

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Blackwell, Morton: Files
Folder Title: Solidarity Day (09/19/1981)
(1 of 5)
Box: 24

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

August 1981

National Non-AFL-CIO Organizations that have Endorsed Solidarity Day 

ACORN

African Methodist Episcopal Church
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority
Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity
American Agricultural Movement (Louisiana)
American Baptist Churches National Ministries, U.S.A.
American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, Inc.
American Coalition To Support The Arts
American Council of the Blind
American Ethical Union
American Medical Student Association
American Personnel & Guidance Association
American Public Health Association
American Psychological Association
American Veterans Committee
Americans for Democratic Action
A. Philip Randolph Institute
Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores
Association for Retarded Citizens
Center for Community Change
Children's Defense Fund
Children's Foundation
Church of the Brethern - Washington Office
Citizen Labor Energy Coalition
Citizens for Tax Justice
Citizens Party
Coalition for Legal Services Inc.
Coalition of Labor Union Women
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
Committee for National Health Insurance
Community Nutrition Institute
Concerned Seniors for Better Government
Conference on Economic Progress
Congress of Italian-American Organizations, Inc.
Congress Watch
Consumer Coalition for Health
Consumer Energy Council of America
Consumer Federation of America
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority
Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee
Disability Associates
Disabled American Freedom Rally
Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs
Environmental Action Foundation
Environmental Action Inc.
Environmentalists for Full Employment

Food Research Action Council (FRAC)
Frontiers International, Inc.
Frontlash
Full Employment Action Council
Health Security Action Council
Housing Assistance Council
Improved Benevolent & Protective Order of Elks of the World
Iota Phi Lambda Sorority
Japanese American Citizens League
Jewish Labor Committee
Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity
Labor Council for Latin American Advancement
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
League of Women Voters of the United States
Lutheran Council, USA - Office of Governmental Affairs
Mexican-American Legal Defense & Education Fund
Migrant Legal Action Program
National Anti-Hunger Coalition
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc.
National Association of Community Health Centers
National Association of Farmworkers Organizations
National Association of Market Developers
National Association of Negro Business and
Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.
National Association of Public Adult Educators
National Association of Real Estate Brokers, Inc.
National Association of Social Workers
National Audubon Society
National Bar Association
National Beauty Culturists League
National Black Lay Catholic Caucus
National Business League
National Capital Area Trade Union Retirees Club
National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice
National Center on the Black Aged
National Coalition for Economic Justice
National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing
National Committee for School Desegregation
National Community Action Agency Executive Directors Association
National Conference of Black Mayors
National Conference of Catholic Charities
National Congress for Puerto Rican Rights
National Consumers League
National Council of Catholic Women
National Council of Churches - Division of Church & Society
National Council of Community Mental Health Centers
National Council of Negro Women
National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc.

National Education Association (NEA)
National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association
National Farmers Union
National Funeral Directors & Morticians Association
National Gray Panthers
National Hispanic Housing Coalition
National Image
National Legal Aid and Defenders Association
National Low Income Housing Committee
National Neighbors
National Newspaper Publishers Association
National Organization for Women
National Organization of Legal Services Workers
National Puerto Rican Forum
National Rural Housing Coalition
National Society for Autistic Children
National Treasury Employees Union
National Urban Coalition
National Urban League
National Women's Political Caucus
New American Movement
New Democratic Coalition
New Jewish Agenda
Paralyzed Veterans of America
People United to Serve Humanity (PUSH)
Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc.
Project on Food Assistance and Poverty
PUSH Inc.
Recruitment & Training Program
Rural America
Rural Coalition
SANE
SOS (Save our Security)
Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority
Social Democrats USA
Southern Christian Leadership Conference
The Sierra Club
The Wilderness Society
Unitarian Universalist Association
United Church of Christ - Commission for Racial Justice
United Methodist Church - Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church Board of Global Ministries, Women's Division
United Mine Workers
United Neighborhood Centers of America
United States Catholic Conference - Office of Domestic Social Development
United Church of Christ - Office of Communications
U.S. Peace Council
U.S. Student Association
Urban Environment Conference, Inc.
Voter Education Project, Inc.

Washington Office, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Wider Opportunities for Women
Women for Racial and Economic Equality
Women, USA
Women's Equity Action League
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Women's Legal Defense Fund
Women's Strike for Peace
Workmen's Circle
YWCA of the USA, National Board
Zero Population Growth
Zeta Phi Beta Sorority

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 4, 1981

TO: Bob Bonitati
 Mike Baroody
 Ed Rollins
 Paul Russo
 Red Cavaney

FROM: Morton Blackwell

RE: Solidarity Day

Attached are some items which have come my way regarding Solidarity Day. On top is the story in the August 14 Workers World, the newspaper of the Socialist Workers Party.

Also enclosed is a copy of an August, 1980 national survey of AFL-CIO Union members prepared for Committee on Political Education.

Next week I'll send you more materials.

Sept. 19: 'Solidarity Day' with controllers

By Gary Wilson

AUGUST 10—"Solidarity Day" is taking on a new meaning.

The AFL-CIO sponsored march on Washington Sept. 19, called "Solidarity Day," is now becoming a day to show solidarity with the air controllers' strike and to demonstrate against the anti-labor policies of the government.

An angry and militant mood is emerging in the ranks of labor as a result of President Reagan's brutal attempt to bust the air traffic controllers union. For many, Sept. 19 is seen as a way to show their opposition to the government and to demand an end to Reagan's union-busting, strike-breaking policies.

In the AFL-CIO's "Solidarity Day" organizing center in Washington, Charlie Hughes, spokesperson for the demonstration, told this reporter, "There is real outrage in the labor movement [over Reagan's assault on

PATCO]. We've found enthusiasm for the march is increasing. This thing with PATCO is steaming it up. Union members are showing more determination, they're saying, 'If they can do it to a union like PATCO, we're next.' It has added a sense of urgency to Sept. 19."

The new mood is being felt at all levels in the AFL-CIO. Harry Van Arsdale, head of the New York City Central Labor Council, a man known for his conservative views, reflected this when he charged that Reagan was just like another head of state who built a career on union-busting—Adolph Hitler.

AFL-CIO president Lane Kirkland is also feeling the pressure. He charged Reagan with engaging in "counter-revolution" and with waging "class warfare" against the workers.

Reports from local and district level union organizers indicate that people are taking a more se-

rious attitude toward the march. Unions are being flooded with requests to join in the demonstration against the government.

An official in the UAW's office coordinating their "Solidarity Day" activities told *Workers World* that their biggest problem right now is getting enough buses to take everyone to Washington who wants to go. The Steel Workers union reports a similar concern, as do the Machinists.

An important problem is that there are many poor people who are not in a union and can not afford transportation, but who want to join in this important demonstration. *Workers World* asked Hughes of the AFL-CIO what plans were being made to get these people to Washington.

Hughes answered that those not in unions should "Call the Central Labor Council in your city or the AFL-CIO and ask if they have space on any of the buses. Or call one of the principal

unions involved." But no concrete plans have been set by the AFL-CIO leaders to insure that the poor can get to Washington, or to insure that community groups supporting the march will have transportation to the demonstration.

Military budget

There is now mounting pressure on the AFL-CIO for the Sept. 19 rally to demand that the military budget be cut to insure payment for vital social services. The debate is getting louder, and rank-and-file support for a demand to stop the war buildup is being felt in the top echelons of the labor federation.

The *AFL-CIO News* reports that this was discussed in the Executive Council session in Chicago last week. These labor officials noted that there is a "new anti-defense constituency among workers, the poor, minorities, and the elderly," the *AFL-CIO News*

said.

According to Hughes, the question of cutting military spending to pay for vital social services will not be a part of the official program of Sept. 19. "We're sure that people there will express it, though. Groups and individuals who believe that will say it one way or the other with their own signs and their own voice," he added.

One of those groups will be the People's Anti-War Mobilization, which organized 100,000 people to march on the Pentagon on May 3 to stop the U.S. war buildup. PAM has announced that it is actively building for Sept. 19 and urging all its chapters and members to participate. PAM, together with many other organizations supporting the Congress, is planning to spread the word on Sept. 19 about the upcoming All-People's Congress and National Day of Resistance to overturn the Reagan program.



SOLIDARITY DAY

SEPTEMBER 19, 1981

July 31, 1981

American Federation of Labor and
Congress of Industrial Organizations

815 Sixteenth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 637-5380

FACT SHEET ON SOLIDARITY DAY

ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Lane Kirkland
AFL-CIO

Thomas R. Donahue
AFL-CIO

Arnold Aronson
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

Tony Bonilla
League of United Latin American Citizens

Kenyon Burke
National Council of Churches—
Division of Church & Society

Jacob Clayman
National Council of Senior Citizens

Sam Church
United Mineworkers

Murray Finley
A.C.T.W.U.

Douglas Fraser
U.A.W.

Dorothy Height
National Council of Negro Women

Benjamin L. Hooks
N.A.A.C.P.

Reverend Jesse Jackson
P.U.S.H.

Vernon Jordan
National Urban League

Coretta King
Full Employment Action Council

Henry Lacayo
I.C.L.A.A.

