INTERVIEW WITH EUGENE MACELLARI

Date: February 4, 1974

Interviewer: Alice M. Hoffman

INTRODUCTION

Born and raised in Brooklyn, Eugene Macellari moved to Boise, Idaho, in 1950 and took his apprenticeship as a lithographer there. He went to work as a camera platemaker apprentice in the lithography department of Syms-York Company, a mixed shop where just the litho department was A.L.A. under Portland Local 36. Having been influenced by his uncle, who was a member of A.L.A. Local One, New York City, and by his father-in-law, who was on the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training in Boise, Macellari was strongly labor-oriented from the beginning.

Macellari describes the strike in January, 1957, which lasted for three months and was broken by other organizations--namely, the Typographical Union and the Printing Pressmen--who were trying to raid the A.L.A. by convincing A.L.A. people to go through their own picket line. Macellari, who stood firmly by A.L.A., lost his job and had to move to Seattle.

He went to work as a stripper at North Pacific Bank Note Company. He discovered that Local 45, A.L.A., in Seattle had no union office and worked hard to help establish one in May of 1958. He tells how, by a flukish set of circumstances, he became the first full-time, paid officer of the local, taking office as president in January, 1961.

Macellari's story then turns to how he, an unexperienced union man, with a weak local on his hands, came to learn about negotiations, unions, and labor-management relations especially under the guidance of International Representative James O'Neill. Macellari describes the strengths and weaknesses of the labor movement in the state of Washington. He points to the accomplishments of his local such as getting the administration of the health and welfare plan out of the Employers Representation office (the Printing Industries of Seattle) into the Local 45 office in 1961, getting a cost-of-living provision into their contract in 1961, and good wage increases to the point where Local 45 took leadership in the printing industry in Seattle.

Macellari discusses the internal politics of the A.L.A., giving his impressions of people like Ken Brown and Ed Swayduck. He recalls the campaign between James O'Neill and Ted Brandt for International Vice President

in 1963 (and the election of Ken Brown as International President.)

Macellari traces the origins of the movement toward merger and why he did not support it although he was willing to go along with the decision of the majority in order to preserve union solidarity. He deals with the question of merger as a concept and more specifically with the possibility of total merger between the Photoengravers and the Lithographers in Seattle. He closely analyses the problem of merger of the pension funds of the two unions. He tells why he has always supported merger with the Bookbinders for reasons of increased union strength.

Macellari also talks about areas of International concern such as the development of education, keeping up with technology, relationships within the AFL-CIO itself, the fight over labels, and maintaining pride of craft.

INTERVIEW WITH EUGENE MACELLARI

February 4, 1974

Interviewer: Alice Hoffman

Macellari: Eugene T. Macellari, born December 13, 1927.

Interviewer: Okay, Mr. Macellari, where were you born? And could you say something about your family and your schooling?

Macellarí: Well, I was born in Brooklyn, New York. I'm the only child. My mother was born in the United States; my father was born in Italy.

Interviewer: What part of Italy?

Macellari: Genoa.

Interviewer: Hm-hm.

Macellari: He arrived when he was seventeen years old and took out his citizenship papers and didn't have to complete them because he fought for the United States in 1917 in France and was automatically a citizen after that. He was not married at the time, but when he returned. Both my parents were married, I think, quite late in life; in fact, they were in their thirties. So I came along, and I was the only one.

I went to Public School 214 in Brooklyn. I also went to East New York High School. That's about the level of my education. I went into the service on May 1, 1945. . .

Interviewer: That was a good time to go. It was almost over.

Macellari: Almost over. Right. In fact, the war was over in August of 1945, if I'm not mistaken. I stayed in the service until March of 1950; got out of the service at that time.

Interviewer: Were you in Korea?

Macellari: No. No, because the Korean War started in June of '50. By that time I had married. I met my wife while I was in the service, while I was at Mountain Home, Idaho, at an Air Force base there. She lived in Boise.

Got out of the service in California and went up to Boise, and we were married. We settled in Boise, Idaho, and I lived in Boise, Idaho, from 1950 until 1957. That's where I took my apprenticeship as a lithographer, although I had camera background and also some lithographic background in the service.

Interviewer: Had you any work experience before you went into the service?

Macellari: No. But I had always been interested in it because of my uncle. My uncle was a member of ALA Local One, New York City. In fact, he just retired recently from ALA Local One. So there was always that influence of a good labor union, as far as I was concerned, and the Amalgamated Lithographers were more or less part of our household, due to the fact that my uncle was a bachelor until he was about in his forties and always lived with us. Therefore the lithographic influence was there. My father was a chef--at completely opposite ends. I like to cook, but I'm not inclined in that area to stand around a hot kitchen all day long.

But, like I said, we settled in Boise, Idaho, in 1950. I went through a number of jobs, short jobs. Then I became a member of the Boise Police Department and took over their lab and camera because I had the

experience. I enjoyed that job very much. In fact, I was slated to go into FBI School, not for the FBI, but for the Boise Police Department as a training when the apprenticeship opened. I had been beating doors in the printing trades, and I had help--there's no question about that--with my father-in-law, Mr. Warren Cassidy. He was in the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, regional director for Idaho. And so with a little help on his end. . . but it still took three years.

Interviewer: Was there any help from your uncle?

Macellari: Not to that extent, because the Portland local had jurisdiction over Boise, and, of course, my uncle was a worker although he had been on scale committees, I believe, and delegate at times for one thing and another. But the help came from the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, you might say, and contacting Mr. Ace Burnett who was an International representative at the time, working out of the Portland areas. But it finally gelled, and I think I went to work for Syms-York Company in Boise.

Interviewer: What kind of a shop was that?

Macellari: It was the largest shop in Idaho, I believe, but it had a very small litho department. It was extensively letter-press, had a large type-setting department, a large letter-press department, large flat presses at that time, and a large bindery. But the litho department consisted of only two large presses and one small. It consisted of plates and camera, but I think our total employees at the time was about four or five when I went to work there. I went to work as a camera apprentice, camera platemaker apprentice, I would say, with some stripping being taught. The foreman at the time was Fran Bark, and the shop was ALA. . .

Interviewer: The whole shop was ALA?

Macellari: No, just the litho section.

Interviewer: Just the litho section.

Macellari: Right. It was under the Portland local, as I said, and that was Local 36 in those days, Portland Local 36. Of course, I never had contact with Portland local offices because of the fact that they were four-hundred-some-odd miles away. We did receive their notices; we paid our dues. I became shop steward, and then my correspondence was with Stella, the office girl of Local 36; she still is today. We're very good friends. So that's where it went.

Interviewer: What were your relationships like with the other printing trades in this mixed shop?

Macellari: Not too good!

Interviewer: Yeah! (laughing)

Macellari: Personally, I mean with the people involved, we were just fine. You know, when you're in a small town like Boise, it's different. I mean, having been born and raised in New York City and then ending up settling in the town of Boise, Idaho, it's a little bit different. But the people were nice, and we exchanged ideas. So there was no real push, except in the union area, where the contracts were involved; there were problems there.

Interviewer: What kind of problems were there?

Macellari: Well, the problems were on the basis of expanding jurisdiction of the Typographical Union, new methods of whatever you want to call them, and also the Printing Pressmen--the jurisdiction over the press room. But this had been solved; at least for the time being it had. And the ALA had their contract in there to operate that way.

Interviewer: And you had control over the litho press?

Macellari: Yes, the ALA controlled the litho press, the camera, the plate-making, and the stripping, of course. The complete lithographic process was controlled by the ALA Local 36. There were a number of negotiations that I participated in in that short period of time, you know, even though I was an apprentice. I kind of liked it. I didn't know anything, but I liked it. I went in with Ace, and we would try to make. . .

Interviewer: With whom?

Macellari: Ace Burnett. He was the International rep at the time, and it was up to him to negotiate the contract for that particular area.

Interviewer: I wonder if you could say something about the general atmosphere of the labor movement in Boise, or were you completely involved in the printing end of it?

Macellari: I had no contact with the labor movement as such, in Boise. I would say this: with the knowledge of my father-in-law, who was a very staunch labor man--I mean, /he/ believes in labor and was from the ranks of labor when he was appointed to the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training and had a number of contacts and friends in the labor movement in the city of Boise. And Warren (this is my father-in-law) always felt that the labor movement in Boise was weak and could have been a lot stronger, and should have been. There were good areas, but there were more bad areas than good areas as far as the strength of the labor movement. As I progress now and I point this out, when we had our problem there, as I said, I took my apprenticeship on the camera and plates. And in those days the plate-making was a little bit different than it is today. I mean you didn't just take a pre-sensitized plate out of a folder and expose it; you had to scrub it up and coat it and tusche it and--you name it! So I learned the good way of making plates; and I also

learned the camera with films that were not the films that you have today. They were films that you had to really watch carefully. You had a very small latitude. But anyway, it was interesting. I enjoyed it.

Interviewer: What kind of work was this shop doing, by the way?

Macellari: Everything.

Interviewer: Every kind.

Macellari: When the legislature was in session in Boise, which was the capital, they would do the work on the legislation, have it ready for the next day, you know, that type of thing. But they also did brochures. They even had a magazine in there called Idaho Fishing Guide that came out as a monthly issue. They also did the Morrison-Knudsen--M.K. Annual Report--and á lot of M.K.'s work. Maybe many people don't realize this, but M.K., whose headquarters are in Boise, Idaho, is one of the largest construction companies in the world. So we did an awful lot of work for them. We'd do job specs; we'd do brochures and folders; prospectus--you name it!

It was a varied shop. And of course the litho end of it took its share. We could see the handwriting on the wall. In fact, even in the bindery department, we had a fellow in there that was a ruling machine operator. I don't know even if you can see them any more, but they actually had a ruling machine that used pens that would actually do ledger sheets. Beautiful work! There was no question about it. The man was an artist. But the litho was replacing him slowly because our ledger sheets were just as good as his, and not only that, but every one was exactly alike. So he knew it. He told me once, "You know, I'm gonna be phased out of here." But he was older and getting close to retirement

age, and he didn't care. But he said, "My job's gone. They're gonna phase me out." Each day you could see that the ledgers were going more litho.

Well, we get to 1957, January, when we were in negotiations. Negotiations broke down. I think about it now, and I think that probably it could have been handled differently as I look at the labor movement or look at negotiations as I handle them now. But then I don't really know; I can't go back that far. But they did break down. There was a decided issue, and we did take a strike. The unfortunate part about it is that some of our people went back through the line, back to work, and left those that wanted to continue to strike on the line.

Interviewer: And what about the other trades in the shop. Did they honor your picket line?

Macellari: We'll get to that! (chuckle) Not only didn't they honor the picket line, but they were instrumental in getting these people to go back through the line and sign up with their organizations.

Interviewer: So they were really raiding you!

Macellari: That's right. They were raiding us. They broke our strike. My own feeling, you've got to realize, as far as I'm concerned is that the ALA was a background to me at home, back in New York City with my uncle. He always held that organization up. I felt it was a good organization. I felt they had done the best they could possibly do by us, and they continued to do that while we were on the line. So we continued to fight the strike even though we lost it. And we were on that picket line from January to April.

Interviewer: That's not a good time of year.

Macellari: Not a good time of the year in Boise. No, there was a lot of snow, and it was quite cold; but we did do our picket duty. We picketed that plant until they finally found us employment elsewhere. We knew that we had to leave the area, but we continued to do it. . .

