



\$100 Plus Club News

Number 98

Association for Union Democracy

February, 2006

ANNUAL REPORT 2005

Our last annual report, for 2004, characterized that year as a time of transition for the Association for Union Democracy (AUD). In 2004, we settled into a new office and recruited a new executive director. The year 2005 found us undergoing further staff transition, while at the same time, the financial situation stabilized and several new projects were launched. AUD continues to fight for democracy in the labor movement, and we were in the forefront of a number of successful reform struggles in 2005. AUD worked with a groups in a number of different unions to confront problems of corruption, intimidation, and undemocratic practices. AUD provided steady and continuing support to these reformers, through meetings and by telephone and email, advising unionists on their rights with in the law. Because our office is in Brooklyn, a large part of our work involves direct personal contact with workers in New York City.

REFORM PROJECTS

ATU Local 1181: Reformers Organize, Challenge Entrenched Leadership

Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 1181 is the 16,000 member New York City local that represents school bus and para-transit drivers

throughout the City and Long Island. Most of them are minorities and recent immigrants. In April 2004, school bus drivers filed suit against the union to enforce their seniority rights and formed the group that would ultimately become "Members for Change." In July 2004, one thousand bus drivers won a two week strike against four private companies that provide paratransit service to the elderly and disabled for the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) in New York City. The strike was led by insurgents in the local that was organized to demand better representation in their union.

After meeting with AUD repeatedly in early 2005 regarding their election rights and the process, the Members for Change ran a slate of eight (including president/business agent and financial secretary) in a June 2005 election, the first contested election in over ten years. The group got over 20 percent of the vote, a respectable showing. Even in defeat, the rank and file opposition had made a difference in the atmosphere in a local that had been closely controlled and independent voices quelled. The importance of the change became clear a few weeks later when the president, financial secretary, and manager of the union's pension fund were indicted along with an alleged boss of the Genovese crime family -- for corruption in



- 1- 5 **Reform Projects (ATU, IATSE, IUOE)**
- 5 -8 **Legal Battles (know your rights, secret ballots at stake, fair elections, free speech)**
- 9 -10 **Operations (web, finances, publications)**

**Inside
the
Annual
Report**

the local.

Meanwhile, the indicted officials remain in office, in full control of the local. Members for Change, still active, mounted a campaign to oust the indicted officials. In a series of letters, now supported by a petition campaign among the members, the group called upon the ATU international to impose a trusteeship over the local, oust the offending officers, encourage reform, and take steps to prepare a fair election.

So far, the international, remaining passive in the face of scandal, has refused to intervene. At this writing, the reform campaign aims to bring pressure upon the international from local members and the general public. For the first time, Local 1181 is experiencing the stirring of rank and file democracy.

ATU Reformers Win in Local 241

AUD had been working with reformer Peter Fionda, of ATU Local 241 for some time. The ATU International had placed its Local 241 under trusteeship back in October 2002 immediately after Fionda (a long time union member and founder of Transport Workers for a Democratic Union) and two others had been elected delegates to the convention. These duly elected delegates were subsequently denied their seats. Fionda reported that an international vice-president appointed delegates in their place, though federal law requires the secret ballot election of delegates who, in turn, elect international officers.

AUD advised Pete regarding filing a complaint with the Department of Labor for election law violations, and advised him of his rights to campaign without intimidation when the trusteeship was imposed. Fionda and his associates formed a reform slate, which ran for office in May 2005 elections. An amendment to Local 241's bylaws created a new position of Assistant Business Agent which Fionda and another reformer had been urging since 2001.

Fionda's slate won 15 of the 31 seats available, including, after a runoff, the positions of President and Assistant Business Agent for Maintenance.

Reform Successful in IATSE 798

Over the course of 2005, AUD provided hours of education and workshops and fielded questions on union democracy and local elections for a group in Local 798 of the International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees [IATSE], a 1,200-member east coast local of hair stylists and makeup artists in which a reform group maintained itself through a trusteeship and then won a sweeping victory.