Monsignor Francis J. Lally
U.S. Catholic Conference
Office of Domestic Social Development

Reverend Joseph Lowery
S.C.L.C.

Lloyd McBride
U.S.W.A.

Joyce Miller
C.L.U.W.

Gaylord Nelson
Wilderness Society

Charles Pillard
I.B.E.W.

Reese Robrahn
American Coalition of Citizens
with Disabilities

Bayard Rustin
A. Phillip Randolph Institute

Chuck Senci
Concerned Seniors for Better Government

Albert Shanker
A.F.T.

Donald Slaiman
Jewish Labor Committee

Eleanor Smeal
H.O.W.

Jessica Smith
Frontlash

Sharon Stark
Consumer Federation of America

Douglas Tuthill
U.S. Student Association

William Wynn
U.F.C.W.

WHY: To demonstrate the widespread opposition to the Administration's assault on vital social programs and to promote jobs, justice and equality. The focus will be on the following areas of concern (in alphabetical order): Civil Rights, Education, Energy, Environment, Fair Trade, Fair Taxes, Health and Safety, Housing, Jobs, Justice, Lower Interest Rates, Social Security, Voting Rights and Women's Rights.

WHO: Invitations from AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland have gone to all trade unions including those not currently affiliated with the Federation, as well as to organizations affiliated with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and the Budget Coalition. In addition to endorsements from all international unions, Solidarity Day has already been endorsed by over 100 national organizations representing: Blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, women, religious, handicapped, consumers, environmentalists, the aged and various professionals. Planning is being carried forward by an Advisory Board representative of these groups.

WHEN: Saturday, September 19, 1981. A one-day demonstration in Washington, D.C. from 10 A.M. to 5 P.M.

WHERE: Marchers will assemble on the West slope of the Washington Monument for entertainment, picnics and introductions of celebrities and VIPs. This will be followed by a march and a program of addresses by nationally-known leaders and prominent entertainers.

HOW: Each participating organization is asked to name one person as coordinator. Coordinators have also been named to provide information regarding transportation for unions and non-labor groups in major cities and states. Recruiting, transportation and logistics are being handled by the participating organizations. The Solidarity Day office, at 815 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 ((202)637-5380) can provide the names of the coordinators.

For additional information on Solidarity Day call:
(202)637-5380.

A Century of Achievement
A Challenge for the Future

AFSCME COUNCIL 30 SOLIDARITY DAY BUS SCHEDULE

<u>TIME OF DEPARTURE</u>	<u>AREA</u>	<u># OF BUSES</u>	<u>PLACE OF DEPARTURE</u>	<u>APPROX. TIME OF RETURN TO DEPARTURE AREA</u>
10:30 A.M.	FAIRFAX CO.	3	<u>AFSCME COUNCIL 30,</u> 7617 Little River Tnpke. (Rear parking lot)	6:00 P.M.
10:00 A.M.	ARLINGTON CO.	6	<u>SHIRLINGTON SHOPPING CENTER</u> (Behind Best Products).	6:00 P.M.
10:00 A.M.	ALEXANDRIA	4	<u>T.C. WILLIAMS HIGH SCHOOL</u> 3300 King Street, Alex. Va.	6:00 P.M.
10:00 A.M.	ALEXANDRIA	2	<u>MEADS MEMORIAL EPISCOPAL CHURCH</u> Princess & N. Alfred Streets (Parking lot across the street)	6:00 P.M.
9:00 A.M.	PRINCE WM. CO.	1	<u>MARUMSCO PLAZA,</u> Route 1 Woodbridge, Virginia	6:30 P.M.
9:00 A.M.	PRINCE WM. CO	1	<u>MANASSAS MALL,</u> Manassas, Virginia	6:30 P.M.
8:00 A.M.	RICHMOND	2	<u>AZALEA MALL</u> Richmond, Va.	8:00 P.M.
8:00 A.M.	RICHMOND	1	<u>SOUTHSIDE PLAZA,</u> Hull St. near Miller Rhoads	8:00 P.M.
8:00 A.M.	RICHMOND	1	<u>KENNEDY SCHOOL,</u> Churchill	8:00 P.M.
6:00 A.M.	PORTSMOUTH	2	<u>MID-CITY SHOPPING MALL</u> Portsmouth, Va.	10:00 P.M.
6:00 A.M.	PORTSMOUTH	1	<u>NEW MT. VERNON BAPTIST CHURCH,</u> 4th & Lincoln Streets Portsmouth, Va.	10:00 P.M.

For additional information, contact . . .

In Northern Virginia:
AFSCME Council #30
(703) 941-2806

In Richmond:
Stanley Blackwell
(804) 232-5086

In Portsmouth:
Etta Wyche
(804) 399-4248

If long distance, call collect.

IT'S YOUR JOB ON THE LINE

Tens of thousands of public employees will be laid off because of the Reagan budget cuts. You may be one of them.

VIRGINIA Federal Budget Cuts

Revenue sharing	cut \$47 million
Public service employment	cut \$81 million
School lunches	cut \$32 million
Medicaid/health	cut \$13 million
Social services	cut 25 percent

Total Federal cuts — \$290 million
Total State/local job cuts — 6,700

YOU MAY BE ONE OF THEM!

This is unfair to you. This is unfair to your family.
Fight back. Fight for your job. Join the . . .

SOLIDARITY MARCH AGAINST UNFAIRNESS

Saturday, September 19, 1981—Washington, D.C.

CALL YOUR LOCAL OR COUNCIL TODAY



AFSCME[®]
in the public service



*For Workers, Allies***Solidarity Day Offers Chance To Stand Up Against 'Mandate'**

The following is from an address by AFL-CIO Sec.-Treas. Thomas R. Donahue to the National Urban League Business-Labor luncheon, July 21, 1981, Washington.

WHAT WE ARE facing, in broad outline, is a very neat and well-rounded program for transferring resources from those who have little to those who already have a great deal—in the pious hope that the rich (when they are richer), will somehow take care of the poor.

So we have budget cuts that deprive children and old people and the unemployed and the disabled and the disadvantaged in order to finance tax cuts that are designed to benefit the wealthy and the corporations.

We have business-tax revisions that are designed to give huge benefits to the biggest and strongest corporations—the ones with the biggest inventories of physical assets and machinery—while giving little or nothing to small business or to businesses that depend more on manpower than robots.

WE HAVE administrative and legislative assaults on regulations designed to protect the lives and health of workers and consumers to help those who maximize profits at the expense of those who work and those who buy.

We have no re-industrialization program worth the name. We have quite a few proposals to encourage business to do what I have heard called "maximizing human resources" to encourage productivity.

To do that, apparently, you need to be able to pay less than a minimum living wage to youngsters at the bottom of the economic ladder. You need to minimize opportunity by wiping out jobs and training programs and affirmative action programs of all kinds.

You need to put government construction into the hands of the lowest bidder, regardless of the fact that he brings with him the lowest bidders he can find among workers—that is, those with the least bargaining power, the hungriest and most desperate workers in a depressed industry.

TO MAXIMIZE these human resources even further, we are told, it is necessary to work them longer hours without paying overtime. The eight-hour day, in the construction industry, interferes with productivity.

Along with that, of course, it is necessary to move industrial operations into the home. Obviously, productivity can be much higher if you can exploit people who are desperate for work—and their children, too—without paying the rent, without worrying about hours and overtime or health and safety laws or minimum wages or unions.

Now, once you put all this together, how do you keep it? Well, our opponents have thought of that. They remember how all these terrible restrictions on productivity and free enterprise came about in the first place. They remember the years and decades of constructive legislative and political action on the part of the trade union movement and the civil rights movement.

So, they are using their financial power as never before to control the legislative and electoral process. They have invented the negative political campaign, in which the candidate they support lies back as a perfectly innocent bystander while independent political action goes after his opponent—the candidates speaking up for the public interest, the one we think of as the good guy—with the dirtiest tricks and falsifications money can buy.

AND AT THE SAME TIME, of course, they are doing their best to kill or cripple the Voting Rights Act that opened the way for millions of minority citizens, for the first time in history, to take a hand in their country's political decision-making. They want to close the door on that, and keep it closed.

These are some of the methods by which our opponents are doing their best to take us back to 1881. In response, we can't afford to be any less united than our opponents.

We still have friends on the Hill, timid and demoralized though many of them may be. And we need to demonstrate, for the benefit of the lawmakers who have been cowed by the Administration's claim that it has a mandate from the people to rearrange American society along economic lines.

On Solidarity Day, Sept. 19, we are going to put on our walking shoes in the District of Columbia to prove that no such mandate exists, and every member of the Urban League is cordially invited to attend.

WE CALL IT Solidarity Day because it is meant to show that there is a deep and abiding sense of solidarity among the American people where issues of social justice and fair play are concerned. We want to put a little iron into the backbones of the lawmakers who have swallowed the line that the voters don't care.

Solidarity Day is for everyone, not just union members. The point is to show how broad a cross-section of America is willing to stand up and be counted in opposition to the President's program and in favor of jobs and justice.

And we want to show that come what may—win, lose or draw—whether it takes another hundred years or a thousand, we will not go away.

