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

## INTERVIEW OF WILLIAM SIMONS

## TAPE I

MS. EPSTEIN: The following interview with William Simons is taking place on November 18th, 1986 in Washington, D.C. This interview is part of an oral history project contracted by the American Federation of Teachers.

MR. WILLIAM SIMONS: My name is William Simons. I'm a native Washingtonian, born here in 1924. I'm one of eight, five boys and three girls. My parents were originally from Columbia, South Carolina, and moved here during World War I. My father was a government employee, and my mother was basically a housewife, though she was the first woman graduate from Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina. My father was a graduate from Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina.

Well, my father was certainly not a professional in the government. He entered the service as a messenger, and worked his way up in the government as an electrician. However, he was never given full recognition as a master electrician during his government service.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 My mother could have been a teacher and 2 probably would have been a teacher had she stayed in Columbia, South Carolina, but here in Washington, D.C., her interests were devoted to the eight children which she bore.

> I had no inclination towards union, I had no union background whatsoever.

No -- well, I suppose that my father gave me inspiration to fight injustices. One of the early incidents in his career in the federal government, he was hired as a messenger. After a few years as a messenger, his supervisor called him in one day and said that he was going to be promoted to a clerk. However, he would not be given a clerk's salary, he would still be doing the same duties that he had been doing all along. He politely said "No, thank you. If I can't get paid for a different title, I'll stay where I am."

Another incident that he related to us was the fact that he was able to do a number of things with his hands. He was an expert carpenter, for example, and he used to take the scrap lumber and make furniture for his girls. One day while

working on his lunch period, his supervisor said,

"Fine, when you finish that, I would like for you
to make a companion piece so that both would be
ready for Christmas."

And my father said to him, "Over my dead body. If you want me to make some furniture for your daughters, I'll be happy to do so at the going rate. This is for my daughter, and that's where it is going."

My father was very active in the community, and he belonged to a number of organizations. And I suppose that's where I got the inclination to join organizations. But also, he told me that if you are going to join an organization, if it's worth joining, it's worth working in. So, I never joined any organization unless I intended to become an active member of that organization.

I went to school here in the District of Columbia, John F. Cook School, Shore Junior High School, Dunbar Senior High School and then to the Teachers College. Why I went to the Teachers College is very simple, there was no money to go anywhere else, and in those days there were very

few employment opportunities for blacks other than teachers, ministers, dentists perhaps, a few, and that was about the size of it.

Well, unions in the early days were discriminatory just as society as a whole was discriminatory. And certainly the craft unions were not eager to take in black members. Now, I don't know whether there was any union here available for my father to join, certainly I don't believe that the American Federation of Government Employees was in operation during the days that he was an employee.

So, I don't know, there was never any discussion about unions in the home, and I really don't know whether he was offered or ever tried to join a union. But I do know that blacks were excluded from membership in many instances in many unions. Or if they did join unions, they were segregated into separate locals.

To the best of my knowledge, my father was a Republican. I don't know whether or not he maintained a voting residence in South Carolina.

As you know, during those days there was no voting

whatsoever in the District of Columbia, not even for dog catcher. So that politics really did not play an important role in the city, and very little of it was discussed at home, except, of course, during presidential election years. Even though we couldn't vote, we did follow the presidential elections.

Well, my education began at the John F. Cook Elementary School, and I suppose that I, well, had a unique experience in a sense. I started in the first grade when I was five years old. I skipped two grades in elementary school so that I graduated from Dunbar High School when I was 16 years old. Schools, of course, at that time were segregated, and that was the way of life and we simply accepted it.

Talk about busing, in order for most of the -or many of the children in D.C. to get to school,
they had to ride the bus because there were no
schools near them. There were only three high
schools for blacks, and they were concentrated in
the northwest section of the city. So that the
children that lived in northeast, southeast and

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

southwest had to catch the bus, or streetcar in those days, in order to come to the high schools.

Well, of course, black history was played down in those days. There was very little in textbooks. We used to have to get supplemental materials. That's why Carter G. Woodson was so important, because it was he who began to write books about blacks that were used in the schools in the District of Columbia.

Yes, we had heroes. There was, of course, Joe Lewis. There were, of course, the black baseball players such as Sachel Page and Josh Gibson, Buck Leonard and many others. Used to have a team here, the Homestead Grays that used to play in the old Whiffet (sp?) Stadium, 7th and Florida Avenues, Northwest. I used to go there on Sunday afternoons and see the double headers when the Washington Senators were not in town.

I really had no idea of what I wanted to do. I was doing very well in senior high school even though I suffered because I was younger than my classmates, and they looked upon me as a baby. a matter of fact, my senior year in the exchange of

1 Christmas gifts, I received a teething ring and a rattle. When I would ask the young ladies to go to the movie with me, "No, I don't go out with 3 babies."

> Yet, when I finally found someone that would go to the movies with me, she was a tenth grader, and I, of course, was a senior in the 12th grade, then they used to kid me about robbing the cradle.

So, my life was pretty miserable, in a sense. As a matter of fact, my ambition was to graduate from high school. All of us had to graduate from high school because my mother insisted upon it. She said that if she had to come to our graduation in a wheelchair with a seeing eye dog, she would be there to see that each one of us graduated, and we all did. Well, my idea of the world was to graduate from high school and get a messenger's job in the government at \$98 a month. However, most of my classmates went up to the Teachers College, it was Minor Teachers College at that time, to take the entrance exam, and they said "Come on, Bill, let's go anyway. You might like it."

So, I took the exam, and of course I passed

23

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As I said previously, there was no money in the family for me to go elsewhere. I had no knowledge about scholarships or what have you. So, Minor at twelve dollars a year was the place that most of us went to. And you could even pay that on installments.

Well, finished up two years, and then, of course, World War II was under way. They told us in 1941, right after the war had broken out, if we signed up for the reserves, we would be guaranteed to complete our college education before we went into service. But that turned out to be a joke. And in February of '43 I was inducted into the armed services. Took my basic training at Camp Lee in Petersburg, Virginia, then was shifted over to Camp Picket in Blackstone, Virginia. I finished my basic training in May and at the end of June I was on the Queen Mary headed for England.

I spent the next two years, '43 to -February of '43 to November '45 in the service. I
was in a quartermaster outfit. I ended up being
the master sergeant of the battalion on the channel

on D day and landed in France on June 7th, 1944.

It was a very harrowing experience, something that I couldn't buy for millions of dollars, but something that I would not want anyone else to go through. War is hell.

I came back in November of '45. My sister was doing her M.A. at the University of Chicago, and she asked me to come out for the month of December, because I couldn't come back into Minor until February of '46. I stayed out there December and January and then came back to D.C., reentered Minor and finished in '47.

I was appointed as a teacher in September of 1947 at the Bannica (sp?) Junior High School. At that time there was a union here in the District of Columbia of teachers. However, I had no knowledge of the union, but I did decide to join it in 1948.

All right. Growing up in a segregated city, a segregated country, my experiences during the war were also segregated. I can recall one instance when we were in the same vicinity with white troops and we shared the common bath facilities. I was asked on several occasions, "Why do you comb your

hair? Does it look any different when you comb it or when you leave it uncombed?"

So, coming back, even though the war was supposed to be freedom for democracy and all the other slogans, it was business as usual here in Washington, D.C. and everywhere else. And I can recall talking to several people, one person in particular, Julius Hobson, said that when he went back to Alabama in his uniform, he was stopped and they made him take off his uniform even though he had a very distinguished career as a soldier.

When I joined the union, I really did not know anything about the unions, but the building rep came around and simply asked me, how about joining the union? I said fine. Conditions in the D.C. schools were horrible in the sense that classes were large. It was not uncommon to have classes of 45, 50, even as high as 60 at times. Of course, the textbooks were scarce, few and far between. Supplies were almost non-existent. There were any number of things, but I didn't join the union necessarily to -- oh, I did not have in mind when I joined the union that the union was going to

be able to do anything about those problems. I

might say, also, that I joined the NEA around the

same time. In fact, at one time I paid up my life

membership in the NEA, but I soon found out that

that was not for me either.

It was really a revelation when schools were desegregated here in the District of Columbia to really find out just what was on the other side of the fence. I remember before desegregation, a member of the Board of Education, Dr. Margaret Jusbucher (sp?) suggested that the two technical high schools -- there was the white technical high school, McKinley Tech, and there was the black, Armstrong Technical High School -- and she said since they are supposed to be equal, she moved that the population switch, that the whites go to Armstrong and the blacks go to McKinley. course, she was laughed out of the city, but she was serious in her effort to point out that the schools were not separate and equal.

Well, at that time there were three locals -no, there were two locals in the District of
Columbia, Local 27 was the black teachers local,

22

1

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Local 8 was the white teachers local. Sometime during the fifties, and I don't recall the exact date, oddly enough there was formed an integrated local of attendance officers. That was Local 858. So that there were three locals here in the city.

The local tried to address the problems in the black schools. Well, one major problem was the fact that the lunch -- there were no lunch periods really. If you got a lunch period you considered yourself lucky. Problems of supplies, equipment, textbooks, they were addressed by the local as well as the overcrowded classes. The local, of course, testified before the Board of Education, also testified before Congress, because during those days Congress, as it still does now, controls the budget, but it controlled it even more so then. All salary matters had to be taken up by Congress and bills had to be enacted and signed by the president before teachers got any kind of a salary increase.

The local did work on problems, I must admit that I was not very active in the local at the time, and I will relate this. There was a drive on

scheduled lunch periods. And there was a petition that was presented to the principal or -- no, what happened was this. The petition was signed, it was not presented to the principal, but a letter with the signatures was sent to the then president of the local. He in turn contacted the principal about the matter, and the principal called in each of the faculty members one by one and asked them did they sign a letter complaining about the lunch periods. I was called in and I swore that I knew nothing about the matter at the time. That was my first and last time doing that, but I did do that.

was afraid to admit that I would sign something
like that at that time. I have no knowledge of
really what a union could do or what the
capabilities of the labor movement were. I simply
joined because I was asked to join. I had no real
commitment to it. Neither did I have any real
commitment to the NEA at the time that I joined. I
just thought it was proper to join an organization.
And even though I knew that eventually I was going

to become active, at that particular time I was not active and I just felt that there was nothing that could be done. The principal was the lord and master of the individual school. And certainly you couldn't go down and see the superintendent, at least I didn't know that you could go down and see the superintendent or anybody else to talk about the problems. And it just seemed as though it was just a hopeless case.

Nevertheless, I guess I felt within me that something had to be done sometime and that it could be done best through an organization rather than individually.

To me, I never thought about whether or not it was professional or unprofessional to belong to a union. I simply joined an organization not knowing what really it was, and that was that. No, for me, there was no question about the blue collars being below me, because after all, my father was a blue collar worker and certainly I had the greatest respect for him. And people that worked with their hands I knew were very good people. I was just sorry that I never developed

any real skills with my hands.

Prior to 1953 there were the three locals here in the District of Columbia, Local 27, the black local, Local 8, the white local, and oddly enough, the integrated local of attendance officers. AFT started in 1951 to exert its influence to bring about the integration of the three locals. There were joint meetings of the executive committees of the locals during those years. I was not an active member except that I did go to meetings, but I was not an officer. I was a building representative and I really did not know too much about what was going on.

But at any rate, in May of 1953, the merger was completed and a new charter was given to the Washington union. It became Local 6 of the American Federation of Teachers. The local at the time of merger had about nine hundred members, but the membership dropped because there were those who, of course, still did not believe in integration and they dropped out and many of the blacks also dropped out, because the blacks really felt that the local was going to be taken over by

the whites. Many of them felt that way, and they felt that they weren't going to get a fair shake.

Oh, let me go back and add this. That the attendance officers were really a major holdout in bringing about the merger of the three locals, simply because they felt that the teachers would be the dominant force in the local and would not look after their special interests. However, that proved to be false as things went on.

Well, the local still pursued the avenue of testimony before the Board of Education, testimony before Congress in trying to resolve the various problems of the school system.

Integration as far as my teaching career is concerned really made no difference. I stayed at Bannica Junior High School. As a matter of fact, I stayed there my whole 18 years that I was a teacher in the system. I suppose the only major difference was that our classes did become somewhat smaller in that the other schools in the area began to take up students and we did get a few white students. However, one of the things that happened after integration was the introduction of the track

system into the D.C. public schools.