Interviewer: How many of you were there?

Macellari: By that time there were just three of us. One of them found a job in the city of Boise. The other two--Gene Perron and myself--had to leave. Gene had an opportunity to go back into the plant; he was offered a job back in the plant. I was not. He could have taken it, but I talked to him and told him that there wouldn't be no hard feelings if he did because it was gone, but he decided to stick it out with me. So we stuck it out, and finally he got a job first--he was a pressman--got a job up at American Printing in Seattle. Then finally. . .

Before I get there, I'd like to say a few words about the union activity there. I'm talking about the Typographical and Printing Pressmen. I feel this is perhaps a good thing because you're discussing merger. I just feel that it's not right for a union to come up and walk alongside of, let's say, pickets for instance, trying to talk them into going through their own line. To me, it just didn't strike me right; I mean, it's cheap and shoddy, as far as I'm concerned, for union people to take this type of attitude. What had happened is that the. . . and I'm gonna name names, if that's okay.

Interviewer: Fine.

Macellari: The International representative Nikenovich, of the Printing Pressmen came into town. (I don't know how to spell that, by the way) And he still operates; he's around. We're not friends. But, anyway, Mr. Nikenovich came into town and had a meeting. He did not

invite me. I guess I was then a shop steward of ALA, and he probably didn't invite me to the meeting in his hotel room. This was prior to any of our people going back through the line, by the way. I think he knew my feelings on something like that, but he did talk to them. And I guess he convinced enough people to go through the line. After that happened, these people joined the Printing Pressmen's Union, and they went back to work. They did hire a scab or two, if I'm not mistaken, but there was never any violence or any threats. But we did have our problems.

Interviewer: What was the wage differential between pressmen and litho press operators?

Macellari: There was a little. In fact, that was the bone of contention. He didn't want us to take any more of an increase because he wanted us to slide into where they were. We were a little ahead of them. And that's the same old story. They were stronger, and he could have continued to operate that plant, which he did. Nobody honored our line. I mean, the Bookbinders didn't honor our line; the Printing Pressmen didn't honor our line; and the Typos didn't honor our line. Believe it or not, the only people that did honor our line were the clergy.

Interviewer: (laughing)

Macellari: That's the truth! That's the truth! I remember a Lutheran minister coming up there and looking at the strike line and asked us about it and then decided, "Well, do you have any idea where there's another printing plant?" We told him, and so he took off and went that way. And there was a Catholic priest. They were the only people that honored our line. But everybody went to work. Everybody used to say, "Hi (this)" and "Hi (that)" because we all knew each other, but there was not unity in that sense of the word.

But Mr. Marvick, Walt Marvick, who was the International representative for the ITU, came into the area, and he tried to get Gene and I to join the Typographical so that this way there would be an election in there finally between the ITU and the IPP to find out who's going to run the litho department. This was his idea--to come in there and organize us, go back through the line, and there would be half Printing Pressmen and half ITU in there, and they'd fight it out over the shop.

Well, Gene and I decided to stay ALA, and we told Mr. Marvick. In fact, I told Mr. Marvick in no uncertain terms. Years later I met him in Seattle. He didn't remember me, but I remembered him! (laughter) And I told him again that I felt that that wasn't labor's way, but that's neither here nor there.

But it was over. We had to move. I sacrificed, I think, considerably in the move. Left my wife and children in Boise to sell our place and home, moved to Seattle, and went to work at Deers Press. They were down on Second Avenue then. Went to work for them as a cameraman plate-maker and worked for them just about four months, though. All of a sudden they decided it was getting a little slow and they wanted to lay me off. That was fine with me, because I couldn't do anything about it, but I certainly couldn't support myself in Seattle and my family in Boise on a layoff. I contacted our union representative, our union president, and it just so happened that a job was opening in his shop as a stripper. I had done considerable stripping work by that time, not too much, but enough to get by on anyway, and asked them if they would put me on, which they did. They were very nice about it, but people in the shop helped me considerably in the stripping department. There were five strippers at that time, and I was the sixth. And so they kind of carried me a little bit there until

I got my bearings on some of the things I had never done before, which did real well.

Interviewer: What company was this?

Macellari: That was with North Pacific Bank Note Company. One thing I might add (just for a little union background), that just came to my mind and might help you understand as to how I got to my present job: when I arrived in Seattle, I picked up the Yellow Pages to call the office. And there's no ALA #45 in the Yellow Pages. I'm thinking to myself, "Well, there's something wrong somewhere." As it turned out, there wasn't any office for ALA #45. Well, here's a city like Seattle and there's no office! This kind of irked me a little bit, and I had to call the president at his home or at his place of business.

Interviewer: His office was in his back pocket.

Macellari: That's right. And had been for fifteen years--same president. Walt Jacobson was a good president, as far as I'm concerned; he did a job. He did the best he could, being that he had to serve two masters, and you can't do that. Unfortunately, I believe that he was tempered somewhat by the fact that he had to make a living in a plant and then besides that be a union president. So I hold nothing against Walt because, had I been in his shoes, I don't know what I would have done either. But the local was weak to that degree.

After coming to work in Seattle, I was finally given the opportunity to be close enough to attend union meetings. In Boise, four hundred miles away, I never did attend the union meeting. But I talked to people, and there were a lot of good union people in that town. A lot of good union people worked in our shop, the North Pacific Bank Note Company. In fact, a lot of the officers have come out of that shop--Bill Wakelyn, for one.

He's not in our union any more, but I can tell you that he is a good union man. He and I discussed this many times. He's a very good friend, by the way, even though he's management now. But he's management that I can take! He and I discussed this a lot, and I told him, that it kind of griped me to have the city of Seattle with no union office. Why? That's quite a few people.

So we actually started to work on that end. It was, I think, more his idea than mine, but I think I planted the seed. And we finally worked--along with a lot of other people--finally worked to the point where in May of 1958. . . (my family wasn't up there. They were still. . .)

Interviewer: Your family was still in Boise?

Macellari: Still in Boise. We didn't move up there. . . well, I devoted a lot of time to the union. She didn't come up from Boise until fifteen months after I moved up there. I moved up there in April of '57.

Anyway, it was in May of '58 that we opened our office. We raised our dues a little bit to pay for it, and we hired a girl for a half-day. We started getting files together and throwing things away and keeping some. Next thing you know we had a little office going. And she was a good girl. There was no question about it; she did a good job. I'd like to put her in there. She's dead now. Her name was June McMillan, and I would like to put here in there.

Interviewer: What was her background?

Macellari: I don't think she had any union background; but the reason I have to put her in there is that she took the union, more or less like Stella does in Portland. Stella's been in there. . . I think she's a fixture in Portland, Stella Troychuck. But June McMillan took the union to heart, and it was her union. More or less, really, every-

body was working at the trade except her. So she was more or less running the show in a way, and she really took it to heart. And she helped a lot. Set up a lot of good systems in the office, and it was good.

But anyway, it went on. Finally, after much ado, we decided, "You know, there's an International subsidy program." Of course, by that time we didn't realize it, but we were actually over the amount of people that we could have had to have a subsidy.

Interviewer: How many people did you have?

Macellari: By that time we had about three hundred, close to three hundred.

Interviewer: Were you actively organizing?

Macellari: Not really, not really. That's something that we haven't really done as good as we should have done in Seattle. Maybe it'll come about, hopefully. But we were growing. We were picking up a shop here and there, and we were growing. And we felt that we should have an officer, a paid officer, so that we could handle the problems of the union without. . . I worked in the same shop as Walt Jacobson, and I could see the amount of phone calls that he received. For an employer to tolerate that, you're gonna get something back in return, and that is where we were weak. So we decided at that time to really go and get a paid officer. This was in 1959, early '59.

Now, we decided to write the situation up and figure out the least amount of dues that people could pay to support an office at the salary that we had set and then have the incumbent officer be the office; in other words, the first full-time officer. We put this plan into effect, got it passed, and we sent it out to a referendum. Well, it failed, and it failed quite heavily. The leader of the opposition was a man named

Frank Weber. He was the original president of the local. Frank's still alive today; he's on retirement, and a good union man that kept that local alive out of his own pocket back in those days. I'm going back to 1920. He's actually on the charter. His name was Frank Weber, president at that time. The local was chartered in May of 1920.

So anyway, I went up to him. . . there was a lot of friction at that time because I was fighting for one thing, and he was fighting for something else. Things changed after that, and we became real good friends. But anyway, I grabbed Frank aside and said, "Frank, my gosh, why?" And the answer he gave me--it's in the record. It's true. He said, "Gene, I'm not opposed to a president or a paid officer, but not the incumbent." And there was the defeat.

Then I started to pick out the other little pockets of opposition, and we found that that was the reason why it was defeated. It wasn't defeated because they didn't want to pay the money. It was defeated because they didn't want the incumbent to be the full-time officer. Maybe they didn't have confidence in him; maybe they felt there were other reasons. I don't know, and I'm not going to go into that now; it doesn't make any difference.

Elections came in 1960. Back in the old ALA the conventions took place on the odd-number year, and the elections for the local officers took place in the even. So elections came up in 1960; nominations came up and elections. And Walt Jacobson decided not to run because on the issue was not only the officer, but the paid officer. In other words, there were two items; there was the new officer, but there was also on the ballot whether he would be paid full-time or part-time. There was a dues increase involved with this and everything. Well, Walt felt that

he wasn't going to run. I think in Walt's mind, in the background, he thought perhaps there was a place for write-in's and he may win that way, so there was an open area.

Now comes down to the nominations. I was on night shift, so I didn't attend the meeting. If you'd like me to give you the background of how it happened. . .

Interviewer: Yes, sure.

Macellari: . . . this is where I come in, you know, where I come in, so you can see how flukey it is. What happened was that at nominations Frank Weber nominated a man from his shop, Willard Bookter. The North Pacific Bank Note, which was there in force, I might add, looked around and there were no further nominations. And they kept waiting for a nomination, and there was no nomination. The way I got it second-hand was that they were not going to vote for Willard Bookter. That's the way they put it. So they decided to nominate Bill Wakelyn; this is the gentleman that I spoke to you about before. Bill Wakelyn happened to be at the meeting and said no way was he going to run for office. He felt that he was gonna be union, he was going to do the work for the union and everything else, but he did not want that job, either part-time or full-time.

So then it fell on who are they gonna nominate. Since I was not present (laughter)--that's the truth--since I was not present, they decided to nominate me. I had no knowledge of it whatsoever until I came to work the next day and checked and punched my card in and walked through the pressroom on my way to the preparatory department. And I heard these little remarks from the pressmen, "Good morning" or "Good afternoon, Mr. President." So when I finally arrived in the prep depart-

ment, everybody was standing around sheepishly, and I said, "What did you get me into now?" So this is the way it came about. They told me, of course, that I had ten days, and our by-laws state that you have to put in your acceptance in writing. If you don't put that in, you're automatically off the ballot. I said "Well, I'll have to talk to my wife about it because if it should be full-time, she's gotta realize that I'm gonna have to quit my job."

Interviewer: Did it mean a pay cut for you?

Macellari: Yes, because of the overtime. In fact, it was at least four or five years before I actually made the same salary that I made that same year. That's right, there was a pay cut. I never thought of it that way, but you're right! We talked about it, and I think we realized it. Of course, overtime is a variable; you don't know whether you're gonna get it or not. And they did pay me above anyone in the contract, so in that respect I was making better than anyone in the contract. The fact that that year I made X number of dollars on overtime and every year that I worked for them I did, it was a pay cut. And the hours, I might add, were not only the same, but probably even more! But my wife and I decided; she said, "This is what you want to do?" and I said, "Yeah, I'd like to give it a try." I said, "I may not be paid, but I'd like to give it a try, even if I'm not paid. I'll do the job. At least for two years I will."

