

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

INTERVIEW

OF

ROSE CLAFFEY

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

August 10, 1986 April 10, 1987

A STENOGRAPHIC RECORD James P. Connor By: Notary Public Stenographic Reporter



JOHN E. CONNOR & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1860 ONE AMERICAN SQUARE INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46282 (317) 236-6022



TAPE 1

MS. RENE EPSTEIN: The following interview with Rose Claffey is taking place on August 10th, 1986 in Salem, Massachusetts. This interview is part of an oral history project contracted by the American Federation of Teachers.

MS. ROSE CLAFFEY: My name is Rose

Claffey. I was born in Salem, Massachusetts on

September 5th, 1917. I'm the oldest of five

children in a family where mother remained at home

always and my father was a railroad conductor,

trainman and conductor. I live in the home we've

lived in all our life, is over 200 years old and

embraces much of the historical values of the city.

The composition of the city was largely cosmopolitan with all types and phases of people and life existing in the community. Many of the people were leather workers, the leather industry flourishing in the nearby cities of Peabody and Lynn and in Salem at that time, and large portion of the population were associated with the Peabody Mills which later went south to avoid unionization.

No ethnic group predominated. There were all

strains of people living within the city and, therefore, I think at an early age we learned to accept all kinds of people and to live with them comfortably in the setting in which we were raised. And that carried over into the world of unionism and teaching, and has been one of the saving features of our associations with people.

I attended Salem schools and graduated from Salem High School in 1934, and then went to the state college at Salem where I received my degree in 1938. At that time teaching jobs were very, very scarce. And the exam system predominated whereby one must attain a high mark on the exam and have two complete full years of experience before being allowed to teach in the Salem schools.

I was fortunate that I received my permanent appointment in 1940 and had substituted in the Salem schools in the interim period and finally embarked on my teaching career in the forties. My first appointment was as an elementary teacher in the A. L. Low (phonetic) School, and later I continued as an elementary teacher in the Pickering School of Salem, the A. L. Low having been outmoded

and come to its end.

The type of experience I had as a Salem teacher is probably the basis of my whole teaching career. As a young teacher I was elected to a committee composed of three leading citizens, a superintendent and a representative of each level of the school system, and together we explored every facet of education. From this experience and trying to prove my worth as a young teacher among a group of older colleagues, I learned a great deal about the educational situation of the past and present of those years.

From that experience we learned to be concerned about issues that were dividing teachers and to be concerned with how we could bring them together. One of the big problems facing us at that time was the issue of degreed versus non-degreed teachers, much the same as we have in nursing today.

The other major issue facing us at that time was the kind of salary schedule that existed in education. High school men were paid more than high school women, junior high men were paid more

than junior high women but less than senior high people, and elementaries were paid less than junior high women. There were no men in the elementary schools at that time, and thus the salary schedule seemed to be predicated on that of a single woman living at home.

This, needless to say, caused much division of the ranks, and therefore, there was little or no unity in teacher ranks, nothing to bring the group together. And that seemed to be the basic problem among faculties at that time. The experience acquired in this situation provide realization that some day, not only a Bachelor's degree would be essential, but that a Master's degree would be a necessity in the future. With that in mind I proceeded to go to work to attain a Master's degree.

At the same time in the nearby city of Lynn, equal pay for equal work had gone on the ballot, the first city in the Commonwealth to undertake this venture as a result of recent legislation.

However, it passed overwhelmingly much to the surprise of the Lynn Teachers Association, the

ranking organization in the city at that time. And they were not prepared for single salary, and thus, came to a contact they had on our committee in Salem to adopt our single salary schedule as theirs, and it went into vogue in the city of Lynn shortly thereafter.

The big problem, however, was that in building a salary schedule, they had raised salaries of all people to the then salary of a high school man, which meant that a high school man received no increase in pay as a result of this great legislation. This disenchanted high school men generally, and they migrated toward the School Men's Association, an organization which was popular nationwide at that time. After being with them a few years, however, they realized this organization could not suit their needs, and they finally decided they would explore the American Federation of Teachers.

In those days in Salem I had been a member of the only existing teacher organization in the city, the Salem Teacher Association, had been a very active member of the association and ultimately

became the vice president. My reason for active participation in the organization was, as I indicated earlier, to bring unity to the group and to rectify the horrible salary situation and the division that existed within the ranks.

Participation in the association in those days was somewhat different than any participation we've known in the organization in recent years. At that time all teachers in the building strove to have a hundred percent participation in the existing teacher organization, with little or no realization what the organization was all about or what it was attempting or not attempting to do on behalf of teachers.

In 1946 the single salary schedule went into vogue in the city of Lynn, and at that time large numbers of teachers in the area decided to go to Lynn for an increase of a minimum of a thousand dollars, in my case an increase of \$1400 which about doubled my pay because I had started at a thousand and had received pittance increments not on an annual basis to the extent of 1400.

When I went to Lynn, we only had a teacher

association available to us, thus I with the others joined the association, but we were not acceptable to the association, and we found it to be more of a tea and crumpet situation that we had known previously in our respective communities. The threat of the experience that many of us had had in our respective communities bothered the leadership of the association. The leadership of the association were afraid that we were coming to take over what they thought were their posts of high esteem, because we all had had experience in our respective communities, and the results of our experience were well known to the teachers in Lynn.

However, at that time the unrest in the city were such that the men were pulling out of the situation, and they applied to the AFT for a charter, and the AFT advised them that they should have men and women within the group. The men were predominantly high school men and were not interested in having an avalanche of non-degreed elementary women join their ranks, and so they were being highly selective as to the people that they sought to join their union.

I was badgered for a few weeks by evening calls from members of the group asking me to join the union, and each time was somewhat evasive. And on one occasion my father asked me would I please advise him as to what this conversation was that I was conducting nightly and giving the same reply to the people, it didn't make sense to him. And I told him that a union was being formed and they were seeking my participation.

My early reaction to the request to join the union was a complete lack of understanding of what a union was all about and as to what impact a union could make on education. My only understanding of unionism was that the leather workers were organized and in Lynn the General Electric was organized, but in terms of education, I had no understanding of a union as it related to education.

My father on that meaningful occasion sat me down and I was soundly redressed for the first time and told that I wouldn't have been educated, I wouldn't have had the benefits I had had, had he not been a charter member of a union. He painted

colorful pictures of what it was like to be a working man prior to unions and the differences that he had witnessed as a member of a union. As a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Workers, he had seen a complete change in his working conditions whereby, prior to unionism, he had what we would call a split shift working a couple of hours early morning, a couple of hours mid-morning, a couple of hours in the afternoon, and a couple of hours early evening.

had standard shifts and working, defined working day that was within normal conditions. So, as a result of my lecture by my father, I went to the library the next day and got an armful of books on the history of education, the history of unionism and read them as carefully as I could, and immediately went back and not only signed the union application, but told my colleagues that I thought they were the poorest organizers on earth because none of them knew how to sell their product.

The Lynn local was chartered in April of 1949, but in the early months it was kept strictly

to a closed group and it wasn't opened up until

December for membership to the rank and file. And

so, late in December I signed my card for the first

time and commenced to be an active union of the

local.

I was fortunate to be associated with a group of people who had very clearly defined priorities in terms of what education could do for union and what the union could do for education. And particularly in the city of Lynn where GE dominated the economy and where the international union, IUE local was an integral part of the community, we had the support of that group in attaining our goals while at the same time we were extending a better education to their children.

We found that in the early days that we were handicapped in the city by a prorata law which placed a ceiling on educational expenses whereby the mayor, with the support of one other person on the school committee, could successfully deny any increases in payment to teachers.

Thus, the repeal of prorata was the number one priority in the city of Lynn for teachers, and

to achieve our goal we realized that this would be both beneficial to us and to the citizenry of Lynn, and we were able to sell this to the organized labor groups in the community who worked diligently with us to this end.

Our early experience was such that we were able to get members of organized labor to come to our union meetings monthly each month from different unions, to explain what the benefits had been to them as union members, and what they saw would be the benefits of unionism to teachers and to the public generally. The application of trade union principles to education was viewed by many as thoroughly incompatible.

However, if one had looked back at the history of labor and the history of education, one would see that the organized labor movement had always been able to accommodate the times in which it was operating. And now it was time for the organized labor movement to move forth into a new field, a field to professionalism and the working people in these unions understood that better than we did as teachers at that time.

I found this a gratifying experience that all of us could work together effectively, and delved into the union head-over-heels. I think I was most stricken by a presentation made by union men to our school committee when a member from the Brewery Workers Union hit the table and said, "this is an insult, our beer drivers, people driving beer trucks make a lot more money than teachers do," and as a result we received an immediate increase.

Now, to be sure, we were not going to use these people, but these early revelations were bases on which we could unite people and we could proceed to do more sophisticated kinds of things.

The experienced union leaders from the other unions were able to portray to us in very graphic fashion what their evolution of experience had been from the situation we were in at that time to where they were as a highly organized group at the time.

