27

STUDENTS AND LABOR

by R. Alan Haber

Al Haber is a former President of SDS and a past National Secretary. He was the first director of SDS's Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP).

distributed by:

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY
112 EAST 19 STREET
NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK

PRICE: 10¢

Labor today is the most liberal of the main stream institutions. It is also the most harrassed by the dominant economic and political groups in the country and the most weakened by the continual post-war recession. Strangely too, it is shunned or treated as at best a distant ally by the major part of the student political community. It is well past the time for a reappraisal of the relationship between labor and the student.

The argument to be developed is that there is an alliance of interest and a basic strategic urgency that should unite the student radicals with organized labor, primarily at the local level, but also regionally and nationally.

What's so wrong? We are concerned with the separation of two institutions, with the estrangement of the student liberal from the personnel, problems and programs of organized labor, and in a parallel way with the lack of interest from labor in the university or in college students.

By way of example, in the recent three volume report by Walter Reuther to the 18th Constitutional Convention of the United Automobile Workers and the three volumes of resolutions adopted by that convention, there is barely a mention of the university or of college students, and there is no mention of the past two years of social protest and ferment centered around the campuses of the country. Similarly, in the 140 pages of resolutions of the United States National Student Association there is not one mention of organized labor and in the hundred-odd student publications geared for local, regional or national audiences in the last academic year, there appeared hardly a mention, to say nothing of an analysis, of the relations between students and the forces of organized labor.

This situation contrasts sharply with the close relation in ideology and in practice between students and labor in the 1930's and 1940's. The radicals of the campus identified with the radicals of the industrial union movement and aspired to positions in that movement. Today, one hardly finds a young radical or activist who looks expectantly to a role in the union movement. Students, once quick to join the labor picket line, organize support committees or provide personnel for organizing campaigns, now find the demands and disputes of labor distant: only in a few of the major student political centers is there a ready response to labor's immediate struggles.

Is this so strange? Perhaps we should expect the student movement, without ideology or historical roots, to be slow to approach the institutional home of their more "political" forbears; and perhaps we shouldn't wonder that the leadership of a movement embracing 13.5 million members should look slightly askance at pleas from a few thousand youngsters who have probably never worked in a shop or known the "facts of economic life" that are the daily concern of the working man. But if there is a psychological barrier, there should not be intellectual barriers to correcting the situation.

The agents of social change: There have been several groupings commonly identified as "agents of social change" in the United States. The surge of oppressed or exploited peoples has given impetus and irreversibility to the movement for a democratic social order. It lay at the base of the reforms of early capitalism in the 19th century, and provided the human substance for the organization of the American labor movement in the late 1800's and up into the 1930's and 1940's. It provides the momentum today for the movement of Negro people for a life of

decency in this land of abundance. The political party structure, and particularly the Democratic Party, has served as spokesman in the electoral and legislative processes of American democracy for these impulses to social change. If there has been a distinct contribution of the student movement, or of the "new left" of the last five or ten years, it has been to identify the university as an institution, like the labor movement, the civil rights struggle or the reform tendency in the Democratic Party, having a significant potential to initiate and guide liberal social change.

The base of the argument for the university as an agent of social change is both theoretical and practical. In theory it is an organization of resources--personnel, knowledge, equipment, and the production of skilled manpower--that are vital to the functioning of society. Consequently, influence on the internal operation of the institution, and on the control and allocation of its resources will have external implications of a considerable sort throughout the whole society. In practice, this potential of the university is in fact being realized. Its students and faculty are doing basic research in technological advance, in social theory, in economic policy and in foreign affairs that provides the intellectual underpinnings for the movement for social reform. It has been the center from which has come the most articulate criticism of the fabric of American life and institutions--providing a philosophic and political framework for the enterprize of social reconstruction. Its student bodies have provided manpower and radical impulse for growth of grass roots movements--best exemplified by the civil rights struggle of the last two and a half years and the growth of a reform movement in New York City and California Democratic Party politics. Its personnel have been serving both as candidates and as the research and work force behind candidates for public office on local, state and national levels and its faculties are called upon as consultants in allareas of public policy and, as well, by corporations and private institutions. In a very immediate way the university has been having vital, and often decisive, influence in the course of American life. Obviously, in a long term way it has determining influence in that it provides the training and political orientation for the business and professional students that it yearly graduates into positions of community influence and power.

If the university is to provide an institutional base for the liberal movement, however, its resources must be systematically evaluated and rationally connected to the other progressive forces operating in the country. In this view the connection between the university and the labor movement is matter of high priority on the theoretical and programmatic agenda of the liberal and left community. Certain immediate points of connection and ways in which the institutions need each other as well are obvious:

1) The major grouping of unorganized workers are the so-called white collar and professional employees: teachers, engineers, doctors, technicians of various kinds and liberal arts graduates occupying public or service jobs. These people are trained and have their professional standards set in the university. They are also the groupings traditionally most resistant to organization. If techniques are to be found to bring these people into the labor movement, their college training (or "apprentice period") will certainly have determining influence on the success.

2) Labor organization needs continual recruitment of radical leadership who not only have skills in dealing with the economic and organizational problems of labor but who have an orientation to the political role of labor as a force in American politics. Traditionally, universities have provided this kind of

resource to the labor movement and if the relationship has attenuated in recent years, it is doubly in need of rejuvenation now as labor must launch a new offensive if it is to survive.

3) the program of labor, to the extent that it is a social program and not simply a narrow economic concern with wages and work rules, is dependent on wide community understanding and social support. The universities are crucial to provide research dealing with such problems as automation, area development, social security and health programs, etc., to provide public broadcast of the issues and ideas of social reconstruction and to provide systematic educations for the inheritors of influence that are graduated from colleges into positions of public responsibility and decision making.

