



Foundation Action

The bi-monthly newsletter
of the National Right to Work
Legal Defense Foundation, Inc.

Vol. XLIV, No. 1

8001 Braddock Road • Springfield, Virginia 22160

www.nrtw.org

January/February 2024

Buffalo Starbucks Barista Counters NLRB's Move to Trap Workers in Union

Appeals Court brief defends workers' right to oppose and decertify union

BUFFALO, NY – Although the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is charged with neutrally enforcing federal labor law, it has a notorious reputation for strengthening union officials' power while diminishing the rights of workers opposed to union representation. Even with this biased history, the Biden Labor Board has already established itself as the most radically pro-forced unionism board in history.

The NLRB's ideological bias is most apparent in its massive campaign to impose coercive unionism on Starbucks workers, while repeatedly blocking and undermining Starbucks employees' attempts to remove unwanted union representation. While agency officials have approved hundreds of petitions for votes to bring the Starbucks Workers United (SBWU) union in, it has not let any of the roughly 20 worker-backed petitions seeking votes to remove the union advance to an election.

NLRB Cites Workers' Desire to Oust Union as Reason to Impose Union

The NLRB's anti-worker tactics have reached a new frontier. The NLRB is now citing a petition to remove the union as a reason why the union should not be removed and should serve as the basis for an injunction against Starbucks. NLRB lawyers are asking the Second Circuit Court of Appeals to overturn a District Court ruling and



As Mark Mix explained on Newsmax TV, SBWU officials spent millions to infiltrate Starbucks with covert union agitators. That led to some of the first unionized Starbucks stores in Buffalo, NY, but now Buffalo baristas are trying to oust SBWU.

issue an injunction that would force Starbucks to engage in bargaining talks with the union, despite the fact that the decertification petition proves that a majority of employees at a Buffalo, NY, Starbucks want to throw the union out.

The decertification petition in question was collected by Starbucks barista Ariana Cortes. Cortes sought a vote to remove SBWU from her workplace, but the NLRB has refused to conduct the election. National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation staff attorneys represent Cortes and Starbucks employees in nine other locations where workers are seeking votes to remove the SBWU. Now staff attorneys have filed a legal brief for Cortes and fellow Buffalo Starbucks employee Logan Karam in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, countering the NLRB's latest

outrageous maneuver.

Cortes' brief attacks the NLRB's strategy as condescending toward workers. It argues the NLRB's view

See 'NLRB Attacks' page 6

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Tire Wholesaler Employees Force RWDSU Union Out of 15 Locations
- 3 IUOE Union Bosses Hit With Federal Charge for Illegal Termination
- 4 Foundation Brief Exposes ILA Union Scheme to Destroy 270 Nonunion Port Jobs
- 5 Foundation Blasts Biden Plan to Sneak Union Monopoly Power into Agricultural Sector
- 7 Puerto Rico Union Bosses Try to Dodge Consequences of Janus Lawsuit

Tire Wholesaler Employees Force RWDSU Union Out of 15 Locations

RWDSU union officials abandon 500+ employee unit ahead of vote

WINCHESTER, VA – The Biden National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), which includes among its members two former union bosses from the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), is pursuing an agenda that hasn't exactly been making it easy for workers to vote out a union they don't want. But that hasn't stopped workers across the country from going to extraordinary lengths to kick out unions that don't serve their interests.

In October 2023, Chris Dorney, a Winchester, VA-based employee of tire wholesaler Max Finkelstein, kick-started a cross-country effort to vote the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union (RWDSU) out of 15 warehouse facilities across the eastern United States. This work unit included more than 500 employees across Virginia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut.

Virginia Worker Mustered Strong Showing on Petition for Union Ouster Vote

With free legal aid from the National Right to Work Foundation,



Tire-d of the RWDSU: Chris Dorney submitted a huge number of signatures from his Max Finkelstein coworkers when petitioning the NLRB for a vote to remove the RWDSU union.

Dorney submitted a petition to the NLRB containing more than enough employee signatures to trigger a vote to remove the union from the large unit.

While Dorney and his fellow Virginia employees enjoyed the Right to Work freedom to opt-out of dues payments to the union, the same couldn't be said for any of the other employees, all of whom hail from states where dues payments can be mandated as a condition of employment. But voting RWDSU bosses out of power entirely would end the union's forced-dues power.