In the midst of all this we had a strike at the General Electric, and this probably was the most stimulating union meeting we had in the early days, because it brought forth the lack of understanding of us as professional people who were

teaching the children of the strikers, and yet we had no understanding of what these people were up against. To have these people come down and tell us how many strikes they participated in, what it meant to them, what it meant to the families, how much money they were taking home, and for us to contribute to them and to bring them coffee and to help them was the beginning of an experience which in later years was going to be very meaningful to us. We had -- I had never seen a strike before. I did not understand what it meant to be -- to have a strike hit the wage earner in a family, and I did not understand the full implications of the strike situation until that time.

Despite this experience, the fact was that our constitution had a no-strike clause in it at that time. The constitution of the Lynn Teachers Union had a no-strike clause in it at that time. This enabled many people who did not want a strike, who did not believe in a strike, to still join the union, but those of us who knew that the strike was the end in the union process, knew that we still could strike despite what it said in the

constitution at that time because of the membership voted to override what was in their -- would be accomplished and that's what was happening and did happen at a later date.

At that time it didn't seem too important, because we were novices, the situation was brand new and would be many years before we had to face this kind of situation and appropriate adjustments could be made at that time. And a few years later we were able to remove the no-strike clause from the constitution and give us the freedom to let the membership make that decision when the occasion arose, and that is precisely what happened. Some eight years ago, I believe, it happened, I'm not sure of the exact year.

I was elected on June 7th, 1950 as recording secretary of the organization. The following year was vice president, and ultimately became president in June, 1953 and was re-elected in '54 and '55 as president of the Lynn Teachers Union. The major event during my term of office was the repeal of the prorata law. This had been my first experience with a referendum, the referendum being essential

because it had been enacted through that route, and therefore, could only be eliminated by that route.

During my concluding years of service as president, we were able to see the effect that prorata repeal had had on the salary schedule, many significant changes being made for the first time, thus giving the teachers some hope that teachers working together with uniform schedules would result in an effective and profitable future.

In the early and mid-fifties, Miss Sally
Parker was an AFT representative assigned to the
New England area. From Sally I received the best
schooling and background in unionism and collective
bargaining that anyone could receive from another
human. Sally is probably one of the brightest
people we ever had in the AFT, and under her
tutelage we wrote resolutions on collective
bargaining for submission to the Massachusetts
State Labor Council convention and the AFT
convention and the Massachusetts legislation as
early as 1956.

The concept of collective bargaining had tremendous appeal to me at that time because I

could see that eventually we were going to come to that, the same as all of the unions had come to it, and that we should prepare ourselves with as much information as possible to be ready for the events that were ahead of us. However, the teachers in this area were so new to the concept of unionism, that to now add the concept of collective bargaining was almost an impossibility. At that time most of the new locals hadn't had any experience with strikes, hadn't had any knowledge of the labor movement as it related to education, and now to add a new concept would have been overpowering at this time.

Sally Parker was a person with an unusual background, a background attained from a father who had tremendous journalistic talent and a mother who had been an early organizer for the AFL and later for the united AFL-CIO. Sally was a very incisive type of person, able to cut through all the details in order to write effective legislation and resolutions and to interpret this meaningful concept of collective bargaining to people who had had no experience in this field. Prior to this

time my only contact with the American Federation of Teachers had been as a delegate to the convention in the years '51 through '55.

My early experiences at the convention were very meaningful ones to me. The caucus structure was a new concept to me, and to go to the convention floor and to see the caucuses divided evenly on both sides of the floor with floor leaders Mary McGoff and John Fukes and the speakers for the respective caucuses was something I had never witnessed before.

evenly divided with the majority of our membership at that time being within about a 50 mile radius of the city of Chicago where our headquarters were during those early years. John Fukes was the spokesman for the caucus of the Midwest, and John was a powerful figure with a booming voice, and yet with the most deferential manner when it came to trying to mediate any disputes that would arise.

Mary McGoff was a spirited fighter who came from St. Paul, Minnesota and she was the leader of the Progressive Caucus. And when Mary and John

agreed on anything, you knew it had to be the gospel truth.

The ideologies of the caucus at that time were not clearly defined and it seemed our greatest area of differences to whether or not the national office should be located in Washington or should continue to remain in the Midwest. It always appeared to me that the difference was Midwest versus the rest of the organization.

The early debates at the conventions in the early fifties were largely concerned with the McCarthy hearings and the communist activity throughout the country. I am sorry to say at this time that at that time it didn't mean too much to me because I had not had any experiences of that kind in my immediate environs at home and I listened wide-eyed to all the stories that were being discussed on the convention floor.

On the contrary, many of the people at the convention had had deep and trying experiences within the framework of their locals with the communist element, and therefore, they came full of vim and vigor to fight the cause as they understood

it.

I hate to say again that my early experiences were very limited, so much so and so lacking in understanding were the people of my area about the situation, that when I had Arthur Schlessinger as a banquet speaker in 1955, people thought that I had joined the ranks of the communist party. That's the kind of provincialism we were encountering in many of the smaller communities at that time which is not understandable to those people in the larger cities of the nation.

Whereas my early perceptions of the American Federation of Teachers was that it was a powerful nationwide organization that could achieve most anything on behalf of teachers. I realize in retrospect that the AFT at that time was as much a novice in the organization of teachers and the problems attended to teachers as I was myself. Everything in those years was done on a personal basis. The organization was small enough to conduct everything on a personal basis, and loyalties were established based on personalities rather than on principle. What I mean by this is

that a man like President Megel appeared to be a strong, powerful, nationwide force.

Carl Megel had been the first full-time president of the organization. Prior to this we had had an executive secretary who conducted the full-time activities, so Carl being the first full-time president had access to a membership and Carl was the kind of person who got to know the leaders throughout the country by name and by face, and knew all about them. And through that kind of contact he developed a following which became very, very effective in building the organization.

It must be remembered that, as I said
earlier, we had a concentration in the Midwest, and
since Carl came from the Midwest and knew the
people of the Midwest, he received wonderful
reaction from the people of the Midwest in his
leadership role. This he was able to extend into
other sections of the country, and for the time and
the years of service, this provided this band of
loyal followers, provided a good base for the
organization.

As a result of my work in the local and

particularly the repeal of prorata and the attending publicity in the American Teacher, I was asked to run for vice president in the 1956 election at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. At that time there were two caucuses, the Progressive Caucus and the National Caucus.

I was a member of the Progressive Caucus and there were to be elected 14 vice presidents. The initial attitude of the caucus was to name twelve and to let the National Caucus have two. However, in the primary in the caucus, I placed 13th, one vote behind the incumbent New England vice president. And therefore, the caucus decided that maybe they ought to run a full slate of 14. It was on that basis that I became a candidate.

In the final count, the Progressive Caucus won 12 to 2, the other organization placing two people on the council. In the early days the vote wasn't exclusively by caucus. There were many votes that crossed caucus lines, and therefore, the 14 to 2 election does not truly reflect the participation that existed in the two caucuses.

The composition of the Progressive Caucus at

that time was largely East Coast with New York and Philadelphia and the state of Michigan also was added to the East Coast. And so the state of Michigan, particularly Detroit together with New York and Philly were the base of the power structure in the caucus. Although I would have to say that Wisconsin, strange as it may seem, was a member of the Progressive Caucus at that time contrary to the rest of the Midwestern states.

Through the years the caucus structure changed considerably, and as the situation evolved in collective bargaining, caucuses began to reflect in greater numbers the largest cities of the nation and the wonderful organization in New York began to be the base of the Progressive Caucus, and in recent years New York has been the controlling and dominating factor in the Progressive Caucus.

In the meantime, the other caucus has had rather a motley crew of people with many of the larger Midwestern cities gravitating to the Progressive Caucus and many smaller units across the nation gravitating to the opposing caucus.

The composition of the caucus in the early

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

days, as I indicated earlier, was largely regional, but as time went on and with the unionization and the collective bargaining contracts in New York and the merger of the association and the union in New York, New York became the stronghold. And so, the desire to be with a winner became very important and many people switched from one caucus to the other, leaving a real imbalance in the caucus structure at the present time with the Progressive Caucus controlling without any problem whatsoever. In the meantime, whereas the Progressive Caucus had once been known for its liberalism versus the other caucus for its conservatism, the situation changed so as now the other caucus embraces a large number of flaming liberals.

The lack of balance in the caucus structure and the domination that results with one caucus being so large seems to many people to abandon the democracy that we so long urged and preserved.

However, on the other hand, there are many people who believe that the delegates to a convention reflect not their personal opinions but the constituency they represent, and therefore, the

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

democracy, it's said by others, that the democracy really prevails regardless of appearances.

When I became a vice president in 1956, I was a full-time teacher in the Lynn school system, teaching grade 1. I continued as a full-time teacher until 1963 when I became the executive secretary of the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers. My early days on the council, almost without exception the vice presidents were all full-time teachers, and therefore, brought to the situation the day-to-day problems of teachers across the nation. But as time went on and the organization became larger, a more bureaucracy became established and many people had full-time jobs either in their local or in their state organization while simultaneously serving as an unpaid vice president of the American Federation of Teachers.

In the early years the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers met a few days each year before the annual convention, and every year met from the day after Christmas through New Year's Eve. This was rather difficult for a vice

president to meet only twice a year and still know all the goings-on in the organization. A great deal of the work was done by committees. From my early days on the council, I was a member of the Budget Committee which I continue to be a member of through my 20 years of service, and as a member of the Budget Committee had access to all the information as to the financial structure of the organization and the planning and allocation of funds within the organization. Membership in the organization in these years was very small compared to the present time.

