

Ovo, zauzvrat, podrazumeva sposobnost prevladavanja internih konflikata i protivrečnosti putem institucionalnog prestrukturiranja. A njegova praksa treba da bude zasnovana na socijalnoj koheziji i kolektivnoj privrženosti reprodukciji i razvoju socijalističkih vrednosti.

#### WORKER EDUCATION AND WORKER PARTICIPATION: REFLECTIONS ON THE U.S. EXPERIENCE

Alice KESSLER-HARRIS\* and Bertram SILVERMAN\*

Trade Unions in the United States have barely begun to address issues of worker participation and control. The labor movement has had an instrumental view toward work and production. Historically its concern has been with the pay check, or questions of distribution, as opposed to participation in management, or the organization of production. In this respect the United States lags behind many advanced capitalist societies where the focus of activity is shifting from the distribution of the products of labor to a renewed interest in worker participation in the management of production. Why is the United States so far behind? Part of the reason lies in the absence of a "cultural and educational base", to support effective demands for worker participation.<sup>1)</sup> How has the education of workers inhibited the extension of economic democracy? What have been some of the underlying assumptions and characteristics of worker education in the United States? This paper attempts to examine these questions and to explore a new attempt to enhance the ability of education to speak to problems of worker participation.

In the United States the inability to provide an alternative framework for worker education stems in part from the success liberals have had in perpetuating the myth that education is the means toward realizing the ideals of democratic participation. In this view the inherent tension between social class inequality and democratic participation is reduced through individual social mobility to which education is the direct access route. As Ivar Berg has suggested in his *Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery*, for liberals, "formal education has been the equilibrating mechanism in a progressing industrial democracy that has been relatively free of class conflict. It was the liberal who helped to

\*) Hofstra University, Center for the Study of Work and Leisure.

<sup>1)</sup> Interview with William W. Wimpisinger, President, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO, *Challenge*, March/April 1978, p. 48.

A resolution on industrial democracy was passed by the October 1977 Congress of the International Metal Workers Federation (IMF). Among the U.S. unions affiliated with the IMF are: The Automobile Workers, The Steel Workers, The Machinists, The International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

sell America on education and who saw in education the means by which merit might ultimately conquer unearned privilege".<sup>2)</sup>

And yet liberal theory suggests that equality of educational opportunity cannot overcome the inherent inequalities of modern industrial society. Existing divisions between manual and mental labour, between managers and the managed are interpreted as functional requirements of the application of modern science and technology to the production process. Class privilege and power are based on a meritocracy rooted in the technical, scientific and organizational requirements of all advanced industrial systems.<sup>3)</sup> But there is evidence that the distribution of education has served to reproduce the hierarchical division of labour. As Sam Bowles argues, "laws guaranteeing inheritance are not enough to reproduce the social division of labour from generation to generation. Skills and educational credentials must somehow be passed on within the family... schools play an important part in reproducing and legitimizing this modern form of class structure".<sup>4)</sup> Credentials have become the symbols of a new property-right; and instead of providing access to the meritocracy, they effectively limit workers' capacity to participate in the decision making process.

Only recently have Marxists begun to look more closely at how education and skills have been used to perpetuate myths about the inevitability of the unequal distribution of power and authority. While they have attempted to expose the ideological content of liberal analysis, they have been unable to provide a coherent alternative approach to the idea of a meritocracy. On the one hand Marxists have frequently tended to assume that capitalism automatically reproduces among workers both the capacity and values for control. More recently some have developed the notion of a "new working class" which represents a growing stratum of more educated labour demanding greater control over the labour pro-

<sup>2)</sup> Ivar Berg, *Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery*; in Bertalan Silverman and Murray Yanowitch eds., *The Worker in "Post-Industrial" Capitalism Liberal and Radical Responses* (NY: The Free Press, 1974), 214.