4) The developing student movement in the university designed to bring the institution's resources into the service of liberal reform programs for the society generally is without a social base of support. It is countering a repressive institutional authority structure and outmoded educational practice. It is without financial resources or a backlog of organizational experience and desperately needs a working connection with the mainstream of liberal political activity. The labor movement has the facilities and certainly the experience that can be decisive in the building of an allied movement in the universities. or of slowing it down and stopping it. Stop Talking of labor as "liberal" it is part of the power structure and has a vested interest in the status quo.

If the points of connection are clear, the obstacles to cooperation, objective and subjective, remain formidable and will have conditioning effects on any relationship that can be developed:

for the student: 1) self image. The student has a professional orientation whereas labor remains identified with the "working class" and the wage system. The student does not see himself as a potential union member.

2) class background. Students remain largely drawn from middle or upper-middle class families. They have not been led through past experiences to identify their own aspirations with the trade union movement in particular or with collective action in general.

3) value bias. The focus on upward mobility, pervasive in the colleges, emphasizes competition, self-reliance, individual initiative and devalues both cooperative action and identification with group needs or problems. The "labor image" is laden with "alien" values.

4) formal and informal education. In both high schools and colleges, the labor movement is underplayed or criticised as a progressive force in American development. Students are ignorant of its history or activity and are conditioned by the generally anti-labor mass media to a critical view of labor activity.

5) past failure. Past efforts to contact or join forces with the local labor movement have led often to frustration or cynicism. Labor's locals are infrequently militant and lack an established habit of rank and file involvement beyond their immediate concerns. Too frequently local leadership reinforce membership privatism and find themselves caught up as cogs in Democratic political machines. Students don't find the friends they expected at the head tables of the union halls. or in the ranks.

6) labor's record. In the last years labor nationally has suffered continual defeats and has failed to sieze the political offensive: the exposure of instances of corrupt or undemocratic organization buttressed by rank and file apathy, ineffectiveness and irresolution in organizing in the South or agricultural workers, racism, jurisdictional disputes and legislative defeats. Students fail to see labor as a clear champion of their causes. In some cases, such as civil rights, labor appears an enemy. AMEN! (15)

For the unions: 1) On the defensive. Labor bears the brunt of an ailing economy. It suffers from automation, the insecurity of defense employment, declining industries, oppressive legislation, foreign competition, and generally an illiberal National Labor Relations Board. It is protective of its resources and has few victories to spur its initiative beyond its traditional frontiers.

2) Its constituency. Labor is responsible to a membership of working men having little knowledge, identification or fraternity with the student community, and demanding attention to their economic and social needs from their dues dollars and paid officials. Student and university affairs have not had programmatic connection to the immediate concerns of the men in the locals.

3) institutionalization. The primary responsibility of union organization is servicing membership, carrying on collective bargaining, maintaining greivance machinery, welfare and other similar service programs. Specialization and bureaucratic organization make a great number of the union people oblivious or unconcerned with broader issues in the labor movement or beyond.

4) issue emphasis. Labor has been comparatively inactive in the areas of most concern to students: civil rights, peace and educational problems. This affects both the image of the movement and the possibility for cooperation on local levels. Conversely, the progressive concerns of labor in areas of economic and fiscal policy, national planning, social welfare and development have not yet found programmatic expression in the student community.

5) political style. Labor functions within the established channels of political and social change: the elective and legislative machinery. Student activists have been largely suspicious of the potential of these mechanisms to effect change and, failing a view of a radical role within the political process, they tend to rely on forms of direct pressure and action from the outsid

While these various factors condition separation between the movement of labor and a similarly inspired movement centered in the universities, there are a number of reasons for believing that a closer relation can begin to develop:

1) With the increase in the peace and civil rights movements' activity and support of candidates for congressional and local office (almost always with pro-labor platforms), the base for cooperative activity becomes clearer. Students in the Boston area provide an apt example of this--in civil rights through EPIC and more recently in peace through TOCSIN they have taken the initiative which has brought labor into these movements in an effective and political way. At last! Now I see it

2) With the mounting crisis in financing higher education, labor is the one organized constituency with a strong interest in public federally aided education. This again provides a basis for joint political and community action. The recent (so far successful) campaign against tuition in the New York City universities has brought together student and labor leadership.

3) The growing need to organize office, technical and professional workers can be expected to lead labor to a more direct interest in college curriculums and to securing at least a groundwork in professional programs to support later organizing efforts in the professional workplace. Interest already shown by the UAW and some pilot efforts in the Rubber Workers indicates the potential in this direction.

4) The imperatives for a planned economic conversion away from the war economy will bring the economic interest and experience of the labor movement into strategic relation to the research facilities of the universities. The interest of student radicals in "peace research" can play an instrumental role in catalysing this relation.

5) With the increase in labor-industrial relations institutes, (note Rutgers, Cornell, Wisconsin, Berkeley, Michigan) unionists are growing less suspicious of and closer to the university environment and there are expanding opportunities for students and labor people to meet.

The Bigger Problem: a Loss of Vision

There is a much more basic problem which supports the disinterest in labor by student leaders. The labor movement in its origins was an "opposition group". It championed the causes of the people against the starkest forms of economic and social oppression, it fought minority rule of the workplace and of community—whether by capitalist power or entrenched political machines. It put forth a set of values and a social image of "industrial democracy" challenging and counterposed to corporate society organized to produce for profit, not use, and for the advancement of property rights, not human rights.

No longer does labor have this immage. It appears not as an opposition group but as a reform club within the "establishment". It does not call for militant rank and file action, it does not basically challenge the structure of the Democratic Party, it doesn't challenge the economic privilege of corporate elites. Even more disheartening to students, its failure to banish discrimination from within its own house makes it a party to the racism that pervades almost every institution of American life. And after surrendering its possibility of independent social power in favor of the more respectable role of lobby and critic, it appears to acquiesce as well before the icon of bipartisan unity, in a tacit, if not active, support of the Cold War.

