

B O O K 26

Paul Iaccino

PAUL IACCINO

Mr. Iaccino is a Chicago labor leader, former assistant to the president of the Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union Council, AFL-CIO and former Cook Co. Chairman of the Committee on Political Education, AFL

This interview was done by his son, Richard Iaccino and donated to our project.

Interview with Paul Iaccino
By Richard Iaccino
1973

I. Mr. Iaccino, first of all, the question I would like to begin with is what, in general, are the primary functions of COPE?

R . To get the unregistered voters registered to vote, I would say, is the primary function of COPE. After that, the committee has to raise money to establish a headquarters, and they can be set up either on a congressional district basis or on a ward by ward basis or township by township basis, but it depends strictly on the amount of manpower that you're able to pick up; that is to say the number of volunteers you can get to do the work. Basically, the function of COPE is to help develop some type of organization, and the way you get organization is to get volunteers from the unions to get the manpower you need to do such work as checking the registration lists against the union membership roster and any other lists which might show residents of the area where the COPE, organization is functioning. I say check the registration lists mainly to see that you have at least the union members registered. Therefore, the primary function of COPE organizations at all levels would be first and foremost to get the unregistered voters registered.

I. Are there any other functions of COPE? For instance, what about educating the voters, or getting out the vote? Are these functions of COPE? Are these functions left up to local organization?

R. First, you're asking about five questions in one, but the idea behind COPE is, of course, to educate, as indicated in the title of the committee, but education has been going on for years in the labormovement. It's a constant thing when it comes to politics. When it comes to endorsements, there are a number of ways to get endorsements. For national elections, that is strictly the National COPE's job to make endorsements at that level. For congressional and senate seats, the recommendations come from the State committees, where the candidates are running? If they are new candidates it is strictly the states prerogative to investigate, question or query the candidates on their positions qualifications, background, etc. If they are incumbents, the national committee keeps a running voting record of the candidates, which they issue to the state for the purpose of endorsements. In local elections, it is left up to the city COPE organizations- or central bodies to make endorsements for city and local governmental agencies. For state offices, it is left up to the state to make endorsements of the governor, state legislature and any other offices in state government. But the educational process is a continuous one that goes on all year round. Every international union's newspaper carries stories about what's happening in congress or in the state legislature in which the individual lives and works.

I. Then basically, the primary functions of COPE, either on the national, state, or local levels, is the same. That is to register the unregistered voters, to educate the voters, to

endorse candidates for public office, and even to help finance the candidate's campaign, as well as supply him with voluntary manpower to do the necessary work.

R. That's right.

I. My next question, then, would be what differences, if any, would there be between the national organization, the state and the local COPE organizations?

R. None really, other than the scope of the activities, such as the interviewing of candidates would be done on the local level for local state legislature offices or U.S. Congressional offices, with the local organization's recommendations being forwarded to the state or federal organizations for endorsements.

I. How would you define the differences between the functions of COPE in relation to the functions of the CIO's PAC or the **AFL's LLPE?**

R. The CIO's PAC went pretty much along the same lines of what I just mentioned. They were the recommending arm, the fund raising arm, the educational arm of the former CIO's PAC. The LLPE of the old AFL was more of an educational process, although within the Chicago area, they operated pretty closely with the Political Action Committee and on local levels were fairly identical, even though they maintained separate offices. They did a better job on the registration, because their unions were willing to give up their mailing lists of their members for registration at the time that they were in existence. Therefore, they had a better breakdown of their membership,

where In the CIO there was a tighter hold on mailing lists of international unions in the area. But when it came to the actual functions of the organizations the CIO did the "Jimmy Higgins" work. They were out in the precincts ringing doorbells, talking candidates in the shop, talking registration In the shop, talking issues. Therefore, the former CIO program , was mostly adopted into the COPE program. The COPE program today is really a combination of both former programs using the educational process, but also using the old CIO process of getting volunteers to give their time in the precincts working for either the candidate or the party of their choice. They do a lot of mailing, and overall it operates pretty much, like a political party would, developing a foothold in the community.

I. Would you say that there is anything new or different about the functions of COPE today, in comparison to PAC or LLPE going back prior to the merger in 1955? Are there any new programs or innovations?

R. One thing that is new is that all of the unions were asked to make a survey of all their members. They were to do a polling process to find out just how their members felt about candidates. I think they were able to do this because the labor movement was bigger after the merger. They developed a number of film programs that were used to conduct educational purpose8 in local unions. Other than that, the only newness

was the incorporating of the two into one operation with more cohesiveness of ideas and activities to coordinate and combine the efforts of both groups. There were a few new innovative ideas regarding publicity and media relations, development of films for registration, getting out the vote, and other films of this type, that came into being after the merger also.

I. How about the youth vote? Is that becoming part of the program now with the advent of the 18-year old vote?

R. There was a time when there was talk about developing a special youth program within COPE, and there is presently a sub-committee called "Frontlash" which functions primarily the same way as COPE. This, too, is an innovation which has developed since the merger and because of the 18 year old vote. They are, however, still in their infancy and are not really too sure of where they're going, because actually, the materials that are being put out by National COPE are not materials that are solely devoted to people over 18 years old; they're devoted to everyone who is eligible to vote. There have been many big discussions among the international unions as to whether they should set up separate groups just because of age. There's been a lot of resentment by many union members, feeling that you don't segregate but you bring together all of the forces that you have, 18 year olds and up, and even those over 65 who are retired, and try to keep them working together rather than in separate groups. In uniting, them you have more strength. By dividing them you have weakness.

I. That is an interesting point. With the advent of the 18 year old vote, COPE now has "Frontlash" as a sub-committee for the youth vote, Is there now, or do you foresee in the future a program for senior citizens?

