Relations industrielles
Industrial Relations

Federation Expulsions and Union Mergers in the United States
Expulsion des centrales et fusions syndicales aux États-Unis

Gary N. Chaison

Volume 28, numéro 2, 1973

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/028395ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/028395ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (imprimé)
1703-8138 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Chaison, G. N. (1973). Federation Expulsions and Union Mergers in the United States. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, *28*(2), 343–361. https://doi.org/10.7202/028395ar

Résumé de l'article

Au cours des dernières années, le mouvement des fusions syndicales s'est accéléré aux États-Unis. Cependant, le nombre de fusions effectuées demeure mince. La structure politique des syndicats, ce qui comprend les sentiments d'hostilité causés par les rivalités d'autrefois, la répugnance des chefs syndicaux à renoncer à leurs postes et des méthodes différentes de fonctionnement entre les syndicats comme, par exemple, la tenue des congrès et le mode d'élection des dirigeants, constitue des barrières formidables aux fusions. Ces barrières sont le plus souvent renversées quand les syndicats sont acculés à des difficultés financières, qu'ils subissentdes défaites à répétition dans leurs campagnes de recrutement et qu'ils perdent un nombre substantiel de membres.

Cette étude tend à démontrer que les facteurs de nature à inciter aux fusions, tout en abaissant les barrières, peuvent résulter directement de l'expulsion des centrales et de maraudages qui l'ont suivie. De plus, on peut noter que la présence d'un nombre accru de syndicats expulsés ou indépendants dont le champ de compétence est très vaste fournit un excellent véhicule de fusion aux syndicats expulsés plus faibles peu désireux de faire « peau neuve » en vue d'obtenir leur réaffiliation.

L'analyse du statut actuel des syndicats qui ont été expulsés des centrales depuis 1949 révèle la fréquence et la forme des fusions. Les motifs d'expulsion comprennent la domination communiste (onze syndicats du C.O.L), la corruption (un syndicat du C.O.I. et quatre syndicats de la F.A.T.-C.O.I.) et l'appartenance à deux centrales opposées (un syndicat de la F.A.T.-C.O.I.).

On s'est rendu compte que seuls deux syndicats expulsés se sont effrités, pendant qu'un seul a renoué ses attaches à sa centrale. Les autres syndicats expulsés ont subi toute une série compliquée de fusions avec des syndicats rivaux affiliés ou d'autres syndicats expulsés. Les pertes d'effectifs consécutives au maraudage pratiqué après l'expulsion ont eu, selon toute apparence, pour effet de pousser les syndicats expulsés à rechercher la sécurité au plan du recrutement et de la négociation collective dans la consolidation avec d'autres organisations plus fortes. En outre, des mouvements internes visant à bannir les dirigeants corrompus ou communistes ont atténué l'importance de la barrière principale à la fusion, c'est-à-dire la répugnance des chefs syndicaux à céder leurs postes

On peut présumer que ce désir réel de fusion se présente sous la forme d'une réaction récurrente des syndicats expulsés aux menaces d'isolement. Même si le vocabulaire des recherches voit dans les fusions un moyen commode d'éliminer des champs de compétence chevauchants et d'augmenter la stabilité des centrales, il semble plutôt que les fusions aient joué un rôle dominant et compréhensible dans l'activité des syndicats expulsés pendant les années d'après-guerre.

Federation Expulsions and Union Mergers in the United States

Gary N. Chaison

While the frequency of mergers among unions in the United States has only recently increased, mergers have played a major role in the affairs of unions expelled from federations (AFL, CIO and AFL-CIO) since 1949. An examination of the seventeen expelled unions indicates that only two have entirely disbanded and only one has returned directly to its federation. The remaining expelled unions merged with or into either their rival affiliates or other expelled unions. It is suggested that this high incidence of mergers was the results of the manner in which isolation induced exiles to merge while also reducing previously formidable barriers.

In recent years an accelerated trend toward union mergers has been apparent in the United States. In 1971 it was noted that thirty-six mergers involving seventy-seven unions had been consummated since 1956. Of this total, thirteen involving twenty-one unions occurred since 1967 [1]. This quickened merger pace indicates that barriers to mergers are increasingly being surmounted and the number of unions with similar or overlapping jurisdictions is declining somewhat [2]. The purpose of this article is to briefly survey the frequency of mergers involving unions

CHAISON, G.N., Assistant Professor of Organization and Human Resources, State University of New York at Buffalo, N.Y.

1 Lucretia M. DEWEY, « Union Merger Pace Quickens », *Monthly Labor Review*, Washington D.C., v. 94, June 1971, p. 63.

2 *Id.* However, Dewey notes that overlapping jurisdictions continue to be common in the textile, shoe, paper, furniture and retail trade industries.

expelled from the American federations since 1949 [3]. It will be seen that expulsions often result in mergers as federation exile leads to membership loss, financial instability and the displacement of incumbent leadership.

The consolidation of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations accented the desirability of mergers as a means to eliminate overlapping jurisdictions and alleviate inter-affiliate rivalry. During the period of intense conflict between the federations each organization tended to charter rivals to established unions in their counterpart [4]. The eventual formation of the AFL-CIO rested upon the assurance that jurisdictions of affiliates would remain unchanged despite conspicuous duplication [5]. Mergers would be encouraged but not forced : to do so would have been an unpardonable intrusion into affiliate autonomy [6]. As a result of this policy jurisdictional overlap has continued and only twenty of the seventy-seven mergers entered into since 1956 have been between former affiliates of the AFL and CIO [7].

