The ability of striking construction workers to effectively picket work sites has been restricted since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. A union picketing against a particular employer, with the intent or effect of keeping workers of other contractors or subcontractors off the construction site, constitutes an illegal secondary boycott under Taft-Hartley.

This ruling was upheld by a 1961 Supreme Court decision prohibiting these kinds of pickets.

For over twenty-five years, Labor has attempted to defeat the "secondary boycott ruling". Some argue that contractors and subcontractors working on the same project are "joint venturers" having common interests, and that picketing against joint venturers was not a secondary boycott.

This fight of building trade workers, to obtain the same bargaining tools allowed to unionized industrial workers of a single employer, was recently used to cover up an "attempted robbery" of workers' rights. The robbers were from our own ranks - the Labor leaders of today.

Common-Site Picketing Bill

The "Common-Site Picketing Bill" (HR 5800) will undoubtedly go down in history as the most lobbied for and emotional bill in the past 94th Congress.

In the construction industry, the Common Site Picketing Bill would have made secondary boycotts legal, thus allowing construction trade unions to picket a construction job site even if it meant keeping other workers off the job - including those employed by another contractor.

However, one of the provisions of the Common Site Picketing Bill required a union wishing to engage in common site picketing, to give 10 days notice in writing to all unions on the site, to the general contractor, to the parent labor organization (the International), and to a Federal Collective Bargaining Committee. It also stipulated that common site picketing is legal only if the International Union authorizes the action, taking control another step away from the local rank-and-file.

No wonder, the Internationals spent so much time and money (our dues' money) trying to get Congress to pass the Bill. And these leaders had most of us fooled too - including our local leaders.

Quoting Andrew J. Biemiller, leading lobbyist for the AFL-CIO, as stating that the purpose of the Bill was "to see that every job in America is a union job".

When was the last time our unions tried to organize the unorganized? We know that the real reasons behind the Common Site Picketing Bill was to rob us of our local autonomy. The International tries to steal from us, not just money, but more and more control of our local situations.

And the International labor leaders want "every job to be a union job", except they don't care about what wages and conditions the workers have (see "Pan Am Comes to Trident", page 4).

Curse...Foiled Again

Believe it or not, President Ford did workers a favor when he vetoed the "Common Site Picketing Bill" on January 7, 1976. Although Ford's veto halted the plans of the national labor bureaucrats to acquire more control, he did not intend to protect our local autonomy either.

President Ford, along with the employers and our sell-out leadership, was looking for another bill that would revamped the entire collective bargaining process in the construction industry. The President indicated that he would sign the Common Site Picketing Bill only if both Bills reached his desk at approximately the same time.

The Bill, called the "Collective Bargaining Bill of 1975" was an attempt to give national unions and national contractors and builder associations more control over their local chapters during negotiations.

COMMON SITE PICKETING

Local Control of the Right To Strike

"We are practical men", said Robert A. Georgine, president of the AFL-CIO's Building and Construction Trades Department, who endorsed the Bill. "We think that whatever the negative effect of this (Collective Bargaining) Bill, it is far outweighed by the establishment of an orderly procedure for bargaining."

The "orderly procedure" that Georgine is talking about means a surrender of local union autonomy and rank and file control to a sellout national leadership.

Both the Common Site Picketing Bill and the Collective Bargaining Bill have been "killed" by Ford's veto. The right of workers to effectively picket construction sites, should not be gained at the expense of our right to democratically control our union's affairs.

However, we need and must fight for the right of Common site picketing, but the control must be in the hands of the workers involved locally. This right should be fought for in all contract negotiations, instead of waiting for legislation (see Plumbers Fight for Right to Strike, page 8).

In the future, we should examine every issue affecting our work and rights, especially those issues the current leadership tries to sell us. We should examine the democratic character of our unions and Internationals to guarantee that our future national labor leaders respect and fight for the interests of workers, and not for "peace with management".
No Separate Peace

“No Separate Peace” is a monthly newsletter covering local, national, and international issues as they affect us as members of a working community.

