ILWU members who live in California will have a chance to vote in the state’s primary election on June 5. The outcome could shake-up the political establishment – depending on who votes and how many go to the polls or mail back their ballots.

Some locals are encouraging members to vote, and the ILWU’s Northern and Southern California District Councils have interviewed candidates and analyzed which ones are committed to supporting working families and labor union members instead of business interests.

“Our District Council tried to interview every possible candidate so we could see where they stand on our issues,” said Local 10 President Melvin Mackay, who heads the Northern California District Council.

Those issues include:
- Support for ILWU issues and concerns.
- Willingness to honor or join picket lines.
- Supporting “Medicare for all” healthcare.
- Courage to challenge corporate power.

“After interviewing the candidates, we talked among ourselves, and it was usually clear who deserved our support,” said Mackay.

District Councils in both Northern and Southern California have compiled their list of recommendations, which can be seen on page 4 of this issue. Members should also check with their local union to see if they have any suggestions, as Locals 10, 34, 91 are doing – then make their own decision and vote.

Mackay noted a number of races where votes will matter on June 5, including U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein who is facing her first serious challenge in decades from Kevin De León, son of an immigrant house-cleaner who rose to be President of the California Senate.

Another race he’s watching is for California Attorney General, where public-interest Insurance Commissioner Dave Jones is running against Xavier Becerra, who voted for NAFTA and supported ending the Jones Act that protects good union jobs – including members of the Inlandboatmen’s Union, the ILWU’s Marine Division.

“Everybody complains about politics, but some who complain aren’t even voting, which makes me wonder how serious they really are about changing things,” says Mackay.
Bay Area proposition promises more ILWU jobs: Regional Measure 3 will boost transit & ferry funds

California’s primary election on June 5 will provide Bay Area voters with an opportunity to support a local ballot measure that promises to generate more good-paying union ferry jobs while easing the region’s terrible traffic jams.

Regional Measure #3 (RM3) has a dual title but an important purpose: improve the crumbling roads and transit systems – including more ferries to ease congestion throughout the nine Bay Area counties.

The first hurdle to passing RM3 is getting a majority of voters in nine Bay Area counties to vote “YES.” The other challenge is convincing voters to raise tolls on all seven State-owned bridges by $5 – in $1 increments, phased-in by January 2025. It’s been almost a decade since the last time bridge tolls were raised, and two previous bridge toll transit measures were passed by voters, so the odds are promising but far from certain.

If voters approve RM3, it will begin the flow of $4.5 billion in new funding for a host of transit improvements, including expansion of the San Francisco Bay Ferries – along with $300 million for new terminals, other facilities and new vessels. Additional RM3-funded projects will employ thousands more union construction workers and other union members to:

- Build express lanes on Bay Area freeways.
- Improve freeway interchanges & connections.
- Purchase new BART cars & update the tube.
- Extend BART into Santa Clara and San Jose.
- Connect SMART trains to the Larkspur ferry.
- Bring Caltrain into downtown San Francisco.
- Buy more buses for Transbay & SF buses.
- Link other Bay Area bus systems together.

“Passing RM3 is a great way for union members to make progress against the political headwinds that threaten to push us back,” said Robert Estrada, IBU’s elected Regional Director for the Bay Area. “I’m voting for RM3 and hope all ILWU families will do the same.”

LETTERS TO THE DISPATCHER

Dear Editor,

I am an African-American woman who spent 24 years (1983-2007) on the waterfront and want to share some of my experiences with readers of The Dispatcher.

