

Nick Westra Jr. he's obviously italian, i guess? np.  
 he was a hollander.  
 he's dutch, eh? what rel?  
 dont know.  
 how old was he in 33?  
 about 20.  
 so he's a young guy.  
 yeah. there was a senior there two. there was a bro in law,  
 his bro in law(west va. bro(?))  
 what was his attitude to U in 33?  
 very much against union, practically always was.  
 in faction fight between boll and cio gropup, did he not

get involved at all?  
 no, he wanted no part of it at all, he never attended union meets  
 he never did anything.  
 how many of TR workers at that time, 33, were completely aloof--  
 let's make tw o categories, one is aloof, the other is hostile.  
 so we'll start with alloof. basicially this is 2 categories of  
 non-union attitudes.  
 I would say there were just prpbably 5 or 6 that were ~~q~~ quite  
 hostile to the union.  
 what about aloof?  
 you could say that there would be about ten who were very aloof.  
 this is out of total of how many?  
 close to 100 workers.

(while I'm doing this I might as well keep going down)=====  
 so the rest of workers werer pro union in one way or another.  
 actually, we were on this before, i think. I think you said  
 about 25% of workers in TR were solidly pro-U, and the other  
 75%, I guess excluding this handful, just sort of went along.  
 yeah.  
 actually, . . . I'm trying to get some more vivid sense of the  
 relationships between, let's say if we make up various categories,  
 like very active, active, or good rank and file, and then maybe  
 something like passive rank and file. now these might not be  
 appropriate cateogires. I know that there are degrees of in-  
 volvement and degrees of iniaitative, and that when you get lower  
 down on this scale, let's sa owads inactive pro U attitudes, the  
 more you get involved--tell me if I'm on the right track--  
 in what's really no so much a clear set of ideas and values  
 of union on this lower level, and people kind of see more active  
 as ones who could carry out aspiationsof inactive. but seems  
 to me it seems m e realistic in terms of this lower group of  
 inactive groups of lower active workrs being drawn into struggle  
 between bonds of friendship and work ties, and because they might  
 generally g look up to the more active guys in many respects,  
 not just in terms of union. in other words, its a more organic  
 and complex setup. you dont have each individual making a cldar  
 rational decision deciding union is goodsthing. but many may  
 have been drawn in through family or long standing friendship ties  
 where they kind of trust to the judgement of the more active.  
 in all the union mvmnt there are always leaders and they look  
 up to that kind of thing , they look up to certan people as being  
 a leader because that's just the way uni nsm is run. somebody  
 carries role of leader and become spokesman for loarger group.  
 not all working people are suited to lead. they are working



p ple, and that's what they are, they never go beyond that because of their education, you might say. they wouldnt have the courage to even think that they would be capable of leading as we go down list of names I should ask certain questions of the manner in which they got involved in the union, and see if I can develop more concrete questions. let's finish with westra. was he born in this country.

yes: his father was an immigrant. he had about h.s. ed. anything that struck you about him like his attitude toward his family or drinkin . . ?

he was very standoff, he never had too much to do with anybody else and he had a sort of an attitude of wanting to be alone. he was not a joiner with a group of any kind. a very independent attitude to his nature, you never could be friendly with him, I dont know, there was these type of people wanted to be left alone, you know.

were he and his father the only dutchemn in the place? except for tony boll.

but wasnte he born in germany?

yah, but we always called in the hollander, i dont know why.

yeah, on his personel records, i forget name of town. I know everyone says he was the ducheman. (yah) the reason I ask --we used to call him wooden shoes, had nickname becuae of that-- I guess he must have been then.. reason I ask: westra and boll would be only 2 duchmen, and that leads me to wonder, if boll was german rather than dutch, would give easy explanaiton for westra's alienation.

did westra drink?

was teetotaler.

what was his attitude to fater coughlin?

we never really discused it much.

was that unusal among the . . .

yeah, it was unusual, becuae it was a topic of that day.

I wonder if he couldint be some kind of pietistic protestant, rather than a catholic or a lutheran. his main topic seemed to be saving money.

Oh, ~~kixx~~ that was his main topic of disc?

~~ye~~ yeah. he would never , he had attitude that everything hdd' to go in bank.

would yo say that generaly among fellow works at that time you could say of each one he had one of several topics of convers that seemed importatnt to him, like this westra case?

yeah, he always had -- his attitutde wa always to put his whole check into bank and only take out what he had to, which was kind of unusual. his object was someday to be very wealthy. I gather that he did marry a woman who had a real good job later on in life, and etween the two of them I guess they did become quite wealthy. . . . of al the disagreements i had with p ple in the tool room, him and I had arguements over union, I was very much for it and he wasnt. but I never carried arguments too far.

what was his argumeht, what kind of things would he say?

i think a lot of it stemmed from his father was foreman of T&D repair, and probably he had idea that he had to be a little different from averybody else.

what kind of things would he say?



nothkng specific, just that he di t need no union.

you mean it was all couched in personal terms, and he saw no need for it himself?

he was a rugged individualist; there was a few of them+\*\*\*\*\*  
ever put it in terms of principal, did he have antiunion ideology, or just personal feelings?

just personalsfeelings.

(little bit of analaysis 'st's petty good) lt's go on to ed ard white.

294

this fella become a very active unionist later on, not at first.

By that he become steward in TR, and was somewhat of a leader.

was somewhat of leader later on?

yeah, about two years later?

about what year did he begin to emerge as leader?

during war, around 41, 42, arond there.

born in this untry, polish.

did he get job through family?

dont believe so. he come in theremore or less on his own.

any other family in there?

no, may have had friends, no family ties. he was one of the  
f ellows that was very much doing a lot of ciriticizing of the family ties in our dept. (as a union man).

what kind of things would he say?

well, that the people who had relatives moved up faster than he did, and that was one of the reasons tht he was quite active in U, he wnted to stamp this out.

you mean like he wanted to establish more ratianal objective system.

he thought that people was having threir somes moved up faster than ot r ones, this was a common thing before the union, and when the union took over the attititude changed . foremen couldnt move theire somees up, they went by seniority, from then on. you had same opportunity if you were relative, but you moved up on sen. when they made leaders in dept was done by sen and ability.

you mean White made these criticism before u contract?

no, itwas after. he made sure there was no favoritism shown to family ties over the other people.

in reality, say from 37 - 41, was the letter of the u contract adhered to in this respect, or did family ties still count for something?

well, family ties still hd some bearing on it, except that you couldnt do anything. after the uni n contract people couldt be moved up out of sen.

in other words, what I'm geting at, did white in late 30's still have a elgitimate grievance in what he saw.  
no, it wasnt taking place,



1,a 354

it was more or less an attitude he made darn sure it never happened.  
the way it did at first without union.

would you say he was one of people who was instruemtnl in enforcing  
the senio ty provision?

yeas, he was. in our dept.

how many others like him, hot on issue of merit and sen.?

all active U leaders, they had to go according to their concept  
of unionism.

was this also true of Boll group?

oh yes.

both had same concept of sen.

no diff there.

f who were most energetic, like white was, in terms of making  
sure that things went by sen?