Questions about the activities of Local 798 union officials arose in summer 2004, when rumors of a government investigation and financial double-dealings by the business manager began to circulate. Members formed the "Concerned Members of Local 798" and began holding regular meetings and set up a website. Concerned Members

The \$100 Plus Club News is published by the Association for Union Democracy, a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting the principles and practice of internal union democracy in the North American labor movement, Kurt Richwerger, editor.

AUD staff and officers: Judith R. Schneider, President; Herman Benson, Secretary-Treasurer; James McNamara, Research Director; Matt Noyes, Internet Coordinator, Kurt Richwerger, Development Director.

AUD: 104 Montgomery Street, Brooklyn New York 11225 (718) 564-1114 email: info@uniondemocracy.org. www.uniondemocracy.org. AUD also publishes the bi-monthly *Union Democracy Review*.

Note: Opinions expressed in the *\$100 Plus Club News* are solely those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Association for Union Democracy.

sent a letter to the membership with thirty-eight signers, describing the problems in the union and calling the members to action. In December, 2004 members of the caucus met with AUD. As Concerned Members gained momentum so did the stories of financial corruption. The press reported that the business manager "tried to sell more than \$1 million worth of real estate bought with members dues to his brother and brother's girlfriend at sweetheart prices," and that he had engaged in an "elaborate plot to rob" the family of a retired Local 798 member of her entire estate. The Manhattan Attorney's office confirmed the rumors of government investigation.

Concerned Members had their work cut out for them. Two brothers, Ed and Vincent Callaghan, had held the office of business manager for more than forty years between them. This would be the first election in years where the position of business manager was contested. In addition to this, the local's president was apparently willing to look the other way, although the local had filed suit against business manager Vincent Callaghan. The President wrote the membership, "...Vincent Callaghan, continues to do his job representing us with our employers. And Vince has been co-operating fully with the attorneys." In postings on the Concerned Members on-line forum she referred to the rank and file reformers as "assholes" and said the website is run by "ignorant dissidents" who are "uneducated and obnoxious...who do not believe in democracy." In the Local's January 2005 meeting, she called the reformers terrorists, referring to them as "our own little Taliban." In addition, Vincent Callaghan used the front page of the newsletter to blatantly campaign for his own re-election.

The January 10th general membership and nomination meeting in New York City drew members from as far away as Delaware, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and North Carolina, just to have their voices heard. Concerned Members organized a pre-meeting, which almost fifty members attended. At the local's meeting reformers donned specially made t-shirts which read "truth and democ-

racy for the rank and file -- www.798members.com," and distributed press reprints and literature. They nominated reformer Joe Cuervo for business manager. Rank and file members stayed on for almost an hour to discuss the future of their union after the president abruptly ended the meeting and stormed out.

But in January 2005, shortly before the election, the IATSE international office announced a trusteeship over the local. The Concerned Members did not go away. In October 2005, the trusteeship was terminated. Local membership promptly voted to require that the business manager be appointed by the incoming executive committee. In the ensuing election, Concerned Members slate swept the Executive Board, taking all positions. They were installed December 12, 2005. Vincent Callaghan was indicted and ultimately pleaded guilty.

Operating Engineers Local 18: At last, successes in a tough construction local

In Local 18, International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE), AUD has been working with a group of insurgents called "Members Voice." Operating engineers are the workers who run the huge bulldozers, cranes, backhoes, and pile drivers out on the roads. Local 18, with 14,000 members, has work sites in 85 of Ohio's 88 counties and four more in northern Kentucky. The local has a history of undemocratic practices. In 1984, Stephen W. Gard, a law professor who had represented insurgents in Local 18, testified before the Senate Labor Committee that there had been a ten-year record of illegal elections, blacklisting, intimidation, and beatings of those who dared to oppose the regime. An insurgent group waged a reform battle, but after ten years of defeat, and the death or retirement of its leaders, it vanished from the scene. AUD told their story in its publication *Union Democracy Review*. But until the appearance of this new reform group, we heard little from Local 18 for 15 years.