I'd say at that time we probably had now escalated to 43 or 44,000 members, and the source of income to the organization was in the form of per capita from those members. Funds were meager, teacher's salaries were low, teachers weren't willing to pay large dues to organizations, and therefore, the realization of the dreams of many wasn't able to be fulfilled with the meager budgets which were available. To expand the organizing potential of the organization of the AFT was a major concern at that time.

organizers. We had Henry Becker in the Connecticut area, we had Sally Parker in Massachusetts and northern New England, and we had Hank somebody or other, I can't remember his last name, from San Francisco doing the West Coast organizing. The function of these three people was to service locals within their area and try to expand the membership of existing locals while simultaneously organizing new locals in the area. This was sort of a real grass roots activity which is very tedious. And in those days, to join the union was not a very popular concept among teachers in the smaller cities and towns of the country.

As the testimonies to the effectiveness of these people I can give readily because I worked very closely with Sally Parker and Henry Becker, particularly with Sally accompanying her to many of the organizing sites throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and northern New England. Together with Sally I organized my home city of Salem and the neighboring city of Peabody and neighboring Essex and the neighboring town of Danvers. Sally

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

on her own organized Pittsfield, Massachusetts,

Leominster, Massachusetts, Somerville,

Massachusetts, Methuen, Massachusetts, and the

University of Massachusetts. Again we both went to

Gloucester, Massachusetts and organized a local

there.

Their function was to instruct the leadership in unionism, to help them write constitutions, to help them plan programs, to talk individually to members and to generally expand the membership potential of a given area. And the growth in particularly Massachusetts and Connecticut at that time was very significant. The personality of union organizer varies considerably. Some people are very mild mannered and come across and have appealed to certain sections, whereas somebody else may be a bit more dynamic and be almost offensive in some sections of the country. One has to determine what the needs are of a given section before one can assign an organizer to go in and break new ground.

As the New York situation began to show promise, the AFT added Albert Shanker as a national

rep to be assigned to the city of New York to work with Dave Seldon who had been a full-time organizer in the city of New York for the past few years. In the late fifties the concept of collective bargaining began to take shape when the New York local decided to really move forward after having combined the all New York guild with the high school men's organization and to the United Federation of Teachers.

To finance a campaign of this proportion was going to be a very rigorous undertaking for the New York local, and they needed help from the American Federation of Teachers and any other source where funds could be made available. I recall that Charlie Cogan, then president of UF came before the council of the American Federation of Teachers and asked for a grant of \$50,000 from the American Federation of Teachers who, incidentally at that time, had the tremendous sum of \$54,000 to its name.

The motion was invented to say that up to \$50,000 would be accorded to New York and to win their struggle for collective bargaining rights in

their campaign against the NEA locals, NEA groups that were assembled under the umbrella of the -- hundreds of groups assembled under the umbrella of the NEA. AFT afforded them a few thousand dollars periodically as it could be expended, and at the same time decided to approach Walter Reuther who had demonstrated some interest in teacher organizing across the country.

President Megel of the AFT, President Cogan of the UFT, and I believe Dave Seldon and myself met with Walter Reuther at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York to explain the plight of the New York teachers. The meeting opened with President Megel suggesting that as a former football coach and football player, he should take the initiative and move forward, and Walter Reuther quickly told him, "Now, Carl, just keep quiet and let me proceed."

And Walter Reuther proceeded with great determination to extract from President Cogan and Seldon the exact program they had in mind detail by detail, and there were no extra words, there were no embellishment of any kind, it was just how many men do you need, you know. And one is not prepared

for that kind of a question.

You know, you thought you were going to have to haggle over how many dollars you were going to get. But the result was that Walter Reuther after carrying on more or less of a dialogue with Cogan and Seldon trying to extract from them their defined procedures, said, "Now, on Monday morning, how many men could you use?" Then he proceeded to say he could send men from the various locals on Monday morning, and on Monday morning these men appeared to work at UFT. At the same time he promised \$50,000 to be put into the New York campaign as immediate help, and he would look the situation over as time went on.

It was a very gratifying experience. I think the thing that impressed me the most was when we approached the hotel door, that the people, somebody would look through the peephole and then a tremendous guard, probably one of the biggest men I've ever seen, let us in and he was then Walter Reuther's bodyguard.

The Industrial Union Department was a group of industrial unions of the nation that had

convened under the banner of Industrial Union Department with Walter Reuther as president who also at that time was president of the Auto Workers, and they were trying to expand the organizing potential for other groups outside of the industrial spheres of the country, and organizing teachers had seemed like a good venture to him.

I don't remember which convention it was, but at one convention, either immediately preceding this meeting or following this meeting, I'm not exactly sure, Walter Reuther had been the convention speaker at the AFT convention when they had large banquets at the convention on Thursday evenings. And Walter Reuther had berated us for our lack of having organized the teachers of the nation, and explained to us that it took money to accomplish ends, and that we must put more money into organizing if we ever were going to be successful in this country.

He at that time promised to give us one dollar from the Industrial Union Department for every increased dollar in funds that we could raise

within the framework of the organization. And was this kind of opportunity that was made available to us that resulted in increased organizing efforts throughout the American Federation of Teachers.

Walter Reuther's leader in organizing efforts was Nick Zonnerich, and Nick was responsible for assisting teacher locals in their programs to increase AFT numbers.

The Industrial Union Department placed in New York City, also besides the organizers they sent in there, they sent Harold Ash who had had a long background in organized labor having worked in the old CIO locals, and I recall only too vividly that the law firm I was using in Boston were among Harold's closest friends, personal friends. Harold had worked with them many, many, many years before in early organizing activities, was well known nationwide.

Dr. Lucille Swaim, an economics major, was also assigned into the situation, a very, very brilliant woman with a concern about details and facts and figures and very thorough in her

preparation of materials. And together they had worked together previous to this situation and knew one another rather well and worked together very harmoniously.

One of the things that I remember most vividly was my first experience visiting the New York local, and it was in a horrible part of town and it was a ramshackle of an office and it was crowded. The ladies room was a positive disgrace, and in measure of the great growth of New York, their facilities in New York today have proceeded on an even pace with the gains of teachers in the New York City which is very important, and this in contrast to my early experience in that first local, in that first office.

My first meeting in the office was en route to the Pennsylvania convention where when I picked up President Megel at the Hotel Astor in New York and drove to the New York local for the express purpose of straightening out details attendant to the forthcoming election and to set the stage for the activity that would occur on the convention floor when the convention convened two or three

days later. On successive occasions we met with President Cogan and organizers Seldon and Shanker relative to the collective bargaining election in New York.

It was here for the first time that I saw these three men operate together. Of course, Charlie was very much the scholar, very mild mannered, listened, took it all in, whereas both Al and Dave were planners. They had a vision that took them many, many years ahead of where they were at that time, and their vision has been realized both in New York and in the AFT.

It was an interesting experience to watch the two of them. You can almost see the wheels go round in their head as they sat and planned and outlined for us where they were going and in considerable detail brought forth all of the items that they were considering in that situation.

It was evident that success was in the air. They had covered every base. They knew exactly where they were going. They knew it was a tough fight because they didn't have the basic numbers going in to ensure an outright win, but they had

calculated all the odds to the extent that they were pretty sure that they could pull off the deal, and that they did very, very successfully.

I was privileged to have been a party to these early proceedings, and was very much interested because I had been the coordinator of the AFT workshop at the University of Connecticut from the years '57 to '63, and strange as it may seem, the main thrust of our deliberations during those weeks in Connecticut had all been on the topic of collective bargaining as a result again of the tutelage of Sally Parker that this was imminent and that we should be prepared for it. Therefore, having this occur in New York came as no surprise to me.

Success in New York, there was immediate reaction in all the major cities of the country to attain the same ends as had been achieved in New York. And there was great movement in Philadelphia and Detroit, and Boston had been chosen to be the beneficiary of some organizing funds from the Industrial Union Department who had established an office, northeast industrial union office in

Braintree, Massachusetts. Harold Ash and Lucille
Swaim were first assigned to Boston, but
Philadelphia was in need of Harold's services and
Philadelphia was Harold's home city at that time.
So, Harold left and went to Philadelphia and
Lucille Swaim remained in Boston to carry on the
leadership function.

Boston had, prior to this, had only had a maximum of 300 members. The biggest problem that we envisioned on a short-term basis in Boston was a lack of sick leave. They didn't have any sick leave that prepared one if one had two day cold or three day upset. They had long-term benefits. If you were sick a year you get a half year's pay or something similar, but what good is that when one considers the variety of ailments that one has over a shorter span?

So, the first goal was to attain sick leave for the teachers of Boston which under Lucille's leadership was achieved. And the membership rose from three hundred to twelve hundred in that period of time. And now the long-term goal that had been developed in presenting the plan to the IUD was to

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

attain collective bargaining.

