

National Academy of Arbitrators  
HISTORY COMMITTEE INTERVIEW

Ralph T. Seward

NAA President, 1947-1949

Interviewed by Gladys Gruenberg

(No date listed)

RALPH T. SEWARD

PRESIDENT NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ARBITRATORS

1947 - 1949

INTERVIEWED BY GLADYS GRUENBERG

My name is Gladys Gruenberg and I am interviewing past President Ralph T. Seward who was President of the National Academy of Arbitrators from 1947 until 1949. This project is sponsored by the Academy History Committee in order to preserve the account of activities and the background of the Academy presidents. First we are interested in your personal background. We would like to find out where you were born, raised and educated - That type of thing- so just let us know all about it.

I was born in New York City in 1907 and grew up there originally, went to various boarding schools because my mother died fairly early. I finally wound up going to Cornell University and in 1923 and graduated there in '27.

Would you tell us what your major was?

English and public speaking and when I got out I was very much interested in international relations and thought it might be a good idea if something was done about war. The First World War was still in all of our background at that point and so I managed to get myself a job in Geneva, in Switzerland. My idea was to study there and I was earning my living taking tourists through the League of Nations buildings and helping to organize conferences and so forth. I had a fascinating time for about five years, working five summers in that sort of job and three winters. The other two winters I came back and taught government at NYU. Well, by the end of five years I realized that this was fascinating but it was not getting anywhere really. Because international relations study meant studying the international end of a lot of different subjects without learning any particular subject thoroughly. When I came home I decided to try to get a Ph.D. I had gotten an MA at NYU, and they told me I ought to be either an economist or a lawyer, so I walked around the block a few times and decided to go to law school. I had been out of college already five years before I went to law school and some of my students at NYU were in the entering law school class with me at Columbia. I thought I had lost five years, but actually it was a wonderful experience. I went through Columbia Law School and got out and went down to a Wall Street law firm, Simpson, Thatcher and Barlett, and stayed there for about almost eight months, realizing very quickly that that was not what I wanted. The New Deal, of course, was going on then, and through friends I came down to Washington and managed to

get myself a job as an attorney with the NLRB.

Who was the Chair of the NLRB at the time?

That was the original Board, Warren Madden, Ed Smith and John Carmody. I was first a review attorney, and then a regional attorney out in Los Angeles resigned, so they sent me out to Los Angeles as region attorney for Southern California and Arizona. I am afraid that I personified all the criticisms of the NLRB in those days for sending out kid attorneys to pester the life out of companies. I had a fascinating time. There were just the Regional Director, John Nylander, myself and one secretary for all of Southern California and Arizona. I came in in the middle of (well, it started eight days after I was there), the hearing against the Douglas Aircraft Company. It was really a fascinating time. Of course, at first everybody thought we were unconstitutional and nobody paid much attention to us. I also was a representative of the LaFollette Committee and had a subpoena from the LaFollette Committee giving me all the authority in the world for investigations. I carried on an investigation, an interview for two or three weeks, of a man named Joe Roach who had been the representative of Federal Laboratories in selling industrial munitions all over California. I found out that almost all the tear gas and billy clubs and all the rest of it used by the California Highway Patrol were bought and paid for by private companies. It was interesting and fun, and we went through many sit-down strikes at Douglas Aircrafts due to a little group that called themselves the Western Mechanics, about four hundred people trying to run a strike of a plant of three or four thousand and getting nowhere. My boss, Tom Nylander, and I had to go into the plant and try to persuade them to leave. Anyway, I thought, I was beginning, finally after all the years of education, to learn a little bit about life in the raw. Then I was called up by a friend of mine, Paul Herzog, who was on a newly created New York State Labor Relations Board, and Paul asked me if I would come back to New York and be Executive Secretary of that Board.

How had you met him?