“No Separate Peace” is not an idea, a catchy slogan, or some bilateralistic rhetoric. “No Separate Peace” is a FACT. We believe that no single struggle or issue is separate or isolated from one another. Therefore, as working people, should not be short sighted in our objectives and goals. Nor should we minimize whatever victories we have fought for. But if we stop fighting or relax because a segment of our working community has won “better conditions” or “better wages” without realizing the real nature of our problems, it is a separate peace.

NISP embodies and advocates the principle of a combined effort by all workers of all nationalities for the accomplishment of common goals.

This publication is addressed to a specific audience—construction workers in Seattle and is intended to stimulate discussion and action.

“No Separate Peace” is a publication of the United Construction Workers’ Association (UCWA). The UCWA is a Seattle based organization of Third World (national minority) construction workers who are also active members of various AFL-CIO unions.

The magazine is a non-profit publication. We ask a $2.50 fee for yearly subscriptions. Address correspondence, criticisms, complaints, and checks to No Separate Peace. The NISP office is located at 105-Fourteenth Avenue, Suite 1A, Seattle, Washington 98112.

The Bug

“No Separate Peace” is a publication produced by trade unionists. In choosing NISP’s printer, the main concern was how it could be subsidized.

NISP does not support kooch shops. Only through strong unions can printers and all workers strive for better conditions in the workplace and in the community. Printing NISP in a non-union shop would weaken the struggle among printers to form an organized union.

Therefore, NISP is printed in a union shop and is proud to carry “the BUG” on every issue.

When the question of racism is raised in most situations, those who take part in the discussion have many different definitions as to what it means. Conversely, almost no one knows what its effects are and whose interest racism serves.

In order to understand racism and its effects, we must examine its historical origin and historical effects. Once we know the past we are better equipped to understand the present.

The question of racism and its effects didn’t start with the Supreme Court’s decision on school desegregation or the civil rights movement of the ’60s and ’70s. Nor is it a phenomenon common only to the American people.

We can trace racism to people in ancient China 2,000 years ago when dynasties were made up of people of the same race or nationality. In search of wealth and power the rulers in these dynasties fought amongst each other. They conducted wars to suppress other nationalities. We see the physical and cultural difference of Europe being used as a basis for the suppression of one group by another. Actually the wars have been fought by nations that formed on the basis of geography, culture and language. However the racial and cultural difference was used by the victor to distinguish and suppress the people of different races. We find these differences in pre-colonial Africa. However, since feudal times, the results have always been the same. The suppression of one race by another for the good of the ruling elite, which was only a small part of the conquering race.

One only needs to go back to post-World War I to Germany to get a good example of this kind of racism. To see its negative is a pinch of a race that was the same as the ruling elite and the people who were the victims of this racism.

At the end of World War I the German government by passing laws without the natural resources and cheap labor to produce goods necessary to maintain the economy of an advanced, industrially-developed capitalist country. In order to maintain their economy, they had to develop new sources of raw materials and new markets to sell these goods in. This could not be done in a democratic society unless the masses of the people thought that it was in their interest to do so, which certainly was not the case.

First of all, resistance to foreign war had to be suppressed internally. A division among the German people was necessary to take away their democratic rights (freedom of assembly, freedom of press, speech, etc.), and establish a fascist state that could enter into wars without the consent of the people. The French-Crimea, China war and the American Vietnam war are examples of what happens when “democratic” countries attempt to engage in wars of suppression without first taking away the democratic rights of the people. In both these cases the internal resistance to the war became a contributing factor to forcing the government to withdraw its military forces. The target of the German ruling elite was first the German people, then other European states. This fight to destroy the internal resistance took the form of racism against the Jewish people.

In order to weaken the German people, a fascist doctrine took the form of the racism of supremacy. The German people were taught that they were better than the Jewish people based on racial purity. Because there were Jewish financial capitalist (bankers) in Germany, the entire Jewish people were blamed for the fall of the national economy. The German mark was virtually worthless by 1920. Inflation had destroyed the country.

Economists could trace this problem directly to the loss of their North African colonies. The German government and the ruling elite, also saw these colonies as the origin of their problems. However, they knew that it was in their interest to blame these problems on the Jewish people, thereby, dividing the working class, and weakening the resistance to fascism.

The German majority turned on the Jewish minority and the German fascist state came to power. One of their first actions was to disband or make illegal any trade unions.

