

Chapter 1 : Swedish Dockworkers' Union: Born Fighting Bosses and Bureaucrats

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Working without a contract for most of the last six years, the bus drivers, mechanics and servicers of Local want to wage a struggle against the arrogant Chicago Transit Authority CTA bosses. Workers leaving the meeting told WV salesmen that many waited in line for up to two hours to vote to authorize a strike even knowing that the vote was already one-sidedly in favor although hundreds left before voting. The final count was 1, for and only 11 opposed. The CTA also seeks to make mechanics work eight years to reach top pay and to increase pension contributions from all workers. Local provides a vital service, operating about one million passenger trips each weekday. The transit unions should revive the traditional fighting labor slogan: No contract, no work! While the Republicans openly spit in the face of workers, black people and the mass of immigrants, the Democrats lie to labor and minorities while carrying out their attacks against working people and the poor. Such a leadership must be based on the political independence of the working class. Break with the Democrats! For a workers party that fights for a workers government! Sensing the frustration of the ATU membership with their leaders, Teamsters officials have attempted off and on for several years to raid Local But the Teamsters bureaucrats, who are guided by the same class-collaborationist outlook that defines the ATU tops, are no alternative. A successful Teamsters raid would break up the relationship between ATU locals and , which represent nearly 90 percent of unionized CTA workers. The two locals have a history of joint contract negotiations and struck the CTA together for four days in Joint action by the ATU locals can pave the way for one industrial union of all transit workers, including those in the craft unions, that fights for more full-time jobs with full benefits and seniority rights for the entire membership. The Local tops held the strike authorization vote a week after the Teamsters filed petitions claiming that they had the signatures of 3, CTA workers seeking a representation election. Until recently, the ATU International had deprived Local members of a voice in their union and effective representation on the job by keeping the local in trusteeship for more than two years. The International sent out-of-town officials to Chicago to help oppose the Teamsters raid. Many members would be pleased if the bureaucrats had that much enthusiasm for fighting the company! Transit workers have told WV that the question of the legality of a strike has been a hot topic in the bus barns ever since the strike authorization meeting, where Jefferson said that unlike former local leaders, he rejected the idea that transit strikes were illegal. But then Jefferson turned to binding arbitration, during which strikes are banned by state law. The relationship of forces between capital and laborâ€”not words on paperâ€”is what determines the outcome of class struggle, and the question of working-class leadership weighs heavily in that balance. But with strikers up against both the transit bosses and the courts and cops of the capitalist state, the TWU International stabbed them in the back while the city labor tops left them out to dry. Working for the CTA has long been seen as a good job in Chicago, but for years the transit bosses have ratcheted up their drive against wages and working conditions. A fighting ATU, with its largely black membership, could draw behind it the working class and poor of the inner city. The ATU should fight for free, quality mass transit! The only way to put an end to the exploitation and racial oppression of this society is to put an end to the capitalist profit system itself. It is only through a workers revolution that a planned economy can be established in which the tremendous resources of this society will be placed at the service of those who labor, providing a future for generations to come.

Chapter 2 : Workers'™ power not bureaucrats'™ power: lessons from Argentina | ideas and action

Workers, Bosses, and Bureaucrats: A Socialist View of the Labor Movement in the 's [Tom Kerry] on blog.quintoapp.com
**FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