So, as it turned out, I was elected over Willard Bookter; and it turned out that they voted for a paid officer. I've been the president there ever since. I took office in January, 1961.

(To interviewer) I'd like you to let me know where you want to go from here.

(End of Tape I, Side 1)

Interviewer: Why don't we start out with some kind of a description of the printing industry in Seattle?

Macellari: Fine. Well, I walked into the job in January of 1961, and, of course, walked into a beauty because there were negotiations that year in the spring. In fact, the contract expired March 16. So I walked into the job and I walked into negotiations at the same time.

Before I go into negotiations, I'd like to state that the ALA #45 was weak, the ALA #45 was always second in the area. I think you might say the employers liked us because they could use us against other people. We were down-and-out benefits; there was no question about it. We had dropped over a period of years to the point where we were not leaders; we were more or less just plugging along. I think that the Typographical Union and the Printing Pressmen in the area at that time had paid officers, if I'm not mistaken; maybe the Bookbinders did too.

Interviewer: What about the Photoengravers?

Macellari: No. They never have had. They were just too small, and to this day, I think they have eighty-five active members. That's including the whole state of Washington. But their contracts were comparable; there's no question about that. So we were on the receiving end of taking what you got and liking it, and that was about it.

Well, the International realized that here was a man just coming out of the trade, inexperienced, and I needed help; there was no question about that. They did send me a person that I thought was excellent in that respect. There's a big history on this. But they sent us International Representative Jim O'Neill, James O'Neill. But he was out of the Midwest. He finally was reassigned out to the Northwest because at the time Ace Burnett had resigned, had left, and there was no representative

up in that area. But they sent James O'Neill, and I learned an awful lot in our relationship about negotiations, about unions, about dealing with employers. And I can honestly say that, as far as having a background, I have him to thank; there's no question about that. I did get excellent cooperation from the International; I'm not gonna deny that. We had our problems, and I'll get to those, but I just feel that they did help. It was an organization that I was proud to be a part of, and that was the ALA.

The industry in Seattle--let's put it this way--it's not a printing town. It never was, probably never will be. There are good printing plants there; they do excellent work. But it's certainly not a printing center like the Twin Cities, Chicago, Philadelphia, New York City, places like that. . . nowhere. . . or San Francisco or L.A. for that matter. We just do printing more or less for the area.

Now, as far as the state of Washington is concerned, you couldn't find a better state for labor. I would say we have probably (and I think I'm correct) the largest per capita union labor force of any state in the Union. And it shows, it really shows, that labor does a good job in the state of Washington. You can see how we elect our people up there, and it's a very oddball state, really. You know, when everybody goes for one side, somebody's going for something else. We were the only ones that went for Humphrey. I think from the Mississippi River on west, we were the only state that supported Humphrey against Nixon. This time Nixon took it. But I think there were a lot of things behind that. But I think a lot of people are sorry about it, too. Anyway, that's neither here nor there, but it is a good labor state. It has a good labor council, state labor council. It has a United Labor Lobby, for

instance, that lobbies in Olympia for bills that help the working man. Not necessarily sponsor them, but they do do an awful lot of sponsoring. Is this what you want me to cover, stuff like this?

Interviewer: Sure.

Macellari: I think that's really great because we're going to present a bill, or they're going to help us with a bill, in the state legislature. It was our baby and because of the strike that we've had now at the present time in Ridgeway, we're going to try to pass a law that makes it mandatory for an employer, if he has a labor dispute and he's advertising for help, he has to state in that ad that a labor dispute exists. They're going to help us with that in the next session of the legislature. I'm hoping to see that presented as a bill.

But this is the type of work they do. They have the United Labor Lobby that takes not only the AFL-CIO unions (although Washington State Labor Council is AFL-CIO) but it also has Mine Workers, Teamsters; any of the people that are not associated with AFL-CIO also have people on that United Labor Lobby. They do a doggone good job, I think, of passing legislation that's going to help the working man; and this is important. A lot of states ought to have things like this.

We have a lot of active labor councils, county labor councils, the King County Labor Council being the largest, I would imagine, which is the city of Seattle more or less, although it takes in Renton and some of the outlying areas--Bellevue and what have you. It's strong. The Teamsters are extremely strong in Seattle. I think all in all, although I wouldn't say it's <u>that</u> well organized, I would say that the state of Washington is pretty well labor-oriented, always has been. You mentioned before that it's been a seat of radicalism, you might say, and it has; there's no question about it.

Interviewer: You think of the Spokane Free Speech fights and the Wobblies and so forth.

Macellari: Oh, gosh. You can take history there as far as that type of. . . if you want to call it radicalism, yeah, that's quite a background. Like I said, I'm not a native of the state of Washington; I don't really know that much. You'd be surprised how many people aren't natives of the state of Washington, and I think this has a lot to do with it. You have people looking for something if they're coming out to that area; they really are. They're getting away from a particular area. It may be just climate, for all I know. I don't know. Maybe it's just the generalities of eastern cities or wherever they're from. You get people in there from Los Angeles; you get people in there from Chicago; they come from all over. They're people of all backgrounds, and I think this is good. It's more or less like the old melting pot for the United States where they came from all different countries; now you're getting them from all different states. And it's good.

Interviewer: It's good in the sense that it makes them dependent upon each other. . .

Macellari: Right. Right. And I think you find people coming in there and changing. For instance, people that I know of that come in from areas that are not unionized. All of a sudden they change, and they say, "My gosh! Look what I get for doing the same work that I did down in those states." Why? Because we're all pulling together on this thing, and we're saying to the employer, "look! We want our fair share. That's all we want, and we don't think we should get handouts." And they change.

I had one man in particular in my local that, when I took over the office, he hadn't come to union meetings for ages because he had been

browbeaten on the floor of the union. . . while they were trying to put in a pension fund. One of the officers of one of our locals in California had come up to present this case, and he had more or less ridiculed this man for asking a question. In my understanding it was a legitimate question; this man's very intelligent. From that time on it kind of soured him on the union. Well, I got him to the point of finally, over the years, to not only come out, but he's been our treasurer for quite some time. So I think this is what you're up against. He happened to come from Oklahoma, which I think, as all people know, is not the greatest labor state in the world! He had an opinion, and they helped form that opinion by taking that attitude with him on the floor. So you have to change these people, make them sure what it really can be like if people do it right.

I'm going back now to negotiations in 1961. With the help of James O'Neill and some of the committee and myself, we all worked together on this thing. We actually came up with the best contract that that local had ever come up with. One thing we wanted to do, which we tried to do in 1959 and were told was a strike issue, was to get the administration of the health and welfare plan out of the Employers Representative Office (the PIA) into our office, which we accomplished in '61 under threat of strike because we then put it on their foot and said, "It's a strike issue with us. Now, if you want to take a strike. . ." Well, the employers didn't want to take a strike. And so they agreed to give that portion away, which was no skin off their nose. They didn't care who they paid the administrative fees to. It wasn't the fact of the administrative fee; we wanted it so that we could keep our fingers on it so that we could do better service for our people. So we did take that over.

One thing that we did put in at that time that has really been a boon--in fact, it's become International policy--is a cost-of-living provision into our contract. The employers at that time didn't feel that they were giving us too much. I think they'll regret that 1961 negotiations for the rest of their lives, but anyway it's been with us since 1961. And we've really reaped some money on the cost-of-living provision!

Interviewer: I guess you have!

Macellari: It's kept us ahead. Let's put it that way. It's kept us ahead, and we're thankful. But we did take over the health and welfare; we had a good wage increase; picked up an extra holiday; and the contract was a good one. The people were satisfied, and the image of ALA #45 in Seattle changed. We were no longer the friend of the employers, that's not the job of the union. If you're a friend of the employer, then you'd better look out because I don't think you're doing the job you should be.

Interviewer: Right.

Macellari: And so we weren't satisfied with that. From that day on I think ALA #45 took leadership in the printing industry, from 1961 on. We have, right now, I think, the best contracts in the area. We have certainly the best wages of any of the printing trades. We're far ahead of them all, and that may be of some detriment to us, too, in organizing and what have you. Because (I have to say this) not so much with the Typographical Union, because with the Typographical Union, at least in the city of Seattle, we will go at each other with knives, but face to face. Just put it that way: they probably will take anything that I've got, and I'll take anything they've got if you're gonna do it that way, which I haven't done and they haven't done, although they've tried to take jurisdiction and we're had some nice little jurisdictional fights, especially

over paste-up, cold type, which we won, by the way, which was a great case. But at least I do it and they do it face to face, where I can't say the same for the Printing Pressmen. I'm sorry, but especially in the city of Seattle, the Printing Pressmen work hand in hand with the Printing Industry of Seattle, which is the PIA; they help each other. . .

Interviewer: What does PIA mean?

Macellari: The Printing Industry of America. The Printing INdustry of Seattle, Inc., is actually a PIA section of the organization.

Interviewer: Right.

Macellari: But they work hand in hand with them. In fact, to the point of where I'm sure that some shops have gone and signed contracts with them on the recommendation of the Printing Industry of Seattle because they're gonna get a better deal and a better shake from the Printing Pressmen than they will from the ALA. . . well, now GA /Graphic Arts/ #45.

So I don't like that. We just had a meeting recently where we tried to get the Allied Printing Trades unions together again and tried to keep them in a council where we would at least govern each other. The biggest fight in that meeting was the Typographical Union with the Printing Pressmen. They were at each other hammer and tongs. I understood they were going for merger, but I don't know if they would ever merge in the city of Seattle. This is really something else! I mean, I'm like a mediator between those two! The Printing Pressmen will not come into the Allied Printing Trades in Seattle. They haven't been a member of the Allied Printing Trades for twenty years in Seattle.

And they continue to issue their own label. They issue it on a basis of. . . for instance, they have a plant that has a building that

has the presses in it. Everything else is done non-union and yet they put the label on it because they have a contract for the presses. As far as I'm concerned, that label means nothing! But I cannot agree to say, "I'll take the Allied label" and let the GAIU label go and put only the Allied label when I know what the Allied label means. It means everything has to be done union, from one end to the other, even, now that they've relinguished their hold over the fact that it had to be different unions, one union can have it door-to-door, but still those particular trades have to be union. I'll be darned if I'm going to relinquish GAIU label while the Printing Pressmen are putting their bloody label on anything they want to.

So we've got that climate in Seattle as far as the Printing Pressmen are concerned. I can fight with the ITU if I have to fight with them, but I can fight with them on a face-to-face level, whereas I can't trust the Printing Pressmen. And that's pointed out in this Ridgeway strike where they are actually actively recruiting people to come in there and take our jobs. So this is something that I think we. . . oh, I'm getting ahead of myself now.

Now, a little background as to how I felt about the ALA. . . well, I didn't know that much about the ALA other than what I read and associations with people like James O'Neill. And of course, if I'm not mistaken, we had had some kind of a meeting back prior to. . .yes, yes, we had some kind of a meeting, and I had met some of the officers. It was a Pacific Regional Conference, if I'm not mistaken. Don Stone attended that one and Ted Brandt attended it, and all in all it was an organization that I felt "Well, looks like it's gonna be okay."