Patricia Kohl, who headed the Members Voice slate, ran a campaign critical of the local's "one-party system of government." The Members Voice platform insisted that "every union should be thoroughly democratic in its own internal life." It called for an end to "blacklisting, blackballing, and retaliation," for the election of business agents instead of their appointment, for opening the pages of the union's publication to members' opinions, and for full accountability from all union funds. In its campaign, the group distributed lengthy excerpts from AUD's book *Democratic Rights for Union Members* and suggested that local members visit AUD's website. On the reformers' web site (www.local18membersvoice.com) and in their handbills, they offered a program of democracy and fair play in job referrals. They said that the union should comply with the provisions of the LMRDA and "must exceed them....Most of us have been subjected to or, at least been afraid of being blacklisted, blackballed, or other retaliation." Kohl said that she was fired after working for 5 ½ years as a union staffer: "I could have kept my \$78,325 a year job ... by just keeping my mouth shut. I just couldn't do it."

Another insurgent, Paul Gonter, ran for local financial secretary. He proposed opening the pages of the union's publication, the *Buckeye Engineer*, to comments by the members and "responsible constructive criticism of officers and policy"

In the 2005 elections, the insurgents surpassed their predecessors. The reform slate elected five of the eight candidates it ran for district advisory board. Patricia Kohl was elected to the executive board of Local 18 as one of the two delegates from her Division 6. Even more impressive was her campaign for president of the local, finishing second in a three-way race with 1,244 votes, or 27.7 percent of the total, running well ahead of the third candidate, a man, who got 827 votes. Kohl was one of only eight women among some 300 candidates running in races in all six of Local 18's divisions. Paul Gonter, the slate's candidate

for local financial secretary got 1,404 votes, or 33 percent of the total. John Ginley, an independent candidate for the top job of business manager, got over 35 percent of the votes.

Nevertheless, in the larger interests of her union's democracy, Kohl and her associates are challenging the conduct of the elections, though it could jeopardize their own victory. Kohl and six other local members filed an election protest with the International. They argued that an electronic system of counting ballots made it impossible to verify the tally; that an unreasonable meeting attendance rule was unfairly applied to disqualify at least two aspiring candidates; and that other procedural defects violated the law's requirement for adequate assurances of a fair election. They protested the refusal of the local to break down the election tally for local officers by district. They charged that the incumbent used union money in the campaign.

Operating Engineers Local 66: Reformers Lose But Continue to Fight

Reformers in Operating Engineers Local 66 fought to get elected to local office this year. This was a formidable undertaking since the 7,000 member local is spread over 33 counties in Pennsylvania and three more in Ohio. Reformers put over 18,000 miles on a single vehicle and spoke to 1,400 members face to face.

Joe Beasley (candidate for Chief Executive Officer-Business Manager) identified the key issue in Local 66 as effective job representation. Another candidate concurred and said, "...you don't dare to try to enforce the contract even if you are in the right." The gripe is with the business agents, "it has got to the point where agents come in [to investigate a member's grievance] and the first thing the agent does is talk to the boss." While representation is the number one issue for members there are financial concerns too. In 2002 the union leadership proposed a building fund to either build or buy a much needed new space to house the union. The member-

ship approved the proposal and began paying into the fund. Two years later, Beasley (who was then Recording Corresponding Secretary) says he discovered that the union leadership was using the building fund to pay for general overhead. One member says this building fund plan has turned into nothing more than an unauthorized dues increase; he reports that when Joe Beasley's father was Business Manager (a position he held for twenty years) the union was much more frugal; retirement parties used to be simple affairs serving only sandwiches. "Now they are held at country clubs." Beasley and his team are concerned about the rising salaries of the top officers in the union. He reports that in the last 4½ years they have received a 40 percent increase while union members' income has risen approximately 3 percent per year.