See correction note appended on bottom. A wrongful dismissal case launched by a Yukon bureaucrat who made secret recordings of his colleagues will be heard later this month. On the recording, a male voice can be heard laughing. The territorial average was 75 per cent. Two sources The Star spoke to confirmed the meeting took place and the recording is real. A transcript of the recording, filed in court by the Yukon Government, also matches the tape. A government spokesperson confirmed the recording but would not identify the employees in question. Schaer claims the voices on the tape belong to Ian Young and Erin Deacon. Emails to both people were not returned. Schaer was let go five days after coming forward with the tape in November. Schaer forwarded the recordings to Yukon College president Karen Barnes in February, who was concerned enough to send them on to the government herself. She said countering those outdated perceptions is a big part of what the college does, in part by ensuring all staff and students take a course called First Nations So how and why did Schaer start making secret recordings in the first place? Schaer started working for the Yukon Government on May 10, , under a standard six-month probationary period. Almost immediately, he began feeling harassed and bullied, he said. You can buy them online. Meanwhile, his co-workers were growing uncomfortable. An affidavit sworn by Monkman said she never witnessed any bullying or harassment of Mr. Instead, when she tried to explain to Schaer that his behaviour was making her and others uncomfortable, Schaer insisted that "pretty much everyone else in the office was trying to sabotage him with false complaints. As his relationships with colleagues continued to deteriorate, Schaer said he kept the recorder rolling the whole time. In late September, that tape picked up the meeting where the two bureaucrats, who Schaer claims are Deacon and Young, allegedly made the disparaging comments. Still, he said he kept his mouth shut and recorder running. But by mid-October, things reached another boiling point. Schaer, who said he is also Francophone, claims he was speaking in French on the phone with an employee at the federal government. During the call, according to an affidavit sworn by Schaer, Young told him to "Take that fg French s--t someplace, else! He also emailed a detailed list of his allegations to his bosses, and their bosses. Schaer claims the decision to extend his probation in the first place was an attempt to buy time while his bosses figured out a legal way to fire him, which he claims they ultimately did. It was also granted an injunction barring Schaer from publishing any more of his recordings, and a restraining order preventing him from contacting Denise Monkman. Emails between numerous senior Yukon Government staff spanning the five days in question shed some light on the situation. Ullyett then emailed Justin Ferbey. Schaer was told to leave the building immediately. He refused, arguing with Ferbey about why he was being let go. And, as he had done for months, Schaer was recording. During a recording of this confrontation, a male voice can be heard saying, "Andrew, you need to read the letter. You are being terminated because you are taping people. The male voice at first refuses, then agrees to escort Schaer to his desk. Schaer refuses and the stand-off continues. He claims he is being held against his will, and asks the police to come and investigate. With the police on their way, Schaer is allowed to leave with his bag unsearched before police arrive. In the early s, Schaer was a member of the Barrie, Ont. Court documents show he served each member with his statements of claim himself, in person. During several of those interactions, the police were called. One of those members was Ian White. White armed himself with a centimetre fibreglass baton, opened the door, "and in no uncertain terms told Schaer to "Get the f--k off my property," Loukidelis wrote. What happened next is a matter of some dispute. White claimed that after he opened the door, Schaer jumped back, "struck a karate-style pose" and continued to taunt White with claims that they would see each other in court. White was found not guilty in a separate criminal trial. Schaer also lost his broader suit against the yacht club over his removal from its membership, though not before he appealed all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada, which declined to hear the case. This article was edited from a previous version that misstated the name of the Ontario Superior Court Justice who authored the decision. The judgment was authored by Justice Ernest Loukidelis. Correction- May 25, In fact,

Schaer has not filed a wrongful dismissal claim. As well, the article was edited to make clear that a hospital report referenced in regard to an incident in Barrie in represented the findings of a court decision by Justice Ernest Loukides.

Chapter 3 : Notes - The Bureaucracy

Bureaucrats are caught between the workers and the bosses. On the one hand, they want to keep the workers quiet; because the more organized the workers are against the bosses, the more they have the power to take away the bureaucrats' privileges.

This army of bureaucrats — almost 3 million strong — gave Clinton a large majority of their votes and over 90 percent of their campaign contributions. Newt Gingrich, a top Trump adviser, warns: The bureaucracy generally has a vise-like grip on the executive branch — presidents come and go, but the bureaucrats remain. Public unions are already digging in for a fight. After the election, J. Thousands of sick vets died at VA hospitals because of employee self-dealing. Bureaucrats doctored the medical wait lists to earn bonuses while vets languished without care. How hard is it to fire anyone at Veterans Affairs? As a candidate, Trump promised to make swift changes. Exit polls show military families voted for him over Clinton. The same changes needed to turn around the VA have to be made across all federal departments. Right now, workers found guilty of serious misdeeds like tax evasion, watching porn on the job or fraudulent collection of unemployment benefits typically keep their jobs and get bonuses. Supervisors ignore the waste and just hire someone else to get the work done. Breaking up the federal employee protection racket will require muscle from Congress and the Department of Justice. Now, with the White House and Congress under Republican control, taxpayers have a fighting chance. A bipartisan VA reform bill with real teeth has already passed the House and is ready for Senate action. It will shorten the process for firing and demoting senior VA personnel, even eliminating appeals to the misnamed Merit Systems Protection Board, which protects criminals and dead wood, not merit. Count on fierce opposition from union-funded pols like Sens. Will Trump, a newcomer to Washington, succeed where other presidents have failed? After all, he defeated spendthrift Clinton with less than a quarter of the campaign staff and half the spending. But federal employees will scramble to stay on the gravy train. One hand washes the other. Trump understands who should be calling the shots in Washington, DC:

Chapter 4 : SparkNotes: The Bureaucracy: What Is a Bureaucracy?

EUROPE Swedish Dockworkers' Union: Born Fighting Bosses and Bureaucrats. The Swedish Dockworkers' Union (SDU), or Svenska Hamnarbetarförbundet (HAMN) in Swedish, has been shaped by decades of rank and file dockworkers' rebellion, bureaucratic expulsions from a general transport union and a long history of international solidarity.