Well, in 1961 they had the convention in Miami. I believe it was September. Then I really got to meet the people. It just seemed to me, from attending my first convention and sitting on the floor of the convention and listening to these people and also being honored, I guess you might say, with being placed on the Resolutions Committee (chuckling)--I have never been on the Resolutions Committee since--but I was first time in on the Resolutions Committee, and of course I think I kept my mouth shut a lot more than I have in the past, at that time, but that's hard for me to do.

Interviewer: What kind of issues were there in that '61 convention?

Macellari: Well, you're really taxing my memory. . .

Interviewer: I read about something called the Canary Fiasco. . .

Macellari: Well, no, that was gone. The Canary situation took place in '58 in the Cleveland conference, I think, and that was gone. Brown took over in '59 in Portland. And although I was in the union in those days, I only read about it. I had no idea of the background politics or anything else.

Interviewer: You didn't know anything about those issues?

Macellari: Not at all. And so when it did get to '61, things had changed somewhat. I thought Ken Brown a dynamic president. I still do, but I don't agree with him on everything. But I thought to myself, "Well, we've got somebody in there that's gonna go." And, of course, he had help. I mean, he had people in the background. He had the Council, and I'm a firm believer in the Council. I really am. If they're doing their job! I don't know whether they're doing it all the time, but if they're doing their job. I wish I could get the actual minutes of these Council meetings, not these edited things, you know.

Interviewer: (laughter)

Macellari: Because I get background fed to me from people that I know attend these Council meetings, and it's a little different sometimes than what comes out in the actual Council minutes.

Interviewer: Right.

Macellari: But I'd love to be able to really get the transcription as it came out because I think you'd know a little bit more about your organization that way than some beautifully edited job where you can't tell who's on first and who's on second.

Anyway, I believe in the Council principle because I think that there should be a president that would institute--if you go back a little ways, from things that I've heard, there should have been a president--an International president, that more or less has ideas on where to go. And the Council should either support him or not support him on certain things, and it shouldn't be up to the Council to have to tell the president what to do. . I believe that. I believe that.

I also believe that there should be checks and balances, and I think that the Council should be the check and balance, like our senators. You know, we're their constituents. They should report to us. This is the thing that always more or less griped me about International councils. I've campaigned for an International council a number of times on the basis that I felt--I never did make it--but I felt that I would like to be able to put out, at my own expense if I have to, a report to the local presidents that I represent because, after all, it's a region. And you never see this. Why should I have to receive International Council minutes that I know have been doctored and they've been reviewed and things have been taken out of it that probably should have been left in?

If that's the way you felt, don't take it out because you'll hurt somebody's feelings. To heck with it.

But I believe an International Councillor should be more or less the arm of the area that he represents. He should report back to those people. If he can't go around--and he has no allotment for doing this--can you just imagine, for instance, if I was an International Councillor from the city of Seattle, which has maybe four hundred members, how in the world could I afford to go down and make my report to San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego? But you could put it in a newsletter and say, "Look, there's background to this and this and this," and "Look, there are things in the wind. How do you feel about certain areas?" You know? You get these things. You could do it. But you don't get that. I don't know if they do that in the East, but you don't get it in the West. So I have a little feeling about that particular area.

But all in all, I really can't remember all the issues. But I think merger was starting to gel in 1961.

Interviewer: Right.

Macellari: And I could see some lines forming. Again, this was my first convention. And politics, I know it's there; I know it's in everything there is--church, business, unions, schools. I don't care where you're at. . . universities. Boy! did we have politics at the University of Washington! Unbelievable! I know it's there, but sometimes it just . . . (sigh). . . but anyway, I listen, I talk, but sometimes it gripes me that you line up for one reason or another. But I guess that's the way the game is played. Anyway, I could see that there was little bits here and there, a little animosity toward one guy or another. Why? Because he was a little more dynamic than this particular guy and because

he dressed a little bit differently or was able to project himself on the floor.

Okay. Came my contact then with Ken Brown, who as far as I'm concerned is quite eloquent. He could probably end up selling refrigerators to Eskimos! And Ed Swayduck, who also could probably end up selling refrigerators to Eskimos. And I thought to myself, "Well, there's going to be a little bit of. . ." But, of course, I knew the background, and I knew that Ed Swayduck had more or less groomed, I would say, Ken Brown for the job, because Ed Swayduck was quite a power in the International at the time. There's no question about it. Local One has more or less always been a power in the International. But I had no idea of politics or some of the things that I found out afterwards, you know, or heard about, let's put it that way. So I thought, "Well, I guess you have to have that, so I'm not going to argue with the fact." But it seemed to me that on the floor the majority of delegates were doing a good job for their people. And that impressed me, and I thought, "Well, that's good. I'm glad to be part of this organization." Have been, always have been, will always be proud to be part of this organization.

But anyway, that's the way it happened. We had our problems as we went on. We also had our problems with the International. I felt there were situations where people came into an area just to say that they had a part of a certain thing when they didn't do a bloody damn thing to help out. Actually, all they did was take a little glory after it was all over.

That came about in 1961 where, for instance, I remember one of our people made a report to the International as to the help that we received and everything else, and we made a little notation that so-and-so had

been in to speak before the employee group but unfortunately he was called away. You know, it almost looked like he had nothing to do with it, and really he didn't have too much to do with it! (laughter) Gee, I got a call, and the man was a little disturbed with the fact that we had made that report. Well, I'm in a position to feel that I should make everybody happy. I wrote a letter stating that I felt that he was neglected, you know.

But I can go into a shop, and I can come out and make a report three pages long as to what happened in that shop; but most of the time it only takes a few lines, and most of the time you're just talking to the fellas about how things were going and what have you, but you could stretch it if you wanted to.

Interviewer: Well, now, in 1963 you were in Montreal. . .

Macellari: Right.

Interviewer: Which was a rather famous convention.

Macellari: Well, you can go back to the 1962 Policy Conference in Atlantic City, too, because that's where it really started to gel. I could see the lines being drawn then because Mr. Swayduck was by that time being isolated, you might say. And it was in '62 because I can remember that. In fact, in 1963 I don't even know if they were staying in the same hotels!

Interviewer: No, they weren't. . .

Macellari: That's right. But in 1962 the undercurrent was there at the Policy Conference. See, the old ALA used to have a convention on the odd numbered years and the Policy Conference on the even years. They did away with that. I attended the last Policy Conference, if I'm not mistaken, and the last Policy Conference was in 1962. And I

could see at that time that there were lines being drawn.

In 1963 in Montreal, I attended that convention, and at that time merger was well on its way to becoming a reality. But there were doubts; there were doubts in a lot of people's minds. Frankly, I attended a meeting in Montreal in another hotel; a number of us attended that meeting. In fact, I know John Stagg was there. He was there as Philadelphia's representative to report back. I mean, we're not stupid.

Anyway, I attended that meeting, and Ben Robinson was there and Ed Swayduck. Maybe Marty Silverman was there or maybe he wasn't, and Ed Hansen. And they gave us their side of why they felt this was going too fast. It sounded legitimate to me, and maybe it was. I don't know. They just felt there was some problem with their pension funds; there were some problems with certain other areas. They felt that they would have their problems in New York City with the Photoengravers' segment, which was large and which had considerable unemployment. And they didn't know. There was a lot of open areas; there were a lot of ifs, ands, and buts.

I could see it coming that we were going to lose ALA One because when you make a statement, especially Swayduck, when you make a statement, you're not going to backtrack on it. And I thought to myself, "Now, what are we gaining to lose them?" And that was my decision. That's why I did not support the merger. I didn't support it. I felt there were areas there that should have been, /looked at/ and there were other people who felt the same way. I think you can go back and . . . what the heck, it's for the record. Teddy Meyers of Pittsburgh, he didn't support it, and he felt that there were areas there that should have been looked at. A number of other people. I don't know if Cal

Jack was that crazy about it himself. This was the St. Louis local. We discussed it with a number of people; we had meetings, too. I was included in them. As far as we were concerned in Seattle, we were a drop in the bucket, and we were 3500 miles away from everybody and we were stuck up in a little corner somewhere. But we felt just that there was a certain area there that we couldn't neglect. The fact is that we were talking about ALA people as opposed to Photoengravers that we were going to lose. Why, if they felt that strongly about it, shouldn't somebody stop and say, "Hey, wait a minute! Let's get together and sit down. Let's not stampede into a merger on this doggone thing just on that basis."

Interviewer: Now, in your own area, in the Pacific area, it's my impression that merging with the Photoengravers was a very small item.

Macellari: Absolutely!

Interviewer: Did this influence your thinking?

Macellari: No.

Interviewer: It did not one way or the other?

Macellari: No. Because we've actually really been trying like crazy to merge with the Photoengravers now. Really, we felt the decision was made.

Anyway we went to the. . . well, if I'm not mistaken, the vote came up, and then the decision was made at that time that they would not. . . if they felt that we had to go along with this, that Local One may decide that they weren't gonna go along with it. Of course, Brown made his famous statement there. I think the delegates agreed on the situation. I mean, I more or less agreed on my own that I may not support it; I may say that to my local because I felt that way. But I

would go along with the decision of the majority.

There had been talk; there had been a number of conversations; there had been different cross calls on different areas about not only Local One, but other locals breaking away. I did not want to do that. I did not feel that it was. . . I think we could have. I think a lot of locals could have, because Local One won their point in their case. But I didn't feel that the organization should splinter like that. I was sorry to see Local One go, and I hope I've remained friends with everyone in that particular state because I felt that there was a lot of good people in Local One. Not only people that could help the International as far as their counsel was concerned--I'm talking about the officers of Local One. As far as attorneys are concerned, that's something else. But as far as the officers are concerned, as far as the people themselves, the Local One people, I think that if Local One people came out to Seattle, I would treat them just like anybody else. I mean, as far as I'm concerned, they are craftsmen; they have a job if I've got it. In fact, I'd be happy to put them to work, and I'm hoping it's the same way in the other direction.

But we did vote against merger in Seattle as far as the balloting is concerned. But I also made a statement in Seattle to my people when it was over that we certainly didn't feel. . ."It's over. Things are done." Now, you have to go into this a little bit, as far as my background is concerned. . . we ran Jim O'Neill for International office. . .

(End of Tape I, side 2)

Macellari: Going back a little ways. . . this officer, by the way --I might mention the fact--had been a little bit put out with us on the amount of work that he did in the Seattle area, taking credit for it, that was Ted Brandt, our vice-president, who was living in the Los Angeles area at the time. Ted Brandt is Ted Brandt. He's a personable guy. There's no question about it except that Ted Brandt started to lose his lustre, as far as I was concerned, as an International officer on some of the issues that came up in the Seattle area and some of the things that were said and some of the positions that were taken by him during some of our problems up there.

Frankly, I feel that there were mistakes made in the fiberboard negotiations or fiberboard organizing. I would say because of the fact that people come in after most of the work is done and try to reap the glory, then foul up the whole bloody doggone organization. And I think that it's a proven fact from the people that I spoke to in fiberboard--I've gotten to know some of the people in fiberboard--that we don't have those shops, but we could have had them. But too much time was let go because. . .

Interviewer: Who has them?

Macellari: I don't know. Paper, Pulp, and Sulphite or somebody.

Interviewer: The Paper Workers?