Student radicals are much less inclined to accept, either in action or in rhetoric, The System as the framework of operation. They seek basic ways to understand and to change the structure of the establishment, to blast the Dixiecrats out of the Democratic Party, to impose democratic principle on the distribution of power and privilege. Students would see that a "collective bargaining and legislative program" is hollow if not supported by an organization that can mobilize votes as a political power, that can move men into the streets in economic or social dislocation, that can march its forces to Washington as an ultimate demand for change.

Students do not see in labor this kind of movement. They are dismayed that a year after the expected labor upsurge with the merger of the AFL and CIO the Political Action Committee in the Stevenson-Eisenhower campaign could obtain solicited contributions from only one of every 24 unionists and prompt only 40% of the rank and file to vote. The record since is hardly any better. Blame can

be laid to insufficient funds for political action; insufficient attention to building political allies, either in civil rights or in universities; to a lack of focus on political targets; but whatever the specifics of explanation, the roots seem to be in the lack of intent to build a mass, politically directed movement. Even in the United Automobile Workers, which is the strongest advocate of political action, the strength of the union remains identified with the International -- not the solidarity of the locals.

This is not, however, the sole problem. Parallel to it is a failure of vision. The labor movement, at least from the perspective of the student, is preoccupied with limited issues and disinclined to speak squarely on the broad problems that in a more fundamental way corrupt the democratic quality of American life. Take as an example the issue of education. Numerous concerns are expressed in the resolutions of the AFL-CIO and of the UAW, and in the membership paper of the United Federation of Teachers. They range from adequate facilities, classroom size, expenditure per pupil, need for federal aid, loans and scholarship support, equality of opportunity, teachers' salaries and training, problems of special education, migrant education, etc. And the problem portrayed as one of tremendous magnitude ultimately is laid to a failure of "democratic conscience!

The problem of American public education however is not one of democratic conscience, it is failure to make power responsible to the public and the problem will not even be confronted until the "anti-school efforts of the National Association of Manufacturers, Chamber of Commerce, Republican-Dixiecrat coalition at the local, state and national level" are not simply mentioned but are in fact opposed by a n offensive in the PTA's, in the city councils, in the local units of the Democratic Party, in the local union halls and in the polling booths at the local, state and national level. Education will not be made a social priority until the determination of priorities and of the allocation of the society's resources is taken out of the hands of profit-oriented, private concentrations of power. Democratic conscience, unfortunately, has little to do with this.

Moreover, while the problem of facilities is acute, the more fundamental problem of education in America is barely mentioned, and that is one of quality. What is taught and what should be taught, what is the structure of the education system, what should be its function in society, what values should be at its base, which ones are now, how should it rwlate to the development of a democratic social order? Students do not complain with the answers given to these questions; the complaint is that the questions are not seriously asked. They see labor as a lobby without being a critic.

This view of labor, if critical, is not novel. It is adeep concern expressed by many leaders throughout the labor movement. It is combined with the recognition that if labor is to come off the economic defensive, it must go on the political offensive. This task must begin; labor must begin to construct a movement adequate to the problrmd and obstacles of the 1960's--in this it can build an alliance with students and with the university. Short of it, the relationship becomes opportunistic and shorn of the mutual respect that should bind members of the same political community.

Labor's willingness? It is no secret that labor is divided and has many factions within its house. It has not in the past seriously undertaken its task. An assumption of "working-class anti-intellectualism" seems to prevail in the rhetoric of union leadership and to operate in their relations with the university. But even more generally, the unions have not committed themselves to building a radical or a political movement in America. Their financial contributions to the liberal "causes" have been slight at best. An aggregate amount of a hundred or

two hundred thousand dollars gives subsistence (or token) aid to the ten or fifteen liberal organizations that operate nationally. But that id from the entire labor movement. Lack of resources can harldy be argued. Millions of dollars are contributed to such respectable activities as the Red Cross, Community Fund, medical research and so forth. American Labor's international operations involve tremendous outlay, not always ameliorative of Cold War tensions. The dollars and cents facts reflect where labor, at this time, is putting its priorities.

Thus, if an alliance is going to develop, students will have to do more than show their own passive willingness. They will have to convince labor that it is necessary.

Is alliance necessary? To speak of an alliance is to talk of a strategy for social change. In very broad terms, the strategy we see is realignment -- the development of political organization on the local level representing the demands of labor, the Negro and other minorities, the city poor, the small farmer and businessman, the liberal intellectual; and the extension of that organization to the national level through the expulsion of the Dixiecrats and urban machines from domination of the Democratic Party. In this we see university centers playing a crucial generating role for political ideas and program and a crucial supporting role in strategically designed research or action moves.

We see this strategy not simply as desirable but as absolutely essential if ther is to be effective oppostion to reaction in American politics and if there is to be any substantial democratic reform of American domestic or foreign policy. In this lies not only the future of our universities and independent institution of higher learning but as well the future of a free and independent trade union movement.

If students feel perhaps more attachment to the slogan and maybe a greater urgency in the situation of American politics, there is left by this time little identification in the liberal community with the Kennedy Administration as the champion of its causes and as its political leader. Thus, even without total consensus on the slogans--and realignment is little more than a slogan--it is possible to lay out several programmatic priorities for, say, the next two to six years. We see five such priorities:

1) a campaign against the Republican-Dixiecrat domination of the Congress.
2) the development of a liberal wing to the Democratic Party.
3) producing and implementing a plan for the conversion of the permanent war economy.
4) launching a campaign for fair apportionment in both state and national representative districts.
5) developing theory and a radical literature geared to the 1960's and beyo

We see these priorities as imperative directions in each of the "mass movements. They should be before the civil rights groups as that offensive is continued and intensified. They should be paramount in the peace movement and in the view of reform Democratic politics. In particular they should be before the labor and student movements and should provide the points of focus around which alliance is built.

