

By David Moberg

NINE AMBULANCES CONVERGED ON CHICAGO's Federal Plaza last week to save the victims of a massacre—a massacre of public health by a medical system that is too expensive, too inequitable and too exclusive, neglecting 40 million uninsured Americans.

One sponsor of this cross-country ambulance drive—which this week will deliver to the nation's capitol 4 million cards demanding universal health care—was Jobs with Justice. Launched four years ago, Jobs with Justice is an effort by 25 major unions, joined now by community, student, feminist and senior groups, to build broader solidarity among union members and between unionized workers and their communities. At its heart is the recognition that individual unions can rarely succeed these days without support from other unions and the general public.

Now health care—the main issue in four-fifths of recent strikes and a growing community concern—is the top priority for Jobs with Justice. But it is not the exclusive focus. Soon the organization will join in the National Education Association's Campaign for New Priorities to cut military spending and shift the money to domestic needs.

While mobilizing support for national issues or major strikes, including Eastern Airlines, Jobs with Justice has also tried to build local coalitions of labor and community groups to fight on job-related issues. For example, on a day of national health care protest one year ago, boilermakers from the shipyards of Norfolk, Va., took part in a local demonstration by calling a one-day protest strike against cuts in their own health care. These local coalitions have been strongest in the Sunbelt and other areas where unions have been weak or where there were not already well-developed citizen-labor coalitions, such as the affiliates of Citizen Action (part of the national Jobs with Justice network and a sponsor of the current Emergency Drive For Health Care).

Mobilization first: Jobs with Justice represents a departure from the dominant, narrow, service-oriented business unionism. For one thing, it emphasizes mobilization of supporters in protests and other actions, whether or not the supporters are members of unions. It asks individual workers—not just union officials—to take part in the coalition by signing a pledge that during the year they will “be there at least five times for someone else's fight, as well as my own.” It tries to build worker solidarity, not narrow organizational interest.

Although Jobs with Justice has decided against getting involved in electoral politics, it emphasizes that winning job-related goals—now, more than ever—requires

Jobs with Justice helps unions broaden support

breaking out of the limits defined by contract-oriented unionism and increasingly restrictive labor laws. Yet despite the overlap with such groups as Citizen Action, Jobs with Justice is distinctive in its focus on conditions and rights on the job. “The Jobs with Justice idea is that the lack of jobs that pay well is the source—as well as a symptom—of all the fundamental social problems in this country,” says Bob Muehlenkamp, a top Service Employees Union staff official.

Communications Workers of America Organizing Director Larry Cohen conceived of Jobs with Justice after a bitter experience in Detroit: while a union representation election was pending, MCI laid off all 400 of its potential union employees and moved the operation to Iowa. Workers need more than jobs, he found himself arguing a few weeks later, they need jobs with justice.

Seeing others' fights as one's own: The organization's first major rallies—some involving more than 10,000 people—were held in Miami and focused on the fight between Eastern Airlines workers and their boss, Frank Lorenzo. But the south Florida Jobs with Justice coalition, still one of the strongest, has taken on many other battles: supporting local transit workers against wage and service cuts, attacking politicians hostile to labor, mobilizing hundreds of picketers for besieged workers in small factories, pushing legislation proposed by the building trade unions to require all contractors with Dade County to provide health insurance and turning out hundreds or even thousands of protesters at trade shows or banquets catering to the city's elite.

In other parts of the country, Jobs with Justice mounted unprecedented demonstrations for workers' causes and won major victories. For example, thousands of marchers descended on the small Texas town of Nacogdoches to protect the jobs of cafeteria workers at the local university. Repeated demonstrations helped workers at the *San Antonio Light* turn back the newspaper's union decertification drive. In Denver, another Jobs with Justice stronghold, the organization mounted successful campaigns to protect workers at the federal mint, the Denver Philharmonic and the *Denver Post*.

“The main reason we started doing this is for someone to see another's fight as their own,” says Cohen. “They'll act under a banner that will be there when they need support

as well. Also, for workers to gain power, they're going to have to go outside the context of the National Labor Relations Act and work in the community context as well.”

Andy Banks, a labor educator at Florida International University and a leader in the south Florida Jobs with Justice, contends that Jobs with Justice must move in the direction of “community unionism.” In a forthcoming article in *Labor Research Review*, Banks defines community unionism as a movement in which important non-labor groups have “some sort of ownership of the

LABOR

unionization effort” and that both union and non-union workers are involved. Union actions must break out of current legal confines, involve groups without an immediate stake, have resources for long-term efforts and recognize that the battle for public opinion is central to the unions' success.

“Jobs with Justice is at a crossroads,” Banks says. “We're either going to become a national mobilization or we'll become a grass-roots, decentralized movement based on a different concept of unionism than business unionism or industrial unionism.”

Cohen wants Jobs with Justice to strengthen its local coalitions. Several union leaders in New York City recently overcame byzantine local politics to form the first important Jobs with Justice organization in a traditional Northeast-Midwest big city labor stronghold. If Jobs with Justice can flourish in such cities, it will gain new stature.