<sup>3)</sup> See for example Clark Kerr, John T. Dunlop, Frederick H. Harbison, Charles A. Myers, *Industrialism and Industrial Man* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), Daniel Bell, "On Meritocracy and Equality", *The Public Interest*, Fall 1972.

In some versions of liberal theory, since the acquisition of knowledge depends on innate intelligence, class domination is no longer socially determined but rather "biologically" inevitable. Richard Herrnstein presented the argument in the form of a syllogism.

- (1) If differences in mental abilities are inherited and
- (2) If success requires those abilities and
- (3) If earnings and prestige depend on success,
- (4) Then social standing (which reflects earnings and prestige) will be based to some extent on inherent differences among people.

Richard Herrnstein, "I. Q.," *Atlantic*, September 1971. For evidence refuting this argument see Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, "I. Q. in the U.S. Class Structure," *Social Policy*, November/December 1972, January/February 1973.

<sup>4)</sup> Samuel Bowles, "Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Hierarchical Division of Labour," in Silverman and Yanowitch, eds., *op. cit.*, 220.

cess.<sup>5)</sup> Others see in the changing occupational structure a deskilling process that systematically excludes workers from the knowledge and information of modern industrial society.<sup>6)</sup> The theory, therefore, offers no clear idea of what alternative approach is necessary in preparing workers for greater control over the process of production.

But recent events provide renewed opportunities for a new approach to worker education. Conditions of limited economic growth have raised questions about whether social and occupational mobility are sufficient to contain the conflict between the liberal ideals of democracy and the reality of social and economic inequality. Modern capitalism has greatly expanded both the time workers spend in school and the number of unskilled and fragmented jobs. As a result, education requirements have become inflated, causing considerable dissatisfaction and disillusionment with both the educational process and the work world. Limitations on social mobility open the possibility of a "participatory" model for worker education which derives its legitimacy from the democratic promise of liberal ideology. There is therefore a renewed potential for new forms of education for workers. The important issue is no longer how many years workers spend in school — a figure that has greatly expanded — but the degree to which education provides the skills and values necessary for participation in decision-making.<sup>7)</sup>

<sup>5)</sup> An exponent of the new working class theory, Bogdan Denitch has written recently that "the problem (of the education of workers) has been grossly exaggerated by some critics because of a tendency to place too much emphasis on expertise and formalized training. The modern industrial working class is far better educated than was its 19th-century predecessor, and is no longer willing to concede legitimate authority in the economy based on a supposed monopoly of expertise held by the owners and managers." "Beyond the Welfare State," *Dissent*, Summer, 1973, 355.

<sup>6)</sup> Harry Braverman, *Labour and Monopoly Capitalism* (N. Y.: Monthly Review Press, 1974). Richard C. Edwards, Michael Reich, David M. Gordon, eds., *Labour Market Segmentation* (Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975). Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America* (New York: Basic Books, 1977).

<sup>7)</sup> The most recent data suggests that the median school years completed by workers in most occupation categories is above the high school level. (See table on p. 608).

## OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS 16 YEARS OLD AND OVER, BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, MARCH 1977

