

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Bonitati, Robert: Files
Folder Title: Union Busters [and Union Attitudes]
Box: OA 6848

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 2, 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR ELIZABETH H. DOLE

FROM: BOB BONITATI

SUBJECT: Union Attitudes

In the last several weeks, there has been a number of media stories focussing on organized labor's political efforts for the 1982 elections. Most of these stories suggest that the AFL-CIO unions, in particular, are putting on a massive effort to send the President a message and to reduce the size of the Republican delegation on Capitol Hill.

Having had some experience in labor political efforts, I can testify to the fact that they are making a massive campaign effort and are making better use of their resources than in previous years. There is little doubt in my mind that in several marginal House and Senate races, the money and manpower being provided by organized labor could be the factor which will determine the outcome of those races.

What is interesting to look at, though, is what impact all of this campaign effort has had on union members, themselves.

The most recent ABC/Washington Post poll (completed October 11) suggests that union members continue to react to the President's leadership in much the same manner as the rest of the general population.

The ABC/Washington Post poll gives the President a 47% approval rating with the general public as compared to a 44% approval rating with union families.

A further comparison with ABC/Washington Post polling data from October 1981 continues to substantiate the claim that union members (despite the union's propaganda) continue to view the President in much the same manner as the rest of the general population:

JOB APPROVAL RATING

	<u>October 1981</u>	<u>October 1982</u>	<u>Change</u>
General Population	59%	49%	- 10
Union	51%	44%	- 7

JOB DISAPPROVAL RATING

	<u>October 1981</u>	<u>October 1982</u>	<u>Change</u>
General Population	33%	44%	+ 11
Union	41%	52%	+ 11

While there is a variance from the general population (probably due to the high identification of union members with the Democratic Party), this gap has been relatively constant since February 1981.

While it would be far more preferable to not be the subject of negative union propaganda, there is strong evidence that union leaders have not had much impact on their members' attitude toward the President.

file
UNION BUSTERS

1. Advanced Management Research, New York City
2. Alpha Associates, Minneapolis, Minnesota
3. American Hospital Association, Chicago
- * 4. American Management Association, New York City
- * 5. American Society for Personnel Administration, Berea, Ohio
6. Applied Leadership Technologies, Inc., Bloomfield, Illinois
7. Arent, Fox, Kinter, Washington, D. C.
8. Associated Building and Contractors, Columbus, Ohio
9. Associated General Contractors, Washington, D. C.
10. Blackstone, Simmons and Peterson, Minneapolis, Minnesota
11. Blakeney and Alexander and Machen, Charlotte, North Carolina
12. Blakenship and Will, Indiana
13. Bond, Schoeneck and King, Syracuse, New York
14. A. Val Bradley and Associates, Minneapolis, Minnesota
15. Branch and Swann, Atlanta, Georgia
- * 16. Center for Management Development (Bryant College) Smithfield, R.I.
- * 17. Center of National Labor Policy, Arlington, Virginia
18. Center for Values Research, Inc., Dallas, Texas
19. Central Piedmont Employers Association, Inc., North Carolina
20. Constangy, Brooks and Smith, Atlanta, Georgia
21. Craft, Barresi and Associates, Troy, Michigan
- * 22. Dartnell Institute of Management, Chicago, Illinois
23. Eidson, Lewis, Porter and Haynes, Topeka, Kansas
24. Elarbee, Clark and Paul, Atlanta, Georgia
25. Employee Communication Consultants
- * 26. Executive Enterprises, Inc., New York City
- * 27. Federal Publications, Inc. Washington, D. C.
28. Felhaber, Fenlow, Laison and Vost, St. Paul, Minnesota
29. Fisher and Phillips, Atlanta, Georgia
30. Fox and Grove, Chicago, Illinois
31. Fulbright and Jaworski, Texas
32. Haynsworth, Baldwin and Miles, Greenville, S. C.
33. Hogg, Allen, Ryce, Norton and Blue, Tampa, Florida
34. Hospital Management Research Group, Independence, Missouri
35. House, Holmes and Jewell, Little Rock, Arkansas

Supervisor convicted of perjury in NLRB case.