The reformers tried to run a slate to fill almost all 24 positions at stake, but, Beasley reports, they lost some of their candidates due to restrictive eligibility requirements because candidates were one or two days late in dues payments. The challenges in this campaign were huge. The incumbents have mounted an aggressive retaliation campaign against the reformers. Beasley no longer gets regular work, and the union has filed charges against him for posting minutes from the membership meetings on his website www.vote-beasleyhay.com. AUD provided guidance and encouragement in this difficult situation.

Operating Engineers Local 2: Despite a Partial Victory Reformers Want An Audit

In Local 2, a 2,500-member union based in St. Louis, Walter J. Russell and Pat Vaughan headed up a "Committee for Change and Fairness" to participate in the August 2005 officer elections. They report that there had not been a contested local election since the 1960's and that the incumbent business manager had held the job for 23 years.

Neither Russell nor Vaughan ran for office, but the committee which they sparked tried to enter

two candidates. However, too late for a substitute to be nominated, one candidate was disqualified because of a misdemeanor conviction many years ago. And so the incumbent Business Manager coasted in without opposition; although the opposition candidate who remained on the ballot defeated the incumbent financial secretary, 284 to 203.

But the successful insurgent lasted only a month as financial secretary. After taking office, he demanded a "full and independent audit of Local 2's finances." When the local refused, he resigned, explaining, "Without a complete and independent audit it may be impossible to determine what actions and decisions were mine and which were my predecessor's."

Meanwhile, as chairman of the Committee for Fairness and Change, Walter Russell filed protests before and after the election charging that more than 25 percent of the membership had not been informed of the nominations meeting and that the meetings were held at a time when it was difficult for working members to attend.

LEGAL BATTLES

AUD continues to struggle for union democracy not only within unions but with the Department of Labor and through the courts. In 2005, AUD fought for members rights on a number of fronts, having to do with enforcement and interpretation of the Labor Management and Reporting and Disclosure Act (LMRDA), the federal law that protects union democracy. AUD board members Alan Hyde, Michael Goldberg, Arthur Fox, and Barbara Harvey made important and potentially groundbreaking advances. Some of the legal issues currently being pursued by AUD:

Federal Unions Must Let Their Members Know Their Rights

After years of neglect, the US Department of

Labor (DoL), the agency responsible for LMRDA, announced in early 2005 that it will adopt a regulation which directs unions of federal employees to inform members of their democratic rights. A petition and brief prepared for AUD by Arthur Fox and Michael Goldberg, AUD board members, prompted the DoL to act. The proposed rule would incorporate into the standards of conduct for federal sector labor organizations an obligation to inform their members of such critical rights within the union as freedom of speech, equal treatment, due process in union disciplinary proceedings, and the right to nominate and vote for candidates for union office in fair elections.

DoL decided to adopt a rule in response to the 2002 AUD petition following a decision of a federal appeals court (as a result of an AUD initiative) which ruled that unions in private industry have a continuing responsibility to comply with LMRDA, section 105 (which provides that unions must inform members of the provisions of federal law which protect their rights in their unions.)

Some unions complied with this provision, but only once, when the law was first adopted. Since Section 105 required enforcement by private suit of union members, union members had to find the resources of a dedicated attorney to take on the tough battle in court. AUD recruited Andrew Rotstein to represent three machinists *pro bono*, and the U.S. Appeals Court, Fourth Circuit in Maryland, ruled in 2000 that a one-time compliance was not enough, that unions had a continuing disclosure responsibility.

Since federal employees are not protected by the LMRDA, this decision had no direct immediate effect on them. However, under the terms of the Civil Service Reform Act (CSRA), the DoL is responsible for enforcing rights for federal unionists similar to those written into the LMRDA. DoL is now preparing to publish the final regulations that will incorporate the section 105 duty-to-inform into the CSRA.

In the proposal by DoL notice would be given to all new members of the labor organization; all members would receive notice at least once every three years through the union journal; and the web sites, if any, of federal sector unions would be required to contain a hyperlink either to the union members' rights and officers' responsibilities under the Civil Service Reform Act or to the union's own accurate notice of the CSRA's standard of conduct.

