

National Academy of Arbitrators
HISTORY COMMITTEE INTERVIEW

Anthony V. Sinicropi

NAA President, 1991

Interviewed by Jim Oldham

June 3, 1993

1

OLDHAM: June the 3rd, 1993. My name is Jim Oldham. I am interviewing Tony Sinicropi who is just completing his year after the presidency that is to say going off the board of governors at the end of this annual meeting, if I'm not mistaken. This project is sponsored by the Academy History Committee in order to preserve the accounts of its activities and background of Academy presidents. First, therefore, we are interested in your background and pick up the story at that point.

AVS: Well let's see, I guess I should begin with the fact that I was born in 1931 in a little town in western New York state - Olean. I've been told it's an Indian name for oil. Oil was discovered about 14 miles from my home town, although its discovery is always associated with Titusville, Pennsylvania. (Actually that's where the first oil well was drilled) but the discovery of oil occurred in New York state where a French missionary Father Devereaux was lead to the spot near Cuba, New York by some Seneca indians.

I grew up in Olean and was raised by immigrant Italian parents. My father went to the fourth grade in Italy and my mother came over as an infant and went through the first year of high school. After high school I started college at St. Bonaventure in 1948, had my college career interrupted in 1951 by service in the Air Force during the Korean conflict. I returned to college in 1954 to finish my education at St. Bonaventure (which is located right outside of my home town) in 1956. There I studied economics with a strong emphasis on labor and was influenced by Jack Flagler who was a professor there and who is a prominent member of this Academy. Jack had a powerful influence on me and served as a role model. I went on to graduate school at Jack's urging, and studied at Cornell's ILR school, receiving my MILR in 1958. My goal and ambition at that time was to become a personnel manager, wear a white shirt, belong to a country club, play golf and maybe be part of a weekend poker group. At the time I thought that would be great life and labor relations would be part of it. However, at graduation time, jobs were scarce, but I was offered a job teaching

the labor courses Flagler taught at St. Bonaventure and I became a "college professor".

At Bonaventure I taught many different business courses, including the labor courses that were associated with Industrial Relations. I sort of inherited the labor chair that was at one time or another occupied by others such as Don Cullen, who is now a Cornell professor, Jack Flagler - and others who were Cornell graduates who went to Allegheny, New York and taught at Saint Bonaventure. I taught at Bonaventure for a year and a half and got the bug for teaching and went on to Gannon College (a small diocesan catholic college) in Erie, Pennsylvania. All the while I taught extension classes - labor education courses for Cornell and Penn State.

OLDHAM: Could you put some dates in here.

AVS: Initially I started at Bonaventure in 1948, went into service in 1951, graduated from Bonaventure in '56, and graduated from Cornell in '58 and started teaching at Bonaventure in '59. I left for Erie, Pennsylvania in 1959 and then taught there at Gannon until 1963. At that particular time I had a strong union orientation.

In 1961 or '62 I received a grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Labor. Eli Ginsburg, who was at Columbia University at the time, (and a prominent Sociology Professor) thought my little model to look at manpower retraining activities for displaced coal miners was pretty good and he suggested I conduct the pilot study for the national program. So I began the project by interviewing coal miners in Wilkes-Barre and Scranton and areas around Pittsburgh. But in 1963 my friend Flagler moved on to the University of Minnesota and he asked the University of Iowa, where he was then a staff member, if they would like to take a chance on me. They did and I became the director of the labor education program at the University of Iowa in the fall of 1963. I wasn't a professor at Iowa but rather a program director, involved in the teaching of

trade unionist, covering such areas as steward training, how to run local union meetings, collective bargaining, etc. At that time I really thought arbitration would be a neat thing but not within the realm of possibility for me. My first serious introduction to it was at a collective bargaining class taught by Jean McKelvey in 1957 at Cornell and that year a young arbitrator who was just starting out was a visiting professor at Cornell. His name - Arthur Stark. And that also influenced me. But I never dreamed that I would have the opportunity, nor would I have the capabilities to go into arbitration. But while I was labor educator in Iowa I was asked to arbitrate a dispute sometime in 1964 or '65. I arbitrated my first dispute in Des Moines and the award was published. As I look back now the decision was poorly conceived, poorly written and probably wrong. Apparently that didn't end my beginning career. The next year I was appointed to and heard three cases but my way to success as an arbitrator seemed to have come to sudden halt. I had one case the next year. After that, my career more or less took off. At the time public sector bargaining was beginning to expand and that provided an opportunity for me. I want to add one other thing about my education. In addition to my job I went to Iowa with an understanding that I could further my education, but since I was in a business school and was considered part of the faculty, they were reluctant to take me on as a student - economics was also in the business school. So I drifted over the Iowa Law School but it was really a full-time law school and they allowed me to take courses on a part-time basis and I did that for about a year and a half. But with six children and a full time job, I thought this situation would never end, so I then switched to a Ph.D. program in educational administration. I was able to use all my law school credits, all my ILR credits from Cornell and by 1968 I had completed all the requirements for the Ph.D. I wrote my dissertation on model statutes in teacher bargaining. One of the elements of that dissertation was my advocating the right for teachers to strike. Then in 1968, I think I became a panel member with FMCS and AAA in the late 60's and