OCCUPATION AND SEX	TOTAL EMPLOYED (THOUSANDS)	PERCENT DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED											MEDIAN SCHOOL YEARS COMPLETED
		ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COMPLETED					HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED					COLLEGE	
		LESS THAN 5 YEARS	5	6	7	8	1 to 3	4	5	6	7		
		100.0	1.5	3.4	5.0	16.0	39.7	16.7	10.4	7.3	12.6		
ALL OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS	88,221	100.0	1.5	3.4	5.0	16.0	39.7	16.7	10.4	7.3	12.6		
PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL, AND KINDRED WORKERS	13,642	100.0	1	2	5	2.3	14.2	17.7	31.4	33.6	16.5		
MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, EXCEPT FARM	9,562	100.0	4	1.4	2.7	8.1	33.6	22.4	19.8	11.6	13.5		
SALES WORKERS	5,534	100.0	2	1.0	2.7	13.5	40.2	23.4	15.3	3.8	12.8		
CLERICAL AND KINDRED WORKERS	15,830	100.0	2	.6	1.5	9.8	56.3	23.2	6.8	1.6	12.7		
CRAFT AND KINDRED WORKERS	11,273	100.0	1.4	4.6	7.0	18.8	49.6	14.8	3.1	.8	12.4		
OPERATIVES, EXCEPT TRANSPORT	10,159	100.0	3.3	7.6	9.8	26.3	43.8	7.6	1.3	3	12.1		
TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT OPERATIVES	3,404	100.0	1.6	6.5	9.0	25.3	44.4	10.8	1.9	.6	12.2		
LABORERS, EXCEPT FARM	3,938	100.0	4.8	6.3	8.2	29.9	37.0	11.0	2.6	.2	12.0		
PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD WORKERS	1,120	100.0	5.0	13.3	11.9	36.9	26.1	5.6	.9	.1	10.7		
SERVICE WORKERS, EXCEPT PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD	11,320	100.0	2.0	5.1	6.9	26.8	40.6	14.7	3.0	1.0	12.2		
FARM WORKERS	2,439	100.0	7.5	9.7	14.3	18.6	34.8	8.8	4.8	1.5	12.0		

Historical evidence reveals the dominant role of liberal ideology, the limited influence of a socialist alternative, and the real possibility for a democratic strategy. It demonstrates the difficulties of establishing worker education that does not merely reproduce the existing social division of labor. Public schools were designed to serve the emerging needs of corporate capitalism. For most students, they instilled a suitable work ethic that taught respect for authority, neatness and order, encouraging conformity and rewarding effort and obedience.<sup>8)</sup> In addition to some minimum literacy in language and arithmetic, by the late nineteenth century business interests were demanding the development of a network of manual training schools which would provide a general introduction to industrial skills as well as some specifically vocational training.<sup>9)</sup> In part, these schools were developed to undermine the bargaining power of labor and were at first resisted by trade unionists. But unions acquiesced when they were assured input into curricular content, and the content increasingly focused on developing proper work habits rather than on specific skills. The outcome was a tracking system which reproduced the segmentation of the labour market. One track was to prepare the future work force; the other was to select out a limited number of students destined to enter professional and technical managerial strata. The end result was to produce schools with narrowly based subject offerings, and classes with increasingly low expectations of students from working class backgrounds.<sup>10)</sup>

Organized labour did not resist these trends. The development of the public school system paralleled labour's early compromises with corporate managerial control. After the turn of the century, the mainstream trade union movement paid little attention to the organization of production, permitting itself only a limited role in worker/management decisions. It could and did work toward legislative amelioration of some of the excesses of industrial capitalism. Workmen's compensation for accidents, unemployment insurance, minimum wages and maximum hours have been achieved in this way. But the unions gave up the possibility of influencing the use and direction of new technology, and their ability to respond to the incursion of efficiency techniques became merely defensive. Workers could, and to a limited extent did, share in the economic gains of increased productivity. But the social costs of particular new technologies were beyond their range to influence and quickly became beyond their knowledge even to discuss. For the most permanent debilitating effect of the emerging relationship was that corporations were free to gather into their hands, unchallenged, the expertise and information essential to making intelligent choices about economic directions.<sup>11)</sup> Under the aegis of scientific management (which assumed

<sup>8)</sup> See for example David C. MacMichael, "Occupational Bias in Formal Education and its Effect on Preparing Children for Work," James O'Toole, ed., *Work and the Quality of Life* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1974), pp. 281-98.

<sup>9)</sup> Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957* (N.Y.: Vintage Books, 1964), pp. 36-41.

<sup>10)</sup> Colin Greer, *The Great School Legend* (N.Y.: Basic Books, 1972).

<sup>11)</sup> Harry Braverman, *op. cit.*

full strength and energy in the U.S. in the first two decades of the twentieth century), hierarchical structures clamped down tightly over the organization of the work process; manual skills were reduced to obsolescence by mass production techniques.