By this time Lucille had returned to New York and the local had a good basis for a collective bargaining campaign, but Sally Parker was once again called into the area to lead the collective bargaining campaign in Boston. And Sally and I provided the leadership for the collective bargaining campaign in the city of Boston. At that time I had become the full-time person of the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers, and so I was into Boston on a daily basis reporting there daily for a period of three or four weeks doing all the dirt work that has to be done in a campaign of that And the election was to be held on nature. November 9th, 1965 at the Boston Arena. At that time in the city of Boston our opposition was an independent organization called the Boston Teachers Alliance with whom President Megel had conducted merger relations many, many years earlier, but to no avail in the final analysis.

The Boston Alliance was the majority organization in the city of Boston, and the union was the minority organization. The Alliance was

under the leadership of an attorney who ran the Alliance out of his office, published their newspaper and did all of the work that had to be done in building an organization.

On November 9th, 1965, the election was held at the Boston Arena, and strange as it seemed, when people reported to vote in the afternoon, the streets for miles around were pack jammed and people couldn't get to the voting place. So, many people decided to go home and come back in the early evening. At about five o'clock that night the great northeast blackout occurred and all lights went out all over the city of Boston as well as in the rest of the East Coast, and the election was continued by candlelight and flashlight until the election hours were concluded.

I recall that I was manning the office and left to be there for the count. When I arrived at the arena it was in blackness except for the candles and flashlight, and when it came time to sign the official document as to the results of the election, the attorney who represented the Alliance just encouraged the president of the Alliance to

sign the thing as if everything had been hunky dory, and she did and the election was over and tested to them as being legal.

By the following morning the president of the Alliance arrived at the executive secretary's office full of vengeance that he hadn't pointed out what she could have done the night before instead of encouraging her to sign this document. And a majority organization was thoroughly dissipated within a very short span of time. And the union grew by leaps and bounds until it became a majority organization and has been so ever since.

The task of organizing teachers in the other jurisdictions of the country was not as difficult as it was in New York City, because New York had to lead the way. The others had a pattern, a successful pattern to follow and they did so, and they did so. And as long as they continued to do what had been done in New York, they were almost bound to have success, and so the results were easily attained than they had been early on in New York.

In 1964 President Cogan was elected president

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of the American Federation of Teachers, being known nationally as the leader of the New York campaign and being the president. Following the campaign he had wide acclaim throughout the country in the press, and the teachers of the nation were glad to see a man of this -- (inaudible) -- as a candidate.

There had been a push on within the organization to get somebody to run against Cogan, both within the caucus and outside of the caucus. And the strange part of the entire situation was that in reaching for candidates, both within the caucus and outside of the caucus, they were reaching to get someone that was in the age category of Charlie Cogan which really never seemed logical, but that's what they were doing, because Charlie had achieved greater current odds than any of the other people of his age category. therefore, defeated the candidate of the opposition caucus who was John Fukes, John having been many years earlier president of the Chicago Teachers Union.

Immediately after the election I was contacted by the Cogan forces to meet with them the

following day. And I met with Dave Seldon, Jewels Colodny -- I forget who else, but anyway, met with them to take a look at the organization. The truth of the matter was, none of them had had any experience within the framework of the AFT. they didn't know what the procedure was. following day there was a question about who was to be the secretary-treasurer, were we going to continue with the same secretary-treasurer or were we going to have a new secretary-treasurer, and of course I voiced my opinion loud and clear. I think when they realized how strongly I and others felt about it, they stayed with Bob Porter, because at that time the secretary-treasurer was elected on a year-to-year basis.

22

TAPE 2

MS. RENE EPSTEIN: This is Rene Epstein. My interview with Rose Claffey is continuing on August 10th, 1986.

MS. ROSE CLAFFEY: Bob Porter was named executive secretary to President Megel on President Megel's recommendation and after being interviewed by the Executive Council. Bob was very mild mannered. He's very quiet spoken as he is today. He hasn't changed one bit. He was a young man with a young child at that time and a wife, a very devoted wife who has been an integral part of his activities. Bob is very bright, knows exactly where he's going, and non-combative, doesn't have to raise his voice, doesn't have to fight. He knows how to attain his ends by other means.

The new administration everybody viewed as going to be a radical departure from the prior administrations. However, the new administration conducted themselves very, very well in trying to understand the various elements of the organization and place them in proper perspective for proceeding into the future. Bob Porter was readily accepted

by the Cogan forces, and he and Dave Seldon had a very close working relationship.

A major function of the new administration was going to be expand the organization. Dave Seldon had always had an interest in organizing that stemmed back to his presentation before a group of people at the 1952 Syracuse convention when he appeared and talked to all the delegates and offered them an opportunity at the rate of ten cents per member per month to organize within the framework of existing locals. And he had a great vision as to the kind of organizing that could occur in the country. Now as Cogan's assistant, he had the opportunity to make that dream a realization.

So, in 1964 they initiated the Co-Aug (phonetic) program whereby state organizations could put on full-time help on a three-to-one basis with the AFT assuming the three and the local group assuming the one. I was a beneficiary of one of these programs, because in 1963 I had left teaching and taken a leave of absence to do precisely the same thing in the state of Massachusetts.

Unfortunately we only had a backup budget of \$5,000, plus current income. So, my expenses for the year ran somewhere 15 or 16,000 including my salary and the rent and the expenses and all else. So, at the end of the first year I was four or \$5,000 in the red.

So, when the Co-Aug program came, I was rather interested in this program. The way I received one in Massachusetts was when Michigan was moving and Michigan, the council committee was asked to support two people from Michigan, and I said, "How can you ask me to support two when I haven't even got one?" He said, "Will you support two from Michigan if we give you one?" And I said I will do that.

So, as a result, Massachusetts received a grant that year of \$15,000 and the state had to raise five and so, we moved forward with that budget into a full-time program. The first year I was on leave of absence, but at that time when the AFT gave the grant, I gave up my full-time teaching job and became the full-time Massachusetts Federation person on the payroll.

On to the Co-Aug program, it enabled

Massachusetts, as all the other states that

subscribed to the program, to expand their

activities in order to be ready for collective

bargaining if and when, and the when was very near

in Massachusetts. Collective bargaining was going

to be allowed.

The basis on which people could participate at that time was that you had to have per capitas of 30 cents per member a month payable to the AFT, and to have a potential within the framework of the state jurisdiction of numbers that could be organized. Jim Mundy was director of organizing at that time, and Mundy provided the leadership for the Co-Aug program throughout the nation.

Mundy had been hired by the organization. He came out of New Jersey and he was a rather robust chap with a sparkling personality and real desire to organize teachers and provided great inspiration to many of the people who hadn't had the experience of meeting the leaders of the organization prior to this time. Simultaneously with the organizing of the Co-Aug program, they had to expand the national

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

staff. We went into a very rapid, rapid expansion of the AFT staff in order to accommodate the needs of the nation.

The Co-Aug program lasted through the Seldon and Cogan -- Cogan and Seldon years. Of course, Seldon had been the assistant to Cogan and was responsible for the day-to-day operations of the entire program and thus continued so on during his term of office. And the Co-Aug program reached tremendous proportions in terms of staff personnel and was virtually no section of the country that wasn't covered by AFT personnel. And this enabled the AFT to have a very, very, very significant and meaningful growth, because we now, with collective bargaining, we're getting majority organizations where in the early days we were getting a handful here and a handful there, and not able to be a meaningful force in their local community.

But with collective bargaining and with aid in organizing, we were able to organize majority situations that could attain collective bargaining, that could get meaningful contracts, which in turn begot similar situations in neighboring

communities. And so, the growth was rapid.

The need for staff, of course, depended on -varied in the different sections of the country and
depended on the needs of the section, the kind of
people in the area. And in many cases the local
situation had people that they recommended to the
AFT for consideration, and they would participate
in the program if they could have so-and-so doing
the work. And if that person had made significant
contributions and had a good potential, the
organization looked at that person in terms of
whether or not they should be hired.

Now, in other situations states would rather have an out-of-towner. For example, I had a young man working with me in Massachusetts who originally had come from Michigan and had been raised in Ohio. And one day I was in the office and found out they're hiring somebody in Ohio, and I recommended that they consider him because he would be second man in with me for a long period of time where he would be number one man in the new situation and with more money. And he went and they had a closed mind, they already knew who they were going to

hire, and they liked the second man better than the first man, and they ended up hiring the two of them. So, they had an outsider and an insider and they worked together for a period of time. that was the kind of situation that existed in the programs.

Now, in many of the situations, the state situations and the local situations, some locals qualified for this kind of activity. And in most cases we took the word of the local group and after some investigation by the national office, allowed the decision to go through on that basis.

In other situations they had a new AFT staff that could move into the situations and give the help that was needed, and they would find somebody that was worthwhile. For example, the young man that worked with me went one night to a situation in West Hartford, Connecticut where a strike was going on. And the president was Anne Lespey (phonetic). Anne is now the executive secretary of the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers. reported back to me the next morning that that was a comer, and that's somebody we ought to do

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

something for.

And he had asked her, could you get a leave from now until the end of the year, and she said yes, because we had several situations in Massachusetts and he knew we could use a woman. So, she got a leave and we hired her temporarily from then until June. She worked in Springfield for like three weeks and then in Pittsfield for three weeks and then went in and took on a situation all by herself and Bill Ricker. But she said to me I don't mind as long as you're on the end of a telephone. So, she functioned and did a remarkable job there. And then there was no job for her in Massachusetts. We had no more funds and that was the end.