shortly thereafter I became a member of some state panels, such as the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission.

I didn't serve an apprenticeship with anyone. The closest two contacts I had with arbitration at that time were Harold Davey, who was teaching at Iowa State University and a well known and very well established arbitrator, and Clarence Updegraff also a well known academy arbitrator who was teaching at the University of Iowa Law School. Davey was a little too far away to help me and Updegraff was a good friend, but he was then about ready to go off to Hastings Law School, so I was pretty much off by myself. In retrospect I guess that was a pretty good opportunity because the field was pretty wide open in Iowa and I had opportunities that probably wouldn't have come to me otherwise. In 1968 I also left labor education and became a "respected" full time faculty member, having become an associate professor of business administration and later the director of graduate studies in business in charge of all the graduate programs in the Business School of Iowa. A few years later I also became an adjunct professor law where I taught labor arbitration and maintained those two affiliations until I retired in 1992. In the early 70's Iowa granted me a professorship and I became the John F. Murray Professor of Industrial Relations.

OLDHAM: Okay, well then let's turn to the NAA. Tell us how you got into the Academy or your early awareness of it.

AVS: In 1964 or 65 I invited E*ert Gottleib, who was the assistant director of research for the AFL-CIO and an industrial engineer, to be a visiting professor at Iowa. Bert and I became close friends and colleagues. He had attended academy meetings in the past and told me about them and encouraged me to go to Academy meetings even though I wasn't a member. I was invited as a non-member through Bert. I think the first meeting I attended was in 1965 or '66, I can't remember the year. It was held in San Francisco. I remember meeting Arvid Anderson and being very impressed, not only with the

Academy but I was also impressed with the fact that I was staying at such an elegant hotel - the Fairmont. I went to all of the meetings after that and my caseload started to get to the point where I thought I might be considered for membership. I remember making application and being turned down. I suppose the decision was predicated on the fact that I just didn't have enough volume. I imagine that was '68 or '69.

In 1972 I made application again and was admitted at the meeting in Boston that year. I think Sandy Porter was the chair of the membership committee that year and Bill Fallon hosted me. My interest in the Academy was great and I read all the proceedings. I remember marveling at the fact that all the great names I had read and come to know and heard about were at the Academy meetings and I was just overwhelmed with the possibility of becoming a member of this organization. And it has become everything I thought it would be, and even more. I found this to be just a marvelous experience. I became active in committees and other activities in the Academy relatively early. I can recall, although I don't remember where the program was, but Harry Edwards was the program chair and he came to me and asked me to be a moderator. I remember the panel was to be about whether certification of arbitrators was needed and people such as Bob Colson and Larry Shultz were on the panel and I was very nervous. I remember very vividly introducing Bob Colson as the president of the American MANAGEMENT Association, rather than the American ARBITRATION Association (incidentally many in the audience thought the mistake was an intended joke and it got a laugh), and that was my introduction to standing up on a platform before a great number of colleagues. I think I had some stage presence but that was the result as a performing musician for many years, but this is the first time I had to stand up on front of people who were my peers, - people I held in great esteem (in fact I still do). I was very nervous about all this. After that I was asked to serve on various committees and take on several different committee assignments and

I willingly did so. I found out if you keep your nose to the grindstone and do your work, people respect you for that. I really enjoyed such activities. I have to say this at this point. I have more friends in the Academy than I have met through any other kind of institution I have ever been associated with. I'm talking about school, where I teach, I'm talking about religion - my church, I'm talking about any social activities etc. I guess the Academy and its work has become my social activity. It has been, and is a great experience.