1) The Dixiecrats. The Dixiecrats stifle the committee system of the Congress and, allying with economic conservatives of the Republican Party, are primarily responsible for the defeat of major progressive, social welfare and civil rights legislation introduced in the Congress. They represent the absence of a two-party system in the South, the domination of the southern community by an

entrenched class, not only segregationist in social philosophy, but also anti-labor and anti-welfare. This is the class that attracts industry to the South on enticement of low wages, union busting by scabs or racism or guns, and tax incentives that shift social costs from corporate profits to consumer incomes. It is the class that dominates southern justice, civil service and political machinery. An attack on the Dixiecrats, carried to the community level, is an essential accompaniment of labor organization in the South, of Negro voter registration, of building "New Frontier Democratic Clubs" and of carrying forward the direct action movement for civil rights. Needless to say, the opening of the Southern universities to genuine controversy is dependent on limiting the political authority of state and municipal officials to ride rough-shod over students. Such an attack provides the ideal possibility of connection between students and labor. It would also serve to identify the basic institutions needed to replace the Dixiecrat structure as the representative of the South in the Democratic Party.

The students have begun the assault--working both in the South and in other movements. Labor has yet to declare itself. It has been hesitant about organizing in the South, or even to support the students who are at the radical front in the civil rights effort. It acceded to Johnson as Kennedy's second man and has given no sign of launching an attack against the Dixiecrats at the next Democratic National Convention.

2) The liberals. There exists no structure connected to the Democratic Party in which political representatives as well as university people and leaders in the labor, civil rights and peace movements can plan a national strategy for political and social action and can initiate the groundwork necessary for such a program. The lack of such an identified liberal grouping in the Democratic Party leads to lack of coordination and too often ineffectiveness in the efforts of th liberal and left community.

The students' role in the creation of a "liberal wing" lies in a program to fulfill the notion of the university as an agent of social change. It means getting research done on issues; it means attacking in a systematic way the problems of influence and getting ideas accepted in various communities; it means enlisting faculty people in active political life; it means in every professional curriculum carrying on a program of education and reform that will link the professional role to political responsibility; and it will mean the providing of manpower to support a program of community action.

The difficult problem, particularly with a Democratic Administration elected with wide liberal support, is to get people to identify themselves. The only organized opposition is from the Right. The liberal opposition doesn't exist or is too unsure of its status (i.e., too much under political control) to articulate a viewpoint and organize for a program to the left of the President. Studen whose lack of economic and social "obligations" have been ideally suited to initiate militant action, are also free of the kinds of political entanglements that would prevent a systematic criticism of the Administration. They can thu play an important role in articulating the need for an organizational expression of political opposition to "official" policy directions.

Their effectiveness in this has already been illustrated in direct campaign work There are some twenty congressional candidates running in the 1962 elections with platforms primarily "peace" priented. Students and university people are playing crucial local and regional roles for many of these candidates. Notable examples are the PAX organization in Massachusetts, Voters for Peaceful Alternatives in Ithaca, New York, Californians for Liberal Representation and similar

organizations in Chicago, New York City and Baltimore. These candidates are opposition candidates: they reject deterrence as a viable basis for foreign policy. They look to challenging this policy politically at the level of the wards and precincts, and publicly through the organization of a "peace caucus" in the Congress. A platform for peace, as these campaigns show, is a liberal response to the stranglehold of military and industrial interests on the economy of the country, an attempt to revise national priorities to recognize human needs and to advance not only the welfare of our own people, but of an international community moving toward the rule of law. It is very definitely a pro-labor platform

Student initiated plans are underway for a research center, a network of field representatives, and a coordinating operation of peace organizations that will attempt to put 75 to 100 candidates into primaries by the elections of 1964.

In every area these people have, and must continue to look for labor support. Their program must provide an economic plan for their district to deal with the consequences of disarmament. Labor should play a central role in developing such a program. In every shop peace campaigns could provide an issue for debate and indeed an issue around which labor can (in the words of the SDS Port Huron Statement), "constitute itself as a mass political force demanding not only that society recognize its rights to organize--but also a program going beyond desired labor legislation and welfare improvements.

Seeing labor assume a crucial role in the intrusion of a peace concern into the political life of America is obviously important for its significance in the building of an identified liberal-left group connected to the Democratic Party, but doubly so, it is important because of the role "peace" can be expected to play in the politics of the next few years.

3) The War Economy. Liberals must give immediate attention to developing a social and economic plan for disarmament. We can expect--unless war intervenes--a disarmament agreement in the next five or ten years. (In the absence of one, war becomes a certainty, so...) Any such plan, whether liberal or reactionary, will have massive effects on every aspect of American economic life. It will require the dismantling of the permanent war economy that brought us out of the depression and sustained us since the boom following World War II. It means an end to the continuous use of military spending as a solution to economic problems.

The impact of this can be grasped by noting the extent of the defense-based economy. Quoting from the SDS Port Huron Statement: "The Department of Defense, ironically the world's largest single organization, is worth $160 billion, owns 32 million acres of American land and employs half of the 7.5 million persons directly dependent on the military for subsistence, has an $11 billion payroll which is larger than the net annual income of all American corporations. Defense spending in the Eisenhower era totalled $350 billions and President Kennedy entered office pledging to go even beyond the present defense allocation of sixty cents from every public dollar spent. Except for a war induced boom immediately after "our side" bombed Hiroshima, American economic prosperity has coincided with a growing dependency on military outlay -- from 1941 to 1959 America's Gross National Product of $5.25 trillion included $700 billion in goods and services purchased for the defense effort, about one-seventh of the accumulated GNP. This pattern has included the steady concentration of military spending among a few corporations. In 1961, 86% of Defense Department contracts were awarded without competition. The ordinance industry of 100,000 people is completely engaged in military work; in the aircraft industry, 94% of 750,000 workers

are linked to the war economy; shipbuilding, radio and communications equipment industries commit forty percent of their work to defense; iron and steel, petroleum, metal stamping and machine shop products, motors and generators, tools and hardware, copper, aluminum and machine tools industries all devote at least ten percent of their work to the same cause."