"We warehouse workers and drivers at Max Finkelstein may be from many different facilities in many different states, but we are in agreement about one thing: RWDSU union officials don't represent our interests," Dorney said of the effort. "It's our right under federal law to challenge RWDSU's forced representation power."

RWDSU Bosses Flee Unit as Union Officials Rack Up Losses Nationwide

However, before the vote could occur, RWDSU union officials disclaimed interest in continuing their monopoly representation powers over the unit, likely to avoid an embarrassing rejection by workers at the ballot box.

Unionized workers are increasingly requesting elections to remove unwanted unions -- a potential reason for the Biden NLRB's efforts to crack down on decertification votes. Additionally, union bosses are increasingly losing these contests. As of last year, filings for union decertification votes had shot up by over 40 percent since 2020. Of decertification elections that occurred, the number which resulted in union bosses losing went up by 72 percent.

"Mr. Dorney and his coworkers' effort to kick out the RWDSU union, which spanned several states, 15 facilities, and hundreds of workers, is yet another example that workers often want to escape union officials' one-size-fits-all agenda. It's also a demonstration that workers will go to great lengths in order to exercise this right," commented National Right to Work Foundation Vice President Patrick Semmens. "But the Biden NLRB, bent on empowering the President's union boss political allies, plans to grant unions even more power to defeat workers' will." ✚

Foundation Action

Sandra Crandall
William Messenger
Don Loos
Patrick Semmens
Mark Mix

Chairman, Board of Trustees
Vice President and Legal Director
Vice President
Vice President and Editor-in-Chief
President

Distributed by the
National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation, Inc.
8001 Braddock Road, Springfield, VA 22160
www.nrtw.org • 1-800-336-3600

The Foundation is a nonprofit, charitable organization providing free legal aid to employees whose human or civil rights have been violated by abuses of compulsory unionism. All contributions to the Foundation are tax deductible under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

IUOE Union Bosses Hit With Federal Charge for Illegal Termination

Longstanding law protects against mandatory dues deductions, formal union membership

PLEASANTON, CA – Sometimes, even the extraordinary power to demand payments from workers under threat of termination isn't enough for union bosses, who frequently go beyond what is legal to coerce workers into membership and dues payment.

Alexandra Le, an employee of Construction Testing Services (CTS), found herself on the receiving end of such illegal demands from International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) officials in October. But Le is now fighting back, hitting IUOE bosses and her employer with federal charges at National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) Region 32 with free legal aid from the National Right to Work Foundation.

Union Misinformed Worker About Rights

Le's charges state that IUOE bosses got her fired after she rebuffed their demands to formally join the union. Additionally, Le's charges maintain that union officials unlawfully deducted union dues from her paycheck without her permission and failed to inform her of her right to pay reduced union dues as a non-member -- a right secured by the Foundation-won *CWA v. Beck* Supreme Court victory.

Because California lacks Right to Work protections for its private sector workers, Le and her coworkers can be forced to pay some fees to the union to keep their jobs, even if they've abstained from formal union membership. However, as per *Beck*, in non-Right to Work states, union officials can't force non-member employees to pay for union expenses (such as union politics) that go beyond what the union claims goes to bargaining. Other Supreme Court precedents require union bosses to seek workers' express consent before deducting dues directly from their paychecks.



Firestop inspector Alexandra Le isn't going to let IUOE union bosses snuff out her livelihood over her refusal to join or support the union. She's filed federal charges with Foundation aid.

In Right to Work states, all union financial support is voluntary and the choice of each individual worker.

Employee Demands Federal Injunction to Reverse Illegal Union-Ordered Firing

"It's outrageous that IUOE union officials believe they can get me fired simply because I don't agree with their organization and don't want to support or affiliate with them," Le said. "IUOE union officials have been far more concerned with consolidating power in the workplace and collecting dues than caring about me and my coworkers, and I hope the NLRB will hold them responsible for their illegal actions."

Le's charge against the IUOE union states that, after she refused to affiliate with the union, IUOE bosses "caused Charging Party to be removed from the work schedule by her Employer as of October 2nd." The *NLRB v. General Motors Corp.* U.S. Supreme Court decision protects the right of workers to refuse formal union membership, even in a non-Right to Work state.

As a remedy, the charge asks

the NLRB Regional Director in Oakland to "invoke its authority under Section 10(j)" of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), which empowers the Board to seek an injunction from a federal court to stop IUOE and CTS management from committing the unfair labor practices.