Mixed messages: So far, it looks like Jobs with Justice has won loyalty from participants, says Communications Workers of America Research Director George Kohl. (Service and public worker unions and several industrial unions have been most active in the coalition.) It has created a network among liberal, aggressive union staff and developed a new body of organizing experience. But the rest of the labor movement knows little about it.

That's because of the attitude of the AFL-CIO. Although the AFL-CIO convention delegates endorsed Jobs With Justice, officials in Washington and elsewhere have ranged from cool to downright hostile. Some in the labor establishment are obsessed with fears of a loss of control over members and organizations. Jobs with Justice is frequently at-

tacked for “dual unionism,” an old redbaiting term for establishing a separate union. Still, a few local or state labor federations have embraced Jobs with Justice, and Jobs with Justice leaders in Miami and Atlanta won control of local labor councils.

In Denver the regional AFL-CIO director has repeatedly attacked Jobs with Justice and its leaders and has tried to undermine the coalition's actions. He is suspected of having helped opponents oust the Jobs with Justice leader from her local union office in a campaign that attacked her for spending too much time helping other unions.

Many conservative labor leaders also don't like the occasionally militant tactics of Jobs with Justice. During the Eastern Airlines strike, top Machinist officials initially supported a Jobs with Justice plan to slowly drive cars through several airports to blockade traffic, but then backed out under pressure from the AFL-CIO, according to several insiders.

In June, when Jobs with Justice staged nationwide actions—such as literally tying up insurance companies with red tape—that provided labor rare favorable publicity in hundreds of newspapers and TV news reports, the *AFL-CIO News* did not cover the event. “I don't feel compelled to cover them,” AFL-CIO Director of Information Rex Hardesty said. While lauding the group's public relations and coalition-building efforts, Hardesty acknowledged conflicts “when they purport to speak for all unions nationally.”

Although Jobs with Justice stresses mobilization more than policy, the persisting divisions among unions over health care plans could still be a problem. As Citizen Action leader Don Wiener observed while traveling on the Emergency Drive, “The rank and file is out ahead of the leadership of some groups in favoring the single-payer, Canadian-style plan.” If Jobs with Justice makes its implicit support for a single-payer solution more explicit, conservative AFL-CIO officials may attack.

Some labor officials who sympathize with the Jobs with Justice mission to build solidarity nevertheless question whether forming a new organization makes sense instead of organizing ad hoc strike support or specific legislative campaigns. They doubt labor has resources for another structure. But Cohen notes that the nation's unions combined have more than 35,000 staff members and bring in \$4 billion annually in dues, much of it not used wisely or well. Jobs with Justice could grow much faster with more money and staff, but so far has succeeded with few full-time organizers.

However, “The core problem is the dynamism of the unions or the lack thereof,” says one Jobs with Justice sympathizer. “Where there isn't that dynamism, Jobs with Justice can't make it.”

If Jobs with Justice nurtures the little remaining dynamism in the labor movement, it will justify its existence. Kohl envisions a future of stronger coalitions linking local issues to national issues. Cohen sees Jobs with Justice providing a link between the initiatives of staff organizers and people spontaneously organizing themselves, like the organizing committees of the '30s CIO. “My fantasy is that both will come together,” he says. “I really believe we're on the verge of that.” More than most actions by labor unions, Jobs with Justice is making that very optimistic goal somewhat plausible. □

Message to Israeli Government & U.S. Congress from some American & Israeli Jews:
END THE OCCUPATION! LET THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE GO! NO MORE BILLIONS UNTIL!

For a unique and free information packet please contact:

The Jewish Committee On The Middle East (JCOME)

(202) 362-JCOME - (202) 362-5266 - Fax (202) 362-6965 - POB 18367 - Washington, DC 20036

JCOME ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Dr. Yigal Arens, Univ. of Southern CA; Prof. Michael Astour, Univ. of Southern IL; Prof. Joel Beinin, Middle East History, Stanford Univ.; Mark Bruzonsky, Former Washington Rep. World Jewish Congress; Prof. Noam Chomsky, M.I.T.; Prof. Richard Falk, Princeton Univ.; Prof. Herbert Hill, Univ. of WI; Jeremy Levin, Former CNN Beirut Bureau Chief; Prof. Zachary Lockman, Middle East History, Harvard Univ.; Prof. Seymour Melman, Columbia Univ.; Dr. Eileen Newmark Ph.D., Intercultural Communications; Prof. Don Peretz, Middle East Studies, SUNY; Henry Schwarzschild NY; Prof. J. David Singer, Univ. of MI; Richard Walden, Attorney. With Jewish Professors at over 150 Universities nationwide.

New: "INFO BY FAX" - Call For Details

* Students: Please Call...We Need Interns.

This is the second in a three-part series of essays examining the historical context and future implications of the remarkable geopolitical events of 1991, a year that has seen the collapse of Soviet communism, the rise of nationalism worldwide and the war in the Gulf.