I spoke to President Seldon and he wasn't able to accommodate her at that time. I spoke to Frank Sutherland in Pennsylvania and Frank was able to get her on the staff of the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers. Later the AFT saw her value and they wanted to hire her and she worked as an organizer for the AFT and more recently she's now the executive secretary of the Pennsylvania

Federation of Teachers. But she came about by that one night contact with a gentleman who sensed that she had it and that we should utilize it, and that's the way many of the contacts are made.

> What makes one a good organizer is a question that's very difficult to answer. In this particular case the girl, she was exceedingly well groomed and tastefully groomed and had a good wholesome appeal to both men and women, and this made her acceptable to many of the forces. Whereas sometimes in those early days if you send somebody in with a beard to organize teachers, you didn't stand a prayer of organizing them. So, you had to make those decisions and lots of times people's success or failure hung on something as ridiculous, I suppose I should say, as some of those traits that used to carry a lot of weight.

> Well, for a personal point of view, I was responsible for training a lot of people in Massachusetts, and I felt that my job was to make them better organizers and better AFT people than I And so they should have full benefit of anything I could offer, plus benefit of anybody

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

else's abilities.

So, I used to take them with me day by day by day, and then if I wasn't going out in the field on a given day, send them out with somebody else, and then ask them to assess for me the difference in the way I did thus and so, and the fellows did thus and so, and then say to them, now look, there's no magical formula. I might not do it right, they might not do it right, what would you do if you were out there. And then give them the opportunity to voice where they saw our strengths and weaknesses and then to let them go and do it on And sometimes they found the answer their own. themselves, sometimes they had to come back and admit, no, they should have done it the way so and so did or so and so did. But it's a personal touch that was important.

I had two young men that worked with me, and they came to me fresh out of the University of Massachusetts Graduate School For Labor Studies, and they were just annoyed to death with me, because I wouldn't turn them loose the first week and let them go organize. I didn't think it was

202122

fair to them or fair to the organization to do that. But I was building for that day when they went out, that they would be top drawer, and people wouldn't refer to them as the young men as they were very young. They were only like 21 or two at the time.

So, when they went out they came back and said to me, "Now I know. We thought we were ready, but today we encountered this, this, this and this that we didn't anticipate, and we know now why we needed that long period of training, because I recall that arose here and I was able to answer that because it arose here and this arose there," and they were able to see the value of the training. But to throw people to the winds I think is a mistake and too many times we've done that.

I'm reminded at this time about another instant we had with Walter Reuther when there appeared to be a potential in the state of Florida for organizing. And I recall very vividly that Bob Porter and I went to visit with Reuther again to discuss organizing in the state of Florida. And again he was very receptive and he gave us an

allocation of money, allocation for Florida. And staff was put on in Florida, an intensive campaign was conducted over I don't know how many weeks or months, but the results seemed to come to no end. And it was very disappointing.

I felt almost like we let Reuther down and that we hadn't come through like we had on the other situations, and then much to my delight in later years, some of those early contacts that were made in Florida during that intensive organizing campaign began to flourish little by little, and before you knew it, we had a big organization in the state of Florida. The next thing we had, a merged group in the state of Florida, and today in Florida we have an extensive organization. That's the kind of thing that resulted from the emphasis on organizing that occurred during the Seldon years, Seldon and Cogan years.

Some people think that it catches on easily in some places and more reluctantly in others. But I dare say that it never catches on with vengeance in any situation on the first flash. I, in looking back over the records of things that happened in

Massachusetts through the years, I learned that a woman who later had a significant role in the government in Washington, Miss Peterson -- I forget her first name -- had once been a union organizer in Massachusetts, organizing teachers in Massachusetts, which came as a real surprise. And in the situations where she had been, sometimes no results had come.

But years later somebody showed up that -- I recall being in Dover, New Hampshire seven or eight years ago, and a man got up and he said, "Didn't I see you in district such and such in New Hampshire many years ago? I'm a member because of you." And he recalled, and I had no luck that first meeting, but that stayed with him and it flourished later.

I think that's the way the growth goes. I don't think that you move in and people join you in numbers just for the sake, unless they've had a long study and some success stories from friends. Sometimes it's a cousin in California or an aunt in Michigan or a brother in Michigan or somebody in New York. It's amazing the network going on, just amazing. You wouldn't believe the network that you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

encounter as you move forward in this.

The caucus situation is a situation that I call to mind in terms of how come we have the power concentrated in one caucus. And it goes back to the election when Ken Meesen (phonetic) challenged Dave Seldon. And that was a very difficult situation for me, because I was on Dave's team and Ken was my protege. In the election Ken came very, very close, very, very close, almost nosed Dave out, but the section of the constitution that called for a ballot whereby you had to state your preference on the ballot was the result of Dave winning by large numbers. Because a lot of people who were committed to Seldon were voting for Meesen, but on the showdown when they had to sign the ballot, a roll call ballot was the result of the election because there wasn't a clear cut win.

So, there was a roll call ballot, and many of Ken's supporters left him when they had to sign, because they had an indebtedness to Dave because of Co-Aug or some other situation. And so from then on the roll call was employed on a full-time basis. There was a new constitutional amendment to employ

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

the roll call on a full-time basis. And that's when the caucus got strengthened to the point where it is today, when the roll call ballot became a part of the constitution.

This brings us to consideration of the democracy of a caucus if one caucus is a major factor as opposed to the membership of the organization being segmented in smaller caucuses. And this is very, very difficult, particularly for new people to understand. What the rationale is that when you go to a convention, you do not go to represent yourself, you go to represent people back And therefore, the people back home have a home. right to know to whom you committed them with your vote. And so, this is very, very difficult for people to understand. Prior to the employment of the roll call ballot, when we had secret ballot elections in the organization one had to be a good politician to be able to survive.

For example, in one election I recall that we had a pre-primary ballot in the caucus, and I as a vice president received 90 percent of the caucus vote. Megel at that time was running for president

and even the incumbent president only received 68 percent of the vote in the caucus. Now, this was supposed to be a secret. They were so chagrinned by the results of these numbers that they decided not to tell anybody. But like everything else, things come out.

And so, when the final vote came, I found myself coming in way, way, way low, because all my opponents in the caucus didn't want me to outstrip them, so they voted, they short balloted me in the election. And so, there we were on a caucus ballot, but the caucus was not adhering to the purposes of that caucus.

On another occasion I went to a convention only to find that some of my best friends were avoiding me, and I began to think that a major entity was denying me support. And so, there were a lot of new names on the ballot that time. And when I became suspicious that somebody was denying me support, I found it necessary to move forward to the forces outside of the caucus and to seek some support which I had never had to do on previous occasions.

When the votes were counted that year, I was the ranking person in the Progressive Caucus, even though a major entity had short balloted me. And for the first time in many years, our caucus lost control of the Executive Council.

So, if you're going to maintain the integrity of an organization and the leaders are going to know where they're going and what the program is going to be and who's with them and who's against them, then running on a ballot and having a roll call ballot to back up the support is the only way to keep the organization truly democratic.

Now, on the other hand, people think that when one caucus prevails, that the democracy is lacking. And I would have to say that New York represents the largest segment of the organization, and yet proportionately speaking, New York does not have that kind of voice in the organization. New York has bent over backward to lend all of its wonderful facilities and abilities to other locals and other states across the nation. They have not attempted to outmaneuver any other grouping, and I would say that they have maybe enhanced the

democracy rather than ruined the democracy as some people would have you believe.

Now, there are people who would say that in response to what I have just said, what about Shanker at the time being the president of the New York State Federation and being president of New York City and an AFT vice president? Do you not think that's too much power concentrated in one person? Normally that may be considered to be too much power contained by one person, but the fact is that Shanker had a goal. His goal was to solidify New York City and New York state.

To do it from the city point of view, he had accomplished all he could as leader of New York
City, and now that the merger was effected while he was president of New York City, if he could be the leader of New York state he would be able to bring his people in New York City with him more readily to unify that whole state in the same way that the city had been unified. And at the same time, of course, as AFT vice president, he had the backing of the national organization to move forward and to attain these goals.

So, I don't think that was a power move on Shanker's power. I just think it was a vehicle for the execution of the plans that were necessary to achieve that goal of unifying New York state. Now, Shanker as president of the organization still has a lot of power, but I don't see any misuse of power. I see that power being put to great use unifying the teacher union movement of the nation with other major groups such as parents and community groups, legislative groups. No, I really think democracy has prevailed.

During the Seldon administration the organization had tremendous growth in membership because there was great intensity placed on the organizing campaign, but more so because of his stance on militancy and teacher power. The base of Dave's beliefs were that teachers had power and that they should execute that power, and that he moved to do this. It's interesting to note, however, that even though he stressed teacher power and militancy, his book relative to his years failed to concentrate on that great aspect of his contribution.

The collective bargaining campaigns had been well underway at this time and the teachers were beginning to realize that the collective bargaining agreement wasn't any good unless they had a weapon to have it enforced. And therefore, the strike had to be recognized as the end step in a collective bargaining process. This was very hard for teachers to understand at first, but this was the thrust of Dave's campaign to make people realize that the strike was there as a weapon to achieve their goals, collective bargaining goals.