R. When you are talking about senior citizens, if you're talking about those who are retired, there are programs in many unions that were established specifically for them. The only reason that was done is because they don't have the day-to-day contact in the plant or on the job anymore. They're away from it, and the only way you can get retired people to remain involved is by having something separate and different for them. As long as people are working inside of a plant, it doesn't make any difference what age they are; as long as they're old enough to work, programs have to be developed for understanding purposes but not for a segregated program of youth, adults and then senior citizens. The program of politics is politics, and you can't divide politics into segments because the ultimate goal is the same and you have to teach the old to continue doing what they've been doing to make sure that they get the right kind of people elected and in office in order to protect their special interest.

I. Well, as far as COPE is concerned, we'll get into the activities of COPE shortly, but as I understand it, one of the functions, of COPE is lobbying for specific legislation or against other legislation. Wouldn't these special programs for youth and senior citizens have closer contact with these

groups, in order to determine what types of legislation should be proposed and lobbied for and against in Washington?

R. Again, you're talking about two different things here. First, you're talking about them lobbying and that comes under the jurisdiction of the legislative committee of the AFL-CIO. When you're talking about issues, the issues come about as Congress is in session. The issues are developed from what they do or don't do, and the kind of program that labor looks for is developed by conventions of international unions who then recommend resolutions to the national AFL-CIO convention, which at that time develops the type of legislation that is considered Labor Legislation, which doesn't necessarily mean that it just deals with wages, hours and working conditions or contracts that unions develop and agree on with management. It covers more than that; it's a complete social reform type-of legislation that is developed by the unions, that they feel is going to be beneficial, not only to union people, but to all people who have to work for a living.

I. Mr. Iaccino, you began during our previous discussion on the functions of COPE to discuss some of the various activities of COPE. I'd like to go back now and ask, what are some of the primary activities that COPE becomes involved in? What basically does COPE do?

R. Well I think. one of the first things that unions are asked to do is to establish a COPE committee within their own local unions. This committee is given certain direction by their own international union as to what they're supposed to do. Each international union has its own way of operating when it comes to COPE, and these committees follow a pattern or a by-law provision to establish the committee. The local union committee's function is to do the educating of the members of that local union, regarding the issues of the day.

The local committee is also asked to see if they can get volunteers from within the membership of their local to participate in the overall "local area COPE". The function of the local area -COPE is to educate, train, bring to the attention of the committee the issues that are at stake, help to develop a screening process to screen candidates, do some of the raising of money to keep the local area COPE in operation, and teach the individual how to be a precinct worker. When the individual learns to be a precinct worker he then knows how to talk to people in order to get his points across. He then goes out to visit all union people, whether registered or unregistered, to relate the issue to them and also the candidates and what they stand for.

I. Are you speaking now of just the local union COPE committee and the local area COPE?

R.. No, because this carries upward into the central area COPE committees.

I. Would these same activities, then, carry upward all the way to the national COPE?

R. That's right.

Would this be because of the local union's autonomy and tightly knit structure and the federations at the higher level being more weakly knit?

R. That's correct. Therefore the national COPE would ordinarily follow the dictates of the state COPE and state COPE would follow the dictates of the central area COPE, etc. , down the local union COPE committees.

I. You mentioned before, fundraising. There has been some, or quite a bit of discussion over recent years regarding where the funds from unions, which are donated to political candidates, come from. How is the money raised, who does it go to and how is it supposed to be used?

R. Well, there are a number of ways that it is raised and certain monies can be used in the local campaigns, and these monies can be treasury monies. They can be raised in a couple of ways. One is by local unions taking from their treasury monies to contribute to local candidates. Another way of raising funds would be to run different types of affairs, such as dances or raffles where the individual buys the tickets

themselves and these monies can be used In any fashion because it comes out of the pockets of the individual and not out of union treasuries. The other way of raising money is by the voluntary dollar contribution, which is money that can be used for federal candidates. This money, then, goes to the national COPE, which in turn returns a portion of it to the states, who then in turn, turn over the money to the Congressional district's COPE organizations and the Congressional candidates throughout their state. So basically, there are only the three ways of raising funds, either a social function or raffle, treasury money, or the voluntary COPE dollar.

I. We were talking a little bit before about some of the other activities, like doorbell ringing, lobbying, and canvassing both the local union and also the local area. Does COPE have a program set up for the training of the leaders in each of these areas, such as on the local union level, in the local area COPE, in the Congressional districts, etc.?

R . There used to be an extensive training program, but we have to go back again to the difference between the former AFL and the former CIO political programs. The former CIO used to conduct an extensive precinct training program that ran one night per week for two or three hours over a six-week period. It was conducted so that the individual precinct worker, and he wasn't called a "captain", just merely a union precinct worker or a PAC precinct worker, was trained enough so that he knew if any type of a problem arose in that precinct, he would be capable of resolving that problem. through the political machinery

in the precinct or either the Republican or Democratic precinct captains or both. He was able to make sure that the garbage was picked up and knew who to contact in the ward if it wasn't. He knew how to handle many personal problems so that he became a very effective part of the precinct set-up. This kind of a program has now been somewhat diminished, and there's no longer the straight training of being a good precinct worker, but being a precinct worker who knows how to register and knows how to get the vote out. So a change has taken place since the merger, but I guess it was found to be more expedient to train people how to be a precinct worker and just take care of the problems of getting people registered, learning about the issues and getting the people out to vote for the candidates that COPE had endorsed,

I. The old functions of the precinct worker, then, sort of crossed lines with the community services programs of the unions.

R. That's right. In fact, one of the six evenings was devoted, entirely to community services.

I. Was this a better program, in your opinion, at that time than the present COPE program? Or should COPE be concerned only with the political education and the election of candidates favorable to Labor's point of view?

R. I think that COPE should pick up where PAC left off, because a precinct worker should be a precinct worker on a year round basis. If he expects to get people out to vote, he's going to have to know who they are. If he has done some favor for them, then they're sure to respond with a favor in return,

and really this is what politics is all about, in my judgement, it's helping people out when they can't help themselves. If the precinct worker is well trained and knows where to get the answers and get problems resolved, then he's going to be looked up to when it comes to getting people out to register and getting them out to vote. So I think the COPE machinery should reconsider some of its past experiences that the CIO had in PAC. They were good experiences, too. They proved to be very worthwhile and helpful at a time when the labor movement was at its highest peak of power because it had "real" trained precinct workers.