Workers Need More Protections Against Union Boss Coercion

"Ms. Le's case shows why Right to Work protections are important," commented National Right to Work Foundation Vice President and Legal Director William Messenger. "Even if IUOE union officials had followed federal labor law in this case, Ms. Le would still be forced to contribute to the activities of an organization she clearly doesn't want to be part of."

"As Ms. Le's case demonstrates, union bosses often value workers merely as sources of dues revenue and will go to extraordinary lengths to keep the money flowing," Messenger added. "Workers deserve more protections against union boss coercion, not fewer." ✎

**National Right to Work
Legal Defense Foundation**

**Rated "A"
by CharityWatch**

Source: *Charity Rating Guide
Winter 2023-2024*
American Institute of Philanthropy

Foundation Brief Exposes ILA Union Scheme to Destroy 270 Nonunion Port Jobs

Biden NLRB gutted union boycott prohibition under guise of ‘work preservation’

CHARLESTON, SC – Charleston’s Hugh K. Leatherman shipping terminal represents the State of South Carolina’s roughly \$1 billion investment to expand the state’s shipping sector. The terminal sports five massive ship-to-shore cranes, which rank among the tallest on the East Coast. Nonunion crane operators -- state employees who have handled such work since Leatherman opened in 2021 and for years before that at other port facilities -- work alongside unionized private sector employees to keep the port running.

But union bosses of the International Longshoremen’s Association (ILA) think that the port should be effectively shut down until they get control over all jobs at the facility -- even the crane jobs that the union’s members have never performed. They’ve backed up that coercive vision by suing any cargo carrier that docks at Leatherman until the union gains control of all crane lift equipment jobs at the facility. In December 2022, the Biden National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) outrageously ruled 2-1 against a challenge by the South Carolina Ports Authority (SCPA), holding that ILA union bosses’ secondary boycott scheme was lawful. Then the U.S. Court of Appeals, also by a 2-1 vote, affirmed that disastrous ruling.

Foundation Highlights Workers’ Plight After Disastrous Decision

As the U.S. Supreme Court now decides whether to hear the case, National Right to Work Foundation staff attorneys filed a legal brief with the High Court highlighting how the Biden NLRB’s rejection of longstanding precedent will let 270 nonunion state employees at Leatherman be put out of work. That’s despite them having done nothing wrong when performing



Despite employing hundreds of both union and nonunion employees and being a big boon to the Palmetto State’s economy, ILA union bosses want to shut down Charleston’s Leatherman Terminal until they gain a monopoly on jobs at the port.

crane work exactly as they have for years.

“In short, the decisions below, if affirmed, will cause grievous harm to 270 non-union Ports Authority workers and their families,” the brief reads. “The Foundation submits this brief to provide a voice for the otherwise voiceless non-union Ports Authority workers, so the Court has a clear view of the stakes involved for the workers and their families if the decisions below stand.”

Job-Destroying ILA Union Gambit Breaks Federal Law

The brief states that the ILA union’s scheme, if allowed to continue, would require South Carolina to both fire the nonunion state employees of the port, and then turn control of crane jobs over to a private company with an ILA union contract. That’s because South Carolina protects its public sector employees by banning union monopoly bargaining.

If the union’s gambit succeeds, the devastating effects for current employees would go beyond just getting fired. The brief reveals that, even if terminated state workers were to seek new employment at Leatherman with the private company under the union’s control,

the ILA would likely give hiring priority to its existing unionized workers above the former state workers under the union seniority provisions and hiring hall referral rules contained in the contract.

“Crane and lift operators who have spent years as non-union Ports Authority employees will likely find themselves at the bottom of any ILA hiring hall list behind the union’s 2,000 current members,” the brief notes.

See ‘Foundation Presses SCOTUS’ page 8

Exposing the NLRB’s Sham “Work Preservation” Union Power Grab

Watch Foundation Vice President and Legal Director William Messenger and staff attorney Glenn Taubman explain why the ILA union’s scheme to seize jobs at Leatherman Terminal is illegal and will lead to devastating consequences for employees.



Scan the QR code to the right or visit www.nrtw.org/ila



Foundation Blasts Biden Plan to Sneak Union Monopoly Power into Agricultural Sector

Comments expose DOL rule's rigging of agricultural visa program to favor union organizers

WASHINGTON, DC – Federal labor policy in the United States provides a smorgasbord of powers to union bosses in the private sector, not the least of which are the powers to impose one-size-fits-all contracts on dissenting workers in a unionized workplace, and to force workers to pay dues in non-Right to Work states.