Now, it is said by many that the purpose of the track system was to resegregate the schools within an integrated situation, because we found that in a majority of the instances the blacks were relegated to the lower tracks and the whites were in the upper tracks. We also found that over the years that the students that had started out in what was then called the junior primary which was somewhere between kindergarten and first grade, usually ended up in the basic track.

Prior to integration, even though the conditions were horrible, teachers made a conscientious effort to see to it that the students were up to par with any students no matter where they might find them. Not just because since we had limited employment opportunities, you might say that the best of the blacks went into the teaching profession. And this showed up in the progress of the students throughout the city. The track system, of course, as I said, was instituted after integration. It was supposed to be based on the fact that you put like students together, you work

with them, but then as a student progressed, the student was supposed to be able to move up to the next level. That did not happen.

I can recall one year the principal came to me at the beginning of the school year and asked if I would take a basic class. This was a class of nine girls. I said yes, because I felt that I could work with them as long as the number stayed small, and to be able to do something with them.

Basic track is the lowest track. I guess today we would call those students who are now in special education, were in the basic track.

For a semester, from September through

February we had fun. The girls really needed help,

but I was able to give it to them because there

were only nine and we were able to do a number of

things. And then as luck would have it, lack of

funds for sufficient teachers, in February they put

in 18 boys with those nine girls, and bink, there

went my program. And from February to June it was

just a matter of keeping order and just daily

routine, not too much learning took place.

In the still predominantly black schools,

because we did not have busing here in the District of Columbia to integrate the schools -- they did have boundaries, and well, by that time, of course, the housing patterns had changed and there were many blacks moving into different parts of the city, just as I moved out here where I am located now, and the junior high school right across South Dakota Avenue, of course, was a white school, but my daughter went to that school. So, there was no busing as such.

Now after the Scally-Wright (sp?) decision, you did have a shift of teachers in an effort to try to integrate the teaching population. But that was very difficult to do because, well, by that time the student population was about 95 percent black. The teaching population was about 80 percent black. So, very little integration that you could do.

All right. As I said, there was no busing here for students in order to try to achieve integration. That would have been impossible as the student population was 95 percent black. The teaching population was about 80 percent black.

Many of the white teachers who were here before integration went to Maryland and Virginia and to other parts. However, the track plan made it possible for those schools that still had a good percentage of white students, schools west of Rock Creek Park, to maintain segregation in those schools through the tracking method. Most of the black students were put in the basic or the general track and the white students were in the college preparatory or the honors track.

Well, now, what you have to remember is this, that when the schools were segregated, of course the blacks work with blacks and that was that. The black teachers did everything they possibly could to make sure that the children were properly prepared. But now you've got a different situation. With integration there were many whites who felt that the blacks could not learn, still the squeamishness, what have you, did not want to be bothered with them, and in an effort to make sure that they would not contaminate the white students, they were segregated within the schools.

Yes, it was supposedly done on testing, but

then there was quite a bit of arbitrary and capricious placement of students. Now, this was not only in what were the formerly all white schools, but we also found many shoddy practices in black schools. For example, we found that -- when I say "we", I'm talking about the union, because the union did become involved in investigating the track system and fought to abolish the track system.

Now, at Bannica we had the track system, and as I had indicated, I became involved with the basic track with this group of nine girls I only enjoyed working with for a semester, and at the end of that semester, 18 boys were thrown in with the nine girls and my program was shot to hell.

Now, also, one of the things that caused me to become concerned about the track system was the fact that what used to happen when new students transferred into the school, they simply looked for the smallest section of that grade level and put the student there. I had a student that was transferred in during the eighth grade and the first day I knew that she did not belong in a basic

class. I tried that whole semester -- this is in September when she came to me -- I tried the whole semester from September to February talking to the principal, to the counselor, assistant principal, everyone, trying to get the young lady moved out of that class because it was stifling her and I could not take the time to give her the work that she needed.

next door who had the same level eighth grade section and asked her to let this young lady follow her section program. I taught her section, so that's one class we didn't have to worry about. I went to all of the other teachers and asked them to take her in. The girl ended up winning the Shakespeare Festival contest that year. But she was put in the basic track, and finally let her go on with that class in the ninth grade. And I think she's teaching today.

The supervisors at Bannica were all black and it was just that they did not want to make change. They like anything else, people reluctant to make changes that needed to be made.

Another example was the fact that there was a girl who made the school honor society, but because she got into some difficulty, a minor scrape with one of the teachers, they would not let her go into the honors track in the ninth grade. You had to enter the honors track in the ninth grade in order to continue through high school. She made all A's in high school but she did not graduate as an honor student because she did not start out in the honors track in the ninth grade.

The basic children were segregated in the cafeteria. They were prevented from attending various assembly programs. They got very few opportunities to take school-related trips. And it was that that led me to believe that the track system was wrong, and it was not in the best interest of the students. That's why I became active in the union to try to get rid of the track system.

The union was integrated in 1953, received charter number 6 from the American Federation of Teachers. At that time I was a building representative at Bannica Junior High School.

Building representative is the union rep in the building, comparable to a shop steward. But we call them building representatives.

The first president of the local was a counselor at what was then Western Senior High School. Membership dropped for various reasons. Whites got out because they didn't believe in integration. Blacks dropped out because they had felt that the union could not do anything and you were going to have white leadership, and that would not be interested in the interest of the black teachers.

The membership fluctuated, I would say, between 600 on down to 250 and up again, up and down during those early years. The second president of the local was a black, Paul Cook. He at that time was an assistant professor at the Teachers College. He was very active in bringing about, bringing attention to the numerous problems that existed in the school system, and there were many problems. As I indicated, the classes were large, the supplies were still negligible, and also the fact that no duty free lunch periods,

especially on the elementary level.

He remained president for two years and then we had Carol McCameron (sp?) who was a high school mathematics teacher. She was white. She remained president for four years, and then Paul Cook became president again. He is my immediate, or was my immediate predecessor.

Now, during the time I did begin to become active in the union. In 1956 I attended a union workshop at Pennsylvania State University during that summer. I was parliamentarian of the local.

I then became corresponding secretary for the local. In 1964 I was elected for the first time as president of the local.

I realized that a strong organized body could bring about some changes, not only in ensuring that the students were going to get a fair shake, but also that teachers would get a fair shake.

We had no collective bargaining at that time, but I thought that we could achieve collective bargaining if we simply kept at it. Some of the issues that we took up, the track system which we fought and finally abolished with the Scally-Wright

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

decision, also meetings of the Board of Education.

The Board of Education used to meet at two o'clock in the afternoon which meant that teachers could not attend the meeting, nor could the working public. We were able to get the Board of Education to shift its meetings to night. And that was done with the help of the Central Labor Council as well as the Congress, parents and teachers.

Prior to my becoming president of the union, there was very little activity. Many of the teachers were afraid to join the union because the principals did not like unions. As a matter of fact, in a few schools the principals used to pay the fees for the NEA, DCEA and the teachers would have to pay back during the course of the year. The principals were anti-union. They intimidated teachers. We had principals who made comments to the effect that "I know of two organizations here in the city, the Teachers Union and the District of Columbia Education Association, to my knowledge there has never been a teacher in my school who has been a member of the union." And there was not much activity going on.

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

There was a relationship with the Central Labor Council, there were delegates from the local to the Central Labor Council, but even so, the Central Labor Council was not too much involved or too much interested in the union activities. And I think the reason was that the union was really not doing anything. There was no definite organizing strategies. The building representative used to go around to teachers trying to collect the dues which in those days was six dollars a year, but even so, could get very few takers. And if you got taker there was very little activity going on. no collective bargaining at all during those days. There was no grievance procedure. So, you were really at the mercy of the bureaucracy of the school system.

The major activity of the union prior to my becoming president was to make presentations before the Board of Education. There was a legislative representative who followed measures on the Hill relating to the D.C. public schools. It's very difficult to measure the terms of success or failure of the legislative activities. Really I

don't know, I suspect that there were some successes in getting some of the bills passed. But very little is really known about that.

As far as the school system is concerned, you had a polite reception at the Board of Education, a polite reception from the superintendent, but that was just about it. At that time the District of Columbia Education Association, affiliate of the NEA, claimed to be the representative of the teachers. I suspect they did have some measure of influence on the Hill because many of their representatives, the legislative representatives is what I am trying to say, lived in Virginia and was very close to then Congressman Joe Broyhill (sp?) and other members of Congress. But it was just simply a lobbying organization without any effective way to lobby.

I learned about the AFT by going to conventions. My first convention was in 1957 in Chicago. Then I have been to every convention through this year, 1986. Will probably be my last one, but nevertheless, I was there.

Well, actually, as far as the union's

participation in the various caucuses of the AFT, some of the older members, Selma Borschot (sp?), for example, I suspect was a member of the progressive caucus. There really wasn't too much attention given to caucuses by the local as such. I used to experiment with all of them before I finally joined the progressive caucus. So that really didn't play a role in local affairs.

Now, I don't know why, I just guessed that we went to conventions and we became involved in activities at the convention, and at the end of the convention, that was it. I didn't think about it any more until next year. And then next year we started all over again.

What you have to remember is that since there were no local politics at all, the political factor was not very important in this union at all. There were no divisive factors, there were no factions at all within the union. They were just individuals who agreed on certain items and who disagreed on certain things. So, we don't have that political action within the locals. As a matter of fact, I can recall the days when the union refused to make

recommendations to the judges of the district court of the District of Columbia about board members.

Now, board members used to be appointed by the judges of the U.S. District Court, and the judges would ask groups to send in recommendations. And this union refused to do so on the grounds that you might alienate someone. So that there was no political action at all, no political factions.

Lacking a political climate here in the city, many people sort of reticent about trying to do things, we had no one really to whom we could go to address problems. The city government was appointed by Congress. We had then three commissioners who really had no power whatsoever except for ceremonial functions. All of the laws were passed by Congress. We didn't even have a non-voting delegate in Congress as we do today.

There were people who did keep their voting registration in their home states, but they were few and far between. They never really got together to make a concerted effort to go see someone from New York or someone from South Carolina or wherever, a group of them might have

come from originally.

So, I think that the lack of political action really hampered the development of the union, and I suspect that coming out of a segregated mold knowing that the blacks in the city really had no power. As a matter of fact, I can recall the black superintendent while he was an assistant superintendent, head of the public schools, used to boast about how much money he had saved Congress by turning back a portion of the school budget allocated to the black schools to Congress each year. So, that sort of thing, there really wasn't anything to really grab ahold to.

Now, the District of Columbia Education

Association which claimed that it represented over two-thirds of the teachers in the city really were tools, the organization with tools of the principals, and it really never challenged anything.

So, there wasn't really anything doing. Now, in 1962, Carl Magel was president of the AFT, and Carl was invited as our luncheon speaker for the annual building representatives meeting. And at

that meeting Carl said that he believed that Washington was ripe for collective bargaining and for the growth of a union, and that he would do what he could in order to help this along.

Paul Cook who was then the president of the local told Carl that he believed that the teachers union could win a collective bargaining election if we could ever get one from the Board of Education. Of course, at that time Washington, D.C. was considered an appendage of the federal government, and we were under the same kind of regulations that the federal employees were under. No collective bargaining for the federal employees at that time, hence no collective bargaining for teachers at that time. Nevertheless, Paul Cook was convinced that a job could be done.

Now, prior to that my only knowledge of help from the American Federation of Teachers was the time prior to 1953 when Carl Magel was instrumental in integrating the three locals into one union.

Other than that, I have no knowledge of anything that the American Federation of Teachers did for the teachers here in the District of Columbia.

However, we did have a vice president on the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers, Selma Borschot who also served as the Washington representative for the American Federation of Teachers during those years. So that there was contact with the American Federation of Teachers, but of course I was not active on the scene at the time.

No, after I became president, I felt that the union should take a more active role in addressing issues not only in education with the Board of Education, but taking stands on issues in the community at large.