So, there were many strikes during this period of time, and in the 1969 convention, I think it was, a militancy fund was even created whereby locals could dip into the fund to achieve, to get some money to achieve their militancy goals.

During this time there were several large strikes and the, I think it was the Newark strike that Dave had to go to jail for, and when he came out of jail there was a series of bread and water parties across the nation to concentrate on the fact that a person such as the president of the organization who was well known by all of the

members, had to go through this ordeal and sort of prepare local people for what they might have to face when the time came. And we had one in Boston at that time, and Dave explained his position and it was a real educational medium through which many of our people were enlightened.

In addition to women's rights, Seldon was also interested in expanding the organizational setup that had been initiated through the Co-Aug program. It was getting very large throughout the country, and so, therefore, he initiated a regional plan whereby he appointed four regional coordinators to be responsible for coordinating the various work in the locals and state federations within their jurisdiction. This was sort of decentralizing the bureaucracy.

We had come from a situation with Megel where Megel was the only person one could contact when one had a problem down through the Co-Aug program with Cogan whereby we had a director of organization and then we get to Seldon and we have to further decentralize and have regional coordinators to take care of the fast growing needs

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

of the nation.

At this same time college organizing came to Dave had always had an interest in college organizing and put a lot of his efforts into that, created a committee of prospective college people across the nation, and already organized college people across the nation to work together to expand the college potential. during this time that we did a lot of college organizing in the New England area which had been almost unknown prior to this time.

At first college organizing was rather difficult because there was an air of elitism among college faculty that hadn't existed in the elementary and secondary schools of the nation. However, after one explored with college groups the similarities that existed in their situation, they began to find out that they had more in common than apart from the elementary and secondary teachers.

And at that time here in Massachusetts we were able to organize several of the state colleges. We organized Boston State College, Lowell State College, Worcester State College,

Bristol Community College, Southeastern

Massachusetts University, Wentworth University.

There are others, I can't tell you offhand what the others were. Massachusetts College of Art was included, also.

Then what happened here, it happened other places. The state college units unified under one unit and had one bargaining representative to represent all of the units. And so, the units became larger and again they were more centralized, whereas decentralization was occurring in the organization, centralization was occurring in the states across the nation.

The militancy fund enabled both elementary, secondary and college personnel to try to move more readily toward their goals when the funds were available, and many, many locals took advantage of this militancy aspect to do just that. The St.

John strike in New York, of course, which had occurred during the Cogan years had set a pattern. The court decision in the St. John's case was very, very difficult to overcome because they had ruled in that case that the faculty were in effect

administrators, and so it made it very, very difficult to proceed, to proceed -- no, I'll have to take that back, it was Yeshiva that happened, and it made it very, very difficult in the Yeshiva decision to have other colleges pick up because some of them still wanted to adhere to that elitism of being considered an administrator while still a faculty member.

So, it was slow coming, but it has moved rather consistently through the years, and we do have a large segment of college people. Again New York provided the leadership in organizing, all of the state units in New York which proved to other states that it could be done.

Teacher merger was a goal during the Seldon years, also. And the NEA through the years -- our position had been one of protest to the activities of the NEA because we had differences of opinion on a variety of issues, and it seemed on each of the issues we finally convinced them to our point of view, the latest of which at that time was collective bargaining. We had started out with the NEA being violently opposed to collective

800-626-6313

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

bargaining, but as time went on they finally participated in New York, put all of their -- many units, not their own units, and paraded them under the banner of the NEA, and finally they conceded that collective bargaining was here to stay.

Now, if collective bargaining was reality and we were being organized heavily in the major cities of the nation and they were being left in the smaller towns of the nation, it seemed that the time was right for a merger of the two organizations. Now, prior to this time there had been many, many discussions on merger talks across In Massachusetts we had had merger the nation. talks, meeting with Frank White who was then the director of organization of the NEA unit in Massachusetts, and even to the extent of White and his boss, the executive secretary there, William Hebert, wanting to go to New York.

So, I took them down to New York and they met with Shanker and Seldon and we went through the New York offices and we went upstairs and saw the computers and saw the kind of materials they had, and proved to them that New York was way ahead of

2

3 4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

anybody else in the country and at a place where we all ought to be.

It was strange, shortly thereafter Frank White became the executive secretary of the New York State Teachers Association and, therefore, started in on the original merger talks with Shanker in New York state. However, Tom Hobart was the president, but if you know the structure of the organization in the NEA, the executive secretary always was the key figure and the president was more or less a figure head. Whereas in the AFT the president was the key figure and the executive secretary was the figure head.

So, finally Hobart began to realize that he was the president and Shanker was the president, so president ought to be dealing with president. it ended up with White being dealt out and White --I don't know where White went after that but he no longer was in the picture.

But there had been merger talks of that nature across the nation, and there was great sentiment among large blocks of people in both organizations to move toward that end.

Now, at this time we had some meetings with the Executive Council and the NEA leaders. I think we had three meetings with them. There are varying opinions as to what occurred at those meetings, and I either wasn't there, which I'm sure I was, or I wasn't at the same meeting as some of the other people, because I can't subscribe to some of the stories. But my idea was that we were almost there.

At one time at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington suddenly the opposition decided it was all over and they were leaving. So, at that time we moved forward and created a National Coalition For Teacher Unity. In doing that we employed an NEA leader from Minnesota who was to head up this organization. And he was to make the contacts within the framework of the NEA and then bring various people together.

Well, a lot of that work was done at the Portland convention of the NEA, Portland, Oregon convention of the NEA that year. And we really believed that we were moving toward a realistic merger. However, my personal sentiment is that the

poor reception that the New York, the merged New York forces received from the NEA at the national conventions of the NEA, began to make people realize that maybe the NEA wasn't as in earnest as they had heretofore believed they were.

The AFT poured a lot of money into the merger. There had been some benefits that have come from the merger. The Florida situation probably is -- I remember that the people who now are the union leaders in Florida were NEA leaders in the merger movement at that time, and it's safe to assume that this occurred elsewhere that I am unaware of. But on the overall basis it had some saving grace, but it really didn't develop as anticipated.

why merger wasn't a success is a much debated issue. First of all, there are many people who believe that the job of the leadership in even convincing the staff who are out in the field every day to represent them, that merger was essential, was not well handled. The staff, it is said by many that the staff felt that they would lose their job if merger occurred, which of course was

ridiculous because they would be more needed than ever before. But there was a lack of sympathy among the staff for putting over this program at that time.

There was also a lack of understanding among many of the leaders in the organization who were not intimately affected by organizing activities or who did not participate directly in the collective bargaining process. They didn't seem to realize that the time had now come when we were no longer a protest organization fighting the NEA.

We now had come to the point where we had forced the NEA to fight on our turf. For many years the teachers of the nation, particularly those of us that were active in the AFT, had built all of our organizing campaigns and all our approaches toward organizing on the fact that the NEA was not doing the job that the teachers of the nation thought they were doing. And therefore, we were trying to prove that we could replace them more effectively if we would be given the opportunity to do so.

Now, with collective bargaining, we got that

opportunity in many major cities that we really didn't have deep concentration in prior to the elections, but after we attained the collective bargaining we had great success in many major cities, and suddenly now we are the power and the NEA is attacking us in many of these cities and towns rather than us attacking them. And for a few years the campaign seesawed back and forth. They would win one year and we would win the next year, and vice versa.

So, now some of the teachers who are only dues-paying members who are not activists, they find it very, very difficult to understand why it is that we want to merge with an organization that just a few short weeks or a few short months ago was our bitter enemy. They were not conscious of what was happening underneath all this turmoil, and that we were gaining stature whereas the NEA was losing stature, and that we now no longer had to consider the NEA in our day-to-day dealings, we only had to consider doing a better job educationally and politically and legislatively for our own organization.

In retrospect, it appears that the National Coalition For Teacher Unity might have been a mistake. If the merger had been able to be effected directly between the leadership of the two organizations, rather than having this entity in between the two organizations, we might have achieved greater gains than we did. Yet, it is still difficult to ascertain whether or not the coalition per se was the gab slide that has since moved many people to consider merger. The role of the president has been documented in books and what not in this regard, but the fact is that Dave was an intense and devout believer in merger.

Until this time, however, Dave had always been the man to create the ideas, to do all the behind-the-scenes work and to feed it to someone else to execute. And I would say that probably for the first time Dave was called on to take his own ideas and to develop them and to sell them. It was harder for him to do that than it would have been for him to have achieved this goal as second man through another person.

It's in the nature of one's personality that

one sometimes gets tripped. Another evidence of the personality situation was Dave's attitude toward the vice president of the AFL-CIO. For a long time Dave had sought to be the AFT representative within this body, but had received little or no reception from the power structure in the AFL-CIO. At the Atlantic City convention of the AFL-CIO, there was talk of an AFT placement, but this never developed.

But during Dave's term of office, the issue arose and he was brought before the Executive Committee in the New York office one day, and Dave indicated that he would like us to consider him as the representative to the AFL-CIO. Even though I have always operated on the premises of only one president and one works with the president in order to make things effective, I could not subscribe to Dave becoming AFT vice president representative to the vice president of the executive — of the AFL-CIO Executive Council, because he was not acceptable to Meany and he was not acceptable to other leaders on that council.