Traditionally that hasn't been the case in the agricultural sector, where each state has the freedom to make its own labor policy. But in November 2023, the Biden Department of Labor announced a rule which could upend this balance and effectively impose on temporary agricultural employees portions of federal labor law that are overwhelmingly favorable to union bosses. The National Right to Work Foundation promptly filed comments exposing the slated rule as a Big Labor power grab.

Biden Admin Defies Congress by Granting Union Bosses Power Over Farmworkers

The proposed rule would assist union bosses with imposing monopoly bargaining privileges over temporary agricultural workers in the United States, including workers who don't support a union. Among other things, the rule requires that employers fork over employee contact information at union bosses' request -- regardless of whether the union has any employee support. The proposed rule would also cajole employers into entering into so-called "neutrality agreements" with union bosses. "Neutrality agreements" typically require employers to censor information about the union and provide other aid to union bosses in their efforts to collectivize workers.

The comments cite multiple reasons as to why the Department of Labor lacks the legal authority to implement the proposed rule, such



Julie Su -- "acting" secretary of the Biden Labor Department due to bipartisan opposition barring her from the agency's top job -- is overseeing an attempt to sneak union boss power into the agricultural sector against Congress' will.

as the fact that Congress expressly excluded agricultural workers from federal labor statutes.

According to the comments, the Biden Department of Labor admitted in its rulemaking announcement that it is trying to impose parts of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) on the agricultural sector, despite Congress' intent.

"The Department not only lacks Congressional authorization to take this action, it is defying express Congressional intent to not subject these types of employees to provisions of the NLRA," the comments state.

Comments: Union Power Grab Won't Help Workers

The comments also point out that the provisions in the Department of Labor's rule are unrelated to the rule's stated purpose of helping agricultural workers avoid exploitation, and rather resemble a list of proposals to empower union officials at workers' expense.

"The Department fails to explain how allowing unions to access employees' personal information, to bargain for neutrality agreements,

and to prevent employees from accessing information for and against unionization helps to alleviate the concerns identified in the proposed regulations," the comments argue.

"The Department should not adopt the proposed regulation," the comments conclude.

The Department of Labor's notice of rulemaking comes as the Biden Administration is making a full court press to expand union boss legal privileges across the country. That includes the Biden National Labor Relations Board's (NLRB) plan to wipe out the Foundation-backed Election Protection Rule, which eased the process by which workers could obtain votes to remove unpopular unions from their workplaces. The Biden NLRB seeks to make it more difficult for American private sector workers to exercise their right to remove unwanted unions, while giving union officials more tools to gain power in a workplace without even a vote.

"Despite the Department of Labor's claims, the true underhanded goal of this rule is clear: handing union bosses more power to corral workers into union ranks, while cutting back on workers' privacy and rights to resist unwanted unionization," observed National Right to Work Foundation President Mark Mix. "Temporary agricultural workers should not be used as pawns to expand union bosses' sphere of control into the agricultural sector. But that's exactly what the Biden Department of Labor is attempting in direct contradiction of the choice made by Congress not to subject such workers to federally imposed monopoly unionism." †





IT'S A NEW YEAR – MAKE A PLAN FOR 2024

As we welcome in the New Year, National Right to Work Foundation staff are gearing up for a busy year defending workers victimized by forced unionism in the workplace. You can assist these courageous workers today by making a tax-deductible gift to the Foundation.

With over 250 cases -- and a record number of requests for assistance -- Foundation attorneys are busy challenging Big Labor schemes at all levels of the judicial system.

In addition to cash contributions, gifts of long-term appreciated securities (where you can deduct the full fair market value and pay no capital gains tax when contributing stock that has been held for more than a year) are one of the most common ways the Foundation receives support. Increasingly, donors are also sending qualified charitable distributions from their IRA accounts through their IRA custodians or financial advisors with a yearly gift of up to \$100,000 (available as long as you are 70 ½ or older).

Additionally, many friends of the Foundation are deciding to leave a long-term legacy of freedom by including the Foundation in their estate plans through a will or trust. Leaving an estate gift is quite simple: You can make the Foundation a beneficiary of a specific amount from your estate or of a residual bequest. A residual bequest comes to the Foundation after your estate expenses and specific bequests are taken care of.

Only your investment in the Foundation allows us to assist brave workers in challenging Big Labor coercion, and we deeply appreciate every gift that makes that work possible!