In 1964 at the convention in Chicago, the
American Federation of Teachers said to me that
they would give me a full-time organizer if we
could put together a program of organization
leading toward collective bargaining. The AFT was
able to get a full-time organizer from the
Industrial Union Department. Mel Stack came to
work with the local in September of 1964, and he
was out beating the bushes getting members. We had
become active on a number of issues. The AFT did

send in additional assistance in the form, in the persons of Joe Casella (sp?) and George Brickhouse (sp?). Joe Casella shocked the city by saying that the Board of Education in Washington, D.C. was supporting segregation in that the principals in many schools were forcing teachers to become members of the NEA.

The NEA was still segregated at the time, and therefore, drawing the inference that the Board of Education was responsible for supporting segregation. That made headlines in the black press, the Washington Afro here, and that really started things moving. We were then able to begin to get into buildings. We confronted the superintendent about having meetings in the school buildings during the lunch period and after school or before school at times we would not be obstructing the instructional program.

The superintendent was reluctant, but he finally agreed, and that's when we started visiting all of the schools in the city. Now, in November of '65, that was when John F. Kennedy issued the executive order 10966 which provided for collective

bargaining, albeit limited collective bargaining for federal employees. That was made applicable to the District of Columbia employees with the exception of the teachers, the fire fighters and the police.

I petitioned the Board of Education to adopt the executive order.

# 

#### TAPE II

MS. EPSTEIN: This is Rene Epstein. My interview with William Simons is continuing on November 18th, 1986 in Washington, D.C.

MR. WILLIAM SIMONS: Thank goodness, the Board of Education did not adopt the executive order, for the scope of bargaining under the executive order is very limited. There were very few things that the federal employees unions could bargain over at that time. Times have changed and things have gotten better. But we would have been very limited in the scope of bargaining with the Board of Education. Plus the fact, the Board of Education had no power to establish salaries for teachers. That was still done by Congress. So, we could not do anything about that at any rate.

We understood the situation. And as I've told people time and time again, this is the only situation like this in the 50 states of the United States. We realize that we could bargain with the Board of Education on working conditions. However, we still would have to go to Congress in order to get salary increases.

Now, under the executive order, anything that pertained to policy whatsoever, was outside of the scope of bargaining. So, it meant that there was very little that the early federal unions could really bargain about. But nevertheless, the idea that they could bargain collectively was very important.

Now, Mel Stack and I worked very well together. He took care of business during the day. I was still teaching that year, '64-'65. I spent every spare moment I could out of a classroom on the telephone talking with Mel getting things straight, and as soon as school was over I would go down to the union office and spend the rest of the night trying to take care of other matters that had to be taken care of during the -- or taking care of union business.

We were fortunate in that the Industrial
Union Department sort of adopted us, gave us our
first office space in the TWA Building on the
corner of 17th and K Streets Northwest. It's no
longer there now. We stayed there and then they
brought us over to the AFL-CIO Building and gave us

space in the Industrial Union office. So, it made it convenient. We had a place to work with all of the facilities and equipment necessary in order to get the job done.

Jack Conway was the then executive director of the Industrial Union Department. Jack simply told me that he would furnish whatever I needed and for me to go ahead and get the job done. Nick Zonerich (sp?) was his assistant, and I worked very closely with Nick. As a matter of fact, Nick had a daughter who still teaches in the D.C. public schools, and she became a building representative and helped to organize her building west of Park.

They never bothered me in any way, shape or form, and never asked me about how things were going or what have you, and they would pass pleasantries, but never tried to get into our business of how we were organizing. And I was so grateful on the night of April 25th, 1967 when we were declared the bargaining agent for the teachers, that I could go to Jack and Nick and say thank you, thank you, thank you, because it was a wonderful feeling.

The Industrial Union Department was very much interested in organizing the unorganized, and they looked upon the teachers as a group of unorganized people in general that could make a contribution to the labor movement. I can recall my last NEA convention in Denver, Colorado, in 1962. The then president of the IUE -- oh, what is his name? At any rate, I'll think of it -- was invited to speak to the convention. And he began to tell them about the New York story about what could happen when teachers organized and began to bargain collectively. He was hooted off the stage. And I guess it was that incident that made me realize that NEA might not be the organization for me.

It was that and another incident that made me that was my last dealings with the NEA. I revoked my life membership after the 1962 convention. I guess the other thing along that line was the fact that it wasn't until 1961 that the National Education Association recognized that the Supreme Court had spoken in 1954 about the integration of schools. In the 1960 convention in Los Angeles, working with a group of enlightened folks in the

2.2

NEA, we were able to put the motion on the floor getting the NEA to recognize the Supreme Court decision. However, we were not skilled in parliamentary procedures, and even though the motion passed, it was recalled and voted down.

However, over that winter we kept in contact, and in 1961 at Atlantic City, I put the motion on the floor, we had all of our bases covered and the motion finally passed.

In 1962 in Denver, I came with the idea of putting some additional resolutions with respect to integration on the floor of the NEA convention, but was told, "You're going too fast. You've got all that you're going to get out of this organization at this time." So, I guess that and the way that Jim Carey, that's his name, president of the IUE, was treated at the convention made me give up any hopes for the NEA. That's when I began to turn my full attention to the American Federation of Teachers.

Now, Mel Stack was the only organizer for most of the year. The next year Joe Casella and George Brickhouse was sent in from the AFT. We got

along very well together, because I established right from the beginning that I was the president of the local and that things that they wanted to do, if they had any question about them, please check with me first, don't do it and then come back and tell me what you have done.

We, of course, had our scrapes. I can recall, for example, the night that I was presenting or getting ready to present testimony on the track system before the Board of Education, Joe says, "You're not going to present that." I said, "The hell I am not. I am going to present it."

And we had other squabbles. But basically we worked very well together. We didn't get in each other's way, and we were all for the purpose of trying to organize the teachers which we successfully did.

I came out of a classroom in December, 1965.

I realized that I was not doing a good job in the classroom, and certainly was not being very effective or as effective as I knew I could be with the union. So, I asked for a leave of absence, and I was granted leave of absence from my teaching

position in December, 1965, and I became full time on the union staff.

Working with Mel Stack who had a year under his belt in working with the teachers, and he hit it off very well even though Mel did not come from a teaching background, he was able to relate to the teachers and they were able to relate to him. That was when we started our school visitations. He would do the noontime and after school and I would make visits after school. That was '64-'65.

Mel and I talked and got an understanding as to how I felt the best way would be to approach teachers. And just simply you would present yourself as a sincere individual, give them the facts, don't try to do a snow job on them. Don't try to lead them astray. Don't try to make them any promises that you know that you can't keep, but just simply level with them, find out what their concerns are, and let's see what we can do to alleviate some of those concerns, because some of the problems could be addressed on the local school level. Some of the problems had to be addressed to the superintendent.

So, it was just his manner of approach to teachers I think was the major thing in selling him. He sold himself even though he did not come out of a teaching background.

The basic point that we tried to get across to teachers was that you could do something about your problems. What I used to tell teachers time and time again, just think about the civil rights movement. As long as the blacks were in their churches singing and praying and asking for help, nothing was accomplished. But when they took to the streets and started singing and praying, things began to happen. As long as you sit in the cafeteria or sit in the teachers' lounge and gripe to each other, nothing is going to happen. you get together, identify the problem and approach the principal in a group, you're all together, something is going to happen. And teachers listen to that and began to do that about little things, about discipline, about the lunchroom periods, playground and what have you. And things began to change.

The objective was to create a union chapter

23

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in each of the schools. There were a few schools in which we already had strong union chapters even though there were still a number of teachers in those schools who were not members of the union.

So, it was a matter of working I guess one on one. I mean one on one, one building on one building at a time, building up the union membership and the confidence of the teachers at that time.

We really never talked about striking as such. That really never entered the picture. I'll tell you one thing that caught their attention, that is the teachers' attention, the bus company looking for drivers had a sign on the back of the bus "Drivers wanted, 5,646 starting salary, high school education."

At that time the teacher's salary was about 4900, and the question was, well, how can they command a salary of 56 and we only get 49? We've got four years college plus, and only a high school diploma is needed for that. Well, the answer is simple, they're organized. They move together as one body, not as separate entities.

I was able to convince them that even though

the Congress established the salaries, if we had an effective organized group, we would be able to do something about that. And what happened in 1966, Congress did pass a major salary reform act. Now, there was a joint committee made up of the school administrators, representatives from the union and representatives from the DCEA that met for a year and drew up the salary proposals, and we presented those proposals and supported them as a group. That measure passed, and I was able to use that as an example, if we go down together rather than separately, we can get the attention of Congress.

As for the strike, of course many of the teachers were leery about striking. Striking to them in many instances was unprofessional. So that we did not dwell upon that at all, just simply saying to them that if a strike would happen, it would be your strike because you would vote on it. If you voted not to strike, there would be no strike.

Now, as far as professionalism is concerned,

I used to say to them that what is a professional?

How do you define a professional? And I used to

use the example of the professional golfer versus the amateur golfer. Sometimes the amateur golfer beats the professional golfer. However, because he's an amateur, he can't get the money. I said that's the only difference. I said no one can confer a title on you. It's something that you have to earn. And you can become a professional when you are able to help to make the decisions which are going to affect your working conditions. That's when you become a professional, not because you have a degree.

And just various things that we were able to do. I remember, for example, a school in one of the poorer sections of the city, the principal refused to have a free lunch program. Every other school in that community had a free lunch program. We went to work on that, and we got a free lunch program at that school.

When I say we went to work on it, I mean I simply wrote letters to the superintendent on the various problems as they arose making sure that I had all of the documentation necessary so that our arguments could not be blown into the water. And

by doing so, I was able to get a number of things changed, things that people complained about before, but nothing ever happened.

And doing that, oh, I can't recall all of the various things, but there were little things such as that. Oh, the one school where the basic track children were still being segregated in the cafeteria, wrote to the superintendent about that and got that matter cleared up. Other instances where teachers really were assigned 15 minutes to eat lunch, and even though there was no prescribed lunch period, we were able to get that changed so they at least got half an hour each day in which they could eat their lunch alone.

It was just a matter of pursuing these matters before the superintendent and before the Board of Education. One matter -- well, of course, now I wouldn't touch it with a ten foot pole, that was smoking in schools. It was illegal for teachers to smoke in schools. And by confronting the Board of Education, we finally got a room designated in which teachers could smoke. And I can remember the newspaper articles that were

written about that. Bill Gold who no longer writes for the Washington Post, and I had a running dialogue on that matter. In doing this we built up the confidence in the teachers.

Membership, when I took over as president of the union, was somewhere in the neighborhood of about 175, 200 teachers. We began to grow slowly, and when we approached the election in 1967, we were up to a membership of 1200 out of 6,000 teachers. But growth had been steady each year. The national reps from the AFT worked out very well. Of course, they were in and out as they had other assignments. But as I said, by and large, we got along very well, because I made it clear from the very outset that I was running this show, and you are going to work with me or you're not going to work here at all.

I had asked the AFT for assistance because I knew that we did not have experienced people within the local, because nobody in the local had had any experience in organizing as such. I would say there were no major problems with AFT except that AFT was used to doing things their way and they

would go into cities to organize and they would simply take over the show and the local people would report to them to get their assignments rather than the other way around. And I simply wanted to make it clear that it was -- I was not going to blow this opportunity knowing my constituents. There were certain things we could do and there were certain things that we were not going to do.

Well, for example, one time they wanted to send telegrams so that they would arrive about three o'clock in the morning to make it appear as though the DCEA was carrying on some monkeyshines.

And I said no, we aren't going to play that kind of game. It isn't necessary, we don't need to do that. I said it's a waste of money for one thing, and the other thing, I think you get teachers angry. And there were things of that nature.

Or my testimony before the Board of

Education, they claimed that I was not vocal

enough, I was not pounding the table and doing all

of these kinds of things. I said I'm not going to

do that, that's not my nature, and no. Or they

didn't like what I was writing. I said, "Well, this is my testimony, not yours. When I ask you to write a paper for me, you do that," just things of that nature. Nothing really major. Because as I said, I established from the very beginning how the show was going to be run.

Yes, we got money from the AFT. I suspect that the election cost about \$250,000 plus, and most of that big collective bargaining election which began really in '64 through '67, cost over \$250,000. And the bulk of that came from the American Federation of Teachers. So that we had no problem in getting assistance from the American Federation of Teachers. Without that assistance from them and from the Industrial Union Department, we would not have been successful.