A disarmament program affecting this amount of the economy and work force, and which has to deal in addition with chronically depressed areas and consumer industries, idle capacity in almost all basic or heavy industry, and unemployment of nearly five million -- such a program will bring the potential for truly significant changes in the character of the American economy: in policy, priorities, planning. Changes of this magnitude are impossible to envision simply as a consequence of domestic pressure. If, however, the planning is left to the Kennedy/Johnson administration, which seems to have a conservative economic policy (note the program of tax incentives to stimulate investment), or to private business, the potential for a progressive direction to disarmament adjustment will very likely be lost.

The question is whether the profit and investment security of business elites will be the dominant criteria in restructuring economic activity, or will the problems of working people, their jobs, families, communities, and futures be paramount in the reallocation of resources. Will there be a call to abolish the national debt, cut federal spending, and reduce profit and other progressive taxation, or will there be a program directing federal involvement in the economy to meet the genuine social priorities facing the country: to abolish squalor, terminate neglect and establish an environment for people to live with dignity and creativeness. Liberals will have to plan and organize if they wish to see the latter course reflected in legislative and administrative action.

Labor plays an absolutely essential role in this. Its economic program, developed in the post-war -- or Cold War -- period, provides the guide lines for an economic system oriented to the consumer, to the public welfare and to democratic control. What is needed is to connect this program, in a most detailed, community by community way, to a plan for disarmament.

1) A National Planning Agency. A group created to meet the goals of maximum employment, production and purchasing power. It would be charged to follow in a systematic way what is happening in the economy, to have access to information about technological innovation, investment plans, plant location, and be able to develop plans regarding the creation of jobs, worker retraining and relocation, use of government spending, etc. It would be particularly concerned to develop with local communities, plans dealing with changes in the economy. Its overarching concern would be to develop a coordinated plan toward the realization of national priorities: education, housing, medical care, end to poverty, urban living, etc.

2) A program of full employment. New jobs must be created to accommodate an expanding labor force and to absorb the displacement caused by automation. As well, a philosophy must be adopted which treats labor not as a commodity subject to the trials of a changing economy, but as the essential human material of economic life. Employment should mean the involvement of the personality, the family and the aspirations of the worker in the productive system, and the responsibility of the system for his security. Basic to this should be the end to the hourly wage discrimination against "production workers" by the universal adoption of a salary system such as now gives job security to "office workers". A flexible work period without loss of pay should put an end to short time and the full week lay-off.

3) A national unemployment compensation system. Standars must be set which raise inadequate levels, eliminate discrininatory and competitive variation from state to state, eliminate indefensibly restrictive eligibility requirements and disqualification penalties. Coverage must as well be extended to all occupational categories and benefits expanded to deal with problems of long-term unemployment or displacement as a result of automation or major economic shifts.

4) A program of job security. We should apply the principle that meeting the human problems resulting from production or product advance should be the first against the profit resulting from that advance. The social costs of a "free labor market" must be acknowledged and met. This means facilities for job retraining, relocation, support and re-employment for displaced workers. It means special attention to displaced workers near retirement, to migrant workers and their families, to young workers seeking entry into the labor market, and to other "marginal" groupings.

5) An end to discrimination. We must secure guarantees of equal access to apprenticeship and training facilities, to equal pay for equal work, to upgrading and entry to all job categories on the basis of merit, and to equal treatment by the agencies of public welfare. Discriminatory treatment against Negroes, Spanish Americans, Indians, new immigrants, or against women or the ageing must be abolished -- in the employment market, and also in labor organizations, in education, housing, credit and public facilities. No federal cooperation with racism is tolerable in any way -- from the financing of schools to the development of federally supported industry.

6) A program of community development. Plans must be developed to transform our cities and towns into genuinely creative and human living places. The basic facilities of welfare must be abundant -- housing, schools, hospitals, and medical care -- but, as well, there must be the facilities of leisure -- libraries and the arts, parks, adult education, etc. -- providing a creative environment beyond the workplace and a rewarding one for both the young and the ageing. This program is at the base of giving democratic quality to American life; it should be the highest priority in the reallocation of resources presently devoted to the permanent war effort.

7) A progressive fiscal policy. The tax and monetary policies of the federal government should be directed to stimulating demand and to insuring the full utilization of productive capacity and manpower resources. Tax reduction should be effected with the view of maximizing buying power of consumer units, principally low and middle income families, rather than to artificially stimulate investments which only add to already idle capacity. Nor should it be directed toward modernization aimed at reducing the workforce rather than increasing production. Ways should be found to transfer the costs of public services (70% of which are financed by state and local governments) from regressive sales, property and payroll taxes (which account for 78% of all state and local revenue) to progressive individual or corporate income taxes (now accounting for only 9%). Central to this must be greater federal support to State and local services. The Federal Reserve Board, as the principal regulatory agency in monetary policy, should be reformed to include representatives of consumer, labor and small business interests to balance the banking and corporate powers which now dominate it.

These seven points represent the skeleton of the economic program, largely unknown to students, which has been developed and championed by the labor movement. It is a program that can provide the economic guides for planning for disarmament; it is also a program designed to meet the needs of American workers and middle income families. Hence, combined with a community program for conversion, it can be taken to the people in local elections, in educational programs and in public media.

4) Reapportionment An overw helming problem of American political structure is the unrepresentative allocation of representatives. State legislatures are dominated by the "upstate" or "rural" counties; the cities and industrial centers are with disproportionately reduced voices in such matters as appropriation to education, state welfare services, tax policy, receipt of federal aid. The conservative interest that dominates the state legislatures in these matters is transferred to the national congress in the overrepresentatic of rural population in determining congressional districts. The Supreme Court has now ruled that this representation without reference to population is in violation of the equal protection under the laws provision of the 14th Amendment. Similar decisions have been handed down and are pending in the cases of the county unit system (common throughout the South) and of gerrymandering, the arbitrary drawing of boundaries to guarantee a certain voting composition to a district.