I had known him at law school, and so I said "yes" and went back to New York and was Executive Secretary of the Board for two or three years. Then Marshall Demick who was Assistant Secretary of Labor under Frances Perkins, who was heading up an effort to revise the Immigration and Naturalization procedures to give the aliens some form of due process, asked me if I would come down and be Chairman of the Board of Immigration and Appeals, The Board of Review they called it then, and supervise the change in rules and regulations. It sounded like fun so I did it and worked as Chairman of the Board of Review until 1941. We got most of the job done although in the middle of

all this, of course, the War [World War II] had broken out, and the temperament of the times had changed from trying to help aliens to being suspicious of them, trying to guard against spies and all the rest of it. So, we had tough going. We did put through at least a part of, a sound solid part of, our program, but not all of it by any means. Then in the middle of that the wave of strikes came along, and Will Davis who was brought down to be Vice Chairman of the newly created National Defense Mediation Board asked me if I would come over as Executive Secretary of that Board.

Had you met him before?

Yes, when I was with the New York State Board, he was Chairman of the New York State Mediation Board, and I had known him and had already learned what a terrific tremendous man, a giant of a man, he was and all that devotion he had to the process of persuasion and reason when dealing with human problems. So I did. I went over to be Executive Secretary of the Defense Mediation Board and had a fascinating time. That was the Board composed completely of generals with one or two privates. I was one of the privates, or maybe I was a corporal and I had a secretary then.

What were your duties in that job?

Well, the Board operated by creating tripartite panels. We had cases certified to us by John Steelman of the Conciliation Service and when cases were certified, we would have to create a tripartite panel with a public, labor and industry members. We had a tripartite board with Will Davis and others of his caliber, Frank Graham from Chapel Hill, President of University of North Carolina and so forth, and George Meany, Bill Murray on the labor side, and prominent CEO's on the industry side. We had to have working panels to handle all these cases as they came in, and it was my job to get names and call all over the country and organize the panels. I remember calling Wayne Morse, who was on a fishing trip somewhere in the middle of Oregon, getting a Forest Service person to go out and find him on a lake to get him down to San Francisco and to Washington fast for a panel of some sort.

Where did all these names come from - these people you called?

Industry members, labor members.

Just a network?

And many of them were people who had functioned on a panel; there were a number of big names - labor and management and public, Wayne Morse, for example, had handled one or two of the waterfront strikes in California and was known in that connection. I had to assemble these panels, set the dates, notify

the parties, organize all of this, and we were short handed. I had to go, myself sometimes. We had the North American Aircraft Company coming in and there was no public member for the panel, so I had to become a public member myself. It came to be quite a case actually because the company refused to accept the Board's recommendations. That was the first case where Roosevelt sent in the troops and took over the plant. The Board was a success actually because it was billed as a temporary and emergency thing - it could not have been a permanent board - nobody had time to function in that capacity continuously. Then we ran into John L. Lewis and the Mine Workers and the closed shop issue, and the Board refused to give John L. Lewis a closed shop. He immediately took a position which destroyed the Board because all the labor members resigned under pressure. That took place about a week before Pearl Harbor. I remember sitting down with all the members of the Board around me listening over the radio to President Roosevelt's speech to Congress after Pearl Harbor. That led, of course, to the creation of the National War Labor Board, and I was asked to be what they called the Administrative Public Member. I had to hire the staff and help work out procedures. George Taylor was the public member who was designated to work with me. I worked under George's guidance.

Had you met him before?

I had not met him before. Another giant came into my life. Boy, the experiences in just two or three weeks of working with that man. He was so quiet and so modest that he made me feel that I was somebody working with him, whereas he was, of course, the man with all the genius and ideas and we set up the board. We had experienced people, from the Defense Mediation Board, but we had to bring in some younger people to help the Board members, to be go-fors, to help them draft, to run errands or whatever they needed. And Lou Gill came in and Ted Kheel and a lot of capable people. I could go through the list. When we were setting up the War Labor Board, these people came over, and later on when wage stabilization came in and the Board necessarily had to set up regional offices all over the country, these original go-fors, panel assistants we called them, became, many of them, chairman of the various regional boards. And along about 1942 came the major crisis in the milk industry in New York; the Board asked me to go up and try to handle a dispute involving the switch of milk delivery from home delivery to every other day delivery, which really meant the death of the home delivery of milk. They could not do it, the costs were too high. I was asked to go up there and supervise that and somehow or other prevent a strike in the milk industry in New York. Anytime anybody threatens milk, you have the Mayor of New York and the City Health Department, the Governor and the New York State Health Department, the New York State Department of Agriculture and the Federal Health Department, and the Federal Labor Department - everybody had a hand in it. And in that industry, there were four locals of the Teamsters