Having been rejected by the Board of

Education in the request for the adoption of the

executive order 10966 -- by the way, the Board of

Education could have done that, because the then

mayor, commissioner of the district, said that this

was legal. Of course, he had control over the

police, direct control over the police and fire

be given collective bargaining rights by the mayor.

But then there were other agencies, the Board of

Education, the Recreation Department, the Armory

and the D.C. Library, other district agencies which

were independent agencies as such did have the

option of adopting the executive order if they so

wanted.

After the board turned us down, we then decided that we would simply push the board for a straight out CB election which we did. The board finally agreed in March of '67 to have the election.

We began to testify before the Board of Education on the subject of collective bargaining. We solicited the help of J. C. Turner who was then the president of the Central Labor Council. He joined us on many occasions approaching the Board of Education. And we began to do some individual lobbying of the members of the Board of Education, talking to them separately. And I guess one of the biggest pushes we got was the selection of Jack Sessions who was then the assistant director of

education in the AFL-CIO. He became a member of the Board of Education, and we had a spokesperson on the board who knew about labor and could present our position of labor to the board.

With Jack Sessions on the Board of Education, our job then became easier, and we finally convinced the board to vote on the matter. They did, and the date was set for April 25th, 26th -- I'll get it right, April 26th, 1967. Meanwhile, as far as Congress was concerned, we did pressure Congress in terms of providing more money in the budget for the Board of Education.

As a matter of fact, during one of the -let's see, I guess it was 1966, every Monday
evening we used to go down after school and have a
demonstration across from the Capitol about the
school budget. Charlie Cogan joined us on many
occasions in those demonstrations. And we did go
to talk to the individual members on the District
Appropriations Subcommittee. But we never bothered
with Congress with respect to collective
bargaining. We learned that it was up to the Board
of Education to do this without any necessary

legislation for Congress. So, we pursued that route in terms of getting collective bargaining.

At the time of the election, I guess our membership had come up to about twelve, thirteen hundred active members. But we had developed such a good record over those past three years, that we really didn't have too much of a difficult time in winning the election. We won it by a three-to-two margin. And that changed things for the school system in the District of Columbia.

Following the victory, April 26, 1967, we had a rapid spurt in growth of membership. By the end of the school year in June, we had reached membership of 2,000. One of the first things that happened, a very interesting incident after the election, it was said that we were out to oust the superintendent, Carl Hanson.

We had a meeting with them two days after the election, at which time we told them that certainly we had no intentions of trying to oust him. While we had many disagreements, one of which, of course, had been the track plan, but that had, of course, been outlawed a few months earlier by the

Scally-Wright decision on integration in the D.C. public schools, but we were interested in getting off to a good start and getting down to bargaining about the many concerns which teachers had raised during the campaign.

The first meeting that we had with the Board of Education after the election was an interesting one. The Board of Education had arranged a table behind which the members of the board sat, and they had put to the side a lectern for me to address the Board of Education. I went to the lectern and told them that this is a new day, we don't bargain standing up, one side sitting down. We bargain by sitting across the table from each other, and would you be so kind as to make arrangements so that the members of the negotiating team can have seats at the table?

Needless to say, there was a bit of consternation, but they rearranged the table and we sat down and had a pleasant chat for the rest of the evening. The then president of the Board of Education made some comments about brothers and sisters in a derogatory way, and he was immediately

jumped upon by Jack Sessions, letting him know in no uncertain terms, that you don't talk about brothers and sisters in a demeaning manner, "and you of all people should know better than that as you are a minister."

So, that was simply an introductory meeting, and it ended on a good note. And then, oh, about three weeks later we began our bargaining for our first contract. The negotiations took place over the summer. However, we were not able to reach an agreement. We went on until the end of November, and near the -- oh, let's see, I guess about the 20th of November I announced that we were going to have a meeting right after Thanksgiving to make a determination as to whether or not we could speed things along, if we stop work for a little while, in order to get a contract.

Well, fortunately for me -- I say fortunately because we were not prepared to take any action -- it snowed on the day we were supposed to have the meeting, and therefore, we couldn't have a meeting. However, we did organize a sleep-in. And about 50 members, some with their children, came down to the

Board of Education that night and they had their sleeping bags and whatnot, and we spent the night down at the Board of Education.

In the meanwhile, I had sent a telegram to Lyndon Johnson asking him to use his good offices in order to help us out. He turned the matter over to Joe Callifano who was then his assistant. And the next night at about 11:30, the members of the Board of Education came trekking into the board room. Though we didn't accomplish anything, we did get them out on a snowy night to meet with the union. They said that they were not going to meet with the union, we were going to meet with the chief negotiator, and that was that. But they did meet with us.

Well, shortly thereafter we were able to conclude our first contract. We were fortunate in that the Board of Education had hired a lawyer to do the negotiating. That's usually a bad sign. However, he was a very good lawyer. And because we had done our homework on the issues and we were able to present them in such a manner that they could not be denied, he would turn to the

administration members on the team and ask them,

"Is that correct?" There wasn't anything they

could do but say yes. He said, "Well, if that's

so, give it to them, because you're wrong." And

that's the way it went.

So, we got a darned good contract in terms of establishing a grievance procedure with binding arbitration, getting a duty free lunch period every day for all of the teachers, getting planning periods for the elementary teachers who had never had planning periods at all, setting up the school chapter advisory committee, meeting with the principal at least once a month to discuss implementation of a contract as well as matters relating to policies within the individual schools, and so on that line, teachers on various committees, selection of textbooks, curriculum and so on.

In 1968, our last pay raise had been 1966, and it seems as though nothing we did would make the committees move on a pay bill. So, in 1968, March 7th, about 2500 teachers did not report to school, but rather assembled on Capitol Hill. And

we spent the day lobbying Congress. We got good reception from some of the members and we were scolded and berated by others who told us "Come back after three o'clock, we'll talk to you, but we will not talk to you now."

Very interesting incident, Mendel Rivers, representative from South Carolina who used to be the chairman of the Armed Services Committee -- and there were many stories about Mendel and his bourbon -- the group went in to see him, oh, I guess about 9:15, and he was jumping up and down, hollering and carrying on and what have you, and one of the staff members said, "Look, he hadn't had his eye opener yet, why don't you come back a little later."

And sure enough, when they went back about an hour later, he was just as calm, polite and courteous. Well, we spent the whole day, we finished up with a mass meeting with Ted Kennedy spoke to the teachers. Out of that we got an 18 percent pay raise and that's when teachers really began to understand the meaning of collective action. We caught the school system by surprise.

They didn't know what to do, so they simply declared the schools closed on account of emergency. So no teacher lost pay, no teacher lost any leave.

During the years of organizing, I of course had to appear on the Hill to testify on many measures, especially the appropriations for the Board of Education. And I was able to make friends with a number of the members of Congress, Don Fraser, for example. A few years later, oh, in the '70's, I got Don Fraser to introduce the first bill for teachers' salaries only. Did not include the administrators. Don Fraser, Andy Jacobs, Brock Adams -- oh, golly, Abe Mitka from Chicago who's now a judge, oh, many of them, I can't recall their names at the moment, but I had been able to establish a rapport with them.

There were members of Congress who had compassion for the District of Columbia. Now, we could not vote for them in any way, shape or form.

And it really didn't matter, but they cared about the District of Columbia and were willing to take time to address the problems. Now, Don -- well,

just because they cared. Don Fraser, for example, could have gone off the District Committee. That's what most of them do. They get on the District Committee, that's the first assignment they do as freshmen, and as soon as they get a bit of seniority they move on. But Don Fraser stayed on the district committee because he believed in the District of Columbia and liked the people here.

And others did, too.

So, there were any number, and Senator Morris was also a very good friend of the District of Columbia. I even got to get on good terms with Congressman from Kentucky, Bill Natcher (sp?) from Kentucky. So that there are people who do care about the District of Columbia, and they were sympathetic to our cause.

But that came about only as after I knew that I had to do this to go down to make testimony, and while there I'd stop and get acquainted with the staff members and be able to get a number of things accomplished.

The union structure, of course, was determined by the constitution, that is the union

officers, president, vice president, treasurer, secretary, vice presidents for the various school levels, and then members at large for specialized subject areas.

Now, as far as the staff is concerned, there were four reps, a legislative assistant and -well, that was the basic staff, plus the
secretarial office help. So, we were not a heavily
staffed union, because I felt that we didn't need
that many people if we all did our jobs, and I of
course included myself as part of the staff because
I handled grievances, made school visitations, as
well as doing the other work of the union. So, we
had a very small staff, but we were able to get the
job done.

We have, the union has monthly membership meetings from September through May with the exception of December. The executive committee meets at least once a month, more often twice or three times a month. Matters are brought before the executive committee, and if they are matters that have to be acted upon immediately, the action is taken by the executive committee and reported to

the membership. If it is something that can wait until after the membership meeting, the matter is brought before the membership and then a vote is taken. Well, for example, the matter of opposing the track system was a vote taken by the membership.

No, we took votes by either voice vote or a division if necessary. I am sorry to say that unless there was some burning issue before the membership, we would rarely get over two, 300 members at a meeting. So that it was very difficult to do business. That's not unlike other organizations, but of course if you had a burning issue like a strike, you would have an overflowing crowd.

Our first strike occurred in September, 1972.

I describe it as a strike that should not have been. We had 18 months to go on the current contract, and of course we had the usual no strike provision in the contract. However, there was a nucleus of members who kept harping on the point that we are not a union until we have a strike. To be sure, there were still some issues that needed

to be resolved. We had just gotten a tremendous cutback in the school budget by Congress which caused a shortage of teachers at the beginning of the school year in '72. And there were many other issues, but they were issues that we probably could have resolved with our meetings with the superintendent and the Board of Education, but somehow or another, the feeling began to spread among members that we had to have a strike.

I suspect that really what gave it impetus was our building rep meeting which we have every year just before the opening of school, and that seemed to be the foremost topic in the informal sessions. So that when we got back into the city, the first week of school they asked for a meeting, we had a meeting.

The issues were laid out -- well, not the issues -- people griping about certain things, all of that was brought out and the momentum build. We then had another meeting which was a strike vote meeting, and it was just about unanimous.

Well, to say that we were ill-prepared for this strike would be putting it mildly. We went

out on a Monday, had a meeting with the Board of Education all night long. We did reduce a number of things to writing, and I figured that it was about the best that we were going to get. So, I had agreed to go on the television and radio and announce that the strike was off and that the teachers should report to work. That's when I learned my lesson.

I got back to the union office with this document in hand, and I met about 50 teachers who proceeded to nail me to the wall. "You didn't call the strike, we called the strike. You can't call it off. We will call it off when we are ready," and so forth and so on. Well, I had not had any sleep, and I just about fell out there.

My secretary rescued me from the mob. We had a meeting that afternoon. I almost fell over but I suddenly regained my composure, and said, "All right, if you really mean to strike, I'll see you on the line Wednesday morning."

Well, we had about, I would say about 50, 52 percent the first day. Wednesday morning it got up to 70 percent and kept going on. But we had not

formulated any real demands.

As I said, the strike picked up Wednesday morning to about 70 percent and it kept going up.

We had not taken the necessary measures at all, or the preliminary measures in order to prepare for a strike. We had not notified AFT, we had not notified the Central Labor Council or anybody else. We were simply out there. But fortunately the Central Labor Council rallied behind us.

The mailmen stopped delivering mail, would not cross the picket line. The Teamsters did not cross the picket line. So that we had a good community of support. The AFT sent in Chuck Richards who was then on the national staff to assist, and with his help we finally formulated some issues. The negotiations did not take place with the Board of Education, oddly enough. were involved in it, but the mayor, Mayor Walter Washington and his chief labor negotiator, Don Weinberg, really handled the negotiations. in the meanwhile the Board of Education sought to get an injunction and actually the court did order us to cease and desist.

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A very interesting thing, in meeting with the judge, I told him that I would take his message to the membership meeting that particular night and then I would call him. He gave me a special number to call him. And the membership voted no, and I called the judge and I said, "I'm sorry, sir, but we're still going to be out."

Now, a side light of that was, of course, the beginning of the growth of opposition to me. And what I found out later after the strike was over, that the central reason for the strike was to get me thrown in jail so that they could take over the union. However, it didn't work that way. I was sentenced to go to jail until I had agreed to purge myself. But fortunately it was stayed, and by that time, by the time of the next hearing, we had come to an agreement.