The relatively small number of mergers among either affiliates or non-affiliates is most often caused by barriers developed within the po-

[3] This time period was selected because it covered a large number of expulsions from all three federations for reasons of alleged communist domination, corruption and dual unionism.

[4] For a list of these rivals in 1940, a period of intense inter-federational warfare, see : Walter GALENSON, *Rival Unionism in the United States,* New York, American Council on Public Affairs, 1940, pp. 21-24. A detailed description of this rivalry in major industries may be found in : Walter GALENSON, *The CIO Challenge to the AFL,* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960.

[5] The entrance of unions with overlapping jurisdictions into the federation signaled the demise of the rule of exclusive jurisdiction. However, insistence upon one affiliate for one jurisdiction would certainly have blocked the consolidation of the AFL and CIO. As A. H. Raskin noted : « Both sides (AFL and CIO) agreed that amalgamation might be delayed for a lifetime if they waited for a tidy formula for deciding which union would do which work under which circumstances in which industry since the boundary lines of unions restricted to skilled craftsmen and that which organize from top to bottom of an industry have grown increasingly broad, making a harmony formula more difficult of attainment. » A. H. RASKIN, « Labor's House Three Years After », *New York Times,* November 30, 1958, Sec. IV, p. 104. The resulting structure of affiliates' jurisdictions caused Raskin to call the federation « a league of overlapping empires ». A. H. RASKIN, « Marital Trouble in Labor's House », *New York Times,* December 9, 1962, Sec. VI, p. 86.

[6] John D. POMFRET, « Unions Resisting Merger Concept », *New York Times,* June 1, 1955, p. 24.

[7] DEWEY, *op. cit.,* p. 63.

litical structure of labor organizations [8]. Prior intense rivalry between unions may create a climate of hostility in which a merger agreement can not be reached. Also, a formidable barrier may be found in the reluctance of union leaders to vacate their offices no matter how small their union. In some instances leaders may fear that merger conferences with a rival will give political opponents within their union an important campaign issue in an upcoming election. Finally, merger attempts may fail when two unions differ widely in regard to such practices as the election of officers, the granting of local autonomy or the holding of conventions.

Where and when these barriers have been overcome the contributing factors were often changes in leadership and/or a desire on the part of younger union members to find an alternative to what they considered to be an outmoded union structure. Furthermore, impending financial difficulties, repeated organizing defeats and substantial membership losses in declining industries have acted as strong incentives to merge. Often, mergers have coupled aggrandizing unions expanding into new areas and small and weak unions seeking financial and bargaining protection [9].

The factors which induce unions to merge and overcome the mentioned barriers might directly result from federation expulsion. However, while successful post-expulsion raiding campaigns lead to mergers involving exiles such mergers do not necessarily bring about reaffiliation. The presence of aggrandizing expelled or independent unions with broad or unlimited jurisdictions provide an option to the weakened expelled union which favors merger but does not desire to sufficiently « clean house » for reaffiliation. The frequency and patterns of mergers may be revealed through a review of the present status of those unions expelled from the federations (AFL, CIO and AFL-CIO) since 1949.

THE CAUSES FOR EXPULSION

Since 1949 seventeen labor organizations have faced federation expulsion : eleven from the CIO in 1949-1950, one from the AFL in

---

[8] Description of these barrier may be found in : DEWEY, *op. cit., pp.* 63-64 : Harry GRAHAM, « Union Mergers », *Relations industrielles — Industrial Relations,* Québec, v. 25, August 1970, pp. 552-566 : POMFRET, *op. cit.,* p. 24 : « The Labor Month in Review : Steps Toward Union Mergers », *Monthly Labor Review,* Washington D.C., v. 90, March, 1967, pp. iii-iv.

[9] « The Urge to Merge Hits Unions Again », *Business Week,* New York, April 20, 1968, p. 62 : DEWEY, *op. cit.,* pp. 63-64.

1953 and five from the AFL-CIO in 1957 and 1969 [10]. The causes for expulsion have included alleged communist domination, corruption and dual unionism (i.e., simultaneous membership in opposing federations).

Expulsions for Communist Domination

In late 1949 and 1950 the CIO purged itself of its communist dominated affiliates [11]. Soon after its inception the CIO had attracted communist led unions as well as members of the communist party. In the pre-war period the communists also gained influence in the newly created affiliates as well as the federation's intermediate bodies on state and local levels. The communists became further entrenched during World War II but their post-war attacks on American foreign and domestic policies brought them into conflict with non-communist elements within the CIO. Purges were initiated within individual affiliates and the communists and their followers found themselves ousted from positions of influence in the United Automobile Workers, the Transportation Workers Union and the National Maritime Union.

In late 1949 the CIO began to move against its communist dominated affiliates. The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (UE) and the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers (FE) received the brunt of the anti-communist drive. Both unions had been targets of severe raiding from CIO affiliates and had bitterly denounced federation officials. Protesting the CIO's inaction in preventing raids, the UE and FE merged and announced their independence of the federation. Despite this, the CIO formally and separately expelled the unions at its November 1949 convention. In addition, the CIO Executive Board was given the authority to expell any other affiliates whose policies and practices followed those of the Communist Party. Charges were soon brought against several other unions and after nine months of hearings it was demons-

10 The total of sventeen unions included separately those organizations which had merged into each other immediately before expulsion but were expelled on an individual basis. Therefore, the two expelled laundry unions were counted separately, as were the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (UE) and the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers (FE).