When the votes were counted on October 5, a 54 percent majority of UPS Teamsters had given the thumbs down to a tentative national contract chock-full of concessions to the shipping giant. The deal also offered only paltry wage raises for part-timers and included no protection for employees against the ratcheting up of high-tech surveillance and other forms of harassment and speedup. But the Teamsters leadership, dead set on avoiding a strike, tossed the vote out the window. Those filling these positions will have to work unlimited forced overtime and work weekends with no premium, while their pay will top out well under what traditional drivers make. As is the case throughout the labor movement, introducing such tiers at UPS is corrosive to the unity of the union and gives a huge gift to the bosses. In fact, the union bureaucracy has long helped the company expand its part-time workforce at bottom-level wages. A strike at UPS in , which was cheered by workers across the country, won wage increases for part-timers, but the difference in pay with full-time workers has increased ever since. Many of the 10, full-time jobs the company promised in settling the strike have since been lost through layoffs or changed into split shifts. Other jobs have been moved to new locations with no notification to the union. Every warehouse worker and package driver knows that the three-month holiday rush season is the perfect time to strike. There are over a quarter million UPS Teamsters, the largest private-sector collective bargaining unit in North America. They had voted by over 90 percent to authorize a strike. The 12, workers at the UPS Freight subsidiary have also rejected their contract proposal, seeking to protect their jobs from outsourcing to non-union contractors. The UPS workforce has substantial potential power, as do longshoremens and other workers involved in the movement of goods. Teamsters officials justified ramming through the contract by citing a provision in the union constitution that requires a two-thirds vote to reject a final offer if less than half the membership casts a ballot. This time, some 45 percent of eligible members participated, far more than the previous contract vote five years ago. The Teamsters leadership blocked a potentially powerful strike with a blatant violation of union democracy. This is just the latest illustration that the fundamental loyalty of the Teamsters bureaucracy, like the rest of the labor officialdom, is to the profitability of American capitalism, not to their members. This class-collaborationist crew is long overdue for replacement, but the current crop of out-bureaucrats and would-be reformers in Teamsters United and Teamsters for a Democratic Union TDU is no real alternative. Workers need a leadership that would mobilize labor against the capitalist exploiters, breaking the political chains binding workers to their class enemy and helping to build a class-struggle workers party. For Union Independence from the Capitalist State! There is some bitter irony in the fact that Hoffa was re-elected Teamsters president in by a smaller margin and with a far lower turnout rate than the contract rejection vote. The whole purpose of union democracy is so that the membership can hammer out how best to fight for its interests against the bosses. The only reason these capitalist agencies intervene into the unions is to bring them to heel. In the meantime, the state authorities will tighten their grip on what are the only mass organizations of the working class. Workers must oppose any and every intervention by the capitalist government into the union. The TDU challenged this in court, as part of a series of lawsuits that helped open up the union to government intervention. The Feds have been running Teamsters elections ever since, as well as installing regulators and putting locals in receivership. The real crime was perpetrated by the TDU. In , Carey was elected Teamsters president. For a Class-Struggle Leadership! The difference, though, is that UPS workers are one of the few unionized workforces in the vast, just-in-time cargo supply chain. The crucial issue is leadership. In response to attempts to divide the union, a class-struggle union leadership would demand: Equal pay for equal work! Wage raises to close the gap between warehouse workers and drivers! To stop the brutal pace, it would fight for more jobs to spread the work around at no loss in pay. A militant leadership would also insist that any introduction of labor-saving

technology be used to make jobs easier, not for more speed-up and layoffs. The Teamsters own history provides an example of such leadership: These socialists, who drew inspiration from the October workers revolution in Russia, proceeded from the standpoint of class war. Against the scabs, company goons and cops, they deployed roving pickets dispatched from the union hall. To counter the lies of the capitalist media, they produced a daily strike newspaper. For more on this and other strikes of , see our July pamphlet Then and Now. These militants placed no faith in any capitalist government official or state institution, including the Farmer-Labor Party governor and federal mediators sent by Democratic president Franklin D. Above all, workers were prepared for the inevitable confrontations with the capitalist state. The leaders were overawed by the government, the newspapers, the clergy and one thing or another. They tried to shift the conflict from the streets and the picket lines to the conference chambers. In Minneapolis the militancy of the rank and file was not restrained but organized and directed from the top. Our people were prepared for that since they were political people, inspired by political conceptions But the Teamsters national leadership under Daniel Tobin, a key labor operative for FDR, launched its own campaign, to drive the Trotskyists out of the union. In , the federal government, spurred on by Tobin and cheered by the Stalinist Communist Party, prosecuted leading Trotskyists and Minneapolis Teamsters for their opposition to U. Eighteen went to prison. Today, workers face a daunting situation given the weakening of the unions as a result of decades of betrayals by the labor tops. But the ruling class cannot extinguish the class struggle born of the irreconcilable conflict of interests between workers and their exploiters. The conditions that grind the workers down can and will propel them into struggle, together with their allies among the black and Latino masses and others oppressed by the capitalist system. The Spartacist League aims to win workers to this perspective.

Chapter 5 : Teamsters Bureaucrats Sell Out UPS Workers

Illegal payments for lengthy administrative leave are used by federal bosses to induce problem employees to resign rather than enduring tedious firing processes.