Steve Tyll; dick woyshner, norm dettloff, gus zotz. that's about  
the ones that are really watching that close.

so these five guys(four and white) were most insistent on making  
sure . . .

yeah, that it was done the way a union should operate. By the  
way gus zotz just dies last week.

Dettlof--did he have any family in there?

no.

Woyshner, did he have any family?

no, no family.

and gus zotz?

no, he was an immigrant from germany.

ah, very interesting. the five guys most active, tyll comes from  
family, but the rest of them were individualis(laughter)

Yeas.

ed white's religious attitudes?

not very religious man, I think he was supposed to be cath.

how old in 33?

about 20.

what was his attitude to U at that time, first mesa struggle & strk?

at that time i believe he was working in production, I didn't  
know him.

when did he come into TR? time of siiddown strike?

no. no.

what about his . . . h w did he get on with other guys?

got along pretty well, was quite a, you might say they looked up  
to hin for leadership.

this is in later period.

later on, yeah. he become quite active in the union because he  
took a very militant attitude, when things didn't go right he would get  
a group and walk out, they'd lose a day but win their point by  
waling out.

so he was a wildcat leader?

right, in some respects. and then a later on they made a foreman  
out of him in the TR(laugh).

what was period of his most intense wildcat activity?

i would say right after the war, 1945. they didnt like the  
changeover policies that was taking place from wartime work back to  
peacetime work.

did that mean basically a cuttingof rates?

well, it meant a considerable loss of overtime , and the tpe of  
work we had to do to get us back into peacetime work. reworking  
these old dies that ere stored all during the war. it was very



caused a lot of

undesirable work and we had several walkouts in that period. it was dirty work, these tools become rusted, and we had to rework them to get them in shape. plus the fact that we had been making so much money during the war that they were pretty well anxious to have a few days off. it was used as a vacation. they used to say, let's go fishing, and then they would all walk out.

did they really sometimes mean it just that way--let's take a vacation?

yeah. they would get together, and if they felt like taking a day off they would instigate some problems and walk out. this is where the ~~problem~~ the wildcat stuff--it wasn't quite acceptable to everybody

yeah, what kind of group was it that seemed to follow white's leadership in this vacation seeking

younger polish boys. he derived most of his leadership from this group.

they were poles? well, it sounds, remember the last time you were describing the young blacks and how they stuck together. this looks very similar on the surface (yeah, yeah), and ethnic group, a young group (yeah, they talked the same language you might say--kluck) in that period, how many of wildcats were vacation wildcats?

i would say about 75%.

laughter 2x!!!!

75%. yeah.

in a way there were expressing some of the things in practice that some of the more democratic currents of syndicalist radicalism express. workers should have more control over the nature of their work, pace, less oppressive, etc, and here they are, with no theory, I'm sure . . . was white at all political?

no, he was just a strong union man, and he figured when he got to be steward he took a more radical attitude, and he decided they weren't going to work that day he would just get the group together and pretty soon they were walking out. of course, they'd go to the boss and make an issue on something, and out they'd go, and everybody else was wondering how come they were walking out.

because they could never really acknowledge that it was a vacation.

no, they would never admit this.

but he doesn't emerge in this manner as a militant until the beginning of the war?

yeah.

what's he doing then before the war? what kind of an impression did you get from him?

well, he was just coming up into the TR, and he was trying to establish himself as a good toolmaker, which he did, he came up moved up to leader on the work, so he had quite a knowledge of the work.

so would you say he was first class?

he was first class toolmaker.

end side a, tape 1 (3/16/76)



he was a man of real ability, never got in too much trouble with mgnmt  
they apreciated his knowledge, although he got carried away sometimes  
(talking about White)  
not all followed white's leadership, probably 25%  
probably 20 followed his leadership  
pf: this would mean 80 younger poles in TR at this time  
no, wati a minute, 25% of dept ~~about~~ followed white(\*20)  
pf: these 20 all polish? any non poles?  
detloff wasnt, he seemed to go along;  
pf: anyone else who seemed to go along who didnt quite fit in sociologically?  
no, I think the rest of them are all polish.  
how many 2nd gen poles in dept who didnt go along with white?  
Eddy Tyll didnt seem to follow.  
Ed was a young guy?  
yeah.  
pf: any other poles? would there even be as many as two other 2nd  
gen poles who did not follow?  
cant think of his name, another 2nd gen POle  
pf: in other words he had nearly all of 2nd gen poles  
um um.  
Pf: was there any kind of conflict in terms of leadership and goals  
between the Tyll family and White?  
there was some, not too much.  
pf: what would the issues be when there would be some conflict?  
mainly over the type of work each one of them was getting--pf:  
each individual or each group?--each group. there was a little friction'  
which one group would have against the other.  
pf: I guess the white goup would have the least seniority?  
yeah.  
pf: there was diff in work assignments.  
there was some fricton there, well , other than what you might say, there  
was a feeling that they were getting some of the ~~in~~ better work.  
pf: what was some of the better work, what kind of jobs, ops?  
it was the type of dies that were built; some required a litle more skill  
than others.  
pf: when did this friction develop?  
that seemed to go on as long as I worked there, from the beginning.  
some of that was always taking place.  
pf: scenario: could one of white group's gripes have been as time went  
on they saw they werent getting a chance to increase their skills,  
because they saw that the other goup ~~dominated~~ seemed to dominate the  
better jobs, and they saw themselves in a sense graudally being kept  
out of the highest categories of skill in the TR.  
Yes, that kind of sums it up.  
pf: was there actually a change taking place toward more specialization  
in the TR, and that therefore these younger guys were getting caught with  
only being partially trained?  
no, it wasnt that, they were making sure that they were getting their  
opportunity to develop themselves, and through the union they could  
express their opinion.  
pf: do you think that white group had any legit basis for their grievances,  
even a slight basis?  
they had a slight basis, yeah. You know, you have to assert yourself  
wherever you work if you want to get the better jobs, you just cant  
sit back and leave everything slide by.



pf: so in a sense you are saying that unless you are either a very forceful individual, or you have ties, or you org an interest group, a political interst group, like these poles were, you are going to miss the boat.

yeah. you wouldnt get the same opportunities, unless you made yourself, and I beleive that's the way he made himself strong in his group by asserting himself. By speaking up to the foremen, that's how he become a strong leader, just through this assertion.

pf: it looks like that you have same situation that you have in urban ethnic politics. you described the blacks before, how they stuck together as group, fought as group for group benefits.