Solidarity Day to Put Focus On Impact of Reagan's Cuts

Organized labor's Solidarity Day protest set for Sept. 19 in Washington will draw into focus the frustration of millions of Americans over the Reagan Administration's plans to turn back the clock on 50 years of social and economic progress, AFL-CIO Sec.-Treas. Thomas R. Donahue declared in a network radio interview.

Between now and September, Donahue predicted, more and more Americans will become aware of the harmful results of the Reagan Budget cuts and the generally bad effect of the President's proposed tax cuts on the economy.

THE PLANNED demonstration in Washington ought to have a telling effect on the Administration and a more important effect on the people's representa-

tives in Congress, Donahue said on Labor News Conference. The protest should "make them understand a little better than they do just where the people are," he added.

Donahue said the nation's judgment of the Reagan Administration ultimately will come down to how well it handles the economy. Right now, he observed, the outlook is bleak.

"Take a look at what they're saying," he said. "They're saying that all of the budget cutting, all of the restrictions on the economy—the tight-money policy, the 20 percent interest rates, and so forth—all of that is going to produce two million extra jobs by 1986."

(Continued on Page 5)

Discontent on Reagan Policies Seen Focus of Labor's Protest

(Continued from Page 1)

"I hope we can wait. That's a long time for eight million to remain unemployed—a long time to wait for those two million extra jobs to be added to the economy. . . .

"IT SEEMS TO ME that a more effective program would be to try to find ways to keep the people employed in the meantime, not to create a budget which will, in and of itself, account for an extra million people unemployed."

Donahue acknowledged that the President is personally popular, but he stressed that "there is a great gap" between that assessment and "what the people's real attitudes are towards the individual actions of the Reagan Administration."

He said that congressional votes in which long-time supporters of the labor movement—both Democrats and Republicans—have switched to support Administration programs opposed by the labor movement reflect a hurried view. "They are

reading the tea leaves differently," he suggested. While "they're running with the pack" now, those elected representatives will respond differently "when the people's real attitudes are toward the individual horrors that are being visited upon them," he said.

DONAHUE REJECTED the contention of Labor Sec. Raymond Donovan that "workers have more to gain than to lose by going along with this program." Donovan, he pointed out, is "the same Labor Secretary who said the Supreme Court shouldn't apply the best health standards to workers in the textile industry . . . the same Labor Secretary who proposed a renewal of industrial homework—the worst kind of exploitation of the past."

"Sec. Donovan needs to take another look at all of these issues," he asserted, and "another look at the economic effects of the Reagan program."

AFL-CIO MASS RALLY IN WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 19

Local unions and councils will be asked to make arrangements to transport members to the rally. The Brotherhood expects to be represented by several thousand demonstrators.

A successful demonstration, Kirkland wrote the coalition groups, can "refocus the nation's attention on our goals of social and economic justice for all."

Details of the Solidarity Day program are being worked out and will be announced later. Kirkland said at a news conference after the Executive Council meeting that the goal is to bring to Washington a broad cross-section of the trade union movement and allied groups.

At its recent convention in Denver, Colo., the NAACP voted enthusiastic endorsement of the AFL-CIO's Solidarity Day demonstration and called on more than 2,200 local branches to take part in the September 19 rally in Washington.

Nearly 5,000 delegates to the 72nd annual convention of the nation's oldest civil rights organization applauded and adopted a Solidarity Day "emergency resolution" that was brought to the floor at the opening session of the convention.

Other special resolutions adopted at



SEPTEMBER 19, 1981

The AFL-CIO has set Saturday, September 19, for a massive "Solidarity Day" rally in the nation's capital "to protest the Reagan Administration's assault on social programs."

AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland invited all AFL-CIO affiliates, state and local bodies and the 150 member organizations of the Budget Coalition to join in "Solidarity Day."

"A demonstration of grass roots support for our mutual goals will be the most effective response to the Administration's claim that it has a mandate from the nation and speaks for the vast majority of the American people," Kirkland said.

He said the goal of "Solidarity Day" would be to promote jobs and justice and to reaffirm labor's historic commitment to social and economic progress.

John Perkins, associate director of the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE), is coordinator of "Solidarity Day." (Perkins, incidentally, is also a member of the United Brotherhood.) The union, church, social action, civil rights and women's organizations in the Budget Coalition were asked to designate a coordinator for the protest rally.

General President William Konyha has designated Charles Brodeur, a special assistant to his office, to serve as UBC coordinator. Brodeur will be assisted by General Rep. Leo Decker.

the same session with the support of the NAACP board sharply criticized Reagan Administration budget cuts and pressed for renewal of the Voting Rights Act.

The Solidarity Day resolution and a message from AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland stressed the long and close alliance between the trade union and civil rights movements.

In endorsing Solidarity Day, the NAACP cited the attempts by the Reagan Administration to "diminish or destroy" programs to help "the aged, the poor and the disadvantaged"



AFL-CIO

**SOLIDARITY
DAY**

SEPTEMBER 19, 1981

Washington, D.C.—On September 19, the voices of thousands of working people, their families and allies will ring throughout this city protesting the Reagan Administration's budget cuts.

That day—Solidarity Day—has been organized by the AFL-CIO to fight the administration's attack on social programs and services that affect millions of Americans.

In proposing the day of protest at AFL-CIO Executive Council meetings in Florida and Baltimore, AFSCME Pres. Jerry Wurf—an AFL-CIO vice president and Executive Council member—asserted that the action would be “a meaningful way for Americans to express their outrage at the

Reagan assault on jobs and services.

“AFSCME has fought the budget cuts from the start,” notes Wurf. “We believe people across the country are already seeing the disastrous consequences of the Reagan budget and will fight to save needed programs.”

Pres. Wurf, in a telegram to AFL-CIO Pres. Lane Kirkland, stated he has called a series of planning meetings to “ensure AFSCME's full participation in Solidarity Day.”

Announcing the rally, AFL-CIO Pres. Kirkland stated that “Solidarity Day will be the most effective response to the Administration's claim that it speaks for the working people of Amer-

ica and will show that union members insist on protecting the gains we've made over the last half-century.”

The Administration's budget cutting ax will fall heavily on the hundreds of services that union members provide in communities large and small across the country. AFSCME jobs at every level—state, county, city—are threatened under the Reagan onslaught.

Social Security pensions, on-the-job safety and health, job development and wage and hours standards, clean air and water legislation—all will be cut if the Administration has its way.

Well over a hundred organizations will be allying themselves with rank-

and-file union members to participate in the September 19 demonstrations. Civil rights activists, women's groups, environmentalists, senior citizens organizations and many other public interest groups are scheduled to take part.

The demonstration will include a march from the Washington Monument to the U.S. Capitol, entertainment and comments from various speakers.

The International will provide full details on the march, including transportation arrangements. September's PUBLIC EMPLOYEE will contain the latest information on this most important day of protest.

Mark it down—September 19—Solidarity Day.

Texas Unions Mounting Up For Solidarity Day Rally

Austin, Tex.—A record number of delegates to the Texas AFL-CIO Convention pledged strong support for the Solidarity Day protest in Washington Sept. 19 and state AFL-CIO President Harry Hubbard told a press conference that Texas would be well represented at the demonstration.

Hubbard said, "We cannot let the Reagan Administration undo 50 years of social progress without a fight. We've been in the streets before on picket lines, in civil rights marches and in a demonstration of support for a minimum wage for farm workers.

"WE'LL BE IN the streets in Washington on Sept. 19 to let the President know that Americans of conscience still care about retired people's social security, job development for youngsters from poor families, safety rules in workplace and educational opportunity for every child in the country."

Hubbard was re-elected to his fifth two-year term and Joe D. Gunn was re-elected

secretary-treasurer. Hubbard is a member of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers and Gunn is a member of the Communications Workers.

The delegates unanimously approved an increase in the per capita payment to the state federation from 30 cents to 40 cents a month.

Key speakers included Hispanic civil rights leader Ruben Bonilla, who is general counsel for the National LULAC organization; and Texas NAACP President A. C. Sutton, both of whom told delegates they personally will be in Washington for Solidarity Day along with other members of their organizations.

THE DELEGATES spent a day and a half of the four-day convention in 36 workshops covering topics ranging from grievances to polls, priorities and candidate recruiting.

House Majority Leader Jim Wright, who represents Fort Worth, Tex., in Congress, told delegates that Republicans had cried wolf about the "bankruptcy" of social security for the last 20 years. He stressed that "Congress will not allow the social security system to go bankrupt."

The convention expressed strong opposition to President Reagan's proposed "guest-worker" program, as part of his immigration policies, saying that it would be especially harmful to workers in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs in states along the Mexican border. The state chapter of the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement adopted a similar resolution.

HUBBARD TOLD the delegates in his report that membership in the Texas AFL-CIO had increased by 42,000 in the last two years and that it would top 300,000 by mid-August.

The convention put heavy emphasis on fund-raising for the Texas COPE. Cash contributions, pledges and sales of promotional items totaled \$143,550.

Election Message Distorted

Reagan Administration Bases Program on 'Invented Mandate'

The following is excerpted from an article in the *Washington Post*, June 28, 1981. The author is senior study director of the 1980 American National Election Study at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research.