I. Mr. Iaccino, during the 1952 national elections the CIO Political Action Committee(PAC) and the AFL political arm, Labor's League for Political Education (LLPE) seemed to be at odds with one another, and the trade union movement seemed to be politically fragmented. At this time the APL people and the United Mine Workers seemed to be in favor of Alben Barkley for the Democratic Presidential nomination; yet the CIO people were against Barkley as a Presidential candidate. John L. Lewis attacked the CIO vehemently for their position, flashing the label "commie" at the CIO throughout his attack. This leads me to believe that there was a strong difference in political philosophies between the AFL and the CIO. More recently we have seen the Teamsters ousted from the AFL-CIO and the UAW voluntarily divorce itself from the AFL-CIO. Does some of this same animosity still exist between the AFL and the CIO, and does it become, prevalent in the, activities of today's committee on Political Education?

R. Well, to begin with, you're talking about something that goes way back to '52. The CIO at that particular time in history were out in favor-of Adlai Stevenson. John Lewis, you must remember, had been disturbed about an earlier election, and he decided that he was going to pull away from all political endorsements and make his own endorsements. So this may just have been a follow-up of that particular time. As far as the former CIO is concerned, they felt that Adlai Stevenson was the most qualified man in this country to lead it, and I'm sure that as history goes on, it will be recorded that he was "knocked out of the box" not so much for his ties with Americans for Democratic Action or any "commie" grow, so to speak, because he wasn't. He was just a man with alot " of intelligence that just couldn't understand. He was too Intelligent for the people in that particular time in history. There was no question in the minds of the former CIO people about Al Barkley as a vice presidential possibility again, but they were concerned more about who the presidential candidate should be and who was best qualified to fill the spot. John L. Lewis was just, disturbed about anything that the former CIO was doing in those days anyway. AFL President Greene and he had some ill feelings between the two of them from the beginning. They never did like each other, especially after Lewis pulled a few of the internationals out of the AFL and formed the CIO. So there was never any love lost there, but the CIO had gone right down the line as far as the Stevenson nomination. Some of the AFL unions fell in line after this; it wasn't just a straight rejection by the AFL at that time of the Stevenson nomination. There were a few unions within

the APL that sided in with the CIO at that time and made the endorsements of Stevenson and Sparkman.

I. In some -of our previous discussions of these subjects over the past years, there was some mention made that some of the upper echelon of the AFL, especially the AFL as individuals, tended to lean more toward the Republicans rather than the Democratic candidates. However, the trade union movement as a whole generally supported the Democrats. Does this type of situation still exist today? Could this be part of the reason for the AFL-CIO's refusal, to endorse either George McGovern or Richard Nixon? Or were there other factors involved here?

R. Part of what you say is true. There were and still are former AFL unions who endorse Republican candidates, but the number is getting fewer. This past election you had the majority of AFL-CIO unions not endorsing anyone and a few of them endorsing McGovern. Then on the other hand, you had a few of the independents, the -Auto Workers, for example, who endorsed McGovern and the Teamsters who endorsed Nixon. So I think that this type of situation is going to be part of the labor movement all of the time. .I don't think there will ever come a time in organized labor when all unions will agree on one particular presidential candidate. It's never happened before and I can't see it happening now.

I. Does the present split between the UAW and the AFL-CIO and also the Teamsters being thrown out of the AFL-CIO have any relation to the political philosophies of the AFL-CIO, or were there other factors involved?

R .No, there were not political philosophies that caused this. While the Auto Workers remained in the AFL-CIO one of the Reuther brothers was running the political registration drive for the AFL-CIO. He conducted a program that ran from one end of the country to the other with full backing of the AFL-CIO. So with the UAW there wasn't a political philosophy that caused the split but rather the feeling that the AFL-CIO. should change some of its top leadership and if this would have happened, the UAW would never have pulled out of the AFL-CIO. The Teamsters, on the other hand, first of all were thrown out of the AFL-CIO, and one of the reasons for it was the president of the Teamsters. At the time, one of the reasons that they still are not back in, is because they were given a directive by the AFL-CIO that to come back in they were going to have to "clean house." Evidently the AFL-CIO at the present time doesn't feel that they have "cleaned house," and therefore they aren't back in yet. But the principle reason that the Teamsters supported Nixon in the last campaign is because of the favor that he had done for them in letting their former president out of prison. So there was a political philosophy which was based on expedience on the part of the Teamsters in endorsing Nixon. It was a commitment that if Hoffa came out, then the Teamsters would support the Nixon administration in the campaign.

I. Right now we're talking about a number of different-things. Since the main subject is the development of COPE since the merger, I'd like to ask when COPE comes into the picture, in reference to alot of the things we've been talking about here in the last hour? How much has COPE become more or less sophisticated since the merger. in terms of what the two separate groups were, PAC and LLPE, before the merger?

R. PAC was, prior to the merger, using every type of media available to them to conduct the educational aspects of their program, whereas, LLPE was limiting its efforts to the types of materials that could be sent to the homes of its members rather than a concerted educational effort. As for the sophistication of COPE, there is more sophistication because there are new developments, that have been introduced into the COPE programs, such as computer systems. This, of course, is one of the big ones, because they feel that if they can computerize the entire membership of the AFL-CIO, at least they'll have the beginning of a better orientation as to whether or not these members are still alive, whether or not they're registered to vote, and if they're not, they can use printouts to get out to the Congressional districts to get these people registered and then get them out to vote. A number of things have now been done with COPE that I can't recall ever having been done before. One was international unions giving up their mailing lists for certain campaigns. In other words, one of the big things that was done in the State of Illinois, was when Paul Douglas . 'ran against Percy the international unions gave their mailing lists to the state of Illinois COPE, with all the members in Illinois, and a publication was put out specifically for the state by national COPE dealing with Douglas and Percy. There were thousands and thousands and thousands of mailings that went out to all of the members in the state of Illinois, which is the first time anything like that had ever been tried. So there are many new things that have come out and onto the market that can be beneficial to any political activity, and COPE is experimenting with them. If they feel it could be used, they're trying it out.