The trade union movement was now doubly restricted. Except on questions of distribution, it had largely given up challenges to management about the organization of production, and it had minimal input into an educational process that might have prepared workers for greater understanding of, and participation in, economic life.

Under these circumstances alternative worker education systems were proposed and developed by people eager to preserve working class identity and to resist the unfolding corporate liberal educational policies. Part of a larger movement to develop an independent socialist political presence in the U.S., before World War I, these worker education schools drew support from socialists, educators, women, and a few local unions—most from the needle trades with a heritage of social unionism. They aimed to develop the class consciousness of workers and to prepare them for changing the social order.<sup>12)</sup> After the First World War, socialist perception was influenced by an increasing admiration of scientific technology and the organization of production of advanced capitalism which many felt could be readily transplanted to a socialist society. Their education programs did not directly challenge the dominant trends in public education of workers or the unfolding occupational division of labor.

By 1921, about 200 programs directed toward working adults were supported by a variety of universities, trade unions and philanthropic groups. Although each group defined its objectives differently, curricula stressed general education with special emphasis on the social sciences and humanities. Students were recruited individually both from without and within trade unions. Most of the schools were residential, with programs varying in duration from summer sessions lasting four to eight weeks to a single college with a two year curriculum. In its early years, until the end of the 1920's, the worker education movement was supported both financially and administratively by groups and individuals on the periphery of, or outside, the trade union movement.

But the potentials of such a movement were limited by the industrial relations system nurtured by corporate capitalism and which guided the worker education movement until the 1960's. Under the system, whose outlines had emerged in the early part of the century, conflict was regarded as a formal contest between legally recognized parties, each of whom agreed to delimit its field of action and to recognize the legitimate claims of its adversary-partner. The legitimate actors were unions, management and state authorities, rather than social classes and strata in the production process. The system was institutionalized du-

<sup>12)</sup> In addition to the "labour temples" — informal training centers that had existed since the 1880's — Local 25 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union ran classes of all kinds as early as 1905, and the Women's Trade Union League conducted training sessions for women. The Rand School was founded in 1906 by the Socialist Party of America. See Richard E. Dwyer, *Labour Education in the U.S.: An Annotated Bibliography* (Metuchen, N. J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1977), 2—8.

ring the economic crisis of the 1930's and the Second World War. Trade unions were integrated into a complex bureaucratic system of collective bargaining involving large corporate structures and the government.<sup>13)</sup>

When the relative affluence of the 1920's receded into the depression of the 1930's, many worker education schools simply collapsed for lack of funds. Others, seeking help from organized labor, were transformed to serve the practical needs of the trade union movement in the new era of institutionalized collective bargaining. Some trade unions, particularly in the newly formed CIO industrial unions, began to develop their own educational departments to serve their organizational needs. The legal and economic environment of formalized and bureaucratic collective bargaining demanded more highly skilled trade union leaders. Labour education began to emphasize leadership training, and membership loyalty to the union. The basic objective of labor education was to train members "in the functional day to day aspects of collective bargaining".<sup>14)</sup> The curriculum increasingly stressed utilitarian "tool" subjects like grievance procedures, public speaking, parliamentary procedures, etc.

To serve these needs, and "to promote harmony and cooperation between management and labor",<sup>15)</sup> state universities began in the 1940's to develop labour education centers. Primarily training grounds for management, they offered extension programs for trade unions. Unlike earlier worker education programs, courses in these new Industrial and Labour Relations Institutes tended to be brief residency summer programs usually a week or two long. Students were recruited from within their respective trade unions, and the programs were financed and administered either directly by the trade unions or by the state through the extension division of a public university. These labour education programs still form the predominant mode of post-secondary schooling for union leadership.