Unfair apportionment has forced liberals and labor people to operate in politics under extreme handicaps. Now that the legal weapons have finally been given to correct this situation, it is imperative that the campaigns be launched in every state full representation to urban and liberal population groups. This is a precondition to legislative success in enacting a liberal program to meet the needs of growing city and wage earning populations. In this initiative the combination of labor and university groups can be a powerful one. Redistrictingplans for both state legislatures and for congressional districts must be researched and formulated, put before the people and into the courts, and in many cases taken to the polls.

5) Producing new theory and new literature We need a new literature and a new initiative in social and political theory. The corporate state is different from the capitalist model of the 1930's and before. Bureaucracy, automation, mass communication, Big Business, Big Government: these are new realities. The values of democra cy and freedom take on different meanings in an institutional structure dominated by these phenomena. It does not end the matter to say that at all levels the people should have control of the decisions which affect them and the resources on which they are dependent; it barely opens the questions. These institutions affect the quality of life and of the values that impel our political action. But beyond understanding their impact, we must examine them in terms of the mechanisms necessary for change. This is not now done. The intellectual guide lines for social analysis are still those set out in the old radical and socialist literature. Yet, in fact, much of this is outmoded in its programs, sterile in its rhetoric and no longer applicable in its basic categories of analysis.

Similarly, the political action guide lines are almost non-existent. If there is a view from the left, it is "realignment". But that is more a slogan than an imperative deriving from a rigorous political analysis. There is not, for example, in the whole literature of the American left a detailed study of the Dixiecrat- Republican Coalition, its congressional operation, its operation through patronage and pork barrel on the local level, its relation to the localized structure of American politics, and the ways to change it. Likewise there is no study of the "military- industrial" complex. ... New realities are capsuled in slogans and supported by theory pertinent to 20 years ago.

Labor and much of the liberal community seems to have adopted the view that the New Deal set the direction for economic reform and that the time for theory is past.The modern task is a pragmatic one of manipulation of power and influence to carry through the welfare and regulatory institutions already

initiated or projected. The academy, which might be expected to fill this void in theory, has succombed to a research and "objectivity" fetish that makes it unrespectable, and thus disadvantageous to connect values to analysis. Professional discipline requires that you simply describe the environment; if you want to criticize or change it, that mustn't be done from your university chair. Academic freedom, people are reminded, is not academic license. Graduate students surrender their vision -- and vigor -- to the research requirements of dissertation committees. The few "think centers" around the country, such as the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, are charged with confronting the new complexities, etc., but they find themselves, if sometimes critical, basically satisfied with the theory and solutions now public in the liberal and left community. There does not exist an intellectual current genuinely to the left of the New Deal and the Administration. This fact represents a complacency that we feel is disastrous.

We think it incredible that labor can continue to urge control of capital power by governmental regulatory institutions, that it can applaud Kennedy for slapping down Roger Blough and Big Steel, that it calls for various national welfare and planning programs that further concentrate economic decision making in government and administrative commissions, and that it can in general look at government as a mediator and as an ally against the assault of business -- without looking out for the democratic quality of the structure that is coming into being.

We see in this labor becoming but one of many petitioners for favors before the independent, bureaucratically insulated authority of government. It will lobby for its demands, but concessions will be won in a way that surrenders the decision-making to governmental authority. Labor becomes an administrative cog, subject to and exercising the will of Big Government. Government accumulates power, (shared of course with corporate and other elites) without an organized public holding its use responsible. "Leadership groups" come to represent a mythical set of countervailing "interests" -- labor, business, consumer -- but the followers, the Americans in town and cities with families and futures, remain unorganized and without access to administrative centers where the "decisions which affect them are made, and the resources on which they are dependent are allocated." And this is indeed the course that has tended to develop in labor over the last years. It maintains the vision of a democratically based movement of workers in their workplace, but in operation it has adopted more elitist patterns, implementing convention resolutions by high level machinations rather than a mass mobilization of unionists.

The alternative is to recreate the democratic public. For labor it means shifting the base of its power from the influence of its leaders to the organization of its locals. Labor will be manipulated, and generally out-manipulated, by corporate and governmental interests, until it develops the social power that resides in its membership.

But if labor has seemed unwilling to deal with this fundamental choice, its failure has been no more than that of the entire liberal community, the university included. Democratic alternatives to the present course seem random and unclear. Little more could be expected because the problems being dealt with are too roughly formulated: there is not an analysis of the power structure, behavior of elites, anti-intellectualism, privatism and estrangement as they apply (or don't apply) to workers and other population groups,

the political significance of automation, leisure, mass communication, etc. Our understanding of these matters should make much clearer -- and more resolute -- the course of democratic policy in the next years. Values must be examined in terms of social reality, the empirical present and reasonable expectation of the future. This theoretical, philosophical and pre-eminently political job of developing a new radical literature must draw heavily on the university, but it is a job on which the future of labor may well depend.

These priorities before a liberal movement in the United States should indicate the mutual imperative that alliance be formed uniting the labor movement and the university as seminal institutions in directing the course of social change. From labor, the mass base, financial resources and leverage in the economic life of the country; from the university, the direct access and influence in all class, occupational and decision making centers, the intellectual and research resources and the leverage on the production of trained personnel -- these are the resources that need to be strategically combined in the immediate tasks of the next few years: attacking the Dixiecrats, building a liberal political expression, countering the permanent war economy, seeking just representation in legislative structures, and developing a theoretical understanding of our modern circumstance.

It should also be clear that this alliance is not merely a matter of convenience; it is a matter of mutual survival. Unless the university establishes connection with real politics its role in making knowledge pertinent to the functioning of democracy will be lost in the sterile "objectivity" of academic discipline. And unless labor mounts a movement, conjoined with all its democratic allies, that places social power in the communities across the country with its membership, it will find itself stripped of independent power in a government-regulated corporate economy.