I. Mr. Iaccino, today I want to talk about COPE operations and I want to set up a situation here and I'd like you to explain to me what COPE can do, how they operate, and so on. As I get into the situation, you'll see what I'm asking for. Let us assume that I have decided that I would like to run for a public office of some sort. Now the first thing that I'll have to do is possibly run in a primary, become nominated or submit nominating petitions. Of course the submission of nominating petitions would be first. Now from this point, how would I go about getting the support of organized labor and of the Committee on Political Education (COPE)? Secondly, what does COPE have to offer to me today, aside from their endorsement, in the way of manpower, funding, etc. to help me to get elected?

R. I think your first analysis of how you go about getting on the ticket should be reconsidered, because if you're looking for not only the endorsement but the financial help and manpower that's needed to conduct a campaign, it would seem to me that the first place you should be is to COPE and have them help you get the petitions and have them help you with the political organizations, which ever one of the parties you would want to run in.

I. Alright then; how would I go about that? How would I contact COPE? Where can I find them? What should I bring to them in, terms of credentials or attitudes or philosophies that will more readily make me acceptable to them as a possible candidate for political office?

R. First of all, you're telling me everything that you should be bringing to them and that's exactly what you'll have to bring

to them. But it depends on the office that you're running for.

If you're running in a local election, or if you want to run for an alderman or if you want to run for a state, representative, this is where you go first.

I. Let's say U.S. Congress!

R. If you want to run for Congress, then you check with the state AFL-CIO; you let them know what Congressional district you're in, then they'll put you in touch with the fellow or woman who's heading up that Congressional district and you go over and visit with them. In visiting with them, you take your credentials; you let them know what your philosophies are, even if you have to put them in writing; you give them your background; let them know where you stand. And then go to them, and if they feel that you're the kind of a person that they'll want to help, they'll help you to get on the ballot. If it means the getting of names on petitions, they can give you any manpower they have to help you get petitions signed. Once you're on the ballot and you've cleared all these other hurdles and you meet the qualification of endorsement by COPE, you'll get the endorsement of the state organization of COPE, and they, in turn, will give you whatever they can to help, whether it's financial or manpower or whatever it is that you need. You won't get a lot of financial help because there's limited monies in Congressional races because of the federal law that prohibits the use of treasury funds for federal candidates, but there are limited funds that national COPE has, and they make the determination of how much it would be that you'll get, but the manpower is available to you, that is whatever manpower is in that Congressional

district that the COPE Congressional district can muster to help you out.

Ii Alright, what kind of assistance can COPE give me in terms of gaining the support of the regular organizations, either Democratic or Republican?

R. Again, it depends on the area that you're in. If you're in an area that is predominantly Republican and this is the party that you want to run in, it might be that the COPE committee is in the opposite camp. They might not be able to give you any help with the party, but they can help you with the funds, manpower, and getting your name on the ballot by petitions.

I. Would COPE also be able to assist me in finding an adequate campaign headquarters?

R. They could either help you find it or they could let you work right out of their own headquarters.

I. Alright, now let's say I reach the point of getting on the ballot. I have the support of the regular organizations. I have the support of COPE. I have whatever manpower is available to me. I have whatever financial assistance is available to me. What happens now? What does COPE do from this point on? How can they help me now to get elected to that office?

R. Well, again they can do a number of things. They can either help you to get out the vote, getting the registered voters out to vote, which is one way. They can help you by putting a mailing out to all the union members in that district, letting them know who you are, and that you're running, and that you have the endorsement of COPE. They might even be able to get you sound trucks.

It depends on what your total needs are and how big the Congressional

district manpower in that particular COPE district is, as to how much help you're going to get, but you'll find them out on the corners with you, if you want to make distributions of any kind to any mass numbers of people either at elevated stations or at bus stops or shopping centers or any place that you need them. All you have to do is ask and they'll be there.

I. What about local races? Let's step down a little from the Congressional level, because this is sort of a high level of involvement. Let's say, for instance, that I want to run for such a thing as a township office or a village office or a park district, office, or something along these lines. How deeply involved can COPE get in elections of this nature? Can they give me the same type of support? Not necessarily to the same degree, but can they give me all of the same things in a smaller election as they did in the larger election?

R. Well, again it all depends on how that particular COPE committee is set up. You know that they're set up on a Congressional basis, and if there are any segmented political races they can get as involved as they are physically capable of. There is no limitation, other than their size and capabilities and the size of the campaign. In other words, if you're-running for a park district position and your area is of such a nature that there is very little unionization or very few union members in the area, then the amount of manpower you're going to be getting is very limited and that is true also of funds, but they can get as involved as they want, even down to the position of dog catcher if they want, if that is a position that's elected in any particular community.

I. Let's go beyond this now into something a little more complex. In some of the readings I've seen where referendum votes were won or lost, depending solely on the union vote. What would be different, if anything, about a referendum vote or bond issue vs. a candidate running for public office as far as COPE activities are concerned?

R. There isn't too much difference because there is an issue at stake, and if the COPE committee feels that they want to become involved in any type of a referendum, regardless of what effect it's going to have; after it is decided what direction they're going, there's no reason why they can't get as deeply involved in that as in an election of a candidate. Bond issues are bond issues, and they, affect the pocketbook of the union members as well as the non-union member. If they feel that it's important enough, they can put out literature, they can do mailings, they can hold meetings. There's no limit to what they can do if they want to. It just depends on how active they want to become. This has happened already! A good example is out on the south side. I think it was in Calumet City about 6 or 7 years ago, I got a call from a young typographical union member who was very much concerned about a bond issue that was being raised in Calumet City dealing with schools. He was quite incensed about it and wanted to know what he could do. The only thing that we had out in the area was just one or two people who had been involved in the 4th Congressional District, but we had a few names of union people out there and we just gave him the names. He contacted the people; they knew other union people in the area; and they started a chain movement of getting the union people together. They each contributed a few dollars and they went out and had some materials printed as to why they felt that the bond issue wasn't a

good one and delivered it to all of the residents in the community and were able to defeat the- bond issue. So it depends on how much- the individual COPE group wants to do, how much they want to get involved, and how much time they want to spend.

