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Recent construction settlements will raise earnings levels for many craftsmen to those of doctors and lawyers unless moderation is achieved.¹

You cannot increase...construction wages 50 to 60 percent in 3 years...without changing the nature of the United States. ... The No. 1 domestic problem of the country is the effect of the wage push on the total lives of everyone.²

[W]age rate wars can break out, much as gasoline price wars do. ... I don’t view it as equity that when one chicken gets out of the coop, all the others have to be let out, too.³


Note to the Second Revised Edition

On December 6, 1999, the construction industry’s leading trade magazine, Engineering News-Record, published an article about Wars of Attrition reporting the book’s use of the Business Roundtable’s own archives to document the key role played by the Roundtable in undermining construction unions.1 Literally the next day the Roundtable disbanded its construction-related activities.2

The response to Wars of Attrition has been astonishing. Its author would have been the last to predict that a 450-page academic tome freighted with almost two thousand footnotes would become must-reading for rank-and-file construction workers, union officials, unionized construction firm managers, and anti-union construction organizations. Many workers and union officials (both those who lived through the events of the 1960s and 1970s as well as younger ones) have drawn diametrically opposite conclusions from the book: the Roundtable conspiracy did us in and we did ourselves in. The principal reason the first edition went out of print so quickly is that construction unions acquired many copies to use for internal education. Management’s reaction has been an amalgam of amusement and bemusement: the book rings true, but it’s a tad surprising that the Roundtable wanted its behind-the-scenes activities publicized.

This second revised edition, the only changes in which are corrections of typos, is appearing now to meet the large volume of requests for the book. Significantly, its publication has been made possible in part by grants from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the National Electrical Contractors Association. Those who were unable to obtain a copy of the first edition before it went out of print are now indebted to Jim Rudicil, IBEW international representative, whose enthusiasm for the book and organizing skills made that financing happen. The AFL-CIO’s George Meany Center is also considering publication of an even larger print run in 2001.

Marc Linder
November 2000
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Preface

Nowhere else...is there to be found so cogent a proof of the axiom that unionism in America is merely the other side of capitalism's coin. It is the same coin. It is not a token of any other minting.¹

The decline of the once quasi-monopolistic construction unions during the last quarter of the twentieth century has, according to activists, "shaken the building trades' wing of the House of Labor to its foundations...."² To be sure, construction unions have not been alone in suffering huge losses. In the steel, automobile, rubber, clothing, and other industries unions have also experienced severe decreases in membership.³ But unlike industrial unions, the building trades were not victims of cheap imports from an inexorably globalizing economy: high-wage union pipefitters building petrochemical and power plants in Texas and Michigan did not lose their jobs to low-paid construction workers in or from China, El Salvador, or Indonesia.⁴ Instead, their jobs were taken by compatriots, some of them until recently union brothers, employed by cut-rate antiunion construction firms—some of which had been union firms in good standing. Indeed, some nonunion contractors are subsidiaries of long-time respectable union contractors.⁵

Despite advances in prefabrication and modularization, today, as in the

¹Herbert Harris, *American Labor* 150 (1939) (referring to the United Brotherhood of Carpenters).


⁴"In many industries, the main reason why labor and management are worried about productivity is that productivity has been growing faster...in Japan or Germany or some other trading partner than in the United States, and that has led to a rising volume of imports. That sort of concern, in the direct sense is really not relevant to the construction industry. We are not worried about Japanese contractors coming in and building American roads or American buildings." Albert Rees, "Measuring Productivity in Construction: An Overview," in *National Commission on Productivity and Work Quality, Measuring Productivity in the Construction Industry* 5-10 at 7 (n.d. [ca. 1973]).