Now, one of the interesting things was that even though the community did not like a strike, there was no effort on the part of the community to organize to keep the schools open, none whatsoever. I was also told later by a group of community activists, that if I had gone to jail, there would

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have been trouble in the town that night.

During my years as president of the union, I always felt that it was incumbent upon me to be an active part of the community. One of the things I used to tell teachers was that as long as you stay within the four walls of your classroom, nothing is going to change outside, and therefore, nothing is going to change inside your classroom. You've got to become a part of the community.

I was an active participant on behalf of the union in, you name it, all kinds of activities, the Vietnam war protest, the PTA, speaking at forums and what have you. I made it a conscientious effort to be identified with the community, and that paid off in this instant.

One thing I might add is that a reporter asked a little girl why did she think that her teacher was on strike, and the little girl's name was Allison, and she said, "Well, I see my teacher coming in every day with two shopping bags full of materials, materials that she had to buy money out of her own pocket, even so far as to buy pencils so that we would have pencils to do our work in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

school." And he did a very lovely editorial on that, "Pencils for Allison," as to why the teachers are on strike.

As I said, teachers had begun to feel their They were remembering four years ago in '68 when we closed down the schools to go down on Capitol Hill and nothing happened, and they felt that they could do pretty much the same and get away scotfree. No one gave any thought to losing the job or what have you. And while, as I said, we did not have any issues, that is we did not formulate anything to present to the Board of Education and get a negative response that would have caused that kind of reaction. It was just an accumulation of things that had gone on. And as I indicated, a terrific cut in the budget for the Board of Education caused layoff of teachers. Also, we had problems with supplies, et cetera, and so on. And those things, it was just simply an emotional pitch. And the people at the meeting, of course, were on a high, and that was that.

I suppose another factor was that teachers had become aware of the many strikes that had been

parts of the country. We took groups up to Newark at the time that they were having difficulties. We also took groups to Philadelphia. We went over to Baltimore, and they were aware that teachers could go on strike. And I suppose that was another major factor in their decision. But it was really an emotional kick, emotional high, I should say, that they had gotten into and come hell or high water, they were going to strike.

I would say that I was perceived as a person with good balance, though I did not appear to be a militant individual because I was not always hooting and hollering, pounding on tables.

Nevertheless, I was firm in my convictions and resolute in my desire to get things done and would go ahead and get them done, taking what action necessary whenever that time came. Now, we had many strikes in schools.

Oh, I recall, for example, that one school had a problem getting its trash and garbage picked up. I told them, well, I'll be over there and we'll just stand out until somebody comes and picks

up the trash and garbage, because it was becoming a major problem, and do things like that. Or when the group of teachers refused to stay in their classrooms because windows had been broken out, glass was on the floor, it was cold, and I told them to take their classes to the auditorium and try to hold the students there, which they did, and stood by them all the way. We won that case in arbitration, things like that. So they knew that once I had decided to do something, that I was going to do it. And militancy did not mean shouting and banging on the table all the time.

I had been in office for eight years in 1972 at the time of the strike. Now, I had an assistant, he's dead now, Charles Chang (sp?), he died in that airplane accident in Chicago. Charlie had been sent here from the Michigan Federation to work in our collective bargaining campaign, and at the end of the campaign George Brickhouse suggested that he might be a good person to hire in order to help things move along. Now, I hired Charlie, he was a very effective worker.

# 

### TAPE III

MS. RENE EPSTEIN: This is Rene Epstein. My interview with William Simons is continuing on November 18th, 1986 in Washington, D.C.

MR. WILLIAM SIMONS: Charlie had come to me in May of that year and asked me to write him a letter of recommendation to Harvard University for the graduate studies program he wanted to enroll for his PhD. I had gotten an inkling of that from someone I knew that he had applied to Harvard.

Well, at any rate, before I had gotten the application, I realized that things were not moving as they once were. So I asked Charlie one morning, I said, "It looks as though we're beginning to have some problems. There seems to be a concerted effort to oppose just about everything that I put forth." He said, "No, Bill, I don't think it's that, I think that the members of the Executive Committee wanted a little more opportunity to express themselves and to be able to put forth their points of view on issues." I said, "Well,

look, no one has ever stifled anyone from talking, and I don't understand it." I said, "By the way, where are you in all of this?" And he looked at me and he said, "I'll give you my answer in about a week." Which I thought was very odd.

But within that time the letter came in from Harvard, so in effect he was gone. I thought it was very odd that he would want to leave because in his contract he had a provision for a sabbatical for a year that would have given him 75 percent of his pay. But instead, he decided to quit, he left. However, he didn't leave until August, and that was -- he was in attendance at our building rep conference that year, this is 1972, before the strike. And I dare say that he played a major role in stirring up the people to call for a strike vote.

Anyway, he left, the group continued to function and they did everything that they could to sabotage the strike. As I learned later, their goal was to get me incarcerated so that they could take over the union, but that didn't happen.

That group died out, disintegrated after

Charlie left. As a matter of fact, they had invited Charlie to come back to speak at a rally that we had scheduled for that Sunday. However, we called off the rally because we had reached settlement that Sunday. He came down anyway, I did not see him, but he did not have any audience to speak to.

We have never had political caucuses within the union. There have been groups who have gotten together from time to time, but nothing really on an organized formal basis. I've had opposition I guess every time that I've stood for election as president of the union, and there were times when the contests were very heated. But in spite of that, while there are differences of opinion, there are groups, small groups that meet, there's never been any real basic split in the organization as such, that is, in terms of organized opposition.

Now, I don't know why that was so, but anyway, that is the way that it has been.

The group that organized then around the candidate, who was a female, soon disintegrated. I think that as long as an individual is capable of

providing effective leadership for an organization, then there shouldn't be any question about how long that individual serves as a leader of the organization. Certainly I always presented myself to the membership with the posture when you no longer feel that I am effective, then, okay, I'm ready to go, just tell me and I will step aside. I certainly provided opportunities, at least I thought I provided opportunities for new leadership to develop.

Of course, one of the things that happened along the way that a number of individuals that I had tried to groom for leadership were lured away into school officerships and left the union. But certainly I did not try to keep everything under my control whatsoever. I gave everyone ample opportunity to learn all of the ins and outs and to be able to be conversant. But, as I said, I see nothing wrong with an individual staying in office for a number of years, 21 years, as in my case, if I'm capable of doing the things that are necessary to keep the organization moving. And I feel that I did do that in my term in office.

One of the interesting things that came out of the 1972 strike was the establishment of a scholarship fund from the fine that was levied against the union for striking. I do not believe that there is any other such scholarship fund in the country. This happened in a very unusual manner.

After the strike had been settled, the judge asked me to come over to his chambers one day to talk about a matter that was totally different from the strike altogether. But while I was there, I took the opportunity to mention to him the fact that I thought that we ought to be able to do something with that money other than just turning it over to the U.S. Treasury, because that is where all fines went at that time. And he said, "Yes, what do you have in mind?" I said, "Well, we ought to be able to do something for the children in the school system, maybe setting up a scholarship fund or something of that nature."

So he talked to the chief judge, who was then Hal Green, that's the famous judge that broke up AT&T. Hal Green was the chief judge of the

Superior Court of the District of Columbia at the time. He researched it and found that there was no bar to it. So, as a result, the \$50,000 was used to establish a scholarship fund for graduating seniors from high school. And thus far we have been able to help 24 students from that fund, and it's still going strong.

I might add that we were able to convince

Judge Gladys Kessler in 1979 to do the same thing
with the fine money that was assessed against us.

The fine had doubled by then. The first was
\$50,000, this was \$110,000. But it went into the
scholarship fund and the fund is growing.

One of the other interesting situations in contract negotiations, in 1975 we were at a dead lock in our negotiations. A strike vote had been taken and the Executive Committee had been given the authorization to call a strike at an appropriate moment. This was in February of 1975. The Central Labor Council, of course, had been kept abreast of the developments. I at the time was secretary of the Council, so I had kept them up to date as to our negotiations.

So the Executive Committee asked to meet with me to see what they could do to prevent a strike, and they said, well, we ought to get the mayor involved in this. The mayor had issued a statement that he was not going to become involved in negotiations, but if there should be a strike, then he was going to move into action for the good of his city. So we tried to prevail upon him, why don't you move now before you have to take emergency action.

Anyway, we met that Friday evening, and we decided that what we would do would be to put out a message on the wire that we will be meeting with the mayor on Saturday in order to see if we couldn't resolve the strike matter. The issue in 1975 was that the Board of Education wanted to increase the school day and the school year but the Board of Education still was powerless to grant pay increases, and we were saying we had no problem with increasing the time but we wanted to get the necessary additional funds. And since you couldn't guarantee that Congress was going to give us that, we are not about to sign a pig in a poke or if we

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

get the money kind of deal. That was the major issue.

At any rate, we contacted the AP and the UPI and they put the message out. The mayor was evidently going home that evening and heard the message on the radio. He called us from his car and said that he could not meet on Saturday, but what about two o'clock Sunday in his office. said fine. We met with him on Sunday and we wrote out an agreement to get the matter off dead center. After we did that, the mayor called the president of the Board of Education and had her come over to sign the agreement, and in that way we averted a strike in '75. The board president paid for it with criticisms from her fellow members, and the Board of Education adopted a resolution that from henceforth no board member would participate actively in negotiations.

We got over that hump and went on for peaceful relations until 1979. By this time the membership was about 5,000, out of then about 5,600. We had lost a number of teachers over the years because of rifts. But we were well a

majority organization of teachers. We did not have the agency shop at that time so that we could not get any money from those 600 who were not members of the union.

In 1979 there was a determined effort on the part of the superintendent and the Board of Education to really break the union. They played hard ball all the way down the line, and in October of '78 we had gathered in the Greater New Hope Baptist Church prepared to go on strike at the time when I got a call from the Board of Education that they had agreed to extend the old contract for a period of three months.

There was a change of leadership in the superintendency. I might say that during the period '67 through '77 we had six different superintendents. Vincent Reed was appointed superintendent. Vincent Reed had been the personnel officer for the school system. He had also been the assistant superintendent and superintendent in charge of secondary schools. And I thought that I had a very good working relationship with him because we were able to do a

number of things together when he was in those previous positions.

As a matter of fact, the day that he was named superintendent he called me and came over to the union office and he met with me and the general vice president for about three hours and we talked about the things that we could do together to get the system turned around, et cetera. And I thought we were off to a good start. But I soon found out that we were not.

The first thing that happened was concerning the textbook committees. Up until that time what had been happening was that I would meet with the superintendent in charge of instruction and we would get together and make a list of committees of textbooks, I would appoint the teachers and he would appoint the school administrators. However, when I sent the list back over this year, Vince Reed said no, you're not going to do that. Who gave the union authority to name teachers to textbook committees. And we took that to the Labor Relations Board as an unfair labor practice.

years, we lost that.

And from then on it was downhill. And finally Superintendent Reed said no, in effect he said, we're going to get rid of this damn union.

Well, the Board in October of '78 agreed to extend the contract for four months. We continued negotiating; however, in February of '79 it became apparent that we were not going to get anywhere in our negotiations, took a strike vote, and on March 5th we went out. That strike lasted for 23 days.

Again, we had good support from the community. They didn't like the strike. They, of course, would have rather seen the teachers in school. And we settled the matter at the table, but there was no organized effort on the part of the community to try to keep the schools open.

We had at that time what we called a community bulletin which I guess we had a circulation of about a thousand, mostly organizations, PTAs and other community groups, civic associations and the like. So that we kept the community abreast on what was happening with our negotiations and other matters that we felt of

interest to them. So the community was well aware of the problems that we were having in trying to negotiate a new contract.

Well, AFT came to the assistance of the local. I might say we never had any problem in getting assistance from the AFT when we needed it. By the same token, we had never asked the AFT to forgive us for any back per capita. We paid all of our debts to the national. They assisted us in sending in Bob Bates to help with the negotiations, Al Shanker spoke at one of our rallies, and many of his staff people, Bob Porter and others participated in many of our rallies. So that we had full assistance from the AFT in that effort as we had had in 1972.

This time was much different than in 1972.