The August RUB Sheet, reported on supervisor Brad Barasic's indictment on 10 counts having to do with alleged attempts to rig the election against the union. He was finally convicted on making false statements -- a felony -- and fined \$10,000.00 plus thirty days in a work furlough program, 11 months probation and ordered to contribute 300 hours of community service.

This conviction arises out of a case where the employer had hired the anti-union firm of Littler, Mendelson, Fastiff & Tichy to try and stop employees from organizing.

#

Anti-union firms.

We have had numerous requests for a list of anti-union firms. Given the large number involved that is almost impossible. However, our records show that some firms show up again and again in our files. So, it might be useful if you were aware of the major repeaters.

On the next few pages are a list of the major union-busting and other firms that engage in anti-union activities on a regular basis.

Most of these are full time union busters. Others, are double breasted -- engaging in responsible collective bargaining in some cases but resorting to union-busting when requested by the employer. A few specialize largely in union-busting seminars and training materials.

We realize that your favorite union-buster may not be on this list. But this only reflects our files. Send us more information on others and we will include them in the future.

#

36. Human Resources and Profit Associates, Midlothian Virginia
37. Ice Miller, Donadio and Ryan, Indianapolis, Indiana
38. Imberman and Deforest, Chicago, Illinois
39. Industrial Relations Associates, Minneapolis, Minnesota
40. Jackson, Lewis, Schnitzler and Krupman, New York City
41. Jackson, Yeiser, Forman and Allen, Memphis, Tennessee
42. Kuhlman, Lang, Inman and Bee, New Orleans, Louisiana
43. Labor Relations Association, Houston, Texas
44. Littler, Mendelson, Fastiff and Tichy, San Francisco, California
45. McKnight, Henderson, Lewis and Henderson, Memphis, Tennessee
46. Management Education Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan
47. Management Science Associates, Kansas City, Missouri
48. Master Printers Association, Arlington, Virginia
John Doesburg, Scottsdale, Arizona
Pierson, Ball and Dowd; Francis Coleman, Tim Ryan, Mike Moreno, Arlington, Virginia
- ** 49. Modern Management Methods, Deerfield, Illinois
50. Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
51. Mountain State Employer Council, Denver, Colorado
- * 52. National Right to Work Legal Defense and Education, Fairfax, Virginia
53. Ogletree, Deakins, Smoak, Stuart and Edwards, South Carolina
54. Paul, Hastings, Janofsky and Walker, Los Angeles, California
55. Pechner, Dorfman, Wolffe, Rounick and Cabot, Pennsylvania
56. Pope, Ballard, Shephard and Fowle, Chicago, Illinois
57. Professional Seminar Associates, New Jersey
58. Research Institute of America, New York, New York
59. Roberts and Ryder, Indiana
60. Roger, Phillips, Swanger, Des Moines, Iowa
61. Seligman and Seligman, New York, New York
62. Seyfarth, Shaw Fairweather and Geraldson, Chicago, Illinois
63. Shackelford, Fanion, Stallings and Evans, Tampa, Florida
64. Shaw and Rosenthal, Baltimore, Maryland
65. John Sheridan and Associates, New York, New York
66. Siegel, O'Connor and Kainen, Hartford, Connecticut
67. Skolar and Abbott and Hayes, Massachusetts
68. Smith. Reed, Shaw and McClay, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
69. Southeastern Employers Service Corporation, Bristol, Tennessee
- ** (formerly Modern Management Methods) Raymond Mickus and Associates, Northbrook, Illinois (a split from Modern Management).

70. Southern Employees Educational Fund, North Carolina
71. Sullivan and Hayes, New Haven, Connecticut
- * 72. Tactical Advisory Group, Cincinnati, Ohio
73. Tate, Sykes and Bruckner, Nebraska
74. Thompson, Mann, Hutson, Greenville, South Carolina
75. University Research Center, Chicago, Illinois
76. Vedder, Price, Kaufman and Kambolz, Chicago, Illinois
77. Venable, Baetjer and Howard, Baltimore, Maryland
78. Wackenhut, Coral Gables, Florida
79. West Coast Industrial Relations Association, Santa Clara, California
80. Wettmeyer and Associates
81. Young and Perl, Tennessee

* Activities consist primarily of sponsoring or conducting union busting seminars.