One way capitalists do this is by retrenching workers and making the remaining workers work harder to meet production targets, as well as by attacking wages, working conditions and benefits. States help capitalists do this, among other things, by increasing interest rates while giving corporations tax cuts, commercialising and privatising state owned enterprises and outsourcing the provision of basic services. Unions have failed to defend workers from the immediate threat of these attacks by preventing dismissals and defending jobs, wages and conditions, as well as to mount an effective resistance that can prevent further attacks and begin to roll back the devastating effects of neoliberalism. Moreover, union bureaucrats are often complicit in these attacks through deals they make with governments and bosses. Nactu, Fedusa and Cosatu. Faced with this ruling class threat and with union bureaucracies that are either complicit or unwilling to fight, workers in Argentina have begun a process to build unity in struggle and a democratic worker-controlled alternative. In July, workers at a PepsiCo factory in Buenos Aires arrived at work to find a sign posted on the factory entrance announcing its closure and the dismissal of over workers. Production would be moved to another plant where workers would be expected to work harder and longer to make up for production lost by the closure of the Buenos Aires factory. Left to their fate by union leaders that could or tried to do little to help, workers had no hope but to try defend their jobs through direct action. They collectively decided to occupy the factory to prevent its closure and keep their jobs. The occupation was violently evicted by a massive police operation after a few weeks; but the dismissed workers continued to fight for their jobs. At this camp the PepsiCo workers made an open call to all organisations that wanted to join them in building an independent pole of worker organisation and resistance. In contrast to the union bureaucrats, this initiative would be based on democratic decision-making by workers themselves in open assemblies, and combative class struggle in opposition to years of conciliation by union bureaucrats that try to make workers believe they have something in common with the bosses and government. Instead of being bought off, they chose to rely on their own collective strength; and they took it beyond their won struggles to fight for other demands. Thus they turned their struggle into an example for the entire Argentine working class. One group that heard the call, at a meeting in February, was that of workers dismissed at the beginning of from the Posadas Hospital. The leaders of the big unions and federations have left us to fight alone. We have had strikes, blockades and mobilisations. Now we are uniting to fight, no matter what province or union we are from. We all struggle together and demand a national plan of action so that we can get our jobs back. They demanded an end to the stillness of the union leadership and raised the need for a national general strike and a real plan of action. This action was followed two days later by a general meeting where workers agreed that the central problem confronting them is the role of the bureaucratic union leaders that are either complicit in attacking workers, turn a blind eye or do everything they can to encourage conciliation and compromise. In opposition to this the meeting decided to continue the call for a national general strike and a plan of action; but also to develop a plan of action now specific to the various sectors in struggle, from below, through general assemblies of affected workers. To take immediate steps to strengthen each local conflict, but also to take steps towards formulating a joint plan of action and compelling the leaders of all the union federations both to adopt the joint plan of action and call a national general strike.

Chapter 6 : President Trump's toughest foe: the bureaucracy

Get this from a library! Fighting back in Ukraine: a worker who took on the bureaucrats and bosses. [Oleg Dubrovskii; Simon Pirani].

Some frequently asked questions about WSA and anarcho-syndicalism. WSA differentiates itself from other U. It is a revolutionary organization centered around a specifically libertarian approach to organizing as well as proposing a replacement for capitalism. WSA is dedicated to building a specifically libertarian organization that engages in both organizing and education activity in regards to the anarcho-syndicalist tradition, as well as helping to develop that tradition towards a strong libertarian union movement. We mean unions run by and for workers themselves – the self-organization of the working class in a new kind of militant labor movement. Even in cases where their leaders are sincere, the top-down structure of those kinds of unions leaves the members out of key decision-making and, at best, defends the lousy deal workers already have. We aim to develop unionism in the original sense of the word: The purpose of self-managed unionism is not only to get as much out of the bosses as we can, but also to fight for an end to capitalism and towards a free, self-managed society run directly by workers. Self-management means having a say over decisions that affect you; it means having control over your life. This means people being able to collectively manage the industries they work in; it also means controlling the places you live in. Corporate hierarchies in industry would be dismantled and replaced by workers direct management, through democratic industrial organizations rooted in face-to-face meetings. To most people in the U. That is not what we are for. But we oppose centralized, top-down planning or state ownership of the economy. Under state control, workers are still dominated by a corporate-style boss hierarchy. Does this mean you favor a market system? Markets tend to encourage people to seek narrow competitive advantage, and generate privileges and inequality. When combined with collective or public ownership of productive assets, a market system would inevitably lead to the entrenchment of a new class of bosses. Workers would remain a subjugated and exploited class. A market enables people to use things that give them more bargaining power to gain advantages over others. People who have experience at management or marketing, or technical knowledge important to market success could get firms to give them privileges and perks to entice them to work for that firm. As workers become increasingly dependent on people with expertise, and management knowledge, they will become increasingly under their control. A kind of class division will begin to emerge, in other words. How are the workers going to be able to question decisions if they lack the training and information? Instead of a market-driven system, or top-down central planning, we believe that there needs to be a comprehensive agenda for production that everyone, the entire community, participates in developing. What about WSA and students? Students organized into fighting, democratic unions can push forth their demands on the administration and win important gains more academic freedom, changes in the curriculum, better lunch room food, etc. What about WSA and social issues? WSA is about much more than organizing around workplace issues. Tenant rent strikes or fights against bus fare increases are also part of the class struggle. Our members are active in such areas as housing struggles, the struggles for abortion rights, for gay and lesbian liberation and more. We fight for complete equality for women and oppose all forms of racism. We organize anywhere working class people are, and around issues important to the society we want to create. What about the rest of the world? We see ourselves as part of a broader global movement fighting against oppression, both here and abroad, and actively take part in solidarity campaigns with workers in other countries. Syndicalism is from the word for unionism in the Latin languages. We believe that the working class can develop into a revolutionary force. Through the experience of struggle, working people learn more about the system and how to fight it. When people see a larger and more militant movement, this will encourage them to believe they have the power to remake society. To emancipate themselves from class oppression, workers need mass organizations they directly control, through which they can create a new, self-managed society. The self-management of organizations we build today foreshadows the future self-management of the society. Anarcho-syndicalism is thus a revolutionary strategy for the creation of a society based on workers self-management. Is the WSA itself a