Even though there were many reasons contributing to the inability of German workers to successfully resist their own oppression and the rise of fascism, racism became the most decisive tool of the fascists. Racism allowed them to divide and ultimately destroy the German trade unions...resulting in a devastating defeat to the German working class.

The results of what happened to both the Jewish people and the German people are well known. What we as American workers must begin to see, is how our interest lies in our unity and how racism effects us in our day to day relations.

This article is the first of three in a series. The first part deals with the historical development of racism. The second part is about racism in America and the third part is about How Racism Manifests Itself in the Work Place and How It Divides Workers.

RACISM: The Divider

It is important that we fight against racism and see whose interest it serves.

There are a number of parallels in the German situation and what is happening in America today.

The loss of foreign markets through national liberation struggles in Vietnam, Mozambique, Cambodia, etc. (See workers victorious in Angola) Jewish workers increased competition from foreign manufacturers and through nationalization of U.S. corporations in Latin America and Arab countries, have caused the American economy to decline.

Because most workers fail to make any analysis of the class structure in this society, we incorrectly conclude that because someone's skin is the same color as ours, then that person will always be our ally. This will allow a white worker to conclude that the Rockefeller's or the Gatsby's interest is the same as his, when in fact, they are diametrically opposed.

One is in the business of purchasing labor for the lowest possible price, while the worker is in the business of selling labor for the highest possible price.

It then stands to reason that those who sell labor must come together with others who sell — and those who buy labor with others who buy — both to strengthen their ability to win against each other.

This has already happened in both cases. The buyer has formed employers associations while the seller has formed trade unions.

Unity inside both these associations are necessary to their survival.

In the case of the employers associations, unity can only go as far before one consumes the other. This can be seen in the development of monopolies in this country in the food industries and in the auto industries, where only three car manufacturers remain: Ford, General Motors and Chrysler.

In the case of the seller of labor (workers), only through our unity will we win gains in wages, working conditions, fringe benefits, etc.
RACISM cont.

The struggle for unity among the American workers is necessary in the face of a declining economy, when economists see the solution to inflation in higher unemployment. This unity cannot be achieved in the absence of organizing the unorganized workers and fighting against racism.

Labor History

We will have an article in every issue on United States labor history. It is important that we know the past in order to understand the present. Most so-called labor leaders today have us believe that we must beg for our rights, trying to make us forget our history of struggle and the many gains won through solidarity and struggle.

MR. PRESIDENT: VETO THE HARTLEY-TAFT SLAVE LABOR BILL

The Taft-Hartley Act is a vicious anti-labor bill that was passed in 1947. It is one of the strongest strike-breaking tools the employers have. It has broken seven longshore strikes, five in aerospace, three in maritime, and two in atomic energy. Taft-Hartley was used twice against miners’ strikes. The miners, however, stood firm and united and won both times.

The Wagner Act

In 1935, however, Wall Street’s boys on the Supreme Court declared the National Industrial Recovery Act unconstitutional. Labor, in turn, pushed President Franklin Roosevelt and the Congress to pass the Wagner Labor Act (the National Labor Relations Act), backing up labor’s right to organize and bargain collectively.

Again, a great upsurge of union organizing followed; Labor, under the leadership of the CIO was on the rise. Four years later, organized labor, with about 10,000,000 members, had almost tripled its growth and had gained over $6 billion more a year in wages for its members.

The Nazis in Germany and warlords in Japan, however, after smashing workers’ organizations in Europe and Asia, decided to make a grab for the whole world. U.S. labor leaders, calling for “Equality of Sacrifice”, adopted no-strike pledges and minimal wage gains until the fascists were defeated.

IN-equality of Sacrifice

Big business’ patriotism was overridden by its capitalist greed, however, as profits shot up 250% during the war years, as the cost of living climbed 43.5% and wages gained only 15%.

After World War II, the workers returned to the struggle at home. Over 5,000,000 workers went on strike in 1946, the most ever in U.S. history. Big business, fearful of this new mass uprising, called on its government for help in beating back the workers’ gains.

The National Association of Manufacturers, the organization of big business, drafted and sent to Congress the Taft-Hartley Bill. The Taft-Hartley Bill was openly anti-union.