In '72 I did not get a hold of the strike until

after about the fourth day and was able to get

things back in order and rode it on out in fine

style. This time we were very much organized. In

1975 when we had a near strike we had set in motion

a strike organization with the picket captains, the

area coordinators and the telephone networks. We

kept that in place from '75, so that in '79 the only thing we had to do was to get some new names because people had moved, some had retired, gone on to other places. So we did have a mechanism so that everything was definitely under control and there was no confusion whatsoever in the 1979 strike, we'll say city-wide strike, and I guess that at the height we had a 93 percent participation. Towards the end, of course, it fell down, as strikes always do. But we had a good high level participation. There were no activities going on in the schools whatsoever. The schools were supposedly open but nothing was happening.

Things have changed considerably since 1979.

For one thing, we now have home rule or at least a semblance of home rule in the District of Columbia, a situation of which the Board of Education can grant salary increases for teachers so we no longer have to go to Congress. More importantly, the District of Columbia government that enacted a personnel law which provides for collective bargaining for the unions, but it also calls for binding arbitration instead of a strike. So that I

doubt if a strike could be successfully waged by the teachers at this time.

Of course, several other things that have happened, the attitude of the current administration in the White House, the lingering effects of what happened to the Air Traffic Controllers is also important. And also the attitude now of the country is different than it used to be, and strikes are not tolerated as they once were. Though that I would suspect that any effort to try to get the teachers on strike at this time would be futile.

Local 6 ordered the PATCO strikes, and I participated in many of their rallies and demonstrations, spoke at various forums supporting the Air Traffic Controllers. I think we are seeing the result of the action of the President in the tragic situation in the air traffic today. There isn't a day that goes by that we don't read or hear about a near miss. And, of course, we know the tragedy that happened in California a few weeks ago when the large plane from Mexico hit a small plane because of misdirection by an air traffic

controller.

I don't know what the situation is now with the community and the union, whether the new leadership has undertaken a concerted effort to cultivate the community is unknown to me at this time. But, as I said, I don't believe that a successful strike by teachers could occur in Washington, D.C. in 1986.

The election of 1985, I was a candidate. My assistant ran against me and was able to con the people and I was defeated. Though I've left the union and I really have not had any dealings with it whatsoever, so I really couldn't give an accurate assessment as to what is going on, except that I run into teachers every now and then in my travels, and they are constantly complaining about the things that are not being done. But I have no personal knowledge about it.

Recalling the 1979 strike, there were a series of meetings with the mayor of the city,

Marion Barry. He did all that he could to try to bring the strike to an end. We had a meeting with him and he told us that he would do everything that

he could to see to it that negotiations would get back on track and that we should have a settlement of the contract.

He met with us one Sunday morning at the union office and explained his position in full. I told him that I was sorry, I believed him, I believed that he had our best interests at heart, but what I was afraid of was that if we went back to work he would then turn his attention to matters that he had neglected because he'd been trying to settle the strike and we would be left high and dry. He did not like that, but nevertheless, that was my response to him.

Now, that was a Sunday morning. We had a mass rally scheduled for the church, Metropolitan AME Church that Sunday afternoon. However, in the meantime Judge Kessler had issued a back to work order. I realize that we would not have enough time to discuss the matter at the church because they had a four o'clock service schedule. This was during the Lenten season. So at twelve o'clock I called around trying to find a place to meet. We were finally able to get the Sheraton Washington

Hotel which did not have anything scheduled. Then the problem was how do you notify people that there is a change of the meeting place at that late date. Once again, the media came to the rescue. I contacted them, and they put out the notice that the meeting site had changed. I sent some of the staff members down to the church to let the people know that the site had been changed.

I was afraid that people coming to the church would say, oh, what's the use, I'm not going up to the hotel. But on that Sunday afternoon 3,000 members showed up at the hotel. I presented the proposition that the judge had laid out for us. There was no recommendation from the Executive Committee on the matter. I let the members decide. And there was a unanimous vote that we would stay out.

The mayor went to work again and evidently went back to the judge with another proposal on Monday. It was finally accepted by the judge on Wednesday, that is, that we would go back to work under the old contract and would have three months in which to complete negotiations. That was

agreeable to the membership, and we returned to work on March the 23rd.

My relationship with the media had been good. On the next day after the election in 1967 I will never forget meeting with two reporters from Channel 4, that's WRSC-TV, Don Doke (sp?), and the other name escapes me at the moment. But what they said to me is that if you continue the way that you have been over the past few months, you should not have any problem with the media.

The one thing that you want to remember is do not try to abuse the media, and at the same time don't let the media abuse you. And I followed that throughout my career and really never had any problem getting my message across through the media.

With the community, as I'd indicated earlier,

I made it a point to be in touch with all segments

of the community attending as many meetings as I

could, sending representatives to other meetings.

And in that way we built up a rapport with the

community which stood us in good stead during both

of the strikes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And certainly with the politicians we developed a very good relationship. The Washington Teachers Union was the first union to endorse Mayor Barry in his first attempt to become the leader of the city. And he has never forgotten that.

I attended my first AFT convention in 1957. The summer before I had attended an AFT workshop at Pennsylvania State University. I, of course, was feeling my way around the convention trying to get a handle on what was going on in the national organization. I did not join any caucus. My first few years I attended meetings of all of the caucuses in existence. However, I quess about 1960, '61 I began to gravitate towards the progressive caucus. And in 1965 at the convention at Los Angeles I was nominated as a candidate for vice presidency, for a vice presidency on the Executive Council. I won that election, and I remained a vice president from 1965 until 1972, my first split with the progressive caucus.

What happened was one of the staff members,

Ken Meeson (sp?) ran against Dave Seldon in the

election at Pittsburgh. There was a question as to

whether or not Dave Seldon received a majority vote. It was ruled -- or at least that question was put to a referendum, a roll call at the convention.

I had made it clear from the very outset that I never did and never would pressure the members of the delegation from the local to join any particular caucus or to take any particular stand on any particular issue. I would present the facts to them and then let them make their own judgment as to how they were going to vote.

So that when the question came up at the convention in 1970, once again I explained to the delegation just what the situation was, and I left it at that. Or when the votes were tallied, the vote in the delegation was something like 64 to 6 against Dave Seldon. My votes went for Dave Seldon because I had promised them my votes, and I told them that's the only thing that I can promise you that I will know that I can deliver. And one other delegate's votes went to Dave Seldon.

Well, they became -- that is, the progressive caucus became very furious with that vote.

Although I had been elected as a vice president in 1970, I knew that my time was up, and in 1972 in St. Paul I lost and took a hiatus from the Executive Council until 1976.

In the AFT there have always been various caucuses. When I first joined or first attended the AFT convention in 1957 they had the national caucus, they had the classroom teachers caucus, and the they had the progressive caucus. The national caucus was the predominant caucus at the time. It elected just about all of the vice presidents as well as the president.

There began to be a break in the ranks of the national caucus, and slowly but surely members of the progressive caucus, a few members were elected to the Council. But the vote was always overwhelmingly in favor of the national caucus.

During the early days, I guess about the only major difference that I could discern between the caucuses was that you had the Midwest farm block centered around Chicago and Minnesota, Iowa, as opposed to the eastern block; New York, Philadelphia, Detroit. We were not very strong in

the west at that time, but I noticed that many of the delegates from Colorado were members of the progressive caucus as well as many members from California. I did not discern any ideological differences between the caucuses, just a matter of regional differences.

In 1964, this is the first time that one caucus won the presidency and all of the seats on the Executive Council. That was the convention in Cleveland, and that was the beginning of Charlie Cogan's term as president of the American Federation of Teachers. As I indicated, I came on the next year in 1965 in Los Angeles because Ray Howe from Dearborn, Michigan resigned because he became a college administrator.

From 1964 on the progressive caucus has been the dominant caucus, though there have been other caucuses formed for a short while and then died.

So that we had the position now that the progressive caucus really comprises about 95 percent of the delegates. So today you have differences within the caucus rather than differences between the caucus. However, because

2

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of the dominance of the people who support Al Shanker, there's really very little dissension or discussion of issues within the caucus. It's really a matter of cut and dried. And I have predicted that one day that caucus is going to break up and there will be a shift in policies for the American Federation of Teachers.

Two things happened in the AFT. I believe 1970 -- well, between 1970 and 1972, and those two things were this: A change in the delegates' strength, that is, the delegate voting strength at the convention. Instead of voting merely the votes of the delegates that had been elected for the convention, the change was made so that you voted the entire membership of the local. So that if a local had 5,000 members and 35 delegates, that In case of New York local would have 5,000 votes. City, they had I believe at the time somewhere in the neighborhood of 60,000 members, so they came to the convention with 60,000 votes. So it was really one man, one vote idea, but in this situation this was certainly not democratic, because one place had just about all of the votes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The second change was going from the secret ballot for the election of officers to the open ballot. The reason that was given was that the members back home who didn't come to the convention had a right to know how each individual delegate voted on the matter of the officers.

Those who favor the secret ballot claim that the delegate is a representative of the local and, therefore, the local has a right to know how the delegate voted for an officer. That's all well and good, and that would have been fine in the early days of the American Federation of Teachers when you had candidates to announce before the convention, people traveled around the country trying to sell themselves so that they could have sufficient votes when the convention came in order to succeed in their quest for office. However, such is not the case. No one knows who is going to run for office until you get to the convention. So how can a local take a position on a candidate when really there are no candidates until you get to the convention.

I have asked just about every local around

the country is there a report given at the first meeting in September on how the delegates voted for officers. And the answer has been universally no. My problem is the real reason for the open ballot is to maintain control of the convention. Now, it is said that in New York if anyone strayed from the ticket that was put forth by the progressive caucus, that individual would not get his expenses paid nor would he ever be considered as a delegate to another convention. And there have been other locals that took similar action.

Another factor was many of the locals, especially the smaller locals, were dependent upon the AFT for financial assistance. And that was one way of keeping them in check by having the open ballot to determine how that local voted, and that usually influenced whether or not that local received the assistance requested. So that all in all, there was no question about it, the purpose of the open ballot was to maintain control. And this was told to me a countless number of times that that was the way it was going to be.

That is the tragedy of the situation. Of

course, I can only speak about Local 6 in terms of not being compelled to do anything because of the need of assistance from the national. I made sure that after the collective bargaining election in 1967 we paid off all debts and all back per capita. I didn't ask for any forgiveness. Therefore, I did not need the help of the national, and we took an independent course in terms of the elections and in terms of issues.

Now, I have no problem with having delegates being recorded on issues. But when it comes to voting for people, I say no, it should be a secret ballot. But by having the open ballot, that gave the national office control over locals, not only in terms of the election, but also in terms of issues.

I can recall, I don't know how many hundreds of delegates would meet me in the elevator or in the halls of the hotel and tell me that they supported my position, they only regret that they could not vote for my position. And I said, "Well, why tell me that you support my position if you can't vote for my position?"

There were a number of issues that I raised on the convention floor other than the secret ballot. When the question of support or opposing the war in Vietnam came up, I, of course, took the position that the United States had no business in Vietnam. We had seen what had happened to the French, and history should have taught us a lesson. However, I did not prevail on that issue because the leadership took the position that the United States had to provide democracy for the people in southeast Asia.

Another issue was the Bockey (sp?) case. And the whole question of affirmative action, the Bockey case, the Webber case, and there were other cases that came up. I always argued that the blacks had a special interest in these matters, whereas I understood perfectly the position of the Jewish population with respect to quotas. I said it was different for the blacks. Where the Jewish had quotas, that meant that X number could get in. The blacks had no quotas at all, and usually it was zero. So that if the blacks got five spots, that was a base upon which we could build. As long as

we didn't have any base, we could not go anywhere.

So that affirmative action meant a whole lot to the black people. And I thought that the organization should recognize that because it had a considerable membership of blacks. However, we were run over every time the issue was brought to the floor. But I maintained that I was going to support those issues that I believed in.

And basically the argument was that quotas were bad for people because it meant an exclusion.

And as I have indicated, I can understand the Jewish position, but then on the other hand the Jewish people have to understand the black position on the issue. Blacks were shut out completely in many instances and no way could they get in.

I always use this example. When I walk into a room for an interview for a job, I have instantaneous recognition. They look at me as a black period. Maybe they might discern that I have on a suit and the way my hair is cut that I am a man, but I am a black.