union? I thought anarcho-syndicalist organizations were unions. WSA is not a union but an organization of activists. We advocate self-managed unions so that rank and file folks can control their own workplace struggles. Where AFL-CIO unions exist, we advocate self-managed rank and file organization, independent of the union bureaucrats. We also support efforts to revamp existing unions, to the extent feasible, so they exhibit solidarity in practice and are run in a self-managed way. We also advocate forming self-managed independent unions; for example, in workplaces where AFL-CIO unions do not exist. The idea is to use tactics that will work to foster the growth of militant unionism self-managed by the rank and file. I thought anarchists are against leadership. How are you going to overcome the powerful institutions of the present system? And how can we do that without a coordinated leadership of the struggle? Workers become stronger as they develop links of solidarity and organize themselves independently of the union bureaucrats, politicians and parties, so as to develop broader agreement on aims and a more coordinated struggle. The kinds of hierarchies we find in the national unions of the AFL-CIO, for example, prevent them from being an effective means for ordinary people coordinating their struggles. The AFL-CIO national unions are largely professional cadre organizations beyond the effective control of the rank and file. When push comes to shove, these clauses in union charters are used to squelch a local whose militancy is a threat to the bureaucratic structure. Activities that focus on legalistic bargaining and lobbying with politicians, on the other hand, tends to favor the role of the professional union cadre, who monopolize the specialized knowledge and connections involved in that kind of activity. But the balance of power in society can only be shifted to the advantage of the working class through larger numbers of people being involved, in wider and more militant actions. A movement that concentrates knowledge and expertise and levers of decision-making in the hands of a minority is not a movement that could lead to ordinary working people gaining control over their lives. The alternative is to have an organized effort to build up knowledge and leadership skills in the rank and file. Things like activist schools or study groups or worker centers can help to create more informed activists, and develop abilities like writing and public speaking and critical thinking in rank and file participants. We are not opposed to people taking positions of responsibility, where they are directly accountable, like a shop steward who works the job with her fellow workers. What we are opposed to are top-down hierarchies of professional representatives, as in the AFL-CIO, because this denies self-management to the rank and file. Nor are we opposed to the existence of a coordinated movement of activists, trying to influence larger mass movements in certain directions. The WSA is itself an organization of anti-authoritarian activists that exists to help develop the kind of self-managed movements we favor, and in the process to further the influence of our ideas and program in the labor movement and other social movements. Both workers and consumers, as community members, would take control over the decisions that affect them. Creating a new, self-managed society does mean creating new political institutions — institutions for setting the basic rules of society, protecting self-management against fascist gangs, protecting people against murder or rape, settling disputes, and so on. But we envision this as a grassroots structure of political self-management, direct self-governance, built on grassroots organizations in which the mass of the populace participate, such as neighborhood assemblies and regional congresses and so on. This differs from a state because a state is top-down, is separate from the people, with armed forces that answer to the command of state leaders. The reason that states are separate from the working class is to enable them to protect the interests and power of elites who dominate the working class. Anarchists in the past have sometimes been confused about this, thinking that nothing would replace the state in a libertarian revolution. But it is not possible to have a society without institutions for the making of basic rules and enforcing these rules. A polity is whatever set of institutions play this role in society. A state is merely a certain kind of polity, a hierarchical polity that supports the interests of dominating classes. To liberate itself from class oppression, the working class must get rid of the state, not to replace it with nothing, which is impossible, but to replace it with a self-managing polity that empowers the mass of the people. But it can only be through their own self-managed mass institutions — based on worker assemblies in industries and community assemblies in neighborhoods — that the mass of the populace could be in control. Putting the leaders of some political party into control of a state would not empower the mass of working people. The contest for state power — power over a top-down hierarchy — puts emphasis on people who have special skills and connections,

