

# Charges Fly As Strike Endures

--Brian Tokar

Into the third full week of the Service employees' strike, the Institute community has been bombarded with literature from all sides, charges and countercharges, overall confusion, and further polarization of opinion. MIT has been taking advantage of its position by releasing almost daily Reports dominated by lists of accusations blaming the union for everything under the sun; meanwhile the union and its supporters have attempted to use their limited resources to explain the alternative point of view of the issues involved. They have sought to elucidate the reasons why there are still no ongoing negotiations and why at one meeting with a Federal mediator called by the union last week, the former reportedly "threw up his hands" in a gesture of hopelessness upon hearing the position of MIT negotiator Robert Davis.

Last week it was asserted that MIT's wage offer had been negotiated up from 6% with the Service Employees. This is not true in that such negotiations only took place with the Technicians' Union, and Davis' offer to the strikers never changed from 7 1/2%, as has been reported time and again.

Citing the destructive nature of MIT's position, the staff of the Cancer Center on Friday issued a leaflet addressed to the administration protesting the numerous inconveniences the strike has caused. Since the Center's daily operations

depend upon all facilities being in nearly perfect condition and their support of the strike makes it "morally repugnant" to hire scabs, they have taken the initiative in what it is expected to become a signifi-

cant show of faculty support and direct pressure against the MIT administration. Toward this end, another group of faculty members from various departments has planned a TEACH-IN on the strike for Wednesday afternoon

Which brings us to the matter of the hack Institute Report. As everybody probably knows by now, this amazing reproduction accused the union in MIT's own style of such absurdities as cutting all of the electric cables into Walker and attacking secretaries who tried to deliver mail during the day (one department followed up with a warning against such incidents!) and it credited the Institute with hiring students in the mailroom at \$4.20 an hour and suggesting that Institute Mail be wrapped with newspapers. Approximately 1500 copies of this "Report" were placed in the corridors for distribution by the small group of students who prepared it, and they were all removed shortly after, when it became apparent that readers were really getting angry at the union due to the new vandalism "charges" (The author of the "Report" has announced that only 300 copies had actually been taken.)

Monday

MIT  
Artspaper

Sept 30  
1974



This all happened a weekys ago, but what matters now is the high state of uproar that was created in Institute circles by this harmless hoax. And the only explanation being offered for this uproar is that maybe the leaflet was believed because the "charges" it leveled, however absurd, were no more so than that of the real Institute Reports. In fact, there were people who absolutely refused to believe that the "Report" was not real. If MIT does not consider the hoax to be a serious affront to their dwindling credibility, why did they exclaim that "as many as 5000 could have been distributed..." and why did a large-scale investigation of the incident begin immediately and continue until the author "confessed" under way immediately.

With this in mind Tuesday afternoon, we decided to contact some of the departments directly mentioned in the "Report." A call to the mailroom asking for a job yielded a simple "no jobs-- it was a hoax" reply, but officials at Student Accounts and Dining Service were not taking it so lightly. When we called the former asking for an "expected" commons refund, we were told of the hoax by a secretary who obviously hadn't even hesitated once to blame everything on the union. "Just because one union is on strike," she declared, "they think the whole Institute should be shut down." However, she did say that individuals who hadn't eaten lunch that day due to the report of Walker closing should be able to get a refund, and we promptly called Dining Service for a confirmation.

The Dining Service, as expected, was much more cautious in dealing with our innocent ripped-off commons customer, and after a short huddle off the phone, the secretary left the number of one of their officials to call. The official, unknown to us until later, turned out to be Dining Service's head accountant, who said that we might have a case, but that a refund could only be approved by the management of Walker. Only Dining Service officials have the authority to decide on such a matter, and if they think otherwise, "Student Accounts is way out in left field!" And so goes the tight efficient image which the MIT Administration so loves to paint for itself.

