership. I remember when Cat Allen was president in Dallas and the cowboy hats. I remember Laura Mae Brown and some of the problems that occurred with her. I remember that horrendous representative assembly with Anita that went until 4:00 a.m. We were talking about reorganization. Anita was overly organized and very scared of that particular meeting. It turned out to be a disaster because there were a lot of people that wanted to ruin it. Anita wasn’t nasty enough to tell them to sit down and shut up. Those kinds of things stick in my memory.
I haven’t had a chance to talk about my treasured relationship with LeRoy Walker. I love him to death. He’s been a marvelous companion in terms of our professional lives. On one occasion, when LeRoy and I both held leadership positions in the Southern District, we attended a program in Atlanta. We sat together at the speakers’ table. The program was black and white boys and girls dancing, singing, and performing together. In my most philosophical mood, I leaned over to LeRoy, patted his arm and said, "You know LeRoy, who ever would have thought that you, a black man, and I, a white woman, could be sitting here together in Atlanta, sharing a meal and watching our black and white students dance together?" LeRoy looked at me and said, "Yea, it really is a wonder. To tell you the truth, I never thought whites had that much rhythm!"

I’ve known LeRoy for years. We’ve suffered through a lot of things together, including segregation policies that once made it almost improper for me to talk to him, let alone eat with him or touch him. I knew his wife, too, a lovely lady who was very kind to me.

Another dear friend is Ross Merrick. Although he is a controversial figure, he was most supportive when I was president of NASPE. It was called the Physical Education Division at that time. Ross convinced me to run for office. I probably wouldn’t have done so if he hadn’t encouraged me. In addition to that, he was always amenable to ideas and ready to pick up on them. He’s a real workaholic and, from my point of view, a dedicated professional. He has given his life to the Alliance. I like his wife, Gladys, very, very much. She has also given a great deal to the Alliance.

I haven’t yet talked about George Anderson. I once told him to his face that I considered him plain vanilla and that I always do better with tutti-fruitti. I later realized that George had never let himself go. When Tyke, LeRoy, Roger and I were on the executive committee, we were in the middle of horrible
financial problems, debates about women’s athletics and issues of that sort. Yet at times, we would absolutely giggle and have a marvelous time. George’s staff would come in and say that they had never heard George Anderson laugh like that before. Nevertheless, things were so glorious and so much fun that none of us really thought of that as a bad thing. George later said to me, "You know, I never have enjoyed a group of people more than the four of us that have met together over this time. I think our good times came out of knowing that there were problems, but also believing that people had worse."

George and I worked together in many ways, some that weren’t as serious as others. Roger used to come to our meetings with his little notebook because he was taking notes for his history class. George and I had been with the Alliance in differing roles for so long that we had seen the issues and events from many perspectives. At our meetings we would focus on an incident. George would say what happened and I would say what happened. We didn’t always tell the same story, but they were both truthful stories that we were able to put together. Meanwhile, there was Roger taking notes like mad so that he could know, for instance, the real story of Laura Mae Brown’s presidency.

Though we will never do this now, George and I once said we should write a history book together because we would be able to present it from such different points of view. George turned out not to be plain vanilla or tutti fruitti at all. He liked me and I really liked him. I appreciated the kind of support that the national staff, from the secretaries on through, gave me when I was president. They’re wonderful people. When we moved to Reston, I felt as though I had some part in it. Although I was not instrumental in the move, I did convince them to hire Gene Logan to create the statue in front of the new office. They raised the money to help do that. I feel very good about all of these things. I wouldn’t trade my experiences in life for anything.
ALLYS SWANSON: Celeste, I want to say that it has been our personal pleasure to interview you today and to get to know more about your insights and your experiences. Your personal lifelong dedication to high standards of scholarship, honesty and fairness have made a long-standing significant contribution, not only to the profession but to the people it serves. It’s difficult to put a timetable on this because these contributions will unfold as we go through our future history. We are both impressed by your insight, your honesty, your ability to see the big picture and by the courage you have to speak your convictions. Your leadership talents have been outstanding throughout your career.

Now that you are completing ten years of a deanship at the University of Oregon, we would like to wish you future success. Thank you very much for this interview.

DR. ULRICH: Thank you. You’ve been much too generous in your accolades. I appreciate it very much. It’s been fun.