In recent years, a new kind of tension has provoked interest in broader education for working adults. Unlike earlier socialist and liberal initiatives, the new trend is part of the democratic impulse that has emerged from outside the trade union movement. Yet, unions have had to be responsive to it. One result has been an increased demand for higher education on the part of groups traditionally left out: newly activated and politicized blacks, the poor, young people, and women. Adults previously deprived of education are now seeking credentials for advancement. In an effort to bring reality to the promise of occupational and social mobility, labor began to encourage the development of broader education programs for its members.

The expansion of education in the 1950's has intensified the potential contradictions in the liberal ideal of a meritocracy as the means for achieving greater social and economic democracy. The emphasis on

<sup>13)</sup> For an early discussion of this trend see Daniel Bell, "The Capitalism of the Proletariat," in *The End of Ideology* (N. Y.: The Free Press, 1960), 211—33.

<sup>14)</sup> Agnes Douy, *American Workers' Education in Action* (Paris, Economic Cooperation Administration), cited in Dwyer, *op. cit.*, 10.

<sup>15)</sup> Public Laws 307, Statutes of the State New Jersey, 1947, cited in *ibid.*, 11.



schooling and higher education has undermined the work ethic and raised working class aspirations about more meaningful and rewarding work. The discontents of various groups in the 1960's were not a result of the economic breakdown of capitalism but were directed at capitalism functioning at its best: not, as Harry Braverman suggests, at its failure to provide work but at the quality of work provided.<sup>16</sup> A longer run impact of the enormous growth of higher education since World War II may be the development of a more culturally homogenized and nationally organized labour force unwilling to accept the basic values of an imposed work ethic and work structure.<sup>17</sup>

Efforts at increasing participation on the part of the educationally deprived have stimulated new initiatives in the education of workers. A new movement, sometimes referred to as "labor studies", has begun in a limited way to reassert the older traditions of "worker education". While these programs are not part of a socialist alternative, they go beyond the narrow utilitarian ends of the traditional collective bargaining and management courses and attempt to develop a more integrated program exploring the larger relationships of workers' work and non-work lives. Most of these programs are university related and many have begun to offer courses that vary from basic tool subjects to advanced degrees.<sup>18</sup> They have grown out of the rapid expansion of university education in the U.S. and reflect both the university's desire to make enrollment gains in the face of a declining college-age population, and increasing pressure on the part of the trade union movement to share in the seeming benefits of educational credentials.

To some extent these labour studies programs tend to confirm the traditional direction of the trade union movement. Their emphasis on individual opportunities contrasts sharply with the social change models of the 1920's. Their existence on the periphery of university life—in part-time extension courses, nondegree programs, and evening schools, keeps them in a perennially second-class status, underfunded and without respect. They provide the appearance of credentials without the substance.

Despite their weaknesses, labour studies programs carry the seeds of a possible redirection of worker education towards education for greater democratic participation. The Labour Institute of Applied Social Science, founded in 1975 at Hofstra University in New York, has attempted to nurture these seeds and provides some insights as to the preconditions for their growth.

The reopening of a dialogue between universities and unions, if it has so far manifested itself in education directed largely toward individuals ends, does not need to remain so. The participatory ideal offers an alternative to the "mobility" conception of worker education as a means of fulfilling the promise of a democratic society. In this view of worker education, as the Institute's Advisory Committee put it, "the economic status of workers is unlikely to change but their competence as ci-

<sup>16</sup> Harry Braverman, *op. cit.*

<sup>17</sup> Christopher Jenks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1969), pp. 146-51.

<sup>18</sup> Lois S. Gray, "Academic Degrees for Labour Studies: A New Goal for Unions," *Monthly Labour Review*, June 1977, pp. 15-20.

tizens, as educated men and women, as participants in the life of their union will be the principal channels through which their educational experience will find expression"<sup>19</sup>) Education not only serves the interest of the workers as an individual but also as a member of a social class. At the Institute of Applied Social Science, we make explicit our goal: to offer workers the educational and cultural prerequisites for more effective participation and leadership in their union, work place and community.