Taft-Hartley reinstated injunctions and unions the power to fine for alleged violations. It established an 80-day cooling-off period in which strikes could not be declared, it outlawed mass picketing. It provided for the suing of unions for “unfair labor practices.” It institutionalized the right to outlaw the union (Section 148). It prohibited secondary boycotts and weakened the active shop steward system.

Individual workers could now take their grievances to the bosses and settle them even at the expense of their fellow workers, without having to consult the shop steward.

The Taft-Hartley Act institutionalized red baiting. It required all union leaders to swear to “non-communist affiliations” in order for their unions to be able to use the National Labor Relations Board, or appear on the ballot for union recognition. This provision was meant to starve witch hunts within the unions, and established the basis for legal discrimination against union militants. It was no longer enough for a leader to be a legitimate member of the union. Now his or her political beliefs were to be controlled and investigated by the government.

"Friends" of Labor

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed by the Congress in 1947. In the House of Representatives 103 Democrats voted for it, 85 against. In the Senate, it was 17 Democrats for, 15 against.

President Harry Truman, posing like a typical Democratic “friend of labor”, vetoed the bill. He did so, because he knew his veto would be overridden and the bill would become law anyway. Despite his feeble opposition and veto, Truman was forced to use Taft-Hartley 58 times in the next 29 months, or about once every two weeks.

The American Federation of Labor (AFL) and the Congress of Industrial Organization (CIO) both voted to oppose and non-compliance, especially to the red-baiting affidavits.

To prove that action speaks louder than words, almost all union officials signed quickly, however, and raised other unions who refused to let their officers sign. Taft-Hartley not only was to be a huge labor cannon aimed at the workers, but also led the labor movement to work for its own destruction and disunity.

The United Electrical Workers (UE), a large, democratic union with the best contracts in the country, refused to allow its officers to sign the affidavits. Other unions, including the Auto Workers and Machinists, raised UE locals around the country, losing many of the best contract provisions and splitting the labor movement.

Miners Fight and Win

On April 9, 1948, a judge issued an injunction against 320,000 striking coal miners at the request of President Truman. The miners struck to force the companies to make the payments into their pension fund as required by the contract.

After four more days on strike in defiance of the injunctions, the coal companies agreed to the full pension demands. Two-thirds of the miners stayed out on strike for 11 months to remove the court’s “contempt” action against the United Mine Workers Union and its president, John L. Lewis. On June 22nd, the judge was forced by the striking miners’ refusal to return to work to rule the pension demand legal - a complete triumph.

Less than 2 years later, on February 6, 1950, Truman issued a Taft-Hartley injunction against 100,000 striking miners. They were immediately joined by 270,000 more miners. Many United Auto Workers (UAW) locals called for a 24 hour national strike. UAW locals sent money and food to the miners and a huge labor caravan set off from Detroit. On March 5th, the coal operators collapsed and agreed to the seventy cents a day demanded by the miners.

The miners showed that unity, organization, and determination the Taft-Hartley Act can be made a mere piece of paper. We must not let big business and government flunkies defeat our just struggles.

The fight to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act must be taken up by all labor unions, from the locals to the International AFL-CIO Executive Committee. Until repeal, we must not be afraid of Taft-Hartley (or any other) injunctions, but must stand determined and united to win a better life.
In late May, construction workers at the Trident Mistle site also learned that Pan Am World Airline had broken the maintenance contract. The real building was being completed and the Navy would take possession in early June. The Navy would, however, turn over only these buildings over to Pan Am for maintenance.

The Maintenance Mkhth

As construction workers, we often make comments about maintenance, an issue that seems to only involve cleaning, or keeping a three year old happy. An issue called maintenance instead of construction? I think we should be paid lower wages.

Because of this mythical difference, we the employee to the workers at lower trades, for instance, organizes the unorganized workers and gets them to all come under a collective bargaining agreement. It is too early to do this, but I feel that it will be necessary to recognize the basic trade skills.

The question, then, of who will be affected by the construction workers by the Navy, who would become unemployed and who would work for the Navy? This will also work for the Pan Am maintenance corporation. This will also work for the Pan Am maintenance corporation. This will also work for the Pan Am maintenance corporation. This is a point at which the maintenance and the work is an issue. At the very least the maintenance and the work is an issue. At the very least the maintenance and the work is an issue. At the very least the maintenance and the work is an issue.