If you have any questions, or need further information regarding a gift today, or an estate gift, please contact Ginny Smith (gms@nrtw.org), Director of Strategic Programs for the Foundation. (As in all estate or tax matters, we urge you to consult an estate attorney or your tax or financial advisor before making a gift.)

NLRB Attacks Starbucks Workers' Freedom in Federal Court

continued from page 1

that Cortes' decertification must be stopped to protect workers is rooted in the wrongful idea that workers cannot think for themselves and lack independent reasons for wanting to get rid of a union.

Foundation Brief: NLRB Denies Workers' Agency, Free Choice

"In reality, Cortes collected her petition because of the Union's anti-employee behavior," the brief says.

Foundation attorneys also contend in Cortes' brief that what the NLRB is seeking from the Second Circuit -- a 10(j) injunction under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) that will force Starbucks managers into working with SBWU union bosses to craft a

monopoly bargaining contract -- is extreme. Such injunctions can only be ordered when the harm done to workers in their absence would be "irreparable." Foundation attorneys argue Cortes' and other employees' attempts to decertify do not make any injuries suffered by the union "irreparable."

Dangerous Precedent Set If Court Grants Injunction That Undermines Right to Remove Unwanted Unions

If the Second Circuit grants the NLRB's request for an injunction on behalf of SBWU union bosses, it would be the first time that a federal court has ordered a Starbucks store to engage in bargaining with union bosses on the basis of an employee's

decertification petition.

"The NLRB is digging an even deeper grave for employees trying to exercise their rights to remove an unwanted union from their workplace," commented National Right to Work Foundation President Mark Mix. "The Board's attempt to twist the limited employee rights to throw out a union into a reason to force a union upon employees is a new low.

"Ariana Cortes and Logan Karam are taking a courageous stand to ensure their coworkers aren't disenfranchised and trapped under a union hierarchy they oppose, and we're proud to support them," Mix added. 🇺🇸

Puerto Rico Union Bosses Try to Dodge Consequences of *Janus* Lawsuit

Worker still battling scofflaw union officials who tried to saddle him with restraining order

SAN JUAN, PR – When Reynaldo Cruz, an employee of the Puerto Rican Aqueduct and Sewer Authority (PRASA), made a Facebook post referring to a chapter president of the Authentic Independent Union of Water and Sewer Authority Employees (UIA) as “lazy,” the chapter president tried to hit him with a restraining order.

“A UIA union official targeted me with a restraining order for daring to speak out against the union, which is my free speech right,” commented Cruz. “That’s ridiculous coming from union officials who claim to ‘represent’ me and my coworkers.”

National Right to Work Foundation staff attorneys in October 2023 defeated the UIA official’s specious argument that the court should issue a restraining order against Cruz because he would have had to “stalk” him to know of his laziness. But Cruz’s battle against the UIA union is far from over.

District Court Refuses to Crack Down on Obvious *Janus* Violations

Cruz is currently challenging a decision by the District Court of Puerto Rico in his years-long case to reclaim dues money that UIA union officials took unconstitutionally from his paycheck.

The District Court made the puzzling move of dismissing Cruz’s suit as “moot” after UIA officials deposited money due to Cruz with the Clerk of the District Court of Puerto Rico. In his motion to alter and amend the judgment, Cruz argues that because the court has not decided any of his underlying claims or entered a judgment in his favor, he has no entitlement to and cannot seek or obtain that money. Cruz is also appealing the District Court’s dismissal of his suit to the First Circuit Court of Appeals in



PRASA employee Reynaldo Cruz didn’t back down after UIA union officials tried to foist a specious restraining order on him. He isn’t backing down in the face of UIA union officials’ Janus violations either.

Boston, MA.

“Until the Court enters a declaratory judgment for Cruz, Cruz’s injury-in-fact will persist because Cruz has not received monetary relief and the Court has not entered judgment for Cruz entitling him to the UIA deposit,” Cruz’s motion reads.

Cruz argues in his suit that various provisions of the Puerto Rico Labor Relations Act, which UIA union bosses relied upon to take money from his paycheck, violate the First Amendment. In 2018, the Supreme Court ruled in the landmark Foundation-won *Janus v. AFSCME* case that public employees have a First Amendment right to opt-out of dues payments to an unwanted union, and that public employees must waive this right before any dues are deducted from their paychecks.