But more important, so goes the Institute Report. MIT has continually blamed the union for every unusual incident that happens here, and the union is already preparing a libel suit against some of the charges. Meanwhile, the administration has asked that anything suspicious be reported to the strike center instead of Campus Patrol, so that the accusations can continue to flow. As optimism for a rapid settlement and continuation of Institute services grows rarer with time, it is no surprise that many MIT people have concluded that MIT can never deny the content of the hack Institute Report until there is a full

admission as to the dubious and destructive nature of the "real" ones.



The following is the text of the confession given to Campus Patrol by the students responsible for the hack Institute Report distributed last Tuesday.

"We, Douglas Foxvog, Richard Hilliard, and David Holladay created and distributed a counterfeit institute report. It was an attempt in the vein of the many parodies of Institute publications and newspapers that have appeared before. We first planned to write an obvious hack-one that would not mislead anyone. As we discussed the idea we began with many outrageous, truly, unbelievable statements. Many different things were suggested. As we refined our ideas to a final draft, it was still quite funny to us. By the time we finished, we had decided to make it more realistic. But apparently we hid the humor too well; we believed it to contain much subtle humor-but to others, especially people less knowledgeable about the strike, it seemed quite normal and was believed.

We thought that by the afternoon everyone would realise it to be a farce. We thought its only tangible effect would be some morning phone calls to the administration.

We printed 1500 copies and distributed 300 copies in the lobbies of Bldg. 7, 8, 10 at

approximately 8:45 am on Tuesday. We felt the effect of it immediately. Students were talking about it, other people around the Institute seemed to be taking it seriously. We realised that what began as a parodistic hack had become very serious. Somewhat after 9:00

am, we returned to the lobbies where we distributed them. Fifty were left of the 300 we had placed there. We retrieved them. All undistributed copies were destroyed.

At this point we considered coming forward, identifying the source of the report, and stating the innocence of our

intent. We were not attempting to disrupt any negotiations, or inconvenience anyone. But then it seemed that the Administration was considering serious investigations and possibly criminal prosecutions for those involved. We decided to keep quiet.

After consulting with Prof. Jerry Lettvin, and Chief Oliveiri, we have decided to come forward.

To the members of the SEIU Local 254 we apologise and to the MIT administration, to students and other Institute people, we are deeply sorry about any in-

convenience or anguish this prank has caused.

[ signed ]

*David Holladay*  
*Douglas Foxvog*  
*Richard F. Hilliard*

## NOTICE!

There will be a Strike Teach-In sponsored by faculty members on Wednesday, October 2 from 12 to 2 pm in Room 10-250. Speakers from faculty and union. All invited.



*a "real" institute report*

# institute report

SPECIAL  
REPORT

Massachusetts Institute  
of Technology

September 23, 1974

Volume 3, No. 3

M.I.T. today filed with the Boston office of the National Labor Relations Board charges of unfair labor practices against the Service Employees' International Union (SEIU) Local 254 and will ask the Board to seek an injunction from the federal court against the continuation of illegal strike activity. The action is in response to numerous instances of mass picketing, vandalism, and threats of violence in connection with the strike, which are in violation of federal statutes regulating strike conduct.

- o -

While it is clear that the majority of M.I.T. employees and others participating in the current strike have made every effort to conduct themselves in an orderly and lawful manner, some persons have allegedly engaged in actions which interfere with the rights of others not involved in the strike.

Since September 13, there has been mass picketing (i. e., masses of pickets acting so as to block access to M.I.T. property) almost daily at the Lincoln Laboratory in Lexington and at a number of sites on campus.

Of greater concern, however, have been the threats of violence, and one actual incidence of violence, which have been perpetrated against members of the Institute community:

Last Thursday a student was punched in the jaw as he entered his car following delivery of a quantity of yogurt to the 24 hour coffee house at the Student Center. The student has filed assault charges with the Cambridge police, and a hearing is set for October 3.