11 The names of these expelled unions are listed on Table 1. The events leading up to the expulsion of the communist-dominated unions are discussed in : Max M. KAMPELMAN, *The Communist Party vs. the CIO,* New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1957. For a detailed analysis of the status of these unions in 1968, see : F. S. O'BRIEN, « The 'Communist-Dominated' Unions in the United States Since 1950 », *Labor History,* New York, v. 9, Spring 1968, pp. 184-209.

trated that nine affiliates had publicly supported the communists. Expulsion was recommended by the hearings committee, approved by the CIO Executive Board and carried out at the convention of 1950. None of the expelled unions exercised their right to appeal and the federation severed its relations with eleven unions and between five-hundred thousand and one million members [12].

Expulsions for Corruption

While the CIO used expulsion as a means to reduce growing communist influence this strongest form of federation sanction was directed by the AFL and AFL-CIO against affiliates allegedly controlled by corrupt elements.

In 1951 corruption within the structure of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) was brought to the public's attention [13]. A New York State crime commission investigation revealed extensive improper activities on the part of union officers. An AFL subcommittee examined the situation within the affiliate and soon demanded reforms including the removal of officers with criminal records and a modification of the « shape-up » method of hiring. The ILA responded that while it would effectuate some of the suggested reforms the cited officers would not be suspended. After a series of joint conferences failed to result in an agreement between the ILA and the AFL, the union was informed that the Executive Council would recommend suspension if there was a continued lack of compliance. Efforts to reach a compromise solution failed and in 1953 the AFL revoked the ILA's charter. The delegate vote

---

12 It is difficult to estimate the membership of the communist dominated unions at the time of their expulsion because of rapid membership losses during 1948 and 1949. For example, see : O'BRIEN, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

13 For a chronology of the events leading to the ILA's expulsion see the following sections on « Developments in Industrial Relations » in the *Monthly Labor Review,* Washington D.C. : v. 76, March 1953, pp. 293-294 : v. 76, July 1953, pp. 766-767 : v. 76, August 1953, p. 877 : v. 76, October 1953, p. 1099 : v. 76, November 1953, p. 1215. Descriptions of the AFL's campaign against the ILA may be found in : Ace M. KEENEY, « Good Progress on the Docks », *American Federationist,* Washington D.C., v. 60, November 1953, pp 3, 38 : Ace M. KEENEY, « Miracle on the Waterfront », *American Federationist,* Washington D.C., v. 61, March 1954, pp. 14, 25 : « George Meany Discusses Old Mob-Ruled ILA », *American Federationist,* Washington D.C., v. 60, November 1953, p. 28.

for expulsion at the following convention was 79,079 for and 736 against [14]. As it left the federation the ILA counted 75,000 members [15].

The AFL's only post-war expulsion resulted from charges of affiliate corruption. Soon after the AFL-CIO merger, improper activities again led to charter revocations, though this time on a massive scale.

In 1957 the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee considered bringing charges of improper activities against several affiliates : The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, the Textile Workers' Union, the Laundry Workers' International Union (LWIU), the International Union of Cleaning and Dye House Workers (CDHW), the Bakery and Confectionary Workers International Union (BC) and the Allied Industrial Workers. The committee set down terms for continued affiliation and these were met by some of the above mentioned unions. However, the Teamsters, LWIU, CDHW and the BC found themselves expelled from the federation.

The alleged improper activities within the Teamsters included the misappropriation of union funds, connections with underworld figures, the creation of paper locals and interference with union elections [16]. In October 1957 a suspension notice was served on the union by the federation, citing instances of corruption and insisting that James R. Hoffa, vice president, and Dave Beck, president, be expelled from their offices. The Teamsters refused to acquiesce and elevated Hoffa to the position of president. In the following December the delegates to the AFL-CIO convention voted 10,458,598 to 2,266,497 in favor of expulsion [17].

The corruption within the BC centered around the activities of the union's leaders. President James G. Cross and other union officials were accused of misappropriating union funds and stifling union democracy. It was charged that Cross had amended the union's constitution in order

14 Philip TAFT, *Organized Labor in American History,* New York, Harper & Row, 1964, p. 694.

15 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, *Directory of Labor Unions in the United States,* Bulletin no. 1127, Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953, p. 21.

16 For example, see : TAFT, *op. cit.,* pp. 694-706.

17 « Labor Cleans House : Convention Expells Teamsters » *American Federationist,* Washington D.C., v. 65, January 1958, p. 18 : A.H. RASKIN, « AFL-CIO Ousts Teamsters by Vote of 5 to 1 », *New York Times,* December 7, 1957, pp. 1, 14.

to enable himself to select and remove members of its Executive Board. In 1956 Cross was said to have withdrawn $30,000 from the BC's treasury without leaving any vouchers. Also, BC officers were accused of misuring trusteeships : vice president George Steward allegedly diverted $40,000 from the funds of two locals under his control [18]. On September 25, 1957 the federation ordered the BC to « clean house » by removing suspect officers and instituting internal reforms. The BC failed to take the required measures and was suspended on November 15. At the AFL-CIO convention held the following month the BC was expelled after a delegate vote of 11,003,835 to 1,608,695 [19].