and the Dairymen's League and a lot of independents - all trying to live under these rules, blizzards of rules and regulations coming down on them. I found myself what they called the czar of the industry. To my complete surprise, knowing not one thing about milk delivery or milk processing, I had to learn quite a bit very fast. I found myself deciding how much milk could be put on any milk truck in New York. If I tried to exercise all of the authority they gave me, and they gave me a bunch of it, Lord, what I could have done. I could have really killed that industry. I had been warned by George Taylor, Frank Graham and Will Davis to keep my horns very well pulled in. I realized that this was a collective bargaining job, and that we needed to sit down, and set up bargaining procedures, and we worked out procedures for the transition to every other day delivery. Now I suddenly found myself asked to become chairman, arbitration chairman, permanent umpire of the milk industry, settling grievances - so in 1942 I suddenly discovered I was an arbitrator, which I had never dreamt of being in my life. And I arbitrated in the milk industry from '42 to '44, running down to Washington every once in a while because everything had to get War Labor Board approval because of affecting costs. Then, at that point All&n Dash resigned from the General Motors umpire job, and George Taylor, I guess, persuaded GM and the UAW to offer me that job, and I went on to Detroit as umpire at General Motors where I was for three years. At the end of three years I had made a lot of decisions. I had some scheduling cases concerning upholding a man's rights in certain work scheduling areas, which were very hard for the union to swallow. Walter Reuther called me up and said, "Ralph, I'd like to have lunch with you." And we had lunch and I could see what was in the wind, and Walter said, "Look, Ralph, I understand exactly what you have been doing and I understand why you did it, but I am fighting for my life with George Abbott for the Presidency, and as far as I am concerned you have to be expendable. So I am afraid when you finish up this Spring, that we are going to have to say goodbye and thank you very much." I lived with a lot of good fortune because other people's bad fortune, became my good fortune. Herb Bloomer had a similar experience at U.S. Steel; his term as impartial chairman, as they called it at U.S. Steel, was terminating and they called me up from Pittsburgh and asked me if I would take over the chairmanship at U.S. Steel. And so I packed my clothes and got into the little Oldsmobile I had and drove down to Pittsburgh and set up shop in the Hotel William Penn. I got a room and went down to find I was impartial chairman with an office and a member of industry and a union member on each side of me and became impartial chairman of U.S. Steel. That was a fascinating job because they said they believed, as General Motors had, in the strict interpretation of the agreement. They wanted to know what the language was and General Motors did not want me running off and telling the UAW what they should have bargained for. They just wanted to know what they had bargained for when they couldn't agree. The Steelworkers had the same idea, but they sat on a tripartite board, which meant that we were necessarily trying to negotiate the meaning of words. And that was quite an experience for two