Who is Pan American Airways

Everyone was surprised when we heard that Pan Am was coming to Trident. The Navy was totally surprised. I thought the company was only in service with international routes. We certainly did not see it as a viable competitor. Thanks to a picture-line by the Liberty Union on Tuesday, June 8th, we were able to do some closer checking. When we look closer at Pan Am, we see a major international corporation engaged in many areas with the airline being only one of them.

We also saw Pan Am as a company with a declining profit margin. When Pan Am decided to seek a government agreement to keep the company solvent, the president of the corporation used the argument that the decrease in their profit margin was due to an increase in competition from foreign airlines, both in the United States, Europe, Japan and in developing countries in the world.

These foreign airlines, Pan Am's direct competitors, could have cut costs by removing the government subsidies. Now we have to pay our workers at the government wages, and Pan Am's interest in the company could be the reason why we are not paid.

Pan Am - Am Can't

However, this does not have to be the case. The question is not if we can do better, but if we can. Why? Many of the union members could decide that this is not the right issue for our members. We are not here to tell you what to do, we are here to tell you we have to do it.

On Wednesday, April 21st, a rumor was spreading like wildfire in the Trident maintenance area. The word was there was going to be a strike. People were going to the union, not to the shop, but to the union. The strike was on.
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WORKERS VICTORIOUS IN ANGOLA

There arises a moment in history when the colonized, the exploited, become conscious of their condition and of themselves. And it is not possible for them to be conscious of their situation without revolting against it, because revolt is the only human reaction to the recognition of an inhuman condition.

The exploited one does not separate his destiny from that of others. One's misfortune is, in fact, a collective misfortune and it is due to the economic, political and social structures of the society in which one lives.

Who Defeated the Portuguese

The real history behind the situation in Angola is being sidetracked when it is stated that there are three genuine liberation movements or that the struggle is a "tribal conflict". The essence of the Angolan conflict is the struggle between the forces of international capitalists, seeking to maintain Angola by way of the tribal-based African elites, and the true forces of progressive popular democracy.

It is now clear that only one movement consistently confronted and finally defeated Portuguese colonialism in Angola. And only one movement fought for the genuine independence in the interest of the mass of Angolan workers and peasants. That movement is known as the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). It has always been a nationalist movement with a multi-tribal leadership.

After the Portuguese Coup

MPLA agreed to form a united front with the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), the other liberation movements in Angola. Their objective was to negotiate with the Portuguese for the independence of Angola.

On January 14, 1976, the Alvor Agreement was signed with the Portuguese, establishing a transitional government and plans for elections to be held for Independence day.

The anti-imperialist front (MPLA) was willing to work with the puppet forces (FNLA and UNITA) because they knew this would win greater support from the people in the long run and help expose the reactionary character of these puppet forces.

This is, indeed, what happened. MPLA representatives in the transitional government initiated and encouraged the organization and mobilization of workers and peasants in the urban shantytowns and villages. People's Commissions were established to tackle literacy and health problems and to involve the workers and peasants in the decisions of the transitional government.

Early successes included the raising of black workers' wages to equalize with the white workers' wages.

Opposition Exposed

The Angola workers' economic, political and social rights are the most important rights because it is their blood, sweat and toil that has made the nation what it is today. Everything existing is created by the Angolan workers. Therefore, it logically follows that these workers should control their economic, political and social structures.

But to enable the rich U.S. Imperialist and the Portuguese to get richer, they had to oppose this ideology of the Angolan workers taking control of their own destiny rightfully theirs. The bourgeoisie corruptedly maintained what they wrongfully took from the workers by whatever means necessary, but the Angolan workers were constantly aware of this corruption.

The corrupt elements of UNITA and FNLA in the transitional government soon arose when they realized their dependence on the will of Others.

Lacking popular support, UNITA and FNLA began trying to seize control by force and intimidation, which is a typical reaction for collaborators supporting imperialism. But now that MPLA has declared the People's Republic of Angola, a free and sovereign state, reactionary imperialist forces have shifted forceful aggression to economic strangulation of the new people's state. A secret economic boycott, as happened in Chile before the To call for coalition or "national unity" with such traitors is similar to calling for unity with the CIA and South African fascists.