articulate speakers, people with privileged backgrounds and educations – these are the people who rise to the top of political parties. The contest for control of a state leads to political solutions that emphasize decision-making and control concentrated into the hands of leadership cadre. Control of a state by a leadership group implies that they give orders, and working people are expected to obey. This is a recipe for creation of a new class of bosses, with the working class continuing to be subjugated and exploited. The CNT was an anarchist-influenced federation of mass, self-managed unions in which most workers in that region were members. The second of these proposals was advocated by the union delegation from Bajo Llobregat an area of industrial, working class suburbs south of Barcelona and supported by Juan Garcia Oliver, a well-known revolutionary within the CNT. It is this second proposal that we think they should have carried out. But the working class cannot emancipate itself except by creating mass, self-managing political and economic institutions through which the populace can control the society. The creation of the collectives by the CNT workers who seized thousands of workplaces in Spain shows that they understood this. Engaged in a life-or-death struggle, the mass of workers in Catalonia knew that unity of the workers in the various unions was crucial. There were only two ways that unity could have been achieved: But the central government was well aware that the revolutionary mass movement were the main social power in Catalonia and were reluctant to help build up a revolutionary working class militia, led by anarchists. The CNT collaboration with the Popular Front government, whose leaders mostly opposed direct workers power, led to replacing the working class-controlled labor militia with a top-down, state-controlled army in which the Spanish Communist Party eventually gained most of the officer positions. The CNT government collaboration thus played into the hands of the Stalinists, who aimed at gaining hegemony over Spanish society by gaining control over the predominant armed force. In September of a national CNT convention did propose the formation of a National Defense Council run by the unions, to replace the national government, and Regional Defense Councils also. But by failing to carry this out in the major region where they were strongest – Catalonia – they weakened their bargaining power in trying to get the other main union organization, the Socialist UGT, to go along at the national level. This proposal for a National Defense Council controlled by the mass worker organizations was taken up later in the Civil War by the Friends of Durruti Group. Okay, I think I agree with you. But why should I join WSA? Maybe I can just continue to advocate these ideas on my own. If activists work together, coordinating on campaigns or projects, we can accomplish more than if everyone acts in isolation.

Chapter 7 : The Labor Bureaucracy – Workers World

In contrast to the union bureaucrats, this initiative would be based on democratic decision-making by workers them-selves in open assemblies, and combative class struggle in opposition to years of conciliation by union bureaucrats that try to make workers believe they have something in common with the bosses and government.

They wheel and deal with the politicians in the back rooms like a boss. When it comes time to call a strike or fight hard for a better contract, sometimes you think they are listening to the boss. But are the labor bureaucrats really the same as the bosses? The bureaucrats depend on the existence of the unions for their jobs, and so are forced to fight the bosses enough to keep unions intact. In fact, in order for the antagonisms of class society to be maintained, the existence of a labor bureaucracy is necessary. Bureaucrats are caught between the workers and the bosses. On the other hand, the bureaucrats cannot work completely for the bosses, because the bosses are generally opposed to the very existence of unions. Even buying the bureaucrats off costs the bosses money. They may hold the union back, stop it from organizing new workers and encourage workers to participate in less-threatening political action. These leaders are often guilty of backroom deals with the boss that cut the workers out of the process and sell working-class interests short. Real rank-and-file leadership is still visible in some independent unions and at the local level of some of the traditional unions. The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, International Longshore Workers Local 10, United Steelworkers Local Boston School Bus Drivers , and many others around the country offer a glimpse of what the labor movement could achieve if rank-and-file workers were empowered. For the labor movement, there is a real danger of drawing national chauvinistic and protectionist conclusions from objective developments that divert the struggle away from the companies. Many resources are diverted from the organizing of workers into unions and put into canvassing campaigns to support Democratic Party candidates. How did these class-collaborationist labor bureaucrats get control of the unions, which were born out of the bitter struggles of workers for their basic rights? The main reason they were able to gain control was by winning support from the more privileged and skilled workers, who do not typically suffer from national or special oppressions. The bureaucrats, most of whom came from this more privileged section of the working class have been bought off by the extra money and privileges that the ruling class had to offer as a result of the super-profits they had made from imperialism. They used the unions to defend these privileges before anything else. So, indirectly, the ruling class was able to buy off a part of the workers. Still, without the unions the bureaucrats are nothing. With the growing economic crisis, the pressure is on them to act.

Chapter 8 : Workers' Solidarity Alliance | From Self-Managed Movements to A Self-Managed Society

Tubeworker: a platform for rank-and-file London Underground workers, telling you what the bosses and bureaucrats won't blog. quintoapp.comrker reports on workplace issues, puts forward strategies that we think will help workers win, and supports militant, democratic trade unionism.