* * *

In seeking to demonstrate the necessity of this alliance, we should give particular note to a problem that has too little occupied the attention of liberal student and university community: <u>the professionals problem.</u>

Most of the programming of the liberal, left and activist community has been focused on the liberal arts college or on the liberal arts curriculum within the larger universities. It is generally a matter of comment when a Business Administration, Law or Medical student turns up on the mailing or membership lists of a liberal political group. The activist's view of citizen responsibility or of university reform do not have within their experience (and hence do not encompass) the professional schools.

Yet, the humanities and liberal arts programs are not the ones, by and large, producing the significant decision makers in society. The major groups of social influence are the lawyers, doctors, journalists, educators and teachers, scientists and engineers, business administration graduates and other "professionals." These are the titles of status, or the skills of business and finance or the channels to accumulated and inherited powet. It is of vital importance that those concerned eith the social function of the university develop an orientation to the professional schools and the professional curricula.

This is no easy task. "Professional education" is generally isolated from the mainstream of liberal arts activity and the liberal arts student body. The faculties tend to be politically conservative and without an emphasis on the social role of the profession in dealing with the major issues of political social or economic democracy -- or at least without a liberal emphasis. The schools are without informal extra-curricular programs encouraging controversy, involvement with social issues or broad political activity. The students are oriented to moving into the major professional associations or social orbits -- The American Medical Association, the Bar, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, etc. -- and they tend to adopt the norms of behavior and political thinking that these groups represent.

The professional programs, with very few exceptions, described are conservative, rigid and resistant to new influence. The emphasis is on technical competance and conformity rather than wide ranging social responsibility that should follow from the status and influence of the professional in society. Yet, it is largely from programs such as these that the executive offices of business are filled, that the school systems are staffed, and as well, that the candidates for public office are graduated.

The people receiving the main part of their education in these schools will have loud, and often decisive voices in the most basic programs of any democratic movement in America. The economic program just sketch d above will find the opposition of the professional associations which now set the norms for professional "education." These new graduates will have much to do with the future of labor's imperitive: to organize the unorganized. These people, the white collar, technical and professional workers, of the next ten years, are the major unorganized -- or are their bosses. They will have telling influence on legal reform and in reform of the penal system. Any manner of national health insurance, humanization of the treatment of mental illness, or a national health service will require wide support from these people, now in or soon to enter our professional schools. Reintroducing the newspaper and mass media as institutions giving knowledge democratic relevance is a task that will be in the hands of those professional people moving into the decision making positions in the communication, journalism and publishing industries. Public subsidy for the arts and for cultural activities will not become possible without support for the "professionals" -- the people who now provide private patronage to the arts. And likewise, if we hold as a value that men of science -- or of knowledge generally -- should be responsible to the values and ideals of their society, and not simply to the funds which support their research, then an initiative must be taken in the programs of scientific education to introduce this neglected conception of the professional role.

The theorists of "university reform" hold that the universities function is not simply to fill social slots with men of competence, but much more important, to examine critically those "slots" and to fill them with men of vision. In this the university becomes a progressive force in the society. But if this task is under way in the liberal arts schools, it is barely conceptualized in the professional schools. This must become a new priority in the effort to most fully draw the university into the movement for social change. Labor is clearly an ally in this cause. It has probably been the institution most concerned over the years with the reactionary policies of the professional associations, it has the greatest resourse in developing counter material and it has the greatest personal interest in seeing controversy as a liberal influence enter the professional schools.

What is the program? We have argued by pointing to a number of strategic issues that there should be an alliance between the student radicals and organized labor -- primarily at the local level, but also regionally and nationally. Many people in both the labor and the student community would readily support that thesis. The trouble comes in finding a programmatic translation of what is an obvious political necessity. For many others, however, organizational life has brought the more pragmatic formula that the proof of the theory is in what it can accomplish. In either case, it is necessary to lay out some of the broad areas of student-labor cooperation.

1. support in action. The $1.50 minumum wage fight in New York, a hospital workers organizaing drive, migrant labor organization, the New York teachers strike, the 1960 General Electric strike -- these are instances where students have participated in labor action at the community level, providing added militance and vital support to union efforts and to the morale of the workers. The ability of students to dramatize an issue in a community need not be doubted on review of student action in civil right, peace and civil liberties. There is no reason why that action cannot be turned as well to issues like unemployment, federal aid for redevelopment or urban renewal, plant location, unionization of unorganized shops or white collar groups. Two campaigns seem obviously geared to student and university involvement:

a. the union label campaign. This could be effectively carried to clothing stores in college towns, to the procurement offices for university furniture, paper supplies, printing service, etc., to the purchase of cigarettes and a host of similar items.

b. an organizing campaign in the university: With initiatives from the appropiate unions students could do much to promote the organization of university maintenance, kitchen, clerical and hospital employees. These are drives in which the liberal campus groups and the faculty could combine forces, and in many cases serve to draw the student government into conflict with the administration

However, the basic point is that in every town where there is a university or college, and that is about 1200 towns in the United States, labor could combine with already active individuals or groups at the school to sponsor a program of student political activity and education. And that program would soon produce a manpower pool and research facility that could enter labor struggles, catalyze political campaigns, publize liberal economic and political ideas and produce long range studies on the economic development of the community or area. Given the weakness of local organization in most small towns, and even some cities, the investment over a year or two to create such an auxillary force would more than repqy itself.

2. Civil rights in the South. Students in the South should combine a demand for labor organization with their demand for other civil rights. Their direct action should be applied not only to community facilities but also to industrial shops. They should enter into discussion with those unions which are organizing in the South and should locate a number of specific targets on which to combine labor action with civil rights. If the right to organize were made a demand by every negro person now asking the right to vote and the right to integrated education, then not only would the foundation of racist economy be attacked, but the labor movement would become an indigious force in the South.