First, let me tell you that without God and help from the old-timers, I wouldn’t have made it. The work was hard and dangerous. When I first started in my 20s, I had no idea what longshoring was all about. I quickly discovered that the union membership was almost entirely male with family connections that went back generations. Because I didn’t arrive with those kind of family connections and friends in the industry, it seemed like a stroke of good luck when I met Local 13 member Mark Williams in 1983, and his father, Walter E. Williams. I learned that Walter had been part of the “500” African American men who eventually became registered longshoremen after working on the docks during WWII. They had some hard times before becoming union members, but Walter always believed that the ILWU would become stronger if we could unite workers of all races – an idea shared by Harry Bridges, the ILWU’s first President. Women faced similar challenges, something I experienced myself as one of the early African American women to become registered. I became more involved and served as a union steward, where I learned from the old-timers how to understand and enforce the contract – and prevent injustices. I remember the early days when I worked on the banana dock where we unloaded 40 and 50-pound boxes with our hands and two cranes. I miss seeing Mr. Cooper sell his sweet potatoes at the hall, along with the “burrito lady. I appreciate the help we received from Mr. McCoy, Spiderman and Jelly who helped protect our jobs. And I miss seeing all the men who gathered in front of Ganon’s Store on Fridays to cash their checks and buy a pair of gloves for work. I’m no longer working on the waterfront, but still carry the most important lesson I learned there: “An injury to one is an injury to all.”

Tami Lyn
Local 13 Pensioner
Bellflower, CA

Send your letters to the editor to: The Dispatcher, 1188 Franklin St., San Francisco, CA 94109-6800 or email to editor@ilwu.org
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ILWU Canada holds 35th Convention

ILWU Canada’s 35th ILWU Convention took place April 17-20 and featured four days of lively debate and conversation. Delegates were exposed to new ideas and inspirational speeches from labour leaders.

The theme of the convention was Union Rights = Human Rights. ILWU Canada Secretary-Treasurer Bob Dhaliwal explained that the slogan reflects “Our fight to improve working conditions for our members – support workers across the country – and help move everyone’s standard of living higher.”

On the first day, Irene Lanzinger, President of the British Columbia Federation of Labour, spoke about the successful “Fight for $15” campaign – which she said could not have happened without the support from unions like the ILWU.

ILWU Canada has been active in the BC Labour Federation’s successful Fight for $15 campaign. “We understand that workers can’t survive on poverty wages,” said Dhaliwal. “Unions have to fight for the betterment of the entire working class – not just our own members,” he said.

Also on the first day, Natasha Tony from the International Alliance of Theatres and Stage Employees (IATSE) gave a fascinating keynote presentation that explained how human rights are linked to the struggle for better working conditions, benefits and pensions. Among the examples she provided was her own personal struggle to obtain a decent job and raise her daughter as a single mom.

British Columbia’s Premier, John Horgan, attended the Convention on the last day. The 58-year old leader won office on a promise to create good jobs while carefully managing the province’s resources and environment. He’s a leader of the New Democratic Party (NDP) which was formed in 1961 when Canada’s Labour Federation merged with the Commonwealth Federation that had socialist roots dating to the 1930’s. The NDP is famous and respected for winning Canada’s National Healthcare program that provides “Medicare for all” type coverage for every citizen.

The Convention also featured a strong show of international solidarity with guests who attended from all over the world. Dynamic speakers included: Joe Fleetwood from the Maritime Union of New Zealand, Marc Loridan and Monique Verbeek from the transport Workers Union of Belgium (BTB), along with Frank Bomball and Bartosz Tuzynski from Germany’s Transport Union, Verdi. All spoke for the need to maintain strong connections between dockers unions in the struggle against common employers.

All of the ILWU International officers also attended the convention. Gifts were presented to ILWU International President Robert McEllrath in honor of his retirement later this year. He was presented with a collection of quintessential Canadian items including a hockey goalie stick signed by all the ILWU Canada local presidents and ILWU Canada officers. The stick symbolized the many times he has saved the ILWU from serious harm.

Convention delegates debated several resolutions, including a progressive policy statement that will remove gender references from the ILWU Canada Constitution. “We want to continue pushing the envelope on inclusion,” said President Rob Ashton “Our founder, Harry Bridges, understood that any division among workers only benefits the bosses.”

ILWU Canada’s new and returning officers have two years before the next Convention to continue pushing an agenda of workers’ rights, health & safety and their union’s progressive social and economic agenda.

Outgoing officers Bill Hoadley, 2nd VP Education and Romeo Bordignon, 3rd VP for Safety, were thanked for their service to the Union.

The titled officers returning to serve will be: Rob Ashton – President, Pat Bolen - 1st VP, and Bob Dhaliwal - Secretary Treasurer.