Macellari: Paper Workers, yeah. We could have had them, but there was no coordination. Somebody was out to get the big deal, you know, and there was time that lapsed that shouldn't have lapsed and other things. One thing led to another, and finally in 1963 at the Montreal convention, we had asked Jim O'Neill if he would run for International office; and we nominated him against Ted Brandt. Well, as it turned out,

Mr. Swayduck was not too crazy about the situation anyway, there's no question about it. And he delivered a tremendous bloc of votes for Jim O'Neill and ended up upsetting Ted Brandt, although I would say this: we did do the best we could more or less handling the campaign in Seattle, but it was certainly nothing of any size.

Interviewer: Now, you were supporting Ted Brandt or Jim O'Neill?

Macellari: No, Jim O'Neill. In fact, we nominated him.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay.

Macellari: And I think Portland seconded his nomination, and then there were a lot of other locals that picked it up. Oh, we put on a fairly good campaign, and we wrote into certain shops. Wrote to the shop stewards, for instance, in Metal Decorating and these different locals and felt that there was a right way to go. We were chastized considerably by a number of presidents throughout the United States for doing this, but we felt that we had done no wrong and they should go to the International council if they felt we had done wrong. We felt it was a national election and why can't we send our material in because we know where it would go if we put it into the local. It would go into the garbage can. Because, if you're supporting Ted Brandt, you're certainly not going to distribute that stuff. And it's a proven fact. We put the stuff right into the shops. We were lucky enough to get mailing lists of shops, so we addressed it to the shop delegate of ALA in that particular local.

Interviewer: Where was your financial support coming from, Local One?

Macellari: No! We didn't get support from Local One other than the votes, believe it or not. No, we set aside X number of dollars in

Seattle. And Portland, which was Jim O'Neill's home local, set aside X number of dollars; and one thing led to another. Our campaign was more or less mimeograph-type work and also some printing that we got done and mailings. That's what it amounted to. Now, we did get help on the mailing lists probably from Local One because I don't know where else we could have got them from. They had quite a file on the locals as far as shops were concerned. Unbelievable! I don't know where they got them from, but they did. But anyway, that we did get from Local One. But Local One then delivered that bloc of seven thousand votes, and it was about fifteen hundred votes enough to put them over the top. Of course, they couldn't have done it alone; Local One couldn't have done it alone because there were a lot of other votes that came in. So here was an upset, you know.

Now, here's where my opinions start to change somewhat. I think Jim could have done a good job. I don't think he was given a chance to do a good job. This is my personal opinion, just from speaking to Jim O'Neill. I don't think he was given a chance; I think that he was ostracized. And this changed my complete opinion of the International to some degree. I felt that he won an election; the other man lost. Now, they took that man, and they made him an International rep. It's okay; I have no objections to it. But they kept him on ice, in other words, because. . .

Okay. Finally Jim came to me some time in 1964 after the Minneapolis convention, the merger convention, and said that he disliked doing this but he just felt he had to resign from the office. He said, "When you're in that kind of a boat that you're on one side and everyone else is on the other side, it just don't work out." So I said, "Well, that's up to

you, Jim. You do what you want to do." I was disappointed that he did it. I don't think that he should have done it. I wouldn't have done it. But that was his decision to make.

It was over, and he left the situation. Brandt again took office.

Interviewer: Was he appointed to fill out Jim O'Neill's term or . . .?

Macellari: I don't remember. I don't remember if he was or not. There was an election, I think. An election took place, and he was nominated. I don't think he was the only nominee or something. I don't know. . . maybe somebody else. . . I don't remember it, but it didn't make any difference. . .

Interviewer: One way or the other, he was back.

Macellari: Right. He was back in. Okay. Ted Brandt from that day on was persona non grata in Seattle. Not on my account! That's the truth. Because he asked me one day, and I said, "Ted, you can come in anytime you want to. You're an International v.p. I don't know what kind of a reception you're gonna get from the local because. . ." As far as they were concerned, Ted Brandt was just out! So. . . that's neither here nor there. . .

Now, from that time I had no dealings as far as I'm concerned, with Ted Brandt. This last time that they ran against him. . . that's politics of a different nature. I've heard about it, but I had nothing to do with running against Ted Brandt or running for him. I was completely neutral. My local went the way they wanted to. Ted Brandt lost in my local, but that's because of background and the past; and it made no difference one way or the other. I didn't campaign for either one of them. I don't even know who ran against Brandt. I guess it was Donahue

that ran against Brandt.

But I was disappointed in Jim O'Neill's decision. I was disappointed frankly, in the International's position, taking that tack with O'Neill. There was perhaps a lot on my part, too, that was not. . . I should have been maybe a little bit more tolerant in some areas with the International. I mean, there were areas where I was probably shooting my mouth off or thought that things were going wrong where maybe they weren't wrong. I don't know. I was maybe listening to the wrong people.

But anyway, it was an era. We went through it. It all culminated in Detroit because at the Detroit convention, which was the first nominations since the merger convention in '64.

Interviewer: This was in '65?

Macellari: Right. Local 45L got up and nominated James O'Neill for president of the organization, and we asked Jim, of course, first if we could do this. If I remember back, we had asked Ken Brown for a decision; and Ken Brown had made the decision at first that what we had asked for was all right. But he made the statement to us that, if there was dissatisfaction, the place to show it would be at the ballot box. So we decided that was the only way we could show it. I'm not sorry we did this. Maybe it was a little ill-advised on our part to do it, but we did it because we just felt there was a problem. Now, I don't think anybody should be sorry that we did it, either, because it did show that Jim O'Neill. . . there was only one local, by the way. I don't think there was a second. There was never another nomination for O'Neill, but there was a lot of undercurrent. There was a lot of exchange of correspondence. This bothers me a little bit. What bothers me is this: if you feel a certain way, why not? You might be wrong! But why not?

For instance, if a guy is in the boat of being not in favor at the time, why do you have to talk to him in his hotel room? Why can't you talk to him in the lobby so everybody sees you talking to him? Do you have to go behind a palm somewhere (laughter) and say, "Hey! come here! I want to talk to you."

So all of a sudden I started to get letters. I still have these letters! I started to get letters, I started to get phone calls from different locals, you know, asking us about this thing. I said, "My gosh! Maybe we have some support!" And we did get some support. Oh, Ken Brown won by a two-to-one margin; there's no question about it. I mean, gosh, when you've got the local in Chicago, Philadelphia, you don't have a chance. We didn't think we had a chance, but he showed, for somebody who was just an International rep and had been International vice-president at one time for a short period of time, he put up a good showing. And we didn't have Local One any more. But it showed good. And there was Photoengraver locals, believe it or not, that voted for Jim O'Neill, and there was contacts made with Photoengraver locals. I felt, "It's not bad to have that every once in a while." It shows the guy up at the top, "Hey. . . . "

Interviewer: "We're watching you!"

Macellari: "We're watching you," Right. So I felt, "Well, I'm not sorry at all we made that decision to do this." And we moved along into another era.

Now. . . merger? There's been a change in the Seattle area, as far as I'm concerned and as far as our local is concerned. I think we realize that we have to merge. There's no question about it. The employers are ganging up on us. They are powerful. They're going to be just as

powerful and they're fighting because they know if we merge, they're not going to be in a position where they're going to be able to fight one against the other.

Interviewer: Let's talk about merger with the Photoengravers as opposed to the Bookbinders. I get a little sense from what you're saying that merger with the Bookbinders is more important.

Macellari: No. I meant merger itself.

Interviewer: Oh, merger as a concept.

Macellari: Merger as a concept.

Interviewer: Okay.

Macellari: We started to cooperate with the Photoengravers immediately. There's no question about it. We opposed the merger in 1963. Our local voted against merger, one of the few locals that did. But when it was all over, I made that statement in a letter to my people that "It's over. It's done. We are International. We'll go along with the International, and that's it."

Interviewer: Why did you oppose merger? Was it because you were persuaded by the logic of what Local One was saying with respect to the pension plans and the age of the Photoengravers and so forth?

Macellari: I would say so. I would say so. I thought perhaps we were "buying a pig in a poke." There was quite a few variables, areas left a little open, and it just seemed to me that that was the thing to do. So we continued to push the situation in Seattle that it was over, it was done, that we would continue to oppose people and policies that we didn't feel were doing the job. And we have, continually. But we felt that the way to go was to stay with the organization, so we did.

We started right away to meet with the Photoengravers and help them.

Now, I can honestly say--and nobody can dispute what I'm saying right now--that the Photoengraver local in Seattle has gained tremendously by being associated with Local 45. They've gained in negotiations; they've gained in assistance by a paid officer which they don't have, by myself. I sat on their negotiating committees; I sat on their scale committees. They're part of our health-and-welfare plan; we took them in. We took them into our credit union. They're still a separate local. I just feel that we've done a good job for them. In commercial, they're even with us. I mean, their scales, everything else is even with us. Their contract is quite similar. They are in fact in some areas a little bit better than us. For instance, they have three-day sick leave, which we don't have. But we're a little more flexible than they are in their contracts, but I feel we have to be.

Interviewer: What's holding up complete merger?

Macellari: The Photoengravers, 23P. That's honest; it's there. I talked to Hank Dillon about that. He called me up a couple of weeks ago and asked me, "What's happening up there? I thought we were. . ." "Hank," I says, "you talk to 23P. We've gone as far as we can go. We have an agreement to merge, an implementation agreement, and the by-laws. Everything is set. All we have to do is get them to tell us what's their hang-up. We have no hang-ups. Every time they've given us a hang-up, we've adjusted it. Now, where is the hang-up? You ask them. Don't ask me. We're ready to go, and we're not bothering with it any more. I'm not going to push merger any more in the Seattle area until they're ready to go. I've gone as far as I can go!"

Interviewer: What do you think is their hang-up?

Macellari: Well, loss of identity is one. That's the old bugaboo.

Seems to be more prevalent with the Photoengravers than it is with the Lithographers. I don't know. Maybe in other areas it's just vice versa. I don't know. But there's some personalities in there that feel that they don't want to merge. I don't know what that's all about. They do have a strike fund, you know, but that's no problem. They can still have it, for all I care. All we ask them to do is to meet us per capita-wise. The dues are not too far off; they might have to come up a buck-and-a-half or a buck-and-a-quarter a month or something like that. But they're going to be having the services of a paid officer and office and everything else. We gave all these other items free, gratis; nobody's asking for anything. . .

Interviewer: Is part of the problem that the current local union president in a merged organization would not continue to be a local union president probably?

Macellari: Theirs you mean?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Macellari: Oh, yeah, that's true. But I don't think that's the problem because there's no paid officer in there. But there would be a meshing of the officers. What we were going to do was give up two officers and they would give up two, so then we would have four again. And then we would give up so many executive board members and they would give up so many executive board members. But we gave them parity vote for X number of years so that there would never be any, you know, crossing. . .

Interviewer: They would never be outvoted.

Macellari: No! And we gave them representation after that time. What I was trying to tell them is that we even have trouble sometimes filling our own positions, and there would be no problem of saying, well,

after that certain period of time the Lithographers are going to run the local. I said, "My gosh, if you're good and you're willing to do the job, it's very well possible that Photoengravers will end up running the local. That doesn't make any beans with these fellows here. It's whoever is doing the job and willing to do the job." But I don't know. . . I've dropped that because I think we've bent as far as we could to try to achieve merger with the Photoengravers.

Now, after G.A.I.U. . . . I pushed GAIU, contrary to what happened in 1963. I pushed merger with the Bookbinders.