Why Imperialist Forces Want Angola?

Are the imperialist forces intent, simply to prevent Soviet influence in Southern Africa?

President Neto's response to this question is: "I wish to make it clear that we appreciate and recognize the assistance from all our friends, including Russia, but we do not accept any form of foreign political domination... We do not take orders from any big power in this world. We have always had the pride to determine our political line, ourselves, and the ideology which suits the people's interest." MPLA has received support from the Soviet Union as have many other liberation movements around the world, such as the National Liberation Front of Vietnam, FRELIMO of Mozambique, the Palestine Liberation Organization, but it does not logically follow from this that they are "clients of Moscow."

By using the term "Soviet backed" referring to MPLA, the bourgeois mass media is trying to distort Angola's independent socialist character and rouse the opposition of all elements critical of the Soviet Union. Every progressive country in Africa (Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Algeria, Senegal, Tanzania, People's Congo and Zaire) has recognized and supported the People's Republic of Angola. Other revolutionary forces supporting MPLA include Vietnam, Cuba, People's Republic of China, to name a few. MPLA should correctly be referred to as a progressive, anti-imperialist, popular democratic movement.

Angola, Potentially the Wealthiest Nation in Africa

The real reasons behind North America and West European involvement in Angola are not the "preventing imperialism" or the "preventing Soviet influence". They are actually Angola's natural wealth and strategic position rather than both of which are important to corporate and military interests in the West.

Last year alone, multi-national corporations extracted over $1 billion in profits from Angola, a country with no strategic position for domination of Southern Africa, whose mineral wealth is increasingly vital to the expansion of international capital interests.

It has vast deposits of copper, iron, diamonds, manganese, titanium and other vital minerals; most of all, oil.

Agriculturally, Angola is vitally important. A study by a U.S. consulting firm suggests that Angola could become a breadbasket for Africa.

A genuinely independent Angola will utilize these resources to serve the Angolan people. They do not defend and do not intend to defend the principle that this wealth should be handed over to the imperialist capitalist. Nor does Angola intend to have its peasants and workers exploited.

We, as workers from other countries, should not allow our fellow workers to be exploited so that the bourgeoisie can maintain their standard of life to which they have become accustomed at the expense of unpaid labor, cheap labor and looting in colonies. We as workers in this country are exploited and only through workers' solidarity can we overcome international exploitation of workers.

The solidarity and commitment of other revolutionary forces has been great. The President of the Mozambique Liberation Front, Samora Machel, has stated, "the fate of the revolution is being played out in Angola.

An initial force of 250 experienced FRELIMO militants fought alongside of MPLA, and workers throughout Mozambique have contributed a day's wage in support of the Angola People's Republic. The MPLA leadership for their strong international spirit and commitment, sent some of their sons and daughters to fight alongside and to assist MPLA building block.

Just as Angola will be a support base for other liberation struggles in Africa and just as Cuba, the Soviet Union and other countries were bases of support for Angola, it is in the interest of workers from other countries to support struggles of liberation.

A liberated Angola will be a base of support for the liberation movements in Namibia (South West Africa), Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and South West Africa (Namibia) and an example for progressive forces in Zambia and revolutionaries in Zaire.

It is this which worries the multi-national corporations and their agents in Africa. The fact that liberation movements are rapidly growing and fighting for freedom and against imperialism means eventually bringing imperialism back home. Then, I say, run away shops cannot run away any more. Multi-national corporations bought cheap labor elsewhere because wages were higher, but their leaving meant unemployment for us.
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The most glaring defect in the private pension system is the fact that over 50% of wage and salary workers in the U.S. do not participate in any pension program. With fewer than half of all employees now covered ever receiving a penny of benefits and the meager monthly payments made to plan participants, pensions have proven themselves to be an ineffective solution to a worker’s retirement security (see “No Separate Peace,” May 1976, “Pensions - Our Future Security?”).

The root cause of this failure lies in the design and control of these pension plans.