⁵Throughout “open shop” is used interchangeably with “nonunion” and “antiunion.” Although employers in this sector assert that they are literally “open shop” because they do not discriminate against individual workers who happen to be union members and who wish to work for them, this meaning is Pickwickian since such employers are vociferously antagonistic to the members’ unions and tolerate the individual workers only so long as they refrain from organizing. The disingenuousness of employers’ claims to indifference or impartiality became manifest in the 1980s when unions began their “salting” campaigns: employers fired or refused to hire qualified construction workers who were known to be union organizers. See below chapter 15. Historically, unions have taken the position that all shops are closed—either to unionists or nonunionists. William Haber, *Industrial Relations in the Building Industry* 241-45 (1930).
past, buildings largely remain nontransportable commodities so that buyers in one locality must pay the going rate there regardless of cheaper rates elsewhere.\(^6\) However, unlike the situation earlier in the century, the growth of national firms with mobile workforces has meant that industry is no longer so localized that unions can assume that monopolizing the local labor market will also shield the local product market from competition by lower-wage firms.\(^7\) And although a corporate owner requiring a building for a site in Chicago must still have it built in Chicago, it may choose to shift the site to Alabama if construction costs are too high, just as it might close an existing manufacturing plant and open another one in Alabama (or Malaysia) if it decides that the plant workers’ demands interfere with profitability.

 Unlike their counterparts in manufacturing industries, where employment has plummeted in tandem with unionization, construction workers have significantly increased in number.\(^8\) Moreover, whereas the world market did not begin intimidating U.S. industrial workers until the latter half of the 1970s, construction unions became subject to economic and political attacks a decade earlier during the Vietnam War. This asynchronous development is curious because competitive pressure on the construction industry was largely derivative. As Roger Blough, the leader of the Roundtable, told Congress in 1971: “It is not the direct kind of competition..., but there is definitely indirect competition between construction costs abroad and construction costs in this country” in the sense that “[e]very time you sell a pair of shoes, you are selling a piece” of the factory in which it was manufactured.\(^9\) Since the primary source of these attacks was large industrial owner-customers, which complained that exploding construction wages were driving new plant construction costs to levels at which the products produced in them were becoming less competitive, it is remarkable that manufacturing corporations chose to focus first not on their own employees, but turned instead to construction workers, whose wages represented only a small share of the costs of manufactured products. And finally, much more so than their industrial colleagues, construction workers were attacked by a complex coalition of employers, the state, industrial customers, and the media, intent on breaking unions’ control of the supply of skilled building tradesmen.

 Construction unions in the early 1970s were subject to the first wave of

---


\(^7\) Royal Montgomery, *Industrial Relations in the Chicago Building Trades* 4 (1927).

\(^8\) From 1979 to 1997, production or nonsupervisory workers in construction rose 23 percent (from 3,565,000 to 4,361,000) whereas those in manufacturing fell 15 percent (from 15,068,000 to 12,809,000). Calculated according to *Handbook of U.S. Labor Statistics* 139 (2d ed.; Eva Jacobs ed. 1998).

demands by employers for concessionary bargaining based on allegedly untenable union-nonunion wage gaps (and productivity-inhibiting work rules).\textsuperscript{10} To be sure, similar developments had emerged in the mid-1950s in textiles and in the late 1950s and early 1960s in meatpacking.\textsuperscript{11} But those industries differed from construction in that textile wage differences were rooted in North-South differentials, while the newly emerged nonunion meatpacking firms were able to lower wages because they had opened operations in rural areas with capital-intensive technologies that increasingly eliminated the need for large numbers of skilled workers.\textsuperscript{12} Nonunion construction firms, in contrast, competed solely on the basis of lower wages and benefits and elimination of union work rules. Wage differentials offered nonunion firms considerable latitude for competitive underbidding: between 1967 and 1975, the union-nonunion wage gap for building craftsmen varied between 30 and 42 percent, while that for laborers ranged between 40 and 48 percent. In contrast, the average in manufacturing industries ranged between -1 and 10 percent and 14 and 24 percent, respectively.\textsuperscript{13}

The only roughly comparable developments with regard to wage cuts in 1971-72 in manufacturing took place sporadically except in the rubber industry and at General Motors' Frigidaire division against the background of employers' complaints about a productivity squeeze. Firestone Tire and Rubber Company first threatened to (and later did) open a new plant in Tennessee rather than in Akron unless its union workers accepted the equivalent of a $1.14 (or 19 percent) per hour wage cut. At the Frigidaire plant in Dayton, workers, represented by the International Union of Electrical Workers, worked under collective bargaining agreements similar to those at GM automobile plants; consequently their wages were $2 an hour higher than those at competing appliance manufacturers.