The federation's charges against the two laundry unions also dealt with corruption among top leadership. Eugene C. James, LWIU secretary-treasurer, was accused of misappropriating $900,000. Also, in May 1957 LWIU president Samuel J. Byers resigned his post after it had been disclosed that he had been convicted of a felony. He was replaced by Ralph T. Fagan but the federation soon accused Fagan of being hand-picked by James : both leaders were from the same Chicago local [20]. The AFL-CIO's dissatisfaction with the affiliate's leadership changes and lack of internal reforms resulted in expulsion at the November convention [21].

---

18 A brief description of the activities of the BC officials may be found in : John F. KENNEDY, « Bakers' Unions : A Study in Schism — The Problem : Corruption », *Virginia Law Review*, Charlottesville, v. 45, 1949, pp. 203-204. Senator Kennedy declared : « The members of the union were deprived by their officers of control over the affairs of the national organization : local unions had been subjected to trusteeships, apparently for the sole purpose of aggrandizing the national union officials. Dues entrusted to the national officers have been plundered, and in all likelihood the interests of the members in collective bargaining have been sacrificed throught 'sweetheart' contracts. » (p. 203).

19 « Labor Cleans House : Cross Led Bakers are Ousted », *American Federationist*, Washington D.C., v. 65, January 1958, p. 19. The BC had been warned that the federation would charter a new bakers' union if Cross was not expelled. See, for exemple : Stanley LEVEY, « AFL-CIO Plans New Bakery Unit », *New York Times*, December 11, 1957, p. 23.

20 Joseph A. LOFTUS, « Union Suspended by AFL-CIO : Two Others Warned », *New York Times*, May 24, 1957, p. 1 : « Laundry Union Elects », *New York Times*, May 16, 1957, p. 21.

21 For a description of the events leading up to the expulsion of the laundry unions, see : LOFTUS, *op. cit.*, p. 1 : « Union Upset by Ouster », *New York Times*, May 26, 1957, p. 20 : « Labor Cleans House : Laundry Workers Union is Expelled », *American Federationist*, Washington D.C., v. 65, January 1958, p. 21.

The 1957 expulsions resulted in a loss of over a million and a half members, the vast majority of which were from the Teamsters, the largest affiliate [22]. This massive expulsion for corruption was also the last.

Expulsion for Dual Unionism

The most recent expulsion was brought about by charges of affiliate membership in an opposing federation. In 1968 the expelled Teamsters and the UAW (which had withdrawn from the AFL-CIO) entered into an organizing alliance under the banner of the Alliance for Labor Action (ALA). Although the alliance attempted to present a no-raiding agreement to the AFL-CIO, affiliates of the latter were warned that ALA membership or support would constitute a form of dual unionism and would be considered grounds for expulsion [23]. In 1969 the International Chemical Workers Union (ICWU) became the first affiliate to formally join the ALA [24]. The AFL-CIO branded this act as dual unionism despite ICWU claims that it would refrain from raiding [25]. Expelled at the federation's 1969 convention, the union claimed a membership of 104,000 [26].

In the post-war period the three federations expelled seventeen affiliates with a membership of over two million. Not content to lose these members, the federations often encouraged extensive raiding campaigns either by affiliates with jurisdictions similar to those of the expelled unions or by newly chartered rivals. Faced with external challenges and

---

22 At the time of its expulsion the membership of the Teamsters was placed at 1,338,000. BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, *Labor Relations Yearbook, 1968,* Washington D.C., BNA, 1969, p. 539.

23 Descriptions of the formation of the ALA and its early relations with the AFL-CIO may be found in : BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, *op. cit.,* p. 276-281 : Damon STETSON, « 2 Biggest Unions Set Up Alliance », *New York Times,* May 27, 1969, p. 48 : James P. GANNON, « AFL-CIO Warms of Action Against Unions the Join or Back UAW-Teamster Group », *Wall Street Journal,* New York, September 17, 1968, p. 4 : Jerry M. FLINT, « No-Raiding Pact Offered Meany », *New York Times,* November 24, 1968, p. 66 : « UAW and Teamsters Propose Coexistence Accord to AFL-CIO », *Wall Street Journal,* New York, November 25, 1968, p. 19.

24 « Chemical Workers Vote to Join New Alliance, Defy Expulsion Threat », *Wall Street Journal,* New York, September 18, 1968, p. 2 : « Chemical Union Defies AFL-CIO », *New York Times,* August 22, 1969, p. 38.

25 AFL-CIO, *Proceedings of the AFL-CIO 8th Annual Convention,* Volume 1, Atlantic City, New Jersey, October 2-7, 1969, pp. 136-172.

26 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, *Directory of National and International Labor Unions in the United States, 1969,* Bulletin no. 1665, Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970, p. 23.

internal upheaval several of the expelled unions actively sought mergers with either their rivals or well entrenched and stable expelled unions.

THE FREQUENCY OF MERGERS INVOLVING THE EXPELLED UNIONS

The present status of the seventeen expelled unions is indicated in Table 1. Only three of these organizations remain existent and unaffiliated : the UE, the ILWU and the Teamsters. On the other hand, only two expelled unions have entirely disbanded : the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards and the United Public Workers of America. Both cases involved substantial membership loss and economic difficulties before and after expulsion.