Now you describe the young poles in TR in same way. they hav a group, its an ethnic group, and . . . was there any ele ent in this that was based on fact that prior to emergence of polish diemakers the trade had been dominated by north europeans.

yeah. there was that feeling among the polish that they had to break a barrier that existed for a long time.

pf: and which ethnic groups did the poles see as having the grip on the good jobs?

particularly the German.

pf: so in a way there is a kind of group conflict, even though it wasnt too severe(yeah). were there ever any kind of comments made by either germans or poles that were ethnic comments, like you lousy german or something like that? any kind of ethnic slurs? yeah, during the war we had quite a few of them, but it basically come from the fact that we were at war, but i dont think it had any serious grounding or you might say that there was more or less a trying to undermine the german die makers through this effort, the war effort they were using this to run somebody else down.

pf: it was a kind of opportunistic playing on chauvinism. yeah, playing on this particular time to run a certain type of nationalit down, they used that angle, but they never got anywhere with it, but it was used.

pf: on one hand you have ed white looks like real good working class leader during war period(lefties see this side) but when they see other side(marxists cant see racism, ) but here is same group of 2nd gen poles who also take their chance during the war to use wartime hysteria to get an advantage in TR and was used quite often.

((((pf: metaspeech: how well its going)

pf: his attitude to family, to drink and to money.(white?) well, he didnt, he was a very free fellow, he liked to drink and liked to have a good time. never discussed anything about saving money, he always was having a good time, probably direct opposite to Westra Jr.

pf: how did he relate to family? was he pretty much family centered, or did he spend more of his time hanging out with his buddies in bars?

I would say he did more of that than he was a family type man. At times he was a heavy drinker, not th the extent that he didnt come to work . . .

pf: did he go drinking with regular group of guys? yes, they often met. about four or five of them. they more or less took a back seat in the union. They were White's followers, they took that much of an action that they would walk out with him in these



292

wildcat affairs, they didnt hesitate to walk out, they were that militant, they would.

pf: t is gets back to leaders re rank and file. white and dr buddies: to what extent ~~in~~ did they take the time to find out what unions were all about(the union), to what extent was it just a translation of their ties of soidarity with ed white, and that it went sort of in the direction they felt they were going in, militancy was a kind of youthful thing too.

I dont think they made a real sltudy of unonism.

pf: when it came down to the basic org principles

no, they had nothing to do with that. part of it

pf: so in this case I guess you could say they really lacked any rational understanding of what the union was all about. they gave me the impression that they cared less so long as they gained their end, what ver they were doing at the moment. (how far in my book?) .. ref to:(got to expansion)

book ref

ref: remember description of dept 17 & 19, and there were groups of gangs, young poles, they way edmund described them he said they really were just looking for a fight, and there wre feelings of solidarity, but they had no real sense of the union. problem: what's the relationship between leaders and institutional framework, on one hand, and the gang kids. apparetnly similar to the guys ~~ex~~ you are describing who went drinking with white.

yeah.

who have, its almost lke they have a lot of energy, aggression coming out... did they all generally think of the company in very strong

comp w/other groups! neggtive terms as the enemy?

yes, I would say so. everything that the co did seemed to, they had the attitude that it was against them, w ether it was good or bad they disagreed with everything that the co wanted to do.

pf: might call it a primitive class consioaness.

yeah.

it seems like that they were ready to do almost anything, it ~~want~~ wasnt a question of right or wrong

yeah, so long as it would further their own gain, or womewhere, they would do anything.

pf: their own gain like in the sense of improving their own position, as individuas or as a group

that they could, I'm talking about so that they could have more freedom ~~at their~~ work and more. . . you have to u erstnat you didnt always have holiday pay, and these fishing trips brought about the holiday pay, like the different holidays come up; at first when we had the union we didnt have that, this came later on.

pf: you mean fishing trips in a way forced the issue?

it forced this issue that labor needed a day once in a while to rest, to have fun.

pf: any idea how mgmnt saw this problem with the fishing trips? they just saw it as the boys needing a day off. they accepted the fact, people werent fired because they took one day off.

pf: is this true, then? it seems like from mgmnt point of view, the insitutionalization of holiday pay would institutionalize this kind of recreational and put it more under their control.

yes. yes. holiday pay was something that well if you look back, people on salary never lost any pay when holiday came up, so this is the basis that the union and unio people figured that a working man would have the same rights, this was a very strong feeling. when I'm siting home at Xmas, i should get paid as well as person on salary.

salry: holiday  
status, equality



386

pf: no here's the thing about hol day pay as mgmnt sees it, as a way of institu onalizing this taking off anyway. it sems they had 2 realistic alternatives: crack down, impose sanctions on people who took off, until they could get kind of discipline restored to do what they wanted. the otheris to do what they did. now to do what they did involves an ~~expense~~ expense. I'm wondering whether mgmnt saw the expense as worth it becuase it enabled them to plan and caluclate production more rationally?

yeah. and it involved a happier working group, and I do believe that they benferfited from the people being more sasisfied withtheir work, they had some privileges.

pf in a way both sides gained by this?

yeah, both sides gained somewhat. except, at first, whenever you payout money that isnot being gainfully employed, the cost had to be passed on to consumer, one way or another.

pf: or else taken up as greater productionvity. well, which was it, was holiday pay passed on to consumer, or did this stabilization of labor relations involve an increase in productivity?

I would say that the degree of productivity and hapiness to the worker (??)

pf: it seems almost impossible to measure this. you you have any idea how the holiday pay setup did increase productivity? or to what extent did it?

holiday pay  
state-cap

I would say that the working man become probably about 10% more efficient. by having some time off for his family.

pf: on what basis can you give estimate?

well I just feel that a man, if he dont have any time off, ~~if~~ he is working six or seven days a week, he does go down in efficiency after a certain amount of weeks of this type of work, mainly mentally he becomes , he gets s feeling that he dont have much in life, a very boring ~~xxx~~ feeling, he cant function the same as when he is happy. and for that reason you can have a big turnouver of uhappy workers, they just wont stay in an industry where ther dont have some privileges.

pf: whole question of efficiency of complex productive organism:

. . . so holiday pay is a kind of instrument of gaining some ~~kind~~ of control over these two factors, turnover and workers attitudes (right) I guess also includes the fact that ther is almost a physiologica falling off of your efficiency ~~at the end of the~~ ~~the~~ ~~last~~ last hour of a long day, the end of the week (right) or dragged this six or seven day week thing (right). . . what are presented as great benefits for the workers which are in a certain context, arent simply one sided gains; in turn mgmnt gets a greatdeal more control over the work force and overthe work process

RIGHT

pf: I guess we see it more in production than in toolrooms?

yeah, you would more so in production, but you also see it in TR.

pf: how did mgmnt aquire increased control in TR, or, did degree of control exercised by mgmnt over T&D makers, change in any way over a several yearperiod?

well, they did lose some control, becuase mgmnt olst some control when the unon, because the fear of losing job was gone, senioiryt protection.

pf: but I'm thinking more in terms of increased division of labor or reduction of degree of freedom the worker had in ~~eterm~~ing how to do his job, add what pace to set, time and motion study, if any of that?