His relations with Meany dated back to

earlier years in New York, and I'm not aware of the details of it, but it was deep rooted apparently.

However, I think it was interesting that once when I was hospitalized Dave sent me a book and it was the Life of George Meany, which I thought was very significant knowing his attitude toward George Meany. So, I somehow feel that he wasn't altogether opposed to George Meany, or I don't think he would have put the money into getting that book.

The fact is that at that time those of us on the Executive Council indicated to him, the Executive Committee of the Executive Council indicated to Dave that we thought Al would be a better representative. It was at this point that the breakdown came. He refers to the group, the Executive Council in the group that supported Shanker by some Shanker followers or some such thing, I don't know what it was, but this was all unpremeditated, and we all came to the conclusion on our own as an Executive Committee. And then we reported to the council and the council took it up, and it was deemed that Shanker would be the

representative.

This then was the beginning of breakdowns.

It was a heartbreak to Dave, a real heartbreak.

But hard to understand because when one gets in the arena, one has to take the ups and downs of the arena. I found it disconcerting that he would let something of this proportion ruin what heretofore had been a wonderful relationship between himself and Shanker.

Together the two of them had -- and I said this to them at the time, and particularly to Dave who talked with me at length about it -- together they were planners. Together they had planned for the collective bargaining in New York, first the high school merger, then the collective bargaining campaign in New York, the merger of New York, and now the plans for the merger of the nation were at stake and now we're going to let something like an AFL-CIO vice presidency break a longstanding friendship and break the goals.

If they had made these plans in the past, it was my contention they could make these plans in the future and still maintain this friendship. But

it was not to be. The vote was taken, Shanker was named the AFL-CIO vice president, and Dave by his reaction to this situation, created an opening for Al to succeed him as president of the AFT.

There are many that say why did Dave take
this so hard? I think he took it hard because he
felt betrayed by his own Executive Council. On the
other hand, the Executive Council had recently been
expanded, and most of the more recent council
members had always viewed their position on the
council as something attained through Seldon and
Shanker. They thought of them in terms of one
mind. They never thought the day would come when
they had to make a decision between the two men who
had been responsible for them being placed there.

So, when they had to make that decision, they found it very, very, very difficult. I'll never in all my 20 years on the council, I have never seen water run off foreheads the way they ran off the day of that vote. And those of us who were hardened warriors of the fight, you know, faced up to it. But some people found it very, very difficult. It was very, very difficult to be on

the losing end of that twosome.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The entire situation was very difficult for me personally, because I had a very close working relationship with Dave and also a close working relationship with Al. However, I felt that Al would be the better vice president to the AFL-CIO, and that's why I voted my conscience in that That did not mean that I didn't think Dave was the man to continue on in the presidency. However, the ensuing months I, too, changed my mind and decided that now that Shanker was a candidate for president, he would be a good candidate for the presidency of the AFT. I, therefore, found it very difficult to be the person to nominate Al Shanker against Dave Seldon before the caucus on that occasion.

The reason I had subscribed to a Shanker candidacy was I thought the time had come for an experienced person, one who had had leadership roles at the local, state and national level as well as one who had been an employee of the AFT, one who knew every segment of the organization well, to come in to unify the work of all the

1 predecessors.

We should realize that during all these period of years from 1952 until 1974, we had Megel, Cogan, Seldon in leadership roles, and now we move into a period where we're about to have a new president, and I thought it was significant that we get one that had all of the experience, experience that none of his predecessors in the organization had had. He was a younger man and had the experience that none of his predecessors had had.

Moreover, I felt that Shanker had now made a national name for himself through the articles that the New York local had sponsored in the New York

Times through the past years of his service in New York. Through these articles it became apparent that Shanker not only knew what the problems were of the day, but he knew the problems of the future. It became apparent that he was reading widely and thinking widely and polling widely on all of the issues that were ever going to be touching the lives of teachers.

So, we had out there in the field a large, large number of people both in both organizations

that suddenly were looking upon Shanker as a voice of teachers. The number of superintendents and school committees that said to me through the years how religiously they read his articles and even saved his articles, was testimony to me to the fact that we were now reaching into a population that none of our predecessors had attained.

So, as we moved forward into the Shanker years, we were solidifying all the work of those earlier presidents. The presidency that Megel assumed was no more like the presidency that Shanker assumed than the man in the moon. They were two completely different organizations. Megel had inherited an organization where he was the first full-time president of the organization. And in the office there was only himself and a group of secretaries -- an office manager and a group of secretaries.

If anyone across this nation or any local across this nation needed help, they had to go directly to Megel. Megel was a master at the communication system. Megel was and still is the best vote garner in the AFT. Megel knew more

people by name than any other person in the AFT.

And so, he built -- his segment of the growth was based on his personality and his personal contacts with locals and individuals and state federations across the states, and he traveled where any ten people would convene.

Now, as we moved into the Cogan years, we moved in with a man coming upon us who had just completed a collective bargaining election in New York, a win with which he had been largely credited. Therefore, he was a name attraction across the country as the man who had spearheaded a collective bargaining campaign. And he brought that emphasis to the situation that he embarked on. Not only that, but he was an academic and an attorney and widely read. And as a scholar, he had appeal to large segments of the population. Cogan, therefore, also had advantages that Megel hadn't had.

Toward the end of Megel's term of office he had added some staffing, but now Cogan comes in and he has an assistant, an assistant to carry out the day-to-day work of the organization while he became

the image of the organization across the nation, and we were able to capitalize on that image in many quarters.

We then proceeded from Cogan to Seldon as the president, and here we go from a very rather austere scholarly gentleman down to a very casual type leader who again had a following among many of the younger and more liberal forces throughout the nation. And he was able to build within the framework of many of these constituencies. The militancy and the power and the activity that was attendant to these beliefs was certainly part of an evolutionary process. Under the Seldon administration we increased the staffing considerably. So, one would hardly recognize the organization of the earlier years.

Dave was interested in organizing from the early years. I recall only too vividly my first convention at Syracuse, New York where Dave Seldon had posters in the hall convening people at a given point and we went and heard him talk about how he was willing to volunteer his services. He would come into a local if we paid ten cents per member

per month for organizing and he was able to
establish some groupings on the East Coast in this
fashion. But people didn't see the need of it on a
widespread basis, so that didn't last and he went
into other kinds of active work supported by the
New York local in an organizing campaign at a later
date.

However, I recall that as early as '52, I heard his views on organizing and knew how interested he was in organizing and saw that during his term of service he was still putting into practice those things that he had been espousing for many, many years.

So, we had about 110,000 growth during his many, many years, his many years there. But still in all, there was still another grouping out there that we weren't reaching.

TAPE 3

MS. RENE EPSTEIN: This is Rene Epstein. My interview with Rose Claffey is continuing on April 10th, 1987 in Salem, Massachusetts. This is Tape 3.

MS. ROSE CLAFFEY: What is significant during these years of service is that after Megel was president, he became the Washington representative. So, during the Cogan years and the Seldon years, Megel was still available with his background on the organization.

I remember only too vividly during the Cogan years, Megel and Cogan collaborated on founding a professional arm of the AFL-CIO, an organization to which all professional union organizations under the banner of the AFL-CIO participated. At the same time the Kaiserling Report (phonetic) during the Cogan administration, there was the first economic review of teacher economics. And Kaiserling worked closely with Megel and Cogan on providing that research which became the basis of continued research in the organization.

So, Megel continued aboard all the time,

Seldon continued aboard, and Cogan continued aboard as a member and a leader in retired teacher groupings. So, all of the characters that had been in leadership roles since '52 were still with us except Seldon who chose to remove himself from the situation.

Now, I would hasten to say that through this they all benefitted from the leadership of Bob Porter. Bob Porter probably can be credited with as much of the glory for any success as any other members of the organization, because he was able to carry on all of the business details of the organization regardless of what they may be.

With Shanker's election came a new day for the organization, not a new day in terms of the needs of the organization, because in Megel's final report after twelve years of service to the organization, he rendered a report that outlined in detail what he thought was necessary for the success of the organization. And although he had made baby steps in achieving many of these goals, the work remained to be picked up, and it was picked up during the Cogan and Seldon years.

But much remained to be done during the

Shanker years. And I look upon Shanker's term of
service as unifying all the work that his
predecessors had done, and moreover, expanding the
horizons of teachers and educators generally
throughout the United States.

Whereas one time we couldn't fight our way in to being speakers on selected programs across the nation, Shanker is probably the most sought after educational speaker in the entire nation, and even in Europe. The way that he is able to address groups, doesn't get upset, doesn't become unraveled, keeps cool and calm through it all, and presents to parents and businessmen, and whoever the audience may be, a realistic picture of education and teachers and has converted more people to thinking in terms of teacher needs and teacher expectations than we have ever had in the history of the NEA or the AFT.

So, it would seem to me that the time has come -- we've done a complete about face whereas we had to be concerned with fighting for status, fighting for power, fighting for competition with

the other organization, fighting for collective bargaining rights, fighting school boards in strikes and things like this -- the time has come when we've reached the point where we can put all that behind us and do what we always tried to do but didn't have the time to do, the most important part of teacher welfare, the professional development of the faculty and the children within their public schools.