The ICWU was the only expelled union which reentered its federation without undergoing a merger. In 1971 the union severed its ties with the ALA and reaffiliated through an exchange of correspondence between its leaders and those of the AFL-CIO [27]. The membership of five other expelled unions also returned to a federation but did so through the merger route.

Mergers Between Expelled Unions and Affiliates

In 1967, seventeen years after its expulsion from the CIO, the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers (Mine-Mill) merged into the United Steel Workers of America (USWA), an AFL-CIO affiliate. Mine-Mill had fought off raids from the UAW, USWA, the International Association of Machinists (IAM) and District 50 of the United Mine Workers of America [28]. Its membership had been reduced from about 108,000 in 1948 to 75,000 in 1967 [29]. Merger into the USWA was motivated primarily by the need to eliminate expensive raiding and provide more effective coordinated collective bargaining in non-ferrous metals mining The agreement combined eighty percent of the employees in that industry into one union [30].

---

27 Agis SALPUKIS, « Chemical Workers Reinstated by AFL-CIO After 2 Years », *New York Times,* May 13, 1971, p. 32.

28 O'BRIEN, *op. cit.,* pp. 197-201.

29 *Ibid.,* p. 189. At the time of the merger the USWA's membership was recorded as 1,068,000. DEWEY, *op. cit.,* p. 70.

30 « The Labor Month in Review : Steps Toward Union Mergers », *Monthly Labor Review,* Washington D.C., v. 90, March 1967, p. iii. The Mine-Mill had about 28,000 members in the non-ferrous metals mining industry while the figure for the USWA was placed at 38,000.

TABLE 1

Unions Expelled from the Federations (AFL, CIO, AFL-CIO) Since 1949

Date of Expulsion	*Federation*	*Expelled Union*	*Present Status*
1949	CIO	United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (UE)	Unaffiliated
"	"	United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers	Merged into UE in 1949
1950	"	International Longshoremens' and Warehousemens' Union (ILWU)	Unaffiliated
"	"	American Communications Association	Merged Into Teamsters in 1966
"	"	International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers	Merged into the United Steel Workers of America in 1967
"	"	National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards	Disbanded in 1954
"	"	International Union of Fishermen and Allied Workers	Merged into ILWU in 1949
"	"	International Union of Fur and Leather Workers	Merged into the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen in 1955

TABLE 1 (continued)

Unions Expelled from the Federations (AFL, CIO, AFL-CIO) Since 1949

Date of Expulsion	*Federation*	*Expelled Union*	*Present Status*
1950	CIO	Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union	Merged into Retail, Wholesale, Department Store Union (RWDSU) in 1954
"	"	United Office and Professional Workers of America	Merged into RWDSU in 1954
"	"	United Public Workers of America	Disbanded in 1953
1953	AFL	International Longshoremen's Association	Merged with International Brotherhood of Longshoremen in 1959
1957	AFL-CIO	International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers (Teamsters)	Unaffiliated
"	"	Bakery and Confectionary Workers International Union	Merged into American Bakery and Confectionary Workers International Union in 1969
"	"	Laundry Workers International Union	Merged into Teamsters in 1962
"	"	International Association of Dry Cleaning and Dye House Workers	Merged into Teamsters in 1962
1969	"	International Chemical Workers Union	Reaffiliated with AFL-CIO in 1971

The International Union of Fur and Leather Workers also ended its existence by merging into an affiliate. Expelled with a membership of about 100,000 the union lost about one quarter of these through raids launched by AFL and CIO unions. After finally purging itself of its leftist leadership the union was permitted to merge with the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen in 1955. At that time a few of its locals decided to join the Leather Workers Organizing Committee, later to become the Leather Workers International Union of America (AFL-CIO) [31].

Two of the communist dominated unions returned their membership to the expelling federation in an indirect manner. The Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers (FTAAW) faced an intense raiding campaign from the Retail, Wholesale, Department Store Union (RWDSU), the Brewery Workers Union and the Packinghouse Workers Union — all CIO affiliates. As a result, the union's membership declined from 46,700 in 1947 to 22,600 in 1949. The expelled United Office and Professional Workers of America (UOPWA) also suffered substantial membership loss when its jurisdiction was given to the CIO Insurance and Allied Workers Organizing Committee. The ensuing raiding campaigns reduced the UOPWA's membership from 45,000 in 1947 to 12,000 in 1949. In 1950 the UOPWA and the FTAAW merged with the Distributive Workers Union (DWU) to form the Distributive, Processing and Office Workers Union (DPOWU). The new organization claimed a membership of about 55,000, the majority of which came from the DWU. In 1954 the DPOWA had largely eliminated the communist influence among its leadership and chose to merge into the RWDSU [32].

The two remaining unions which reaffiliated did so through mergers with or into their federation chartered rivals.

After expelling the ILA the AFL-CIO believed that the longshoremen could be won over by a new union. To accomplish this it chartered the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen (IBL), which soon attracted ten secessionist ILA locals. Authorization cards were collected and a petition was filed for a certification election in the ILA's bargaining unit. An election held in December 1953 was won by the ILA but set aside by the National Labor Relations Board because of campaign irre-

31 O'BRIEN, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-194.

32 *Ibid.*, pp. 191-193. The DWU was formed from Local 65 of the RWDSU which had split off from its parent union in 1948.

gularities. In a second election the ILA won by a vote of 9,407 to 9,144 and retained its representational status [33]. However, the competition provided by the IBL prompted the ILA to institute internal reforms and oust corrupt elements. In 1959 the union's leadership and practices had been sufficiently altered and it was permitted to join the AFL-CIO by merging with the IBL [34]. At the time of the merger the ILA had about 52,000 members while the IBL claimed 30,000 [35].