478

technically, there was a vast improvement after the war, that offset the gains that labor had made.  
pf: what about edward white and coughlin?  
it would seem from his remarks that he didn't care for him.  
pf: would you have heard any of his remarks in the period of coughlin's greatest popularity, 33-34?  
no i think that it was later that ed white was in TR.

end tape 1

tape 2, a

pf: when coughlin broke with FDR, how much of his support was wiped out in the plant?  
a good 50%. in my estimation there.  
pf: then that means there are still a lot of Coughlin supporters remaining.  
yeah, there was some, because there were certain basic principles that he tried to express that some people thought should have been carried out.  
pf: ethnic or economic principles?  
economic.

pf: who were people who remained coughlin supporters? interested in seeing if there is any difference in ethnic bcg, between those who split with coughlin when he splits with FRD, and those who stay with Coughlin. In fact, i have hunch that those who stayed tended more toward the boll group.  
well, there was a, you hear comments during the day about some thought that father coughlin still had right idea about how country should change  
pf: did this go up into 1938 or 1939 you would hear these comments?  
around 1936 37 around there.

pf: who remained the most outspoken coughlin supporters in 38?  
Joe Nighting, Gus Zotz; Nighting catholic german. Zotz not a catholic, lutheran.

pf: were these the most outspoken of the pro-coughlin people?  
yeah, they did most of the talking for coughlin, except i was very much for him myself until he had this run in with Roosevelt, and i was a very strong Roosevelt man, so i figured well, Roosevelt was doing more for the working class than coughlin ever could, so . . .  
pf: did Nighting and Zotz go with Boll in the faction fight?  
yes.

pf: OK, that's good(!)  
pf: both were in TR. How many others were in TR who, when coughlin split with fdr, they didn't leave coughlin behind like you did?  
that's the big diff, that split.

there wasn't too many of them . . . there was an awful lot of people believed in coughlin, opened up the eyes and ears of a lot of people about what was wrong ~~kluck~~ with the country at that particular time.

pf: as i go down different names, i'll check, but white anyway was anti-Coughlin when you got to know him, which was sometime when, around 38?

around 38.  
pf: did white have any... what were his main topics of conversation?  
he was very much against families being moved up ahead of him.

pf: so his main topic was family. any other topics?  
he stressed that we have a very strong union, we stick together.

pf: when the Poles were getting together as Poles behind White's leadership and fighting for some of the better jobs that the Germans had traditionally had, did the Germans make any comments about the

White anti-  
Coughlin

101



Poles being uppity and wanting germans jobs similar like you described last week when the blacks ~~went into welding~~ began to go onto welding and other production workers said . . . yeah, there was a strong feeling amongst the germans that they didnt have a bona fide apprenticeship, the polish, that they were moving up ~~to~~ thru other means.

pf: the other means being what?

years of service in the ~~plant~~ plant regardless of how they studied for the job. some of em took lk (didnt like) that attitude that anybody could get into the trade.

pf: was there any legitimacy to that complaint?

just the fact that they the german mecha ic felt that they werent completely trained to become a toolmaker. this was basic through the whole industry.

pf: was this true, that the level of training of the two groups was different?

was different, yes, that's a true statement. they didnt serve a four year apprenticeship, they picked up theri trade as they went, the young poles,

pf: so basically the poles were less skilled?

yes because they never served a four yar apprenticeship. the way this was accomplished, before they had a journey an's status, throughout the auto industry in the union, a fellow would go in and say he was a toolmaker or a diemaker he was given a job if they thought he ~~could~~ could do the work he had a job, but later on, when the joueneyman status come about, you had to show a journeyman's card like you have to do today. I other words you would have had to have 10yrs, now it's 8yrs, it was 10 yrs working at the trade before he would qualify, or going through an apprenticeship.

pf: if we were to compare the attitude of germans toward poles in TR with attitude of ~~whites~~ whites toward blacks in the assy dept in regard to this upward mobility thing, what would be the similarity and differences. trying to put racism into historical comp perspective. Well, it's somewhat different because the bcg of ~~the~~ tradesman in production was just a matter of the polish or whoever had these better jobs when the colored were coming up, the colored had no special training for the job, its just that the polish people who had these jobs had them through years of service in the ~~plant~~ plant. but when the colored man come up he got the rights through unionism, by becoming a steward or commman, he got these rights that way, not through years of working at it.

pf: in some say some similarity to status thing: in this case, years, rather than skill. anthro concept: white workers ~~who~~ were welders had begun in their own eyes begun to aquire status by virtue of the fact that they were welders, and one of the elements that went into thi status was the ~~xx~~ years of service thing, and if blacks were going to be coming up first of all without the many years of service that it had taken them, that would tend to degrade the status of the job and thereofre the status of these white workers doing the job.

Yes. that had a lot of bearing on it. Tha's true.

pf: and is that similar also in the TR that the germans saw that the craft itself was becoming debased?

the craft was b ing deteriorated by the lack of ~~a~~ ammount of years they worked at the trade.



263

pf: so in this case does it seem that there is a similar attitude on the part of whites in ~~asy~~ and germans in TR in that the threat they saw was a threat to the status of their jobs.

Right.

pf: university analogy degrading of value of degree

pf: so here is an element where, so it seems that on a lot of jobs, not just skilled jobs, but even the better jobs on production, workers begin to acquire some of their own identity from the nature of the work they are doing.

Right.

pf: do you recall any kind of remarks on the part of either group that would seem to demonstrate some concern, psychological, by the fact that they themselves are being degraded ~~by~~ the degradation of their job, while in the case of blacks coming up to work in welding, there is not just the fact of people of not many years coming in, but also the addition of racial factors. which would be stronger than the ethnic factors, blacks being the low status people if they are in your occupation, its going to drag your status down too. was there any of that ~~going on~~ kind of thing?

yeah, there was some talk like that, yes.

pf: you mean actually explicit talk to the effect that blacks are niggers in society's eyes, and if I am doing the same job as a ~~nigger~~ nigger, what am I kind of attitude.

that's a basic attitude, the more common a job becomes, the less valuable it is in the eyes of other people. a toolmaker or a diemaker was looked up to years ago as the trade of the auto industry. at that particular time they were the most highly regarded people in the auto industry because I don't believe they could make the automobiles if it wouldn't have been for the tool and diemakers if they hadn't imported them from Germany. in the first place, that's the only place they had to get them, till Ford Motor Co started developing a few.

pf: must explore: this identification acquired from your job. it seems to tie in closely with family and ethnic group things, ie, ethnic group has a hold on certain job class, so the status of ~~the~~ the group and the status of families that are in there as part of ethnic group is linked up with status of job. I guess with long experience and the fact that these jobs are passed on traditionally, or even if its not passed on ~~through~~ through the family but through the community well, it was the way they were trained for the job would set them away from somebody else, I guess over there it required year and years of hard study to accomplish that, and over here, actually the auto industry didn't have much choice but to train people fast, so they used the Polish element, because the Poles by nature like to advance themselves, and that was a good line of work to get into. any Polish man who had several sons, he pushed them toward that goal because he knew that was the highest one of the highest paying jobs in auto industry. In this area around where I come from, there was an awful lot of Polish families and immigrants.

pf: not all Poles pushed their sons in this way. not all, but a majority of Poles did. they had that tendency, they believed in education, in pushing themselves.

pf: do you know that Edward's father pushed him into...?  
no, I didn't know his father.