 Newly-elected officers are Dan Kask - 2nd VP for Education and History, and Chad Wellcome who will serve as 3rd VP for Safety.

Local 502 members Shannon Hoolsema, David Backie and Adan Noullet talked during a break in the action.

Union Rights = Human Rights: The 35th ILWU Canada Convention tackled a range of issues to improve wages and conditions for ILWU Canada members and support for workers across the country.
## Northern CA District Council

**Election Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Measure 3</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop 68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 69</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 70 No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 71</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 72</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governor**
- Gavin Newsom

**Lt. Governor**
- Gayle McLaughlin

**CA Attorney General**
- Dave Jones

**Secretary of State**
- Alex Padilla

**Controller**
- Betty Yee

**Treasurer**
- Fiona Ma

**State Superintendent of Public Instruction**
- Tony Thurmond

**Insurance Commissioner**
- Asif Mahmood

### Assembly Districts

- **District 2**: Jim Wood
- **District 4**: Cecelia Aguilar-Curry
- **District 6**: Jacalyn Smith
- **District 7**: Kevin McCarty
- **District 8**: Ken Cooley
- **District 10**: Mark Levine
- **District 13**: Susan Eggman
- **District 15**: Dan Kalb
- **District 16**: Rebecca Bauer-Kahan
- **District 17**: David Chiu
- **District 18**: Rob Bonta
- **District 19**: Phil Ting
- **District 20**: Bill Quirk
- **District 21**: Adam Gray
- **District 22**: Kevin Mullin
- **District 23**: Aileen Rizo
- **District 24**: Kansen Chu
- **District 25**: Ashley Kalra
- **District 26**: Mark Stone
- **District 27**: Robert Rivas
- **District 28**: Joaquin Arambula

### Senate Districts

- **District 2**: Mike McGuire
- **District 4**: Phil Kim
- **District 6**: Richard Pan
- **District 8**: Tom Pratt
- **District 12**: Anna Caballero

### Board of Equalization – D2
- Dual Endorsement
  - Cathleen Galgiani*
  - Malia Cohen*

### SF Mayor (Rank Choice Voting)
- Dual Endorsement
  - London Breed*
  - Mark Leno*

### SF Board of Supervisors D8
- Dual Endorsement
  - Jeff Sheehy
  - Rafael Mandelman

* Indicates a primary endorsement.
Earlier this year ILWU Local 5 was approached by the leadership of a small independent union, the Oregon Historical Society Employee Association (OHSEA). Formed in the early 1990’s, the union had been involved in a solitary struggle to improve wages and working conditions for its members. Over the last several years the employer had slowly been chipping away at who was in the union with so-called “promotions” to management that brought the membership of OHSEA to dangerously unsustainable levels.

OHSEA President Joey Beach reached out to several different unions in Portland seeking support, solidarity and ultimately a partnership. It was clear from early on that the membership of OHSEA and ILWU Local 5 had much in common and it was not long until the membership of OHSEA was holding a formal vote to affiliate with ILWU Local 5. The vote was a resounding “yes” and at the moment, members of OHSEA became the newest workers to join the ILWU.

Over the next several months, ILWU and OHSEA worked closely together in preparation for contract negotiations. We surveyed the membership on their priorities as well as moved forward with demands on the employer for open and transparent negotiations - where the membership could witness the proceedings first hand.

After several months of negotiations, we had achieved a tentative agreement. That agreement (which has now been ratified), provided for an 11.5% increase in wages over a three-year period. It also maintained a platinum level healthcare plan at no cost to the workers. It maintained all other economic benefits for the duration of the agreement—again at no cost to the membership.

The one exception was that while the negotiating committee did hold on to the 401K matching for current employees, something the employer was attempting to cut. They unfortunately did end up decreasing the 401K match by 1% for future employees. This reduction was the one loss we sustained through these negotiations.

This contract was largely about improving the union’s ability to effectively represent the membership. In order to achieve that, the negotiating committee won the following provisions: notification to the union of job openings; notification to the union of newly hired workers; notification to the union of disciplinary actions; on the clock union orientation meetings between union officers and newly hired workers; and on the clock union meetings (30 minutes) up to 3 times per year.