On the previous weekend, two employees were telephoned at work by two men identified as union officials and threatened with bodily harm if they did not leave their jobs. The men remained on the job. However, the wives of the two men were telephoned at home and told that if their husbands continued to work, someone from the union would "get" the wives.

Prior to the strike of the Cooks and Pastry Cooks Association, at



least three cooks were accosted on their way to the kitchen and told not to go to work.

A number of vehicles on campus have been vandalized. Several M.I. T. delivery trucks and a private car have had three or more tires slashed, and some have had windows smashed as well. Nails have been strewn on the driveways and parking lots of four campus buildings.

Non-university vehicles servicing the Institute have also been targets of interference.

Spikes and nails were put in the path of a Wellesley exchange bus Thursday evening. As a result of fear of further difficulties, the bus company made plans to discontinue service as of that evening. Only after several hours of negotiations between M.I. T. and bus company officials was the decision made to continue service at a number of designated pick-up points.

On September 13 a truck making deliveries to Building 41 had its tires slashed and its windows smashed. Subsequently some drivers of service trucks in that area have been physically threatened by masses of pickets. Two companies under contract to the Institute for delivery of goods have discontinued their service as a result of such actions and as a result of telephoned threats to their offices.

There have been several scattered incidents of vandalism on campus. Last Tuesday, a key was used to enter the mailroom in Building 24, remove sorted mail from its slots and scatter it about. Later in the week, washrooms in several buildings had toilets stuffed with rolls of toilet paper, and several others were flooded with running water.



# institute report

*see Tech Talk ← a forgery.*

SPECIAL  
REPORT

Massachusetts Institute  
of Technology

September 24, 1974

Volume 4, No. 4

---

Yesterday the National Labor Relations Board announced that it would "...conduct an investigation into charges of alleged vandalism, threats of violence, and mass picketing..." by the Service Employees' International Union (SEIU) Local 254, before acting to seek an injunction from the federal court as per M.I.T.'s request.

- o -

All Commons has ceased due to vandalism. Last night, electric cables for the Walker kitchen were cut. Large quantities of food were ruined. Service will discontinue following the breakfast meal. The M.I.T. Police are investigating the incident. Repair will begin as soon as is feasible. In the meantime, students on Commons should go to the Students' Accounts Office (E19-215) for refunds.

- o -

While delivering mail to their offices, some Institute secretaries have been harassed. Several have had their mail taken from them and one was physically attacked. It has been suggested by the supervisors at the mailroom that people delivering Institute mail conceal it in a newspaper or other means so as to avoid any troubles.

- o -

There have been several other incidents of vandalism and violence: Over the weekend, paper towels were found to have been stuffed in toilets around the Institute, causing drains to back up and flood in some areas. Suspected union members were seen scattering bags of rubbish in the Institute halls. On September 22 at 4:00 am, a rubbish removal truck from Walker had its tires slashed. There have been telephone threats to members of the M.I.T. administration and their families at home.

- o -

As everyone must know by now, the strike of the services union has introduced a good many Institute employees to such unglamorous chores as mail delivering and rubbish disposal. Some supervisors have discovered a simple but successful method for eliciting the manpower needed to keep their quarters tidy and in touch with the world outside: they roll up their own sleeves first. Students are needed to work at the mailroom for \$4.20 per hour. apply at 24-007.



Massachusetts  
Institute  
of Technology

# TECH TALK

September 25, 1974  
Volume 19  
Number 13

## Counterfeit Report Issued

A counterfeit *Institute Report* prepared by forgers apparently familiar with offset printing and containing grossly misleading strike information was distributed at MIT early Tuesday.

John Wynne, vice president for administration and personnel, denounced the forgery for causing undue alarm and concern among employees and students.

"I deplore the effort to create confusion and trouble in a community already troubled by the strike of maintenance and custodial employees," Mr. Wynne said. "We are seeking to determine who

(Continued on page 2)

## Counterfiet Report Issued

(Continued from page 1)

did it and if we are successful we will deal with them appropriately under the law."