352

pf: the next guy is william clark willis. ethnic bcg. english. not an immigrant, came up from one of southern states, maybe indiana. has been in this country as I understand it his whole life and his family before him. old stock american.

pf: were they from coal fields of s ind.

no, I dont think so. he came from briggs motor car co, and he was out to there when the union--now this fellow came, he's not one of the early ones in tr, he came later on, after the sitdown. not there during fact n fight. there in 1940. 39. cant say exactly about 38, or what year he come in. I think around 38. he might have been (there during factionalism)

pf: what was his attitude to boll vs cio?

I couldnt say. his religion was protestant. dont know what kind. was in his late 40's when first met him. he wasnt really active in union, he more or less went along with the crowd.

pf: basic attitudes toward family, drink, coughlin, anything like that.

he liked to drink a little bit.

pf: it seems like you really didnt know him very well.

yeah, I didnt know him too well. not like I knew some of the rest of them.

pf: why is that?

probably because, he was a different nationaliaity, english.

pf: so as you see those things, then, national and cultural bcg does have a lot to do with what you have in common with people, who you become friends with.

yes, I would say so.

pf: who were his friends then, who did he club together with?

I dont think too much of anybody, he was more or less by himself. did he seem to get along pretty well with Brear or Dyer.

yeah, he had more to do with Boll than he did, he worked a lot with Boll that with the other two.

pf: the next one is stanislau or joseph Zacharias.

yeah, he's polish, a large family, very strong catholic. not an immigrant. his father was an immigrat. there at time of mesa strike in 33. hew was about 30 I think at that time. had one son later on, but he wouldnt be on record because it was about the time the plant was about ready to close. when he came in he was alone.

pf: what was his attitude toward the mesa?

he seemed to be wanting a union of some kind you know. but not real active.

pf: there were about 100 guys in TR at that time?

yeah.

pf: in terms of his degree of activity where would you put him on a scale of lets say from here, lets say #1 at the top, most active, down to #100 at bottom, probably would be Westra, he would be right in the middle somewhere.

pf: when you went out on strike, he just went along, is that right?

right. whole line of questioning: how he ~~would~~ have respineded to a call for strike. in th4 sense of things he might have said or revealed attitudes toward it, ambivalences and things like that. fear, anything of that sort.

he had a strong fear of being out of work because he had a large family and I know at that time he had 6 or 7 children already.



485

pf: and he expressed this fear at the time of the strike?  
yes, he exprewssed it.  
pf: did he seem to be in agreement with the aims of the strike?  
yes.  
pf: he had his fear but he went along. how was he on coughlin?  
very much \_\_\_\_\_ father coughlin. we often discussed it. and when  
coughlin broke with roosevelt, what did he do?  
it sort of upset him. he didnt know which way to turn.  
pf: and which way did he finally turn?  
he become a strong rosevelt man.  
pf: and he turned his back on coughlin?  
~~yeah~~.  
pf: did he do much drinking or hang out with the guys or anything  
like that?  
no. no. very good family man.  
pf: august zotz.  
we call him gus. I was very close to him, we worked together for a  
long time.

end 3/16/76



pf: you mentioned that there were 3 or 4 scots in TR. ~~names?~~  
no I cant recall their names. I'm thiking of one but I cant  
remeber his mame.

pf: the one you are thiking of scot 1, was he active in union?  
yes he was. didnt play a leadersip role, but was always talking for it.  
was from scotland. was 45 yrs in 33. he was a toolmaker.  
seemed to be a follower of tony boll.

pf: what about time of ~~afx~~ factionalism?

in my estimation he was for trades people, trade rather than industrial.

pf: how did this kind of trade not ind consciousness manifest itself?

how --real borad loose question--did they think in terms of their  
specific property in their specific job more so than the ind strial  
~~people?~~oriented people?

they figured that they had, in order to more or less protect their  
trade, they were looking for ways to in repsect ~~of~~ their trade can  
be improved, not that they didnt want to ~~m~~ everybody else to make  
a good living, but they figured this had to be the movement to get  
the union moving properly and follow a trade line. that's what they  
were brought up in that's what they knew.

pf: h w did they look at the unskilled workers in shop, what did they  
expect of them?

well they

pf: if they were trade union rather thanind u consciousness that would  
pose problem of how they would look at prod wokerers in shôp.

some of them sort of figured they could be replaced, but in their  
type of work they couldnt be. unless you were a tradesman you  
couldnt be replaced. ~~xxxx~~ they figured they were on a higher plane.  
now when you talk about production workers ~~ix~~ you can hire them off  
the street. but you couldnt hire a better class of workr off the  
street unless they were trained for it.

pf: but did these trade uninnists welcome the prod workrs in to the  
union?

oh yes.

pf: they welcomed them into the uion . . .

but they also wanted to keep thesevles on a little higher plane.

pf: what does that mean, keep themselves on a higher plane organi-  
zationally as distinct group?

they would always would be considered making more money than prod  
worker. If I could be replaced on job by anybody, that dont set me  
up as something important. but if I have to be trained 4 yrs for  
a certain job I should be allowed more money per hour than somebody  
that can~~x~~ be replaced.

pf: your talking about a wage differential.

there was always a strong feeling for a wage diferential. which  
the fight is still going on if y u rad the papers, its still going on  
yet, it started in the 30's and we are still fighting the same fight.

pf: was their thinking about what the union should be that there  
should be 2 classes of membership, the tradesmen and the others?

yes. that was the genral idea, that it should have been always,  
they wanted it to be kept an industrial union for the strength, but  
they wanted it separated in regards to wages, which it hasnt been.

pf: what do you mean it hasnt been?

well, they havent kept the same differ tial of wages that when the  
union first started, there was a certain difer tial of wages, and



147

now that gap has been narrowed somewhat, and now everybody is very much dissatisfied.

pf: but in those days, back in 33-41. is there any kind of, does this desire to maintain themselves as distinct and above the prod workers manifest itself in any organizational form, like did they want some kind of org structure whereby the power of the union would be more concentrated in the sk trades, or some kind of constitutional way where the sk trades would be recognized as separate. yeah, that is what they were after, that's why they formed the tool and die conference back in the 30's and that lasted till up in the 50's and now we have a different setup, its setup in uaw and solidarity in sk trades dept, this one section was eliminated and now its sk trades dept.