What I witnessed is an increased polarisation between left and right, but above all an open clash between the revolutionary wing of the Bolivarian movement and the reformists and bureaucrats. In a series of articles I will attempt to illustrate this. One of the most important industrial centres of Venezuela is in the southern state of Bolivar, around the CVG complex of basic industries, producing and processing coal, iron, steel, aluminium, etc. Most of these giant companies are state-owned or have been recently nationalised or re-nationalised by the Chavez government. An example of this is the theft, in November alone, of 12 lorries loaded with tonnes of cabillas, worth BsF 1. Its aim is to build 2 million new homes by However, they have met resistance, not only from old managers, but also from the bureaucracy of the Bolivarian movement itself. These companies generate massive resources and with them widespread mafioso networks selling contracts for supplies, repairs, maintenance, and directly stealing materials to be sold on the black market. It is clear that Luis Velasquez is just the tip of the iceberg of a much wider operation. He even said that some of the workers at Briqven and Orinoco Iron who provided proof against Velasquez were now being threatened with dismissal. Clearly, this shows that the only effective way to combat corruption and bureaucracy is precisely through the democratic participation of the workers at all levels of the management of the companies. Apparently Velasquez, amongst other things, was also diverting cabillas, which are sold at subsidised prices in order to promote social house building, to companies he is involved with in the private sector, which would then sell the cabillas on the black market at 3 or 4 times the official price. Other materials were diverted to Colombia and Brazil where there are no regulated prices and where Velasquez also has business interests. This also shows that you cannot really regulate the capitalist market. Either you take over the means of production and integrate them in a democratic plan of production, or the anarchy of the profit making motive of capitalism will sabotage any attempts at regulation. If private capitalists for instance in food production think that the profit margin they are allowed to make with regulated prices is not enough, they will either shift production to other non-regulated products, or they will sell them to other countries or on the black market at higher prices. Elio Sayago after being attacked. This campaign has nothing to do with genuine trade union democracy, but rather uses mafia type methods, including physical assaults by armed thugs. A worker at Ferrominera del Orinoco FMO was killed in early June in a gun fight at the company gates over trade union elections. Having control of the union in any of these companies gives these bureaucrats power, privileges and access to key information about contracts, suppliers, etc. The FSBT bureaucracy, with the backing of a small group of workers, organized a blockade of the factory gates in June this year which lasted for 34 days, including violent clashes in which a member of the FSBT threatened other workers with a gun. He was arrested, but quickly released because of pressure from Rivero and governor Rangel. The day after, Sayago was accused by two women workers, members of the FSBT, of assaulting them, even though there is video evidence of the attack having been against him, not the other way round. Jesus Pino specifically mentions Swiss based commodities trader Glencore, which is opposed to any attempt to process aluminium in Venezuela into elaborated products and wants to purchase just the raw material in order to sell it on the international market. Under capitalism, the CVG industries had been developed by the state, using oil money, to fulfill a role that the private sector, the parasitical Venezuelan ruling class, was unable and unwilling to do. The CVG had become part of a system in which the state mined iron ore, coal, produced electricity and finally delivered cheap basic products of iron and aluminum to the private sector, which then sold them at a massive profit margin. The nationalisation of companies like Briqven and Orinoco Iron was meant to break with this structure and gear the CVG to fulfill Venezuelan national needs, particularly in the house building sector. The workers are facing powerful enemies, but they also have a proud revolutionary tradition. During the bosses lock out in December , CVG workers maintained the factories working and refused to join in the counter-revolutionary attempt. This was at

a time when SIDOR was in the hands of the Argentinean multinational Techint, whose management was part of the conspiracy to overthrow president Chavez and put an end to the revolution. In the basic industries in Bolivar we can see in a nutshell all the contradictions facing the Venezuelan revolution. But most importantly, we can also see the only force that can solve those contradictions and guarantee the final victory of the revolution:

Chapter 9 : Art Preis: Bosses Push Open-Shop Drive Despite CIO-AFL â€˜Peace Pactâ€™™ (21 April)

New York Post. Share this: Expect federal workers and their union bosses to use every trick in the book to block Trump's reform agenda. Bureaucrats doctored the medical wait lists to.