By Arthur H. Miller

THIS MAY GO DOWN in political annals as the Year of the Invented Mandate.

Treasury Sec. Donald Regan, defending the Administration's three-year tax cut plan, proclaims that the president "was elected on this basis." Vice President George Bush declares that congressional opponents of the president's spending and tax cut proposals would "in effect thwart the mandate of the people."

Budget chief David Stockman adds his assertions that cuts in social programs are dictated by the elections, and Nevada Sen. Paul Laxalt defends anti-abortion, pro-capital punishment and other conservative social causes by contending: "That's what the election was all about. It is part of the Reagan mandate."

ALL THIS MAY or may not be good politics but it certainly is nonsense, and awfully repetitious nonsense at that. If Administration officials are going to keep it up, there is little choice but to repeat back, emphatically: That is not what the election was about. The accumulating evidence makes it quite clear that the November returns provided none of these claimed mandates, just as they did not represent the broader "historic political realignment" that more than a few observers have suggested.

The more limited and tentative messages of the election are particularly evident in the emerging findings of our 1980 American National Election Study at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research (ISR). These, I think, bear some scrutiny if we are to avoid, on this and other scores, the kind of inflated rhetoric which is not merely contrary to the majority's wishes but which may ultimately lead us back to deep disillusionment with our political system.

Consider, for example, Sec. Regan's imagined tax mandate. The reality, our study shows, is that less than half the Republicans and independents and only a third of the Democrats who voted for President Reagan favored his three-year tax cut proposal. The president clearly was not "elected on this basis," and later evidence gives no reason to believe his tax plan has inspired more confidence since November.

A NATIONWIDE POLL taken in mid-April by the Los Angeles Times found that less than half of all registered voters interviewed thought a Reagan-style, across-the-board tax cut would get the economy moving again. Similarly, the separate May ISR Survey of Consumer Attitudes showed that only 41 percent of respondents thought they would be better off if President Reagan's plan to reduce federal taxes and spending were enacted.

The same holds for the Administration's across-the-board cuts in social programs. The election provided no "mandate" for this drive, no matter what David Stockman pretends. On the contrary, our study confirms other findings showing that voters in 1980 continued to express their long-standing support for these programs.

NOR HAS ANY significant shift in preferences for social programs been detectable since the election. In April the CBS/New York Times Poll even reported that those identifying themselves as conservatives opposed spending reductions for such programs as the Comprehensive Employment & Training Act (government jobs for the unemployed) or loans to college students, both currently on the Reagan chopping block.

One could scarcely find better evidence of popular opposition to domestic spending reductions, in fact, than the fears of Reagan supporters about voting on individual program cuts in the House budget battle last week.

Least of all can one find evidence of Sen. Laxalt's mythical "mandate" on a social issue like abortion. If it needs saying again, in November, as for a decade, the country was firmly committed to a woman's right to have an abortion.

WHAT DID THE election say? It may leave political theologians on all sides unsatisfied, but the 1980 vote essentially was an expression of growing American worry about inflation and our slipping economic growth, as well as about U.S. military strength and prestige abroad—not a clear endorsement of specific means for solving these universally recognized concerns.

In other words, despite the striking Reagan sweep of the electoral college, the 1980 election was not ideological in terms of issues. Our study shows that ideology in fact played a less important role in 1980 than it did in 1976 to 1972.

A majority of both Carter and Reagan voters, for example, favored increased military spending. But they did not view this suddenly acquired preference—a response to events in Iran and Afghanistan—as a tradeoff for reduced outlays in long-supported domestic social programs. Rather, our study makes clear, military increases were supported *in addition* to domestic programs.

The support for reduced spending that voters did express in the 1980 election, our study shows, was more a response to the belief that waste and incompetence can be cut in all areas, defense as well as domestic, than an ideological rejection of all Great Society programs.

It should be abundantly clear from all this that Reagan did not have a mandate for most of his policies at election time and has not yet succeeded in establishing a popular consensus. The Administration's repeated claims to "mandates" can thus be seen as part of its attempt to in fact create such a consensus today, either by inventing popular wishes or using selective evidence to support its case.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF AFL-CIO UNION MEMBERS

Prepared for
Committee on Political Education
August 1980

by
Opinion Research Survey, Inc.
A Division of
Ruttenberg, Friedman, Kilgallon, Gutchess & Associates, Inc.
1211 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary	1
Introduction	1
Members Attitudes Toward Their Union	2
Union Strength and Anti-Union Sentiment	9
Legislative Activities of Unions	13
Members Opinions on "Right Wing" Issues	18
Government vs. Business in the Economy	30
Relative Ability of Political Parties to Solve Problems	34
Influences on Members' Opinions and Voting Behavior	36
The Role of Unions in Politics	44
Involvement of Union Members in Politics	48
Members' Registration and Voting	50
Demographic Characteristics of Union Members	52
Description of the Survey	59

SUMMARY

National Survey of AFL-CIO Union Members

A nationwide survey of AFL-CIO union members was taken in July, 1980 to elicit opinions and attitudes on political and legislative matters. The following is a summary of the results of that survey.

1. Union members give their unions a fair to good rating on the services they provide. Unions got the highest ratings for increasing medical benefits, improving health and safety conditions on the job, and increasing wages. Members gave unions low ratings for protecting members' jobs against plant closings, supporting candidates for the United States Congress and increasing workers' compensation benefits. In between, in ascending order, were increasing pensions, informing members about the voting records of Senators and Congressmen, supporting legislation in Congress that is important to workers, improving working conditions and representing members' grievances. The highest score on each service was consistently given by members living in the southern region of the country. Black union members tended to rate services higher than did white, with the notable exception of grievance processing.
2. More union members think that unions in this country are getting weaker than think that they are getting stronger. Exceptions are union members in the South, women and black union members, who think that unions are getting stronger.

Union members also overwhelmingly think that large corporations are becoming more anti-union. The highest level of anti-unionism was reported by members in government and transportation unions, and by members of unions in the western part of the country. The least perception of increasing anti-unionism came from members in the South. More union members also think their own employers are becoming more anti-union than think they are becoming less anti-union, but with far less certainty than for corporations in general.

Union members do think it would make a lot of difference to them if Congress passed legislation to restrict the rights of unions to organize and bargain. The benefits they would be most concerned about losing are pensions, medical benefits and wage increases, followed by job security, health and welfare benefits and cost-of-living increases. Very few were concerned about losing ground in working conditions, job safety or grievances and arbitration.

Most union members do not think that such legislation restricting unions has any likelihood of passage, nor do they think it matters which party is in control of Congress and the White House when it comes to passing such legislation.

- note* ✓
3. Union members feel that it is important that their unions be able to lobby for or against legislation of concern to labor, and that passage of a law that would curb the effectiveness of union's lobbying efforts would make a difference to them. Members of government unions felt most strongly about this.

Union members ranked the following issues from highest to lowest in terms of the effort unions should expend in getting them adopted: increase social security benefits, increase penalties for businesses that discriminate against union members, strengthen regulations against industrial pollution, put back controls over oil and gas, reform tax laws so that corporations pay a greater share, increase taxes on profits of oil companies, enact national health insurance, limit a corporation's ability to relocate factories overseas, adopt wage and price controls to fight inflation, prohibit businesses from asking their employees for political campaign contributions, and maintain the prevailing wage act for construction workers. The low score for maintaining the Davis-Bacon Act was a function of it being a construction issue and therefore a large number of "don't know" answers.

- NOTE* ✓
4. Those issues that the "right wing" politicians have adopted as their own appear to ring responsive notes in somewhat more than one-half of union members. Seventy-two percent of union members are opposed to cuts in defense spending, 65 percent of union members favor a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget, 60 percent of union members are opposed to the Panama Canal Treaty, 51 percent of union members are opposed to imposing strict controls over handguns, and 44 percent of union members oppose legalized-abortion. Despite the popularity of these stands that are usually espoused by conservative candidates, traditional union issues are given great weight by even the union members feeling most strongly on the "conservative" issues when deciding for which candidates to vote for Congress. The right of unions to organize and bargain is considered more important by between 67 and 78 percent of the union members feeling most strongly on the various "conservative" issues in deciding their vote for congressional candidates. Curbing foreign imports is considered more important by between 55 and 74 percent of the union members feeling most strongly on the "conservative" issues, and industrial health and safety on the job is considered more important than the candidate's stand on the "conservative" issue by between 58 and 73 percent of union members most strongly supporting

*political conservatism
but
without
weakening
member
support
for unions.*

✓ the "conservative" position. In each case, opposition to the right of unions to organize and bargain caused the most union members to desert the candidate with whom they agreed on the "conservative" issue.

- NOTE
5. Union members think that government is more to blame for the country's economic problems than is business by a three to one margin. Given two series of arguments, the first typically put forth by candidates who blame government for the country's economic difficulties, and the second series those typically put forth by candidates who blame corporations for the country's economic difficulties, however, the union members tended to agree with both sets of statements, indicating more ambivalence on the question of who is to blame than was elicited by the previous, more straightforward question.

