

Labor in Focus by Stanley Ezrol

The IUD and 'post-industrial' industry

The AFL-CIO launches a campaign for the creation of a corporatist American Social Democracy.

The AFL-CIO's Industrial Union Department (IUD) concluded a two-day conference in Washington, D.C. on May 5, entitled "Rebuilding American Industry." In the keynote address, given by William Winpisinger, the purpose of the conference was stated to be the launching of a campaign to guarantee that the 1984 Democratic Party presidential candidate is committed to a corporatist reorganization of U.S. economic policy-making.

William Winpisinger is an avowed socialist revolutionary, president of the International Association of Machinists (IAM), member of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, director of the State Department-controlled and -funded American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), and member of the Democratic National Committee.

"It's time we started importing some of that Democratic Socialism," Winpisinger announced. "We need to elect a government with leaders who aren't currying favor with the corporate state . . . who aren't too timid to take that next step beyond FDR's New Deal, Harry Truman's Fair Deal, John Kennedy's New Frontier, and, yes, Lyndon Johnson's Great Society." Despite Winpisinger's demagogic attacks on the "corporate state," the "multinationals," and President Ronald Reagan, whom he called "Ronnie the Robot" and "the current bus boy for the corporate state," each one of the IUD leaders, each of the four

Democratic candidates (Mondale, Hart, Cranston, and Glenn), and one retired candidate (Kennedy) who spoke at the conference at the IUD's invitation, called for establishing new "tripartite" (business, government, and labor) institutions to dictate all credit and investment decisions, including, most emphatically, those in advanced technologies, for each sector of industry.

Beginning with Winpisinger, speaker after speaker attacked the idea that America was moving into a post-industrial age.

Even Gary Hart, the original "Atari Democrat" who, as recently as last July greeted the "communications revolution" zombies at the World Futures Society "World Assembly" as "fellow revolutionaries," and who has been identified as the Presidential candidate Averell Harriman finds most attractive, announced, sheepishly, "I have never believed that this transition can occur without maintaining our basic manufacturing industries."

In fact, the specific policy proposals made at the conference would prevent any advanced technology industry, in manufacturing, defense, communications, or any other sector from being implemented, while maintaining extra-governmental dictatorial control, through an "Industrial Development Bank" and the previously mentioned "tripartite" bodies, over all wage, investment, export marketing, and pricing decisions.

In a document titled "Rebuilding

American Industry," distributed at the conference by the IUD, it is demanded that "Management should be required to provide the community and workers its rationale for any proposed technological change. Their statement should detail the economic and human impact of new technology." Any observer of the impact of required environmental impact statements and other regulatory policies on the nuclear energy industry knows that this requirement is a prescription for no new technology. Alan Cranston betrayed, perhaps unwittingly, his understanding of the impact of this sort of policy on employment, the one aspect of the current economic depression with which the IUD claims to be concerned. "I will see to it that new technologies are used in ways that will not deprive America of its joblessness," he promised.

The tirades against the "corporate state" were also belied by the largest document distributed by IUD at the conference, a one hundred page report, *International Trade, Industrial Policies, and the Future of American Industry*, prepared by the Labor-Industry Coalition for International Trade (LICIT).

LICIT is composed of major member unions of the IUD plus a number of U.S. based multinational corporations—Corning Glass, B. F. Goodrich, Ingersoll Rand, St. Joe Minerals, W. R. Grace, Westinghouse, and Weyerhaeuser. The report is, primarily, a hit-list of successful development of industry in the advanced and "newly industrialized nations" such as Korea, Brazil, and Mexico, and concludes by recommending that the United States adopt policies to put an end to competition from the successful incorporation of new technologies into industrial development.