OLDHAM: Were you ever active on a regional basis?

AVS: Not really, probably because I live in Iowa. Although I went to one or two regional meetings it was difficult. The problem was I belonged to the Chicago region and the St. Louis region and the distances were great and the costs were high for me to go to such meetings. But I did have a lot of contact with several regions early on in the another way. In the early 80's Arnold Zack and I were involved in regional training activities and we travelled to several regions conducting training sessions. So I got to meet a lot of people and got involved in some regional activities in that way.

The regional activities and the continuing educational activities were very helpful to me, because as a member of those committees I prepared two training manuals, one on evidence and the other on remedies. They became the basis and the foundation of the books I later did with Marvin Hill who had been my student. Had I not been on those committees and prepared those little training guides for those training sessions, I might have never done the books. And the third book, Management Rights - I should tell you about that. Jack Dunsford asked me to give a talk on management rights in St. Louis and I really felt I knew this stuff cold. I gave the talk and I was terrible. And I felt so inadequate, as a result I promised myself that I would do something about this and that is

how that book came about.

OLDHAM: What offices have you held in the Academy besides president, I assume you were a vice president.

AVS: I was a vice president, I was a governor, I was chair of several different committees, - arbitrator training, - archives committee, and I was program chair of the annual meeting. I think I was on the nominating committee twice. I was a member of the executive committee twice - I was on a membership committee, too, for a year or two, so I was on a pretty good cross section of all of the kinds of Academy activities. I consider those experiences very educational because I learned about many different aspects of the organization.

OLDHAM: Do you think, how do you think that the membership in the Academy affected your own career as an arbitrator in terms of cases and selection and so forth.

AVS: Well I have to believe that it probably helped. I have never had anybody come to me and say that is the reason I was selected. But I know there are contracts that require arbitrators to be Academy members and I have to believe that my Academy association has been helpful. But I have to stop here and point out that there are some individuals whose motivation to become affiliated with the Academy is for that very reason. But that wasn't my reason. I felt very strongly that I wanted to be in the midst of the people who established the policy, the direction, the foundation, the thinking, the thoughts of what this whole area of arbitration is about. But I can't deny the fact that my Academy association probably has been helpful to me in terms of case load.

OLDHAM: Have you been a regular attendant at the education sessions as well as the annual meetings.

AVS: I don't think I have ever missed an annual meeting and I think I missed two educational meetings. The first one I was program chair but I missed that first meeting after having been involved in its planning. My wife and I had signed us up for a tour, a ship cruise and there was no way to recoup the money and it came at the same time as the education meeting. I talked with Dana Eischen who graciously filled in for me. So the very first education meeting which I was so much to be involved in I didn't attend. It was in Chicago.

OLDHAM: What year, do you remember?

AVS: Well it would have been after the future directions and I think it would be in the mid or late 70's or perhaps the early 80's. I don't know - I can't really recall. We would have to go back and check the dates on that. And I missed one other - My daughter was in the Oakland earthquake, and that was a meeting I believe might have been Cincinnati, I'm not sure.

OLDHAM: Yes, I think most of us find the education sessions quite valuable. Perhaps more for those of us who are involved in the educational side as well as the practicing arbitrators side.

AVS: It is amazing how much I learned. That is the purpose and it has more that met its purpose. I feel more comfortable about the developments in the field because these meetings deal with evolving concepts and you are learning about them as they occur so you don't have to do all this catch-up all the time. That's very important.

OLDHAM: Well tell us about having become president, When did you first learn that it was going to come, your way?

AVS: Well I really didn't. Although I think I had a lot of close friends many of whom are former presidents and people in positions I am sure could influence other people's choices, but nobody ever

came to me and said, you're going to be president. I had some premonitions and feelings about a year or so before but I reasoned there are so many good people in this organization, I never presumed it and I never assumed it would happen. But I should also say that I was not totally surprised when it happened. You know there are so many great people in this organization and there are only so many years when this can happen that there are many people who are well qualified who probably will never have that opportunity and some of them probably don't want that opportunity for obvious reasons.

OLDHAM: Tell us about the period of time when you were president-elect. What kinds of activities were you called upon to perform then and how much were you involved with the shaping of committees and so forth?

