UNIONIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES**

1. Historical Developments and Analyses


This collection of eight papers includes an assessment of the constitutional issue of a ban on military unionization; an article analyzing the European experience; an argument supporting unionization and one opposing it; a sociological analysis of the military as an institution and public attitudes towards unionization, and a discussion of the history and future of military unionization.


The author provides a brief history of attempts at military unionization. She lists probable functions of a military union, which include: promotion of wage increases, improvement of benefits, and provision of legal representation. Crotty describes several models for change and considers the effects of unionization in "paramilitary organizations." She evaluates the foreign experience in six Western European nations and concludes with an analysis of policy questions, including: unit determination; the scope of bargaining; grievance handling; and prohibitions.


Harris identifies and explains the major advantages and disadvantages of a U.S. servicemen's union and concludes "that a military servicemen's union for all ranks is not only inevitable but can be beneficial to the national defense if approached with a positive view."


A poll conducted in June 1977 indicated that three persons in four—74%—majorities in every population group, opposed unionization of the military and that this sentiment is "particularly pronounced among . . . the college-educated, upper-income, and professional and business
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The authors discuss the potential for, and the possible results of, unionization. Topics include: the basic nature of work in the armed forces; the massive size of the U.S. military services and its implications for unionization; strategies for organizing the military; the effect of unionization on discipline; the effect of military strikes on national defense; and the roles that unions could legally play in the U.S. armed forces.


In this collection of three articles, Lane's contribution explores the susceptibility of the all-volunteer force to unionization by contrasting the current military force with the former conscripted system. He argues the importance of maintaining a "ready combat force equitably compensated." Krendel's paper disputes Lane's contention that unionization might weaken the military's chain of command, citing the positive effects of police and firefighter unions. Taylor completes the collection by examining the constitutionality of unionizing active-duty military personnel.


This collection of nineteen articles is divided into general areas which include: societal trends and prospects for military unionization; the relevance of the European experience; military attitudes toward unions; operational aspects of military unionization; and alternatives to military unions.


The author examines European military associations, unions in America's public and private sectors, the current status of military unionization in America, the aims of the American Federation of Government Employees, and organizational problems unionization would create. He concludes that the European experience cannot validly be compared to America's situation due to significant societal and governmental differences. He explains that the current push for unionization results from increased organization of the non-military public sector, from a perceived erosion of benefits and trust in institutions, and from the emphasis on military service as a career.

This collection of papers explores the background and prospects for military unionization by comparing it with unionization in general, and with the unionization of the non-military public sector. The more general articles deal with the history of trade unionism and the philosophical foundations of the national labor relations system for non-uniformed employees.


David Cortright, of the Center for National Security Studies, and Senator Strom Thurmond argue both sides of the question. After examining the causes of the American military unionization movement, Cortright supports unions as a democratic institution. He contends that unionization of the military could actually improve efficiency, citing the positive effects of unions in Europe. Senator Thurmond, on the other hand, explains why he has repeatedly introduced bills to forbid unionization of the military.


The Hearings include testimony from the Secretary of Defense, numerous officers in the armed forces, members of soldiers' and veterans' associations, representatives from unions in the public and private sectors, and legal experts. Discussion revolves around bills S. 274 and S. 997 to forbid military unionization.

2. THE EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE


Gomberg examines three European military unions. In his presentation he analyzes the trade union function in Norway; notes the implications of right to codetermination on the chain of command in the Swedish armed forces; and reports that in Germany one of the military unions seeks to "keep the army close to its working-class origins" while the other is a "nationalistic-oriented career institution." The article includes a discussion of "the American environment."

"Special Symposium on Trade Unionism in the Military." Armed Forces & Society (Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, Social Science Building, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 60637), Summer, 1976. pp. 475-552. $4.00.

This volume contains papers on the trade union experience of Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and France by nationals of these countries. The editors stress that the variation from country to country
is considerable in format and scope of trade union organization and patterns of group representation within the armed forces.

3. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL ISSUES


The author examines the historical context of the question, including military unions in Europe, federal unions, and the policy of the Department of Defense with respect to labor unions. He considers constitutional and legal issues, including: First Amendment "freedom of association" rights; access of union organizers to military installations; and the scope of collective bargaining.


This article deals with constitutional constraints on government regulation of military unionization imposed by the First Amendment and by the equal protection requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment. It further discusses a Department of Defense directive regarding collective bargaining, strikes and other concerted activity, solicitation, and union membership. The authors conclude that prohibitions raise relatively few and readily manageable constitutional problems but that bans on solicitation or advocacy and membership raise more difficult constitutional problems and require consideration of a large body of not always consistent case law.


Staudohar, after reviewing several U.S. Supreme Court cases, concludes that: commanders can bar active union campaigning from military bases; servicemen have a right to possess union literature on base; servicemen can join and participate in union activities in off-duty jobs so long as this does not interfere with their military duties; prohibition of mere membership in a servicemen's union would be unconstitutional on the grounds of a judicially interpreted First Amendment right to "freedom of association"; and military collective bargaining can be legitimately forbidden.

4. THE PRESIDENT RESPONDS


"President Carter has signed legislation (S. 274) that forbids unionization in the nation's armed forces... The new law provides a maximum penalty of $10,000 and five years in jail for military personnel who knowingly join a military union or who solicit members for a military union. Unions enrolling military personnel in order to engage in collective bargaining could be fined as much as $250,000 under the law."