Interviewer: Why? What was the difference?

Macellari: As far as I'm concerned, I could see that we'd have to merge; in fact, I would like to see it even go further than this. I've seen too much fighting between unions in the printing trades. I've seen the tactics that the Printing Pressmen take in the city of Seattle, and it's detrimental to the whole printing trades. It's wrong; you don't go in and make "sweetheart" contracts. You're letting your people down by doing this. I'm sure a lot of our fellows are going to say, "My gosh, we're going to dilute our craftsmen with semi-skilled or unskilled" and "Good gravy, we're going to get a whole flux of women in here!" (laughter) It's true! Oh, I hear it all the time. I say, "What difference does it make? You people have to realize that . . . look! look at the power that you're going to have. Not to use it, but to have it in the background so the employer's not going to say, "Well, go ahead. I'll take a strike, because the bookbinders are going to come through the line and the printing pressmen will work." You know, this is the type of attitude that they take.

Interviewer: "We'll just print our things in a different method for a while!"

Macellari: That's right! I say, "But when you have those Bookbinders in there and suppose you could have the Printing Pressmen and suppose you have the Typographical Union--all one union--by gosh, you'll close up the industry! And they know it, so they're not going to take . . . and I don't mean to go in there and use that as a great big stick and just beat the living heck out of them. Because, you know, you can be the highest-paid lithographers in the world and be unemployed. What I meant to say is at least you're not using one union against the other as they are now.

An example: the Printing Pressmen signed a contract in November of last year that their contractual scale is four cents an hour ahead of our contractual scale. But we have forty-eight cents an hour on cost-of-living! It doesn't show in the contract, but that makes us forty-four cents an hour ahead of them. They knew it; they didn't take it into consideration; they did a disservice to their people. And yet they did this with something in the background, some thought.

Interviewer: So in other words, your feeling about merger with the Bookbinders was different because it represented what we call vertical organization. When you merge with the Bookbinders, you're merging with the finishing ends. Therefore, if you have the Bookbinders, you have a certain kind of control over the entire trade that you otherwise would not.

Macellari: True. But I also saw, from working with the Photoengravers all these years, how an organization like the Photoengravers can achieve more by having a strength behind them like 45L backing them up. And then I thought to myself, "Well, that could work in other ways when the Lithographers are small in certain areas and the others are large because then they can back them up." Because we backed them up many times;

and the employers knew that if they took a strike with the Photoengravers, the Lithographers would back them up. So this is what changed it. It wasn't necessarily the fact that I thought that the Bookbinders were going to be better people to merge with than the Photoengravers. I just saw over a period of years what could happen and how you could . . .

Interviewer: So it was in terms of solidarity, not . . .

Macellari: Yeah. And the primary function is to better the guy that you're representing. If you can do that. . .

Interviewer: It was not a vertical . . . like, for example, Phil Murray's idea of organizing was that he was going to organize from extraction to finishing so that one of the first things that he did was to try and get those ore votes up on the Great Lakes. That was very important to him. And it was also very important to him to organize the coke by-products: while they had nothing to do with steel, they had to do with firing those furnaces. Therefore it was important to him because he saw that, when you organize coke by-products, you've got the industry by the throat, even if you have only a minority of steelworkers organized.

Macellari: That's right.

Interviewer: How many Bookbinders are there? What's your situation with respect to merger with the Bookbinders?

Macellari: Well, the Bookbinders, I believe there's probably about five hundred Bookbinders in the city of Seattle, which outnumber us by a hundred or more. But the prospects in the Bookbinder area, I think, are good, very good. In fact, we just embarked on a joint organizing drive for Boeing workers.

Interviewer: Boeing what?

Macellari: Boeing Printing Plant workers. We had our meeting on

Saturday, and we have a twelve-person, in-plant committee going. We just wrote our letter yesterday morning before we left for the airport, notifying the company that we have an organizing drive, an in-plant committee. In fact, the in-plant committee asked us to name them in the letter to the Boeing Company for protection. I'm hoping that we can really get going on this . . .

Interviewer: Now, what kind of printing is this?

Macellari: Boeing?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Macellari: In-plant. They have a large printing plant, anywhere from 150 to 200 workers. They print all the in-plant material for the Boeing plant, which is tremendous. They have bindery people; they have lithographers; they have artists. It's really a big outfit. In fact, there's been a number of attempts to organize the printing department. Now, the Aerospace Mechanics are in Boeing; they have a contract with Boeing, but they don't cover the printing department.

Interviewer: The Machinists Union?

Macellari: The Machinists Union, right. So, it's a unit. You can more or less--departmental unit--carve them out. And we're keeping our fingers crossed that this gels . . .

Interviewer: How are the Machinists going to feel about it?

Macellari: I don't know. They have organized a considerable amount of people in there. They have the different areas, but yet they never really went after the printing department. Now, I don't know; I'm hoping it's up to our International to maybe get in touch with their International and say, "Now, look, the people there (and we put it to them) say, 'Well we don't want to be Machinists; we're printers. It's ridiculous for us

to belong to the Machinists Union. What can they do for us if we ever left Boeing, you know, if we wanted to.'" And so it's a legitimate point, and I'm hoping the International will help us out in this area if we run into a problem.

Interviewer: Well, it may be the Machinists didn't go after them because they didn't feel they had the personnel to service printers.

Macellari: That's right. Of course, I understand there's an active drive in Boeing now by the Machinists to organize more departments and also by the Office Employees. So we decided to get on the bandwagon because we felt that there was interest being shown that these people didn't want to become Machinists or become Office Employees. So we're keeping our fingers crossed . . .

But this is good. We have made overtures to the Bookbinders, and the Bookbinders have made overtures to us. I believe that probably within two weeks we will be having a meeting of the two executive boards to pursue the possibilities of merger. Now, this is what prompted Hank Dillon's letter to 23P and 45L. I told Dillon, I says, "Look, if I can merge these two locals, I'm going to, because the Bookbinders feel they need leadership." And I'm saying that outright. They honestly feel this. They need leadership, but they don't have it.

Interviewer: Do they have a paid officer?

Macellari: Yes, they do. But they just don't feel that they're getting the leadership that they want. And they feel that the Lithographers are going to give it to them, not necessarily a person. Don't get me wrong. But they feel that the Lithographers, they're a militant group, they've gone out and gotten the things that they want to get, and they're not wishy-washy about it. And they feel that this will give them

new blood. We'll merge the two organizations together and give them that little impetus to go forward and get things that they couldn't get before because they had this swing . . .

Interviewer: What's the percentage of female employees in the Bookbinders?

Macellari: I'd be willing to say there's probably sixty to sixty-five percent of the five hundred, more or less, would be female, I guess.

Interviewer: Do they have female officers?

Macellari: Yes. In fact, the secretary-treasurer, the paid officer, is a female. And they do have female officers intermingled with the male as far as the executive board and some other officers are concerned.

Interviewer: And some of your people feel a little bit queazy about that?

Macellari: To some degree, although our secretary is female and one of our board members is female. We're not. . .

Interviewer: You're not sexist! (laughter)

Macellari: No. No way! I do have a little gripe about the Bookbinder I - Bookbinder II junk, you know, because there's still that division. Now they don't call it Bookbinder Male, Bookbinder Female any more. They call it Bookbinder I and Bookbinder II. But it's still basically the same thing. Not that a female couldn't be a Bookbinder I, but fat chance!

Interviewer: Is it based on skill?

Macellari: Yeah. It's based on skill, but, you know, it's up to the employer, too. And I've run into this. . . you can't believe it. . .

Interviewer: So in other words, merger with the Bookbinders may involve you in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act?

Macellari: I hope not. I hope it doesn't come to the point of where we're sued by anybody.

Interviewer: No, but you will have to be up on Title VII in a way in which you might not have given that much consideration before.

Macellari: Much thought in the past, right. Because we only have maybe twenty to twenty-five women in our local at the present time. Of course, they range all over the place, you know, from pressmen to color cameramen; but we've never separated anybody. I certainly don't feel that they should be separated. Equal pay for equal skills: I've always believed that. In fact, in 1961 we had in our contract when I went into negotiations a male general production worker and a female, and I took it out of there. I said, "You're crazy!" There was different pay! I said, "What is the difference? Other than one's a man and the other's a woman, what is the difference in the work that they do side by side?" "None." "Then they get equal pay." We cut that out of there, and that's right.

But anyway, getting away from that, I believe that Dillon felt, "Holy Cow! If these two unions get together--Bookbinders and Lithographers--85 Photoengravers are going to be sitting out looking in on an almost 1,000-person union." What are they going to have? They're lucky if they get an executive board representative if they ever wanted to come in. They're going to be separate, a little local going its own way. Maybe that's what they want. I don't know.

Interviewer: Now, was Dillon acting as sort of a . . .

Macellari: He's the merger commission, you know.

Interviewer: His own background is Photoengraver . . .

Macellari: Photoengraver.

Interviewer: Right.

Macellari: He was looking for their interests, and I think that's good. There's nothing wrong with that. So he asked me. I says, "Hank, anything you can do is okay with me. Write to them. Send me a copy, too. Write to 23P and 45L. See if they get on the ball. I'd be happy. We've got all the machinery. Maybe we can make it a three-way deal, and they can still salvage something out of it." So that's where it sits, and I don't know. . .

Interviewer: In other words, what you're looking for is the possibility that the merger with the Bookbinders may facilitate the merger with the Photoengravers?

Macellari: Right.

Interviewer: Because they'll see that if they don't come in now, they're not going to be able to come in on anything like the same terms.

Macellari: I attended their annual meeting, the Photoengravers. They still operate under their 1913 by-laws, you know! It's the truth! It's ridiculous! They haven't changed anything. That's right. Their little by-law book was last revised back in 1913, and they still operate under the same thing. It's in conflict with the constitution, so therefore, it's not valid. And yet they operate on the basis of yearly elections; they elect at their annual meeting, which is a dinner meeting.

I attended their last annual meeting, and I made my little pitch as I do at every one of their annual meetings. I said, "You know, we're GAIU now. We're no longer Lithographers; we're no longer Photoengravers; we're no longer Bookbinders. We're Graphic Artists. So if you're worried about losing your identity, Hell, we don't have an identity any more!" But I don't know; I think it fell on deaf ears. Anyway, it was a good dinner! (laughter)

Interviewer: Let me ask you. . . it's my understanding, and I'm not up on technology at all, but I have heard a little bit about new rotogravure processes that are coming into use.

Macellari: We don't have any in Seattle. There's no rotogravure in Seattle at all. None whatsoever!

Interviewer: So there's not that hope for growth for 23P.

Macellari: In fact, if it wasn't for the newspapers, 23P's commercial area's slowly declining. Now, there's been some gripe about us placing people in their shops because a lot of their shops are going to litho and they don't have the people that can do it. So they place the jobs in openings. They can't supply the people, so they place them on the International job list. When it's placedon the International job list, that opens it to my people. If I've got people unemployed, I send them to the secretary of the local and they send them in turn to the. . .

Now, we've had a little bit of head-knocking on that one because his theory was that it should be open to Photoengravers, and I am completely diametrically opposed to that, as far as I'm concerned. Yes, it should be open to Photoengravers in the area first! But then if there are Lithographers in that same area, why bring them in from some place else when I've got Lithographers out of work that could go to work in that plant? His idea was to place it on the International job list to bring Photoengravers from the outside into the area.