AUD has endorsed these approaches but recommended additional ones including a requirement that the summary of members' rights and officers' responsibilities be included as an appendix in the Constitutions of the covered labor organizations.

The secret ballot and direct democracy at stake

How should LMRDA differentiate between a "local union" and an "intermediate" body? In 2005, DoL requested public comments on this question, "to determine whether additional rule-making is necessary." AUD responded with a brief prepared by board member Alan Hyde with a supplement by Herman Benson. Rank-and-file members of the Carpenters union also submitted a mass petition.

The background to the DoL request involves efforts by some unions to evade requirements for direct secret ballot elections. The LMRDA requires local unions to elect local officers by direct secret ballot vote of the membership. But "intermediate" bodies are allowed to elect officers by vote of delegates. By merging locals into "regional councils," top union leaders are able to set up effectively authoritarian "intermediate" bodies, thereby evading the requirements for secret ballot elections of the council officers. "Regional councils", which have been set up across the country by the Carpenters union, take on all of the power of the locals, including collective bargaining. The local themselves become little more than social clubs, in the view of AUD.

This effort increases the tendency toward the bureaucratization of the American labor movement.

A group of Massachusetts Carpenters asked the DoL to order their New England Regional Council to elect its officers by direct vote of the membership. In 2004, the DoL rejected their appeal, ruling that, as an "intermediate" body, the council could continue to elect officers by vote of delegates. In a 2-1 decision, a federal appeals court upheld the DoL decision. However, the court's two-person opinion was so narrowly drawn, and so skeptical of the Labor Department's rationale, that the DoL felt it necessary to present the problem for public discussion.

In its petition, rank and file carpenters raised their concerns: "We once had local unions which were important to us in our collective bargaining. This is no longer the case....We are not lawyers and so we will not try to come up with any fancy legal formula to correct the situation. All we can say is that the Labor Department should come up with a definition of local that returns the right of Union Carpenters to a voice in running their own affairs, especially the right to elect those officers of the council who have taken over the power of the locals."

In AUD's brief to the DoL, AUD board member Alan Hyde proposes a line between organizations which are engaged in collective bargaining and those which are not. Union bodies which bargain for their members are subject to the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and should be defined as "labor organizations." They should be required to live up to the standards imposed on local unions by the LMRDA. Only a union body which is not engaged in collective bargaining and consequently not under NLRB jurisdiction should be properly defined as an "intermediate" body.

The LMRDA provisions reflected Congress's judgment in 1959, when the law was written, that

such non-bargaining intermediate bodies, particularly Teamster conferences, were frequent sources of corruption and autocracy in the union movement and thus should not escape LMRDA. The entire thrust of the relevant legislative history is the need to regulate such intermediate bodies.

Moreover, Congress, in the LMRDA, limited the ability of higher levels of unions to deprive local unions of autonomy and democracy. At the time the law was written, intermediate bodies were limited to union bodies that do not deal with employers. Congress therefore had a much narrower working definition of 'intermediate body' than the DoL has assumed in its rejection of the appeal. We await the DoL response to our brief.

The rights of election observers

Patrick Ellis, running as an insurgent for president of the 200,000-member Civil Service Employees Association in New York State, was defeated after receiving 37 percent of the votes. He challenged the conduct of the election on the ground, among others, that his election observers had not been permitted to function. The DoL agreed that the denial of his observers' rights was a violation of federal law; but it dismissed his complaint, ruling that, in the absence of other demonstrated violations, the illegal restrictions on observers could not have affected the election outcome. It seemed like an odd ruling: if his observers could not observe, how could they detect other possible violations? However, a federal district judge upheld the decision, finding that it was not arbitrary and capricious.