\textsuperscript{10}The claim that construction was "the first major industry case" of big capital's "union-busting" following management's offensive at the end of the 1950s and beginning of the 1960s, which almost unleashed "a raw re-opening of the class struggle," is exaggerated. Mike Davis, 	extit{Prisoners of the American Dream: Politics and Economy in the History of the US Working Class} 132, 123 (1987).

\textsuperscript{11}Daniel Mitchell, 	extit{Unions, Wages and Inflation} 74 (1980). Even partly unionized firms, such as General Electric, had begun developing strategies in the late 1940s to avoid unions including relocation to the South and opening nonunion parallel production plants duplicating operations in unionized plants in order to counteract strikes. Barry Bluestone & Bennett Harrison, 	extit{The Deindustrialization of America: Plant Closings, Community Abandonment, and the Dismantling of Basic Industry} 164-70 (1982).


Following major layoffs, some workers were recalled at wages reduced by 25 cents per hour. As early as 1971, some labor relations analysts perspicaciously viewed Frigidaire as a harbinger of the wage squeeze to which rising imports would sooner or later subject other manufacturers. Nevertheless, at the same time, as construction unemployment rose sharply, union electricians near Cleveland acquiesced in $4 an hour (or 50 percent) wage cuts for one- and two-family housing construction.14

Construction employers remained leaders of the norm-breaking wave of union wage concessions in the first half of the 1980s in conjunction with unprecedented depression-level rates of unemployment: the industry accounted for 39 percent of all concessionary collective bargaining settlements between 1981 and 1985.15 Again, construction differed from most of the other industries being pressed for concessions. Unlike the metals, machinery, lumber, and automobile industries, construction was not subject to foreign competition; and unlike the airlines and trucking industries, it had not been plunged into deregulation. By the time of the depression of the early 1980s, however, construction was no longer unique: not only were other industries (such as retail food stores and printing-publishing) exposed to low-wage nonunion competition, but the demonstration effect,16 especially among weakly unionized firms, impelled some employers to seek to eliminate unions altogether. Incredibly, 19 percent of large corporation executives polled by Business Week in 1982 openly admitted: “Although we don’t need concessions, we are taking advantage of the bargaining climate to ask for them.”17 Even while the magazine was editorially condemning such companies as “simply bent on taking unfair advantage of the unions’ current weakness,”18 it noted a paradox: “Despite staggering job losses, building trades unions are still demanding and winning double-digit wage settlements where they have leverage.”19

And the anomaly continues: despite the decades-long multi-pronged assault, at century’s end, hundreds of thousands of construction workers remain highly paid union members. Average hourly union pay scales (including fringe benefits) in 20 large cities reached $34.78 for electricians, $33.90 for plumbers, $28.94 for carpenters, and $23.03 for building laborers in September, 1998. In New

---


16Mitchell, “Shifting Norms in Wage Determination” at 582-83.

17“A Management Split over Labor Relations,” BW, June 14, 1982, at 19 (Lexis). The poll discerned a divide between firms less than 40 percent and more than 70 percent organized.


York City, they reached heights barely imaginable to millions of sweatshop and service sector workers: $53.80, $55.66, $50.96, and $36.19, respectively.\textsuperscript{20}

The analysis of construction unions’ decline during the last quarter of the twentieth century begins with the Vietnam War. One economic consequence of that war’s unpopularity—inscribed in Congress’s failure to declare war, and the Johnson administration’s refusal to subject the economy to formal militarization—was that for the first time in the twentieth century, a “full-employment” wartime economy was not accompanied by wage-price controls.\textsuperscript{21} Part I focuses on the contradictory effects of the tight labor market during the Vietnam War. While Chapter 1 deals with employers’ disenchantment with the labor militance spawned by diminished fear of unemployment, Chapter 2 documents how heightened power and swiftly rising wage rates misled some unions and workers to overlook that once the boom became a recession, firms employing lower-waged workers might oust some unionized employers. Part II turns to the rhetoric and reality of charges that greedy and tyrannical construction unions had undermined the economy by enabling their members to be grotesquely overpaid and underworked. Chapter 3 dissects the employer-inspired media campaign, while Chapter 4 presents a detailed empirical account of construction workers’ wages, unemployment, and annual incomes. The unique underlying sources and most prominent manifestations of construction unions’ unusually formidable labor market and workplace power are studied in Chapter 5.