AVS: Well I was very fortunate because Howard Bloch and I had common ideas about a number of issues. For example the alternative labor disputes committee (the if any committee) which initially had a two-year life and now a three-year life. The work of that committee spanned both of our presidencies. From the time when Howard was developing the idea for the committee, I was also thinking along the same lines, so we sat down and we talked about it. I will not say had he not done so, I would have, but the fact that he did and I was in accord made it easy for us to work together. For example, he was very courteous and passed the names of the committee members he suggested on to me and asked for my input and we worked together very closely selecting the members of that committee.

We also more or less institutionalized an idea that started a year or two before in establishing chairs and chair-designates, so that the person who would assume the position succeeding the preceding chair would have a year to observe and work with his or her predecessor. Although we didn't have a great deal of discussion

and interchange on these and other matters we had a good deal of agreement. I also felt that because as president-elect I was so involved, I really learned a lot and could watch carefully because I knew I was going to be doing that same kind of thing the next year. I was much more alert as a result of the experiences of that year. One other advantage I did have came as the result of a situation in Jack Dunsford's presidency. He unfortunately became ill at the time of the educational meeting and I was the vice president he designated to preside at that meeting. So that situation provided me with some experience in chairing a meeting as a president would. These things helped. Being president-elect and having a president who is willing to share all those things with you made it much easier for me.

OLDHAM: All right. What about the actual carrying out of your term as president. Tell us about it.

AVS: Well, the most difficult job and I wrote this in the CHRONICLE, I thought was selecting chairs and members for committees. Committee membership is so difficult - people have priorities and there are only a few slots, and there are so many people who want to serve. It becomes a difficult task. Also some people are not diligent about getting all the preference forms in and that makes this task even more difficult. Another responsibility is making sure you have the columns ready for the CHRONICLE about what you think are timely and interesting topics that are different than your predecessor's. You also must make certain that you have covered all the current kinds of problems going on by making and establishing new committees where necessary and addressing those problems. Finally is the challenging task of dealing with the other agencies and organizations where the needs of the members must be addressed. These are the main responsibilities. I think the final thing is to be available to get around to speak to various regions on demand. You can't make them all but you try to be as helpful as you can.

OLDHAM: Can you illustrate what you mean by the other agencies comment.

AVS: Well there have been membership complaints with American Arbitration Association with, regard to AAA timeliness and awards requirements, procedures, changes in procedures, differentiated procedures between regional offices, AAA orientation towards ADR as opposed to arbitration etc. We had to address our members concerns along these lines and also make sure that we keep a rapport and relationship with AAA in a positive vein without ceding our own independence and our jurisdiction. FMCS, for example, has been running conferences and I think they still do, at the same time as our annual meeting and this puts pressure on both organizations regarding attendance, etc. Our task is to see if we can work out ways that we can keep our friendly, cordial and supportive relationship with these sister organizations and at the same time not detract from each organization's effectiveness - those kind of things.

OLDHAM: Were there any unexpected or major problems that came up during your term that you had to cope with?

AVS: Well, I had to cope with the problem early on with regard to the changing the CHRONICLE staff and the editorship of the CHRONICLE. We had started out as an amatetir newspaper and over the years we have become much more professional. There is nothing wrong with that except many members felt alienated and they wanted to get back not to having the paper being done by outsiders but having it being done by members. And that was kind of a very difficult situation to make sure that you respected the individuals who started the CHRONICLE out by indicating to them the quality and the character of this vehicle will remain at the same level despite the fact that we are not going to have professionals doing this but... that was a knotty problem right off the bat. The continuation of the if any committee was also a bit of a knotty problem. A problem also arose and I think it is still around, with regard to the New York State

Bar Association, the labor relations section, dealing with arbitrator disclosure statements. It becomes a problem because it seemed to be somewhat more intrusive into membership privacy than we wanted it to be. Yet we don't have control over a state bar agency in how they want to behave and what they want to do.

OLDHAM: This question you may have just answered by the comments given about problems but are there items that you would identify as your greatest accomplishment or greatest disappointment during your time in office.

AVS: I could think a lot of things, looking back: but it's very difficult to do much in a period of one year. You have a transition year as president-elect and then you're in for a year and suddenly you're gone. So I don't think the president has that much control over the organization.