I. Let's try to get a little more specific for a moment. Let's take this example that you give of the school bond and let's put some qualifiers to it. Let's say that the bond issue itself is for the school system to gain more money for more buildings and classrooms and things of this nature. Now, let's also add a situation. Let's say that the teachers in this school district have organized into the Teachers' Union, but the school district refuses . to recognize the union as the legitimate bargaining agent for the teachers, and therefore refuse to meet with them in contract negotiations. Meanwhile, the bond issue is coming up and the teachers are asking for more money, but the bond issue does not include any provisions for increases in salaries and fringe benefits for the teachers. Let's say that a fairly good sized COPE organization is involved in this area. What kind of thing would be proper for COPE to do in this type of a relationship or situation? Can they legitimately become involved in the squabbles of another union to become recognized?. Of course, they could go out and work against the referendum vote or bond issue, using as their reasoning that the school district is refusing to acknowledge the Teachers' Union as the bargaining agent, but what other types of pressure can be used, as far as COPE is concerned, and the trade union movement, to gain recognition for the Teachers ' Union as the bargaining agent, and at the same time see that the interests of the people are met in terms of getting more classrooms, etc.?

R. Well, this is a double-pronged question that you don't answer with yes or no, and you really can't answer with a long dissertation either, because when you have situations of -this kind, if the COPE committee in that particular community is a good one and is functioning well, whether it's big or small is immaterial. One of the first things it would do in this particular instance would be to get in contact with the Teachers Union and work with them in whatever way they could to bring both conclusions to a good ending. If the bond issue had nothing in it dealing with teachers' salaries, as you state, and the only thing that they were concerned about naturally -had nothing to do with recognition of the teachers, because that has nothing to do with the bond issue, I'm sure that the COPE committee would just go out and beat it down, because they knew that the teachers were in a plight, because if they were going to do anything, the possible chance of a strike is imminent, and one of the major issues in that strike would be additional wages, so this might be a way of letting the school board know that if the teachers aren't provided for then the bond issue just isn't going, to pass, by defeating a bond issue for schools. That's one thing that could be done. On the other hand, there are things that could be done, too. If the COPE committee is one that is really on the ball, it would or should be very active in election of members for school boards. Now that can be a good thing and it could be a bad thing. I recall where a case came to me where there were three members of unions on the school board out in LaGrange, and when it came to unions negotiating with the school board all three union members acted like they were management. They did everything they could possibly do to create all kind of problems for the unions

that were in negotiations. The union came to me and asked if I would get in contact with these people. One was an Auto Worker, another was a Steel Worker and the other was a Teamster. The union felt that I should try to talk to them and influence them to be more like union members in negotiations and not management people. Well, all kind of hell broke loose. They still didn't do it. They felt that they were representing their community and they were elected by their community and therefore had to protect their community from unions higher wages and that sort of thing, when they were still negotiating higher wages and all kinds of benefits for themselves with the companies they were working for. So it can have its good effect and bad effect, but if the COPE committee is a good committee it becomes involved in all of the politics of the local community and right across the board into the national politics. It can be very helpful if it functions, but it's got to be a year round functioning operation, not just a two month operation just before elections.

I. Mr. Iaccino, what kind of effect does the endorsement of the Committee on Political Education have on the voting public or on union members in a given election? Or does it have any effect?

R. Union members have been rather educated in looking to the leadership of their union to find out just what the candidate running for office has done. A record is kept of the voting of the candidate, and the union then distributes these, voting records to the members. By doing this the member then has some idea and can make a decision within his own mind as to whether or not the candidate is a person who is interested in the well being of the union member.

I. Let us take an example. If I were to receive the endorsement of the Committee on Political Education to run for a political office, what would this mean to me? Does it have a meaning? Does the general public or that portion of the general public which is represented by organized labor readily recognize and go along with these endorsements?

R. Generally the union member follows the endorsements which are recommended to him by the leaders of organized labor. This doesn't necessarily mean that just because there has been a COPE endorsement that all union members are going to vote for those particular candidates. They still are voting in a secret election and once they are in the polling place and in the booths no one knows how they vote. If you take instances where studies have been made, you can find that generally the union member does follow the COPE endorsement. Sometimes a

candidate can be hurt by a COPE endorsement and, using you as an example again and depending on the area in which you live and in which you are running, a COPE endorsement can possibly make you lose an election rather than win it.

I. Do the COPE endorsements follow any standard political line? There seems to be a concensus of opinion that organized labor predominantly leans towards the Democratic party. Is this true and if so, why is it true?

R. Yes, organized labor does lean more to the Democratic party. The reason is very simple, the Democratic party is the more liberal of the two parties and does consider legislation and it's way of voting in a fashion that will benefit the larger majority of the overall citizenry in this country. Where there are liberal republicans COPE makes endorsements of them, too, but they have to be people who are concerned with the people and their voting records must show this.

I. I have looked over very carefully a number of the issues of the Illinois State ADL-CIO Weekly News Letter in which legislative recommendations are made right around election and primary time. I have noticed that there are examples where Republicans are indicated as good legislative choices for both the Illinois General Assembly and the United States House of Representatives and Senate. Can we assume then that organized labor generally takes a position of independence in the making of their endorsements?

R. Independence or non-partisanship?

I. Non-partisanship.

R. Well if you found in the legislative news letter the endorsement of both Democrats and Republicans then you find it has taken a position of non-partisanship. If they were just voting or just endorsing one political party, then you would have to say they were tied lock, stock and barrel to that party. The unions have no quarrel with either party. It's the man himself that they have the quarrel with. If the man votes according to his conscience and his conscience happens to be within the realm of legislation that the Labor Movement is interested in, this is all the unions are concerned with. But it's true, too, if the legislators are only voting along party lines, are not concerned with whether or not that legislation is good or bad, they could be voting in opposition to the positions of the Labor movement. In that sense they wouldn't get the endorsement and it wouldn't make any difference whether they were a Democrat or Republican.