Part III shifts attention to employers. Chapter 6 introduces construction employers’ most important organizations and the positions that they adopted on the role of unions, while Chapter 7 is devoted to the extraordinary impact that the Roundtable, an organization of large industrial construction users, exerted on the development of construction labor-management relations. This account is uniquely enriched by first-time-ever access to Roundtable minutes and internal memoranda.
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relating to the construction industry. Part IV offers an account of the strategies formulated and implemented by the Nixon administration and employers to contain construction unions. Chapter 8 analyzes the first tentative measures taken by the federal government in 1969 and 1970. Efforts by the Nixon administration and employers to use the legal attack on construction unions’ racially discriminatory membership policies to weaken their control over the labor market form the substance of Chapter 9, while Chapter 10 examines a similarly structured but less successful program to promote the industrialization of residential construction in order to undermine the role of skilled workers and their unions. The unions’ counterattack is scrutinized in Chapter 11, which interprets the pro-war and pro-Nixon demonstrations on Wall Street in May 1970 as a building trades’ strategy for luring the administration away from its alliance with anti-construction union employers. Chapter 12 treats the intra-employer debate over and failure to enact national legislation imposing geographically broader collective bargaining units on construction in order to strengthen contractors’ negotiating position. An examination of the Nixon administration’s most decisive intervention, the direct wage controls implemented by the Construction Industry Stabilization Committee from 1971 to 1974, constitutes Chapter 13.

The tentative outcome of constructive labor-capital struggles during the last quarter of the twentieth century is taken up in Part V. Unions’ failure to enact legislation during the brief Ford administration that might have contained the dynamic of the antiunion movement is studied in Chapter 14, while Chapter 15 extensively views that movement’s progress and unions’ resistance. Finally, Chapter 16 provides a comparative historical perspective of earlier open-shop movements in construction.

Research for this book began in May 1970 and continued intensively throughout the 1970s and intermittently during the 1980s before becoming full-time again in the 1990s. The vantage point of the end of the century makes it a much more interesting study than it could have been in the early 1970s, when no one foresaw the vast expansion of the nonunion sector. Not even the Roundtable itself, to judge by its initial pessimistic analysis, predicted such a rapid deterioration of construction unionism: “Nor can the prospects for a more effective utilization of non-union construction labor be expected, realistically, to result from any lessening of union membership or allegiance to unions where these are already established....”22

Pat Anderson of the Nixon Presidential Materials Staff, Tab Lewis, Textual Archives Service Division, and Clarence Lyons, Jr., Chief, Civilian Records,

Textual Archives Service Division, of the National Archives and Records Administration at College Park, were all supremely resourceful in locating documents. Linda Seelke at the Lyndon B. Johnson Library in Austin made available additional archival documents. Richard Strassberg, Director of the Kheel Center for Labor-Management Documentation & Archives at Cornell University, was extraordinarily helpful in making available the materials on the Roundtable contained in Douglas Soutar's papers. James Gross, who is responsible for having acquired these papers for the Kheel Center, also made the initial contacts to arrange for their use. Connie Bulkley, a former archivist at the Kheel Center, helped select appropriate materials. The Business Roundtable provided access to the minutes of all its Coordinating/Construction Committee meetings, internal memoranda, and the entire run of its otherwise unavailable Report and Construction User Headlines as well as access to many former members. Jane Seegal at the Building and Construction Trades Department Center to Protect Workers' Rights provided hard to find materials. Kenneth Hedman, vice president for labor relations at Bechtel Corporation, Ted Kennedy, chairman, BE&K, Inc., Robert McCormick, president of the National Constructors Association, and Douglas Soutar, formerly a key member of the Roundtable, filled in numerous parts of the puzzle. Daniel Quinn Mills, who played an important role in managing federal controls of construction wages in the early 1970s, helped recreate the parties' mindset, while John Dunlop, the institutional memory of construction labor-management relations since World War II, provided useful background information.