Interviewer: Gene, I hear you saying several points of this kind of regional concern. And of course there was this change in whether the vice presidents should represent the International or whether the. . . what is your thinking about that? You alluded to it a little bit before . . .

Macellari: Yeah, except that I think that I agree with the principle of the officers being in Washington, D. C. I really do. I wasn't too crazy about them moving from New York to Washington because I felt it was a tremendous expense, but I wasn't opposed to it to that degree. I felt that maybe a better study should have been made, but if they felt they wanted to go ahead with the majority. . . and I'm not sorry they did. I think they're closer to the other unions; I think they're closer to the Congress and the lawmakers. So I'm not opposed to that. I think it's good.

And, in a way, I'm glad to some degree that they did get away from the concept of International vice presidents representing a particular area, because, I don't think it's necessary any more. But what I don't want to see happen is that they get so far removed that they become like the AFL-CIO. I mean, the hierarchy there. I don't even think they have any concept of what's going on--the AFL-CIO I'm talking about--of what's going on in the local unions. They ought to get out there in that field and talk to those guys once in a while, see in what high esteem they're held back there. Sure, it's great to make big statements about Nixon's policies and everything else, but, by gosh! talk to your workers once in a while. They're the people who are supporting you. So I'm hoping that our International officers don't get to the point of where that's what it is. I hope that they don't forget that their background is lithographer, photoengraver, or bookbinder, and that's where their prime concern should be, the guys out there. I'm not opposed to them being in Washington. I think if they use it properly, if they use the heads that they've got back there and bring them in and say, "Hey, we've got a problem. What do we do?", instead of one guy making the decision--some guy going off on

this end and that guy going off on that end--well, heck, then you're defeating the purpose. But to be all there where, if President Brown needs the officers and he can bring them in and they can all put their heads together and come up with a solution--because I always believe that many heads are better than one. . .

Interviewer: And also this enables different ones of the officers to carve out various areas of expertise.

Macellari: Absolutely!

Interviewer: Somebody can keep himself abreast of technology. . .

Macellari: It's not good for the International VP to be an area VP where he's in that local all the time. . .

Interviéwer: Where he's got to be a jack-of-all-trades.

Macellari: Right. Now, the councillors, that's a different story. The councillors, I still feel, should come from the various regions, and they do and they probably will continue to. Except that I just feel that there should be some kind of allowance made there where they can report to their constituents a little better than in the minutes of the International Council meeting.

Interviewer: I wanted to ask you about one other aspect, and that is whether your activities, if any, were with the county central bodies and state central bodies?

Macellari: Well, we belong to both. In fact, I served two terms as an executive board member of the King County Labor Council and made a lot of friends in the different unions that way. I think it's important for us to do this. To tell you the truth, I could still be an executive board member, but I felt that four years was enough. It took a lot of my time; I got on different committees where I was mediating contracts

for retail clerks, for carpenters, you know, . . . And although I put my effort where I could. . . but this is what happens. You get placed on committees because they've got a problem, and you try to go in there and smooth it over so there's no strike. Well, I thought four years was enough, and I turned it over to somebody else. I could have continued that, but I'm not sorry that I quit.

Interviewer: Somebody else from the Lithographers?

Macellari: No, no, no! From the printing trades. Right now it's Charlie Lumsden from the Stereotypers, representing the printing trades. And I think if I ran again, I could get it again. There's no problem there. The Typographical Union supported me; the Bookbinders supported me. The only ones that didn't support me were the Printing Pressmen; they had their own man running. But we had delegate strength, and we won the election, and I was in two terms. Washington State Labor Council, I think, does a good job in the State of Washington. I think the United Labor Lobby is really its prime function; it really is a legislative arm; that's all it is. We support it; we pay into it. I know Ohio has a very good committee along those lines, if I'm not mistaken. In fact, I subscribe to Ohio's News and Views and some of their letters. They come in from Ohio. Of course, it deals with Ohio, but they have a good format; and I got a lot of interesting information out of it.

But I think the State of Washington is way ahead of other people as far as having a United Labor Lobby . For instance, that Northwest Paper deal where they were a completely independent union, you know; they're part of it. So they go down there, and they put some through; with good lobbying they put. . . And every year when the legislature comes in session we have a one-day session down there where we take the

state legislators to dinner. We have a great big banquet, and all the senators and all the house people and their wives are invited to a great big banquet that labor puts on.

We've done a good job in electing. We only have one Republican from the State of Washington in Washington, D. C. And he just made it by the skin of his teeth the last time around. Other than that, Magnusson and Jackson are Democrats; six of the seven legislators are Democrats.

Interviewer: You're obviously doing a good job.

Macellari: We're doing the best we can.

Interviewer: What about some of the area of International concern? For example, the development of education and keeping up with technology and. . .?

Macellari: Now, as far as the educational program, I'm a little disappointed. I know that they're hurting; they're working on a deficit budget. Probably Stagg or Schroeder before him will agree with me on this: you can only do so much with. . . well, let's get a little more money! I mean, I can go back to my members and I can say, "Look, I'm going to ask you for another quarter a month to make the contribution to the education fund--fifty cents a month instead of twenty-five cents a month out of your per capita." I think they'd buy it. They may even buy more than that. But why do we have to sit there and wait years and years and years for a program to come out, say, for instance, a camera or certain areas that are written and rewritten and they never come out? Now, look, if you're a school like Philadelphia or Chicago, you can write your own. You're big! You've got money! You can do it. We depend on the International supplying us with this information. That's my gripe. Okay, you haven't really put out what I'd like you to put out. But if it's the

money, then by gosh, why not go for a little bit more money in that particular area? I think you could sell the people. We're sold on the educational program in Seattle.

Interviewer: Have you had regional schools? Have you made use of the facilities at the state university?

Macellari: No. Seattle Community College is what we use. We use their facilities. We have our own instructors, our own courses, and I am on their advisory committee as to what to buy and what not to buy, as far as equipment is concerned, along with the other printing trades and employers. But we have the best program, I mean, GAIU, as far as 45L is concerned. Now, 87B has a program, which is the Bookbinders, but it's not doing anything special. 45L has a real good program going in there, and we've put a lot of people through that one. And I think it's one of the selling points, and luckily we have some employers that go along with us like I mentioned Roy Johnson, for instance, of United Graphics. I can deal with a man like that; I can really deal with a man like that. He's an employer. He's not soft by any means, but at least he's fair and he believes in education. And I think we've made good strides with somebody like him in there.

But that's my beef with the educational program, not that we haven't used their materials. Their seminars--my director of education and his two instructors that go back to these--they think it's great. They have their little say about certain areas where they feel, well, you could do a little bit less in this area and a little bit more in here, but then everybody's got their own opinions. But they believe that those seminars are well put on; they're working all the time; and they're getting a lot out of them. So I have nothing but praise in that area. I do feel that

they should put a little bit more emphasis on getting some other courses out. We had to write to Chicago, for instance, and get their course outlines in some areas, rather than write to the International. If it's money, then, by gosh, come out with a resolution on it at the next convention. Why didn't they come out at the last convention and ask for a few more bucks? I think we could sell it.

Interviewer: Well, let me ask you another question that relates to this. You were pointing out that Washington was not a printing area like Chicago. Does that mean that you have been less affected by changes? For example, are your employers less inclined to be putting in this new equipment--color scanners and things of this kind?

Macellari: No. In fact, we do have a color scanner in this area. It's operating quite well, and they are continually upgrading their equipment. There's no question about it.

Interviewer: So your need for this kind of upgrading is just as keen?

Macellari: Absolutely! In fact, the employers, I think the only limiting factor to putting something like that in is the money. If they've got the money, they're going to put the equipment in to stay competitive. No question about it. No, technologically, I think that we've. . . oh, I don't say that we have the equipment that some of these places have, but we do have a trade plant, two trade plants under contract--Van Dyke and Color Control--that actually take work out of the Midwest. I mean, they're that good. So there's no problem.

But our scales are very comparable, if not better, than many places. So we're no competition to anybody; if we're taking it out of there, then somebody's falling down on the job someplace else because it's not

because of wages and conditions. I mean, it's just because we can put out a product and do it better for some reason or other, you know. But I know that we are in competition with a number of the lithographer or photoengraver trade plants in the Midwest, and yet we're pulling work out of there.

(End of Tape II, Side 3)

Macellari: . . . but I have bits and pieces. All I can say is this: I don't know if it's true or not, but if there was information and if it was true that the Photoengraver pension could have been merged with the Inter-local Pension Fund, and not to the detriment of anyone, ours or theirs, and it was not done because of internal politics, then that is a disservice that I feel I cannot forgive anyone. I have to make this point. I'm not on the "in," so I don't know, but I heard (and I don't want to repeat rumors as to people or what I heard or anything else), but if that's true that it could have been, and because of power politics on one side or the other, it was not merged and now these people have to take a reduced pension!! That's the last thing that was voted here was either increase their money allotment going in per month . . .

Interviewer: The Photoengravers. . .

Macellari: The Photoengravers, right. Or slowly take a reduction in the pension, then I think it was a disservice to those people. And I'm sorry that it happened. I don't know. I'm not one of the Inter-local Pension Fund trustees; I don't attend those meetings; I get only what I read in those little condensed minutes of those things myself; I've heard from people that this happened and that happened in those

sessions. I also heard about the Photoengraver sessions of their trustee meetings; and I think it almost broke on the floor of the convention one year. I don't think it was the St. Louis one. I think it was the New Orleans convention. But it didn't quite get that far. I think Brown wisely called for lunch and discussed it. This is what I heard anyway. And it kind of changed the mood when they all came back. And if anybody can do it, he can. And I don't think maybe that was the place to hear it anyway. But I'm sorry about what I understand to be true, that they could have been merged at one time with no hurt to anyone. And by all means, it should have been done.

I will say this: that I opposed merger of the two pension funds on the basis that the Lithographers were not going to be hurt. No way! I told my people that, and we had quite a reserve fund--we still have a reserve fund in the pension fund--and we voted to spend it all on attorneys' fees if we had to. That's the truth. To stop it if there was evidence that our people were to get a reduced pension or our fund would become unsound due to that. Because that wasn't really the purpose of merger whatsoever.

But if it could have been merged--I'm stating this from what I've heard now--but because there were politics involved as to what fund and who's gonna run it or for keeping a segment separate to some degree, then I believe that was wrong, just as wrong as it was for a local, for instance--and I'm using a West Coast local--to keep their people out of the Early Retirement Program. Absolutely! A disservice to their membership. Because here is a program that these people could have had; they could have had a better program than what they've got locally; they had the money. It was feasible to merge their funds. But because of the

fact that, whatever it was--control or it might have passed out of their hands--I'm sure they probably would have been a trustee on that fund, but they would not have been top dog anymore. Well, I think that's petty . . . and I think that you're doing a disservice to your people. And that's not what it's all about.

Interviewer: Well, Gene, is there some issue that we ought to discuss here that we haven't thought of?

Macellari: No. . .

Interviewer: We've covered the ground?

Macellari: I will continue to be president of Seattle 45L as long as people in Seattle 45L want me to be president, and I'll continue to hopefully go back to the conventions and fight for what we think is right. We might stand a little alone sometimes. And we're wrong--we don't disagree that we are wrong--occasionally. But I think it's good to have somebody come in there and stir the thing up a little bit once in a while. It would be terrible to go to a convention where we can be cut and dry.

Interviewer: (laughing) It would be pretty boring!