Factors explaining behavior of officials

1. Recruitment and retention
 - a. Competitive service becoming more decentralized-increasing numbers recruited by agency-specific procedures
 - d. Workers less often blue-collar; increasing diversity of white-collar occupations
 - e. Still some presidential patronage-presidential appointments, Schedule C jobs, non-career executive assignments
- 1 Pendleton Act
- The buddy system
- 1 Name-request job: Firing a bureaucrat
- 1 Most bureaucrats cannot be fired, although there are informal methods of discipline
- 2 Senior Executive Service SES can more easily be fired or transferred
- 3 SES managers receive cash bonuses for good performance
- 4 But very few SES members have actually been fired or even transferred, and cash bonuses not influential
- h. Personal attributes-social class, education, political beliefs
 - a. Results of survey of bureaucrats show that they
 - 1 Are somewhat more liberal than the average
 - 2 But they do not take extreme positions
 - c. Do bureaucrats sabotage their political bosses? Highly structured roles make them relatively immune from personal attitudes This leads to what I call "Bureaucratic Inertia. To what extent would agents of the IRS become "friendlier" just because it was policy. Likewise, if it was a Presidential order, as Commander in Chief, to accept Gays in the military, would the be accepted by Commanders and the rank and file? Culture and careers
 - a. Each agency has its own culture
 - b. Jobs with an agency can be career enhancing or not
 - c. Strong agency culture motivates employees
 - 1 But it makes agencies resistant to change This is also an aspect of Bureaucratic Inertia. Constraints much greater on government agencies than on private bureaucracies
 - a. Hiring, firing, pay, procedures, etc. Effects of constraints
 - 2 Government sometimes acts inconsistently
 - 3 Easier to block action than take action
 - 4 Reluctant decision making by lower-ranking employees
 - 5 Red tape
 5. Why so many constraints? Constraints come from citizens: Agencies often seek alliances with congressional committees or interest groups Harold Seidman estimates that cabinet secretaries spend about 10 percent of their time attending to departmental business and 40 percent of their time testifying before congressional committees. Forms of congressional supervision
 1. Creation of agency by Congress
 2. Statutory requirements of agency
 3. Authorization of money, either permanent, fixed number of years, or annual
 4. Appropriation of money allows spending
 - B. The Appropriations Committee and legislative committees
 1. Appropriations Committee most powerful
 - a. Most expenditure recommendations are approved by House
 - b. Tends to recommend amount lower than agency request
 - c. But becoming less powerful due to: Legislative committees are important when
 - a. A law is first passed
 - b. An agency is first created
 - c. An agency is subject to annual authorization
 3. Informal congressional controls over agencies
 - a. Individual members of Congress can seek privileges for constituents
 - b. Congressional committees may seek committee clearance: The legislative veto
 1. Declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court in Chadha
 2. Weakens traditional legislative oversight but Congress continues creating such vetoes
 3. Their constitutionality is uncertain; debate about the legislative veto continues
 - D. Power inferred from power to legislate
 2. Means for checking agency discretion and for authorizing agency actions contrary to presidential preferences
 3. Means for limiting presidential control-though executive may claim executive privilege
 - V. Red tape--complex and sometimes conflicting rules
 - B. Conflict-agencies work at cross-purposes
 - C. Duplication-two or more agencies seem to do the same thing
 - D. Imperialism-tendency of agencies to grow, irrespective of benefits and costs of programs
 - E. Waste-spending more than is necessary to buy some product or service
 - VI. Reforming the Bureaucracy
 - A. Numerous attempts to make bureaucracy work better for less money
 1. Eleven attempts to reform this century alone
 2. Differs from previous reforms that sought to increase presidential control
 - b. Emphasizes customer satisfaction by bringing citizens in contact with agencies
 3. NPR calls for innovation and quality consciousness by: Less centralized management
 - c. Fewer detailed rules, more customer satisfaction
 - B. Bureaucratic reform always difficult to accomplish
 1. Periods of divided government worsen matters, especially in implementing policy
 - a. Republican presidents seek to increase political control executive micromanagement
 - b. Democratic congresses respond by increasing investigations and rules legislative

micromanagement Important Terms Administrative Procedure Act A law passed in requiring federal agencies to give notice, solicit comments, and sometimes hold public hearings before adopting any new rules. This practice is a recent one and curtails the power of the appropriations committees. These appointments occur in middle- and upper-level positions in the bureaucracy. Although usually not binding, it is seldom ignored by agencies. Freedom of Information Act A law passed in giving citizens the right to inspect all government records except those containing military, intelligence, or trade secrets or material revealing private personnel actions. This network is less common today because of the variety of interest groups that exist and the proliferation of congressional subcommittees. Such networks are replacing the iron triangles. The veto is effected through a resolution of disapproval passed by either house or by both houses. In , the Supreme Court ruled such vetoes were unconstitutional, but Congress continues to enact laws containing them. National Environmental Policy Act A law passed in requiring agencies to issue an environmental impact statement before undertaking any major action affecting the environment. Open Meeting Law A law passed in requiring agency meetings to be open to the public unless certain specified matters are being discussed. Federal legislation significantly limits such appointments today. Pendleton Act A law passed in which began the process of transferring federal jobs from patronage to the merit system. Privacy Act A law passed in requiring government files about individuals to be kept confidential. Schedule C job A form of patronage under the excepted service for a position of confidential or policy-determining" character below the level of the cabinet and sub cabinet. Members of this service can be hired, fired, and transferred more easily than ordinary civil servants. They are also eligible for cash bonuses and, if removed, are guaranteed jobs elsewhere in the government. The purpose of the service is to give the president more flexibility in recruiting, assigning, and paying high-level bureaucrats with policy-making responsibility. These funds are beyond the control of congressional appropriations committees. Whistleblower Protection Act A law passed in which created an Office of Special Counsel to investigate complaints from bureaucrats claiming they were punished after reporting to Congress about waste, fraud, or abuse in their agencies.