A second opportunity provided by the new labour studies programs is intrinsic in academic/trade union collaboration in the liberal arts area. Such collaboration helps link the university ideals of critical thinking to the practice of the labor movement. Workers through such a collaboration can integrate the experience of their organization with more theoretical classroom learning, and can explore more fully the limits and possibilities of worker organization. Moreover, collaboration offers the possibility of using a problem-solving approach in the curriculum. This is an important part of getting workers to do social science rather than to be passive recipients of knowledge. Most significantly the social problems approach shows students how knowledge can be organized and used to effect change within their institutions and communities.

Moreover, working closely with trade unions offers quicker possibilities of overcoming some of the cultural barriers that have prevented workers from taking advantage of university education. In the Institute of Applied Social Science, we have taken advantage of this opportunity to offer classes in the trade union headquarters. This has the advantage of introducing additional support systems and a familiar learning setting, and of providing a rich resource for practical learning. It also helps to reinforce a sense of community and solidarity among our learners.

A third interestice opened by the labor studies approach is in the area of curricular content. In opening the university to organized workers, labour studies programs have legitimized degree work in areas equivalent to those long provided for business. Although most universities have dealt with this by shuttling labor studies into extension and evening divisions, the curricular content of even the most traditional labor studies programs raises question about whether it is as legitimate to train labor leaders to reorder the distribution of authority and rewards of production as it is to train business leaders to become profit maximizers.<sup>20</sup>)

<sup>19</sup>) *Report of the Meeting of the Consultation Advisory and Evaluation Committee*, December 4, 1976, Russell Allen, Herbert Gutman, Ivar Berg, Summer Rosen (chairman), mimeo.

<sup>20</sup>) Herbert A. Levine, "Union-University and Inter-University Cooperation in Workers' Education in the United States," *The Role of Universities in Workers' Education* (Geneva: International Labour Organization, 1974), pp. 172-201.

For an honest and explicit recognition of the role of business schools see also Lester C. Thurow, *Economics 1977, Daedalus*, p. 118. "Business managers are convinced that they ought to profit maximize and are taught how to profit maximize. Economists are in a peculiar position in that if they are completely successful in their preaching function they will be completely successful in their scientific function because they will have created the world they seek to describe, predict, understand, and influence".

In emphasizing education for self-knowledge, the labor studies approach returns to an earlier emphasis on humanistic thought. In most labor studies programs this is translated into encouraging worker/students to select from a typical college's vast offerings in the humanities disciplines. But it offers the possibility of creating special courses that explore culture and the humanities as they relate directly to working life. Since the Second World War there has been an accelerated breakdown of working-class communities and culture in the U.S. Workers are not only alienated from the work but also from community affiliations. Reestablishing a greater understanding of working-class cultural traditions is therefore an essential prerequisite of the participatory model of worker education. A central part of the curriculum and the activities of the Institute is the establishment of a humanities and cultural program particularly as they relate to an understanding of the commonality and diversity of workers' traditions and culture and their relationship to the mainstream of our cultural heritage. This includes not only the teaching of culture but worker and trade union participation in the creation of the arts.

Finally, 1960's demands that higher education be made available to the poorest sectors of U.S. society even if they were poorly prepared academically, created a host of state and federal financial aid programs and university sponsored remedial learning centers. These attempts to overcome the effects of social and economic discrimination have persisted into the seventies. They provide the ideological justification and the economic foundation for breaking down the public school tracking system. They sustain trade union demands for credentials for their members, and they legitimize the collection of educational funds by unions to enable members to continue their education. State and federal aid programs have made it possible for us to develop, with two trade unions, programs that involve full-time study for their members.