Macellari: It would be boring. In fact, that ALA '61 convention I felt was great. It was just really a lot of going back and forth. . .

Interviewer: Did you detect any change due to the increase in salary?

Macellari: To some degree, but I think it'll liven up a little bit. Once them Bookbinders get a little fire under them, I think you're gonna see it. I think they're changing; I think they're changing. We're changing their attitude a little bit, and they'll change us to some degree. No, their convention used to be just a place to take the family, I think.

It really wasn't work. That's what I get from my Bookbinders in Seattle. 'My gosh! I went back there, and this time I had to work! It wasn't like that before!!" I would like to see them get away in conventions . . . and we've had it in LPIU, and I think we had it under the ALA, too. I think I'd like to see the committees really not be steered too much by the International officers or International councillors, you know. I'm opposed to this. I think we kind of ruffled their feathers a little bit in our last convention on the constitutional laws committee. But I don't like to see, for instance, the chairman more or less presenting the question on one side. That's not the chairman's job. The chairman's job is to be the chairman. There's two sides, and he gives each side equally and he calls for the question and that's it. "I believe this and that": well, heck, you're steering the committee, and you've got a lot of people there that just come to the convention and go like this, and that's wrong. That's wrong.

Interviewer: That's kind of the history of the labor movement.

Macellari: How many people you get there, they come there, and you don't even know they're there. I mean they might say "Aye" and "Nay" once in a while, but. . . Gosh!

Well, that's personnel, because people are gonna get up at the microphone, even though they make asses of themselves, and that's okay. But at least they get up and talk. But there are people that are afraid and say, "Whatever I say, I'm gonna look stupid. . ."

Interviewer: It's just a human trait.

Macellari: I've never been plagued with something like that! (laughter)

Interviewer: About how many people are at the convention now?

Macellari: Oh, boy! I don't know! I think we had 370 delegates or something like that at the convention!

Interviewer: It's a whole different ballgame from the Steelworkers' where there are 5,000.

Macellari: Yeah. But gee, look at the old ALA in Miami (Fla). We just had a small group. And, of course, that podium up there is getting larger and larger, you know! (laughter)

Interviewer: This creates real problems. You know, I do a lot of rank-and-file interviews with the steelworkers, and they talk about the managed convention. And believe me, if you think that the Graphic Arts convention is managed to a certain extent, you ain't seen nothin' till you get to a Steelworkers' convention where Mr. Abel has a panel where he can turn on mikes and turn off mikes. And you've got 5,000 people there, and if you don't have a mike that's hot, you're talking to yourself and the people in the immediate vicinity, period! That's one of the ways in which the convention can be manipulated--by which mikes you recognize and so forth.

Macellari: I'm sorry. I don't agree with that.

Interviewer: Well, I don't either, but on the other hand, in Mr. Abel's defense, you have to say this is 5,000 people. And you have to really ask how democratic can you be?

Macellari: Yeah, well, it becomes a little unwieldy. That's true. But the Steelworkers may be a lot more vocal. All five thousand may want to get up and speak at the same time. Well, there's a point; there's a point. But I don't ever find our conventions being that vocal.

But I do believe that everybody should have their. . . and I object to the chair, too. I mean our chair, the main chair, at the conventions

sometimes. If he can play with that chair, he's really great. No question about it. There's the guy that can really manipulate a convention. But there are times when he can say things up there, you know, he's speaking to the question. It's an objectionable thing to me because he's steering it his way. Well, it's okay; I guess it's your privilege. But if you can do it without making it look like you're doing it, then you're really good. And he certainly can do that.

Interviewer: One final thing. What about relationships within the AFL-CIO itself, and I don't mean regionally because obviously you don't have the kinds of hang-ups in Seattle, Washington, that we have in other places. But your International took a pretty strong stand in the McGovern election. You worked hard for McGovern, and that was in opposition to the stated policy of the AFL-CIO on that. And, of course, your organization historically has been in and out of the Federation over the fight on labels. And I wonder if you're aware of certain kinds of stresses and kind of. . . oh, what should we call it. . . anti-Meany feeling maybe?

Macellari: Well, I have my own feelings on that, and I can hear it from some of my people--labor people. I can tell you this: I don't think the King County Labor Council or the Washington State Labor Council really pays too much attention to George Meany. I'm not saying that they break laws or the rules of the AFL-CIO or what have you, but they don't necessarily agree with Mr. Meany all the time. I was sorry to see them take the tack of not supporting a candidate in 1972. I think they should have. But that was not my decision to make. But I think the hierarchy of the AFL-CIO has gotten to the point now where I really think it could use some new blood up there. I really do. I think it's time for Meany to step down.

Interviewer: What about the national federation support or non-support for the label?

Macellari: Our label, you mean?

Interviewer: Uh-hm.

Macellari: Well, we have the label in our. . .

Interviewer: Right. But I gather there has been over the last fifteen years. . .

Macellari: Oh, yeah! Well, I mean, when we were outside of the organization, they had no choice. It was not a recognized label because we were not members of the AFL-CIO, but I have had no trouble since. After we came back into the AFL-CIO, the only trouble I had was with the Allied Printing Trades. They were the ones that were pushing the Allied Printing Trades Label, saying that all of the labels were not the label to _____printing. I brought that out on the floor of the King County Labor Council.

Interviewer: And won?

Macellari: And won. There was no problem there. In fact, I got Meany to telegraph the King County Labor Council and tell them, and they read that out in front of the Council.

Interviewer: Oh, that's interesting.

Macellari: Well, I don't know if he sent the telegram, of course, but we sent the telegram. At least I got an answer from him. I telegraphed Hoffa, too, when he was head of the Teamsters and we had a strike at American Can and his warehousemen were going through our line, but I never got an answer from him. At least we got an answer from the AFL-CIO.

Interviewer: What about your relationship with the Steelworkers in the can industry?

Macellari: We have none at the American Can in Seattle. Believe it or not, they're Teamsters in there.

Interviewer: Oh, really?

Macellari: Yeah. See, the warehouse workers are Teamsters. The can lines are operated by Teamsters. The machines are fixed by the Machinists Union. They're a small segment.

Interviewer: But in other places, as you well know, there has been jurisdictional disputes with the Steelworkers, some of them pretty tough.

Macellari: Sure have! In fact, as I recall, we had a fight in Olympia--not myself--but Fran Boland did, with a satellite plant that was in Lacey, Washington, where the Steelworkers were in there. We were trying to organize the lithographic end because it was a satallite plant of the Continental plant in Portland. So it was quite an interesting fight.

Interviewer: Yeah, I was very amused. One of your members in Philadelphia was showing me cans--beer cans--and he was telling me and showing me how terrible and how sloppy the printing was. And I had to laugh because I said, "I really don't think the average beer drinker . . . (laughter) . . .

Macellari: Looks at it . . .

Interviewer: Looks at it, or is very concerned. But to him, as a craftsman . . . and there are so few craft feelings left in American industry . . . it was offensive, you know, he was picking up this can, and he was saying, "Look at that. Look how terrible it is. That's what steelworkers do when they print the cans. Look how terrible!"

Macellari: That's right. And I've done that. I've actually picked the items off the shelf and I've really had a terrible-looking

thing and I've written to these companies and said, "I'm not going to buy your product if it looks like this!" I'll take off the label, you know, fold it up and put it in an envelope. I'll say, "Good God! What kind of a label is that?" Something like that, you know.

But I know one thing: Olympia Beer is a big beer-making concern in the state of Washington. It serves the west. It only has the one plant in Tumwater, Washington. Huge, fantastically huge, plant to produce beer.

Interviewer: What's the name of the town?

Macellari: Tumwater.

Interviewer: Tumwater.

Macellari: But they believe in the fact that it's due to the water. That's what it says on there and a lot more. I mean, that's their ad: it's the water and a lot more. But they believe in their artesian well-water there that produces the beer that they make. Well, that's fine. I'd probably believe it, too. I don't drink beer, but that's fine. But they are a big, big customer of American Can in Seattle. You can't believe this, but they are finnicky about their cans, about what they look like. And if they're out of register or they're sloppy, they're not going to buy them. That's great! As far as I'm concerned, that's terrific because that's helped us continue to sell cans to Olympia where the National Can has come in and put an extruded aluminum plant over at Kent, making these extruded aluminum cans. But you can't compare them side by side as far as printing is concerned. But these are put on a rotating press and they register about 600 a minute. What can you expect? And they're poor, you know. Olympia says, "No way!"

Interviewer: This whole business which is becoming such a kind of "in" cause: work in America . . . you know, the Autoworkers and the

strike at Lordstown. This is perhaps an area where the Graphic Arts Union is going to have something to say to the rest of the labor movement because I don't get this sense. . . now, of course, the only place where I have contact with rank-and-file graphic arts workers is in Philadelphia where they are in our classes, our Union Leadership Academy classes. That pride of craft is there and makes for a very different kind of work force--where they care about the type of product that is produced. Where Steelworkers, for example, if they complain about the quality of work, the foreman tells them to shut up and they say, "Well, if it's broken, the insurance takes care of it. So don't worry about it." So that the pride in what you do every day is eroded constantly. Maybe this is something that graphic arts workers are going to have to say, "Well, look, our workers do care, and the reason they care is because of the emphasis on what's produced."

Macellari: I can give you an example of that. This uncle of mine who retired from ALA One (and got a darn good pension, I might say, from ALA, and our inter-local's modeled after this). . . You know, as long as we're talking, let's not put anybody down for anything that happened because the benefits that that local has produced for their members, are outstanding! There's no question about it. Because I happen to have an uncle in it that tells me. By the way, his Lithopinion is fantastic as far as I'm concerned. I like that magazine. I get it; it's sent to me. I'm sent twelve Lithopinion every time they come out, and I've got them all distributed out because there are people clamoring for them. It's a good magazine.

But he /his uncle/ came out. The first time he visited me. . . and I might say this uncle of mine lived with us up until just before he

was married, so he was more or less like a father to me, because my father unfortunately, being in the restaurant business, had to work many oddball hours, so he wasn't around as much as my uncle was. But he finally visited me in Seattle, he and his wife; and had never been out there before. So it was nice to have him as a guest, but I had a book that was given to me by one of my shops that was produced by our craftsmen. It was called The Alpine Lakes of Washington. Beautiful! All color! Bound book, large, good paper, and everything else. I asked him if he would take it. It was inscribed to me, but I wanted him to have it because I knew that he liked that stuff. So the funny thing about it is, as he looked through it, he says, "This is beautiful quality!" /He/ reached in his pocket and took out a linen tester . . .

Interviewer: A what?

Macellari: A linen tester, one of these little glasses. He was a retired lithographer; he was a pressman, see. And he put the glass down on it; he's checking the register on it! (laughter) See, that's a perfect example of what you're saying. And I looked at that, and I laughed. Because when I'm working in the area, I always carry a linen tester in my pocket, because I will have to look at a label to make sure that it's ours. Sometimes it's so dark you can hardly see them. Or I just happen to pick it out and I'll say, "Well, your red was a little loud . . ." (laughter)

Interviewer: Well, that . . . you know, there was a time--and I've interviewed some old steelworkers--they would be able to tell from the quality of the steel, they would say, "That was made in Wheeling" because it was not so automated and there was differences in quality. And they

regret so terribly that that's gone. And they no longer have that kind of thing.

Well, thanks very much, Gene.

Macellari: Thank you.

Interviewer: It's been fun!

INDEX

Eugene Macellari