I do think my greatest accomplishment and I can only take partial credit for that is the results of the If Any Committee. I think that Howard Block deserves a great deal of credit for having the imagination and initiative and the fortitude to establish the committee that I would like to think that my follow-through and continuation of that charge and emphasis on it had something to do with the results Mike Beck and the committee of course also deserve the real credit for the work that they did. I think that my accomplishment or my contribution was not only support I gave the committee but my presidential address which supports that committee's results. I think I went out on a limb pretty far in some respects, and although I tried to indicate that I felt very strongly committed to the central historical core of the Academy's goals, I am a very conventional and conservative person in terms of my own arbitration activities, but I also feel that the world is changing out there and we have to accommodate to that, particularly for newer members.

OLDHAM: In terms of the year and its activities what would you say took most of your time as president?

AVS: Well, I think the committee appointments took most of my time initially and perhaps more time than it should have, but in any event it took a lot of time.. The second was giving talks to the various regions. Those talks were tailored to respond to a format and orientation required by a particular region. So, I didn't get to call the shots regarding the theme of each speech. Even though I might have had things packaged and they weren't polished speeches by any means, they took time and they were different. The presidential address also took a good deal of my time.

OLDHAM: But speaking of committees which ones did you think were the ones that were the most important ones to the functioning of the Academy.

AVS: I think the standing - permanent committees that are important are the membership committee - obviously, and the committee on professional responsibility and grievances is also a very important one. I'm trying to think, I don't want to diminish the importance here, the legal representation committee is important not in a broad sense but it is important in terms of its mission and we must make sure it continues to meet that end. But I guess the If Any Committee was very important although it is not a standing permanent committee.

OLDHAM: All right and finally what would you say about the qualifications that you think are most important for Academy president and if you had any suggestions for future holders of that office, tell us what they might be.

AVS: This is a little philosophical. I think any member of the Academy has the capabilities of being president. I think once admitted to membership it's sort of like the testing procedures that come under

scrutiny in the early days of the EEOC where initially testing for entry level position was not limited to that position but to the highest job in that line of progression. Although such procedure fell by the wayside in Civil Rights cases, our entrance requirements assumes that entrants can make it to the top. Thus I think there are many people who could do the job and do it well. I think everyone in this organization is very bright and are accomplished people who have done very significant things. But I also think there is a special ingredient we ought to look for in selecting a president. I picked this up from an elderly gentleman just this year. I was talking with him and he was telling me about his sons who were going to take over his business. I asked him what he thought of them. He said they are smart "boys", very bright "boys". He said they are really knowledgeable. He said they know more than he will ever know. And I responded that he must be pleased and he said, well, I don't know. "They lack wisdom" - Wisdom being that special talent to know when, how and why one should use knowledge.

I think we recognize this organization has many bright people. We assume that everybody has the knowledge, have that qualification, but what is important is how they use that knowledge, when they use that knowledge, why they use that knowledge. Despite one's own views and what one would want to do personally, you have to respect all of the views of different people, different constituencies and what is best for the organization. In that respect the concept of diversity isn't a new one. Even within an organization such as this, there are many diverse views. Thus a president should be sensitive to those kind of things. It's nice to be daring and dashing and have a lot of pizzazz when you lead an organization but you also have to be mindful of the fact that you have a great deal of responsibility even if its only for a short period of time and you can't do things that might be destructive to that organization's continuity. Thus*, one must have wisdom and judgement to use knowledge properly. That's my feeling.

OLDHAM: That is excellent and I guess what I would do finally, Tony, is to invite you to be even more philosophical on a broader basis and just give us a few reflections on the path that your career has taken and the arbitration process itself. You have been a practicing arbitrator now for what, 25 years.

AVS: As I stated earlier in this interview, I never envisioned being an arbitrator, let alone being an arbitrator of any stature. I thought I might arbitrate a case here and there and I think that would be my furthest achievement in this field. But we know more than that happened. But I am very proud and very pleased my success was measured and slow. When I became an arbitrator, the war labor board philosophy prevailed and the war labor board folks were predominant. A little later the public sector emphasis came through the door and interest arbitration, fact finding, advisory arbitration and all the things connected with public sector at the state and municipal level came on the scene. Then the federal sector with executive orders and finally the Civil Service Reform Act became important.

I also watched another evolution and that's the one that we're going through now with a change in the whole economic base of the United States. In addition a change in the values and norms that society has established has occurred and finally I began to see that even though I spend most of my time today in the rather conventional arbitration in private sector industry, it seems all the things we're talking about in terms of non-union arbitration or employer-promulgated or whatever it may be called in terms of the employment-at-will philosophy and changes there and of all the legislation out there I think the field has changed.