I. I mentioned before the word independent. Could it be said that, organized labor takes the position of being independent of either of the two groups?

R. It is independent. It has nothing to do, as far as the candidate is concerned, in the policy making positions of either party. Therefore, it has to be Independent. If it were not independent it would be worthless. Then it would be part of one political party or the other.

I. You mentioned the word liberal. I would like to pose another situation to try to get an idea of what happened and why in the recent election of United States senator. A liberal Republican, Charles Percy, received the endorsement

of some factions or organized labor and a conservative Democrat, Roman Pucinski, received the overall endorsement of the AFL-CIO within the state of Illinois. What happened there and why did this take place? If organized labor generally will lean toward a liberal Individual or liberal office seeker, why, then, would the AFL-CIO endorse a conservative for United States senator who happened to be a Democrat over a liberal Republican?

R. Maybe what you should do before you ask a question like that is begin to define what is meant by liberal and conservative. Again the AFL-CIO makes its endorsements based on the individual's voting record. At the time the two people you're talking about ran for the office, the voting record of Congressman Pucinski was by far the more liberal of the two. There was only one instance where Pucinski's voting record showed that he was conservative and that was on the issue of bussing where he was an ultra conservative. The rest of his voting record was about 90%, as far as the unions were concerned or the AFL-CIO was concerned. Percy's record at that time was hitting, just about the 70% mark. So you have one with a higher percentage voting record in favor of liberal legislation vs. a 70% voting record of a so-called "liberal Republican."

I, Then the definition of the two words "liberal" and "conservative" as we're using them, is the standard accepted definition of those two words, the liberal ideology and the conservative ideology. Am I correct?

R. I think so.

I. Mr. Iaccino, we've already established the fact that historically organized labor has more or less followed the Democratic party line for the most part, with numerous exceptions. In the early history of organized labor there was quite an attempt at each presidential nominating convention to have labor segments added to the national party platform for both parties, Republican and Democratic. Is this still common practice? Does organized labor go to both the Republican and Democratic national conventions seeking to have favorable planks to labor added to the national platform?

R. The Labor movement has always gone to both parties requesting that their platforms include certain type of legislation, mostly social legislation that affects not only those people who are members of organized labor but all people in this country. They have asked both parties when they develop their platform that each segment of social legislation be made part of both Republican and Democratic platforms. The Democratic party in most instances has been willing to take parts of the Labor Movement ideas and put them into the Democratic platforms. The Republican party in most instances has refused to do this and in only a few instances have they ever added to their platform any of these suggested planks that the Labor Movement has requested.

I. IS there a reason for this in terms of why the Republican party tends to shy away from adding to its platform those things that organized Labor has requested?

R. I think there is. The Republican party has proven to be the party of the rich and therefore not concerned as much

with the poor people or the people who have to work for a living or the blue collar workers or even today the white collar workers. They're concerned only with large profits which the major corporations will gain if they get into office. This is where the Republican party gets its money to operate with and therefore they're just not going to disturb too much the position, they have with large corporations. This is one of the big reasons that the Republican party does not and will not add to it's platform those things that are beneficial to the little person in this country.

I. It's been my understanding that for the most part many of the things that organized Labor has asked for in the party platforms have been on a nature of social equality and social justice. It would seem to me that the Republican party would benefit in terms of large numbers of voters by supporting things which are to the advantage of the society in terms of bettering the society as a whole. Again I would like to pose another situation to you in reference to the last national presidential election where you had an ultra-liberal candidate in George McGovern running for the presidency against the conservative Richard Nixon. The AFL-CIO refrained from making any endorsement and the incumbent president won by an overwhelming majority, Is there any type of conclusion that can be drawn from this in view of the fact that the AFL-CIO refused to endorse either candidate? Did this have any effect on the outcome of that election?

R. I don't think the endorsement, in this particular instance, had any effect on the election. As we are watching today, with

the scandal regarding that particular election, I don't think any endorsement for either one of the candidates would have made any difference. The AFL-CIO refused to make an endorsement of McGovern. They felt that the position he was taking was just the exact extreme of the position that the incumbent Nixon was taking. The AFL-CIO was never one who has been all the way to the right or all the way to the left. They're always somewhere in between, and this is one of the reasons there was no endorsement made of McGovern.

I. Do you believe the same could be said of the Senatorial election with Pucinski and Percy, in view of the fact that Pucinski received the AFL-CIO endorsement and yet lost the election by an overwhelming majority was there any effect on that election by the fact that Pucinski received that endorsement or not? Did the presidential election have anything to do with helping to carry Percy back into the Senate over Pucinski, or were there other factors involved?

R. There were many other factors involved. The whole political climate in the state of Illinois and the Democratic party, was such that it was divided to such an extent that there was no real drive made because of the splintering off of the so-called independent Democrats from the regular Democratic organization. This didn't help Pucinski and it didn't help other Democratic candidates, plus the fact that the Nixon landslide victory was so great it was almost impossible for most of the Democratic candidates in the last election to become elected.

I. Perhaps we're taking two different elections to try to analyze in the same year, and perhaps we really can't reach any concrete conclusion from them. Would you say, however, that the COPE endorsement of a political candidate, be it Republican or be it Democratic, has an effect on the outcome of that election, and if so, in what direction?

R. It could have. Again, as I have said earlier, a lot depends on the district or the area in which the candidate is running. If there is sufficient manpower, and when I say manpower I'm talking about voters that are from the organized labor movement, the chances for that candidate are going to be much better than if he is in a rival area where most of the population is made up of farmers and small businessmen. Therefore, the amount of activity that is put on for the candidate in the district in which he is running can be an important factor for him being elected.

I, We've discussed here in previous parts of this interview what COPE does for a political candidate once he has received the endorsement of that organization. Would you briefly summarize what kind of things organized labor does for a political candidate who has received that endorsement?