pf: the forming of t&d conference, did that come about as a result of pressure put on union by sk workers, as a concession to them.

yeah. some way of establishing that you were sk trades by a journeymans card, everybody had to go down and have a picture taken to establish this fact that you were a skilled trade. otherwise there wouldnt be no separation in the union whatsoever. that lasted for a number of years and then the sk trade dept was set up, now its run by dough fraser, vp of uaw.

pf: would all this hold true for the maint conf.

yeah.

pf: same thing, to maintain craft distinctions. now how come the maint men did they want originally to be in with the t&d makers in the t&d conf.

yes.

pf: and what happened there?

they established their right to have a card just like everybody else, so long as they had the basic skills of millwright work, and machine repair.

pf: I'm wondering whether the main men wanted to be part of one big sk trade conf, or whether from the start they wanted their own separate identity.

no, they wanted to be all in the sk trades classification.

pf: how come that didnt come about. was there resistance on the part of the t & d men?

no, I dont believe so. just that there was some resistance on that part because everybody in maint wasnt classified as being skilled.

b because a guy changed a light bulb doesnt mean that he was a sk electrician.

pf: I'm just wondering whether the uaw leadership itself might not have considered better to divide the 2 sk categories in plant rather than have them united, make them easier to handle that way. the object was that they never wanted to break up the ind concept of the u, because they would lose the strength of to negotiate with the big corp, and if you would break it down into small little groups you wouldnt have that same power. that's been the struggle ever since the union existed.

pf: I'm wondering whether the uaw within its organization wanted to keep the main men separate from the t & d.

no they didnt seem to, I never noticed that too much.

pf: how come, was it just a spontaneous desire on part of main men to have their own separate conf distinct from the t&d as well as from the prod workers?

I never did notice that too much, in all the years I worked I never noticed that they wanted to be separate from us, they just more or less wanted



to be recognized as skilled trades.

pf: how come they end up with their separate conf rather thn with a general sk trades conf, what were the forces leading to that? dont really know.

pf: about what % of tr had this trade union consciousness?

I would say a good 90%. the other 10% didnt care.

pf: so you were all trde unionists, rather than industrial unionists. so being part of an ind u was more of a tactical or strategic perspective of a group that had its own identity as opposed to the prod worekrs for whom no reall differences ~~existences~~ existed. in the same way, so that thereis only one way to have a unin, does thatsound right? yeah.

pf: ther is always this sens of being separate, eitherwithin the ind u structue or even apart from it?

yeah, well its all based on they coulnt of organized the auto ind without having the ind u concept, I dont think they would hae been able, you jst coulnt orgainze a few people and have the thing get powerful.

pf: it sems tht for the prod workers tat was the natural form of org, it ~~wasnt~~ just a tactical question, but it was the ~~only~~ way they could think of orgainzing anyway. without any craft traid on or any sort, from all sorts of backgrounds, ~~whereas~~ whereas for the skilled workers they could concieve of various forms of org, ~~while~~ whether simply ~~trade union~~ trade union or in relation to ind org, and then it becomes a quseion of tactics, which way is better, which gives you more strength?

yeah, the strength was the key to the whole situation.

pf: but there would be this developing difference, the sk men had a separate consciousness of who they were, andthe prod men didnt. right.

pf: when the split came between afl and ciohm faction at first and unity, that was the time when kotenko and borivch raided union office, was tht in 38

cant say exact year that was.

pf: I guess its a critical confrontation in developing factional fight, its like another escalation. so that's like a convenient point at which to look at the divisons within theplnat. at tht time, in the TR at the time of the Kotenko borovich raid, what % at the time of the raid, what % of tr was pro-Boll rather than pro Kotentko Borovich and whoever else was in cio faction?

I would say probably about 50-50 in TR.

pf: and did the cio group gradually increase in strength, lets say this is between the Kotenko incident--remem er the nlr election dec 39 or possibly 40

yeah, I remember the election.

~~andthe~~

pf: and the vote was approx 700-500, so that tony boll got more than 500 votes. do you rember how the tr voted in that election?

I would say they voted for boll.

pf: on what basis can you make tat statement?

just from talking to everybody, I'm pretty sure it was that they were pretty strong.

pf: so the tr was a fairly solid place for boll, even as far as the nlr election which came after ~~the formal split~~ homer martin's formal split from the uaw cause they had in feb or march of 39 the two separate convention, cleveland and deteoit. so even 10 months afterwards, there is stil a solid core of afl people. now would you



say that like 75% of tr voted for boll?

I would say so.

could it have been more?

could even have been a little more than that

pf: at that time, in terms of this conflict bwt een boll and who did you percieve as pricniple ~~readers~~ of the cio group?

tom dyer.  
pf: and who else did you say from your point of view, from the vantage point of tr, who seemed to be most prominent cio leaders? did tyll family play a large ~~rolx~~ role in the union as a whole or just in the tr.

just in the tr.

pf: how many votes at tat time would the tr be bringing to boll?

proba y about 100, maybe more.

pf: and then whee else did those tony boll frank carr forces have strength, what other depts.

I think the press room.

pf: was their str ght concetrated among the women, was that another block of stength for boll?

it could have been, I'm not sure, but it could have been.

pf: what % of press room was women?

about 15%.

pf: the men in the press dept, were they alargely 1st gen polish immigrants. did it seem that the polish immigrants were voting heavily for carr and boll.

yeah.

pf: do you have any idea what % of press room as whole voted for boll?

probably about 50%.

assembly: I would say they were more for the cio. voted heavily, I guess more than 75%, I didnt have too much to do with that part of shop

paint mach: dont know too much . .

pf: did you have a lot of contact with hookers and crane ops?

not too much, except theones that went into tr later.

pf: do you have any idea how the voting went in shiping and transp.

no.

pf: . . . . about how many people all together wre in the press room at that time?

I really couldnt say for shre.

pf: did you see any signs of communist activity in plant, anypeople you thought were mmunist ~~andx~~ or communist sympathizers?

I thought pete kotenko was ~~that wayx~~ a little bit that way.

pf: so there wasnt no obvious pesence, maybe one or two people.

yeah, he seemed to be, but perhaps I was just not figuring him right.

pf: I think youre probalby right about him, pete and joe, borvich and sumak, its fits . . . . 3 russians and serbian they were very adical type people.