The Bakery and Confectionary Workers International Union (BC) proved less successful than the ILA in countering the attacks of a federation chartered rival. Immediately prior to the BC's expulsion insurgent groups began to form under the leadership of the union's former vice president and secretary treasurer (Daniel E. Conway and Curtis Sims, respectively) [36]. As the AFL-CIO adjourned its 1957 convention it chartered the dissident locals as the American Bakery and Confectionary Workers International Union (ABC). The new bakers' union counted thirty-six locals with thirty-five thousand members [37].

In the early post-expulsion years the ABC and BC repeatedly confronted each other in raiding campaigns. When the ABC held its first convention in September 1958 it claimed to represent 129 locals with more than 77,000 members [38]. Rivalry between the two unions was so intense during the initial two year period that neither the BC nor ABC could organize more than 2,500 previously unorganized workers [39]. In a twenty month period the two unions had met in more than three hundred representation elections with the ABC winning about eighty percent [40].

---

33 TAFT, *op. cit.*, p. 694. Also see sources cited in footnote 13, *supra.*

34 The ILA entered the AFL-CIO in 1959 on a probationary basis. Its charter was approved in 1961. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, *Directory of National and International Unions in the United States, 1969, op. cit.*, p. 58.

35 DEWEY, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

36 « Foes of Cross Will Seek a New Charter in AFL-CIO If Baker Union is Ousted », *New York Times,* November 25, 1957, p. 24.

37 Stanley LEVEY, « AFL-CIO Plans New Bakery Unit », *New York Times,* December 11, 1957, p. 23.

38 Daniel E. CONWAY, « AFL-CIO Bakers Make Notable Progress », *American Federationist,* Washington D.C., v. 65, August 1958, p. 14.

39 « Old Bakery Union Still Leads in Field », *New York Times,* April 4, 1959, p. 15.

40 Daniel E. CONWAY, « A Clean Bakers' Union Grows », *American Federationist,* Washington D.C., v. 66, September 1959, p. 25.

In 1960 rebel leaders appeared within the BC and demanded the resignation of Cross, who remained the ousted union's president. It was generally agreed that once Cross vacated his office reaffiliation and merger with the ABC would become possible and the raiding would end [41]. On April 8, 1961 the union finally suspended Cross along with Peter H. Olson, secretary-treasurer. Both were accused of misappropriating union funds [42]. Six years later, and after a brief alliance with the Teamsters, the BC merged into the ABC [43]. The consolidation brought together 61,000 members from the BC and 83,000 members from the ABC [44].

In total, five expelled unions returned their membership to a federation through mergers. Frequently, an expelled union overcame the barriers to merger by purging its allegedly communist dominated or corrupt leadership and instituting internal reforms regarding the holding of conventions, the election of officers and the placing of locals in trusteeship. Furthermore, in most cases the loss of membership caused by post-expulsion raiding served as an inducement to merge into a larger union in order to protect or enhance prior bargaining and organizing gains.

Mergers With Other Expelled Unions

Presently, three of the expelled unions remain existent and unaffiliated : the UE, ILWU and the Teamsters. Only the UE has suffered substantial membership loss through rivalry with affiliates. The union found itself raided by a federation chartered rival, the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (IUE) as well as several affiliates which shared portions of its jurisdiction [45]. Competitive organizing campaigns in the UE's jurisdiction reduced the union's membership from about 400,000 in 1948 to 167,000 twenty years later [46]. The UE absorbed another expelled union, the FE, soon before their simultaneous expulsion and made several attempts in the early 1950's to merge into affiliates.

---

41 Ralph KATZ, « Union Fight Gains, Rebel Bakers Say », *New York Times,* July 9, 1960, p. 5.

42 « Rival Baker Unions Plan Merger Talks », *New York Times,* April 8, 1961, p. 31. On April 10, 1963 Cross was found guilty of embezzling $35,000 of his union's funds and conspiring to fix a 1959 perjury trial. «-Ex-Chief of Bakers' Union is Guilty », *New York Times,* April 11, 1963, p. 20.

43 « Developments in Industrial Relations : Conventions », *Monthly Labor Review,* Washington D.C., v. 92, December 1969, p. 67.

44 DEWEY, *op. cit.,* p. 70.

45 O'BRIEN, *op. cit.,* pp. 202-204.

46 *Ibid.,* p. 189 :BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, *Labor Relations Yearbook, 1969,* Washington D.C., BNA, 1970, p. 825.

The ILWU, another communist dominated union, also absorbed an expelled union. Outside of the federation the ILWU did not face any serious challenges from militant rivals and retained most of its membership. In the early 1950's it considered a merger with the Teamsters but this was never realized [47]. Recently the union's leadership has suggested a merger with the ILA but it is expected that such plans will be opposed by the membership of both unions [48]. In 1949 the ILWU absorbed the International Union of Fishermen and Allied Workers, another CIO exile. This union claimed about 25,000 members when it merged but most of these fishermen have since been lost to the ILWU because of a declining fishing industry [49].