3. a local student-labor liaison structure. The most immediate barrier to a functioning relationship is the lack of interpersonal relations connecting either leadership or even individuals in the two communities. The first job would be to set up some kind of liaison committee or channel of interaction. This, however, should not be a social or ceremonial group. It should be a political committee. It should be based on a common outlook to develop a progressive movement in the country in which students and labor each have a crucial role. If the local union leadership do not have this vision, then students should look for reform groups within the union who want to see labor recreated at its local level to play a significant part in political affairs. An initial agenda for such a group should probably include three areas: a. the war economy; b. organizaing the unorganized; c. the politics of the community. While this would lead to other kinds of interaction -- unionists becoming involved in student and university affairs, students speaking at local meetings, setting up internships, etc. -- the purpose would be to develop an agenda for community action.

a. the war economy and its alternatives: a program of public meetings and of research. To what extent is the community tied to the defense effort? What portion of its jobs, productive capacity, tax revenue, etc. would be affected by disarmament? What are the laternative ways these resources can be utilized independently of arms spending? What are the community development and social priorities and how can conversion be planned to meet them?

b. organizing the unorganized: to develop an organizing strategy for the community. University employees, as suggested, might be a place to start and attention should be given to what role if any students play in the local labor market, if any. The goal, however, is to develop a total blueprint: what shops or occupations are unorganized, what are the priorities of action, how can the resources of the already organized and of the university be combined in a systematic program?

c. the politics of the community. realignment on the local level. What is the level of political participation by union members and what are the barriers to particpation? Where are the political allies: in other movements, in the Democratic Party, in the unorganized? What are the needs of the community: tax reform urban renewal, school construction, community health service, rent controls or minumum wage laws, adult education and job retraining facilities, reform of residence and eligibility requirements for voting, a program of leisure activity? Can candidates be found and support mobilized for a program meeting these needs? How can the resources of students and the university be best enlisted in the effort?

While the impuse for such a community agenda may come from students and labor, the liaison structure should be expanded to include people with their roots in civil rights or peace activity, professionals, Democratic Party workers and others concerned with giving a political orientation and expression, to liberal causes. In this way there can gegin to develop a legitimate, indiginous left in the American community.

4. a national strategy committee. There should be a way for students from the various campus based movements to meet and maintain continuing communication with representatives or self-appointed liaison people from the major labor organizations. The principal task of such a communication device -- it might never meet though an occasional conference would seem valuable -- would be the discussion of political strategy: the attitude toward the Kennedy Admistration, the Dixiecrats, action at the 1964 Democratic Convention, legislative issues and congressional campaigns, revitalization of the labor movement, organizing in the South -- the list is inexhaustable. Such a group might also concern itself with providing particular services and financial aid to support joint activity.

5. curriculum reform and research. a study group should be formed in each university or curriculum area within the university. These would systematically introduce liberal material into academic activity. They would develop questions, articulate theoretical positions, find people in classes to serve as gadflies, suggest research areas for term papers, etc. For instance, take a range of problems like the following: reform of the regulatory commissions such as the NLRB or FRB, job retraining and relocation, foreign competition under an extended trade policy, anti-labor legislation, work time and employment policy. These are problems not immediate to the scope of student political activity. Their manner of treatment is largely conservative in the economics and business courses, and certainly not connected with a view of the political program needed to translate liberal theory into accepted practice.

Yet, these issues and the principles of social justice on which they are based could become central issues of academic debate (and influence). It only 20 or so people at each college found encouragement to give this direction to their own education in raising such questions persistently in classes, in the student press, in public speechs and questioning in public meetings. The tone of the university could be much changed. From that beginning a base of interest is created that can be drawn on in carrying the issues into the community obth in civic education programs and in political campaigns.

Such a study group would probably soon assume the functions of coordinating the facilities of the university, both faculty and students, in line with the kind of program laid out by wahtever sort of liaison structure might be established (#2 above). It would properly have the function of organizing the research necessary to accompany political or other action programs in the community,

6. the professional problem. joint area committees should be set up, first on thenational and later on local levels to deal with the reform of professional curricula. The following committees would certainly be in view: Business Adminis ration, Education, Law, Medicine, Theology, Journalism, Engineering, Physical Science. The first range of tasks facing each committee would be to define the problem area: what are the issues that should be dealt with in the curriculum, what are the social problems that the professional will have to deal with, what are the immediate programs that the professon should be playing a role in, what are the forms of professional organization that can develop and maintain a liberal constituency. The groups might then, in a number of "pilot" campuses begin the kind of program that would follow fromtheir preliminary discussions. It would be responsible for drafting study papers, bibliography and readings, speaker lists and so forth, and to establish and maintain relations with the relevant professional associations.

7) Bringing economic issues into the student movement. There must be a systematic effort to connect economic analysis with "activist issues" of the student movement. A priority should be set to produce discussion papers in peace, civil rights, civil liberties, financing of higher education and so forth. There should be a joint research undertaking that would provide students with an economic ground work to support their social impulse. Of similar need, also, are guides to introduce labor organization and ideas into the curriculum: course material on labor history, bibliography and library material, discussion outlines, etc. Perhaps contributions from supporting labor organizations could provide salary for a person to administer the preparation of these materials.

* * * * * * *

The seven suggestions above should provde programmatic guides, essential in themselves and sufficient to establish a framework for the kind of political alliance between labor and the university argued for earlier in the paper. It is the hope that this paper will stimulate students to take local initiative in this alliance, to seek out labor leadership and to launch some of the joint activity suggested. It is hoped also that it will build into the leadership of the trade union movement a recognition and acceptance of the university as an agent of social change, as an ally in carrying forward the cause of labor and in carrying to political expression the vision of a democratic society of, by and for the people.

students andLabor
by /1 Haber

9/62
Students for a Democratic Society
112 East 19th Street
New York 3, New York