The contract negotiations were a success and more importantly, OHSEA found themselves with the support and solidarity they deserve. As we move forward in this contract the membership will work together to defend the gains made as well as resist any attempts to weaken the bargaining unit. Together we are strong! – Local 5

Oregon Historical Society Employee Association votes to join the ILWU

The year was 2000. The day was Monday, May 1st and the 32nd Convention of the ILWU was just being called into session. There was a major campaign underway in Portland, the creation of a warehouse local in the area - with the first unit being Powell’s Books. And there, a scrappy group of booksellers was entrenched in that struggle to form Local 5 and become a part of the ILWU story.

We had been fighting for months for our first contract and through that, had experienced first hand the support of the ILWU and the locals in our area. But all of that could not prepare us for the what happened next. The workers had voted to strike in an effort to push the company to negotiate fairly and to provide a living wage to the then, dominantly minimum wage workforce. We were on the picket line (something new to most of us) and all around us the city was in chaos. Several blocks away, the May Day marchers had turned into a war zone with pepper spray, flashbangs and tear gas being used as means of crowd control. We could hear them going off and see the helicopters circling overhead. The police were being deployed in riot gear, arresting people left and right and the original May Day march plan, to come to Powell’s and support the organizing efforts, seemed to be falling apart. As we continued to march the picket line, management eyed us suspiciously from inside the store. But the business remained open and slow stream of customers continued to cross our picket line. Despite the apparent failure of the May Day march to arrive and customers lack of support to booksellers, we rallied our spirits with chants and song - “The War Ain’t Over Til The Fat Man Sinks” and “Powell’s Books, Run By Crooks”, but it was starting to feel like our efforts were having little effects.

Suddenly, down the street, we could see a sea of marchers coming our way. They took up the entire both lanes, were flanked by riot police and were chanting, loud. We cheered from the picket line. Finally, the May Day march had arrived. We were right - and wrong. Whereas the May Day march was still in chaos, trickling in supporters as folks left the fray occurring at the waterfront and throughout the downtown area, what we were seeing, what had come through with its support, was the ILWU Convention and the hundreds and hundreds of delegates and guests. As they marched down 10th Avenue, the chants grew clear, “IL-W-U! IL-W-U!” They grew louder and louder booming off the walls of newly built buildings of the Pearl District. Soon we were engulfed in a sea of white longie caps. And those faces from management peering out at us were no longer suspicious. The power had shifted. They were scared.

As the Convention descended on the store, the streets and sidewalks became impassable. Several riot cops tried to grab some of the booksellers to make an arrest - then ILWU President, Brian McWilliams, backed by several particularly large longshoremen stopped them - “No, they’re with us.” Astonishing to us, the police backed off and no arrests were made.

The riot cops refocused their efforts on the front steps of Powell’s, hoping to hold the line and protect Powell’s property. But nothing was damaged. The ILWU was not there to destroy. The ILWU was there to build - a local and a worker’s movement. And build it they did. The May Day rallies forced the company to shut down the store. No workers to work and no customers to shop, the day was ours! The tenor of negotiations immediately changed and soon after the tentative agreement was reached and then ratified and Local 5 became the newest local of the ILWU.

Now, 18 years later, a full cycle of conventions, seven contracts, new organizing, and thousands of new and old friendships later, we look back on those formative moments and we know truly what it meant when Brian McWilliams said “They’re with us.” We were brought into the fold. We joined a movement of support where we struggle together. Where an injury to one really is an injury to all. We are ILWU Local 5. We will forever be indebted to your invitation to be a part of this family. We are proud to be with you. Proud to be ILWU.

2018, Portland Oregon, 37th ILWU Convention. Welcome back to town! In Solidarity,
Ryan Takas
ILWU Local 5 Secretary-Treasurer

“They’re with us:” Remembering the 32nd ILWU Convention, Portland

Recreating history: ILWU Local 5 members recreated a well-known of Portland longshore workers taken during the 1934 strike.

Marching for a contract: ILWU Local 5 members demonstrating in Portland in 2000 during the contract battle with Powell’s Books.
Diverse attendance: Families, teachers, students and community leaders came to the neighborhood meeting in Wilmington sponsored by the ILWU SCDC: “Don’t Privatize - Our Schools Are Not For Sale.”