As plan participants, we have forfeited the necessary rank-and-file control to a few individuals called “Trustees,” though our acceptance of the status quo. These Trustees, half of whom are appointed by labor and the other half by management, have the responsibility, the discretion, and the control to make all decisions about our money. Every decision from where it is invested to how much each participant will receive. These kinds of decisions will certainly be necessary to make in the future, even if the control and decision making is in the hands of the workers involved. However, we must ask ourselves at this point, why management is involved in the control of our money? We believe the answer is, that management uses it to invest in their own interest.

In every case the Trustees employ the services of a private administrator, a bank or some other type of financial institution to handle pension funds, thereby taking workers’ pension money one more step away from their control.

These financial institutions are the big winners. The banks are able to make use of the investment of workers’ money in many ways, including the following: 1) through the loans that example to the investment in companies which are long-standing customers of the bank; 2) through investment in companies where the bank already holds blocks of stock (other pension money), and 3) the additional corporate control gained from voting the shares of stock held in the pension fund, bought with workers’ money.

Sometimes, the investment of workers’ pension money by these financial institutions come into conflict with the interests of workers. Often, the benefit money provides the needed capital for a company to close its doors to hundreds of workers by moving its shops to the south or out of the country. Today, when they find cheaper labor.

What is a worker controlled pension... and how is it better?

The answer to that question is for us all to decide in our respective locals. To live in a better understanding of what we could demand, the following is an example of what might be possible for members of IBEW, Local # 46 Wineman’s unit.

The calculations made in the following table are based upon rough estimates of the number of persons to be receiving pension benefits each year. The Wineman’s unit in Local # 46 has about 1100 members. An average of about 750 members working each month, working an average of 1400 hours each year was used to compute the total employer contributions going into the fund annually (example: for 1976 - 750 x 1400 hrs. x $4.60/hr. = $420,000). These “employer contributions” are actually deductions from our wages before we receive our checks.

The U.S. Census Bureau reports that the normal life expectancy for men is approximately 67.3 years and 71.1 years for women. With the current retirement age of 65, pensioners actually don’t get full value in their monthly incomes. After pensioners die, even less goes each month to the spouse. Nevertheless, to insure that this example is an improve over the present plan, we have used the age of 70 years for life expectancy.

The numbers of persons eligible for retire ment has been estimated at approximately 65.6 million per year. From 1976-1977, these numbers increase from 10 to 50.

We can now see how the struggle of the Angolan worker is tied to the struggle of national liberation struggles force these giant corporations to return home and deal with the workers in their own countries. The corporations will then try to reduce wages in their own countries, so that they can maintain high profits. But with strong labor unions, we will defeat their exploitation of workers here at home.

We can now see how the struggle of the Angloan worker is tied to the struggle of national liberation struggles force these giant corporations to return home and deal with the workers in their own countries. The corporations will then try to reduce wages in their own countries, so that they can maintain high profits. But with strong labor unions, we will defeat their exploitation of workers here at home.

However, the determining factor in high profits is the difference in the cost of production and the market value of the product.

One of the main factors in the cost of production is the cost of labor, since these large corporations are hoarding their cheap source of raw materials and labor in foreign countries and because they will continue to do business on the profit interest; they will be forced to try to reduce wages at home.

This fact speaks to the need for us as American workers to build strong trade unions and resist attempts to divide us, or convince us that we should support U.S. intervention in National Liberation struggles.

Each time we look at these cases, where the U.S. government or U.S. corporations have been involved in successful intervention and overthrow of democratic governments, we can see that the first act on the part of the new leadership has been to disband the trade unions.

This was the case in Chile, where both the CIA and ITT played a major role in the overthrow of the democratic elected government. Also, in Argentina, where the military dictatorship took power with the support of the U.S. government and disbanded trade unions.

Our interest lies with the interest of workers in other countries. In order to protect our interest, we must transform workers’ nationalism and racism into workers’ solidarity.
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Each time we look at these cases, where the U.S. government or U.S. corporations have been involved in successful intervention and overthrow of democratic governments, we can see that the first act on the part of the new leadership has been to disband the trade unions.

This was the case in Chile, where both the CIA and ITT played a major role in the overthrow of the democratic elected government. Also, in Argentina, where the military dictatorship took power with the support of the U.S. government and disbanded trade unions.

Our interest lies with the interest of workers in other countries. In order to protect our interest, we must transform workers’ nationalism and racism into workers’ solidarity.