So, Shanker has addressed himself to this situation in such a manner that it's taking hold and will pay off in the immediate future. The fact is that it isn't anything new or anything different, but there is a willingness not to uphold to a traditional position, but a willingness to explore, a willingness to try, a willingness to listen, and to see if we can't find common ground with those who had heretofore been our opposition.

It's interesting to note that way back in the Megel years there emerged on the scene a man named Myron Lieberman. Lieberman had written books about education. He was professionally oriented. He was urging the AFT into positions of professionalism.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But we had the positions of professionalism, but there wasn't time to do all the things that had to be done when one is fighting an uphill fight. But Myron Lieberman made a real and lasting impression on the organization. He was deeply interested in the organization.

Simultaneously he was working within the framework of the NEA, and he was trying to bring the two groups to realization of many common ground points. And so, I think Myron Lieberman has had a real impact on the growth of the organization. as I said earlier, Megel had listed many things when he left office, and Shanker now is pulling together all of the valued policies of the years, all of the contributions that were ever made by anybody like Myron Lieberman and others, and he's unifying them because he is basically a leader who knows how to delegate authority and gives to his subordinates authority to move. The organization has grown in that regard in that heretofore there was almost a choker hold from the presidency down on all of the smaller units within the organization and the employees.

But now there's a freedom. Of course, when one gets to be the bureaucracy that the organization is today, one needs that kind of leadership. That's where we're having our success today, because while Shanker is out fighting the battle on one field, there are a hundred other people fighting other battles on other fields and we're attaining much more momentum than we did when it had to be all controlled from the top.

There are many problems in building effective organizations. One of the problems is that when we were paying ten cents per member per month for dues, you could get anybody to rally to any cause at the drop of a pin. But after we went up the ladder and we attained collective bargaining and got collective bargaining rights and got many gains that teachers never anticipated they were going to have, and their dues increases became automatic through dues deduction and people didn't even have to think of the dues they were paying any more because they had enough money in their pocket, it wasn't sweat and blood money they were paying dues with, then they began to take the organization for

granted.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

They just expect that the organization is going to do everything for them and they don't have to work for it, they don't have to think about it. And so we need to keep moving in new arenas, and now the educational arena is the arena we have to move in to get all our teachers to make each one of us look at ourselves and say we do not measure up to where we ought to be. We ought to be more knowledgeable about this, we ought to learn about this, we ought to take more courses, and this right now is the program of the organization. Not to say we haven't had that program through the years, but the other years we had it and we had to divide our focus between collective bargaining and professional issues.

Now we have time to devote all our time and energy to professional issues until some new obstacle comes along to make us again a fighting force for maybe economic issues. Who knows what that's going to be. But the professionalism is a thrust that people consider more luxurious participation than they did any of the previous

kinds of protest participations.

Noticeable among the approaches in the Shanker administration is the expansion of non-teaching personnel and the expansion of health care workers. There have been many, many non-teaching personnel that through the years wanted to participate in the work of the organization, but we've been able to take any of those people who had heretofore had another union affiliation.

I know in our own experience one time somebody handed me over 300 cards and I was unable to take them because at that time we weren't taking school secretaries and school custodians. But now it seems that a more unified approach to all of those people in the educational field is the answer. So, large numbers of people are coming into the organization who heretofore were unable to participate in the organization.

The reason that clerks and custodians weren't in the organization previously was because there were other AFL-CIO units that were specifically organized to provide for these groupings of people.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

However, as time went on and the units in which they were, locals in which they were members began to expand their horizons into other fields. secretaries and the custodians began to feel a little bit left out when they're under the jurisdiction of school committees and the other comparable personnel in a given city or town is under the jurisdiction of a city council. there's two different bargaining units and many of them felt that they would be better served if they could be in a unit that was bargaining with school committees rather than with city councils. However, we have not been able to take these people in those jurisdictions where union organizations already existed. We were unable to take those. Title 20 of the AFL-CIO prevents us from taking those.

During my many years as a union member I saw numerous changes occur. Whereas the AFT was a protest movement in the early days, so too were many of the other locals, other union organizations in their own sphere. They were protest organizations.

In many ways unions have been hurt by their own success. I talked with many people today who are driving foreign cars, for example, who earn whatever money they have through being union members, and yet they prefer foreign cars to American cars. Many people who started out with very low wages have been very successful through the efforts of the union, and as a result, are now the fat cats and they don't heed buying American products or buying union-made products. They buy whatever they want whenever they want and from whomever they want.

The time has come when we're going to have to take a good look at where we came from and where we're going and decide whether or not unionism means something to us, and if it does, how much participation are we willing to offer to make the goals of that union, whatever it may be, a success.

My home union is Lynn, Massachusetts, my teacher union, and in Lynn, Massachusetts at the present time we're having a real struggle at the General Electric Company whereby there's been a vast cutback in the number of employees and the

number of jobs available to union people. This was the mainstay, the backbone of the city of Lynn throughout the years. And I read in the paper just three nights ago that the now president of the General Electric, John F. Welsh, a former principal and family friend of mine, was telling us how many cuts they had made in their various units across the country.

If Lynn is going to experience that number of cuts and other places with GE groupings are going to experience that number of cuts and they're only one segment of the vast number of factories and great conglomerates and what not that are cutting back, I think once again we're going to come to a day where we're going to be hiring people at lower wages, creating a new group of people at the bottom of the barrel, a new group of people fighting to get up the ladder, and probably bring some revitalization to the union movement.

The problem is that we don't have enough people in the trenches at the present time who are willing to fight or to maintain what we have. Many people are too openly stating that they have now

more than they ever thought they'd get which isn't too complimentary in terms of management's success in keeping them down. And basically this new group of people -- yesterday I was in a restaurant and a group of young men who obviously were new to the country, were seeking employment and they were taking their turns being interviewed. The question among themselves while they were waiting to be interviewed was "Where was the man from the union?"

I thought to myself, these are the people that are going to have to go out to carry on the good fight in order that they some day can achieve the gains that people of earlier years now enjoy.

It seems that our responsibility as teacher union leaders and other union leaders across the country is to see that society does not force us back to the early days of unionism in this country. In our work with the non-teaching personnel, we must see that any newly created roles in school departments employ people at living wages, not minimum wages, but wages that are commensurate with a living wage in that area of the country. We as trade unionists have responsibility to see that we

never have to go back to those early days.

There are times when it appears that that's imminent, but it behooves all of us to partake of this and make this a priority issue in politics and in government so that people can have homes and food and educate their children and live comfortably.

During my years of service with the AFT

Council I was privileged to be associated with many people who were outstanding leaders, many of whom are now deceased and I think that any history should include their name. First of all, there's Mary Harrick. Mary Harrick was a Chicago teacher, a leader of the union, a woman who gave up teaching to go to be the research director of the AFT in the Megel years, a woman who put together a first concept of research in the organization, and that at an advanced age. But a brilliant woman, way ahead of her time from whom I learned an awful lot in my early years.

Another woman, Mary Wheeler from West

Suburban, Illinois, who was the leader in the

Progressive Caucus and a woman with whom I worked

closely on the Executive Committee of the council for many, many years.

Mary McGoff from St. Paul, Minnesota who was a great speaker, great debater, real feisty person who provided great leadership on the floor fights on behalf of the Progressive Caucus.

Florence Sweeney who I read died very recently in her late eighties, a woman that I served -- my first council I served with Florence and I had little or no knowledge of parliamentary procedure at the time. I would sputter and spume until Florence would tell me what the proper motion was, and then we would go from there. Florence had had outstanding parliamentary procedure ability learned from her dealings in the Detroit Central Labor Council when she had to fight the early fights with the other members of organized labor.

Phyllis Hutchinson from Portland, Oregon who was originally from Massachusetts with whom I worked on the council for many, many years.

Selma Borschat (phonetic) who was our legislative representative in Washington was a brilliant woman living in a world all her own that

made great contributions in behalf of the organization. I recall first hearing about the plight of the Indians from Selma Borschat and that has always stayed in my mind.

Veronica Hill, the first black person with whom I was closely associated. Veronica was from New Orleans, and when I first went on the council, Veronica was the only other Catholic on the council. So we went to church together. We got to be good friends. And from Veronica I got a background about blacks that I never had been privileged to understand before and was the beginning of a long friendship with many black members of the AFT.

My early years were dominated by women that I found to be of outstanding leadership ability. The organization seemed to be the only place that I had ever gone where there were vast numbers of women who seemed to be exerting leadership roles. And contrary to what's happening generally in society, the role of woman has been somewhat diminished in the organization as we've had a vast influx of men into the teaching profession and men have come to

take over the roles that many of those women held in the early days. They felt strongly about their role.

I recall one day that a group of about 15 of them invited me to sit down with them and I was scared to death because I had no idea what it was all about. And after five hours, I realized it was their gift to me, their share of the organization they were willing to me. I had to assemble so much material and absorb so much material in five hours that some of it I never did get straight.

However, I think that many of them are deserving of a real tribute as founders, founding leaders of the organization.

END OF TAPE 3