When the decision was challenged in federal appeals court, AUD submitted an amicus brief, written by Alan Hyde, in support of Ellis. Hyde noted that it was established that a finding of any violation in a union election created a presumption that the election was invalid; the party defending the validity of the election has the burden of proof to overcome that presumption. In Ellis's case, Hyde argues, the DoL did not meet

the burden of proof test.

In this case, it is undisputed that the statute was violated. The Supreme Court has stated that all violations of the elections section presumptively "may have affected" the results. The statute and congressional purpose are satisfied, according to Hyde "by ascribing to a proved violation... the effect of establishing a prima facie case that the violation 'may have affected' the outcome. This effect may of course be met by evidence which supports a finding that the violation did not affect the result."....The burden of proof is on the party who asserts that it did not (in this case the DoL).

The DoL also argued that because this was a computerized election, ballots were cast and counted electronically; therefore the presence or absence of observers could have had no effect. AUD's brief pointed out that the record revealed at least one election breakdown seriously affected by the absence of observers. Printed ballots contained a serious printing error and on numerous occasions, the software read the misaligned box line of empty boxes as a vote, causing the ballots to be read as containing more than one vote. Ultimately, 19,860 - over half of all ballots cast and more than double the margin of victory in any of the races - could not be read accurately by the scanning equipment employed. The union solved this problem by "manual determination of the intent of the voter." But as was true of all aspects of ballot tallying, these determinations could not be observed by the candidates' observers. The majority of ballots was read by humans, not machines. The DoL investigation of this charge consisted of asking those who read those ballots whether anything improper happened. Not surprisingly, this failed to turn up any improprieties. We await the appeals court decision.

Fair Election Process

Barbara Harvey, AUD board member, established the right to watch the casting and counting of ballots during contract ratification referendums for

the Teamsters. From now on, it's no longer so easy to manufacture a fraudulent result. A group of 16 office workers voted on ratifying a supplement to the National Master Automobile Transporters Agreement. When the union announced that the contract had been ratified by vote of 5 to 3, Harvey's clients knew the announced tally was false. In court, she produced a sworn statement by five members that they had voted against it. In the consent decree that followed, her three clients won the right to observe the process in any future contract referendum in which they were eligible to vote. The effect of this decision went far beyond the interests of the group of 16 because it established the right to observe in the ratification vote on the Master agreement, which involved thousands of car haulers.

Free Speech

In the United Auto Workers, a retiree and former plant chair and former secretary treasurer of the big Ford Local 600 ran a losing insurgent campaign in 2002 against the local's incumbent financial secretary. During the election, the two rivals indulged in a spitting and hitting fracas. After the election, when the union stonewalled in scheduling hearings on the insurgent's protest, he sought to goad the officers into action by issuing a series of handbills, which he distributed at plant gates, excoriating them as a bunch of corrupt sellouts. Obviously shaken, they filed criminal charges against him with the police, after which he was arrested, fingerprinted, and barred from communicating with the union officers by any means. The charge: "malicious annoying by writing." AUD Board member Barbara Harvey and the local ACLU went into court and got the charges dismissed. Now Harvey is back in court with a civil suit against the local, charging violation of King's free speech right under LMRDA Title I; the complaint charges that the union misused criminal prosecution to suppress the right to dissent. The police department is charged with malicious prosecution.

OPERATIONS REPORT

Counseling and Intake: AUD counseled thousands of workers from hundreds of unions in nearly every state on their rights to free speech, fair elections, due process, and a safe work environment free of sexual and racial harassment. Counseling took place on the phone, over the internet, in person, and by mail. Complicated requests and complaints led us to formalize a new intake and record keeping process. Problems were handled in a variety of ways, including 1) information and education done by phone, 2) arranging for in-person meetings or workshops if the contact was in a larger group, 3) the sending of publications concerning the right to union democracy, or 4) referrals to AUD cooperating attorneys.