By John B. Judis

WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE COLD WAR FINALLY ENDED IN 1989 WHEN the residents of East Berlin began pouring through the once heavily guarded Berlin Wall. For the Soviet Union and for Eastern European countries, the implications were revolutionary: as the wall crumbled, so too did these nations' structures of government and economic life. But for the United States, the Cold War's end has also had profound implications.

The Cold War provided Americans with a ready answer to what their place in the world was. The United States' role, as defined by the Cold War, was to lead a free world alliance against communism. But as the Cold War has ended, long-suppressed questions about the U.S. role have re-emerged: is it America's responsibility to "make the world safe for democracy," as Woodrow Wilson urged in 1917? To what extent should the U.S. subordinate its own aims to that of an international organization like the United Nations or the International Monetary Fund (IMF)? Does the United States have vital interests—beyond its continental defense—over which it should go to war? And what is the relationship between America's foreign aims and its domestic goals?

The debate over these questions has barely begun, but the answers are likely to reflect the continuing tension between two foreign-policy approaches that could be called "evangelical" and "functional." The evangelical approach, which dates from the 17th century Puritans, envisages Americans as a "chosen people" whose goal is to convert the world to their values—whether through example or military intervention. The functional approach—also sometimes termed "realistic"—defines America's goals in terms of traditional national criteria of economic well-being and military security.

In the current debate, the evangelical side can be seen, for instance, in the proposals advanced by American Enterprise Institute fellow Joshua Muravchik or by *Washington Post* columnist Charles Krauthammer. Muravchik, writing in his recently published book, *Exporting Democracy*, favors making the spread of democracy the overriding goal of American foreign policy. By contrast, Alan Tonelson, writing in the July *Atlantic Monthly*, calls for an "interest-based foreign policy" that "would confine itself to securing certain specific objectives that are intrinsically important to America's security and welfare—for example, the protection of regions that are important sources of raw materials or critical manufactured goods, those that are major loci of investment or prime markets, and those that by virtue of their location are strategically vital."

Americans have invariably combined these approaches in all their major decisions—from the Monroe Doctrine to the declarations of war in 1917 and 1941—but where the evangelical has clearly predominated, Americans have suffered. For this reason, it is appropriate, at the beginning of a new foreign policy debate, to review the perils of foreign policy evangelism.

God's Chosen People: The first settlers who came to New England believed they

AMERICAN EVANGELISM:



Cover of *The Bee*, 1888

were establishing a land that would stand as an example of virtue and righteousness. In 1630, John Winthrop, the leader of the Massachusetts Bay Company, reminded his fellow passengers on the *Arabella* that they had not sailed across the Atlantic to find wealth, but to build a "city on a hill" that would serve as a model to those they had left behind in England.

The early settlers thought of themselves as God's "chosen people," New England as the "new Israel," and Europe as the corrupt home of the Catholic antichrist. While taking on different forms, these early attitudes have persisted over four centuries. By the 18th century, Americans' distaste for Catholic Europe had broadened into an indictment of the Old World in general, which they identified not only with unregenerate religion, but also with the persistence of feudalism and monarchy. Two hundred years after that, when, in February 1941, *Time* founder Henry Luce proclaimed that this was the American Century, he counterpoised American virtue to European fascism and communism.

There are three key components of evangelical world view: the conception of America as unique, whether in virtue or in a combination of virtue and power; the conception of the non-American world as depraved, evil and enslaved; and the belief that

the United States has an obligation to transform this world outside itself to fit its image of virtue.

From the 17th century to the 1890s, Americans sought to evangelize primarily through example and through continental expansion rather than by intervening in Old World affairs. In his farewell address in 1796, George Washington saw America's role as giving "mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence." At the same time, he warned Americans not to "implicate" themselves "by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of [European] politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities."

During the 19th century, Americans took an evangelical approach to the Monroe Doctrine, which barred further European colonization of the Western Hemisphere. They viewed the doctrine as a means of protecting the Americas from Old World feudalism. They justified westward expansion as America's "manifest destiny"—an attempt to bring the benefits of American civilization to the continent. Many Americans also saw the Civil War as an attempt to purge the country of last vestiges of Old World class relations.

At the century's end, however, Americans were forced to abandon their splendid isola-

tion. With European powers carving the world up into commercially exclusive colonies, Americans came to believe that if they didn't intervene, they would lack markets for burgeoning industries and farms and would be plunged into another depression as deep as that of the 1890s. After the United States defeated Spain in Cuba and the Philippines, a great debate took place over American objectives, with an imperialist faction, led by Theodore Roosevelt and Senators Albert Beveridge (R-IN) and Henry Cabot Lodge (R-MA), arguing for annexation of the Philippines, and an anti-imperialist faction, led by William Jennings Bryan, bitterly opposed to American overseas colonizations.

But both factions argued their position on evangelical grounds. The imperialists claimed, in Beveridge's words, that God "has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the redemption of the world." Bryan, on the other hand, claimed that by trying to incorporate what he saw as an alien and inferior race—the Filipinos—Americans would be "endangering our civilization."

The debate was finally resolved when the United States adopted the approach implicit in Secretary of State John Hay's Open Door Notes, which declared American opposition to the partition of China and support for open