The Labour Institute rejected the traditional method of conducting programs entirely during evenings and on weekends. Such programs have been established in the New York region for workers who can at best normally attend classes part-time. To achieve full-time attendance by simply rescheduling class time would undermine educational integrity. Most workers with jobs and family responsibilities cannot fulfill the requirements of full-time study. We also rejected an individual tutorial approach, as well as one that reduced classroom hours, because we felt that student faculty interaction and field-based study were more effective vehicles for achieving our objective of developing skills and encouraging practice in participation.

The approach adopted by the Institute and cooperating trade unions turned instead to the problem of working time. Students who wished to attend the program full time are given paid released time from work. Released time brings into sharper focus the opportunity costs of attending school. These costs include the sacrifice of lost income, of family life, of community and union activities that are entailed when a fulltime worker also attends school full time. Released time from work reduces these alternative costs to the student. Equally important, the released time approach involves employers in the cost-sharing process for, wherever possible, they bear the cost of time off for schooling. Thus, the cost of

schooling becomes a shared responsibility of the union, employer, worker and university and the demand for paid released time from work can become part of a democratic strategy to reduce the working day as part of labor's demand for greater participation in education and society at large.

We will not undertake a critical evaluation of our experiences here, except to indicate that we have become more aware of the constraints that limit qualitative changes in educating workers for more effective participation. Enormous effort is required to overcome the educational backwardness of workers. And while we have received considerable support to overcome some of these problems, continuous resistance surrounds our efforts. Worker education will remain on the periphery of university life unless it gains wider support from the labor movement and its sympathizers. This is unlikely short of a larger movement for restructuring economic power and authority.

Despite our ability to structure a situation which enhances learning for participation, we are not sanguine about its future, nor about the possibility of its serving as a model. The resurgence of a powerful conservative trend with its accompanying anti-democratic influence in American society, augurs ill for participatory education. Corporate leaders are already suggesting that educational planning should be more closely related to economic and political goals "either by reducing job expectations or redesigning education for more limited job opportunities".<sup>21)</sup>

The turn, recently, to career education seems to be an attempt to re-create the work ethic—to reduce working-class aspirations and reestablish appropriate attitudes toward work. These programs reduce the liberal arts emphasis on critical thinking and reassert a closer link between more limited work opportunities and education. Business leaders have begun aggressively to reestablish their influence over universities by pouring money into professorships in business.<sup>22)</sup> Campaigns for "quality" education seem designed to exclude some of the disadvantaged to whom doors were opened in the late sixties. The anti-democratic trend was articulated by the Trilateral Commission in May 1975... when it suggested that "the problems of government in the United States stem from an excess of democracy... The claims of expertise, seniority, experience and special talents may override the claims of democracy as a way of constituting authority".<sup>23)</sup>

In the face of this opposition the struggle to achieve the democratic ideal could become a major priority for both liberals and radicals. Worker education can be an important element in this endeavor. Proponents of worker education must be more explicit about the demand to redistribute education, information and culture. These demands may be the most significant strategy for achieving a self-governing economy.

<sup>21)</sup> Michael Crozier, Joji Watenuki, Samuel P. Huntington, eds., *The Crisis of Democracy* (N. Y.: New York University Press, 1975), 184. This report was prepared for the Trilateral Commission and discussed during the plenary meeting of the Commission in Kyoto, Japan, May 31, 1975.

<sup>22)</sup> For recent reports on these developments see for example *The New York Times*, Section 3, July 16, 1978, pp. 1, 9 and *The Wall Street Journal*, May 10, 1978, p. 1.

<sup>23)</sup> *The Crisis of Democracy*, op. cit., 113.

They provide the basis of support for substantive reorganization of control and authority—reorganization that goes beyond formal structures, such as work councils, and the extension of parliamentary procedures to touch the critical knowledge and values essential for true participation. If the recent democratic impulse in worker education is limited to polytechnical or vocational education, as has been suggested by some Marxists, the result will be to restrict participation to the workshop level and to leave the "big" questions to economic and political elites. Modern economies will require decision making at a variety of levels: firms, industries, community, region, nation. Increasing leisure will entail the workers' concern with nonwork as well as working life and their interaction. Therefore, decision making will involve continuing conflicts over group and regional interests, over means as well as normative ends. Education should prepare workers toward these ends.