*Institute Report* is the special publication brought out by the MIT administration to keep employees, staff, students and faculty informed of developments in the strike.

The counterfeit *Institute Report* told students that commons meals would no longer be served in Walker Dining Hall because of vandalism (which is not true) and said that secretaries going for office mail had been attacked (which is not true), that students were being hired to work in the central mailroom (which is not true) and that suspected union members were seen scattering rubbish in Institute halls (which is not true).

Piles of bogus documents were placed in at least four hallway locations in Bldgs. 7, 10, 6 and 8 some time between 8:30am and 9am Tuesday. As many as 5,000 could have been circulated before the fraud was detected shortly after 9am.

Investigations were begun immediately to trace both the typewriters used in preparing the forgery and the presses used to print it.



# institute report

SPECIAL  
REPORT

Massachusetts Institute  
of Technology

September 26, 1974

Volume 5, No. 5

A counterfeit Tech Talk prepared by forgers apparently familiar with printing and containing grossly misleading information was distributed at MIT early wednesday. John Wynne, vice president for administration and personnel, denounced the forgery for causing undue alarm and concern among employees and students.

"I deplore the effort to create confusion and trouble in a community already troubled by the strike of maintenance and custodial employees," Mr. Wynne said. "We are seeking to determine who did it and if we are successful we will deal with them appropriately under the law."

Tech Talk is a publication brought out by the MIT administration to keep employees, staff, students and faculty informed of developments in the MIT community.

The counterfeit Tech Talk among other things denied the authenticity of the institute report Vol. 4 issue 4.

Piles of the bogus documents were placed in at least four hallway locations in Bldgs. 7, 10, 6 and 8 early wednesday morning. As many as 5000 could have been circulated before the fraud was detected shortly after 9am.

Obvious errors throughout the issue may have cued most readers to the fraudulent nature of this Tech Talk issue. Mr. Wynne pointed out for example that Allan S. Bufferd does not wear glasses, and that a '64 Rambler classic is certainly worth more than \$75 even if it needs a new headlight.



MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

CENTER FOR CANCER RESEARCH

77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

TO: Jerome Wiesner, President; John Wynne, Vice President --  
Administration and Personnel; and Walter Rosenblith, Provost.

During the present strike, M.I.T. has maintained the facade of "business as usual." The administration has created the impression that each department and laboratory has gladly taken up the slack created by the strike by performing functions normally done by members of the striking union, S.E.I.U. Local 254, such as obtaining and distributing essential supplies and mail and disposing of garbage. However, this is not the case.

The failure of negotiations between M.I.T. and the striking union has placed a heavy burden on each lab and department, and has created conditions, both physically and psychologically, which are far from normal. Operation of the virology division of the Center for Cancer Research has been impaired.

We are engaged in cancer research, and are put in a position of deciding between two unpleasant alternatives: (1) to come to work and cross picket lines, or (2) to stop work and thus allow important research to be set back.

The only way research can continue is for laboratory personnel to carry out duties normally performed by the striking union. We find this morally repugnant. In addition, some experiments have had to be curtailed due to the time consuming nature of these chores. Necessary supplies have not been obtainable since many delivery companies have honored the strike.

An immediate peril to our work has arisen over the disposal of garbage. Unless someone performs the custodial tasks of trash removal, thus undermining the strike, our director has informed us that he will be forced to close the lab due to health and safety hazards produced by the accumulation of trash in the corridors.

If the strike continues, many of us will find it impossible to continue working. We therefore call upon the administration to recognize the essential role of the striking employees, and to negotiate a rapid, fair, and just settlement.

Signed by twenty members of the staff.

cc: S.E.I.U. Local 254 Strike Committee



## IS M.I.T.'S OFFER FAIR AND ADEQUATE?

In Tech Talk, September 18, R.J. Davis, Personnel Director of M.I.T. stated that the union had never challenged the fairness or the equity of M.I.T.'s proposal. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Let's examine M.I.T.'s proposal against the current inflation spiral in which we find ourselves and which more and more presses down upon the low wage worker - a crown of thorns in greater proportion than any other class of the population.