NOTE

By a two-to-one margin, union members feel that there is too much government regulation of business. This position was held most strongly by members of manufacturing unions, members living in the West, members living in rural areas, members who are 60 years of age or older, and members who identified themselves as Republicans. Only black union members felt notably more strongly that there was not enough government regulation of business.

- NOTE
Decline in belief that Democrats are efficacious.
6. The membership was divided about which political party in Congress is best able to solve our economic problems with 32 percent saying Democrats, 18 percent Republicans, 32 percent that neither party is able or that they are both equally able to solve our economic problems, and 18 percent unsure.

✓ Responses were still more evenly divided on which party in Congress is better able to solve our foreign policy problems, with 28 percent of the union members saying Democrats, 24 percent Republicans, 26 percent neither or both would be equal, and 23 percent unsure.

When the questions on economic problems and foreign policy problems are considered together, the results show a great deal of uncertainty among union members about the ability of either political party to solve the country's problems. Only 22 percent answered that the Democrats would be best in solving both economic and foreign policy problems. Fourteen percent answered that Republicans would be best in both areas. And 63 percent either split their answers, answered that neither party would be good or both would be equally good, or that they didn't know.

7. Union members were presented with the possibility of various groups and individuals who might support a candidates' campaign for political office, and asked how the support would influence their inclination to vote for or against a candidate. The groups and individuals presented were business leaders, such as the U. S. Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers, a labor group, the oil industry, a conservative group, religious leaders, a civil rights group, an environmentalist group, a women's rights group, Ralph Nader, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson, and the local newspaper. The only groups or individuals that elicited strong responses from the membership were labor groups, which produced a strong positive response, and oil companies, which produced a strong negative response. Support by business groups and by civil rights groups received a mildly negative response from the union members. The influence of support from all other groups was evenly divided between those members who would be more inclined to vote for the supported candidate and those who would be less inclined to vote for that candidate.

Three-fourths of union members get a magazine or newspaper from their national or international union. Readership of the union publications was fairly high, with half of those receiving them nearly always reading the publication and another one-fourth reading it half the time. One third rate the publications as very reliable, with another one-half rating them as fairly reliable.

✓ The majority of union members said that they would place "only some" confidence in information received about candidates for U. S. Congress from either their national or international union headquarters, the state AFL-CIO, or their own local union. About one-half of the union members say that they have received information about congressional candidates from the international or state level, while about three-fifths have received information from their local. Thirty-two percent of union members say that they have received information from all three union levels, while 22 percent say that they have never received information from any level of union organization.

8. ✓ Between one-half to two-thirds of the members think that unions should engage in various activities related to congressional elections. In decreasing order of approval, members think that unions should send their members impartial information about candidates for the U. S. Congress, conduct opinion polls among members, endorse candidates, and make voting recommendations to members. Only one-third of union members said that a union should ask its members for financial contributions for its political campaigns,

either on behalf of particular candidates or general issues. Slightly over one-half of those think that less than \$10 would be a reasonable amount for which to ask.

Most union members think that their unions should make a great effort to get their members to register and vote, some effort to hold meetings for their members to hear competing candidates for Congress, some effort to send letters to their members listing the candidates for Congress they endorse, some effort to call union members on the phone just before election day to remind them to vote, somewhat less than some effort to hand out leaflets for candidates at work, shopping centers and polling places, and virtually no effort to make personal visits to members' homes on behalf of candidates.

A small proportion (between 7 and 16 percent) of union members report that they have ever been involved in any one of various political election activities. A higher proportion of members of government unions, members living in the South, higher educated, black union members and members who vote a straight Democratic ticket are politically active. The highest level of political activity was reported by black union members, of whom 16 percent said that they had participated in all six types of political activities mentioned.

Forty-two percent of union members have contributed money to a candidate for some political office.

✓ // When political activity and giving of money are considered together, 15 percent of union members have both engaged in at least one political activity and have given political contributions, and an additional 33 percent of the membership has either engaged in political activity or given money. The remainder, 53 percent of the union membership, is completely inactive politically.

NOTE

If union members were to give a political contribution to their union, they would want that money used for legislative activity rather than for candidates by a three to one margin.

By more than a two to one margin, union members think that business contributes more money to political candidates than does labor.

Sixty percent of the union members are already registered to vote in the November, 1980 election and another 35 percent say that they intend to register, with only 4 percent saying that they will not register and 1 percent uncertain.

✓ Fifty-eight percent of the union membership identified itself as Democrats either by inclination or by registration and 19 percent identified themselves as Republicans.

Nearly all of the union members who are registered or intend to register also intend to vote in November. Eighty-three percent say that they almost certainly will vote, 8 percent that they probably will vote, and 5 percent that they may not or probably won't or don't know.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF AFL-CIO UNION MEMBERS

A nationwide cross section of AFL-CIO union members was surveyed regarding their attitudes and opinions on a number of political and legislative topics. These included:

1. their attitude toward their union and the benefits and services it provides,
2. their perception of current attitudes toward unions,
3. their attitude toward legislative activities of unions,
4. opinions on "Right Wing" legislative issues,
5. the role of government versus the role of business in the economy,
6. the relative ability of the two political parties to solve the nation's problems,
7. the importance of various influences and information sources on union members' opinions and voting behavior, and
8. the appropriate role of unions in national and local politics.

In addition, union members were asked questions about their own political party preferences and voting patterns and about their level of political activism. The answers of the union members to these questions were cross tabulated by the industry affiliation of their union, by geographic location and by the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The following are the results of that survey.

1. Attitudes Toward Their Union

Respondents were asked how good a job their union is doing providing a series of services to their members. The services asked about were increasing pensions, improving working conditions, supporting legislation in Congress that is important to workers, informing members about the voting records of Senators and Congressmen, increasing wages, supporting candidates for United States Congress, representing members' grievances, increasing workers' compensation benefits, increasing medical benefits, protecting members' jobs against plant closings, and improving health and safety conditions on the job.

Taking all of the services together (see Table 13) 13 percent of the respondents rated their unions as doing an excellent to good job, 54 percent thought their unions were doing a good to fair job, and 33 percent thought it was doing a fair to poor job. Unions in the communications industry were given the highest rating, with 16 percent of the respondents rating the services as excellent to good, 64 percent as good to fair and only 20 percent as fair to poor. The lowest rating was given to unions in the transportation industry, with only 9 percent saying services were excellent to good, 50 percent saying they were good to fair, and 42 percent saying the services were fair to poor. Union members who are Republicans rated union services somewhat lower than union members who vote a straight Democratic ticket. Sixty-two percent of the Republicans rated union services excellent to good, as compared to 76 percent of the straight Democratic voters.

On the individual services (Tables 2-12), unions were given the highest marks for increasing medical benefits, improving health and safety conditions on the job, and increasing wages. On a scale of 1 to 4, from poor to excellent, increasing medical benefits got a score of 2.58, health and safety a score of 2.56, and increasing wages a score of 2.53. The lowest ratings were given for protecting members' jobs against plant closings (2.01), supporting candidates for the United States Congress (2.04) and increasing workers' compensation benefits (2.09). In between, in ascending order, were increasing pensions (2.16), informing members about the voting records of Senators and Congressmen (2.17), supporting legislation in Congress that is important to workers (2.33), improving working conditions (2.46) and representing members' grievances (2.48).

There was more variation of opinions about union services between union members in different industries on certain services than on others. One of these was informing members about the voting records of Senators and Congressmen. While the total population gave the unions a score of 2.17 on this service (on the scale of one to four, poor to excellent), scores ranged from 2.49 from members of government unions and 2.32 from members of communications unions to 1.88 from members of sales unions and 1.99 from members of service unions (Table 5). A similar pattern was apparent in supporting candidates for United States Congress, where scores were highest from members of communications unions and lowest from members of sales unions (Table 7). Finally, there was wide variation in the opinions of

members of different industries on the effectiveness of unions in protecting members' jobs against plant closings. Low scores were given by members of service (1.74), construction (1.78) and government (1.79) unions, while much higher scores were given by members of manufacturing (2.21), communications (2.31) and sales (2.25) unions (Table 11).

The highest score on each service was consistently given by members living in the southern region of the country. Notably low scores were given by members in the central region for supporting candidates for United States Congress, by members in the western region for increasing workers' compensation benefits, and by members in the central region for protecting members' jobs against plant closings.

Here are some specifics on the eleven issues.

On increasing pensions, black union members felt that unions were doing a considerably better job than did white union members. Slightly better opinions of unions' effectiveness in increasing pensions was held by members who had not completed high school than by those who had high school educations or better, by members who were middle aged (40-59) than those who were younger or older, and by men than women.

Opinions on unions' efforts to improve working conditions were highest among union members with the least education and lowest among members who had education beyond high school. The oldest group of workers (60+) gave the unions the best rating and the youngest

group (under 40) had the least opinion of union effectiveness.

Union efforts to increase wages were given the highest scores by those union members with the highest family income and the lowest score by members with the lowest family income.

Union members with the least education thought unions were doing the best job, while those with the highest education were the least favorable. Opinion of union effectiveness in raising wages increased with increasing age. There was little difference between men and women or blacks and whites. Catholics thought that unions were doing a slightly better job than did Protestants.