Cruz’s *Janus* lawsuit began in 2017, after UIA officials responded to his request to end his union membership and stop dues payments by telling him that he could only cut ties with the union if

he left his current job. In addition to naming the UIA, Cruz’s lawsuit also names the Governor of Puerto Rico in his official capacity as Cruz is also challenging the constitutionality of Puerto Rico’s laws authorizing mandatory dues and so-called “maintenance of membership” agreements.

The *Janus* case was decided as Cruz’s case was ongoing. The Justices definitively ruled that requiring public sector employees to pay union dues as a condition of employment violates their First Amendment free association rights.

The Puerto Rico District Court issued its ruling on October 17, 2023. In addition to not entering a judgment for Cruz deciding his entitlement to the unconstitutionally seized money, the Court also didn’t reach a conclusion on the constitutionality of the Puerto Rico law authorizing mandatory dues payment and membership, nor did it require the UIA union to abandon anti-*Janus* contract provisions.

Union Bosses Must Be Made to Comply with *Janus*

“The ruling in Mr. Cruz’s case poses serious issues for public employees across Puerto Rico and across the country,” commented National Right to Work Foundation Vice President Patrick Semmens. “If allowed to stand, it creates a precedent in which workers get no relief when union bosses seize money unconstitutionally from their hard-earned pay, and in which laws that authorize such illegal dues deductions are allowed to stand despite *Janus* unambiguously prohibiting them.

“Foundation staff attorneys will continue to fight for Mr. Cruz until his rights are vindicated and he gets a judgment awarding him the money he is constitutionally entitled to,” Semmens added. 📢

Foundation Presses SCOTUS to Stop Ruthless ILA Scheme

continued from page 4

Additionally, the brief points out that the ILA union's scheme violates the prohibition on secondary boycotts in the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), the federal law the NLRB is responsible for enforcing. Secondary boycotts involve union agents targeting a neutral employer (in this case, cargo carriers) in order to win a labor dispute that the neutral employer isn't even party to.

Finally, the brief notes, by granting the ILA control over the jobs of state employees who have never chosen to affiliate with the ILA, the NLRB is undermining the NLRA's fundamental premise of employee free choice -- the rule that "the employees pick the union; the union does not pick the employees."

Supreme Court Must Intervene to Defend Worker Rights

"ILA union officials have a well-earned reputation for valuing power over the well-being of workers," commented National Right to Work Foundation Vice President and Legal Director William Messenger. "While pursuing monopolistic schemes like this that upend the livelihoods of innocent nonunion workers, union agents were also organizing deals in which mob-linked longshoremen from New York and New Jersey could get paid for 27 hours of 'work' per day.

"The ILA union's gambit here should be deemed no less illegal than their interactions with mob members, and the Biden NLRB's greenlighting such a scheme effectively invites other union bosses to try unlawful secondary boycotts that end with workers and businesses suffering needless harm," Messenger added. 🇺🇸



Message from Mark Mix

President
National Right to Work
Legal Defense Foundation

Dear Foundation Supporter,

As we begin a new year, a trend is going on that has union bosses scrambling.

According to the Biden National Labor Relations Board's (NLRB) own data, elections held in which workers have voted on whether to remove a union -- also called "decertification elections" -- have risen by nearly 50 percent since 2020.

And not only that -- the number of decertification elections in which workers have voted against union bosses has gone up by *over 70 percent*.

Your support of the Foundation has been invaluable in helping more and more workers exercise their right to vote out union bosses they don't approve of. You can read about one particularly big victory (page 2) in which over 500 workers of tire wholesaler Max Finkelstein won their freedom from RWDSU union bosses with free Foundation legal aid.

Of course, getting rid of unwanted union bosses is rarely simple.

Workers opposed to union affiliation face not only threats from union bullies and underhanded legal tactics by union lawyers designed to block or delay votes. Independent-minded employees must also contend with a Biden NLRB that rigs the rules at every turn to promote coercive unionism.

That's why workers are increasingly turning to the Foundation's team of experienced staff attorneys to defend their rights against not only union bosses, but also the Biden Labor Board.

Fortunately, your Foundation is well-equipped to meet these challenges head-on. Foundation attorneys are battling on two fronts: fighting for workers at the NLRB while also combatting attempts by NLRB activists to stack the deck in favor of union bosses. (The cover story demonstrates this dual strategy in action for Starbucks baristas opposed to unionization.)

Advancing worker freedom against both out-of-touch union bosses and their cronies in government is a tall order. So without your faithful support, we couldn't take up this fight.

Thank you for standing behind us and for partnering with us in 2024!

Sincerely,