Not all workers can become men and women of all seasons but the redistribution of knowledge should provide procedures and structures that can emulate that ideal. While acknowledging the necessity of formal organizational structures in order to avoid the abuses of "personalismo" worker education must help to develop the facilities to hold experts accountable. To do so, worker education must be more than "technocratic." It must provide the "enlightened understanding" that will enable workers' preferences, needs and interests to be effectively articulated.<sup>24</sup> Only thus, can the democratic ideal be preserved as the basis for challenging the existing unequal distribution of economic power.

#### RADNIČKO OBRAZOVANJE I RADNIČKA PARTICIPACIJA: REFLEKSIJE O AMERIČKOM ISKUSTVU

Alice KESSLER-HARRIS i Bertram SILVERMAN

#### R e z i m e

Članak se bavi realnim pretpostavkama i karakteristikama radničkog obrazovanja u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama. Autori ispituju nivo ponašanja da se povećava sposobnost obrazovanja da rešava probleme radničke participacije.

Liberalna misao u Sjedinjenim Državama smatra da obrazovanje može redukovati imanentne napetosti koje postoje između nejednakosti društvenih klasa i demokratske participacije. Prema ovoj koncepciji, obrazovanje je sredstvo pomoću koga stvarne zasluge (vrline i sposobnosti) mogu u krajnjoj liniji nadvladati neopravdane privilegije. Međutim, podaci pokazuju da je distribucija obrazovanja služila reprodukciju društvenih klasa i hijerarhijske podele rada, a školski uspeh postao je simbol novih svojinskih prava. Marksistička teorija se još uvek nije uhvatila u koštac s idejom meritokratije. S jedne strane, ona smatra da

<sup>24</sup>) Robert A. Dahl, "On Removing Certain Impediments to Democracy in the United States," *Dissent*, Summer, 1978.

kapitalizam automatski reprodukuje sposobnosti i vrednosti potrebne za kontrolu (upravljanje). S druge strane, neki marksisti u promenama profesionalne strukture vide proces smanjenja nivoa znanja i veština koji sistematski udaljuje radnike od znanja i informacija o modernom industrijskom društvu.

Istorijsko iskustvo ukazuje na dominantnu ulogu liberalne ideologije, organičen uticaj socijalističke alternative i realne mogućnosti za demokratsku strategiju. Rani istorijski modeli radničkog obrazovanja pokazuju da su pod uticajem modela društvene promene. Međutim, u poslednje vreme organizovani rad teži tretiranju obrazovanja kao ograničenog utilitarnog sredstva za kolektivno pregovaranje i sindikalno organizovanje.

Uslovi nešto ograničenijeg ekonomskog rasta, uključujući ograničenja u pogledu socijalne mobilnosti, otvaraju mogućnosti za »participativni« model radničkog obrazovanja koji izvodi svoju legitimnost iz demokratskih obećanja liberalne ideologije. Model razvijen u Hofstra University Labour Institute of Applied Social Science kombinuje četiri osnovna elementa. On nudi redovan program fakultetskog obrazovanja za radnike koji je zasnovan na principu plaćenog odsustva. To je program koji se realizuje u saradnji sindikata i univerziteta i koji primenjuje praktična iskustva radničkog pokreta u kritičkoj analizi teorijskog materijala. Ovaj program kombinuje solidne osnove oblasti društvenih nauka sa profesionalnim (stručnim) znanjima iz organizacije i vođstva. Konačno, njegova komponenta humanističkih nauka i umetnosti treba da obezbedi veće razumevanje kulture i tradicija etnički i rasno raznovrsne radne populacije. Ovi elementi formiraju osnovu demokratske strategije radničkog obrazovanja koja može biti deo šireg pokreta za ostvarenje samoupravnog društva.