Workshops and Conferences: In 2005, AUD's Executive Director conducted a day-long workshop for members of the executive board of United Service Workers (USW) Local 777 in New Jersey. She also gave a two hour seminar to apprentice members of IBEW Local 3, and was a guest presenter for the Union Semester program at Queens College, and for a sociology class at CUNY Graduate Center. AUD President Judith Schneider gave a presentation on the LMRDA to a group of flight attendants in Dallas. Kurt Richwerger attended the TDU Convention in St. Louis in November, and staffed a literature table there. AUD advisory Board member Leon Rosenblatt offered a workshop on the legal rights of union members at the convention, and AUD Board member Barbara Harvey also held a workshop. AUD founder Herman Benson spoke on union democracy at a June New York Library Guild event showcasing Benson's book *Rebels, Reformers and Racketeer* published in April.

Web Site: AUD's web site usage and activities continued to expand, under the stewardship of AUD's internet coordinator, Matt Noyes. In 2005

AUD ran a "best rank and file website" to which 35 groups submitted sites. AUD also designed an improved "Request Help" web page. This on-line intake form will help AUD staff to more deal with help requests because it ensures we get the information we need to be more responsive when we talk to the person. The entire web site is now being redesigned with a more sophisticated software program which 1) allows web site users to register, 2) allows for different levels of interactive participation (forums, blogs, discussion lists), 3) has faster posting of articles better linkages to other sites that we reference in our posts.

Use of the website continues to grow rapidly. In December 2005, there were 105,812 "hits" to the site and 22,769 "visits," compared with March 2005's 44,796 hits and 10,444 visits. Statistics suggest that about one-third of the users are repeat visitors. Our most popular web site pages (outside of the home page) were 1) sample letters for addressing various problems, 2) links to rank and file websites, and 3) *Union Democracy Review* excerpts, and 4) info about the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act's Bill of Rights. Finally, AUD's Yahoo group, in which members join and discuss union issues totaled 775 members by the end of the year compared with 595 in March, 2005.

Finances: AUD's financial picture improved considerably in 2005. In 2004, AUD ran a deficit of slightly over \$17,000. The unaudited 2005 figures show a slight surplus. AUD received more than double the grant income it did in 2004 (\$23,000 vs. \$10,300). Additional revenue came from house parties, yielding over \$3,000 compared with \$500 in 2004. Expenditures were significantly less, as in 2004, the staff transition necessitated the presence of the equivalent of three full-time staff for much of the year. In 2005, there were only two full-time staff through October. AUD carried one paid staff person in November and December. In 2006, Judith Schneider is expected to become the paid Executive Director.

ANNUAL REPORT 2005

(from pg. 9)

Publications: AUD had published Secretary-Treasurer Herman Benson's *Rebels, Reformers and Racketeers* in 2005. A trial edition of 300 copies quickly sold out, leading AUD to publish a second edition. AUD finished a fourth printing of *Democratic Rights for Union Members*. In early 2006, two more bound volumes of *Union Democracy Review* (UDR) will be available, for years 1997-2005. AUD printed, at the request of its associate membership, gummed stickers with the phrase "Clean up our union with democracy". The stickers are very popular. We issued a revised version of our brochure "The Right to Union Democracy".

Fundraising: This year AUD employed a new fundraising tool familiar to other small not-for-profits - house parties. One in September, hosted by AUD advisory board member Leon Rosenblatt, proved extremely successful, with over \$3,000 generated in contributions. AUD

plans more house parties in 2006.

Grant writing: AUD submitted numerous grant proposals in 2005, in contrast to the recent past, but so far only two were successful. A grant of \$10,000 from the North Star Fund for general operating expenses was received in January. In July, a general support grant letter of award of \$10,000 was received from the Stern Family Fund.

Newsletters: AUD published six issues of both *UDR* and the *\$100 Plus Club News*. In 2004, staff transition necessitated a less demanding publication schedule (4 *UDR* and 2 *\$100 Plus Club News*). We published two issues of *The Clarion*, a special publication for AUD supporters who contribute \$1,000 or more per year.



Association for Union Democracy
104 Montgomery Street
Brooklyn, NY 11225

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
New York, NY
Permit No. 3108