In July, 1972, the union, restrained by Federal wage controls, accepted an increase of 5.5% and an additional 5.2% in July, 1973. From July, 1972 to July, 1973, the cost of living, according to the Department of Labor, rose 5.7% and from July, 1973 - July, 1974, 11.8% so that during the two years of the contract negotiated under Federal wage controls, union members show a wage increase of 10.7% while the cost of living advanced 17.5%, so that as the bargaining sessions began in July, 1974, the union membership had lost 6.8% in its standard of living.

The Institute's offer of 7.5% made on July 1 has already been eaten up by inflation which is advancing at the rate of more than 1% per month. The offer to increase the wages by 15% over the next two years from July 1, 1974, to July 1, 1976, is inadequate because even conservative projections are that the cost of living will advance in double digits during the next two years.

The Union's proposal of 10% the first year and 10% the second year is a conservative approach and recognizes the realities of dealing with an institute like M.I.T. If there was any validity to an offer of 7 1/2 - 7 1/2 on July 1, its validity has vanished in the increasing spiral of inflation.

M.I.T. has indicated that in the event that further increases must be given to the Union its student population should bear the burden. What nonsense! M.I.T. is no more a college to be compared to Brandeis, Holy Cross, Boston University or Garland Jr. College.

M.I.T. IS THE 44TH LARGEST MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTOR DOING BUSINESS WITH THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE. IN 1972 IT ACCOUNTED FOR ONE HUNDRED TWENTY SEVEN MILLION, TWO HUNDRED SEVENTY FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS IN DIRECT PRIME DEFENSE CONTRACTS. M.I.T. IS IN THE SAME LEAGUE WITH GENERAL MOTORS, LOCKHEED, GENERAL DYNAMICS, BOEING AND GENERAL ELECTRIC. IT IS THE SECOND LARGEST DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECT CONTRACTOR IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Since the strike has started some six million dollars in Federal funds have been funneled into M.I.T. Is this a hard-strapped educational institution that finds it impossible to balance its budget? Hardly. In the past two years M.I.T. has slashed the maintenance and custodial force by 20% - has eliminated overtime - and increased the number of buildings to be serviced and maintained.

This is why we are out on strike. In today's inflationary market, as the old song says, 7 1/2% doesn't buy a helluva lot.

OUR NEXT REPORT - "THE GREAT 1974 PENSION RIPOFF".

Edward T. Sullivan, Chairman  
SEIU STRIKE COMMITTEE  
482-6148



In Tech Talk, August 14, Chancellor Paul Gray announced changes in the M.I.T. Pension Plan. In the last paragraph he said that changes would not be made affecting union members because such matters were subject of the current negotiations. Chancellor Gray well knows that under IRS and Federal Pension Laws benefits for all participants of a pension plan must be the same and, by his action, Gray withdrew from the bargaining table all substantial discussion of pension changes. This in the middle of what M.I.T. calls "good faith bargaining".

LET'S PUT THE M.I.T. PROPOSAL UNDER THE MICROSCOPE AND EXAMINE IT. R.J. DAVIS WAS VERY CAREFUL TO POINT OUT THAT THE EMPLOYER ASSUMPTION OF PENSION CONTRIBUTION WAS NOT A RAISE. INDEED IT ISN'T. AS A MATTER OF FACT ALL MR. DAVIS AND CHANCELLOR GRAY HAVE BEEN KIND ENOUGH TO DO IS TO GIVE YOU BACK THE MONEY THAT THEY HAVE BEEN TAKING FROM YOUR PAY FOR THESE MANY YEARS - AND NOT EVEN AT A BARGAIN - BECAUSE WHILE M.I.T. PENSION PLAN WAS EARNING UP TO 10% INTEREST IT PAID OFF AT THE RATE OF 4%.