The ILWU’s Southern California District Council (SCDC) worked with representatives from United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) to plan a community meeting earlier this year that attracted parents, teachers and ILWU family members to the Harry Bridges “Span” (K-8) School in Wilmington for an event titled: “Don’t Privatize – (K-8) School in Wilmington for teachers and ILWU family members.”

Familathe’s comments speak to the challenge of protecting our public free public education. Today we’ve got the challenge of protecting our public schools from being privatized.

Explosion of charter schools
Familathe’s comments speak to the biggest threat facing public education in a century – the explosion of private charter schools. In Los Angeles, home of the nation’s second largest school district that teaches 640,000 students each year, employs 27,000 educators and operates 1200 schools. Almost 200 of those schools are new private charters – the largest concentration in America. Both public and private charter schools in Los Angeles have one thing in common, both depend on public tax dollars that previously supported public schools exclusively.

Damaging public schools
“Every tax dollar that’s diverted into a private charter school means one less dollar that’s available for our public schools,” said Familathe, “and they keep diverting more resources away from public schools each year.” Losing those dollars to hundreds of private charter schools can quickly add up to real cuts in public education. A new study by the independent research firm, MGT of America, shows that charter schools stripped away a staggering $591 million from Los Angeles public schools during the past year alone.

No better performance
It would be one thing if private charter schools were consistently outperforming public schools, but leading studies show that most students in most charter schools perform worse or no better than comparable students in public schools. And the minority of charter school students who perform better are doing so for obvious reasons:

More days
The leading Stanford University study of students in 26 states found that charter schools added 3 to 10 additional weeks of teaching compared to public schools.

More funding
Some private charters, especially those promoted as having “miraculous” results, receive generous grants from foundations desperate to prove that private schools are superior.

Better students
Some charters attract better students that come from more motivated, supportive and engaged families.

“Washing-out” students
Even charters with “open admission” policies sometimes encourage struggling students with emotional problems and learning disabilities to return to public schools.

Ignoring impact of poverty
Studies over many decades have concluded that the best way to improve educational outcomes is by properly funding schools and reducing poverty. This fact lies at the heart of today’s debate between public and private education. California has fallen behind in both respects; it once had the highest per-pupil spending levels in the country and now lies in the bottom half. And while the state produces enough wealth to make it the world’s sixth largest economy and boasts the largest number of middle-class families on the planet, there are more children living in poverty and learning English in the Golden State than anywhere in the country.

Promising easy solutions
Critics of public education who promote private charters argue that they can avoid increased school spending and policies to reduce poverty. “Just convert our public schools into private charters,” they say, believing that charters can somehow magically overcome the disadvantages of poverty.

Many charter advocates, especially the corporations and foundations that fund the charter movement, believe there’s no need to raise taxes on the rich or worry about income inequality; no need for living wages that support families; no need for affordable health care, Medicare and Social Security; no need to improve teacher salaries – and certainly no reason to respect school employee unions that fight for smaller class sizes and better school funding. Charter advocates are almost universally anti-union.

Spreading like cancer
Public school advocates see things differently. The 600% growth of charter schools in the past decade as a form of cancer that feeds on school budgets, turning once public schools into an increasingly private system that is unaccountable, undemocratic and ultimately bad for students, teachers and society.

History may hold clues
Charters began as a brief experiment in 1988 led by public school teachers and union leaders who wanted to try different teaching techniques. But within a few years, their experiments were hijacked by political extremists with a vision of replacing public education with private and religious schools.

Milton Friedman’s dream
The charter movement’s roots go back decades further to ideas promoted by Milton Friedman, a right-wing economist at the University of Chicago who opposed public education, Medicare, Social Security and labor unions. Friedman’s extreme views were not new, as revealed in interviews where he published his plan to replace public schools by using taxpayer-funded school “vouchers.” Among the few who embraced his ideas then were Southern segregationists who used what they called “union grants” to avoid and destroy integrated public schools during the 1960’s, with vouchers that diverted public funds into private “segregation academies.”