years. I remember cases well, I could go on for all afternoon on this. I remember a case where working the foundry they were doing everything they could, finishing all their molds. Usually about 714 hours - foreman and the men - there was nothing for them to do after about 714 hours and the foreman would let them go home. They were paid for 8 hours. They had been doing that for years and years and years. Under the new 1947 contract U.S. Steel decided that the language having something to do with the wage rate was the rate for each hour a day worked, and that meant that the men had to work eight hours. So they turned around and kept them in the plant for eight hours and the men raised the roof, naturally. They did not have to do anything, just had to sit in the plant for one half hour. Well, that case came to us, all three of us, management representative, union representative and me, and I thought that this was absolute nonsense and the Union was right. But we couldn't decide - they could not agree why the Union was right because it involved the interpretation of language. Was this to be considered pay for not working, was it to be based on the past practice clause? Any mention of past practice in those days gave U. S. Steel the jitters because the practice that had been agreed to hadn't been interpreted yet and they were terribly afraid of it. Well, we went around many, many circles and finally the Company agreed on an interpretation after the whole issue was discussed with the Board of Directors. The Union didn't care, so we issued that decision, whereupon the Company dissented to protect itself against the interpretation which is the only way they could agree. Well, this is why I say this was a remarkable experience of negotiating the meaning of contract terms. I was there for two years at which point the Company thought that I had been doing things that I shouldn't and told me very, very, very courteously. Arthur Goldberg of the Union and John Stevens of the Company had lunch with me and said very nice things to me: "You're such a nice guy, Ralph, and I'm sorry we have to say goodbye." So I was out and again as I told you, my guardian angel was watching over me. Just exactly at that time, Dave Wolff was fired from International Harvester. Dave called up and said, "I think I can get you the Harvester job; would you like it?" I said, "I am unemployed at the moment," and so I found myself umpire at Harvester. That was another fascinating experience of a different sort. Harvester had several types of plants. I was on the farm equipment half. There was the UAW half with a different arbitrator, but I had the farm equipment workers. The Union representatives kept close to the machines and to the men and they knew how to represent them practically. But FE and Harvester had negotiated this agreement sitting at each end of the Labor Department building with mediators running back and forth between them carrying suggested language. Finally, they had agreed on a lot of language deliberately which was so vague that both sides could read into it what ever they wanted. So it was my job to interpret it for them. Dave Wolff had been there for thirteen or fourteen decisions. The Union was deliberately filing grievances on every single issue and not settling them. And they were stacked up in bails. Nobody knew how many there were. There was a room, which I

saw, of grievances appealed to arbitration stacked up in piles with cord wrapped around the pile. Nobody knew what was there. It was our job to go through the contract. We had to handle discipline cases, of course, but issue after issue, we would go around and around on the contract issue, for a year and decide what the language meant. After we had gone around once and issued the first round of decisions, then we had to go over it again and begin cutting it down, taking down the detail of the meetings....

Was this a tripartite arrangement also?

No, . . .no, we had a team though, Phil Luster of Harvester and oh, I've got to think of his name - an awful good man - represented the Union, the three of us went from plant to plant. They argued all the cases and we got to know each other very well. I heard them all but I had to decide them all by myself.

This was after you had already started with your work in the National Academy? At the Harvester?

Yes.

So let's back track a little bit before we get too far and talk about how you got involved with the beginnings of the National Academy.

Well, I was at General Motors, my last year at General Motors in '47 and Dave Wolff called me sometime in the summer, I think. He said, "Ralph, (he was arbitrating over at Chrysler) I want to have lunch with you." So we had lunch and he said, "Ralph, they're going to start an organization of arbitrators. They're going to hold a meeting in Chicago this September, and I think you ought to go." I didn't know what it was about but it sounded interesting, so I went to Chicago and was one of those at the organizing meeting.

That was in April of 1947?

No, the meeting was in September of '47. There was a temporary organization at the conference and they appointed a committee to draft the Constitution and so forth. Then they nominated officers and I was nominated President to my complete and utter surprise. And I found myself President of the Academy. A man named Al Colby who was a real operator....

Had you met him before?