Union effectiveness in representing members' grievances was considered highest by those workers with the most family income and the most education and lowest by those with the least income and education. Men thought unions to be more effective in representing grievances than did women, as did whites than blacks. It is perhaps significant that representing grievances is the only union service on which black members rated unions notably lower than did white members, while it is at the same time the only one of the services listed that unions perform for individuals rather than the membership as a group. On all other services, blacks either rated the union services higher or there was no difference.

For increasing workers' compensation, the lowest income group gave the most favorable rating. This is the only one of the union services for which this is true. The oldest union members gave the highest rating and the middle aged members the lowest.

Efforts at increasing medical benefits were perceived as slightly better by workers with the highest family income, but also slightly better by those with the least education. Neither these nor any other differences were great. Unions got high scores across the board for this service.

Protecting members against plant closings was rated somewhat better by members in both the middle income and the middle education category. It also got a slightly better rating from the youngest group of members and a notably better rating from blacks than from whites.

Improving health and safety benefits on the job received a relatively higher rating from high school graduates than from those members who had gone beyond high school, a slightly higher rating from middle aged than from younger members, and a slightly higher rating from blacks than whites.

Supporting legislation in Congress that is important to workers, was given a somewhat higher rating by middle income workers than by lower or higher income workers. There was no difference by education of the worker. Middle aged workers had a considerably higher opinion than did younger workers, with older workers falling in the middle. Black members thought that unions were doing a better job than did white workers, as did Catholics than Protestants.

On supporting candidates for Congress, middle income workers were again the most favorable. Workers with the least education held higher opinions of unions' support of candidates than did those with high school educations or better. In this case, the oldest group

of workers gave unions the best score, with the lowest score given by the youngest members. Most interestingly, black union members gave unions an overwhelmingly higher score on supporting candidates than did white union members (2.51 vs 1.99).

Few major differences appeared on the service of informing members about the voting records of Senators and Congressmen. Somewhat more favorable scores were given by the highest income union members, by the oldest union members, and by blacks than whites.

These opinions of these union services by the characteristics of the union members is summarized in the following table.

Opinion of Union Services by Worker Characteristics -- Summary

	<u>Income</u>			<u>Education</u>			<u>Age</u>			<u>Sex</u>		<u>Race</u>		<u>Religion</u>	
	<u>Under \$15M</u>	<u>\$15-\$25</u>	<u>More \$25M</u>	<u>12-</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12+</u>	<u>Under 40</u>	<u>40-59</u>	<u>60+</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>W</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>Protestant</u>	<u>Catholic</u>
Pensions	-	-	-	H	L		L	H		H	L	L	H	L	H
Working conditions	-	-	-	H	L		L	H		-	-	-	-	-	-
Wages	L		H	H	L		L		H	-	-	-	-	L	H
Grievances	L		H	L	H		-	-	-	H	L	H	L	-	-
Workers' Compensation	H	L			H	L			L	H	-	-	-	-	-
Medical Benefits	L		H	H	L		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L	H
Plant Closings	L	H			H	L	H	L		-	-	L	H	-	-
Health and Safety	-	-	-		H	L	L	H		-	-	L	H	-	-
Supporting Legislation		H	L	-	-	-	L	H		-	-	L	H	L	H
Supporting Candidates	L	H		H	L	L		H		-	-	L	H	L	H
Informing about voting records	L		H	-	-	-	L		H	-	-	L	H	L	H

2. Union Strength and Anti-Union Sentiment

✓ More union members think that unions in this country are getting weaker than think that they are getting stronger (Table 14). Thirty-three percent of all respondents think that unions are getting stronger, 42 percent think that they are getting weaker, 14 percent think that they are staying the same, and 10 percent don't know. Members of sales unions perceive the most strength, with 40 percent saying they are getting stronger and 41 percent saying they are getting weaker. Members of construction unions perceive the least strength, with 25 percent saying they are getting stronger and 48 percent saying they are getting weaker. Union members in the southern region of the country, where the most organizing activity is taking place, see unions as getting stronger by a 42 percent (getting stronger) to 34 percent (getting weaker) margin. By characteristics of union members, both women and blacks perceive unions to be getting stronger rather than weaker, in contrast to the opinions of the total union population. Forty percent of women think unions are getting stronger and 36 percent think they are getting weaker, while 44 percent of black members think they are getting stronger and 39 percent think they are getting weaker. Union members who vote a straight Democratic ticket also think that unions are getting stronger, while union members who consider themselves Democrats but split their tickets and Republican union members think that unions are getting weaker in about equal proportions.

✓ Union members overwhelmingly think that large corporations are becoming more anti-union (Table 15). Fifty-eight percent of the respondents think that corporations are becoming more anti-union,

while only 21 percent think they are becoming less anti-union. Eight percent saw no difference and 13 percent didn't know. The highest level of anti-unionism was reported by members in government and transportation unions, and by members of unions in the western part of the country. The least perception of increasing anti-unionism came from members in the South. When asked whether their own employer was becoming more or less anti-union, union members were far less definite (Table 16). Thirty-five percent reported that their own employer was becoming more anti-union, 23 percent less anti-union, 16 percent saw no difference, and 26 percent were unsure. The large increase in uncertainty came primarily from those workers in the lowest income and education categories. Forty-five percent of the former and 36 percent of the latter responded that they didn't know whether their employer was becoming more or less anti-union.

✓ Respondents to the survey were asked whether it would make a difference to them if Congress passed legislation that would help corporations resist union organizing and collective bargaining and hence their union could not bargain as vigorously as it does now (Table 17). Fifty-four percent of the union members respond that it would make a lot of difference to them, 22 percent that it would make some difference, 20 percent that it would make no difference, and 4 percent didn't know. Members of communications unions felt that it would make the most difference, while members of service unions were least concerned. More southern members felt that it would make a lot of difference than did members in any other region. More higher income members and members between the ages of 40 and 59 felt

it would make a lot of difference, as did more men than women.

Union members were asked to volunteer what one or two union benefits won through collective bargaining they would be most concerned about losing if such legislation were to pass. Twenty-six percent mentioned pensions or retirement benefits. This contrasts to the rather low rating given unions in providing pension services through collective bargaining. In addition, 21 percent mentioned medical benefits and 21 percent wages or wage increases. The next issue dropped in terms of mentions to 8 percent for job security, and then 5 percent each for health and welfare and cost of living increases. Interestingly, only 3 percent mentioned working conditions or job safety and only 2 percent mentioned grievances or arbitration, despite the relatively high ratings given to those union services in the earlier question.

Union members did not think that such legislation restricting the right of unions to organize and bargain had a very great likelihood of passage (Table 19). Only 4 percent said such legislation is very likely to pass, 20 percent think it is somewhat likely to pass, 61 percent felt it is not likely to pass, and 14 percent didn't know. Black union members are the only group to be more pessimistic. Four percent of black members think it is very likely and 31 percent think it is somewhat likely to pass.

Amazingly, most union members do not think it makes any difference which party is in control of Congress and the White House when it comes to passing such legislation restricting unions. Sixty

percent of union members felt it makes no difference which party is in control, while only 30 percent felt that such legislation is more likely with the Republicans in control.

3. Legislative Activities of Unions

Union members feel that it is important that their unions be able to lobby for or against legislation of concern to labor. When asked if passage of a law that would curb the effectiveness of unions' lobbying efforts would make a difference to them, personally, 46 percent of union members responded that it would make a lot of difference, 30 percent that it would make some difference, 21 percent that it would make no difference, and 1 percent didn't know (Table 21). As might be expected, members of government unions felt most strongly on the subject. Fifty-seven percent of government union members indicated that it would make a lot of difference.

Union members were asked about a series of legislative proposals that unions are interested in, and how much effort they think unions should expend in getting each one adopted (Tables 22-32). Overall, union members wanted a lot of effort put into these legislative proposals. Ranked on a scale of 1 to 3 (no effort equals one, some effort equals 2, a lot of effort equals 3), union members wanted effort spent on the following proposals in descending order: increase social security benefits (2.39), increase penalties for businesses that discriminate against union members (2.39), strengthen regulations against industrial pollution (2.33), put back controls over oil and gas (2.30), reform tax laws so that corporations pay a greater share (2.30), increase taxes on profits of oil companies (2.25), enact national health insurance (2.20), limit a corporation's ability to relocate factories overseas (2.15), adopt wage and price controls to fight inflation (2.14), prohibit businesses from asking their

*Note
Union
members want
legislative
activity for
social aims.*

employees for political campaign contributions (2.06), and maintain the prevailing wage act for construction workers (1.29). The low score for maintaining the Davis-Bacon Act was a function of it being a construction issue and therefore a large number of "don't know" answers.

Union members were fairly well in accord on increasing social security benefits, with no major differences between groups. Overall, 61 percent wanted a lot of effort spent, 22 percent wanted some effort spent, and 10 percent wanted no effort.

On enacting national health insurance, members of communications unions wanted much less effort spent than did other union members. Forty-two percent of members of communications unions wanted a lot of effort spent on enacting national health insurance, as compared to 54 percent of the total union population. Seventy percent of those who rent their residences wanted a lot of effort spent. The amount of effort desired varied inversely with both income and education, with those with lowest family incomes and the lowest level of education wanting the most effort spent. Blacks wanted more effort spent than did whites, as did Catholics than Protestants. Not surprisingly, fewer Republicans wanted a lot of effort spent (44 percent) and more members who vote a straight Democratic ticket wanted a lot of effort expended (74 percent).