R. Well, they do a number of things. They raise money for the candidates; they help find volunteers within the labor movement to help in the campaign ringing doorbells, stuffing envelopes, sticking stamps on envelopes, doing the typing, running off literature, helping develop the literature.

There are many things that are done. There just isn't one set thing that is done for a candidate once he gets the endorsement. Depending on what the candidate's needs are, the Labor movement will try to help the best they can with trying to accomplish what is needed.

I. I would assume that the same types of physical support are given to candidates at all different levels of political activity, be it a local village election or an election to the federal House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate or the presidential seat itself. The difference would only be that the amounts and type of physical support given would vary, depending on the office for which the candidate is running. Can there be any conclusion drawn, in terms of COPE's political effectiveness by the difference in the level of offices which is being sought? In other words, does COPE seem to be more effective on the local village level or the state level or at the federal level and if so, why would this be true?

R. COPE is only effective when it can receive the voluntary help from its members. If there is a local village situation where a candidate is running and that particular area has a good concentration of trade unionists and they want to become active in any type of campaign, even as low as for dog catcher in the village, they can be very effective. A lot is dependent on the type of leadership that is in the area whether it be local village leadership of the union, or whether it be city, county, state, or national. Much is dependent on the type of leadership and the willingness of trade unionists to volunteer their time and services to get candidates elected.

I. In other words then, there is no general conclusion that can be drawn in terms of whether or not COPE is physically more effective on a congressional level vs. a local level, or a, congressional level vs. a statewide level.

R. No, there are no conclusions that can be drawn. The candidate is important. The numbers of people who belong to unions living in the area is important. The need for certain kind of people to be elected in certain areas because of local needs is important. There are many things that go into the effectiveness of the COPE operation. It's not one or two or three particular items. It's generally many and circumstances that dictate the amount of activity that COPE has within any particular area.

I. Let's once again try and take a situation and see if we can analyze it. Congressman Frank Annunzio, in the redistricting of the State of Illinois, lost the district which he was representing. Because of the fact that Roman Pucinski was running for the Senate of the United States, Congressman Annunzio was then moved into the district that Pucinski represented up to that time. I know that COPE was very active physically in that. election. I also know that the endorsement of Congressman Annunzio was basically a regular practice because of his background and his position on legislation which was beneficial to organized labor. Now since COPE was so active in that election, could it be said that they played a major role in the successful campaign of Congressman Annunzio to be elected to represent that district where Annunzio was an Italian-American running

in a predominantly Polish-American district. That district is a well mixed district. It might be that of all the ethnic groups, the Poles may have more, but it's pretty well mixed ethnically, so the change of the name Pucinski to Annunzio had no bearing at all on the outcome. It was strictly the total activity of that particular congressional district COPE team that had been started many years ago and maintained itself as a very active group that was able, not only in Annunzio's campaign, but because of their activity they were able year after year to reelect Pucinski in that district. All that was done was just put that same manpower together and put it, into gear to work for another name, and that's how Annunzio was elected in that district. It happens to be one of the best organized COPE congressional districts in the country.

I. Then COPE was the major factor in that district, not only in getting Pucinski elected but also Annunzio in this last election?

R. That's right!

I. There were some problems that arose in that congressional district in that campaign and there was some concern, at least at one point, that it was going to be a difficult election year for Annunzio in that particular district. My early assumption was that 'because of the large concentration of Polish-American citizens within that area and the name Annunzio, this might have a bearing on the outcome of the election. Was that a factor at all? Secondly, what were those problems and how would COPE go about breaking down this type of barrier?

R. I think the fact that Pucinski put his hat in the ring for the Senate of the United States, that this changed the problem that might have existed if Annunzio had run against Pucinski in

the primary and Pucinski would have lost. I feel then Annunzio, running without the support of the Pucinski name, could have done alot of damage. The Poles rallied around Pucinski and again I can't say they were 100% for him because they weren't. The Polish community was divided into two political segments just like any ethnic group, but because of no primary campaign of any kind, and the pulling together of Pucinski and Annunzio, and the fact that COPE was in there with manpower and some money, I think these were the factors of Annunzio's overcoming whatever difficulties might have arisen.

I. Do you have any first hand knowledge of what problems there were that caused some concern about whether Annunzio was going to be elected once the primary situation had passed and the race had gone into the stretch, so to say, for the general election?

R. I think the only thing I was able to detect, at that particular time, was the fact that Annunzio did not have residence in the area and he had to establish residence. It seems this was the major fear on the part of many that Annunzio might not be able to carry the district. On the other hand he proved that this was not a major factor because both he and Pucinski did put together a sizable vote in the congress district, with Annunzio winning that seat and Pucinski carrying the major segment of the vote out of that district for his campaign for U.S. Senator. So there was rather a good cohesiveness between the two.

I. Mr. Iaccino, I am aware for the most part that financial support coming from COPE varies from campaign to campaign, election to election, year to year, situation to situation. I have, however, some questions which pertain to COPE's financial support of campaigns and candidates. First, what kind of financial support is given to a candidate who has received the endorsement in terms of the average amount of money paid out in a given campaign of the size which Congressman Annunzio carried on?

R. Well, there are a number of ways which COPE looks at each individual campaign. On the congressional district level, the maximum that can be given is \$2,000, but many endorsed candidates don't get any financial support at all. There are other factors, however, to take into consideration. These factors are the type of district, whether it is considered a safe district in which the candidate is running or whether he's running in a district where there is no chance of his winning. In such cases as that there are token money finances which are given to him.