I don't think I had met him before, no. He was in Washington. He was



a real operator and an arbitrator. Al not only was an arbitrator, but he represented management before arbitrators and he represented unions before arbitrators. He played all sides, he walked on all three sides of the street. But he was the going force. A lot of people didn't like Al. I had some doubts. But, if it had not been for Al Colby this organization, the Academy, would not be in existence. He was the man who started it. He was helped by a man named Carl Schedler from the Conciliation Service. Al Colby and Carl were the driving force. Al was the guy who wrote the letters, who I am sure reserved the meeting at the Drake Hotel, reserved the rooms and organized the organizing meeting in Chicago. And he was named Secretary and Pete Kelliher was the first Treasurer. I found myself as President of this Academy with the job of and responsibility of trying to guide it. We had a Constitution that said nice things about our purposes. And we were going to have an organizing meeting at our first annual meeting the following January. We had to decide who was going to come to the first annual meeting, was it going to be open to everybody? We decided, no, it would be only by invitation. I don't know how many came to that first annual meeting, maybe a hundred, maybe a hundred and fifty, it could have been more. We had to decide whether it was going to be just arbitrators or was it going to be open to professors and anybody interested. How about people like George Taylor who had not arbitrated a case in years or how about men who believed in mediation rather than arbitration? What was our relation going to be to the AAA and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service? The question came up and was settled immediately about whether we were to participate in the selection of arbitrators, which we immediately decided that we must not do. That was the job of the appointing agencies. Nobody knew what kind of organization it was going to be. The annual meetings began in Chicago at the Drake Hotel, and the second annual meeting, in January or February of '49, was in Washington. By that time the structure, the outlines of the organization were beginning to emerge. The first issue, big issue, about which there was a lot of debate and real, real disagreement was over membership. There were some (I think Al Colby was leader of that group, but there were a lot of others) who felt that the organization should be sort of a self-appointed group of elites — "top class arbitrators," "the best; the "cream of the crop," in other words, a very restricted approach to the membership problem. There were others, of whom I think Bill Simkin was the leader, who thought the gates ought to be open, that we all had to learn our jobs as all arbitrators, and we should basically be an educational organization to help train each other with gradations of course between those two extremes, and gradually there was the development of a membership policy which went more or less down the middle, in which we obviously were not going to open the gates to everybody since we wanted established arbitrators, but we

certainly weren't going to be a self-appointed group of established arbitrators. It developed more and more that it was management and labor who knew whom they were satisfied with as arbitrators, and they should do the real job of appointing our membership. That's, of course, the membership policy has been refined over the years, coming down to fifty cases in five years approach. We had to work out problems about the part to be played by the great names in labor relations, to what extent should a non-practicing person who was nevertheless a great name in labor relations be admitted to membership. We admitted a number and I am very glad we did. But more and more, the organization came to be an organization of practicing arbitrators. But we also have wisely tried to keep our way open for contacts with universities and academic fields.

Did you find that your being President of the organization interfered with your arbitration practice at all?

Yes, at that point I had this U.S. Steel job during '47-'49 and I had found that I had to spend quite a good bit of time on Academy business. Al Colby was doing all the work, but I had to go over a lot of the correspondence and participate in a lot of meetings, and it had its effect I'm sure because, when U.S. Steel finally told me that was it, one of the things they said (of course, it was a minor point) was, "Mr. Seward, we think one of the things we object to is that you have not considered this a full-time job, and you have been spending a lot of time with this new fangled organization of arbitrators that we hear about". Well, so be it.

Did you have any ad hoc work during this time?

I was President of the Academy so I had no ad hoc. I had a little overlap with General Motors, a few General Motors cases, so I had to finish up after I started U.S. Steel but no ad hoc. No, I was not an ad hoc arbitrator until years later. I went through Harvester and then took on a full-time job at Bethlehem Steel. I was at Bethlehem Steel for years and years before I did any ad hoc work and that was only at the end when somebody else at Bethlehem Steel took over the main job and I went into a consulting capacity. They called me impartial chairman whereas the young man was umpire..

So you were never on the AAA or the FMCS lists?

I was on the list. I have to qualify that, I went into some Presidential Emergency Boards, that sort of thing. I was on the AAA and FMCS lists but I was inactive.

You told them you wanted to remain inactive?

Yes, so I didn't do any ad hoc work really until, oh, I have only been in ad hoc work for about ten or fifteen years now.

What did you consider the major problems of the organization besides getting the structure together and all that sort of thing of the Academy at the time in addition to its problem about membership?