~~ix~~ pf: did they hve any noticiable influence within the union in certain xections of the plant, rather than being free floating radical people without too much of a following.

not too much of a following I would think. they would upset all the meetings anyway.

pf: did they ever make motions in meetings.

yes, they didnt get too much support.

pf: what kind of ~~mixonx~~ motions did they make?

iciton



55

I imagine if we followed everything they said we would have had the plant closed every week. they were more militant, overzealous, I would say.

pf: when they made these motions, were they generally similar motions, did they always get kind of the same votes for their motions.  
yes, pretty much the same, yes. they had a certain following, but it never got too strong.

pf: how many votes would they get in meetings?  
they would get about 20% or so.

pf: how big would be the average meeting?  
we would have 2-300 people.

pf: even in regular routine meetings?  
pretty good meeting attendance.

pf: what years are you referring to?  
30's and 40's.

pf: even through the factionalism and all that you still had pretty good meetings.  
we still had good meetings.

pf: that 20% was a pretty sizable following then. (yeah) do you have any idea who that following was. whether it came from particular dept?  
I think it came mostly from assy.

pf: funny thing there none of them worked in assy. they were from press. did they have much influence in their own dept?  
not too much.

pf: you think it was mainly in assy.  
yeah.

pf: do you have any idea what type of guys from assy would go along?  
did they have much black following?  
quite a few blacks.

pf: of the vote that they would get on their motions at meetings, what % of that vote, of the pro-borovich kotenko vote was black.  
I think that probably about 1/2 of them

pf: it would seem that these ~~xxxx~~ would be blacks who were rejecting the leadership of the black leaders, people like popa hicks, warfield, yeah.

pf: did oscar oden vote with kotenko, was he one of that group?  
I think so, not positive, but I think he was.

pf: was it mainly the young blacks?

yes, they, I guess they were trying to establish themselves and they were using anybody who could lead them until they could establish the power of their own, got common men of their own race and then the power went to them.

pf: did that actually happen once the blacks got established the alliance between them and kotenko B got dissolved?

yeah, it went toward the black leadership, they were just trying to establish themselves. they were using them in order to push something for their end.

pf: any black leaders, not leaders as such

so blacks were using the left for pushing their own power. at what point do you think they got to where they wanted to be enough so they could dispense with the services of kotenko?

as soon as they got elected common men to negotiate.

pf: when was that?

around 45.

pf: so up through the war then this group of young blacks were political followers of kotenko. there were no black common men until then

no.  
pf.

/19 finish (tape)



pf: just stewards.

there ~~xxxx~~ were some stewards, but they never had anybody on comm.

pf: what is the earliest period that you remember this kind of alliance existing, when did it come into existence?

pf: there was the sitdown strike period.

I'm speaking of quite a bit later than that.

pf: that kotenko developed this following of blacks?

that was in the 40's.

pf: backtrack a little bit. between 36 and the 40's when this black group emerges, were these same blacks who would become followers of kotenko, earlier, lets say from 37 to 40, were they active in the union, or prior to that, or was it only in 40's that they became active and did so through kotenko?

yeah, they became active ~~earlier~~ later.

pf: were these guys who had been in the shop in 36 and 37.

yes.

pf: so they really were not participating in union affairs until the forties.

that's right. the amount of black people gradually built up, we didn't have too many at first, as the years went on they kept hiring more and more in assy, til there was quite a few, just like in all industry, I guess, the # increase in every plant.

pf: when you say active in the union, in this case would that mean just participating in union meetings, would that be a good measure.

yes, they realized that in order to improve themselves they would have to become active & go to meetings

pf: or they would never have a chance to fight for their special interests as a group.

yeah, if they didn't attend meetings.

pf: if you look at a typical meeting in different years, you would see a changing social comp of the meetings, the most obvious change would be the appearance of so many black faces. but if we go back to if we start right after the sitdown strike, did you have very large meetings right after the strike, was the strike a generator of enthusiasm? yes, it was a strong generator of enthusiasm after ~~xxxxxx~~ the strike. the union wasn't very strong up until that sitdown strike, from then on it was quite active.

pf: so if we take, in the months following the sitdown strike, did attendance at u meets decline?

no, it increased.

pf: so it ~~xx~~ continued to increase or remain steady for several years. yes for a number of years.

pf: if we start right after sitdown strike, how many people at a typical meeting after sitdown strike? within the first few months? could be a couple of hundred people.

pf: now these two hundred. could you give estimates of the % lets say starting from the top, the tr?

well, we always had a good attendance from the tr, at all meetings, except later on tony boll refused to come, he used the excuse that he had to go to church, but I know it was because the other faction had won out, so he lost complete interest

pf: and as a result of that do the number of t & d makers who had been coming to meetings stop coming also?

yes, some of them stop coming.

pf: do you have any idea about how many stopped coming?

probably 25%.



pf: 25%?

yes.

pf: you mean 25% of thse who had been attending meeting stopped.  
um hm.

checkmark

pf: do you think that these fifteen people ~~that~~ you picked out there constitute just about all of the people who stopped going to meetings, do you think you may have forgotten some or left a few out?

I may have forgotten some, but I think that covers it pretty well.

pf: or if you forgot some lets say would it be more than 3 that you would have forgotten?

it wouldnt have been more than that.

pf: how many men from tr were there altogether before boll lost out attending meetings?

say probably a good forty.

pf: slight discrepancy, because 25% of 40 would be 10, and you actually named 15, so if its 25% who stopped coming it would have to be something like 4 times 15 which would be 60. which to you would seem to be the more secure figure--these you are sure of, you picked out individual names, thats the most solid piece of evidence in terms of memory, so what we got to do is work back from this. if this is true and only 40 people attended then obviously a greater % than 25 dropped out, or do you think it is possible that something closer to 60 people attended meetings from the tr?

no, I would say the 40 figure is more like it.

pf: so that your estimate of 25% ~~would~~ who dropped out would be off. so that would be  $15/40 = 3/8$  so you are off by 12%. so then you get something like closer to  $1/2$  dropping out

end 5/19/76



Barney Kluck: outline/notes of conversations

mentioned MESA leaders: Smith, J.J. Griffin(american-born?)  
Tony Boll, Steve Tyll, Sam Brear(scots or english)

1939: Toolroom moved across the street  
Germans: most were catholics in plant  
TR: half Polish, half German  
(something about 2nd generation)  
has family history in possession

Tony Boll: more a trade(as opposed to industrial) unionist  
sunday meetings

Father(Kluck) was a company man, but saw need of union because  
of the abuses of the workers

*who? brear*  
*what?*  
3 or 4 scots/english, rest were polish, german

Tool room: age, 45-55  
in 1933: 1/2 were over 45; 1/3 under 25  
MESA met at slovak hall; 25¢/month  
10¢ raise

leaders: Boll, Brear(eng or scots); Dyer: spokesman, he left soon  
after(check this; Dyer still in plant in 1950's)

MESA offshoot of IAM; Brear, Dyer, JJ Griffin, Matt Smith held up  
IAM as example(was this in meetings that these men spoke of IAM?)

IAM bcg: a few shaper hands

IAM-Boll (something about Brear, Dyer and Boll relating to IAM(check)

(something about 75%; maybe inactive followers)

didn't mix socially(Kluck, other toolmakers???)