Workers’ Victory can’t wait!

Electricians who have worked on this pension plan example will present a proposal for discussion at the next Wineman’s unit meeting, Wednesday, July 7th.

Members of Local # 46 who agree with this design, or who have other ideas, should come and raise questions or offer suggestions.

*Accurate information is not available at this time due to inadequate disclosure laws.

**There are currently some efforts to change Social Security on a national level to include a 90% retirement income along with an early retirement age.
Plumbers Fight For Right To Strike

Almost 4,000 plumbers and fitters in Seattle, Central and Southeastern Washington are on strike against the Mechanical Contractor Associations of Washington (MCA).

United Association Local #32, in Seattle, struck at 11:00 p.m. June 2nd, rejecting the latest MCA offer.

The central issue is the "Grievance Procedure". The expired agreement provides for arbitration if disputes cannot be settled between union and employer. When a dispute is arbitrated, a "third party" hears the arguments of both sides and then decides how the issue should be resolved.

These decisions however, are not binding. Except for instances where both employer and union agree with the arbitrator, the current Grievance Procedure has usually resulted in litigation, a costly and slow solution, often resulting in favor of the employer, since the orderly process of business is not interrupted.

In place of arbitration, the unions are demanding the right to strike during a contract period, when grievances cannot be settled. The significance of this right can be measured in its logic and resistance.

Neither a judge nor an arbitrator, both of whom are "third parties" should be in a position to decide the terms of our employment. Obviously, the employers recognize the threat represented in a union's ability to strike and they have shown that they are willing to concede to most any other demand.

Money. No Problem

A total increase of $1.25 per hour effective June 1, 1978, with a 50-cent increase in June '77 has been agreed to, and never really was a question. Whatever the increase, it doesn't matter to the employers, because they would pass it on to the consumer anyway. Increased travel subsistence and a few other demands have been met by the employers, as well.

With the lines of division so clear now, what are the tactics of the union leadership?

With their members on strike, union leaders have chosen to walk until management indicates a willingness to negotiate. There are no pickets anywhere. The effect on construction projects has been minimal and therefore the burden is shifted to us workers. Even union leaders continue to draw their salaries, while only workers suffer. The employers can wait us out through the profits they have made through our labor. Are the tactics chosen by our leadership correct?

We should support our leaders in the unions. However, our leaders should also be putting forward a position that all the members have taken part in developing and are willing to fight and sacrifice for.

A 1981 Supreme Court ruling (see front page, "Common Site Picketing — Local Control of the Right to Strike") made it illegal for unions to picket a construction site, as other workers from different employers could honor the picket and effectively close down an entire job. This ruling held that such actions would constitute an illegal "secondary boycott" under the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

Union leaders, if they submit themselves to such laws, have no recourse, but must play the overused and unsuccessful "waiting game". A strong leadership would contest and object to such laws. The struggle against Taft-Hartley is such an example (see Labor History on page 3).

In the contract that just expired, the leadership of Local #32 conceded to the employers, a provision that established a "helpers program". These Union leaders argued that a "helpers category" was necessary for the employers to be able to compete with other mechanical contractors that did not pay their workers the union scale.

In other words, these Union leaders connect our interests to the interests of management. Rather than to lower the wages of union workers, the solution should be to organize the unorganized workers.

We should not allow management or our Union leaders to disguise the conflicting interests of workers and bosses. Contrary to what they tell us, "What's good for management is not necessarily good for the workers".

However, in the current contract dispute, our leaders are correct; it is the employers who would have us lower our wages or "speed-up" so that they may continue to make profits.

We need the right to strike at any time. It is important to the protection of our job security, health, and safety. A strike provision should be fought for in every contract.

What Is To Be Done

Striking plumbers and fitters should demand that their leaders organize pickets for strategic work sites to re-shift the burden onto the shoulders of the employers. The support from other workers in different trades could be gained through these pickets, regardless of these anti-worker laws.

Let's be clear, the employers are only interested in making profits, and these profits are dependent upon the product of our work. We can only pressure the employers to concede to our demands if we disrupt the flow of money into their hands. We, as workers, should not sacrifice the current struggle to gain the right to strike for any price.

ISSUE: GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE
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