The largest expelled union, the Teamsters, grew rapidly outside the federation and absorbed three other expelled unions. When expelled, the Teamsters faced neither the external challenge of a federation chartered rival or substantial internal movements for reform or leadership change [50]. In addition, there were no affiliates capable of launching large scale raiding campaigns in the trucking and warehousing industries, the Teamsters' central jurisdiction. Well entrenched and unthreatened in its exile, the Teamsters maintained organizing alliances with affiliates despite federation discouragement of such cooperative agreements [51]. The AFL-

47 O'BRIEN, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-202.

48 « ILWU's Bridges Seeks Merger with ILA, But Sources Call Dock Tie Unlikely », *Wall Street Journal*, New York, December 31, 1971, p. 16.

49 O'BRIEN, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

50 Some AFL-CIO affiliates wanted the federation to actively challenge the Teamsters. For example, A. Hartnett, secretary-treasurer of the IUE, stated : « We have a duty to go out an campaign against the Teamsters just as the old CIO unions were required to campaign against the communist dominated unions after their expulsion. » However, Meany decided against such a strategy, believing that the Teamster situation was substantially different from that of the other AFL-CIO expelled unions and that there were not enough members in the Teamsters willing to « stand up for a clean house ». « No Plan Now in Works for New Truck Union », *American Federationist*, Washington D.C., v. 66, October 1959, p. 29.

51 In December 1957 the Teamsters had mutual aid pacts with the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, the Machinists and the BC. In the highway construction industry it had entered into a pact with the Carpenters, Operating Engineers and the The Laborers. In addition, the Taemsters had participated in organizing drives with the Hotel and Restaurant Workers and the Building Service Employees, as well as eighteen unions from the AFL-CIO Building Trades Department. A.H. RASKIN, « Teamsters Set Up Big Union Drives », *New York Times*, February 11, 1956, p. 13 : Stanley LEVEY, « Teamsters Offer No-Raiding Policy », *New York Times, December* 3, 1957, p. 39. For a statement of the AFL-CIO policy prohibiting alliances with the Teamsters, see : « Text of AFL-CIO Order Barring Teamster Links », *New York Times*, August 19, 1958, p. 15.

CIO's policy of isolating outcast unions was neither effective nor strongly enforced in the case of the Teamsters, apparently because of the vital role of that union in the strikes and organizing drives of affiliates [52]. Since expulsion, the Teamsters has aggresively organized its unlimited jurisdiction, venturing into new industries to expand its membership and influence.

In 1966 the Teamsters merged with the American Communications Association (ACA). Soon after its expulsion the ACA faced and often successfully fought off raids from the Communication Workers of America of the CIO, the Commercial Telegraphers Union of the AFL and the American Radio Association. This last opponent was formed by ex-ACA members who left their union in 1948 [53]. Expelled with a membership of about 10,000, the ACA retained 7,500 when it merged with the Teamsters [54].

The Teamsters also absorbed the two ousted laundry unions in 1962. Shortly before their expulsion the LWIU, with 72,000 members, merged with the CDHW, with about 18,000 members, to form the Laundry, Dry Cleaning and Dye House Workers International Union (LDC) [55]. In 1957 the AFL-CIO was faced with the decision of whether it should charter union in the laundry jurisdiction. When it was learned that several locals were ready to disaffiliate from their expelled parent union, a new organization was formed : the Laundry and Cleaning Trades International Union. This organization was later rechartered as the Laundry and Dry Cleaning International Union (LCDIU) [56]. However, few inroads were made into the expelled union's jurisdiction and the membership of the LCDIU seldom exceeded 24,000 [57].

---

52 For a description of the importance of Teamster alliances in organizing campaigns, see : Marten S. ESTEY, « The Strategic Alliance as a Factor in Union Growth », *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Ithaca, v. 9, October 1955, pp. 41-53.

53 O'BRIEN, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

54 DEWEY, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

55 BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, *Labor Relations Yearbook, 1968, op. cit.*, p. 539.

56 « Developments in Industrial Relations », *Monthly Labor Review*, Washington D.C., v. 81, March 1958, p. 301 : « New Union Approved », *New York Times*, March 1, 1958, p. 18.

57 BUREAU OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS, *Labor Relations Yearbook, 1968, op. cit.*, p. 537.

In October 1960 Eugene C. James, LWIU secretary-treasurer, pleaded guilty to conspiring to embezzle $900,000 from his union and was sentenced to prison [58]. With its principal sign of corruption eliminated the expelled union attempted to merge with its federation rival. However, AFL-CIO officials believed that it had not sufficiently rid itself of corrupt elements and rejected the merger and affiliation overtures [59]. Finally, in 1962 the expelled laundry union brought its 65,700 members into the Teamsters [60].

In total, the UE, ILWU and the Teamsters absorbed five expelled unions which had been weakened financially and reduced in size by internal strife and pre- and post expulsion raiding. The ILWU and UE both absorbed weakened unions operating within their jurisdictions immediately prior to, or soon after, their expulsion. On the other hand, the aggrandizing Teamsters with its unlimited jurisdiction provided a convenient vehicle through which expelled unions could protect or enhance organizing and bargaining gains without reaffiliating.

CONCLUSIONS

Table 1 indicates that relatively few of the expelled unions have either disbanded entirely or directly reaffiliated. Financial hardship and membership loss brought about the disbandment of only two organizations. Furthermore, the only expelled union to return directly to a federation was the ICWU : this came after an exile of only two years and did not involve any requirement to eliminate communist or corrupt influences.