Ask your supervisor for a "Report of the Trustees of the Retirement Plan for employees of M.I.T., dated December 31, 1973". It is a very revealing document. On that date M.I.T. had \$38,152,414 in assets. During the year, 1973, it collected a massive total of \$5,733,857 and paid out in benefits to retired members or their beneficiaries a paltry \$165,830 and \$75,735 in annuity purchases.

Can you imagine a pension plan in effect for almost 15 years with this tremendous cash flow doling out a pittance like this? Well, indeed, they can now, after collecting from the members for 15 years at an assumed interest of 4%, afford to pay back to the member and assume the full obligation of the pension costs - 85% of which is directly charged to the United States Government by M.I.T., the 44th Largest military prime contractor in the United States.

The amassing of this tremendous amount of money while doling out pennies to its long-term employees is hardly the stuff of which financial geniuses are made. But to present this plan as a raise insults the intelligence of every member of the M.I.T. community.

For years Local 254 has demanded that an employee-beneficiary of the plan sit on the Pension Board. M.I.T. has resisted this with all its strength. Local 254 has filed legislation in the Massachusetts General Court to require employee-beneficiary participation in pension trusts. Without it Employers are free to manipulate these tremendous sums of money without regard to fair payment of benefits.

M.I.T. with its vast military-industrial connections has used the power of this money against the best interests of its own employees and of its neighbors in the Cambridgeport and Kendall Square areas.

Ask for a copy of the report - read it - take it to any insurance actuary and ask his opinion as to whether or not the beneficiaries are getting a fair shake.

Edward T. Sullivan, Chairman  
SEIU STRIKE COMMITTEE  
482-6148





# Bexley Observer

Volume 4  
Number 4

example =  
in-house  
publication.

## 1K HASH RIPOFF MIT.

A thousand dollars worth of hash was ripped off recently from Bexley. The theft was made possible by careless residents allowing the urchin access to the building. Each ripoff encourages others. Don't let in strangers and question suspicious characters.

## BEXLEY WELCOMES BOB AND PAUL BACK

The strike of SEIU local 254 is over and regular services in Bexley resume. MIT's strategy was to wait till the workers ran out of money. Bexley supported the efforts of the SEIU to get a living wage out of MIT. Although a motion to allow Bexley house funds to help our striking custodians was defeated, several hundred dollars in voluntary contributions supplemented their strike benefits.

## FREEBIES

There will be a party at 6:00PM in the lounge on Saturday featuring salad, soup wine and women.  
There will be a Lettvin Sunday brunch.

## HOUSEMASTERS WANT MORE COMMUNICATIONS ON STUDENT PROBLEMS

After the ~~incident~~ incident, the Lettvins were upset about their lack of information on a developing problem. If someone is getting into difficulty or withdrawing into emotional isolation, they would like to know and talk about it before a nasty situation develops. Things like that aren't supposed to happen in Bexley.

## Bexley to be removed - but not soon

By Mike McNamee

Bexley Hall, the old apartment building-turned-dormitory across Massachusetts Avenue from Building 7, might be a casualty of the Institute's building plans within a few years.

The building, which was converted for dorm use by the Institute in the mid-1960s, will be removed from the undergraduate housing system and probably destroyed if or when MIT has the housing capacity to allow removal, according to plans developed by the MIT administration.

Although the Institute has always considered Bexley "temporary housing" and plans for phasing it out of the system

are not new, those plans have taken on a new significance with the construction of a new dormitory on West Campus near MacGregor House.

When Bexley is removed from the system, it will almost certainly be destroyed. "That building is in tough shape," Wadleigh said. "There's little we could do by way of renovating it, like we did Burton or Ashdown."

The MIT Planning Office has considered a number of possible uses for the site, but nothing concrete has been settled, Wadleigh said.