Well, we had the problem of what we were going to do about ethics. We had to establish an ethics committee, which we did. It was called Ethics then. We had then realized the extent or the difficulty of drawing any hard line between ethics and sound practice. But we established an Ethics Committee and one of the problems was how that committee should deal with instances of improper practice which came to our attention. I think in those beginning years we were very gentle. After I left the Presidency, I was on the Ethics Committee for awhile, but I was never Chairman of the Ethics Committee, I don't believe. But I was in on some of the early decisions. When you have an arbitrator and hear rumors that he had been found royally drunk at a hearing and there are complaints and a man's career is involved, what do you do? Do you file or invite a complaint and start all kinds of procedures against him? One of us went out and talked to him, took him aside and said, "Look, brother, you have got to shape up." We handled a lot of situations quietly and informally in that fashion. We were criticized by some people who thought that we ought to have been tougher. I think that in those early days, that was wise. I think now the point has come (and I am very glad it has come) with the growth of the organization and the growth of its importance and drafting of the new code and so forth, where the policing of that code and the enforcement of that code has become a very important job of the Academy and we can no longer be always gentle. We have to get tough some times and that was one problem. Another problem was how we handle relationships. This was a real problem. How do we handle relationships with industry and labor? Were we going to be a private organization meeting together to discuss our own problems? Were we going to open our meetings to representatives of management and labor, and if so, how could we ever do our business - how could people talk frankly in such meetings - in front of their actual or perspective or hoped for clients? Again, a problem for which we had to feel our way. We began very early inviting guests to the annual meetings. We were criticized. What sort of a slave market are you running? All you arbitrators parading up and down in front of management and labor hoping for jobs. A long standing criticism - what are you going to do with all the entertaining which goes back and forth? What happens when you are at an annual meeting and

an arbitrator buys a union president a drink? Or sits down to the bar and says, "Come on, these are on me," and then they say, "The next is on me," and so forth. Are ordinary social rules applicable or are there special rules? When Bethlehem Steel or U.S. Steel or General Motors throws a cocktail party, is it proper to go? We all used to. Gradually the implications there dawned on us. And after a few years of these cocktail parties, the Academy, as a whole, decided that isn't a good idea. The guest question is still, well, we hope it has been settled; we have our own private days, the initial days of the Academy meetings are private, then we open it up to guests. I hope they don't think that a slave market, I don't know how you are ever going to put that sort of criticism entirely to rest, but I think people have gotten more and more sophisticated as the years have gone on and really the guest issue is no longer a matter of grave importance; we know more and more how to handle ourselves.

The other question that I had to ask about was the appointment of the various committees. How did you decide what committees there were going to be and who were going to be the key people that were going to be in charge of them and that sort of thing?

We decided what committees we needed just in terms of the problems that arose. We had to have a committee necessarily to draft the Constitution and By-Laws. We had to have a committee on membership policy, which became the Membership Committee. We had to have a committee on ethics and those as I recall were the original standing committees. We had to have administrative committees to arrange meetings, the next annual meeting, those things were called for, but it was the life of the Academy that produced the committees. We did not sit down and draft a blueprint of an organization, we responded to needs.

We were talking about the committees and the appointment of chairs to the various committees.

I did go through the form of appointing these committees as President, but I sounded out people, there was a lot of give and take, back and forth. I was consulting, of course, practically to find out who wanted to serve, who could serve. In those days we did not have regions organized. That is another problem we had to come to later. And appointing a committee that could geographically get together. To make it possible for them to work. I think some of the west coast members got short-changed in the early days for that reason. Though I don't know, I think Ben Aaron was in on a lot of the original committees. It is hard for me now to remember who was who.

You did not have people requesting to be put on committees, you had to sort of

canvas, the help rather than have them volunteering?