Experiments in Chile
Friedman’s views remained on the margins until 1973 when the C.I.A supported a military coup in Chile that toppled the democratically-elected, pro-union government of Salvador Allende. The ruthless military junta that abolished all democratic institutions ruled with an iron fist for the following 13 years. The junta generals employed Friedman and his team of “Chicago Boys,” who destroyed Chile’s public health, retirement and education programs – replacing them with private and religious “free enterprise” businesses funded with public tax dollars.

Playing to racial fear
Ronald Reagan’s administration was the next to promote the use of public-funded vouchers to privatize schools. Conservative, anti-union politicians hailed this strategy as a “reform” with political benefits, because it helped them win support from fearful, predominantly white, blue-collar parents who were worried about school integration. The first large experiment with vouchers took place in Wisconsin, where Republican Governor Tommy Thompson promoted the plan in his home state, then called later for using the same approach to dismantle Medicare and replace it with private insurance – now the centerpiece of House Speaker Paul Ryan’s plan to privatize both Medicare and Social Security.

Making money for Wall Street?
Wall Street jumped on the bandwagon to replace public schools with private ones funded by vouchers and public dollars in 1992, when the “Edison Schools” were launched. The
El Consejo de Distrito de ILWU apoya reunión comunitaria sobre educación pública y escuelas autónomas privadas

E

l Consejo del Distrito del Sur de California de ILWU (SCDC) trabajó con representantes del Sindicato de Maestros Unidos de Los Ángeles (UTLA) para planificar una reunión con la comunidad hacia principios de este año que atajó a padres, maestros y familiares de miembros de ILWU a la escuela K-8 Harry Bridges en Wilming-ton para un evento llamado “Alto a la privatización – nuestras escuelas no están en venta.”

Las escuelas también es un tema que importa a los sindicatos

“Asistimos y apoyamos este evento, porque la educación pública siempre ha sido un asunto que importa a los sindicatos – y siempre lo serán,” dijo Familte, cuyo hijo asistió a escuelas públicas en el Distrito Escolar Uni- fiado de Los Ángeles (LAUSD). Ella dice que los sindicatos han apoyado la educación pública desde hace más de un siglo.

“Los sindicatos tuvieron dos demandas a principios del siglo XX además del derecho de formar sindi- catos – terminar con el trabajo infan- til y la educación pública gratuita para todos los niños”. Ella dice que los sin- dicatos merecen reconocimiento por terminar con el trabajo infantil en el momento dado constituyó el 20% de la fuerza laboral en las fábricas y minas – y la mitad de esos niños tenían menos de 12 años de edad.

“La lucha con los empleadores para poner fin al trabajo infantil tomó 50 años, desde los 1880 hasta los 1930. En esos años los sindicatos también ganaron la lucha por la educación pública gratuita. Hoy, tenemos el reto de desviar más recursos de las escuelas públicas de las privadas.”

Crecimiento exponencial de las escuelas autónomas (“charter”)…

Familte se refiere a la mayor amenaza que enfrenta la educación pública en un siglo – el crecimiento exponencial de las escuelas privadas "charter", especialmente en Los Ángeles, sede del segundo distrito escolar más grande del mundo y cuenta con el alumno en el país y ahora se encuentra más atrás en ambos aspectos; en resultados educativos es con una adec- uada financiación y en última instancia malo para los estudiantes, maestros y la sociedad. La historia puede enseñarnos algo.

Exclusion de estudiantes “que no dan el ancho” – Incluso escuelas “charter” que admiten a cualquier estudiante, a veces animan a los estudian- tes a terminar con el trabajo infantil en el momento dado constituyó el 20% de la fuerza laboral en las fábricas y minas – y la mitad de esos niños tenían menos de 12 años de edad.

Ignorar el impacto de la pobreza

Los estudios a lo largo de muchas décadas han llegado a la conclusión de que la mejor manera de mejorar los resultados educativos es con una ade- cuada financiación de las escuelas y la reducción de la pobreza. Este hecho es el meollo del debate de hoy entre la enseñanza pública y la privada. California se ha quedado atrás en ambos aspectos, en un momento tuvo el más alto gasto por alumno en el país y ahora se encuentra en la mitad inferior. Mientras que el Estado produce suficiente riqueza para que se le considera a la sexta econom- ía más grande del mundo y cuente con el mayor número de multimillonarios en el planeta, hay más niños que viven en la pobreza y están aprendiendo el inglés en el Estado Dorado que en cualquier otra parte del país.