*++* Tyll family spearhead of CIO

Dyer and Brear leaned toward craft unionism

Coughlin: Barney was firm believer

revolution: 75% of people in TR thought there would be one  
Masons in Midland

II, b

production workers wanted into MESA, after 33 strike--34

press ops very much for, had close contact with die room

(everyday, 34-35) something about contact with prod workers

*change of prod workers attitudes*  
pre-strike: prod had heard of Union, didn't know much  
laughed at us during strike  
took us seriously after strike

1933: press room: 100-150 on two shifts

women: about 30

men; immigrants: 6-7 italians(4 black boys and their father, boys 2nd gen)

Poles 60 2nd gen 4 Pazzi boys, one stepbrother(caruso)

Italian foreman

20 2nd gen ~~poles~~ Poles (this is unclear, at least in my notes\*\*\*\*)

*Kotenko*  
*Borovich*

Pete Kotenko very revolutionary, most rev. (more so than Borovich, it seems)

Toolmakers were anti-Kotenko. K. outspoken at all meetings. rash

Incident: press room, saturday, picket line. Issue: piece-

work rate(a case of selfishness and individualism masking as workers

rights; foundation in fact, because wage adjustments, if gotten

away with on one job, may spread to other jobs)

in 39 picture changed, right to strike done away with. check this

1933-35: blacks on heavy truck assembly

Blacks

*aggressive self-interest individualism*



why?  
Blacks

after sitdown there was an increase in press ops and assemblers after 35, the blacks who were put on these jobs were new hires younger blacks more militant  
Papa Hicks a preacher  
Blacks called father 'Mr. Barney'  
(back to Press dept)

2nd gen showed strong interest in union in 33; 1st gen strong feeling (36 before strike) remarks: how we'd have security, seniority

1st gen expressed these thoughts only in 36

33, older people looking to us as leaders

(not on tape+++++) 1st gen had feeling it wouldn't amount to anything, after strike started to take different attitude.

1932, the NIRA (7a) and the 1st gen: it looked good (to them?)

and then fizzled

looked like union would fall apart (early UAW I assume)

Lewis, FDR, Murray: important factors

Blacks: more active during war: whites got theirs, blacks knew they had to fight; bloc voting

Hicks: more for union in general, younger workers differed

Bradfield had support from whites, Hicks, warfield

Women: lowest paid, gained more than anyone else

ethnic  
behavior /  
nationalism

form of  
white perceptions  
of Blacks

TR: attitude toward blacks: no close contact, some blacks respected only in capacity as workers; between 36 and 39 racist feeling developed

(not TR): they (the blacks) were getting too powerful.

39 not too much activity; 40, started war work (shell casings)

39/40: midland TR was sort of job shop, slight increase (5 or 6 men) mostly on lathes

Blacks went into welding: mainly prod people saw this as threat

Black steward (highest seniority) got crack at welding, or blacks got jobs through foreman

blacks looked up to whites, but the younger ones gradually

developed a different attitude; young blacks stuck together.

why, how?  
black generation  
gap

(end Fri, Mar 5, 1976)



I, a List

1933: nonunion workers. 10 aloof; 5-6 hostile(out of 100)  
Boll: "wooden shoes"  
(topics of conversation)  
Westra: father foreman tool and die repair(father or son?)  
no need for union--rugged individualist; non-ideological

white  
autz-family

Family--White on: "people who had relatives moved up faster."  
white wanted to stamp this out.  
Family ties: still had some after contract  
Boll and CIO: same (viewpoint?) on seniority  
steve tyll, dick woyshnar(no family) norm detloff(no family),  
gus zotz(no family)--same attitude toward seniority as white.

I, b

younger Poles followed white.  
wildcats(as vacations?) 75% of them were  
White, when steward, became more radical.  
25% of dept was polish, about 20 2nd gen(Detloff also went with this group)  
ed tyll, one other, didn't follow white  
Tyll vs. White: some conflict, not too much.  
issues: white, least seniority  
difference in work assignments: white: young poles not getting as good  
work as older germans, poles  
better work: type of dies--some required more skill than others  
that friction always there, not more specialization(?), question of  
opportunity to develop skills. slight basis in fact for this--you had  
to assert yourself.  
white enhanced position through speaking up to foremen

Poles felt that they had to break barrier that existed--esp germans  
during war quite a few ethnic slurs, no serious ground, opportunistic

gave capitalists?

white--drinking group--(4 or 5) not active, took aback seat, they  
never made a real study of unionism--the company was the enemy  
more freedom at their work(?)  
fishing trips brought about holiday with pay. mgmnt: boys need day  
off--holiday pay: social control  
equality with salaried(re vacation)--productivity increased 10%  
because of time off(and the question of turnover)  
mgmnt lost some control with union fear of losing job is gone  
post-war technical improvements offset gains labor made

II, a

Coughlin & Boll

Coughlin: lost 50% when he broke with FDR  
pro-Coughlin: would hear comments: C. had right idea about how country  
should change(36-37)  
Coughlin 38: joe nighting german catholic; gus zotz german lutheran  
they did most of the talking for coughlin  
they went with Boll  
not too many pro-coughlin vs fdr(a lot of people believed that Coughlin  
had opened up their eyes and ears)  
Germans vs. Poles: poles didnt have bona fide apprenticeship, were moving  
up by other means (years of service). Germans felt Poles not competely  
trained--true, they didn't serve a four year apprenticeship; Poles less  
skilled--before journeyman status, just went in and did job.  
Blacks and Poles: identity & debasement of job ("nigger")  
old vs new statuses: Poles pushed sons into tool and die

end 3/16/76



Scots. cant remember name, there was a scot active, always talking for the union. toolmaker. 45. seemed to follow Boll trade, not industrial nx consciousness; some figured they were on a higher plane. they welcomed the unskilled into the union, but they wanted to keep themselves on a higher plane--wage differential

T&D conferences 30's to 50's. some resistance to incursion of maint. 90% Trade Union conscious

[ at time of Kotenko raid--50-50(TR?) in factionalism  
TR in NLRB election: 75%+ for Boll

CIO leaders: Dyer  
Tyll(just in TR)

[ NLRB election: Press: 50%(Poles, 1st gen; women(15%)  
TR had 100 +

[ Assembly: maybe 75% cio, maybe more

CP-like: Kotenko

Kotenko-Borovich: more militant, overzealous

K B following in meetings: 20%(2 to 300)

50% black(maybe oden)

[ Blacks using left to push their own power(until they got some black committeemen)

black-left alliance in 40's; didnt become active til forties

meetings: 200 attendance

TR: later on Boll refused to come, others follow his lead

15 meeting attenders stopped coming(LIST)

40 + from TR attended meetings(highest attendance)

end 5/19/76

"Left"

re Dinkel