Now, a Jewish person can walk into a room, not knowing the name, they see white, and it's only

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

after they begin to question the individual do they find out the religious background of the individual, et cetera, and then they go from there. But I've got one strike on me when I walk into the room, and there's no way that I can get rid of it.

It's a strange thing about the American Federation of Teachers. At one time during its history in the early '60s it was in the forefront of the civil rights movement. In 1966 there was a conference here in Washington, D.C. sponsored by the American Federation of Teachers, Racism in Education. And it to me was the most significant conference that the American Federation of Teachers has ever produced. I'm happy to say that I played a role in that. We had John Hope Franklin, we had Sterling Brown, John Killings, and you name it, all of them were here and gave excellent presentations pointing out the things wrong in society. that point on, the activities in the American Federation of Teachers insofar as civil rights are concerned were excellent.

However, moving on a few years later, I could see a discernible change in the attitude of the

1 officers, the president of the AFT towards civil 2 Take, for example, Richard Parish out of rights. 3 New York who led the freedom school movement with teachers going to Mississippi, into Prince Edward County in Virginia. Dick was really a great fella. But because Dick differed with the leadership in New York in the Ocean Hill Brownsville strike, Dick was crushed as a union person, as a human being. And the funny thing about it, if you look at the 10 literature put out by the AFT now with respect to civil rights, nowhere will you find the name of Dick Parish. And to me, I say that that is a sin 13 and a shame.

> No, I recognize that Ocean Hill Brownsville was not a simple matter. However, I took the viewpoint that if a community was really interested and sincere in becoming actively involved in the day-to-day operations of the school, then it was incumbent upon the Board of Education and the union to work with that community to devise a plan that was going to insure the betterment of education in that particular community.

> > Now, what we did in Washington, D.C. was

23

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

precisely that, so that we had no problem when the people in Adams Morgan decided that they wanted a community school board. We worked with them to help develop the ideas that were necessary in order to make it an effective project. Now, I recognize that Washington, D.C. is an entirely different location than New York City and the problems here were not the problems in New York City. However, I do feel that certain things shouldn't have been done in New York City that were done, and it is my understanding, for example, that the UFT printed a piece of literature and made it appear as though the black community put out that piece of And that to me certainly is an literature. unforgivable action on the part of the union.

Now, in 1976 I was asked to come back on the Executive Council. Al Shanker met with me and met with the Washington delegation asking me to come back on the caucus, come back into the caucus and then be elected to the Council.

I made it clear to him that I would come back the same way that I left, on those issues which I had a strong feeling about I was going to take my

2.2

position. Also, the only votes that I could promise you would be my votes and no one else. I would try to persuade the members of the delegation to follow me, and 99 percent of the time they did follow me on all issues. But they knew that they were free to dissent at any time without any fear of repercussions.

My feeling is that you elect delegates who have a modicum of intelligence and are able to reason for themselves. I also feel that if you are providing good leadership and doing the things that should be done, you don't have to worry about how the votes are going. And I maintained that Al Shanker could be reelected with a secret ballot just as it is with an open ballot because he's doing a very credible job, and you don't need that kind of control over individuals.

Now, let me shift the scene if I may and talk about the black caucus in the American Federation of Teachers. That was borne out of frustration in 1967 at the convention here in Washington, D.C, the black delegates felt that they were not getting a fair shake from the AFT in terms of recognizing

peculiar needs that they had and addressing those issues. That was also the time that there was a shift in emphasis, beginning of a shift of emphasis in the AFT from the civil rights movement going back to the right, becoming more and more conservative.

Now, the black caucus was formed in 1967. It was not a political caucus. The black caucus did not run candidates for office, but rather concentrated on issues that were of importance to it.

The caucus got off to a good start, and I might say that it is still strong today. But however, due to a shift in emphasis, that is, nationally, I'm talking about the country in terms of civil rights, some of the luster has worn off the black caucus.

There were many issues that confronted the nation and also confronted the union. We had a difficult time getting the AFT to support busing as a means of remedying the past practices of segregation. Of course, on the whole question of affirmative action I have talked about that

previously, the big question there was quotas, to which the AFT was opposed as a body, yet this was a very important issue for blacks because it meant the opening of doors.

Now, the AFT's idea of affirmative action is that you do recruiting, training and education and what have you, however, if you look at their record and you look at their staff, there hasn't been much of that going on because there are very few minorities that hold positions in the AFT.

A recent experience for me that was very frustrating involves the senatorial candidate from Maryland, Linda Chavez. Linda Chavez was on the AFT staff for a number of years. It was very difficult for me at that time to gauge just what kind of a person she was. She was friendly and pleasant with me, and we got along well. However, when she left the AFT and became the executive director of the Civil Rights Commission, either her true feelings came out or she was changed because she had then become a Republican.

Now, on several occasions I introduced motions at Executive Council meetings simply

stating that the AFT should go on record as saying that the views expressed by Linda Chavez in her current position do not reflect the views of the national organization. I couldn't get that motion to complete --

## 

## TAPE IV

MS. RENE EPSTEIN: This is Rene Epstein. My interview with Bill Simons is continuing on November 20th, 1986 in Washington, D.C.

MR. WILLIAM SIMONS: My frustration was that I could never get a majority vote on that simple motion. I was not condemning Linda Chavez in any way, shape or form. I was just simply trying to let it be known that her views were not the views of the AFT. Because in every newspaper article that I saw it mentioned the fact that Linda Chavez held a very high position in the American Federation of Teachers. I had calls from all over the country from union members wanting to know what was going on, why isn't the AFT speaking out disavowing those positions that she was stating.

Well, just about everything that she said, she was opposed to affirmative action in any way, shape or form. She was opposed to the Civil Rights Commission taking an active role in trying to address the problems of discrimination in the country. You name it, she was against everything

that I thought was right.

It just seems to me that Al Shanker, while he certainly was not supporting her at least openly, did not want any action taken that would discredit her. For what reasons, I don't know. But that's an example of my frustrations in my latter years with the American Federation of Teachers.

Let me say this, the convention in New York

City -- what was that, 1983 I believe was the

convention in New York. Yes, 1983, because the

next year we were here in D.C. and then we went on

to the two-year convention the next year. The

convention this year 1986 was held in Chicago.

Following the convention in 1983 at the post-convention Executive Council meeting I was berated, chastised, everything under the sun was said about me. I got up and left the room and told them that they could take the position and shove it, because I didn't need it, I didn't need to be on the Executive Council at all. And I suspect that had I not had to make a stop at the john, I would have been out of the hotel, back to my room and on my way to the train station to come back to

Washington, D.C. But because I went to the john,

Bob Healey from Chicago looking for me caught me as

I came out of the john and pleaded with me to come

back into the room.

Now, the complaint against me was that I did not support the positions of the progressive caucus, I did not guarantee 100 percent vote from the Washington delegation for the candidates or positions of the progressive caucus and so on, and they didn't understand how I could be allowed to remain on the caucus. I told them, you can take this job and shove it, I don't need it. I told you my position when I came back to the caucus, and that's going to be my position until I leave the caucus.

The black caucus is still a viable organization within the American Federation of Teachers. Politically it doesn't have any clout whatsoever. Now, there are many members of the black caucus who are likewise members of the progressive caucus. Well, there's a dichotomy in the situation in that while they are very active and vocal members of the black caucus, they are

also members of the progressive caucus, and they are members of locals within the progressive caucus who follow the party line right down to the hilt, and because they put pressure -- the locals put pressure on the delegates, then they become ineffective in terms of trying to get the caucus to -- the progressive caucus to change its positions on certain issues.

So that while the black caucus raises issues and takes positions on issues and speaks for those issues on the convention floor, it still does not have the power to convince a majority of the delegates to support the positions that it takes.

The organizing of the paraprofessionals and even the nurses and other allied health personnel into the American Federation of Teachers is a very significant one, a very positive one and a healthy one for the organization. This means that a number of workers who normally would not have had an organization to which they could become affiliated now have a home in the American Federation of Teachers. I think it's a natural thing for the paraprofessionals in the school system to become a

part of the teachers organization because, after all, they are intimately involved in the educational program in the schools. They work closely with teachers, and they should be a part of

the teachers union.

In the early days there were problems in organizing the paras. The problems came mainly from teachers who resented the fact that here's someone who didn't have a college degree in some instances would be able to share the same lounge facilities, and you name it, that sort of prejudice within the teaching profession.

Today, however, I think that that has just about dissipated, and the growing ranks of the paraprofessionals within the national union is significant. Though I welcome that, even though I was unsuccessful here in Washington, D.C. in getting the paraprofessionals as a part of the teachers union. Just when I thought that everything was all right in terms of the campaign that we had started, AFSCME intervened in the election by telling the paras that there's no way you're going to get a fair shake with the teachers.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

They voted for AFSCME instead of Local 6. However, they regretted it in many instances, and all during the time that I was president there wouldn't be a week that went by that I didn't get a call from some member of the AFSCME local asking me how to resolve a problem.

One of the things that has happened around the country which I guess originated in New York City is giving the paras an opportunity to complete their education. There are programs in which the paras can enroll and take the necessary courses. If they complete them successfully, then they can move from the ranks of paras into the teaching profession, and that has happened in any number of Even though we don't represent the instances. paras here, I know of at least ten former paras who are now teachers because they took advantage of the program that was really offered by the board of education as well as AFSCME, which negotiated for the paras here, and enabled them to get the necessary credits and credentials to become full-fledged teachers. And that is one of the bright spots in the organization of the paras. It

2

3

4

5

6

7

O

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

gives them upward mobility and does not confine them to the lower level for the rest of their lives if they're interested in making a change.

Certainly during my years with the AFT I've seen a change of relationship of the AFT to the AFL-CIO. It has now become a very important affiliate of the AFL-CIO, and for many years Al Shanker has been a member of the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO. I can remember under Dave Seldon's years in office, Dave refused to become a member of the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO. He claimed that this would sort of compromise the independents of the organization and he refused to do so, for which he was censored by the Executive Council. a matter of fact, they tried to fire him, not only for that reason but for other reasons also. But for you the American Federation of Teachers is an important part of the AFL-CIO.

An interesting experience of mine occurred in 1972. That was when the coalition of black trade unionists was formed. A group of us met in Miami, Florida. Bill Lucy, the Secretary-Treasurer of AFSCME; Charlie Hayes, who was then a vice

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 president of the Amalgamated Meatcutters Union. 2 He's now congressman from the first district of Chicago. Nelson Jack Edwards, who was then a vice 3 4 president of UAW. He has since departed, an 5 unfortunate accident took his life. Cleveland 6 Robinson of the Distributive Workers of New York, 7 and myself met in Miami, and we came to the conclusion that the reelection of Richard Nixon 8 9 would not be good for blacks and minorities, nor 10 for the country. And we came to that position 11 based on his record, but we were also chagrinned that the AFL-CIO adopted a policy of neutrality in 12 13 the election of 1972. Of course, you know the 14 history of that and you know who turned out to be 15 right.

Dave Seldon was president of the AFT at that time, and he wrote a scathing letter to Bill Lucy asking him how did he get the nerve to select a black from the American Federation of Teachers to join another organization. Well, I wrote to Dave and said, look, I am not representing the American Federation of Teachers, I'm representing Bill Simons as a black labor person seeking to try to do

have to change their policies in terms of involving blacks in the labor movement.

Well, I did this on my own as an individual.

Now, to be sure, yes, I was a member of the

American Federation of Teachers, I was president of
the Washington Teachers Union. But this was

something that really did not concern the American
Federation of Teachers. I did not talk to Dave

Seldon because, as I said earlier, we had fallen
out in 1970 and I had no allegiance to him
whatsoever.

The other persons mentioned, Bill Lucy, yes, he was the second officer in the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Nelson Jack Edwards, a vice president in the United Auto Workers. Charlie Hayes in the Amalgamated Meatcutters, and Cleveland Robinson of the Distributive Workers. We didn't look upon our being together as being representatives of our representative unions. But we were blacks, we were members of the labor movement, members of the AFL-CIO, and we felt that the time was ripe to try

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to put together an organization in order to call attention to our problems and try to exert some influence on the AFL-CIO to address the problems of minorities in the labor movement.