On strengthening regulations against industrial pollution, 53 percent of union members want a lot of effort expended, 32 percent some effort, and 8 percent no effort. Members of government and

sales unions want somewhat more effort than members of other industries. Younger members are somewhat more interested in having a lot of effort in this area, as are Catholics than Protestants. Finally, straight Democratic voters are more interested in having a lot of effort spent than are Republican union members.

Fifty-eight percent of union members want their unions to expend a lot of effort to put controls back on oil and gas prices, while 54 percent want a lot of effort expended to increase the taxes on profits of oil companies. The proportion of those who want a lot of effort expended reimposing controls is slightly greater among union members in the lowest family income and lowest education groups.

A lot of effort to reform tax laws so that corporations pay a greater share is desired by 53 percent of union members. A somewhat larger proportion of black union members than white desire a lot of effort to be expended.

Forty-seven percent of union members want a lot of effort expended by their unions to secure adoption of wage and price controls to fight inflation. Twenty-eight percent want some effort expended, and 19 percent want no effort expended. A higher proportion (59%) of those who rent their residences want a lot of effort to secure wage and price controls, as do a higher proportion (56%) of lower income union members. Black union members are also more favorable to action in this area (61% want a lot of effort). Surprisingly, about as many Republican union members (45%) as Democratic (49%) want a lot of

but this is not a large overwhelming majority

✓

effort on adoption of wage and price controls. More union members who vote a straight Democratic ticket (56%) want strong action in this area.

A lot of effort to increase penalties for businesses that discriminate against union members was supported by 59 percent of union members. Twenty-seven percent would like some effort, and 8 percent no effort. Desire for this type of legislation is strongest in the South, where 71 percent of members would like a lot of effort expended, and among black members, of whom 75 percent would like to see a lot of effort.

Almost half (46%) of the respondents to the survey had no opinion about maintenance of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage act. Twenty-six percent wanted a lot of effort expended maintaining the prevailing wage, 23 percent wanted some effort expended and 5 percent wanted no effort expended. As might be expected, a larger proportion of members of construction unions (48%) wanted a lot of effort expended. Even among the construction union members, however, 29 percent had no opinion and 16 percent had never heard of the prevailing wage or the Davis-Bacon Act. A slightly larger proportion of all union members in the South than the total membership wanted a lot of effort expended (35%) and desire for a lot of effort increased with the age of the members. The difference between the effort desired between Republican and Democratic union members was smaller than might be expected, with 23 percent of Republicans and 29 percent of Democrats wanting a lot of effort expended.

A lot of effort to limit a corporation's ability to relocate factories overseas was desired by 52 percent of the union members. The most effort was desired by manufacturing union members (58%), and the least by sales union members (42%). Union members who are Democrats wanted somewhat more effort than those who are Republican (55% vs. 45% want a lot of effort).

✓ Finally, only 44 percent of union members wanted a lot of effort expended to prohibit businesses from asking their employees for political campaign contributions. Government union members were strongest on this issue, with 57 percent desiring a lot of effort. The least effort was desired by members of sales unions. The desire for a lot of effort was highest among the highest income union members, of whom 53 percent wanted a lot of effort, and lowest among the lowest income members, of whom 37 percent wanted a lot of effort.

4. Members' Opinions on "Right Wing" Issues

Those issues that the "right wing" politicians have adopted as their own appear to ring responsive notes in somewhat more than one-half of union members. Seventy-two percent of union members are opposed to cuts in defense spending, 65 percent of union members favor a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget, 60 percent of union members are opposed to the Panama Canal Treaty, 51 percent of union members are opposed to imposing strict controls over handguns, and 44 percent of union members oppose legalized abortion. Despite the popularity of these stands that are usually espoused by conservative candidates, traditional union issues are given great weight by even the union members feeling most strongly on the "conservative" issues when deciding for which candidates to vote for Congress. The right of unions to organize and bargain is considered more important by between 67 and 78 percent of the union members feeling most strongly on the various "conservative" issues in deciding their vote for congressional candidates. Curbing foreign imports is considered more important by between 55 and 74 percent of the union members feeling most strongly on the "conservative" issues, and industrial health and safety on the job is considered more important than the candidate's stand on the "conservative" issue by between 58 and 73 percent of union members most strongly supporting the "conservative" position. Based on supplemental data not shown in the tables, between one-third to one-half of the union members are consistently pulled away from the candidate holding the "conservative"

✓
L
But this would be significant only if conservative candidates advocated these specific anti-union positions.

position by all three "union" issues.

Handgun Controls -- A slight majority of union members are opposed to legislation that would establish strict controls over handguns (Table 35). Twenty-five percent of the members are very much opposed to such legislation, 26 percent are somewhat opposed, 13 percent are somewhat in favor of legislating strict controls over handguns and 30 percent are very much in favor of such legislation. Of the 25 percent who are very much opposed to handgun controls, about one-half (13 percent of the total sample) reported that they would vote against a candidate who supported handgun controls even if that candidate agreed with them on all other issues.

Opposition to handgun controls is strongest among construction union members (63% somewhat ^{or} very much opposed) and least among government union members (37% somewhat or very much opposed). Opposition is much greater in the western part of the country, where 66 percent of union members are somewhat or very much opposed to the controls, and least in the northeast, where only 37 percent of members are opposed. Sixty-seven percent of union members living in rural areas are opposed to controls, as compared to 43 percent of members living in cities. Only 29 percent of union members renting their residences are opposed to handgun controls, as compared to 54 percent of those owning their homes. Opposition to controls on handguns increases with income. Fifty-seven percent of those with family incomes above \$25,000 oppose controls on handguns, as against 43 percent of those with incomes below \$15,000. More men

blw-union
vs.
white-collar?

than women oppose handgun controls (55% of men and 32% of women) while far more white union members oppose handgun controls than do black members (54% of whites and only 24% of blacks). In short, those most likely to be exposed to urban violence are most likely to support handgun controls. Somewhat more Republicans than Democrats oppose handgun controls (56% vs. 48%) and many more Republicans than Democrats are very much opposed to handgun controls (32% vs. 19%).

Those respondents who were very much opposed to legislation controlling handguns were also asked to consider how they would vote if a candidate for U. S. Congress was in agreement with them in opposition to handgun controls, but he also was against various specific union issues (Table 40). In all cases, the union issue overrode the opposition to handgun controls by a wide margin. If the candidate was against handgun controls but also against the right of unions to organize and bargain collectively, 67 percent of the respondents indicated that they would vote against him and only 10 percent said they would vote for him anyway. When the choice related to a candidate who was against controls on handguns but also against cuts in foreign imports that limit jobs of U. S. workers, 62 percent of the union members said they would vote against that candidate, and 18 percent said that they would vote for him anyway. Given the situation of a candidate who was against handgun controls but also against stronger industrial health and safety regulations for workers on their jobs, 58 percent of the union members indicated that they would vote against that candidate, while 26 percent that they would

1

vote for the candidate anyway.

Legalized Abortion -- Union members are split in their opinions about legalizing abortion (Table 36). Forty-one percent of members are very much or somewhat in favor of legalizing abortion, while 44 percent are somewhat or very much opposed to legalized abortion. Twenty-four percent of union members are very much opposed to legalized abortion. Of those 24 percent who are very much opposed, one-half (12 percent of the total sample) said that they would vote against a candidate for Congress who supported legalized abortion even if that candidate agreed with them on everything else.

Opposition to legalized abortion is greatest in the southern part of the country, where 52 percent oppose it, and least in the West, where it is opposed by only 35 percent of union members. Those union members with the least income and the least education are most opposed to legalized abortion. Fifty-nine percent of those with family incomes below \$15,000 are opposed to legalized abortion, as compared to 37 percent of those with incomes of \$25,000 or more. Similarly, 50 percent of those who had not completed high school are opposed, as compared to 37 percent of those who have educations beyond high school. Women tend to be more polarized in their opinions than are men, with 22 percent of women very much in favor and 37 percent of women very much opposed. This compares with 18 percent of men very much in favor and 21 percent of men very much opposed. Somewhat more Catholics are opposed to legalized abortion than are Protestants, although the difference is not as great as might be expected. Forty-three percent of Protestants

are somewhat or very much opposed, as compared to 52 percent of Catholics. Thirty-one percent of Catholics are very much opposed, however, as compared to 19 percent of Protestants. There is no difference between Republicans and Democrats on this issue.

When a candidate who is against traditional union issues as well as against legalized abortion is hypothesized, the union issues pull between one-half and two-thirds of those respondents very much opposed to legalized abortion away from voting on the basis of that position. When those respondents who were very much opposed to legalized abortion were asked to consider how they would vote if a candidate shared their opposition to abortion, but also was against the right of unions to organize and bargain collectively, 68 percent of the respondents said that they would vote against that candidate, 17 percent would vote for him anyway, and 15 percent were unsure. When the candidate was said to be in agreement with the union member in opposition to legalized abortion, but also was against cuts in foreign imports that limit jobs of U. S. workers, 55 percent of the respondents said that they would vote against that candidate, 24 percent would vote for him anyway, and 21 percent were unsure. Given the situation in which the candidate shared the union members opposition to legalized abortion but also was against stronger industrial health and safety regulations for workers on their jobs, 59 percent of the members said they would vote against that candidate, 25 percent would vote for him anyway, and 15 percent were unsure.