La promesa de soluciones fáciles

Los críticos de la educación pública que promueven las escuelas privadas “charter” dicen que ellos pueden evi- tar el aumento en los gastos educativos y las políticas para reducir la pobreza. “Simplemente convierto nuestras escuelas públicas en charters privadas,” dicen ellos, creyendo que estas escuelas pueden superar majestuosamente las desventajas de la pobreza. Muchos defensores de las escuelas “charter,” especialmente las corporaciones y funda- ciones que financian su causa, creen que no hay necesidad de aumentar los impuestos a los ricos o preocu- parese por la desigualdad de ingresos, para que pagar salarios dignos, para que tener asistencia médica asegurable. Medicare y Seguro Social, según ellos, no se requiere mejorar los salarios de los maestros – y por supuesto que no hay motivo para respetar los sindicatos de los empleados escolares que luchan por reducir el número de alumnos por aula y aumentar los fondos para las escuelas. Casi todos los defensores de las escuelas “charter” se oponen a los sindicatos.

Invadén como la hierba mala

Los defensores de las escuelas públicas ven las cosas de manera dife- rente. El crecimiento en un 600% de las escuelas “charter” en los últimos diez años es como un cáncer que se ali- menta de los presupuestos escolares, convirtiendo a las escuelas que antes eran públicas en una multitud cada vez más privatizado que no tiene obligación de rendir cuentas, es anti democrático y en última instancia malo para los estudiantes, maestros y la sociedad. La historia puede enseñarnos algo.

Las escuelas “charter” empezaron como un breve experimento en 1988 encabezado por maestros de escuelas públicas y dirigentes sindicales que querían ensayar diferentes técnicas pedagógicas. Pero dentro de unos cuantos años, extremistas políticos cuyo objetivo era sustituir la educación pública con las escuelas privadas y reli- giosas, se apropiaron de sus experi- mentos.

El sueno de Milton Friedman

El movimiento de las escuelas “charter” tiene sus raíces en las ideas promovidas décadas antes por Milton Friedman, un economista de derecha de la Universidad de Chicago que se oponía a la educación pública, Medi- care, el Seguro Social y los sindicatos.

Promesas vacías: los defensores de las escuelas “charter” prometen una mejor educación y oportunidades milagrosas, pero los estudios demuestran que el rendimiento de los estudiantes de escuelas “charter” es igual que el rendimiento de los estudiantes de las escuelas públicas. Las escuelas “charter” tam- bién tienen un efecto muy negativo en los presupuestos de las escuelas públicas, ya que solo en el año pasado perdieron $591 millones en Los Ángeles.

"El Consejo de Distrito de ILWU apoya reunión comunitaria sobre educación pública y escuelas autónomas privadas"
The Walton Foundation, controlled by family members who inherited $130 billion from the backs of low-wage workers at Walmart stores. The Gates Foundation, controlled by Bill and Melinda Gates, who are worth over $90 billion. The Broad Foundation controlled by developer Eli Broad and his $7 billion fortune.

Other tycoons pouring money into charter schools include Jeff Bezos of Amazon, Mark Zuckerberg of Facebook, Pierre Omidyar of eBay, La Familia “charter” incluyen Jeff Bezos de Amazon y su fortuna de $7 mil millones. Other magnates that are investing poverty, and respecting workers’ rights, putting the ILWU into this battle front and center,” she says. “We know which side we’re on.”

La Fundación Walton, controlada por los miembros de la familia que heredó $130 millones ganados a costa de los trabajadores de bajos salarios de las tiendas de Walmart. La Fundación Gates, controlada por Bill y Melinda Gates, que patrimonio ascendio a más de 90 mil millones. La Fundación Broad, controlada por el promotor inmobiliario Eli Broad y su fortuna de $7 mil millones.
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