The remaining expelled unions underwent a complex series of mergers. Five unions merged into affiliates while an equal number merged into other expelled unions. To a large degree this revealed frequency and pattern of mergers indicates the role which expulsion plays in simultaneously inducing mergers while overcoming merger barriers. Membership losses incurred during pre- and post expulsion raiding appears to pressure unions into seeking the organizing and bargaining security found

---

58 « Two Guilty in Plot to Defraud Union », *New York Times,* September 20, 1960, p. 27 : « Unionist and Broker Sentenced in Fraud », *New York Times,* November 16, 1960, p. 27.

59 « Developments in Industrial Relations », *Monthly Labor Review,* Washington D.C., v. 84, September 1961, p. 1011 : « Laundry Workers Assailed », *New York Times,* July 19, 1961, p. 59.

60 DEWEY, *op. cit.,* p. 69.

in consolidation into larger organizations. Internal movements to remove corrupt or communist dominated leadership reduces the importance of a major barrier to merger : the reluctance on the part of union leaders to vacate their offices. Thus, heavily raided and weaker expelled unions would be merger prone relative to well entrenched expelled unions or affiliates.

The preceding discussion has also suggested that for each merger consummated there were often several which were unsuccessfully pursued. In some cases attempts to merge into affiliates were blocked because required leadership changes had not been completed. In other instances repeated attempts finally lead to a merger as signs of corruption or communist domination were slowly eradicated. Thus, we could look at the frequency of both attempted and realized mergers as an indication of the intensity of the urge to merge among expelled unions.

Finally, it has been shown that the federation and its affiliates have been largely successful in weakening expelled unions, with the notable exception of the Teamsters and the ILWU. However, post expulsion raiding strategies did not always bring expelled unions back to the fold. In particular, the presence of the militant Teamsters has provided a shelter for expelled unions which did not wish to, or could not, meet the prerequisites for reaffiliation.

The desire to merge with either affiliates or non-affiliates presents itself as a recurring reaction of most of the expelled unions to the hazards of their isolation. Research literature on union structure and inter-union relations commonly views mergers as a convenient means for eliminating overlapping jurisdictions and increasing federation stability. In addition, mergers are viewed as infrequent though increasing somewhat in recent years. While such may be the case for American unions in general, it is argued here that mergers have played a dominant and understandable role in the affairs of the expelled unions.

EXPULSION DES CENTRALES ET FUSIONS SYNDICALES AUX ÉTATS-UNIS

Au cours des dernières années, le mouvement des fusions syndicales s'est accéléré aux États-Unis. Cependant, le nombre de fusions effectuées demeure mince. La structure politique des syndicats, ce qui comprend les sentiments d'hostilité causés par les rivalités d'autrefois, la répugnance des chefs syndicaux à renoncer à leurs postes et des méthodes différentes de fonctionnement entre les syndicats comme, par exemple, la tenue des congrès et le mode d'élection des dirigeants, constitue des barrières formidables aux fusions. Ces barrières sont le plus souvent renversées quand les syndicats sont acculés à des difficultés financières, qu'ils subissent

des défaites à répétition dans leurs campagnes de recrutement et qu'ils perdent un nombre substantiel de membres.

Cette étude tend à démontrer que les facteurs de nature à inciter aux fusions, tout en abaissant les barrières, peuvent résulter directement de l'expulsion des centrales et de maraudages qui l'ont suivie. De plus, on peut noter que la présence d'un nombre accru de syndicats expulsés ou indépendants dont le champ de compétence est très vaste fournit un excellent véhicule de fusion aux syndicats expulsés plus faibles peu désireux de faire « peau neuve » en vue d'obtenir leur réaffiliation.

L'analyse du statut actuel des syndicats qui ont été expulsés des centrales depuis 1949 révèle la fréquence et la forme des fusions. Les motifs d'expulsion comprennent la domination communiste (onze syndicats du C.O.I.), la corruption (un syndicat du C.O.I. et quatre syndicats de la F.A.T.-C.O.I.) et l'appartenance à deux centrales opposées (un syndicat de la F.A.T.-C.O.I.).

On s'est rendu compte que seuls deux syndicats expulsés se sont effrités, pendant qu'un seul a renoué ses attaches à sa centrale. Les autres syndicats expulsés ont subi toute une série compliquée de fusions avec des syndicats rivaux affiliés ou d'autres syndicats expulsés. Les pertes d'effectifs consécutives au maraudage pratiqué après l'expulsion ont eu, selon toute apparence, pour effet de pousser les syndicats expulsés à rechercher la sécurité au plan du recrutement et de la négociation collective dans la consolidation avec d'autres organisations plus fortes. En outre, des mouvements internes visant à bannir les dirigeants corrompus ou communistes ont atténué l'importance de la barrière principale à la fusion, c'est-à-dire la répugnance des chefs syndicaux à céder leurs postes

On peut présumer que ce désir réel de fusion se présente sous la forme d'une réaction récurrente des syndicats expulsés aux menaces d'isolement. Même si le vocabulaire des recherches voit dans les fusions un moyen commode d'éliminer des champs de compétence chevauchants et d'augmenter la stabilité des centrales, il semble plutôt que les fusions aient joué un rôle dominant et compréhensible dans l'activité des syndicats expulsés pendant les années d'après-guerre.