I. What do you mean by token monies?

R. Well, maybe \$200 or maybe as high as \$500, but never exceeding \$500. You raised the question before of where these monies come from. The monies that are given to federal candidates are monies that have to be of a voluntary nature. They have to be raised on a voluntary basis. In other words, they can't be monies that can be deducted from dues dollars of union members. It has to be what is known by law as "free money." This means the unions have to go out and ask their-members to make a Voluntary contribution to COPE. Therefore, the amount of money that COPE

has is very limited and they have to be used in the best way that COPE can make use of them. On the other hand, if a candidate is not running for a federal office, then local union treasury money can be used. So candidates who run for the state legislature can get monies contributed directly from local union treasuries. This is true also or local community candidates, city wide candidates who run on a city-wide basis, aldermen who run within the city limits, and also county elections. So, as I said, the monies that COPE has are limited and maximums and minimums have to be put on these monies. They have to be put into areas where the national COPE organization feels that the candidate has the best chance of winning.

I. Mr. Iaccino, we've been talking about the effects of COPE's financial support to campaigns. In discussing where the money comes from and if there are maximum and minimum amounts that would be given to a candidate who has received the endorsement of COPE are there any stipulations as to what the money is used for?

R. No, there is no stipulation but the candidate must account for the money and how it was used to COPE and also to the federal government if it's a federal candidate. If it's a local candidate running for some state office the accounting has to be made to State COPE on how this money has been used. So it can be used for anything at all. There is no stipulation as to whether it's used in advertising, whether it's used for printed material, or whether it's used for phones or payment of rent for campaign offices. It is to be used as the candidate feels it is most needed.

I. In other words COPE doesn't have to be used for COPE operations within the campaign of a given candidate. It can be used by the candidate for any other campaign related expenses which are necessary, correct?

R. Well, that's a broad question. It can be used by the candidate for his campaign in whatever way he thinks is necessary, but he cannot take that money and turn it over to some other candidate for his use. In other words, the money that is given to him has to be used by him for his campaign and no one else.

I. How much of a role does the financial support of COPE and organized Labor play in any given election where there are substantial amounts of COPE money given to a candidate? What kind of an effect on the overall election does this financial support which organized Labor gives, have on the election itself or the campaign itself? Does that money play a major or minor role in the overall campaign?

R. Money by COPE is very minimal and really can't affect this campaign too much. If you recall, earlier I said the thing that does affect a candidate is the amount of volunteer workers he gets from organized Labor. Now this, if added up as far as money of a kind is concerned, with hours, time, gas and automobile expenses, can be very very substantial. If a candidate were to depend on the COPE contribution that's made to him, he could never get his campaign off the ground.

I. You mentioned earlier that one of the activities of COPE, or of a COPE organization within a given campaign, was to help in raising funds. Are there any stipulations as to what would or would not be allowed in terms of fund raising? Does the law

place a restriction on the type of fund raising activities that COPE can carry on in a campaign?

R. In a particular campaign, again, if it is a federal campaign COPE is restricted from using treasury monies. Monies have to come directly from the individual as an individual contribution. Now, even in this area there is a restriction on the tax deductibility of an individual contribution as you know. So that the maximum an individual can give and deduct is \$25. Therefore, the type of fund raising that COPE can conduct for a federal candidate could be having a dinner, inviting members of organized Labor to participate in the dinner. And the money would have to come from the individuals own pocket and not from his unions. so it's pretty hard for organized Labor, as such, to raise this voluntary kind of money for federal candidates. On the other hand, for candidates running in local areas, city, county, or state, where treasury money can be used, dinners or dances or whatever type of fund raising the candidate feels is best suited to his personality can be conducted. Many times the state candidate or local candidate gets more money from the unions than the federal candidate can get.

I. I'd like to expand a little on the type of fund raising activities which the union people or COPE people that are on the campaign staff or committee can be involved in. You mentioned the possibility of a dinner or other types of suitable fund raising activities. Are there any limitations placed on the actual activity of union members on the campaign staff? Can COPE people get involved in a door to door solicitation? Can they get involved in such things as selling tickets to a testimonial dinner or a

theatre party or something like this, which is for the purpose of raising campaign funds for the candidate?

R. Depending on the candidate. If it's a federal candidate, the individual can do anything they want as individuals. If they want to participate in the raising of the money they can, but the money can't be treasury money from unions. It has to be voluntary money. The volunteer dollar must be used to pay for tickets or whatever the case might be. So the federal candidate can have many workers from the Labor movement that can be used on a door to door canvas, distribution of literature on street corners, the driving of the candidate around, any of these things. He's just the same as any other citizen. But when it comes to actual hard cash that money has to be volunteered money and there's no way around the law that he can't get anything else but that volunteered money.

I. Then, in other words, an individual COPE worker on a campaign would not be restricted from door to door canvassing for voluntary contributions or the selling of tickets to a dinner party or a theatre party or something like that, which would be suitable to the candidate's own personality?

R. No, there's no restriction there. The only union members that are restricted are those members who work for either state or federal government. They're restricted from canvassing or any other campaigning act. So they, in fact, really are second class citizens. They have the right to vote, but they don't have the right to say anything to anyone else about who they'd like to see in office or even discuss the political situation between

parties. These union members actually have their rights taken away from them, but any other union member, other than those working for any governments, have the same right as any other citizen in this county to do anything they want in helping a candidate, with the exception of using treasury monies for federal candidates.

I. Are any union members who are employed by state and federal governments allowed to make COPE contributions?

R. Yes. Their money would be turned over to COPE, national or statewide, which would eventually be filtered back down to a given candidate. So their dollars are actually given to candidates, which are being endorsed by organized labor.

I. That's a voluntary dollar. So the federal government then cannot restrict them from making that contribution to the COPE fund?

R. No they can't restrict them in that, but they do restrict them from going out and campaigning. They can't campaign. There's a difference in federal employees, too. There are federal employees who are civil service people and these are the ones who are restricted. Appointed federal employees or state employees, have every right in the world to do anything they want. It's the civil service employee who is restricted under the Hatch Act.

I. In terms of financial support to a political campaign and those jobs which are considered civil service, can these people only contribute to the COPE funds? They can't, of course, make any contributions to any particular political candidate?

R. No, I don't think that's true. If they want to make a contribution to any political candidate they can, but they can't

play an active part in discussing the pros and cons of the campaign or solicit others to discuss it with them or solicit them to make similar contributions or solicit votes for them.