Now, this was not the first time that this has happened. You had the Negro American Labor Congress, which was made up of blacks from various unions that tried to do things. A. Philip Randolph was a member of the Negro American Labor Congress. So this was not anything new, it's just that over the years the many black caucuses you might call it had tried to do the same thing but they had all eventually petered out. And we thought it was time once again to try to revive the minority interest or minority caucus within the labor movement to call attention to the fact that the AFL-CIO was really not addressing the problems of minorities in the labor movement. This, I might add, was not a separatist movement in any way, shape or form.

What we were trying to do was get the AFL-CIO to address the problems of minorities, not only in the labor movement but in society as a whole. One of the things that we were greatly concerned about

2.1

was the lack of minority representation in the leadership of the international unions and on the AFL-CIO Executive Council itself. I don't know whether we should take full credit for it or not, but it wasn't until after we began to push our platform, a woman was elected to the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO.

Then later on you had a black woman from the American Federation of Government Employees, who is now a member of the Executive Council, Barbara Hutchison. Also we have seen an increase in the number of blacks who are now on the executive boards of the various international unions. Leon Lynch, for example is now a vice president of the United Steelworkers. Marc Stepp has become a very important cog in the United Auto Workers. He's the head of the bargaining committee for the Chrysler workers. So that we feel that we have made a difference.

We also were able to help convince the AFL-CIO that its policy with regard to South Africa was not a healthy one, and gradually it has changed and really become a very vocal opponent of

apartheid in South Africa.

I suspect that the AFL-CIO is a political animal, the same as many other organizations, and change in policy comes about as a result of taking a careful look of what is happening around them and realizing that an adjustment is needed in policy in order to keep up with the times.

One of the things that I might add is this, that unlike the A. Philip Randolph Institute, which is funded just about completely by the AFL-CIO. The coalition of black trade unions does not get any money from the AFL-CIO, therefore, we can be independent in our positions because we are not beholding unto any group.

It is interesting to note today that there has been a change in the position of the AFT in regards to the coalition of black trade unionists. At first the AFT was totally opposed to the concept stating that the A. Philip Randolph Institute was set up to represent the interests of black workers in the labor movement. And, of course, we know that the A. Philip Randolph Institute is simply an appendage of the AFL-CIO. And since it's beholding

to the AFL-CIO, it essential doesn't step out of line on issues and make statements contrary to the policy of the AFL-CIO.

I know at one time I asked that the AFT give \$5,000 to the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, and you can imagine the reaction to that suggestion. However, in later years Al Shanker has spoken favorably about the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, has indicated that he and Bill Lucy have been together on many issues, and so this is a change of opinion about the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists within the AFT.

Looking at another subject insofar as the AFT is concerned, and that is the question of merger with the National Education Association. This has been on the agenda for many years. Dave Seldon tried his darnedest to effectuate a merger of the two organizations. I opposed merger at that time on the grounds that the AFT was not in a position to extract favorable terms from any merger. I put it in this way, in terms of a merger, he who has the most gets the most. He who has the least, gives the most.

Another objection that I had to the merger at that time was the fact that what would happen to the minorities in the AFT, we were the minorities in a minority organization, and going into a larger organization we would be a further minority within the whole structure of a merged organization.

I had followed very carefully the so-called mergers of the black and white affiliates of the NEA, and in each case what happened was that the whites simply took over all of the property and possessions of the black organizations in turn for giving them a few representative seats on the governing board. Where black leaders were prominent, the NEA took them out of that situation so that they would not be able to compete against a white.

One classic example is Rubert Picot (sp?) who was the head of the Virginia Teachers Association, as opposed to the Virginia Education Association.

After the merger, in order to prevent Rubert from trying to gain control of the organization, they brought him to Washington. The same thing is true of Sam Ethridge down in Alabama with the American

Teachers Association. He was brought to Washington.

So the election that had taken place led me to believe that in spite of the large number of blacks in the association in the south, we certainly would not get a fair shake in the deal.

Now, nothing came of the efforts of Dave Seldon, and under Al Shanker initially he was opposed to merger and he dropped the program altogether. However, somewhere along the way he changed his mind, and actually for awhile when he merged the New York State Teachers, UFT became a part of the NEA, and Al attended a few NEA conventions. That was not unlike my early career when I used to attend the NEA conventions in June, and in August I would come to the AFT conventions.

However, that marriage didn't work. separated. However, New York gained from that in keeping a number of the former NEA locals in the state as a part of the New York State Teachers.

Now, that was my point. New York could withstand a merger at the time of Dave Seldon, because it was the stronger organization within the

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 Rhode Island had a chance of being the 2 dominant organization under merger situation. 3 Massachusetts was in pretty good condition. course, there was no question about Washington, D.C. because there wasn't an NEA organization locally at that time. However, leaving those places and going across the country it would have been the union being swallowed up by the associations.

> Today I think the climate has changed, and I think that there really should be a closer look at the subject of merger. With teachers being whipsawed back and forth all across the nation with the inadequate funding, both from the federal level as well as the state level for education, I think a strong teachers movement would be able to change that in many instances.

And then too, the AFT is in a much stronger position today to exact from merger negotiations favorable terms for the union members.

The differences between the organizations has narrowed considerably over the years. And in many instances the NEA is considered as a liberal

conservative organization. There have been instances where the AFT and the NEA were on the opposite sides of the question. For example, the case in Kalamazoo, Michigan in which black teachers were retained who had less seniority than white teachers in order to promote integration. The AFT supported the Kalamazoo union which wanted to maintain strict seniority. On the other hand, the NEA supported the concept that this was a negotiated agreement between Kalamazoo and the Board of Education and, therefore, the black clause in the agreement should be honored.

You could cite any number of instances where there has been a shift, the NEA on the left and the AFT on the right. But in spite of that, I think that the time is ripe for a merger. As far as Al Shanker is concerned, I think he would be able to survive any merger in a leadership role.

I might say this, that he survived, for example, reelection within the AFT, though he gave up his power base. This was one of the things that I had fought for a long time. I said that the AFT

was an important organization, it needed a full-time president, and that really he could not devote full attention to the American Federation of Teachers as long as he was president of the largest local in the American Federation of Teachers, the United Federation of Teachers. However, I was unsuccessful in getting a change on the convention floor over the years. But nevertheless, it eventually happened when he gave up the position and Sandra Feldman is now president of the UFT, and Al can now devote his full time to the American Federation of Teachers.

American Federation of Teachers, and there are many within the American Federation of Teachers who claim that it is Al's agenda that he has fostered upon the American Federation of Teachers. The interesting point is that many of the things that Al is now embracing are things that the Washington Teachers Union had negotiated in its early contracts. The only difference is that we were not sophisticated enough to really make them work. We had them on paper but we really never gave body to

1 them.

Now, you take, for example, Al has come around to the question of supporting in a sense the question of merit pay. The contract that we negotiated in 1981, and the Board of Education wanted a provision that would put a gate you might say at Step 6. In other words, a teacher coming in, Step 1 would go automatically with a satisfactory rating onto Step 6. However, in order to go from Step 6 on, the teacher had to get a better than satisfactory rating.

I was really chastised severely about that, among other provisions. But my point was this, that we negotiated earlier the evaluation process for teachers, that is, the union help to develop and monitor the evaluation process, we had teachers involved in the evaluation process. And my position was that as long as we maintained control of the evaluation process, that we could protect teachers from arbitrary and capricious ratings.

And I might add that when I left office, no teacher had been -- no new teacher had been denied a step increase from Step 6 to Step 7, because we took

care of that.

And there were a number of other things that we had done. I can go back, if I may, to the question of teachers being involved in evaluation. I was criticized very severely for that when we first introduced the idea of that. And I can recall one convention I had that program on my agenda for the local, and Dal Lawrence in Toledo, Ohio, had the program having teachers assist teachers -- the master teacher concept. They ran both of us out of the room. Oh, I guess this must have been around 1972 when --

Why the organization, that is, the American Federation of Teachers was not receptive to these ideas, I don't know. I suspect that it was a matter of maintaining the status quo. I can recall individual delegates to whom I spoke about my ideas being very upset saying no way do we want to be a part of teachers evaluating other teachers. That's a matter of management and you've got a union member turning in another union member for failing to do a proper job.

It's very interesting that, as I said, after

negotiating the last contract, I was severely chastised by the members of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers and even Al himself. However, the times had changed, and many of the ideas which I had put forth before are now being embraced by the union. So at the convention in San Francisco, 1983, I said to Al, "Gee, it is really heartening to see that the ideas that I had put forth over the years are now being embraced by the organization." His response was, "Touche."

I looked upon the unionization of teachers as an opportunity for teachers to become a part of the decision making process. To me, that was what professionalism was all about, one who is involved in making a determination of what, how, when, and where you were going to carry out that which you were practicing. Unlike lawyers and doctors who are individuals who can set their own fees and their own hours, teachers, of course, were public employees and had a board of education, as well as laws that governed their occupation. However, within that framework, teachers could negotiate any number of articles within a contract that would

give them a voice in the decision making process.

And the more that teachers became involved in the decision making process, the more professional they would really be.

Times are changed, and unions have had to change. However, from the very outset, using the premise that teachers ought to be involved in decision making process as often as possible, contracts negotiated by this union did precisely that. And I suspected one of the reasons that we were able to do that was because up until 1980, '81, we could not negotiate for salaries. So it was not a question of what do you want, more money for your members or more of a voice in the decision making process.

This unique situation in that neither the Board of Education nor the city government really could establish salaries for teachers. In Washington, D.C. it made it possible for this union to focus on educational policy. And that is what we did. It never came down to the final crunch as it did around the country, what do you want, more money or more say in educational policy.

Everything we did had to do with the educational policy of the system. So I suppose that is why we were leaders in this arena and why the many ideas that are now coming forth as education reform were ideas that we had already experimented with in the early '60s and '70s here in Washington, D.C.

Now, times have changed, and unions have had to change. Unions have been established. They have made their point and they are here to stay, they're not going away. However, in refocusing on the professional issues, because we are established now, they are able to do that without any fear that they're going to be demolished. And I suspect that this is the reason why there has been a shift in emphasis in the American Federation of Teachers to embrace many of the ideas and to put forth new ideas in terms of educational reform. It's really a move towards professionalizing the teaching occupation today, which was not possible in the early days of the formation of the union.

Not only is this true with the American

Federation of Teachers, but it's also true with

other unions. They realize that times have changed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and they have taken a different approach in negotiations, and they are looking at areas that were unheard of in the early days of the union movement.

For example, you take the United Auto Workers, they have a seat on the board of Chrysler Corporation. Now, who would have heard or thought of a labor leader sitting on a board of directors of a corporation with which it negotiates contracts. This might be attributed to the fact that there has been a considerable decline in manufacturing in the United States. Just about every industry is hurting. The basic industries, steel, textile, automobile manufacturing, you name it, all of the industries are hurting. So as a result, unions realize that they simply cannot take an adversarial position and expect to come out on We've seen, for example, the negotiations with General Motors for a new plant that is to open in Tennessee. They've made several concessions that would be unheard of. They are becoming a part of "management" in the sense in determining the quality of work of individuals on the assembly

line.

In shifting back to education, we've seen now a great demand for "accountability" of teachers because of the realization that there are too many students who go through school and end up after 12 years unable to read, write or do simple arithmetic.

Now, accountability is fine, but unions realize that you can't have it as a one-way street, someone looking over your shoulder and checking you for what you're doing. So in order to address the area of accountability, unions are negotiating provisions in the contract which help them to become a part of the decision making process. And if they are part of a decision making process, certainly they are going to be accountable for what they do because it's their program, and certainly they don't want to be failures.

And this is one of the things that I stress over and over again. Don't conceive a program and then shove it on the teacher and expect it to be implemented properly. If teachers are a part of the process in developing a program, the success

ratio is going to increase because nobody wants to

be associated with failure.

Just as we've seen changes in education, we have seen changes in the so-called industrial As I had stated earlier, the new contract that was negotiated by the United Auto Workers with General Motors for the new Saturn plant in Tennessee is an example of how workers realize that they have to make changes in bargaining, and management also realizes that it has to make changes in the way that it has dealt with the workers over the years. And as a result, we have a coming together of workers and management in devising ways and means of assuring a quality product at the same time involving both the worker and the manager in the decision making process. And I think that this is healthy. And the more that we do this, I think that we will begin to see a change in society as a whole.

(END OF TAPE IV)

21

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23