Now I love and have grown up with labor arbitration because it is one of constant change. I've seen the change that has made me appreciative of all of the things that are going on in the country so I feel that it has helped me grow personally, not just

professionally. I also feel I'm a better person because I am an arbitrator. I also felt I was a better professor because I was an arbitrator. I'm not a great theorist. I'm a pretty pragmatic person and I was a pragmatist in the classroom, too, I think. That doesn't mean that I didn't teach theoretical concepts or constructs but I wasn't one who was grounded only in theory. One of the things I've seen from the academic point of view is the diminution of labor relations as a discipline as we've known it. It has become absorbed into a broader context so I don't believe that the static way that some of us look at and want to keep our field will be the way it can continue to exist because the feeder system for the field is how people are educated, how they think and where they come from. Thus I think the field is going to change and cause a change in this institution. I don't know if it will be better but I do know that it cannot avoid being something different. That is not going to happen tomorrow, it might be after the year 2000. But as I look at it, I feel very fortunate as an academic I had this experience. I feel very fortunate to be in the academic community for as long as I was there. I feel very fortunate to have been not just an arbitrator but belonging to the National Academy of Arbitrators was not something I did because I belonged to a trade organization. It was something I did because I belonged to a professional organization that taught me to become a broader person in the way I thought about and dealt with things.

I'll go back to where I started, Bert Gotleib said to me, you're going to like being a member of the National Academy of Arbitrators. I asked, why. He said because these are very accomplished people who know how to laugh at themselves and know when not to take themselves too seriously. I think that is the secret of life. What we do is important but it is not all important and all encompassing. It is not the only thing in the world. As a professor friend of mine once said to me, " you know you're not such a big deal. There are a billion people in China who never even heard of you."

OLDHAM: That's good and I'm tempted to close the interview on that note but I don't quite want to do it yet. Tell me, I think I know the answer to this, but tell me whether you would characterize yourself as optimistic or pessimistic about the future of the profession.

AVS: Well I think I'm optimistic. I really do.

OLDHAM: That is what I thought you would say.

AVS: But I really have to say that if you look at the front end of my thinking, a lot of times it may sound as if I'm a pessimist. What I have said is a lot of things have changed and we can't keep things the same. That's pessimistic for those that want to keep things the same. But for those that look at the future and say look at all the things that can happen here, I think there are great opportunities.

OLDHAM: Yes and that limb you spoke of having gone out on illustrates the point, I guess. Alright, finally, I can't leave a little stone unturned from a comment you dropped early in the conversation which was you referred to the musician's union and having had an instrument to play, tell us what that instrument was and what it was like being a part of that process in the union.

AVS: Well, I was a clarinet player. I also played saxophone and flute. I got into dance music at a tender age and I belonged to the local 115 of the American Federation of Musicians and I just got involved in union activity through that union. My introduction to labor relations was when I tried to run for the local union's secretary position against the incumbent. I was disqualified from running because of late payment of dues. I was a young student and I looked up the state annotated codes and I found out that if you paid dues, fees, etc. on days following holidays and Sundays they were paid with equal force and significance as if paid on the day due. My dues were due January 1 and I paid them on January 2. I

made my point that I was legal under the state laws but they said no. Petrillo was head of the union in those days and to make a long story short I was disqualified. As a result I said by God I'm going to do something more about this and so along with that pledge and Jack Flagler's classroom influence, I got into the field. But I also found a lot of things in music were good for me. Music taught me to have a presence before an audience. I also note that students in high school, advance to leadership positions through experience from athletics, or debate team members or whatever. In my case, music was my vehicle. It gave me recognition, it gave me a sense of identity, it gave me the confidence I needed. I went on to play in high school and the service. I was in an Air Force band and I played on the road with dance bands and I belonged to the Union and I learned about that aspect of life. Later when I went to university and taught in labor education I belonged to Local 189 of the American Federation of Teachers, it was the catch-all union of labor educators. Now teachers are anarchists by nature and a teacher's union is really anarchistic. So music was a great vehicle. I have an interesting story on this point. Milton Rubin was also a clarinet player and Milt played with the Vincent Lopez orchestra, a band that played at Taft Hotel in New York for years. Milt has admonished me a number of times saying that I could tell people that I was a better arbitrator than he but I could never tell them that I was a better clarinet player.

OLDHAM: Okay, Tony, thank you very much. Okay, that's the end of the interview with Tony Sinicropi.