No, there was not that sort of thing. People were amazingly willing. Our Academy was like, always has been like, all other organizations. There is a nucleus of people who are interested in the organization, love it and are willing to work, and then there are the others on the outside who are more or less reluctant to do anything but have their names on the membership list. Initially, most of the members of the Academy were very much interested in it, and it was a very large nucleus that was going to work and would serve on these committees. I don't recall having great difficulty getting these committees going. They were never very large. We had a problem, of course. I can remember sitting around at Board of Governors meetings. In those days the Board of Governors met when I would get a hotel suite, we did not have any money, the dues were twenty-five dollars, and that did not go very far, but we would rent a hotel suite and everybody would sit around on the floor or on couches or chairs and I would sit there with a yellow pad in my lap and that was the Board of Governors meeting. But we realized that geography was rearing its ugly head and we had to pay attention in Academy committees, in the organization, in choosing officers and so forth to geography or people would have their feelings hurt. Everybody would feel that New York was hogging it all or that the middle west was being short-changed or the far west or something. That created difficulties, as I said, if you wanted a working committee, but we arranged systems of working by correspondence. In other words, we handled it normally and practically and, when we couldn't all get together, we would write letters. And gradually as the organization grew (this is after my presidency) and got more money and so forth, it became more and more possible for committees to meet in different cities and function more the way they do now.

While you were President, did everybody pay his own expenses?

When I was President I paid all my own expenses yes. And I think everybody did for the reason we did not have any money. There was not anybody to pay expenses. For some reason or another we found at first that there was no problem about the social hour after a meeting of the Board of Governors because Al Colby always came up with some scotch as leading counsel for National Distilleries. And we had to meet informally, I am not sure how we solved that, but that was the way we were working in the early days. Geography in the organization was one of the problems. Let me see what else did we run into. Of course, we had a Research Committee early. Oh, there was another problem. We had this committee on research and education. The question was to what extent should the Academy become a research organization. We never did think that we were interested in sponsored research, however, I don't know. Ben Aaron can tell you and a lot more about that, end of it. But there were real issues at first between the professors, the

academic crew in the original membership and the practicing arbitrators. That affected the size of the organization, the amount of business, the dates. You will notice that the original annual meetings were all held at times which were convenient in between terms because of the academic members. There was never any attempt to hide this, but there were two well defined groups really. The academic group had definite interests and limitations which the Academy felt that it ought to meet. I think more and more as the years have gone on, the proportion of practicing arbitrators and practicing lawyers has increased and the percentage of academicians has declined. I am not sure about whether academic issues still persist in the Academy or not. One other thing which was not a problem, but we all seemed to learn very early in the game that one of the vital things about the Academy to all of us was the chance to see each other. We did not allow our problems to overshadow the social aspects of our organization. Golly, it was such fun getting together, talking over our professional problems, finding people who had also sat alone at their desk with problems that seemed insurmountable, being able to compare notes and to just to be friends. I think that element, the element of friendship, has as much to do really with starting the organization, getting it going and giving it the momentum that it has had and making it the joyous experience that it has been to all of us who really worked with it and lived with it over the years.

While you were President, did the subject of women arbitrators ever come up in connection with applications to membership?

I don't recall it ever coming up except that there were very few women applicants, as I recall. Jean McKelvey, I think, was the first. I don't know when she came in; she may have been a charter member. She certainly should have been if she wasn't. I recall a feeling of welcome and isn't it just fine when women came along. I think we did not, would not lower our standards to permit women to come in, but it was wonderful when women began more and more to meet the standards, and I think that is fine. We obviously were glad also when we had our first black arbitrators come in and the extent to which we can, to which we have, taken in minority groups -- that is wonderful.

To wind this up, do you have any suggestions for future presidents in looking over the past history of the organization? What do you see as the vision for the organization for the future now?

Oh my, I don't think it is for me to chart the future course of the organization. That is for the new generation. Every group of arbitrators, as they come in, is going to have to make the organization what it needs. Arbitration is changing just as labor relations is changing, and the needs and demands of the organization are going to change, and the new membership is going to have to be responsive to those needs. I hope that the organization maintains its devotion to fostering the ideals of reason and persuasion and fairness and

justice in labor relations. I hope that we maintain ourselves as an arbitration organization rather than going into other fields. But that is my own personal point of view. I hope that we maintain our devotion to the maintenance of free collective bargaining because that is what this organization really is about and that means that I hope free collective bargaining continues in this country because that is so basic to a free society.