*note possible
response
via →*

Panama Canal Treaty -- Sixty percent of union members oppose the Panama Canal Treaty that was ratified by the Senate in 1978 (Table 37). Thirty percent each are very much opposed and somewhat opposed, 14 percent are somewhat in favor, 8 percent are very much in favor and 18 percent don't know. Slightly over one-third of those who are very much opposed to the treaty say that they would vote against a candidate who supported the treaty even if that candidate agreed with them on everything else.

Opposition to the Panama Canal Treaty was greatest among construction union members (68% somewhat or very much opposed) and least among service union members (45% somewhat or very much opposed). Regional differences were slight. More men than women and more blacks than whites were opposed to the treaty. Somewhat more Republicans (69%) than Democrats (59%) were also opposed to the treaty.

Those respondents who were very much opposed to the Panama Canal Treaty were also asked to consider how they would vote if a candidate for the U. S. Congress was in agreement with them in opposition to the treaty, but also was against various specific union issues (Table 42). Again, in all cases the union issue overrode the opposition to the treaty in determining voting behavior by a wide margin. Given a situation in which the candidate agreed with the respondent's opposition to the treaty, but also was against the right of unions to organize and bargain collectively, 70 percent of the union members indicated that they would vote against that candidate. Eleven percent said that they would vote for him anyway, and 18 percent said that they didn't know or

that it depended. In the case in which a candidate agreed with the respondents opposition to the treaty, but was also against cuts in foreign imports that limit jobs of U. S. workers, 59 percent of the respondents said that they would vote against that candidate, 18 percent said that they would vote for him anyway, and 23 percent were unsure. When asked about a candidate who agreed with their opposition to the treaty but was against stronger industrial health and safety regulations for workers on their jobs, 70 percent of union members said that they would vote against that candidate, 18 percent said that they would vote for him anyway, and 12 percent didn't know.

Government Spending and a Balanced Budget -- A large majority

Note // //

of union members are in favor of a constitutional amendment requiring that the federal budget be balanced -- 65 percent in all (Table 38). Twenty-two percent of union members are very much in favor of a balanced budget amendment, 43 percent are somewhat in favor, 14 percent are somewhat opposed, 10 percent are very much opposed, and 12 percent have no opinion. Of the 22 percent who are very much in favor of the balanced budget amendment, slightly over one-fourth report that they would vote against a candidate who opposed a balanced budget amendment even if that candidate agreed with them on everything else. There are no major differences among industry or regional groupings or demographic characteristics on this issue. The support for a balanced budget amendment is seen across the board.

✓

Despite the strong support for a balanced budget amendment that is shown, union issues readily pull union members away from their stand on this subject (Table 43). Those respondents who were very much in favor of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget were asked to consider how they would vote if a candidate for the U. S. Congress was in agreement with them in support of a balanced budget amendment but was also against various specific union issues. Given the situation in which the candidate agreed with the respondent on the need for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, but was opposed to the right of unions to organize and bargain collectively, 78 percent of the respondents said that they would vote against that candidate. Only 12 percent indicated that they would vote for him anyway, and 11 percent didn't know. If the candidate agreed with the union member that an amendment to balance the budget was necessary, but was also against cuts in foreign imports that limit jobs of U. S. workers, 74 percent of the union members said that they would vote against that candidate and only 12 percent said that they would vote for him. In the situation in which the candidate agreed with the respondents support of a balanced budget amendment but was against stronger industrial health and safety regulations for workers on their jobs, 73 percent of the respondents said they would vote against that candidate, while 18 percent would vote for him anyway.

Defense Spending -- Union members are overwhelmingly opposed to cuts in defense spending (Table 39). Seventy-two percent of the respondents oppose cuts in defense spending, with 38 percent very much

opposed and 34 percent somewhat opposed. Fifteen percent are somewhat in favor and 7 percent are very much in favor of defense cuts. Of the 38 percent very much opposed to the cuts, well over one-half (22 percent of the total sample) would vote against a candidate who favored defense cuts even if that candidate agreed with them on everything else. Five percent of the total were uncertain how they would vote in that situation, and 12 percent would vote for the candidate who favored defense cuts but agreed with them on everything else. The 27 percent of the respondents who said that they would vote against the candidate who favored defense cuts even if that candidate agreed with them on everything else and the 5 percent who were unsure were also asked two additional questions. Most of the respondents in that category (20 percent of the total sample) responded that the cutbacks in defense spending that took place during the 1970s has reduced the U. S.'s ability to respond to Soviet aggression. Most (16 percent of the total sample) also indicated, however, that they would not vote against a candidate today who had supported defense cuts in the 1970s if that candidate now was in favor of increased military spending.

✓ A somewhat greater proportion of southern union members were opposed to cuts in defense spending than those in any other region (86 percent opposed with 44 percent strongly opposed). Rural union members were also more likely to be opposed, showing 81 percent opposed to cuts with 45 percent strongly opposed. There was little difference by demographic characteristics of respondents and little

difference between Republicans and Democrats on this issue.

Although sentiment against defense spending cuts was extremely strong among union members, union issues were considered more important in determining voting behavior by a sizeable majority of those who felt most strongly on the issue (Table 44). Those union members who were very much opposed to cuts in defense spending were asked how they would vote if a candidate for the U. S. Congress shared their opposition to defense spending cuts but was also opposed to several specific union issues. Given a candidate who was opposed to defense cuts but was also opposed to the right of unions to organize and bargain collectively, 70 percent of the union members feeling most strongly on the issue said that they would not vote for such a candidate, 12 percent indicated that they would vote for him anyway and 18 percent were unsure. When the supposition involved a candidate who was in agreement with the respondent in opposition to defense cuts but was also against cuts in foreign imports that limit jobs of U. S. workers, 59 percent said they would vote against that candidate, 23 percent said they would vote for him anyway and 18 percent were unsure. In the situation of a candidate that was opposed to defense spending cuts but also opposed to stronger industrial health and safety regulations for workers on their jobs, 61 percent said that they would vote against that candidate, 22 percent would vote for him anyway, and again 18 percent were unsure.

The following table summarizes the pull that "union" issues exert away from "conservative" positions held strongly by union members. For each "conservative" issue, candidate opposition to the right of unions

Right Wing vs. Union Issues -- Summary

<u>Conservative Position Held Strongly by Union Members and Held by Candidate</u>	<u>Right to Organize & Bargain</u>	<u>Union Issues</u>	
		<u>Cutting Imports</u>	<u>Stronger Health and Safety</u>
1. Against cuts in defense spending			
Against candidate opposing..	70%	59%	61%
For candidate opposing...	12	23	22
Don't know/depends	18	18	18
2. For balanced budget amendment			
Against candidate opposing..	78%	74%	73%
For candidate opposing...	12	12	18
Don't know/depends	11	14	9
3. Against Panama Canal Treaty			
Against candidate opposing..	70%	59%	70%
For candidate opposing...	11	18	18
Don't know/depends	18	23	12
4. Against handgun controls			
Against candidate opposing..	67%	62%	58%
For candidate opposing...	10	18	26
Don't know/depends	24	21	16
5. Against legalized abortion			
Against candidate opposing..	68%	55%	59%
For candidate opposing...	17	24	25
Don't know/depends	15	21	15

but the needs to specified - do the report as a whole who advise nothing federal or simply fails to report

to organize and bargain causes the largest proportion of the union members to say they would vote against that candidate. Cutting imports was the second strongest "union" issue against the balanced budget amendment and handgun controls, while industrial health and safety exerted the second strongest pull away from opposition to defense spending cuts, the Panama Canal Treaty and legalized abortion.

5. Government vs. Business

NOTE ✓
✓
Union members think that government is more to blame for the country's economic problems than is business (Table 46). Fifty percent of union members think economic problems are more the fault of government, 15 percent think they are more the fault of business, 31 percent think government and business are both equally to blame, and 5 percent have no opinion. As might be expected, members of government unions are less inclined to blame government (39%) and more inclined to blame business (21%) or both equally (35%). Union members with family income below \$15,000 are slightly more inclined to blame government (60%) and less likely to blame business or spread the blame equally. Surprisingly, there is little difference between Republican and Democratic union members.

NOTE ✓

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with two different series of arguments, the first typically put forth by candidates who blame government for the country's economic difficulties, and the second series those typically put forth by candidates who blame corporations for the country's economic difficulties. The union members tended to agree with both sets of statements, indicating more ambivalence on the question of who is to blame than was elicited by the previous, more straightforward question.

Eighty-four percent of union members agreed more or less or agreed strongly with the proposition that if government waste and mismanagement were halted, we could cut federal income taxes appreciably without sacrificing government services (Table 51). Seventy-two percent agreed that government health and safety regulations

NOTE ✓